



DIIS REPORT

Khalid Aziz

Conditions for a Successful
Transition in Afghanistan
Post-2014

DIIS Report 2014:04

© Copenhagen 2014, the author and DIIS
Danish Institute for International Studies, DIIS
Østbanegade 117, DK 2100 Copenhagen
Ph: +45 32 69 87 87
Fax: +45 32 69 87 00
E-mail: diis@diis.dk
Web: www.diis.dk

Layout: Allan Lind Jørgensen
Printed in Denmark by Vesterkopi AS
ISBN 978-87-7605-659-9 (print)
ISBN 978-87-7605-660-5 (pdf)
Price: DKK 50.00 (VAT included)
DIIS publications can be downloaded
free of charge from www.diis.dk
Hardcopies can be ordered at www.diis.dk

Contents

Abbreviations and Glossary	5
Chapter 1	7
Introduction	7
Framing of Issues	9
Chapter 2	13
Afghanistan in the Grip of the Great Game	13
Drivers of Instability in the AfPak Region	15
The Great Game and Creation of Pakistan	17
Nature of Pakistan–Afghan Relations	21
Pakistan’s Drift Towards Radicalization	25
Multiple Wars in Afghanistan	32
Recent Regional Developments	37
Chapter 3. Unfinished State Building in Pakistani FATA	39
Situational Analysis	39
Characteristics of FATA	40
System of Administration	40
Constitutional Position of FATA	42
Underdevelopment of FATA	43
Causes of the Rise of Militancy	44
Pakistani Society’s Sympathy for Militants	47
The Way Forward	49
Chapter 4	52
Security Transition and Reconciliation with the Taliban	52
Chapter 5	58
Amity between Afghanistan, India and Pakistan	58
Recommendations for Improving Afghan–Pakistani Relations	59

Chapter 6	62
Free and Fair Elections in Afghanistan	62
International Assistance Mechanisms	62
Chapter 7	65
Conclusions	65

Abbreviations and glossary

<i>ASF</i>	Afghan Security Forces
<i>BSA</i>	Bilateral Security Agreement
<i>CI</i>	Counter Insurgency
<i>CT</i>	Counter Terrorism
<i>FATA</i>	Federally Administered Tribal Area of Pakistan
<i>FCR</i>	Frontier Crime Regulation, a special law to regulate tribesmen in FATA
<i>FRs</i>	Frontier Regions
<i>IMU</i>	Independent Movement of Uzbekistan
<i>ISI</i>	Inter-Services Intelligence of Pakistan
<i>Jirgas</i>	A group of elders appointed in the tribal area to resolve criminal and civil dispute
<i>KPK</i>	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
<i>LET</i>	Lashkar e Toiba, a jihadist group operating in Indian occupied Kashmir
<i>NSC</i>	National Security Cell, a new division recently created by the government of Pakistan to coordinate civil-military policy and draw up policy measures to fight the insurgency
<i>Punjabi Taliban</i>	A collective name given to a Sunni Jihadist group originating in southern Punjab, including different groups involved in terrorist and sectarian acts of violence and also supporting the Afghan Taliban and the TTP
<i>SU</i>	Soviet Union
<i>TTP</i>	Tehreek e Taliban Pakistan, a Pakistani terrorist group operating in FATA and KP

Chapter I

Introduction

There are doubts whether the exit of a majority of foreign forces from Afghanistan will help the return of peace to that country. Unlike in the case of the SU withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1988, conditions today are more dangerous, and it will be a miracle if the withdrawal is peaceful. The main reason for this is the absence of any reconciliation with the Taliban. This report identifies a minimum set of policies and measures that need to be implemented before successful multiple transitions in Afghanistan can occur. However, the overall picture is not positive, and it is not certain that peace will prevail after foreign troops leave Afghanistan.¹

It is argued that part of the problem is a lack of any analysis able to peel away the multiple layers that bedevil a clear view of the multinational, regional and sub-national levels. Furthermore, policies have been adopted in Afghanistan without consideration of their impact on neighboring Pakistan. For instance, the insistence that Pakistan continues to take military measures is eroding the long-term prospects for peace and is causing the continuation of the conflict, thus weakening the writ of the state.

For instance, the policy of the surge², initiated by the US in Afghanistan in 2009, had a devastating impact on Pakistan, and many of the problems that Pakistan faces today have their roots in that one decision. Ironically, while the US has decided to withdraw by end of 2014, Pakistan is left with the task of cleaning up the mess caused by this intervention. The current manifestation of the surge continues and has caused more problems, like the stabilization operations in Karachi on the one hand, and numerous similar operations that are needed in FATA and KPK on the other. This has led to the merger of bands of insurgents in FATA and southern Punjab that was bound to occur, as explained in this report, due to the cultural and social cohesion between the Pakistan and Afghan peoples, a factor little understood by the international community involved in stabilizing Afghanistan.

¹ *Washington Post*, December 29, 2013, <http://wapo.st/1bbj68i>

² After Obama became President his military commanders advised him that if the level of troops in Afghanistan was increased there was a good chance to counter the decline of the Afghan campaign. In 2009, 33,000 additional troops were sent to increase the level of forces. This measure led to a temporary success in subduing the al-Qaeda and Taliban. However, it pushed the al-Qaeda into Pakistan and led to a deterioration of its internal security. The surge improved training of ANSF as well as stopped the deterioration of security trend in S. Afghanistan, but it did not change the nature of the Afghan insurgency that continued to expand.

On the other hand, the devastating impact of the surge on Afghanistan is an example of the lack of convergence of policies on a regional level. These failures have left Pakistan with huge problems to solve, the cost of which will run into billions of dollars, and they have already caused the loss of innumerable lives, besides leading to a weakening of the state. These issues are unfortunately not recognized either by the US or the wider international community.

This report attempts to assess the level of preparation for ensuring a successful transition in Afghanistan post-2014 that includes the security, political, regional and international transitions. Though there are many areas of high priority and of a transformative nature that remain to be fulfilled, these steps set a minimum of conditions that must occur for a successful transition.

Afghanistan has been a focus of violence and war for more than three decades. However, this war has now established itself inside Pakistan, a neighboring country of more than 180 million armed with nuclear weapons. It is threatened by acute forms of terrorism and violence that is now tearing the state apart. If Pakistan unravels, Afghanistan's woes would appear minor in retrospect.

For reasons explained in this study, the following are the essential conditions for achieving a successful transition in Afghanistan:

- The first condition is to create friendly relations between Pakistan and India, as well as between Pakistan, Afghanistan and India. If suspicions and a lack of trust remain, then it will be difficult to foresee peaceful conditions emerging in Afghanistan.
- Secondly, the chances of securing peace will be enhanced if the forthcoming series of elections in Afghanistan are free and transparent and are accepted by the majority of Afghans. The Afghan presidential, regional and district elections will begin in April 2014. Of these, acceptance that the results of the presidential election to be held in April 2014 have been free and fair is pivotal. If the result is contested, then it is likely that the country will be plagued by violence that will have a negative regional impact, with the greatest fall-out being on Pakistan.
- Reconciliation with the Taliban will reduce the security threat; without it security in large parts of the country is difficult to visualize, and the ANA will face an increasing challenge. If reconciliation is achieved, the burden of the cost of security will be reduced considerably.

- The Afghan National Security Forces will need to be strengthened and provided with the capacity to be able to deal with the security dimensions in their various permutations, like air and electronic surveillance.
- In order to ensure that Afghanistan continues to receive funds and support, there should be convergence between the Afghan government's plans and policies on the one hand and the commitments provided for assistance by the international community on the other. In this context the assistance promised at the Bonn Conference of 2011, the Chicago Summit of 2012, the Tokyo Conference of 2012 and the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework are crucial.
- Lastly, it is important that the Afghan government implements good governance and ends the corruption that has eaten into the fabric of the nascent state.

Framing of Issues

This report attempts to go beyond the clichéd binary narrative according to which the problem of international terrorism in the AfPak region arose after 9/11. Such a narrative unfortunately ignores the long history of the conflict between Islam and sub-continental colonialism prior to partition in 1947, and subsequently the conflict between religion and secularism that has been gathering momentum in the AfPak region for more than 150 years. The US/Western narratives are partially true, but although they may be useful for creating new virtual histories and primary causes for maintaining indigenous support of voters for the war policy, such analyses tend to ignore the regional drivers of conflict that remain a major source of continuing instability. This penchant for simplified analysis tends to direct the attention of Western voters to focus on history from an arbitrary angle starting with 9/11 that is not helpful for finding solutions, since the diagnosis is faulty, and the histories of Afghanistan and other regional nations began many hundreds of years earlier.

It is argued that hidden behind the popular simplified Western narratives lies an unexplored abundance of historical events, muddled interstate relations caused by Partition in 1947 and an intricate social reality that needs to be disentangled if solutions for peace are to emerge. One of the main findings of this report is that, although the US and NATO may want to exit peacefully from Afghanistan at the end of 2014, the armed opposition may well have other ideas.

It may be noted that this region already has a large number of contested histories, including the impact of colonial manipulation through the instrument of the Partition of the Indian sub-continent, multiple ethnicities, sectarian conflicts,

geostrategic drivers, internal state conflicts between traditionalists and modernists, proxy warriors and a contested border with separate narratives. These factors existed long before the events of 9/11 and the US invasion of Afghanistan. The list of issues identified above will continue to influence the history of this region, long after the departure of foreign forces from Afghanistan.

The report studies the problem of FATA as an important contributor to many of the security problems in the region. However, these problems seem to arise more out of the need of the Pakistani state and regional powers to influence events in the Great Game region. It is argued that the solution lies in the reform of FATA and also in the creation of a South Asian sub-continental collective security framework that includes India, Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Central Asian states. However, the initial steps need to be taken to create a security convergence in the form of a South Asian security pact between the core nations of India, Pakistan and Afghanistan first. If success is achieved at this trilateral level, it could then be expanded with the inclusion of others.

Failure to recognize this need for joint security will lead to very poor outcomes. In order to bring about this change, we have to transform the way the three nations have thought so far. We will need to become South Asians in our thoughts, beliefs and existence. That is our only salvation.

The other required transformation is to urge the West to forgo its fondness for the categorization of events into good and evil, for and against, and not attempt to simplify complicated issues; this makes matters more confusing, since such an approach blocks the intellectual evaluation of the complex issues facing the region. This is clearly seen in the West's failure to transform events in the South Asian region: despite the use of massive military means representing almost 70% of the world's military might, the West has not been able either to stabilize the region or to make the world any safer. According to one survey, the Al-Qaeda that was the primary target of the Afghan operation is much stronger today than it was in 2001.³

Although at the start of the Global War on Terror after 9/11 Pakistan was considered a close ally of the US and received attention and benefits, gradually Pakistan changed direction and faded away as a 'friend' after 2004. By 2006 the issue of fighting inside a country that was an ally and not at war with the US was being debated in the

³ *Economist*, 'Briefing: The state of al-Qaeda,' September 28, 2013, London, online edition.

Quadrennial Defense Review conducted by the Pentagon when it specified an additional mandate for the US military. It proposed that it should shift its focus 'From conducting wars against nations to conducting war in countries we are not at war with (safe havens)'.⁴ The signs of a shift in the US attitude towards Pakistan predated this report with the operation of unmanned aerial vehicle (drones) warfare over FATA in 2004 under the Bush administration. *This measure that has stoked the fires of terrorism rather than reducing them.*

It is reported that President Bush gave orders for the use of drones over FATA after he had received reports of Pakistani ambivalence in supporting the US. The CIA obtained a trade-off from Pakistan's premier intelligence agency, the ISI, which had requested the use of drones in the first place to eliminate Baithullah Mehsud, the leader of the Tehrik e Taliban Pakistan, a Jihadist group operating from FATA. In return Lt Gen Ahsan ul Haq of the ISI allowed the US to operate its drone program over North Waziristan. The first flights of the drones began from the Shamsi airfield near Quetta.⁵ Subsequently a writ petition was placed before the Peshawar High Court challenging the drone operations over FATA. In its decision of 11th April 2012,⁶ the Peshawar High Court ruled such strikes illegal and also against international law.

Although the acknowledged narrative was that the US was fighting the war in Afghanistan to eliminate Al Qaeda, its military operations were also directed against the Afghan Taliban. As the war continued, the Pakistani security authorities became concerned by an increase in US nationals, many of them suspected to be security contractors, whose numbers had reached 3,255 by 2007. They were observed conducting secret intelligence activities in FATA and the large cities. While there were safe havens in FATA from where proxy fighters penetrated Afghanistan to fight against NATO, on the other hand private contractors associated with the CIA had begun their own operations inside Pakistan.⁷

Many experts think that by 2003 Pakistani military planners had concluded that the war in Afghanistan would likely align the US, India and Afghanistan together to

⁴ *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, 2006, Washington, 1.usa.gov/GZstkh, p. 6, accessed on 14th Oct 2013

⁵ *Bureau of Investigative Journalism*, Chris Wood, 'CIA drones quit one Pakistan site,' London, bit.ly/19Oyd6S, Dec 15, 2011, accessed 12-10-13.

⁶ Dost Muhammad Khan, Chief Justice, Peshawar High Court Judgment in Writ Petition 1551-P/2012, dated April 11, 2012

⁷ Pratap Chatterjee, 'The Jason Bourne Strategy,' Tomgram December 5, 2013, <http://bit.ly/1d2bp6Z>, accessed on December 7, 2013.

the exclusion of Pakistan. Given the past close ties between India and Afghanistan, such a combination could constitute an existentialist threat to Pakistan. This is a nightmare projection for Pakistani strategists. Coupled with the new interim Afghan administration's exclusionary policies towards the mainly Pashtun Taliban as a result of the ongoing conflict, the Afghan Taliban were identified in peoples' perceptions as being pro-Pakistan. It was suspected that such a hostile configuration of forces represented a threat, meaning that Pakistan needed to improvise its reactions within US-Pak relations at the military and security levels. In order to engage in this strategy, the nature of the geography of the loosely controlled Pakistan–Afghan border provided a perfect opportunity to deny the existence of safe havens inside Pakistan.

Chapter 2

Afghanistan in the Grip of the Great Game

One of the weaknesses in analyses of events in Afghanistan and Pakistan is a lack of focus on geography and culturo-historical factors as the determinants of these events. Secondly, geographical determinism proves that in those areas that are located where the great powers contest each other, such pressures influence their futures. In short, when there is a contest for dominance in a region, the outcomes often become violent and destabilize the whole region.

