**QUESTION NO.1**

**The relationship between Iran and Pakistan started in the 1980s**

The relationships between Pakistan and Iran have been characterized by profound hostility together with philosophical disagreements and outside political influences. The geopolitical landscape following September 11 and Iranian outreach in Pakistan along with the impact of the Iranian Revolution transformed the sectarian relationship into a multifaceted bond between the two countries since the 1980s.

1. **Arab Participation in the Afghan Resistance and the Shia-Sunni Conflict Following the Iranian Revolution**

Under the time of the 1979 Iranian revolution, the country implemented significant changes to its general foreign policy while reforming relations with Pakistan as well as worldwide nations. The establishment of Shi'a Iran under Khomeini and the downfall of the Shah created new Islamic political actors throughout the Muslim world. Khomeini introduced his revolutionary doctrine by exporting the Islamic revolution which damaged Sunni regimes including Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

The religious divide between Sunnis and Shias in Pakistan grew worse because of the Iranian Revolution. Pakistan believed Iran's support of Shi'a political parties and religious groups inside its country amounted to interfering in its domestic matters. Through its financial and spiritual sponsorship, Saudi Arabia enabled Sunni extremist groups that were funded to  conduct a campaign against the ever-growing influence of Iran. Nawaz Sharif  invested in Wahhabi and Deobandi madrasas during General Zia-ul-Haq times, which led to the rise of sectarianism in Pakistan.

The duration of Soviet-Afghan War from 1979 to 1989 made sectarian warfare reach its most extreme point. While the Soviet conquest of the Afghanistan in late years 1979 and early 1980, Pakistan selected Afghan Sunni Mujahideen to receive funding from Saudi Arabia and the United States.

Iranian government chose to advance support for Afghan Hazara refugees who fall under the Shi'ite sect. The realignment of alliances created increased sectarian tensions within Pakistan resulting in a dramatic surge of sectarian attacks on Shi'a community leaders along with counterattacks against them. As tensions between Iran and Pakistan increased during this period, sectarian violence became officially implemented.  
Iran saw Pakistan as a revolutionary base that actively fought a battle against its authority over the region as a result of the growing cooperation between Pakistan and its allies, Saudi Arabia and the United States. Due to these various considerations and problems, Iran decided to support the Taliban in their conflict with its Afghan neighbours throughout the 1990s. These neighbours were hostile against one other regarding future developments in Afghanistan as a result of Saudi Arabia's policy support for Pakistan regarding the country while alienating Iran.

1. **Following the Arab Challenge in Afghanistan, Iranian soft power began to emerge in Pakistan.**

Throughout the 1980s, Pakistan operated with the assistance of ISI (Inter-Services Intelligence) despite growing difficulties brought on by geopolitical biases and sectarian conflicts. The Iranian leadership started gradually interacting with the Pakistani government to increase their presence after realizing that conflict was a defensive tactic. Iran's primary soft power strategy involved using Islamic teachings to influence Pakistani Shi'a intellectuals and their citizens through cultural, religious, and economic initiatives. Iran succeeded in spreading Persian cultural practices together with Shi'a educational insights throughout Pakistan. Through its financial support program, Iran funded religious Shi'a seminaries and madrasa education and built cultural canters inside Shi'a population areas which include Parachinar and Gilgit Baltistan as well as Karachi sections.

Iran established an academic program where they provided opportunities for educational scholarships which permitted Pakistani students to attend Qom's religious institutions to receive training in Tehran's revolutionary framework. Iran made the first step in contact without limiting it to religious objectives. The Iranian leadership sought to build diplomatic, cultural, and political ties by using university collaborations media outlets, and diplomatic initiatives. Following Saudi Sunni propaganda Iran delivered Shi'a religious materials through Urdu language publications and developed its state broadcasting entities, especially Press TV. As Iran's central goal, it projected itself forward to lead Muslim nations in their fight against imperial colonial power while spreading its Shi'a political beliefs.

Iran pursued economic integration with Pakistan by means of constructing the Iran-Pakistan (IP) gas pipeline project. The project started to address Pakistan's persistent energy crisis with a mission to establish future economic relationships. Political factors such as sanctions imposed by the United States and other allies on Iran, as well as pressure from Saudi Arabia, put an end to the project. These hurdles are obvious in the pipeline, demonstrating Iran's commitment to strengthening bilateral economic cooperation. Iran's soft power efforts were met with widespread criticism due to the strong Saudi-Pak connection and the greater Sunni Islamic world. Saudi financial help, as well as religious and political power in Pakistan, overwhelmed Iran's efforts to achieve the same.