Arnold Toynbee, the famous historian, divided nations into two categories: blind alleys and highways. He identified two countries that lay across geostrategic highways. Syria is a link between the civilizations of Europe, Africa, and Asia, Afghanistan a link between the civilizations of India, East Asia, Central Asia, the Middle East and through it Europe. Such countries have both advantages and disadvantages. When countries were connected through land routes before the advent of steam power, they were important and became the center of great-power attention. The region occupied by Afghanistan and Pakistan was included in this category and formed what was defined as the 'Great Game' region.

Geographically, 'Afghanistan is the seventh largest landlocked country in the world in area (652,626 sq km). It is enclosed by a boundary that is some 5,600 km long, over which it has never exercised more than partial control. It is surrounded by four countries: the SU on the north (2,140 km of common boundary), Iran on the west (945 km of common boundary), Pakistan on the south and east (2,430 km of common boundary), and China on the northeast (76 km of common boundary). None of these boundaries was established before the last third of the nineteenth century. It was the 'Great Game', the famous rivalry between Britain and Russia in Central Asia, that led the latter two states to contemplate creating a buffer between their respective dependencies, a kind of defensive barrier intended to eliminate all risk of direct confrontation between them.'⁸

'Thus Afghanistan with its present boundaries was born, the result of geostrategic games in which it played no independent part. The territorial definition of the

⁸ Encyclopaedia Iranica: Boundaries iii; Boundaries of Afghanistan, <http://bit.ly/H6VA5D>; accessed on Oct 19th 2013

country was an entirely exogenous process, especially as the role of the Kabul Amirs was limited even further by Great Britain's exercise of a de facto protectorate over the foreign policy of Afghanistan from 1879 to 1919, the main period in which the boundaries were drawn; indeed, hardly a segment of the frontier was defined without direct diplomatic intervention by the British.⁹

Thus both Afghanistan and Pakistan lie in a region where a tug of war has been going on since 1813, when the Russo-Persian Treaty was signed. The British expansion and occupation of trans-Indus territory to the west was a result of its strategy to protect its Indian dominion from Russian influence. The major event in this contest leading to the control of Afghan foreign affairs by Britain was the demarcation of the following borders:

- The demarcation of Afghanistan's northern boundary with Russia by a Joint Anglo-Russian Boundary Commission in 1885-1888.
- The Durand Agreement (1894-95) demarcating the boundary between British India and Afghanistan.
- The Pamir Boundary was demarcated between Afghanistan and Russia in 1895. This settled the disputed regions between the Russian protectorate of Bokhara, the territories of Kashmir, Chitral and Gilgit, and the Afghan provinces of Badakshan and Wakhan.

Strafor's Friedman explains the influence of socio-historical influence on politics in describing the recent dramatic situation in Ukraine, which both Russia and the EU want to pull into its own camp. He notes that, 'In a fundamental sense geography has imposed limits on Ukrainian sovereignty ...' He suggests that in geopolitics what matters is the love of one's own in the form of family, a community or a people that determines policies of friendship or hostility. The Ukrainians feel that many of them are of Russian descent, and conversely many Russians think of themselves as Ukrainian. Where such feelings are prevalent, he feels that it will be very difficult for Ukraine to join the EU. The Enlightenment period taught the 'transcendental ideal' stating that choices are based on reason and trump compulsions generated by birth or community. This concept is embedded in the American Declaration of Independence – it accepts the thesis that ideology determines outcomes. But this is a partial view.

⁹ Spain, James, *The Pathan Borderland*, Indus, Karachi, 1963

However, the love of nation in its ideological form turns out to be second best when a state becomes brittle due to internal violence or war and fragments into its original denominators of family, tribe and community. When such fragmentation occurs, then geography triumphs; this factor must not be forgotten when considering the future possibilities and the likely influential countries in the context of any conflict arising in Afghanistan post-2014. Because of the socio-cultural affinity between the people of Pakistan and Afghanistan, the former is likely to play a dominant role in Afghanistan's future.

Drivers of Instability in the AfPak Region

Many believe that the main reason for the insecurity faced by the Afghan and Pakistani states arises out of their weaknesses and their poor institutional structures. This factor encourages the development of crisis. However, I find that to be a simplified description of what is the primary cause of unrest in the AfPak region that has unfolded since the creation of India and Pakistan in 1947. It is rather the reliance of communities on a tribal-religious framework to analyze the world and react to issues which is the main factor.

There are many regions of the world where geography or the intersection of rivers or routes results in such regions becoming the focus of the attention of the great powers. This is particularly true of expanses that are routes for advancing armies. Since the nineteenth century, when the British reached the tribal areas separating India from what later became Afghanistan, their main goal was to prevent a potential threat arising against their dominion in India. The British East India Company and later the British Empire moved towards the north west of the sub-continent and occupied the districts lying up to the foothills that were occupied by the tribes and were formerly a part of the Sikh domains that the British had occupied after defeating the Sikhs in 1846. By the terms of the treaty that ended the First Sikh War, the British obtained paramouncy over Sikh territory, and Sikh foreign policy came under British control.

To create another buffer between Afghanistan and the sub-continent, Britain established the tribal belt, which, after the creation of Pakistan, has been administered under a separate set of constitutional rules and is known by its acronym of FATA. Some of the crisis points in the war on terror in the region are the result of incomplete state formation in FATA.

A resurgent Russia recovering after the Napoleonic invasions expanded her borders in Central Asia eastwards. In 1828 she forced Persia to surrender Transcaucasia. The path for Russian expansion to the Caspian and into Turkestan now lay open. By 1832 only the petty khanates of Bukhara, Khiva and Kokand lay between Russia and the Kingdom of the Durranis and British India. Among Britain's activities in carving out a sphere of influence to curtail Russian influence in neighboring northern India were the following:

- In 1837, when the Russians were assisting the Persians in seizing Herat, Lord Palmerston, the British Prime Minister, delivered a message to the Russians stating that Afghanistan must be considered like the frontier of British India; no European nation should have relations with her, either political or commercial.
- When despite this warning the Persians marched on Herat, Britain sent a naval expeditionary force to occupy Iranian territory, forcing the Persians and their Russian helpers to retreat immediately. Other incidents leading to war between Britain and Russia occurred in the period 1873-1885 and arose out of Britain's desire to prevent Russia expanding towards India.
- To prevent disputes from arising between Russia and Britain, the Russian–Afghan boundary at Penjdeh was defined by a Russo–British Commission in 1888.
- A similar approach was adopted to define the Russo–Afghan boundary in the Pamir in March 1895.
- Since a buffer was created between India and Russia, it was important to define its boundaries; thus the Afghan boundary with British India was demarcated in 1893 and is known as the Durand Line.
- According to agreements with Afghanistan, Britain was in charge of Afghan foreign affairs until the 3rd Afghan War in 1919; the treaty of Rawalpindi of 1919 accepted Afghanistan's right to decide her own foreign policy.

This brief narration of events in the 'Great Game' between Russia and Britain shows that it was this tussle more than any other single reason that was responsible for establishing the boundaries of an Afghan state that became many times larger than the Emirate of Kabul. Secondly, stability in the region was maintained by British threats to use force. In other words, the security of British India was not the result of anything intrinsic in the sub-continent, but due to regional security provided by Britain, the superpower of that era.

As long as Britain ruled the sub-continent and controlled events in Afghanistan, India was protected against insecurity and wars. It was for this reason that Russia

was not able to march towards India during the colonial era. It made some territorial gains in Central Asia after the Red Revolution in 1918. However, it was Britain's presence in India that stopped the Soviet Union from moving further east towards Afghanistan or Persia. Britain had openly declared that it would not tolerate any intrusion into Afghanistan, as it lay within its declared sphere of interest.

In 1947 Britain quit India after Partition. The security framework she had so laboriously built up over two hundred years based on a policy of conquest and creating spheres of influence fell apart, and its results were soon to appear with a vengeance in the form of war and instability in the AfPak region, as well as internecine conflict between Pakistan and India and between India and China.¹⁰ In examining how Britain partitioned India in 1947, can one deduce her motives for the creation of a weaker Pakistani state?

The Great Game and Creation of Pakistan

In many ways the origins of Pakistan, like those of Afghanistan, were dictated by Britain's need to protect her interests in Iran and the Gulf, subsequent to her intended withdrawal from India. It was because of this rather than a genuine desire to grant independence to the Muslims of the sub-continent that partition was encouraged.

The original idea of creating a client state in the north-west of India attained centrality in both India and Britain by 1945, and a secret scheme was set in motion by Lord Wavell, the Viceroy of India. He was of the firm view that, given the geographical location of Britain's energy interests in the Iranian oil fields and in the pivotal Persian Gulf as the transport hub to carry the extracted oil to Western markets, it was essential to have a client state that would assist in protecting Britain's interests. He was further convinced that India would not play this role of being the policeman for Britain. However, such a role could be played by the creation of a dependent nation in the north-west of India. On 31 August 1945, in concluding a meeting, Winston Churchill, Britain's prime minister, advised Wavell to 'Keep a bit of India.' At this stage Britain's position was as follows:

- The British military was convinced of the value of retaining a base for defensive or offensive operations against the SU in any future dispensation in the subcontinent.

¹⁰ Jaswant Singh, 'India at Risk,' Rainlight Rupa, Faridabad, 2013, Pp 4-19

- Wavell was persuaded that this objective could only be achieved through partition – keeping a bit of India – because the Congress Party in India was unlikely to cooperate with Britain on military and strategic matters after independence.
- Prime Minister Attlee was willing to accept the division of India as long as it was not attributed to Britain.
- On 6 and 7 February 1946, Lord Wavell identified the following areas for inclusion in Pakistan. This new state would consist of Sindh, KPK, Baluchistan and the Rawalpindi, Multan and Lahore divisions of Punjab, minus Amritsar and Gurdaspur Districts, even though the latter had a Muslim majority (51%). It would also include the East Bengal districts of Chittagong, Dacca and Rajshahi divisions, the Nadia, Murshidabad and Jessore districts, and in Assam the Sylhet district.
- In 1949, after he had left India and while addressing the Central Asia Society in London, Lord Wavell predicted that there would be two strategic factors that would weigh in Asia in the future:
 - ♦ The arrival of air power.
 - ♦ The importance of oil, which, he said, was the source of air power and greatly concerned that part of Asia with which Britain dealt, since the principal known oil reserves of the world lay in the Persian Gulf. The next struggle for world power, if it took place, might well be for these oil reserves.

The designing of the Pakistani state in haste through the Radcliffe award was further manipulated by Lord Mountbatten to please Nehru. This ensured that a bloody Partition would result and also meant that Pakistan would remain embroiled in boundary disputes with its bigger neighbor India and thus become dependent on outside assistance by grooming a state to be victimized and manipulated. After Britain's influence declined following World War II, Pakistan became dependent on the US in the Cold War era.

In 1949, the British Commander of the Pakistan army, General Gracey, directed Major General Tottenham, the army's divisional commander in Quetta, to be prepared to move Pakistani forces to protect the Anglo-Iranian oilfields in Iran if they were nationalized. This clearly showed Wavell's foresight and may also explain why Pakistan was created.¹¹

¹¹ Aziz, Khalid; 'Causes of Rebellion in Waziristan,' RIPORE, Peshawar, March 2007, p. 9; can also be accessed on the web at <http://bit.ly/YgGJP>.

The poor management of Partition, in which eight million became homeless and about one million lost their lives (with not a single Briton dead) is one of the most egregious chapters in British colonial history. It ensured that Pakistan and India would have a legacy of war and violence. It also drove both nations into becoming nuclear powers. In 1992, Christopher Beaumont, an aide to Radcliffe, declared that Mountbatten did not respect the secrecy of the Radcliffe award and had it revised in many places for the benefit of India.¹²

The worst change that damaged Pakistan's future and made the partition bloody in the Punjab was the reversal involved in giving Ferozepur to India, an area of some four hundred square miles, important because its canal head-works controlled the irrigation system in the princely state of Bikaner. Forewarned by a leak of the proposal to transfer Ferozepur to Pakistan, Nehru successfully prevailed on Mountbatten to make last-minute changes to the Radcliffe award to please Nehru and benefit India.¹³

All nations come into existence on the basis of considering themselves an imagined community. If positive symbols from history or culture fail to provide the essential glue of fraternity, then recourse is taken to hatred, prejudice or primal blood lust, achieved by assailing a common enemy, basing it on religion or targeting a vulnerable minority.

Many of the charges against Pakistan, particularly relating to FATA and Baluchistan being safe havens, are a result of the nature of its difficult frontier with Afghanistan. The frontier is long and porous, Pakistan has a very diverse population, and its chief means of unity is Islam. This has led to four wars with India, mainly due to the legacy of unresolved problems left behind by a flawed Partition and the removal of shared security that was previously provided by Britain. Pakistan's slippage into an erroneous narrative was epitomized in October 2002, when an Islamic alliance-led government took office in KPK. The members of the provincial assembly's first task was to pray for Mir Aimal Kasi, who had been executed in the US for murdering two CIA employees in 1993.

This was contrary to Pakistan's official state formation narrative, which says that the Muslims of India under Muhammad Ali Jinnah wanted a separate Muslim

¹² Meyer, Karl, *The Dust of Empire: The Race for Supremacy in the Asian Heartland*, Abacus, London, 2004, pp. 94-96.

¹³ Ibid. (9).

homeland in the sub-continent. The creation of Pakistan was the fulfillment of Jinnah's desire to have a secular state where different religions could be followed by the people of Pakistan, and not the hybrid Islamist type of state that is now taking shape.

The demand for the creation of an independent homeland for the Muslims of the sub-continent fitted neatly into Britain's desire to keep a part of India after Partition. According to another interpretation explaining the creation of Pakistan, Jinnah's aim was not complete independence but to have a Muslim and Hindu nation under a confederal system. Lord Wavell was convinced that an independent India would not allow Britain to use her military and political influence to protect Britain's imperial interests. Hence such a thought was not to be pursued!¹⁴

Wavell's designs could only come to fruition if Pakistan's borders were secure and it was kept under pressure, thus requiring great-power protection. It was for this reason that Jinnah's hopes for a confederal state were sabotaged by Mountbatten and never explored as an option. Other points of tension were created to place Pakistan and India in opposite camps.