Iran works to maintain its aspirations while bolstering its influence throughout Pakistan against Saudi dominance, actively promoting religious and cultural influence among oppressed Shiites.

1. **Geopolitical Conflict and Cooperation Post-9/11**

Pakistan-Iran relations entered a new phase after 9/11, one that was defined by both constructive cooperation and sometimes tense moments. The geopolitical characteristics of the South Asian region were altered by the US forces' deployment and cooperation in Afghanistan in 2001. Although each Afghan state had direct interests in its neighbours, they continuously maintained antagonistic relationships with one another. Due to the hardline Sunni movement's aggressive pursuit of the Shi'a Hazara Afghan minority community, which was supported by Iran, the Taliban rose to prominence in the mid-1990s, dividing Afghanistan and Iran into deadly enemies. Following the Taliban's demise, Iran discovered that its policies and those of the US and, indirectly, Pakistan shared priorities. The Taliban and other Sunni terrorist organizations have historically received support, which has led to major. Iran became concerned about security threats that specifically targeted its Sistani and Baluchistan provinces as a result of Pakistan's financing actions towards umbrella Sunni organizations. The Iranian government accused Pakistan of harboring and aiding Sunni rebel organizations, such as Jundullah, who attacked Iranian security forces.

Cross-border operations conducted by Iran against these groups resulted in international challenges. These events exposed how difficult it is to secure the unregulated border between Pakistan and Iran.

Both countries fully acknowledged that functional partnership in their shared geographic area needed immediate development. The states conducted official negotiations aimed to tackle issues including border protection as well as economic exchange. The countries exchanged information about terrorist activities and border terrorism in Pakistan together with information about drug smuggling networks. The Pakistani government worked simultaneously to preserve diplomatic ties between the country Saudi Arabia and the Iran as well as between Iran and the United States to stop potential Iranian action. The rise upward of the Islamic State was a matter of the concern for both nations operating in the area. The security risk from ISIS threatens all members of both Sunni and Shi'a communities causing these groups to unite in their demand for protection. Border relations between Iran and Pakistan received stabilization through talks aimed at controlling extremism's spreading influence across both countries.

**QUESTION NO. 2**

**The Multifaceted Nature of the India-Pakistan Conflict**

An in-depth analysis concerning India-Pakistan difficulties appears in the book The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry by T.V. Paul. Countries Pakistan and India have maintained hostile relations throughout many decades since their partition in 1947. These state actors' shared disagreements over historical disputes, political-economic views, geographical needs, and their shared pursuit of power domination are the reasons behind their ongoing animosity. Identity, nuclear war, the influence of major world powers, the Kashmir issue, and postcolonial institutions are the five primary variables that Paul claims make up the inter-state conflict. Every element mentioned has had a significant impact on the current conflict between India and Pakistan and shows no indications of abating in terms of their dynamics of reciprocal relationships.

1. **Identity Conflict**

When India and Pakistan were divided, they both went through a severe identity crisis. Pakistan was founded on the principle that Muslims and Hindus could not coexist in the same state, according to the Two-Nation Theory. From this ideology, an anti-Indian identity emerged in Pakistan, exhibiting both anti-democratic and anti-pluralist inclinations along with religious and organic components. T.V. Paul claims that the 'Other' conceptions that shaped Pakistan's national identity development have created a clear 'us-them' divide.

An excellent example of how people define themselves to others is the Kashmir issue. Kashmir's geographic and demographic characteristics make it important to Pakistan since it represents a lasting manifestation of Islamic cultural continuity from the time of the subcontinent's partition. Kashmir became a pluralist, multireligious state as a result of India's secularism and internal political stability.

The conflicting identities of India and Pakistan are revealed by the dispute over Kashmiri territory. Because Kashmir is predominantly inhabited by Muslims and thus is part of Pakistan's Islamic identity, the Kashmir issue serves as a reminder to Pakistan that the Indian subcontinent's partition is still unfinished. India interprets this land territory as proof of its secular structure which ensures that occupied Kashmir fits within an integrated state having multiple religions and ethnicities. Indian politics views any settlement about Kashmir as a threat to national integrity because the issue questions secular principles while Pakistan's survival depends on controlling Kashmir as an independent state.