There are two pieces of strong proof for this conclusion. First, Gandhi proposed to Mountbatten, the Viceroy, that in order to avoid partition he should approach Jinnah and offer him the prime ministership of a united India. This offer was never put to Jinnah by the Viceroy, showing that he had a vested interest in Partition rather than in avoiding it. The second proof was the fact that the Viceroy ordered amendments to be made secretly to the Radcliffe award in favor of India. The map was secretly redrawn by Radcliffe on the orders of the Viceroy, after Nehru and the Maharajah of Bikaner had requested him to do so, leading to Ferozepur, covering some four hundred square miles of area and commanding the canal headwork's of Bikaner state, being transferred from Pakistan to India.¹⁵

This one deed alone threatened Pakistan's use of water supplies from the eastern rivers. It gave India leverage to use the water weapon, leading to a dispute that almost resulted in open war between the two nations when India blocked the Chenab at the Ferozepur headworks in 1949. The dispute was resolved temporarily by the 1960 Indus Water Treaty between India and Pakistan.

¹⁴ Ibid. (9) p. 94.

¹⁵ Ibid. (9).

The last issue that left a legacy of wars and hatred between the two neighbors was embedded permanently by leaving the disputed boundary between India and Pakistan in Kashmir unresolved. It is this conflicted legacy that has brought other social pressures into play and is at the heart of the many-layered conflict between Pakistan and India that has flared into a low-level proxy war between them in Afghanistan during the last fourteen years.

Nature of Pakistan–Afghan Relations

No description of regional polarization can be complete without a discussion of the relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Both nations share a border of 2,250 km (1,398.1 mi) called the Durand Line, negotiated between Britain and the then Afghan ruler, Amir Abdur Rehman, in 1893-94. The Afghans have always claimed that it was demarcated under coercion by the British. It runs north–south from the Hindu Kush and the Pamir Mountains and separates the Pakistani regions of Chitral, FATA and Baluchistan.

When Pakistan became independent in 1947, the legitimacy of the demarcation was questioned by Afghans. The FATA tribes criticized it for dividing their families. Afghanistan claimed that the border had been imposed on it by an imperial power. It may be noted that the Afghans always toyed with the idea of reoccupying their former possessions once Britain departed. For instance, during the Round Table Conferences on the future of the sub-continent in 1931-32, Afghanistan informed Britain that it must have a say in determining the future of the trans-Indus territories. They repeated this demand during the Cripps Mission to India in 1942 and again after the end of World War II.¹⁶

After the formation of Pakistan, Afghanistan, with the support of India and the SU, began espousing the establishment of a separatist Pushtun state of Pukhtunistan based on Pakistani territory.

Indo-Afghan friendship goes back many decades, when both countries supported one another in putting pressure upon Pakistan during its formative phases after Independence in 1947. India and Afghanistan cooperated in sponsoring separatism among the Pashtuns of Pakistan, which was intended to lead to either the creation

¹⁶ Ibid, (7) p. 232.

of a separate Pashtun state in the north-west or the merger of such regions into Afghanistan.

The Afghan objection to the creation of Pakistan and the rejection of the Durand Line demarcated in 1893 as an international border between the two was the reason for Afghanistan to vote against the entry of Pakistan into the UN on 30th September 1947. In November 1947, King Zahir Shah of Afghanistan sent Sardar Najibullah Khan as his special envoy to Pakistan. On this occasion, Sardar Najibullah made the following three demands on behalf of Afghanistan:

- KPK and FATA should be constituted as a separate state.
- Pakistan should provide Afghanistan with access to the sea by providing a special corridor through western Baluchistan or by creating a free zone for Afghanistan in Karachi.
- Pakistan and Afghanistan should sign a treaty that in case of war each will remain neutral and not attack the other.

Pakistan could not agree to commit suicide by fragmenting itself to please the Afghans by separating the two regions as the latter demanded. It was a most presumptive demand to make of a new nation that had recently undergone the trauma of Partition, where eight million persons had been displaced and about a million perished. The demands convinced the early Pakistani leadership that Afghanistan viewed Pakistan with hostility. This initial lack of trust created a large gulf between the two states that has been growing wider ever since.

Afghanistan's demands and the basis of its differences with Pakistan were generated by the Durand Line issue, non-recognition of which by Afghanistan since the creation of Pakistan stands in the way of good relations between them. It is clearly evident that the Afghans based their support for Pukhtunistan on the assumption that if Pakistan split then their support for it could create a claim.¹⁷

An examination of the various treaties concluded between Britain and Afghanistan shows that the two states consistently accepted the validity of the Durand Line. This was reiterated on a number of occasions in interactions between the British and Afghan governments.¹⁸

¹⁷ Ibid. (10) p. 232

¹⁸ Caroe, Olaf, *The Pathans*, Oxford University Press, Karachi, 1958, pp. 463-466.

Britain made a categorical statement about this controversy to bring it to a close from its point of view when the Secretary of State for the Commonwealth declared emphatically in the House of Commons that 'the Durand Line is the international frontier'.¹⁹

However, the continuous Afghan agitation on this matter has muddied bilateral relations between the two neighbors for decades. Is it any wonder that Pakistani strategists have grounds to fear the worst of intentions by two of its hostile neighbors, India on its eastern border and Afghanistan to the west? It has always been a worry and therefore forces Pakistan to have a friendly government in Kabul. Thus Pakistan consistently makes attempts to maneuver a pro-Pakistani government into power in Afghanistan.

To counter Pashtun irredentism in the West, Pakistan began creating influence for a government that would not support the creation of a separatist Pashtun state of Pukhtunistan.²⁰ However, this policy has not worked: even the Taliban government that many accuse Pakistan of creating and that ruled Afghanistan from 1996 to 2001 did not provide any comfort to ease Pakistan's disquiet on this score. It appears that the Pukhtunistan demand has become an identity narrative for Afghans that has been drummed into generations of Afghan minds by its elites.

Thus it will be a miracle to expect any but a muddied relationship between the two neighbors unless wise leadership in both nations shifts the narrative and creates something positive out of this dispute along the lines of the Schumann Plan, which brought Europe's two major antagonists, Germany and France, together, later leading to the creation of the European Economic Community and subsequently the EU, one of the world's major economic engines, with an excellent quality of life for its people.

The availability of the SAARC platform is a ready-made structure that could be used to remove the difficulties between Afghanistan and Pakistan. But this would also require India to play a positive role and to give up any idea of domination in the region. If it can do this in the SAARC comity of nations and join with others to create a South Asian identity, then the region's chances of developing in peace will be enhanced many times over.

¹⁹ Ibid (11), p. 465.

²⁰ DIIS Report 2011:08; Siddiqui, Qandeel, *Pakistan's future policy towards Afghanistan*, Danish Institute of International Studies, Copenhagen, 2011.

However, until its fears are allayed, Pakistan is unlikely to give up its policy of keeping its links with its Afghan proxy fighters intact, since these could be useful tools to blunt any Afghan initiative to support the Pukhtunistan irredentist movement. This has led Pakistan to adopt a policy of duality and ambiguity in its commitment to the US and the latter's war on terror.²¹

Sardar Daud, the Prime Minister of Afghanistan and later its President after his coup in 1978, had begun to mend Afghanistan's bridges with Pakistan when he held discussions with it from June 1976 and March 1978 to settle the Durand Line issue. However, the Soviet-inspired PDPA coup toppled Sardar Daud from power. It is thought that one of the reasons for this was the shift that Sardar Daud was making in Afghan foreign policy, aimed at having good and friendly relations with Pakistan and the US,²² something distasteful to the SU.

In February 1980 Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko conveyed a stern warning to Pakistan that it would suffer consequences for its support of the US. Pakistan had once before suffered for its support of the US in bringing the latter and the Chinese together in 1969. The SU had considered this a hostile act, and Soviet Premier Kosygin warned Pakistan's ambassador to Moscow, Mr Marker, that a price would be paid by Pakistan. The warning was fulfilled in 1971, when India, with Soviet support, created Bangladesh.²³

Pakistan has provided useful assistance to the US in the field of counter-terrorism, but at the same time it has continued to retain its links with proxy fighters to neutralize the expansion of Indian influence in Afghanistan and to neutralize Afghan irredentist ambitions. This pivot of her policy was built around the former Taliban movement in Afghanistan and the Haqqani network. This policy of live and let live concerning terrorist networks in Baluchistan, FATA and North Waziristan has caused a decline in US–Pakistan relations. Thus, while the US has been fighting a war against Al Qaeda and the Taliban, *Pakistan has been fighting a proxy war against India in Afghanistan*. The conclusion is that, unless India and Pakistan are on the same page on Afghanistan, establishing peace in that country will be difficult.

²¹ Siddiq, Ayesha, *The World Today* (Vol. 63, No. 4), 'Between Military and Militants,' April 2007, Chatham House, London.

²² Riaz M. Khan, *Afghanistan and Pakistan: Conflict, Extremism and Resistance to Modernity*, Oxford University Press, Karachi 2011, p. 166.

²³ Marker, Jamshed, *Quiet Diplomacy: Memoirs of an Ambassador of Pakistan*, Oxford, Karachi, 2010.

On the other hand, there is a growing recognition in Pakistan that, while the military wants to use proxy warriors in India and Afghanistan as a force multiplier, such a dual policy has caused serious harm to Pakistan, where the terrorists and criminal syndicates have evolved into a combined network and are on the ascendant. This has led to a loss of control over wide stretches of territories to the Jihadists, who have developed regional networks that specialize in drug-trafficking and kidnapping, besides attacking NATO forces in Afghanistan. At the same time there has been a loss of state control over the intelligence services, whose personnel are seen as profiteering from this spreading illegality.

One of the byproducts of a lack of control over intelligence operations has been the issue of disappeared persons. Human rights litigation in the Supreme Court of Pakistan is now causing a crisis in governance, pitting the civilian government against the military establishment. While all this goes on, Pakistan is fast emerging as one of the most criticized nations in the world. The fear is growing that its failure to curb Jihadists and to deal with terrorists under the law could lead to unwelcome international sanctions against her in the future. This has already interrupted the improvement of bilateral relations with India over the alleged role of the Pakistan-based Lashkar e Toiba in the Mumbai attack in November 2008.

As the above analysis indicates, therefore, it is not surprising that the security operations undertaken over the last fifteen years have failed to weaken the terrorist infrastructure in Afghanistan. In a sense it has been an expensive exercise without a long-term impact. Use of state-of-the-art technologies of warfare, expenditures of wealth and the sacrifice of so many lives have at best only made a marginal difference. Admiral Mullen's suggestion that 'I believe if we walk away from that part of the world, we will be back in 10 or 20 years....' contains a stark warning that must be heeded. It is important that we understand the drivers of action and thought that operate in Afghanistan and the neighboring countries. Without an understanding of them, we are likely to make poor judgments in the future too.

Pakistan's Drift Towards Radicalization

As noted earlier, the creation of Pakistan was not an altruistic move on Britain's part. It represented the formation of a weak nation that had to worry about its very survival from its birth and had to adapt and improvise. To assist her in its defense, it began building a nationhood narrative based on Islam and hatred of its neighbor India, while the later developed a mirror narrative and created a strong hate lobby

against Pakistan. This situation in Pakistan led to the creation of private and tribal militias to do the state's fighting for it as a force multiplier, leading to a divergence in Pakistan between its liberal elite, who are in the minority, and the vast majority of the population, who believe in Islam as the *raison d'être* of Pakistan's existence because of the proliferation of this narrative through the education system and the media.

Today in Pakistan there are therefore two narratives competing for its soul. The majoritarian one is that Pakistan was created in the name of Islam, and some have even called the state a Muslim Zion. The problem with this analysis is that it portrays a revisionist concept viewed today as an explanation of the rationale for its creation. Originally it was conceived as a liberal Muslim democracy by its leader Jinnah.

If Pakistan exhibits the strong attributes of an Islamic state, this was not the case in 1947, and the road to becoming an Islamist state traversed a long journey to reach the current stage. How did this happen? How did radicalization enter Pakistan and Afghanistan? If there are fraternal feelings between the two peoples, why are their official relations antagonistic? It is an apparent contradiction that, although the states of Afghanistan and Pakistan have not been on the best of terms, there is a sense of community between their peoples which is deeply rooted in history. Thus it appears that, whatever the two governments may wish, the people of both countries have too many common historical and cultural links to permit acrimony to prevail at a people-to-people level. This is a saving grace and a potential building block for regional peace.

This report argues that the most essential condition for ensuring peace in post-2014 Afghanistan is for peace to prevail internally among the multiple Afghan ethnic groups and for friendly relations to exist between Pakistan and Afghanistan. However, achieving this outcome is not going to be an easy task because of differences at the government level due to Afghan cooperation with India (which Pakistan views suspiciously), as well as the consequences of the post-Bonn dispensation. These two factors have set in motion certain legacies that will continue to play a spoiling role. The problems connected with the Bonn design arise from the nature of the distribution of power amongst the different people of Afghanistan based on the agreement of December 2001. A review of Afghan population data and data on the representation of various ethnic groups shows that the two are skewed. For instance, the Pashtuns, who represent 42% of Afghanistan's population, have 39% and 35%

of representation respectively in the two houses of the Afghan parliament. A similar disparity is apparent in the case of the Uzbek and Turkmen representation. The main beneficiaries are the Tajiks and Hazaras.

Furthermore, it is not clear in Afghanistan what the basis was for the selection of the 26 Afghans who participated in Bonn and took framework decisions for the future of the country. Since there were no representationally based criteria, the participatory principle looked feeble from the legitimacy angle. It was this gathering that established the transitional framework and agreed to approach the UN Security Council for the creation of an International Peace Keeping Force (ISAF) under UN auspices, which was finally done under Resolution 1386 of the SC.

Participants in Bonn I also agreed to formulate a constitution for the country, which was approved in 2004 and put to a Loya Jirga for approval. Had there been general acceptance of these conditions by all Afghans prior to the Bonn meeting through appropriate democratic means, there could still be some support for the Bonn I dispensation. This is an issue that will require balancing out as a condition for peace in Afghanistan.

Support for the anti-Taliban Afghan Northern Alliance during the Afghan civil war from 1992 to 1996 by Russia, India, Iran and some of the Central Asian States, as well as major European countries like France, was no secret; actually it was the Northern Alliance forces that supported the US-led invasion of Afghanistan after 9/11 and routed the Taliban government that, till shortly before, had the support of Pakistan.

To varying degrees Afghanistan and to a lesser extent Pakistan are states with poorly integrated territories due to the latter's weak penetration by state institutions. Both countries are composed of societies based on tradition and religious values. Tribal affiliations and culture play a pivotal role in the acceptance of their narratives by the majority of their populations.