Religious extremist movements in both countries have exacerbated the identification issue. Despite strengthening Pakistan's Islamic public identity, Zia Ul Haq's Islamic initiatives during his military leadership in the 1980s exacerbated religious tensions. Hindu nationalist groups gained traction in Indian politics during this time, strengthening the BJP's hold on power while deteriorating ties between the two nations. The two nations' rival nationalist disputes divided their populace into hostile factions, making any form of reconciliation nearly difficult. Currently, this identity dispute extends outside of Kashmir's boundaries. Pakistan continues opposition to India in South Asian activities while also acting as a global Muslim ally.

The Indian government portrays itself to the world as a democratic, secular country aiming to become a global leader. The widening divide between the groups has strengthened antagonistic ties, intensifying their mistrust and animosity against one another.

1. **Role of Major Powers**

India and Pakistan are currently engaged in a geopolitical power struggle, with significant international powers taking part in the fight. Because the US and the USSR waged their conflict between the political and military spheres, South Asia's strategic landscape changed throughout the Cold War. The United States backed Pakistan as a strategic tool to counter the expansion of Soviet foreign policy, but India looked to the Soviet Union for diplomatic and military ties. China followed suit with more aid after Pakistan received substantial military and financial help from the United States.

To enable Pakistan to combat India during the 1965 conflict, the United States sent Pakistan military training and equipment during the 1950s and 1960s. China established a strategic partnership with Pakistan as a result of the Sino-Indian War of 1962, providing the Pakistani military with cutting-edge military systems.

In sectors like nuclear and missile technologies, which were essential in building Pakistan's nuclear infrastructure, China's aid proved beneficial. In contrast, the Soviet Union consistently supported India, which resulted in the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation being signed in 1971. Over the course of the Bangladesh Liberation War India received major military backing from this alliance which let them defeat Pakistan and enable the expansion of Bangladesh. Soviet Union cooperation made India avoid international disputes thus it received a major strategic advantage against Pakistan.

The later phase of history presented itself in a completely different way. The evolving economic situation of both nations together with Chinese dominance concerns drove America to develop closer relations with India A 2008 U.S.-India civil nuclear agreement served as a direct indication to Washington about India's rising power capabilities. After 9/11 Pakistan received mainly counter-terrorism assistance in its relationship with United States which operated on pragmatic level.

China maintained its solid support for Pakistan throughout international developments. The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor under China's Belt and Road development strategy has sped up all communication between the nations. The Chinese look at Pakistan as their key partner against India in their diplomatic struggle, but Pakistan needs China economically and militarily as their main supporter. The major power status between India and Pakistan shapes their strategic relationship leading to occasional challenges to peace-building initiatives.

1. **Role of Nuclear Weapons**

Nuclear weapon deployment between India and Pakistan changed the strategic foundation of their rivalry. India and Pakistan publicly announced their status as nuclear powers in 1998 yet concealed the nuclear program development through secrets for a prolonged period. Nuclear weapon strategic usage led to a new strategic situation described as stability-instability dilemma because all-out conflict gets avoided through such strategic employment, but small wars become feasible for states that know they will not trigger nuclear retaliation.

Pakistan intensifies its defensive measures within Kashmir as both neighbouring countries now have nuclear arsenals. The Kargil conflict of 1999 allowed Pakistan to use its nuclear deterrent successfully against Indian plans for a large-scale attack in the Kargil sector of the Indian-administered area. Pakistan engages in Kashmir terrorism because it views satisfying regional actors as its top priority when it serves as a nuclear state.

India exhibits reaction restraint to Pakistani provocations because of the known nuclear threat from its rival nation. India maintains no first use and defensive deterrence policies, yet Pakistan continues to operate with an ambiguous nuclear policy with potential pre-emptive nuclear weapon deployment. India demonstrates limited response in counterterrorism operations against domestic terrorism which includes both the 2001 Indian Parliament attack and the 2008 Mumbai attacks.

The cooperation dynamics changed because Pakistan obtained tactical nuclear weapons and India developed its missile defense system. The strife between the two nations exists as a disturbing global situation because both countries have acquired destructive nuclear capabilities but continue to engage in intermittent battles.

1. **Kashmir Issue**

It is needless to say that the Kashmir dispute is the primary issue of conflict between the India and the Pakistan. After the Attack on Pakistani tribes in 1947, the state of Jammu and Kashmir chose to opt for accession with India, which set the stage for a number of hostilities and a three-decade-long war. Both nations have an emotional connection to Kashmir which makes the relationship between the two countries deeper and more intriguing.

Pakistan considers Kashmir as a Muslim-majority region that, in accordance with the country’s ethos, rightfully belongs to Pakistan. Contrarily, India considers Kashmir as a region of a multi-religious and multi-ethnic national identity. The unilateral change of status and nullification of Article 370 in the August event of 2019 has served to markedly increase tension between the nations, especially after Pakistan perceived it to be an effort at greatly increase Indian control in the area.

The Shimla Agreement of 1972 and the Lahore Declaration of 1999 are two examples of these initiatives; they were all unsuccessful due to a lack of confidence. Local indignation was triggered by Pakistan's hostile stance of supporting the insurgency in Kashmir throughout the 1990s, as well as by the armed forces and persecution of Indian authorities. One of the fundamental arguments for Pakistan's military superiority and one of the most enticing aspects of Pakistani nationalism is still the Kashmir issue.

1. **Role of Post-Colonial Institutions**

Keep optimism alive since the India-Pakistan war is affected by the colonial history in many ways. A combination of speed and inadequate preparation led to the British granting their "freedom dividend," which resulted in fresh territorial conflicts and more intense communal divisions. Since Pakistan's weak political institutions led to a military dictatorship, this paper showed why conflict with India is a crucial state security strategy.

India has continuously had a higher rate of population increase than Pakistan, but its political system's shortcomings—such as erratic political parties and bureaucratic corruption—have made it more difficult to resolve disputes. The military took the place of the diplomatic corps in both nations, which were left over from colonial-era institutions that put security before diplomacy. Because of the ongoing institutionalization of mistrust, there are few prospects for conflict transformation and resolution.

**CONCLUSION**

The conflict between the two nation-states, the India and the Pakistan, has never examined so clearly and completely, according to T.V. Paul's analysis in The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Struggle. The dispute has persisted for seven decades due to a variety of factors, including the definition and status of grievances, the structural and the behavioural issues, the Great Power interventions, the nuclear dimension, LoC and Line of Control, and postcolonial which is institutional frameworks. Such trend-setting issues must be addressed and managed as part of consistent diplomatic and confidence-building communication, as well as a coordinated Asian effort, to aid in overcoming this rivalry. The India-Pakistan dispute will continue to be one of the most complicated and enduring bilateral crises in the world unless there is adequate political will and institutional change.

**QUESTION NO. 3**

**Critical Assessment of Pakistan’s Foreign Policy under Imran Khan**

A new era in Pakistan's foreign policy began when Imran Khan served as prime minister from 2018 to 2022. The strategy adopted by this administration prioritized economic diplomacy, increased membership in international contacts with different regions of the world, and maintained the traditional members of the seven (7) societies. Khan claims that Pakistan is a peaceful country that strives for regional stability. However, his foreign policy was full of contradictions, he lacked a grand strategic vision, and it was largely talk with little action.

1. **Regional Relations and Strategic Balancing**

**Relations with India:**

Prime Minister Imran Khan of Pakistan first pursued diplomatic relations with India, as evidenced by the Kartarpur Corridor's launch in November 2019, which granted Indian Sikh minorities visa-free access to Pakistan. Following India's removal of Article 370 to change the status of Jammu and Kashmir, relations worsened. The move overseas was vigorously opposed by Khan's government, but it garnered little support, underscoring his government's poor diplomatic efforts.

**Afghanistan Policy:**

Afghan perceptions indicate that Khan's strategy was intended to guarantee support for the peace process. The Doha Deal was signed in 2020 as a consequence of Pakistan's assistance to the US in mediating peace negotiations with the Taliban. But when Taliban extremists took control of the nation in 2021, Pakistan lost all authority over Afghanistan, proving the situation. The Pakistani party was polite and applauded the US withdrawal because it was thought to be in favour of the Taliban.

**Balancing Saudi Arabia and Iran:**

The kingdom's precarious twin relationships with Saudi Arabia and Iran were among the most difficult aspects of managing ties. Khan tried to serve as a go-between for these two adversaries, but Pakistan's reliance on Saudi Arabia for financial support made this untenable. His brief attendance at the December 2019 Kuala Lumpur Summit almost caused tensions with Saudi Arabia, forcing him to leave.