An analogous ethnic relationship links the Punjabis with the Kashmiris, as they consider themselves to come from the same ethnic stock. Families from Kashmir migrated to Punjab for decades preceding the formation of Pakistan. It is from this association that there arose the future close links between Kashmiri Muslims and Punjabis. This also led to the formation of one of the most volatile Jihadi groups, generally called the Punjabi Taliban, who have been fed on the narrative of the

victimization of the Muslims in Kashmir for decades. The subsequent formation of Jihadi organizations in Punjab is thus not surprising.

In 1920s the Hindu Maharaja of Kashmir began persecuting Muslims in Kashmir. This led a small group of religio-nationalist Muslims to split from the Indian National Congress in the late 1920s and to form the Majlis- Arar Islam at a meeting in Lahore on 4 May 1931. On July 12 Muslim protests erupted throughout Kashmir against the Hindu Dogra ruler for his use of brutal violence against them. This reaction against the Dogra's rule by the Kashmiri Muslims found sympathy among the people of Punjab, and the Ahrars sent units to undertake *jihad* on behalf of the Kashmiri Muslims, one of the prominent leaders of this movement being Mazhar Ali Azhar of Sialkot. The Maharajah complained to the British over the arrival of Jihadis from Punjab, leading to the arrest of some 45,000 Ahrars in Punjab and 5,000 in others parts of India.²⁴

The coming into existence of the Khilafat movement and the rise of the Afghan Taliban were not sudden phenomena. If the Afghan Taliban are the creation of radicalization begun during the Afghan *jihad* of 1979 to 1988, the Ahrar movement arose out of the Khilafat movement, which demanded the revival of the Caliphate after Turkey's defeat in World War I.

Like other Jihadist movements in India, the Khilafat movement was led by independent *ulemas* who were free of secret association with the British administration, unlike the traditional 'Sajjada Nashin' religious elders, who were reputedly Britain's secret collaborators.

The Khilafat movement came into existence when rumors began in Muslim circles in April 1920 that the renowned Abdul Bari, a Muslim scholar of Lucknow's Firangi Mahal who later founded the Jamiat e Ulema e Hind, had issued a *fatwa* for the restoration of the caliphate in Turkey. At the same time, India under British rule was declared a *darul harab* (land of war), and Muslims under religious doctrine were enjoined under to migrate to *darul islam* (land of peace). This led to an exodus of 60,000 people to Afghanistan, 40,000 of which had migrated from Punjab. The numbers would have swelled had not King Amanullah of Afghanistan and Britain discouraged it.

²⁴ Arif Jamal; "The History of Islamist Militancy in Pakistani Punjab," The Jamestown Foundation, August 2011

This event is noteworthy for the current study because of the following:

- It radicalized a large number of Muslims in Punjab and KP.
- It was the indirect catalyst encouraging the formation of the Ahrar movement in Punjab and the dispatch of Jihadist groups to Kashmir in the late 1930s in support of the Muslims of Kashmir.
- It led to the creation of regional fraternal feelings between the Khilafat exiles who migrated to Afghanistan in 1920 and the Afghans.
- The memory of this event and the religious justification for moving out of *darul harb* in times of oppression played a notable part in the exodus of Afghans when they were faced with oppression after the March 1978 PDPA coup in Afghanistan. From April to October 1978, President Tarrakki took over after the communist coup and began land reforms and introduced new family laws giving property rights to woman. These reforms led to resistance by the traditional Afghan elite.
- This resulted in many arrests and the reported execution of hundreds of traditional leaders in the Pul e Charkhi jail in Kabul. It also caused the exodus of many thousands of Afghans to Pakistan in 1978. According to one report, 74% of the Afghan refugees living in camps in Southern KP province came to Pakistan in this initial exodus in 1978, that is, before the Soviet invasion that took place in December 1979.²⁵
- When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December 1979, the Afghans rose in rebellion against it. More than five million left their homes and became refugees in Pakistan and were freely accepted by the local populations as Muslim brethren. This movement mirrored a similar move made by the Muslims of what is now Pakistan almost sixty years earlier during the Khilafat movement.
- Islamist sympathies were also apparent at the time of the war between India and Pakistan in 1948 over the status of Kashmir. While the Hindu Maharajah was debating what to do, groups of Pathan tribesmen from Pakistani tribal areas, along with Afghan tribesmen from Khost and Pakhtia, descended on Kashmir. India protested to the Afghan government to dissuade its tribes from participation, as both countries were friends and were collaborating in the Pukhtunistan irredentist movement.
- The Afghan government used different types of pressure to prevent the Afghan tribes from participating in the Kashmir war in 1948, which Afghan religious leaders had declared a *jihad*. Afghans were embarrassed by this empathy

²⁵ *RIPORT, Report on Issues Faced by Afghan Refugees During Repatriation*, Peshawar, September 2012, p. vii.

between the tribesmen of the two nations despite the fact that Afghanistan was collaborating with India. Persuaded by the Afghan government through a *fatwa*, the Afghan Jamaat ul Ulami denounced the call for *jihad* in Kashmir issued by the Afghan tribes. A renowned Afghan Islamic scholar, Hazrat Shor Bazar, denounced the recall of the *fatwa* and declared the Afghan tribal intervention to be an Islamic duty. This led to an increase in the number of Afghan tribesmen joining the *jihad* in Kashmir.²⁶

The sympathetic religious links created by the Khilafat movement and the Ahle-Arar preceded the new architecture established by the Cold War between the SU and the US in the sub-continent. Once the Cold War framework was in place, it began to provide relatively greater security, except when the SU and the US contested each other's claims by challenging the proxies and clients of the opposing bloc, as happened in the Indo-Pakistan conflicts of 1965 and 1971.

After the dissolution of the SU in December 1991, a new wave of destabilization prevailed in formerly peaceful spaces in Europe, Central and South Asia and Africa. Evidently, parts of the former SU are still undergoing a post-colonial restructuring that has still not run its course and will likely bring about further changes in the world.

Since the AfPak region, including India and Iran, lie on the former periphery of the SU, the region has lapsed into disturbances. However, the phenomenon of conflict is not limited to this region alone, given the impact of the dynamics related to Britain's departure from India, which generated its own negative effects. These were influenced by the Cold War when the world was split into two blocs, one allied to the US and the other to the SU. Thus two waves of destabilization merged that are still working themselves out. As the dates below show, other wars in the region have also erupted that threaten any chance of long-term peace. Below is a list of the wars and upheavals that have affected the region since 1947 and since the break-up of the SU:

- Indo-Pakistan war over Kashmir, 1947-48
- Re-occupation of Tibet by China, 1951 (China had vacated Tibet in 1913)
- The Indo-Chinese war of 1962 over the Aksai Chen region in the Himalayas
- The 2nd Indo-Pakistan war over Kashmir, 1965

²⁶ Ibid. (13), p. 235.

- The 3rd Indo-Pakistan war in 1971, the result of the Bangladesh crisis in which Pakistan was defeated and the new state of Bangladesh was formed
- Communist-led coup in Afghanistan, March 1978
- Khomeini's revolution in Iran, 1979
- The Iran-Iraq war, 1980-89
- The Soviet Union invasion of Afghanistan and the *jihad* against her, 1979-88
- US reliance on militaries in the Asia-Pacific region
- Dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991
- Yugoslav wars, 1991-2001
- 1st Chechen War with Arab participation, 1995
- The 4th Indo-Pakistan war in Kargil in 1998
- 2nd Chechen War with Arab participation, 1999
- The 9/11 incident and the occupation of Afghanistan by Western powers, October 2001-2014

The observable factors contributing to insecurity and wars in the region are related to the following:

- De-colonization of the sub-continent
- Lack of any joint sub-continental security pact between Britain's successor states
- Communist victory China in 1949 and its re-occupation of Tibet in 1951
- Cold-War conflict between the US and the SU
- Absence of a clear determination in whose sphere of influence Afghanistan was
- Spread of Salafist Islam in the region due to the *jihad* against the SU in 1979-1988
- The conflict between Shia Iranian and Sunni Saudi proxies since 1980, leading to a sectarian war in Pakistan
- Impact of Saudi influence on the Taliban and the Tehrik e Taliban in Pakistan, and similar Iranian influence on Shia militant groups
- Collapse of the Soviet Union in December 1991
- De-colonization in SU after its break up
- Chechen and other wars in the Caucasus and the Balkans
- Spread of Salafism in Asia, Central Asia, the Balkans, the Middle East and Africa.

It is obvious that the AfPak region, like some other regions, is in the midst of a restructuring that still has to run its course. Thus it is expected that in the future too, there are likely to be violent reverberations that will not remain limited to AfPak alone, but will spread in a wider arc to other neighboring regions. Such a conflict

is likely to be more bloody and unstructured since it will have non-state actors as contestants who will have new agendas, including one based on radical Islam. In this connection, there already exist colonies of Islamist fighters embedded within the Caucasus as a result of the repercussions of the *jihad* against the SU in Afghanistan. They will be quite active in the future, as will the Chinese Islamists in Xinjiang, who have been trained in the wars raging in the region.

Multiple Wars in Afghanistan

Once the US defined the post-9/11 conflict as a war against terror, it denied the existence of other drivers of conflict in the AfPak region that were always present but were overlooked. The natural corollary of this narrative was to define the intervention in Afghanistan as aimed at degrading Al Qaeda and removing from power of its supporters, the Taliban government that had provided it with a safe haven.

But as later facts proved this was not a complete description of reality. As 2013 ended, the security situation in Afghanistan had become tenuous, and the region was rapidly descending into a violent spiral in which the Taliban were slowly reappearing to claim large portions of Afghan territory once again.

One of the reasons for the alleged lack of success of the US and NATO actions against the Taliban is attributed to Pakistan. US officials accuse Pakistan of not fully assisting them in their struggle against the Taliban. This is an indication, though indirect, that Pakistan's ability to shape events in Afghanistan is transcendent. In other words, Pakistan has been scapegoated for strategic failures whose cause lies more in the imperfect judgments and misappreciation of factors at work in the Afghan conflict than in Pakistan's alleged duplicity alone.

The criticism of Pakistan's role in the conflict is directed at its complacency in handling the Haqqani group and in allowing Taliban Shura (council) members to take refuge in Quetta while directing the war inside Afghanistan.

Pakistan provided unstinting support to the US and ISAF when the intervention in Afghanistan started after 9/11. Yet by 2004 Pakistan began to doubt the ability of the intervention to succeed. It began to worry that if, after four years of using all its might, the West had not succeeded, then it would be reasonable to assume that the chances of obtaining a conclusive result in Afghanistan were dim. Pakistan reasoned

that, if that was going to be the shape of the end game in Afghanistan, it would be strategically foolish for her not to retain assets that could shift the balance of power towards Pakistan whenever the need arose in the future.

Pakistan also viewed with suspicion the growing strategic convergence between the US and India, and it saw that Afghanistan could be the area from where intrusion into its soft underbelly of FATA could materialize and could threaten the Pakistani heartland of Punjab. It is this imagined future that Pakistani strategists are worried about, forcing Pakistan to protect its proxies at great cost.

Pakistan's suspicions were confirmed when it saw the growing US influence in FATA through the use of secret US combat teams operating inside FATA ostensibly to degrade Al Qaeda supporters. Pakistani intelligence sources have highlighted the role of Indian intelligence operations in Baluchistan. The perception that has taken shape in Pakistan is that there is collusion by the US and India against Pakistan that is also assisted by the Afghans. After 2004, President Bush directed the CIA and the Defence Department to cultivate independent sources of intelligence gathering, as well as targeting the Haqqani group in North Waziristan, where it had been able to create a safe haven through direct US operations.

The other US intelligence goal was to gather CT data from major cities in Pakistan. For this purpose US began deploying contractors. The Raymond Davis affair, when a CIA contractor murdered two Pakistani intelligence men on 27 January 2011 while he was on a mission, clouded US–Pakistan relations considerably. Despite US demands to provide immunity to Raymond Davis, as it was claimed that he was a regular employee in the US embassy and not a contractor, views on this aspect remained inconclusive. A *Guardian* report said that Davis was a CIA spy.²⁷

US–Pakistan relations hit a nadir when multiple US aircraft attacked two Pakistani forward posts in Mohmand Agency in Salala, FATA, killing 24 Pakistani officers and men and injuring 14 others. Coming soon after the Raymond Davis affair, it was becoming clear to the Pakistani government that the US did not care about Pakistani feelings. The second incident led to the closure of the US and NATO supply chain through Pakistan, as well as the closure of the US support air-base at Shamsi in Sindh used for reconnaissance and drone operations by the US over

²⁷ *Guardian*, Walsh, Declan, and Ewen MacAskill, 'American who sparked diplomatic crisis over Lahore shooting was CIA spy', February 20, 2011.

Afghanistan and FATA. After a protracted impasse the route was finally opened on 5 June 2012 after the US rendered an apology over the Salala incident. It is estimated that the closure cost the US an additional \$1 billion.

After the US Special Forces raid near Abbottabad in May 2012 that killed Osama bin Laden, Pakistan's position as an ally was seriously challenged. Admiral Mullen, the former head of the US military, called Pakistan's secret intelligence service, the ISI, a collaborator of the Afghan Taliban. This was a harsh judgment passed by Admiral Mullen without any concern for the highly complex situation Pakistan was facing.

Earlier, Bruce Reidel, President Obama's task-force leader reviewing US–Afghan policy, wrote in a *New York Times* op-ed in October 2011 that the US must recognize that the strategic interests of the two nations are in conflict as long as Pakistan's army controls its strategic policies. He accused Pakistan of permitting the revival of Al-Qaeda and allowing its ally, Lashkar e Taiba, to gain space. Like Admiral Mullen, Reidel was simplifying a very complex situation that is faced by Pakistan.

Reidel further alleged that the attack on Mumbai that killed 163 persons, including six Americans, was undertaken with Pakistan's help (this was contradicted by Director of the CIA Hayden: see below). Reidel went on to say that, while the ISI hunts for Afghan Taliban, Pakistan is simultaneously providing them with sanctuary. Reidel proposed shutting down the US's military to military relationship with Pakistan and weakening its military. While Pakistan suffers from many problems, the evidence for placing the blame on official Pakistani complicity was not found to be true. CIA Director Hayden briefed President Bush and told him that the US investigation showed that Mumbai was not an officially inspired attack by Pakistan.²⁸

The question that demands an answer is how could the Pakistan army, until yesterday the preferred US surrogate in the region, achieve such notoriety? Or, putting it differently, what regional factors led the Pakistan military to adopt strategic policies that have caused its credentials to be questioned as a security enhancer in the AfPak region?