**China-Pakistan Economic Relations**

Throughout his tenure from 2018 to 2022, the CPEC remained the most factor which is important in the Pakistan's foreign policy. His government sought to expand CPEC beyond infrastructure development to include industrial and agricultural development. Bureaucratic problems and security concerns—particularly violent threats against Chinese residents—have hampered growth. Pakistan retorted to China when Khan's attempts to restructure some of the PEC projects failed to produce any significant difference.

**Relations with the United States**

In fact, throughout the Khan administration, especially with regard to Afghanistan,

Pakistan's relations with the United States were fundamentally transactional.

Relations were acknowledged for a short time when Pakistan helped the US facilitate

talks with the Taliban, but they deteriorated after that. Khan's criticism of US policies

and his accusation of foreign meddling in his overthrow in 2022 further deteriorated

relations. The Mohammad was successed in expanding security cooperation with

the United States, but his government was not able to increase cooperation with Washington

in several sectors.

1. **Engagement with Emerging Powers**

Khan persisted in reaching out to sporadic allies like Turkey and Russia. Although his decision to visit Moscow during the invasion of Ukraine infuriated many, his attempt to forge a connection through energy was seen favourably. Pakistan's cordial ties with Western nations have suffered as a result of this mistake. Furthermore, there was little to no business and security cooperation as a result of positive relations with Malaysia and Turkey.

1. **Economic Diplomacy and Limitations**

One of the more crucial facets of Khan's foreign policy approach was economic diplomacy. Even though expenditure was restricted to helping individuals rather than tackling structural economic issues, such initiatives were successful in securing financial aid from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and China, as well as a bailout from the International Monetary Fund . Changes to the enabling environment, like the PRMI's promotion of foreign investment through regulatory modernisation, faced major obstacles due to political upheavals and bureaucracy, producing only poor results.

1. **Critical Evaluation and Limitations**

Khan had an ambitious foreign policy, although it was constrained by a number of factors:

**Diplomatic Overreach:**

He failed to give elements of strategy and implementation in his efforts to bring peace to the war-torn Middle East.

**Economic Dependency:**

While China and the Gulf States have been good sources of aid, the effectiveness of foreign aid reduces Pakistan's diplomatic independence.

**Ineffective Crisis Management:**

Khan's visit to Russia during his nation's invasion of Ukraine was impolite.

**Rhetoric vs. Action:**

He even used extremely menacing language on the Kashmir dispute and placed the blame on international superpowers, which led to diplomacy and prevented the nation from receiving recognition from other nations.

**CONCLUSION**

Imran Khan's foreign policy was centered on economic diplomacy, axis switching, and balancing regional influence. Even while his administration made some progress, notably in the area of regional integration, it was rife with contradictory policies, economic dominance, and subpar diplomacy. Rather, during his tenure, Khan weakened Pakistan's cooperation with FAM's intricate geopolitical context. A more consistent and strategically orientated procedure is needed to address Pakistan's future regional and global issues.

**QUESTION NO. 4**

**Critical Analysis of Critical Analysis of Ejaz Hussain’s Perspective on the Military’s Influence in Pakistan’s Foreign Policy Hussain’s Perspective on the Military’s Influence in Pakistan’s Foreign Policy**

Afghanistan claims one-third of Pakistan while India holds another one-fourth as per Hussain's evaluation. According to this study, the anti-democratic nature of Pakistani foreign policy has always focused on security matters and depended heavily on military involvement.

The research by Hussain offers substantial help in understanding Pakistan's geopolitical moves and draws attention to underexplored areas. The findings of Hussain's research will be reviewed in this paper to assess Pakistan's military control during foreign policy events, although we will identify certain weaknesses, too.

**1. Strengths of Ejaz Hussain’s analysis**

1. **Historical Contextualization**

Hussain's thorough historical classification and analysis of the military's role in Pakistani foreign policy stands out as one of his most significant achievements, in my opinion. He gives a convincing account of how Pakistan's security perspective has evolved over time and how worries about India caused foreign policymaking to become deeply securitised. Hussain shows how early alliances helped to entrench militarism, as did those with the US during the Cold War. The military weakened civilian institutions and imposed its will on decision-making by establishing mutual defence agreements like CENTO and SEATO in order to secure military support.Understanding the connection between military and civil relations.

**Civil-Military Relations**

In actuality, Hussain's reasoning perfectly demonstrates his division between military power and civilian governance. He also shows how the PML-N and PPP's elected leaderships failed to manage foreign policy effectively during their terms in office. Nawaz Sharif, for instance, had previously tried to establish diplomatic ties with India, but the military's stance was unfavourable. In a similar vein, the Memogate Scandal under President Asif Ali Zardari showed how little authority civilians have over international relations and diplomacy.

1. **Actor-Centric Approach**

One strength of Hussain's work is that it adopts an actor-oriented perspective, viewing the military as a player in the complicated humanitarian field. In his discussion of the singularity, he presents the military as reasonable and practical individuals driven by security considerations. By presenting Pakistan as a nation in need of defence against possible security threats, particularly India, it illustrates how the military exploited its position to sway foreign policy decisions.

**2. Critical Flaws in Hussain’s Analysis**

1. **Emphasis on the enforcement of Security-Centric Polices**

Hussain's which has theory goes so far as to assert that the security is the most important part or component of Pakistan's foreign policy, despite the fact that he clearly shows the military's control. In international relations, economic diplomacy, trade, and cultural exchanges are rarely taken into account. For instance, no research has been done on Pakistan's involvement in regional trade organisations or its diplomatic outreach to non-traditional regions like Central Asian governments. Because of this misconception, Pakistan's foreign policy matrix is reduced to an extremely basic level that is impossible to fully understand.

.

1. **There is a strong tendency to underestimate the civilian agency and its influence on social change.**

Hussain slightly downplays instances when civilian governments had divergent foreign policies compared to military regimes. Through Mr. Zardari's confrontation in Afghanistan while Mr. Nawaz Sharif organized peaceful relations with India the civilian authorities proved their ability to shape strong foreign policies. The author Hussain provides exaggerated accounts of foreign policies while showing civilian perspectives which affects how the situation appears in his presentation.

1. **Lack Of Emphasis for Global Power Transition**

The description from Hussain fails to identify the expected effects of global changes on Pakistan's foreign policy. This analysis lacks an explanation of China's economic growth dominance and American strategic moves in South Asia as well as regional partnership formation. The researcher could have gained additional clarity about strategic Pakistan policy development by deeply investigating how these events alter or shape military strategic calculations.

1. **The internal dynamics of the military have not been adequately analyzed.**

Hussain combines various military ideas and opinions into one unified frame. The army, together with the Navy and air force produces shifts that lead to foreign policy adjustments. The role of the military becomes diminished according to Hussain because he does not conduct comprehensive examinations of these processes.

**3. Generalization of military hegemony**

1. **Diplomatic Isolation**

Hussain does an excellent job of showing how Pakistan has regrettably become diplomatically "lonely," particularly about the Kashmir issue, as a result of the military's security-oriented worldview. The main issue with Pakistan's foreign policy is that the state is now vulnerable on a global scale due to militarised tactics and passive diplomacy. The MEA's strategic alliances with the CO have limited Pakistan's involvement in international fora and weakened support for its stance on Kashmir.

1. **Economic Constraints**

Hussain so criticizes the military for putting defence cooperation ahead of economic diplomacy. All things considered, security-focused policies have significantly impeded Pakistan's economic integration with neighbouring nations, particularly with India and Afghanistan. In this sense, trade and regional economic initiatives have been neglected, which has decreased the economy's potential for growth and cooperation opportunities. The prosperity of Pakistan has been endangered by this security dispute over economic interests.

1. **Impediment to Democratic Advancement**

Thus, Pakistan's foreign policy's pro-military stance has impeded the development of democracy in this nation. Hussain adds that civil institutions' ability to formulate original foreign policy has diminished as a result of military meddling in domestic affairs. This has helped to maintain weak governance, undermine democracy, and maintain slim military domination through the politics of patronage favours, where elected administrations are unable to challenge the military for fear of being overthrown.

**CONCLUSION**

Ejaz Hussain presents an extensive evaluation of military control of Pakistan's foreign agenda together with policymakers implementing security protocols in his article. The analysis bases its research on historical and actor-specific perspectives to impact civilian leadership structures while changing economic diplomacy and internal military systems during exogenous transformations. The detailed study of security issues creates problems for complex Pakistani foreign policy plans. After conducting thorough empirical research the analysis of military involvement will help better explain Pakistan's foreign policy policy.