An answer to this riddle is provided by William Dalrymple, who says, 'For the Pakistani military, the existential threat posed by India has taken precedence over

²⁸ Woodward, Bob, *Obama's Wars: The Inside Story*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2010, p. 47.

all other geopolitical and economic goals. The fear of being squeezed in an Indian nutcracker is so great that it has led the ISI to take steps that put Pakistan's own internal security at risk, as well as Pakistan's relationship with its main strategic ally, the US. For much of the last decade the ISI has sought to restore the Taliban to power so that it can oust Karzai and his Indian friends.²⁹

But what are the grounds for Pakistan's suspicions about Afghan–Indian involvement against Pakistan? Is this a generic suspicion, or is there more to it? At least the CIA reckoned that India had 'numerous intelligence programs inside Afghanistan'.³⁰

While Pakistan was protecting some of its past surrogates, they in turn linked up with the Punjabi Taliban, a generic name given to those Pakistani proxy warriors who are engaged in *jihad* against the Indian occupation of Kashmir. In short, although the US and NATO were engaged in stabilization in Afghanistan, by 2007 the *jihad* infrastructure in Pakistan had entangled the Pakistani state in its vice-like grip.

Dalrymple is nearer to reality when he describes the regional conflict in Afghanistan as more of an Indo-Pakistani conflict over Afghanistan. He says, 'After the Taliban were ousted by the US, a major strategic shift occurred: the government of Afghanistan became an ally of India's, thus fulfilling Pakistanis' worst fear. The president of post-Taliban Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, hated Pakistan with a passion, in part because he believed that the ISI had helped assassinate his father in 1999. At the same time he felt a strong emotional bond with India, where he had gone to university.'³¹ Therefore, resolving Indo-Pak suspicions and balancing the Afghan predisposition for closer relations with India should remain the main goal for achieving peace in the region.

Furthermore, US support for India is viewed with worry and suspicion in Pakistan, where the US is no longer seen as an ally. Resolving this quadripartite relationship holds the key to the establishment of peace in Afghanistan post-2014. There is also a lack of clarity over the US's short-term counter-terrorism goals in Pakistan, causing a reaction that ignores Pakistan's long-term, larger goals and those of international security.

²⁹ Dalrymple, William, *A Deadly Triangle: Afghanistan, Pakistan & India*, Brooking Institute, Washington, DC, Brooking Essay, June 2013.

³⁰ *Ibid.* (18) p. 4.

³¹ *Ibid.* (19)

A good description of the diverse US–Pakistani goals in this on-going war is provided in an analysis by Stratfor, which argues that ‘The United States and Pakistan are playing very different games for very different ends on both sides of the border and in Afghanistan. They have different adversaries and are playing on different timetables. The alliance is one of necessity but hobbled by incompatibility, and near-term American imperatives in Afghanistan – lines of supply, political progress, counterterrorism efforts – clash directly with the long-term American interest in a strong Pakistani state able to manage its territory and keep its nuclear arsenal secure. The near-term demands Washington has made on Islamabad weaken the state and divide the country. Obviously, the Pakistani government intends to retain its strength and keep the country as unified as possible.’³²

As the date of the draw-down of US and NATO troops from Afghanistan approaches on 31 December 2014, the US’s Afghan policy remains confused, and there are signs of a civil-military disconnect, with the US President accusing his former military team in Afghanistan, composed of General Petraeus, former military chief Admiral Mike Mullen and Defence Secretary Gates, of ‘Gaming him in front of thirty people.’³³

The question is that, after the review of the various regional and other issues discussed in this paper, how can they be evened out so as to ensure peace? Secondly, is it not evident that the real cause of much of the violence in the region and internationally is due to the lack of an effective security framework in central and north South Asia? Thirdly, is it not the case that the US strategy in Afghanistan has been contradictory, and also one where President Obama felt distrustful of the military advice he received?

Apparently answers to the above questions are not positive, and that leads one to conclude that the post-2014 situation is going to be disorderly and chaotic, will be a cause of worry regarding the security of the countries in the region and is creating pessimism. In comparison, the nearest parallel was the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, which was less violent and more orderly.

Clearly the geography and history of the region demand the creation of a joint security structure that is agreed to jointly by Afghanistan, Pakistan and India. The

³² Stratfor; Nate Hughes, ‘A Deadly U.S. Attack on Pakistani Soil,’ *Security Weekly*, December 1, 2011, accessed at www.stratfor.com/weekly/deadly-us-attack-pakistani-soil

³³ *The Dawn*, ‘Obama doubted his own Afghan strategy: Gates,’ 9th January, 2014, p. 16, Islamabad, (a report on the Memoirs of Robert Gates the former Defence Secretary).

trouble with this proposal is that at the moment the region lacks a statesman of vision who can create such a security framework. Secondly, these three nations have been fed with identity narratives that are in conflict with each other. Among examples of these narratives are the following:

- Pakistanis are encouraged to adopt an identity connected with the Middle East as the center of their social and religious focus. Saudi Arabia has a special place in this configuration, which has anti-Iran implications.
- In India there is a mirror reaction based on aggrandizing Hindu history and socio-cultural traditions. Such thoughts have, as in Pakistan, become an identity anchor, and Hindu nationalism has been collectively referred to as consisting of expressions of social and political thought, based on the native spiritual and cultural traditions of historic *India*.
- Afghanistan, on the other hand, has links with ethnicities that are spread all over Central Asia and in north-west Pakistan. This is a point of contention and has been a source of acrimony concerning the Pashtuns.

Recent Regional Developments

While the world was focused on security and political and economic transition in Afghanistan, Pakistan underwent a right-wing, conservative political transition when, after the 11 May 2013 elections, the PML (N), led by Nawaz Sharif, returned to office. This change is likely to affect Pakistan's Afghan and India policy positively, as well as her relations with Saudi Arabia and Iran. The prime minister has spoken of the urgency of establishing peace in the region as a precondition for economic growth in Pakistan.

In this connection Pakistan is looking to both India and Afghanistan as pivots of regional growth built on trade that will require a resolution of disputes in a peaceful manner. Yet, this can only happen when the leaders of all three nations decide to adopt this policy. The recent cross-border incidents along the line of control in Kashmir do not give a positive message and are a point of concern that could derail the peace process between India and Pakistan if border skirmishes escalate. On the Afghan front, Afghan–Pakistan bilateral relations are worsening. It may be noted that to a large extent Pakistan views with suspicion any enlargement of India's role in Afghanistan. While Pakistan's new Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, has promised better relations with India, President Karzai's recent overtures to India seeking greater defense collaboration are viewed with suspicion.

Internally the Pakistani All Parties Conference in Pakistan agreed to hold peace talks with the Pakistani militants, who are fighting the Pakistan military and using terrorism against the people to force Pakistan to give up its alliance with the US. Any such reconciliation will be a good outcome, but it is difficult to visualize it happening given the yawning civil–military disconnect, the recent increase in cases of terrorism and Pakistan’s use of its air force by way of reaction. Such a reconciliation does not appear possible at this moment.

Chapter 3. Unfinished State Building in Pakistani FATA

Situational Analysis

Pakistan faces several challenges to its national security because of FATA and KPK, as well as its strategic partnership with the United States. This chapter explores the threat to national security as a result of a lack of coherence of policies and suggests certain options for Pakistan. The focus of the chapter is on FATA and related neighboring regions, since in its social and legal formulation lie the seeds of many of the problem that Pakistan faces today.

FATA is a specially administered part of Pakistan that is the focus of international anti-terrorism efforts; it is considered by some to be a safe haven from where the militants launch attacks against Afghanistan. US intelligence projections predict that, if a future attack on US or European soil occurs, it will more than likely have originated in FATA. Since March 2004, Pakistan's military has been fighting the militants in an ever-escalating brutal war which has now spread to the districts of KPK province, as well as into central and southern Punjab, the Pakistani heartland. Pakistanis are dying by the dozen every day, and many of its citizens, now numbering more than a million, have become internal refugees who are drifting from place to place. However, despite the huge sacrifices made by Pakistan, her allies accuse her of not doing enough! It is a moot point whether it can do more. Pakistan's military is overstretched and embroiled in a war that has gone on longer than World War II! Pakistan has suffered more military casualties than all the 35 Western allies fighting in Afghanistan put together; a fact not readily admitted by its allies.

It may also be noted that, despite the criticism that Pakistan is facing from its own conservative Islamic population, who make up more than 50% of its population, the position of the government is made worse by the US drone attacks, which have caused many deaths. In short Pakistan is fighting an unpopular war which is not supported by the majority of its population. It is indeed a remarkable feat that consecutive Pakistani governments have continued to support the war. However, the price paid by Pakistan is incalculable. Not only is the state becoming weaker every day from the challenges of its own people, but it is rapidly losing its military capacity and treasure.

If this trend continues, the end result will be the implosion of the country, with catastrophic consequences engulfing Central and South Asia and thus destroying all

hopes of economic growth in the region. That is how serious Pakistan's predicament is, and it is the reason why the whole world has a stake in Pakistan's survival. The sacrifices that Pakistan is making today are thus on behalf of the whole region and need to be recognized as such. However, it is apparent that changes in policy are needed as recommended in this report if Pakistan's sacrifices are to mean anything.

Characteristics of FATA

FATA is a separate geographical and administrative unit which is managed as a special tribal area under separate constitutional arrangements. It is situated midway along Pakistan's western border with Afghanistan and is a wedge of rugged and difficult terrain, stretching for some 450 kilometers.³⁴ It is the size of Massachusetts and has an area of 27,200 sq km and a population of approximately 3.18 million Pashtuns divided into more than a dozen tribes.³⁵ They regulate themselves under a tribal code of laws called *Riwaj*, which is based on an honor system.

The territories that together form FATA consist of seven 'political agencies' – Bajaur, Khyber, Kurram, Mohmand, North Waziristan, Orakzai and South Waziristan – and six smaller zones, called 'frontier regions' (FRs), which are attached with the districts of Bannu, Dera Ismail Khan, Kohat, Lakki Marwat, Peshawar and Tank. To the north and east, the tribal areas are bounded by Khyber Pashtunkhwa (KPK), while to the south is the province of Baluchistan. The Durand Line, which separates Pakistan from Afghanistan, forms the western border of FATA.

System of Administration

Pakistan's tribal regions are managed through an indirect system of administration for the execution of government policies. The pivot of this administration is the political agent, who influences tribes indirectly through local notables called Maliks. In return for their services the Maliks receive allowances and are provided with patronage. Such a system lays down a narrow base of support for the government and is one of the main reasons for not generating a larger base of supporters for the state of Pakistan.

It may also be noted that the government administers only a small portion of the tribal areas directly, which is confined to roads and government installations like

³⁴ FATA Secretariat, Peshawar; *FATA Sustainable Development Plan 2006-2015*, p. 3.

³⁵ *Ibid.* (24) p. 9.

schools, hospitals, forts and other officially occupied spaces. The rest of the area is managed by the tribes, and the political agent uses his diplomatic skills to further the aims of the government.

This important fact is not known in many countries. It is assumed that Pakistan has a complete repertoire of tools like the police and a bureaucracy with which to control FATA. This mistaken assumption has created a misconception that Pakistan is deliberately not exerting itself in implementing anti-terrorism measures, as Pakistan's options in FATA are severely limited.

Control over the administered portion of the tribal areas is exercised by a stringent law enacted in 1901 called the Frontier Crimes Regulation (FCR). This basic law is used for settling disputes and exercising control. Barring some exceptions, disputes and complaints are handed over to Jirgas (tribal juries) for decisions. An assistant political officer acts as the administrator of a Jirga.

It may be noted that this system works best when the political agent is accepted as the unchallenged head of the agency administration. This has not been the case since October 2002, when the military entered FATA. As a result the tribal administration became dysfunctional and the political agent lost control over the tribes. As stated earlier, the main cause of this outcome was the subordination of the political agent's authority to the military commander and the military's direct handling of tribal matters, a move away from the former practice of exerting control through diplomacy.

The eclipse of political authority by the military occurred at a time when the militants in tribal areas were challenging the state. When the dysfunctionality reached a high point, the prime minister ordered the creation of a Task Force on FATA in 2006, which recommended the revival of the political agent's authority. However, despite the order of the government to implement the Task Force's recommendations, it has not been possible to re-establish the political agent's former writ due to the insurgency on the one hand and the repeated return of the military for anti-militant operations on the other. At the same time the political agent's main instruments for extending the writ of state – the Maliks and notables – were undermined because the militants have systematically executed more than 1100 of them over the past ten years. In this respect the militancy in FATA has taken on the color of a rebellion which has demolished administrative capacity.

This description of administrative crippling is incomplete without reference to the loss of administrative capacity in the KPK border districts neighboring the tribal areas as well. After the launching of military operations, militancy has spread into more than ten of the twenty-four KPK districts. One of the main reasons for this expansion of militancy was the local government reform that abolished the magisterial system controlled by the district magistrate. This method of control was established over 200 years ago by the British and was an established method of working which was very well known to the inhabitants. It is argued that the local government reforms could still have been carried out while retaining the magistracy system and making more judicious distributions of power between the various organs of the executive machinery.

Constitutional Position of FATA

Pakistan was created on 14 August 1947. Before the formation of Pakistan, Britain practiced a system of indirect rule over the tribal areas through the Secretary of State for India, who was guided by the Governor General of India. The Governor of KPK acted as the tribal area's advisor to the Governor General. The laws of India were not enforced in the tribal areas, which were treated as a special case. Tribal areas were considered a part of India but not a part of British India. Only a very small part of the tribal areas was administered directly by the British. Secondly, the British obtained the tribes' consent to their rule based on agreements rather than forcible occupation. Any violation of such agreements led to arrests or fines or the launching of military operations to effect restitution.

After 1947, according to the Indian Independence Act, Clause 7, and Paragraph c: 'There lapse also any treaties or agreements in force at the date of the passing of this act between His Majesty and any powers having authority in the tribal areas, and obligation of His Majesty existing at that date to any such persons or with respect to the tribal areas, and all powers, rights, authority, or jurisdiction exercisable at that date in or in relation to the tribal areas by treaty, grant, usage, sufferance, or otherwise.'³⁶

After the Declaration of Independence in 1947 and the withdrawal of military forces from FATA, there was an increase in lawlessness in the Khyber and Kohat areas. Jirgas of all the important tribes were held by Sir George Cunningham, the

³⁶ Ibid. (13), pp. 202-203.

Governor KPK, to reach agreement with them to accept the new government of Pakistan as their suzerain on the same terms as had existed with the British. Finally an all-tribal Jirga was held in the presence of Jinnah on 17 April 1948 at Government House, Peshawar, which was attended by two hundred Maliks from all the tribes. The tribes pledged their allegiance to Pakistan and re-stated their determination to win Kashmir for their new country. They also requested that they be placed under the direct administration of the central government. This request was met when, on 6 July 1948, the Governor General of Pakistan created the new Ministry of State and Frontier Regions and personally took over responsibility for the tribal areas.³⁷

The tribal areas have retained this special status under the direct control of the President of Pakistan. The agreements that the tribes had with the British are still in force, and the same rules of interaction that were prevalent during pre-Independence days are by and large followed today.

According to the 1973 Constitution, Articles 246 and 247 are applicable to FATA. Articles 247 (3), (5), (6) and (7) provide the main principles underlying the relationship between FATA and the Federal Government. These are:

- No Act of Parliament will be enforced in FATA unless the President may so especially direct by a notification.
- The President may make any regulation for the good governance of FATA.
- The President has the power to end the classification of FATA over any area provided that the President shall ascertain the views of the tribe through a Jirga first.
- The jurisdiction of the Supreme and High Courts has been barred unless the Parliament so provides under a law.

Underdevelopment of FATA

The table below provides a glimpse of the poor human development indicators from which FATA has been suffering, despite the efforts made by the government.

According to one estimate, unemployment in FATA is more than 60% of its total population, with about the same percentage of its population living at or below the poverty line of \$1 or less a day.

³⁷ Ibid. (26), pp. 204-205.

Table I. Selected human development indicators for Pakistan, KPK and FATA (2003)^{*38}

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Pakistan</i>	<i>KPK</i>	<i>FATA</i>
Literacy (both sexes %)	43.92	35.41	17.42
Male literacy (%)	54.81	51.39	29.51
Female literacy (%)	32.02	18.82	3.00
Population per doctor	1,226	4,916	7,670
Population per bed in health institutions	1,341	1,594	2,179
	0.26	0.13	0.17

* Literacy rates according to 1998 census; all other figures for 2003.

Research has highlighted that, where abject poverty is rampant and where the poor have lost hope of making good, they do not lose much by choosing violence because there is little being offered to them anyway. Secondly, it has also been found that, where there are lots of poor people with fewer opportunities for peaceable employment, there is a greater likelihood that they will come out in favor of collective violence.³⁹ This explanation makes sense in the context of FATA and KPK. The poverty in FATA is therefore a trigger for instigating violence and militancy.

Causes of the Rise of Militancy

FATA was exposed to militancy in the 1980s when this area was used for weapons storage and to train militants to fight Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Most tribesmen were not actively involved in the fighting against the Soviets, although they supported the Afghan resistance.

However, tribal equilibrium and the internal tribal security situation were aggravated when the arms and drugs culture penetrated this region as a result of the war in Afghanistan. According to Coll Steve, weapons worth US \$66 billion

³⁸ Ibid. (24), p. 11.

³⁹ Cramer, Christopher, *Civil War is Not a Stupid Thing*, Hurst & Co, London 2006, p. 126.

were pumped into Afghanistan and the wider region from 1978 to 1992.⁴⁰ This included FATA and KPK. The presence of so much weaponry was bound to cause de-stabilization if any aggravation occurred.

From 1992 the different Mujahedeen groups (Jihadi groups) began fighting each other for power in Afghanistan. FATA remained relatively quiet, but internally its social cohesion was eroding rapidly because the dynamics of tribal equilibrium were adversely affected by the gun and drugs culture. Even during the years of Taliban rule (1994-2001) the tribal areas were not the primary source of militancy. These areas had links with the Taliban movement as a transit route and a limited source of manpower, but they could not be described as the breeding ground of the Taliban movement.

Militancy in the tribal areas and Afghanistan increased after the US invasion of Afghanistan in October-November 2001, which overthrew the Taliban government. This intervention, which caused many collateral deaths, mostly of Pashtuns at the hands of the Northern Alliance, is the primary cause fuelling militancy. After the US intervention, many tribesmen and people from Malakand in KPK joined the Taliban. Many died or were injured as a result of their intervention.

This event created sympathy for the Taliban cause. Matters worsened when the US refused to accept the surrender of the Taliban forces in the north and instead handed them over to their enemies, the Uzbeks and Tajiks in the Northern Alliance.⁴¹ This set in motion a chain of events that, in the Pashtun honor-driven society of FATA, can only be redeemed through revenge or restitution. This is the main reason why the Taliban are not willing to hold talks with the Afghan government.

Militancy in the tribal areas was fuelled by some other factors too. First was the escape of Jihadist groups from Afghanistan, following their ouster after the October 2001 attack by US forces, and it included Al Qaeda, which subsequently re-grouped in Pakistan, gaining support and volunteers from amongst the Wazir and Mahsud tribes in Waziristan. The second factor was the rise of local militants, who copied the Afghan Taliban's philosophy. They included mostly those tribesmen who had gone to Afghanistan to fight alongside the Taliban against the Northern Alliance and foreign forces.

⁴⁰ Coll, Steve, *Ghost Wars, the Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan and Bin Laden*, Penguin Books, London, 2004, p. 238.

⁴¹ Rashid, Ahmed, *Descent into Chaos*, Viking, New York, 2008, p. 90.

Local tribal hardline Islamic groups in Pakistan also took to greater activism in reaction to the US attack on Afghanistan. The Kashmiri Mujahedeen who were fighting in Kashmir shifted their focus and began re-engaging with militants in FATA in 2005. Thus we find that all the elements against the US role in Afghanistan created a strong militant fighting group which sent some fighters to support the Taliban in Afghanistan and also began to challenge Pakistan over its alliance with the US. This struggle is causing failures of the state in KPK, FATA and parts of southern Punjab.

Islamic political parties in Pakistan supported these militant groups in the tribal areas because they were equally opposed to American military action and its presence in Afghanistan. This support was provided in the shape of protection from security surveillance because from 2003-08 the KPK government was ruled by a coalition of religious parties sympathetic towards the Jihadis. This created favorable conditions for the growth of militancy in KPK and FATA.

The presence of belief-driven transnational fighters and organizations like Al Qaeda and the Uzbek IMU actively channeled violence against Pakistan. Their aim was to establish an Islamic emirate. Their last attempt to achieve such an outcome was in August 2008 in Bajaur Agency, which was prevented by a timely military operation. One of the priorities of US security policy in the war against terror was to defeat the transnational belief-driven fighters led by Al Qaeda and IMU. These fighters, who are imbued with strong beliefs, consider both the US intervention in Afghanistan and Pakistan's support to the US to be an abomination; they view both the US and Pakistan as religious enemies with whom there cannot be any settlement.

The complex situation witnessed today in the tribal areas is a cause of concern since there has been a rapid takeover of the leadership of the militant groups by a transnational belief-driven core. In Bajaur, Mohmand and South and North Waziristan, as well as in parts of the Orakzai Agency, these fighters have acquired dominance, and the conventional method of tribal control through collective responsibility has collapsed. They have now created a Pakistani franchise of Al Qaeda under the Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP). It is thus evident that in such a situation no purely civilian approach will be enough to regain control.

To deal with this insurgency and deny the creation of sanctuaries and safe havens in FATA, the US urged Pakistan to deploy the military into the tribal areas in October 2002. Serious consequences resulted after the introduction of the military, which as

explained earlier created its own negative dynamics, destabilizing the administrative structure in tribal areas and thus weakening the writ of the state. Had there been a policy of rehabilitation of the Mujahedeen after the withdrawal of the SU from Afghanistan, it is very likely that the reaction could have been minimized. Neither Pakistan nor the US thought it essential to do so, and this allowed the fighters to multiply in an area of rising poverty and a lack of opportunities.

Pakistani Society's Sympathy for Militants

The militants have developed deep roots in Pakistani society by using a particularistic narration of history based on persecution. The absence of any long-term policies by the government to counteract such negative trends, coupled with the growth of unregulated militant organizations, has caused a growth in Jihadist bodies that are now threatening the Pakistani state. Some Pakistani political parties act as a political front for the militant groups in legislatures. Secondly, the militant groups that took part in the Kashmir *jihad* have joined the Taliban because they were looking for an alternative cause. There is now a constant stream of volunteers joining FATA-based militants from KPK, the Punjab, Sindh and Afghanistan.⁴²

As the government has been unable to rally public support for its counter-insurgency policy due to divisions in public opinion, the widely shared perception at the peoples' level is that Pakistan's support of and role in the on-going global war on terror is not in Pakistan's interest. A large number of leaders of public opinion and political activists blame Pakistan for being the US's proxy in return for economic aid which barely reaches ordinary people.

It is also perceived that the Pakistan Army is being used to kill its own people at the behest of the US. This interpretation of the war on terror represents a major weakness in the policy to build public agreement for a major foreign and domestic policy platform. It is mostly due to a lack of clarity regarding policy and the absence of a robust communications strategy that there has been lack of support for the fight against the terrorists both inside Pakistan and abroad, and this is harming the country.

As the government shies away from discussing the war on terror and its alliance with the West because of the fear of a rightist reaction, it is unable to implement an agreed

⁴² Some of the militant leaders of the Swat insurgency belong to southern Punjab, while the leader of the Bajaur militants, Qari Ziaur Rehman, belongs to Afghanistan.

strategy. The other aspect is that, by avoiding debate on the matter, Pakistan is also unable to approve a counter-insurgency policy which lays down the ground rules for the conduct of the war on terror. The availability of an approved strategy and guidelines to the military will go a long way in winning the battle of hearts and minds.

Pakistan's official circles were initially not perturbed by the militant activities because the latter were concentrated in Afghanistan. However, as the militants began to target Pakistani territory with suicide attacks and bomb blasts in 2007-2008, many people became conscious of the threat. Others argued that the suicide attacks were retaliation for Pakistan's involvement in the US-sponsored war on terror, especially Pakistan's security operations in the tribal areas. It appears that such views also run deep in powerful security circles, adversely affecting their capacity to deal seriously with the militants' challenge. This problem is further compounded when ordinary soldiers are exposed to a constant barrage of evangelicalism preached by Islamic hardliners and at the mosques. However, this attitude is now disappearing from those who have been fighting the militants.

The absence of credible popular support for the Pakistani government's participation in the global war on terror and the divided official and non-official disposition towards the militant Islamic groups are the major reasons for Pakistan's inability to pursue a counter-insurgency strategy with full commitment. This also gives ample space to the militants and other groups to pursue their partisan ideological agenda denting the Pakistan narrative and thereby weakening the Pakistani state.

On the strategic front, the Pakistani government faces another dilemma. The inability of the security forces to control militant activities in FATA and elsewhere gives these groups a feeling of ascendancy, while the security forces are perceived to be retreating, if not failing. As long as this perception persists, the militants and other Islamic groups will neither accommodate the government nor stop their efforts to expand their domain to the districts or dispatch suicide bombers to other Pakistani cities. The recent operations against the militants, although causing immense human suffering, have dented the gains made by the militants so far and encouraged communities to come out and challenge them; the state must, however, regulate these initiatives under local lashkars to prevent repercussions later and avoid replacing one set of problems with another.⁴³

⁴³ Recently communities have taken up the challenge against the militants by raising lashkars to contest their domination. The government has decided to support such initiatives.

On the other hand, as long as the Pakistani civilian and army authorities fail to assert their authority in the tribal areas and do not demonstrate that they have the capacity to retaliate if the militants challenge the government, no credible agreement will be possible between the militants and the government. Therefore, the government has to establish deterrence and authority in the tribal areas and show effectively that it has the capacity to contain the militants. Only then will the latter feel the need to reach an agreement with the Pakistan government.

It has already been noted in this report that the surge of the US forces in 2009 increased militancy and violence within Pakistan, as the militant cadres thought it safer to move to Pakistan. It is evident that the surge has pushed people from eastern and southern Afghanistan into Pakistani cities, including Karachi, now the Pashtun's largest city in either Pakistan or Afghanistan. The increase in terrorism in Karachi recently is ascribed to this build-up resulting from the surge in Afghanistan. The surge also pushed many Afghan Pashtuns into Baluchistan and FATA.

It is thus clear that the 'surge', while being marginal to the fighting in Afghanistan, shifted the war into Baluchistan, the urban areas of Karachi, FATA and KPK. This has led to an increase in violence and has severely dented Pakistan's overall security, as well as increasing the level of violence and criminality inside Pakistan. It is projected that it is only a matter of time before the militants become autonomous and strong enough to launch operations outside Pakistan. The 2008 Mumbai operation was a small example of what could happen on a larger scale in the future; this has hazardous consequences and could push the two nuclear powers to the edge.

Ironically Pakistan is a sentry at the citadel's gate protecting India! The two countries may not always be on the best of terms, but paradoxically their destinies are intertwined. The security and growth of India depend on the survival and good health of Pakistan. This geostrategic reality will thus call for a regional solution in dealing with the issue of militancy in Afghanistan, Pakistan and India on a sub-continental rather than a country basis. But do the countries of the region have the vision to construct such a security structure by transcending their internecine and suicidal conflicts with one another?

The Way Forward

The analysis presented above indicates the need to shift our attention to solutions. This is not going to be easy, but one would need to include the following steps in

order to find a way out of the deeply rooted problems, which are constitutional, administrative and cultural in nature. However, the potential benefits to the region are too great to ignore and thus need to be tried.

The support of the US will be needed to make these transformational changes on a regional basis. If executed effectively, militancy will be reduced. However, the solution requires working closely with the governments of Pakistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, India and the Central Asian countries. There must also be close collaboration with the UN, including the UN Security Council.

The following set of issues would need to be resolved between the parties:

- Promotion of a dialogue between India and Pakistan to resolve outstanding disputes to end the animosity between the two countries.
- Influencing Afghanistan to accept the international boundary as the border between the two states, as a contrary position will spell ruin for both states.
- Seeking a long-term solution to FATA exclusivity and to ending its isolation, integrating it fully into Pakistan and providing it with opportunities for development and growth.
- Ending the acrimony between the US and Iran, the chances of which have brightened after the election of President Rouhani in Iran.
- The US needs to establish parity for Pakistan to be dealt with on the same basis as India.
- Since the solution has to found regionally, the first step must be the establishment of an intelligence working group composed of India, Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Central Asian states and information-sharing with the UN Security Council.
- The US and the multilateral banks like the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, as well as Saudi Arabia and the UAE, should provide development assistance to FATA, KPK, South Punjab, Baluchistan, Afghanistan and Central Asia to generate employment, invest in female education and reduce poverty. In the case of Afghanistan this must include the eastern provinces of Afghanistan, as well as the Kunar and Jalalabad regions.
- It is evident that much of the negativism generated against the US and the West is due to the imbalance of US policies in the Middle East relating to the Palestine–Israel issue. It is essential that the US creates a balanced approach, otherwise the existing policy will threaten international security.
- Clearly the US's Afghan intervention of October 2001 has arrayed her against the Pashtuns as an ethnic group. As suggested by the Asia Foundation Report

on *America's Role in Asia*,⁴⁴ the US must engage the Pashtuns by having a specific policy to focus on them. This could lead to talks with the militants under a regional contact group identified above or other permutations. This will eventually lead to a political solution that could be based on the sharing of political power that may include participation of the Taliban in the Afghan elections of 2014.

- Pakistan needs to strengthen its national security institutions. Gratifyingly work on this recommendation has already commenced under Nawaz Sharif's new government, where a new division of the federal government has been created called the National Security Cell to handle civil–military and foreign-policy issues.
- The NSC needs to have provincial and FATA-specific institutional sub-frameworks and institutions to handle civil-military coordination and urgently undertake a review of the policy lacunas in counter-insurgency policy and operations, as well as promote coordination with the military and police in conducting CI operations. However, Pakistan lacks coordination in civil–military matters. Unless this position is reversed, the security crisis in Pakistan will continue to weaken the country.⁴⁵ A new doctrine for conducting CI operations should be generated.
- International support and financial assistance need to be provided to build the capacity of the police and security forces battling the militants in the region.
- Pakistan needs to put in place a robust communications strategy to change perceptions so that the population begins to support government's endeavors against militancy.

⁴⁴ The Asia Foundation; *America's Role in Asia – 2008*, San Francisco, USA, 2008, pp. 63-64.

⁴⁵ *The News*, Islamabad; 'We don't control army so how can we talk to Taliban? asks Imran' 18th Jan, 2014, p.1, <http://bit.ly/1jck7WO>,

Chapter 4

Security Transition and Reconciliation with the Taliban

Conflict in Afghanistan has become endemic. Despite a massive effort by ISAF, including the US, NATO and other nations of the world, stability in the country and the region is not visible. On the eve of the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan by the end of 2014, despite major gains having been made by Afghanistan in degrading terrorist capabilities, the security situation in Afghanistan remains tense, and question marks remain over whether the nascent capabilities of the ANA and the ANP, which will have 350,000 men by the end of 2014, will be adequate to restrain a buoyant Taliban. The latter are inclined to believe that they will be unstoppable after the departure of foreign forces from Afghanistan.

For reasons provided below, a security transition leading to peace in post-2014 Afghanistan is optimistic unless, by some miracle, there is reconciliation with the Taliban, which would enhance security and thus increase the chances of peace. Secondly, one should learn lessons from the gaps left in the Geneva Accord of 1988, among the most obvious being to obtain the commitment of the Mujahedeen leaders or fighting groups for peace. This unfortunately was not done and ultimately resulted in a civil war that began in 1992 and lasted for four years.

After the US intervention in Afghanistan, the defeat of the Taliban was quite rapid: on 9th December 2001 Mazhar e Sharif fell to US and Northern Alliance forces; after three days Herat fell in the West. Two days later, on 14th December, Kabul fell. Previously, on 5th of December, Karzai as head of the interim administration visited Kandahar, the Taliban's seat of power, to negotiate its peaceful surrender to the interim authority. He met Mullah Omar, and it was agreed between them that the latter would surrender Kandahar in order to prevent bloodshed. In return Mullah Omar would be permitted to remain unmolested in his home.

On 6th December 2001 Mullah Zaeef, the Taliban ambassador in Pakistan, declared at a press conference that Mullah Omar had agreed to give up power in return for peace and that there would be no further fighting. It appeared that the defeat of the Taliban had been followed by their leader's decision to seek reconciliation with the new government. Matters appeared quite hopeful at this moment. However, this euphoria was short lived because on 7th December, only a day later, US Defense Secretary Rumsfeld rejected the understanding between Karzai and Mullah Omar by declaring that no one would be allowed to live in peace who had supported

terrorism. This clearly showed a lack of understanding of local circumstances and traditions in the region, as well as clearly conflating the Taliban with Al Qaeda.⁴⁶

This was a costly mistake for the US and the world. Mr Dobbins, the current US special representative for AfPak, said in an interview that by rebuffing the peace offer a mistake had been committed, and now it would take a lot of effort to retrieve the situation. This is truly tragic: it was after Rumsfeld's rejection of the Karzai-Mullah Omar agreement over reconciliation that the latter, along with some of his associates, slipped across the border into Pakistan's vast Baluchistan province.

Although the majority of foreign forces will have been withdrawn from Afghanistan by December 2014, foreign troops numbering 12,000 to 15,000 will remain stationed in seven to nine bases spread throughout the country. Some have challenged the view that the US is actually withdrawing from Afghanistan when such a sizable chunk of forces remain there. This leads one to conclude that at best the US may be changing its strategy rather than withdrawing. Secondly, the presence of US forces will be like a red rag to the Taliban, urging them to continue to fight. Thus it will be reasonable to suggest that, although the nature of the Afghan conflict may change after 2014, the struggle for control of Afghanistan is likely to continue.

As the drawdown of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) picks up speed, the responsibilities for providing security will devolve upon the Afghan National Army. Peace in Afghanistan post-2014 will be severely jeopardized unless a viable and effective Afghan military is in place before another round of tension emerges.

In June 2013 ISAF handed over control of direct military operations throughout Afghanistan to the 350,000-strong Afghan National Security Force (ANSF). With the transfer of security responsibility from ISAF to the ANSF insecurity for Afghans has increased, but this was to be expected as a consequence of the transition. Today, there are differences in the level of security – the north and Kabul are more secure than Afghanistan's south and southeast. Clearly, improving Afghan security through use of Afghan forces is important. Yet, this may not be possible without assistance to capacitate the ANSF, help that was previously committed in Bonn 2011. To resolve matters concerning the provision of security by the ANSF

⁴⁶ Aljazeera TV documentary; *Price of Revenge*, Episode 2, 2013, www.bit.ly/IlyCiqi, at 35 min 08 sec.

after 2014, it is essential that the commitments made in Bonn (2011) and Chicago (2012) are fulfilled, as follows:

- Thus far the US has agreed to support the ANSF to the tune of \$4.2 billion a year after 2014. However, it has committed only \$2.7 billion; that still leaves a gap of \$1.5 billion a year to be filled. So far it is not known how this will be managed.
- Secondly, the support framework in terms of the helicopters and other surveillance platforms required to confront the insurgents still needs to be finalized. These matters may be linked to the US–Afghan Strategic Agreement, but that too is silent on security assistance after 2014. For instance, it is unknown how many special operation forces or trainers the US will retain in Afghanistan in support of the ANSF.

In order to remove these critical uncertainties, US/NATO must indicate at the earliest opportunity:

- The amount and kind of support that will be made available for upkeep of the Afghan National Army.
- The plans for the retention of forces in Afghanistan up to the withdrawal of ISAF in 2014, and the support that the US is willing to provide in terms of aircraft and other assistance to ANSF to prevent the re-emergence of Al-Qaeda/Taliban.

The foregoing account identifies the problems involved in establishing the framework for a viable security transition in Afghanistan after the 2014 drawdown of US and NATO troops. Given these circumstances, what are the essential steps that need to be taken in Afghanistan to help in the establishment of peace?

- Clearly reconciliation with Mullah Omar, which was possible in 2001, still remains a distant prospect for long-term peace in the region and Afghanistan; somehow this elemental factor is missing, and unless there is reconciliation between the Taliban and the Afghan state, peace will not materialize.
- In this connection, the much hyped news that there are on-going negotiations between the Taliban and the US is a placebo. If the US is genuinely interested in reconciliation with Mullah Omar, then why is his name still on the list of the most wanted terrorists, with a \$25 million bounty on his head? Furthermore, as the important members of the Taliban *shura* remain on the UN proscribed list, they are not able to negotiate. These facts lead one to assume the absence of a road map to negotiate a reconciliation; this does not augur well for the future.

- Can reconciliation be achieved when the US is insisting that the Afghans sign the Bilateral Security Agreement with the US? President Karzai has shown a lack of interest in signing it so far. His reason could be that he foresees that the signing of BSA may lead the country into a never ending spiral of war that could fragment Afghanistan with a massive spill-over effect in the region, or he may be bargaining for certain privileges – a normal pattern in the region.
- The extension of the BSA will mean the continued presence of US troops, and that will invite resistance by the Taliban. There are two possible conclusions that can be derived from such a confused situation; either there is a severe policy disconnect in the US team, or the US is really not interested in peace in the region.⁴⁷ The latter is not a position that the US would like to adopt given the lack of voter support for the war and the financial crisis that the country is facing.
- One is also at a loss to understand that, unlike the extended Geneva negotiations that preceded the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan in 1988-89, no recourse to the same methodology (with modifications) for ending the Afghan war was taken. It is not argued that such a process will ensure peace automatically, but if similar regional discussions were held prior to December 2014 – for instance, under the aegis of the UN – the chances of success would be that much higher, especially given that the US is a protagonist.
- Briefly, under the 1988 Geneva Accords that ended the war in Afghanistan, the antagonists were the Soviets and Afghan government forces fighting against the Afghan Mujahedeen and proxies supported by the US and many other nations, who were directed by the Pakistani ISI.
- The Geneva Accords consisted of several instruments: a bilateral agreement between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the Republic of Afghanistan on the principles of mutual relations, in particular non-interference and non-intervention; a declaration containing international guarantees, signed by the SU and the USA; a bilateral agreement between Pakistan and Afghanistan on the voluntary return of Afghan refugees; and an agreement on relationships for the settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan, signed by Pakistan and Afghanistan and witnessed by the Soviet Union and the United States.
- Simultaneously, Pakistan and Iran reached prior understandings on Afghanistan through bilateral talks outside the Geneva Accords (April 14, 1988). The agreements contained the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The withdrawal officially began on 15 May 1988 and ended on 15

⁴⁷ Ibid. (23) p. 16.

February 1989, thus putting an end to the nine-year Soviet occupation and war in Afghanistan without any major hiccups.

- Currently the US is fighting against the Taliban, who are a political movement and are alleged to have Pakistan's support, although the latter is an ally of US/NATO. How will this war be concluded and a viable peace process established so that, at the minimum, the US/NATO withdrawal is affected peacefully?
- Maybe not having a BSA could help in this process – but prudence requires that at least the process of negotiations with the Taliban and the regional countries must be started even at this late stage. However, it is high time that UN mediation were sought.
- Clearly, if Afghanistan is to have the capacity to protect the state, then obtaining a successful security transition that transfers control of the war to the Afghan Security Forces (ASF) and reconciliation are two essential pillars. Since the US-Afghanistan bilateral security agreement (BSA) has not yet been signed, it is doubtful whether a high level of support will be available to the ASF from US/NATO in the future, which is disconcerting.
- There is also a worry expressed by Russia, which suspects that the US-Afghan strategic alliance and the retention of some US forces in Afghanistan post-2014 is meant to create a sphere of influence along the former SU's borders that President Putin is now laying a claim to as a Russian sphere of influence. In this connection the Russian Deputy Foreign Minister has demanded that NATO inform the UNSC regularly about its future operations in Afghanistan. Russia is eyeing the stationing of forces in Afghanistan after 2014 with suspicion, seeing it as an attempt by the West to gain a strategic advantage in Central Asia under the guise of providing security to Afghanistan in what the Russians consider to be their legitimate sphere of influence.
- On the other hand, the Central Asian states fear the rise of terrorism and drug-trafficking from Afghanistan following the withdrawal of foreign armies in 2014, as they fear that a lack of security will weaken any Afghan government in the future. At a meeting of the Russia-NATO Council in Brussels in 2009, the Russian Ambassador feared that the infiltration of terrorism and drugs from Afghanistan would threaten the security of Russia and its allies in the CSTO. The Russians also thought that no marked progress was being made in improving security, and hence they were intensifying their border-control mechanisms with the involvement of some Central Asian republics. While the mandate of ISAF was to bring peace to Afghanistan, the Russians believe that this has still not been achieved after twelve years of effort. They are afraid that as soon as ISAF withdraws, the Taliban and the terrorists will be resurgent.

- Another matter requiring attention is for the Afghan police to maintain a sharp focus on criminal groups and syndicates associated with the drugs trade who are benefiting from the instability of Afghanistan. The Russians are concerned and have negotiated with Tajikistan for the deployment of Russian border and anti-narcotics forces on its border with Afghanistan. From this and other acts, it is clear that Afghanistan's north eastern neighbors fear deterioration in the security situation and are investing in security.
- The Chinese have already made sizeable business investments in Afghanistan's mineral sector and have relied on the ISAF security curtain to protect those investments. With the departure of ISAF they will have to protect those interests themselves, but would prefer to do so under a security screen provided by the UN or the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.
- From the above description of the fears of regional players surrounding Afghanistan, the design of the future architecture for peace-building in Afghanistan is clear and must include a UN presence in some form. It must also include the participation of the regional countries or have representation by their regional bodies, so that confidence is built up to achieve unanimity of purpose among all the main regional players.
- As the current exit strategy is weak, there is a high possibility of a revival of hostilities in Afghanistan and the region. The unfortunate scenario that is visible shows a possible peaking of violence from the next campaigning season beginning in March/April 2014, instead of a reduction in violence. This will cause confusion, and voices against Pakistani inaction will be raised. But any resurgence of violence in Afghanistan will spill over into Pakistan too.
- An agreement with the Taliban can change the dynamics of the security transition favorably; conversely its absence will be a weakness that will hinder the peaceful evacuation of foreign armies from Afghanistan and lead to a prolongation of the conflict.

Chapter 5

Amity between Afghanistan, India and Pakistan

Although there have long been good relations between Afghanistan and India, both countries have poor relations with Pakistan. Thus the enhancement of India's role in Afghanistan, coupled with Pakistan's accusations against Kabul and Delhi, contain narratives like the following:

- Historical alliance of Afghanistan and India since 1947. Their collaboration in sponsoring the dissident Pukhtunistan movement in the 1950-60 era, sponsoring a division of Pakistani territory based on Pashtun irredentism.⁴⁸
- Offer of Afghan support to Baluch dissidents like Baramdag Bugti, who was given refuge in Kabul.
- Presence of TTP fighters under the leadership of Maulvi Fazalullah in Kunar, which launched deadly attacks on Pakistani territory in Dir and other districts of KPK province.
- Increase in alleged Indian interference in Baluchistan and heightened intelligence profile in Afghanistan for increased intelligence gathering.⁴⁹
- Since its birth in 1947, Pakistan has perceived itself to be under an existential threat from India. This perception is the sum total of Pakistan's historical experience since its birth. What began as a conflict over Kashmir has now expanded into other areas like the Siachen glacier and Pakistan's claims of interference by India with the flow of Indus waters upon which Pakistan's agricultural survival depends.
- The ongoing struggle between India and Pakistan has extended into Afghanistan since 9/11. Pakistan fears encirclement by India on her western border through close Indo-Afghan relations, which it has been neutralizing by getting proxies to attack Indian interests in Afghanistan. The US was considered a friend, but after her strategic alliance with India the previous fraternal feelings have ebbed.
- The feelings of religious and cultural consanguinity existing between the Afghans and a majority of Pakistanis might become grounds for a future basis of association between the two peoples, by-passing elitist views that focus on the nation state. Historically, a large majority of people in Afghanistan and Pakistan

⁴⁸ Ibid. (10) p. 233.

⁴⁹ Ibid. (18), p. 4.

have united on the basis of Islam whenever the situation has required it; this will be the same in the future.⁵⁰

- It may be noted that vast swathes of territory in Central Asia, Afghanistan and parts of Pakistan where the control of the state is weak are loosely administered and can easily become safe havens for fighters. Such areas could pull in violence and fighters in the future in a regional conflict.
- Countries neighboring Afghanistan are likely to develop spheres of influence inside it if there is any contest for influence in Afghanistan as occurred in 1992-96, when a civil war raged when regional neighbors of Afghanistan supported their tribal and Islamic brethren, rather than agreeing with state policies. If a similar situation re-emerges in Afghanistan, the past pattern will be repeated.

The question that arises is whether such a region as AfPak can ever remain peaceful without policing? The lesson of history is clear that, without a strong stabilizer in the region, it is difficult to maintain peace. Thus it is high time that the countries of the region agree to a security framework dependent on themselves, rather than looking for one from an outside power. To be able to do this they must overcome their bilateral animosities. Improving Afghanistan–Pakistan relations is at the heart of such an approach, closely followed by improving India–Pakistan relations.

Recommendations for Improving Afghan–Pakistani Relations

To secure peace in Afghanistan, it is essential to ensure that friendly relations prevail between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Unfortunately, it is incomprehensible why tension persists between them at this crucial juncture. Despite the provision of assistance to Afghanistan by Pakistan, President Karzai has seen fit to raise irredentist claims on the loyalty of Pashtuns in FATA KP and Baluchistan by calling into doubt the validity of the international boundary between the two nations that was drawn up in 1893 and is known as the Durand Line. Is this some sort of visceral reaction by a Pashtun to a slight in the past, for which Pakistan is being put under pressure now?⁵¹

This 2,640 kilometer-long porous border was established after an 1893 agreement between Mortimer Durand representing British India and the Afghan Amir, Abdur Rahman Khan. It fixed the limit of their respective jurisdictions separating British

⁵⁰ Roy, Olivier; 'Islam and Resistance in Afghanistan,' Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 33-34.

⁵¹ Ibid. (19).

India from Afghanistan. Although shown on maps as the western international border of Pakistan, it remains unrecognized by Afghanistan. This has been one of the primary reasons for Pakistan creating a sphere of influence in Afghan matters in the past to ensure that a friendly government is in power in Kabul.

It is evident that, if Afghanistan wishes to receive Pakistan's assistance and help in securing peace in Afghanistan, as is in everyone's interest, then it must avoid claims on Pakistani territory, whatever the justification. Inexplicably against the logic of the current situation, President Hamid Karzai thought fit to say that the Afghan government would never recognize the Durand Line as the international border between the two countries.

Karzai has accused the government of Pakistan of trying to force Afghanistan to accept the Durand Line as the formal border through the construction of border gates and other military installations. Karzai even called on the Taliban to fight Afghanistan's enemies in what was widely seen as a swipe against Pakistan. Afghanistan's hostile attitude towards her neighbor Pakistan comes at a time when the United States wants Pakistan to help Afghanistan by persuading the Taliban to engage in peace talks ahead of the withdrawal of foreign troops by the end of 2014. The US has already recognized the Durand Line as the international boundary between the two nations by operating on the Afghan side and avoiding violating it.

Without going into President Karzai's motives, his remarks at this stage, when he is requesting Pakistan to help him, appear to be puzzling and do not augur well for securing peace in Afghanistan, especially when the Afghan High Peace Council's Road Map is heavily dependent on Pakistan to forge a breakthrough in achieving peace and reconciliation with the Afghan fighting groups. Clearly peace will not be possible in Afghanistan unless she has good relations with Pakistan.

Although Afghanistan and Pakistan are allies in the fight against extremism, they have serious differences, bordering on animosity, when it comes to finding joint solutions to problems. Both countries need to restore confidence in each other in order to work jointly to prevent the growth of extremism and to avoid tensions between them. The recommendations below must be in place by January 2015 when the transition process takes off:

- Both countries should recognize the international boundary between them as permanent. If there are differences, these must be discussed and resolved

amicably. As a first step the formation of a joint boundary commission may be undertaken to propose solutions and ensure that peace prevails on the border. This mechanism, coupled with the existence of a hotline between the two military headquarters and NSC, will assist in ensuring peace.

- Talks should be initiated with the aim of drafting a water-sharing agreement regarding the waters of the Kabul river, which are used by both countries. Both countries should agree to a joint monitored framework based on UN Charter principles of non-interference and respect for each other's sovereignty in border management.
- Both countries should agree on a definition of interference and then take steps to remove the causes where interference is reported and confirmed through a joint mechanism involving both civil and military representatives of the two countries in the proposed bilateral boundary commission.
- An extradition agreement between the two countries should be signed to transfer individuals who are wanted for criminal or terrorism charges and have taken refuge in the other's territory.
- Pakistan should shift its security paradigm and bring it into line with Article 40 of its Constitution, which exhorts it to improve international security and to become a respected member of the international community.
- The future of Afghanistan should be viewed as an opportunity to develop north-south and east-west energy and trade corridors with access to neighboring countries, for their benefit. The Gawadar-Kashgar economic corridor needs to be developed by inviting all regional countries to participate in its development.
- Afghanistan, the Central Asian States, Pakistan, India and Iran should create a regional energy framework to exploit energy-related opportunities for regional benefit if possible in the proposed Gawadar-Kashgar corridor.
- A multilateral commercial trading company should be created composed of the countries with the mandate to open up opportunities for trade and commerce amongst them. Although a percentage of equity funding for this company may be made available by participating nations, it should be led by the regional private business community, while the participating countries should jointly facilitate the development of infrastructure and policy that supports commercial development and helps in integrating the regional nations as part of the SAARC brotherhood.

Chapter 6

Free and Fair Elections in Afghanistan

It is worth noting that one of the most important transitions underway in Afghanistan is the presidential election in 2014 and the series of elections to provincial and district bodies. To assist in the establishment of an enduring peace, a free and fair presidential election is crucial and will assist in creating a national consensus that will help in evolving a tolerant path to a peaceful future.

It is absolutely necessary that these elections are held in a fair and free manner and are not open to the allegations of corruption that blighted the 2009 presidential elections. If Afghanistan fails to meet this condition, then the internal acrimony will destroy the chances of peace and security, and it will lapse into chaos again. This carries within it the danger of the re-appearance of non-state terrorist groups again in Afghanistan.

In order to ensure that that free and fair elections are held in Afghanistan, the following recommendations are made:

- Guidelines should be developed that will ensure free and fair elections. Such guidelines should include electoral reforms and the agreement of Afghan civil society over the manning of the Independent Election and Electoral Complaints Commission.
- The role of the Supreme Court and the Independent Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution should be defined clearly on the basis of a general consensus.
- A single foolproof, uncontroversial method of voter registration should be used for the forthcoming elections, instead of the current multiple and corrupt lists.

International Assistance Mechanisms

If peace is to be established in Afghanistan, it will be necessary to obtain regional support for peace and cooperation among Afghanistan's neighbors. A large measure of agreement exists in principle for the process contained in the 'Heart of Asia Declaration' of 2012. In the past, whenever there was an issue of security involving Afghanistan or any of its immediate neighbors as happened at the end of the Soviet withdrawal in 1988, it was essential to obtain the support of Afghanistan's immediate

neighbors, who as a normative reaction supported proxies inside Afghanistan. This must be prevented from occurring again.

Numerous meetings have been held, both in Afghanistan and internationally, in an effort to achieve a consensus on how to handle the security, political and economic transition in the post-2014 period, as well as agreement to provide assistance to it during the phase of transformation that is expected to last from 2014 to 2024. To achieve a convergence of policy between Afghanistan and her international partners, the national and international frameworks need to be in line with each other. This is essential to establish peace and transform Afghanistan into a peaceful region. A review of these frameworks indicates that the following conditions will need to be met:

- All future national and international efforts must adhere to the principles contained in the Istanbul Process and further elaborated at the 'Heart of Asia' ministerial conference held in Kabul in June 2012. These two milestone meetings iterated the adoption of policies based on the following principles:
 - ♦ Recognize the central role of the UN in international affairs.
 - ♦ Respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of states.
 - ♦ Dismantle terrorist sanctuaries and safe havens.
 - ♦ Recognize the need for frequent political consultations between neighbors.
 - ♦ Urge the implementation of trade and other confidence-building measures among member states.
 - ♦ Propose the development of an infrastructure to encourage economic growth and regional cooperation.

The Bonn Conference of December 2011, the Chicago Summit of May 2012, the Tokyo Conference of July 2012 and the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework have laid down the underlying principles for assisting Afghanistan in the security, economic and political transitions that the country will face from 2015 to 2025. Among the important declarations emerging from these conferences are the following:

- The international community promised to help Afghanistan to become a democratic and a peaceful nation.
- It promised to help Afghanistan to eliminate terrorism.
- It exhorted all states to support an end to external interference in Afghanistan.
- In Chicago the nations pledged to provide security assistance and capacity-building support to withstand security challenges.

- In Tokyo, it was agreed to assist Afghanistan in meeting its financial needs for economic growth, infrastructural development and capacity-building.
- The Tokyo Accountability Framework laid down the conditionalities based on good governance that Afghanistan will need to adopt as a condition of support.

Chapter 7

Conclusions

It is thus clear more than ever before that there is a need to adhere to the extended regional cooperation architecture that already exists and that Afghanistan recognizes this architecture as crucial in obtaining peace and stability in the region.

The Heart of Asia Declaration of June 2012 provides a comprehensive regional set of CBMs and cooperation mechanisms that need to be adhered to for implementation prior to the withdrawal of US and NATO forces by December 2014. Since important regional states have reservations about various issues, it may be a good time to call another meeting of the Heart of Asia Ministerial Body to give final shape to mechanisms to be readied and overseen in support of Afghan initiatives preceding 2014.

Evidently, as has been argued in this report, the chances of establishing enduring peace and security in Afghanistan after 2014 will be greatly enhanced if the five necessary conditions elaborated in the report are met. Briefly they are:

- Afghanistan and Pakistan need to have cordial relations through which help and assistance in various forms can be provided to Afghanistan. There is also a crying need for Afghanistan, Pakistan and India to engage trilaterally on Afghanistan.
- It is important to ensure a robust security transition, or else the Afghan state will face challenges and thus may lose control that could result in repeating the tragedy that Kabul faced from 1992-96. It is clear that much needs to be done to improve security conditions.
- Reconciliation with the Taliban will be particularly effective in creating a peaceful environment, and this needs to be pursued actively and with greater vigor. The UN Secretary General may appoint a Special Peace Coordinator to ensure that some form of understanding is reached quickly with the fighting groups, particularly the Taliban. If such an arrangement is not possible, then the chances of a peaceful US withdrawal of forces will also be jeopardized. Force protection may lead to the continued presence of US forces inside Afghanistan.
- The Afghan government must ensure that the presidential elections are seen as fair by the different ethnic groups in the country.
- It is necessary that Afghan and regional policies must be in agreement with the main international frameworks.

Among the other recommendations that emerge from this review are the following:

- Pakistan must understand that allowing confusion to prevail in its civil–military relations is only strengthening the terrorists, who have become stronger through the prevailing confusion and the policy of appeasement. This situation will lead to a weakening of the Pakistani state’s institutions and the emergence of irredentist demands.
- The US needs to understand the drivers of Pakistani security policy, while the latter must assist the US in handling the problems besetting it.
- The policy of violating Pakistani sovereignty by deploying drone vehicles needs to be revisited if Pakistan pursues its FATA reforms and integrates the region more fully into the national framework. This will be a foundational transformation and will require lot of imagination and finances, as well as a lengthy consultative process involving all the stakeholders.
- Pakistan, India and Afghanistan also need to shift their narratives and place more reliance on a sub-continental identity where local culture and traditions provide a built-in safety net against the tyranny of imported doctrines. Strobe Talbott stated it wisely when he said in 1992: ‘All countries are basically social arrangements, accommodations to changing circumstances. No matter how permanent and even sacred they may seem at any one time, in fact they are all artificial and temporary. Through the ages, there has been an overall trend toward larger units claiming sovereignty and paradoxically, a gradual diminution of how much true sovereignty any one country actually has.’⁵²
- The social reality in Afghanistan and Pakistan is the salience of religion and tribalism as the drivers of individual behavior. Their elites also conform to this stereotype. Thus to expect that such countries will react in accordance with Westphalian norms is being over-ambitious.
- Thus judging Pakistan according to Western state frameworks and then labeling it a failed or failing state is erroneous.
- The solution to these problems lies in finding an answer to the question of how to shape the dynamics of those states whose drivers are tribal but mixed with Islamic thinking as transformed by particular places and societies.

⁵² *TIME Magazine*, Talbott, Strobe, ‘The Birth Of The Global Nation,’ July 20, 1992, <http://bit.ly/198P9rE>