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Asia is but a body of mud and water. Its throbbing heart is the Afghan Nation. The Afghan nation’s relief gives relief to Asia and its corruptions corrupts Asia.

Allama Mohammad Iqbal\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1}Allama Mohammad Iqbal is the national poet of Pakistan, born in Nov, 1877 and died in April, 1937.
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ABSTRACT

Pakistan relations with Afghanistan have mostly been frail, based on mutual mistrust which has never allowed the two countries to establish closer ties. In post Taliban era, Pakistan recognized Hamid Karzai government and expressed its desire of establishing friendly relations but nature of relationship was fragile and mistrust was dominant. Their bilateral relations during (2001-2008) showed heightened mistrust which inhibited the development of strong and stable relationship and presented a situation of Prisoner’s Dilemma. Several issues strained their relations and were responsible for widening trust gap. Mistrust in the fight against terrorism, cross border infiltration, blame game, safe havens in FATA and regional factors complicated the situation and halted cooperation between the two neighbors. Pakistan and Afghanistan are security seekers but concrete steps for bringing peace and security are lacking on their part. A friendly and secure Afghanistan is very much important for Pakistan’s future stability, security and prosperity and vice versa. Mistrust and causes of friction, if not removed, will complicate the process of maintaining friendly relations and threaten regional peace and security. The study therefore, highlights the causes of friction and recommends breaking the Prisoner’s Dilemma to establish relations based on mutual trust and cooperation.
Chapter-1

Trust and Mistrust: A Case of Pak-Afghan Strained Relations (2001-2008)

Trust and mistrust is a central theme in Pak-Afghan relations. Trust is an important element that can lead both Pakistan and Afghanistan to a better bilateral understanding and future progress of the region. In Pak-Afghan relations mistrust rather than trust remained a dominant and mutual phenomenon. The intensity of mistrust towards each other has varied in different regimes and though brief cordiality has occurred as well, but never been enough to provide a consistent direction.

For most part of Pakistan's independent history, relations with Afghanistan have been problematic, characterized by recurrent mutual suspicions which most of the times are noticeable in the policies of interference and even in attempts at undermining cooperative measures. Pakistan and Afghanistan are neighboring countries, sharing 2240 km mountainous border. Despite shared geography, proximity, faith and ethnic ties, relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan have never been smooth. With the only exception of Taliban government in

---

Afghanistan (1996-2001), successive governments in Kabul have exhibited varying amount of discontent towards Pakistan. ³

Following the 2001 invasion of the United States led coalition forces and northern alliance⁴ and the resulting overthrow of Taliban regime in Kabul, Pakistan recognized the first democratically elected Hamid Karzai’s government, offered aid and expressed its desire for establishing friendly relations. But the nature of relationship between them showed fragility, marked by heightened mistrust and a situation of dilemma.

Before proceeding further, I would like to briefly define key terms which have been used frequently throughout my work but most of them have been discussed in detail in the second chapter.

**Prisoner’s Dilemma**

The Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) is a situation of conflict which shows why states or individuals opt whether or not to cooperate. In PD, if actors cooperate, they both receive a payoff. If one cooperates and the other does not, the cooperating player receives the smallest possible payoff, and the defecting player the largest. If both

---

⁴Northern Alliance-a coalition of non-Pushtun parties that resisted the rule by Taliban; succeeded in overthrowing the Taliban with American assistance in 2001. Stephen Tanner, Afghanistan: A Military History from Alexander the Great to the Fall of Taliban (New York: Da Capo Press, 2002), 332.
players do not cooperate, they receive a payoff, but it is less than what they would gain if both had cooperated.  

Security Dilemma

The Security Dilemma is a concept which explains that in a situation of uncertainty and mistrust, perceived external threats (real or imagined) breed feelings of insecurity in those states that believe themselves to be the targets of such threats, thus leading those states to adopt measures (alliance creation, arms buildups, and so on) to increase their power and capability to counteract those threats. Security dilemma limits cooperation between states and increases mistrust.

Mistrust

Mistrust according to Andrew Kydd “is a belief that the other side is untrustworthy, or prefers to exploit one's cooperation.” Mistrust halts cooperation, causes serious conflicts and instability between the states. If the level of trust is low between the states there will be non cooperative behavior leading to Prisoner’s Dilemma, despite their desire for security. It results in conflicts between security seekers and can turn mutual interests into zero sum game.

---

8 Ibid. p.15.
Misperception

Misperception means inaccurate inferences, miscalculations of consequences and misjudgment about how others will react to one’s policies. Misperceptions negatively impact bilateral relations; causes mistrust and misinterpretation of reciprocal demands and the other side expectations. Misperceptions amplify the country’s dilemma whether to cooperate or not.

Anarchy

Anarchy is lawlessness and absence of supreme authority above states to impose cooperation. Anarchy leads to uncertainty which creates fear and mistrust between states. Hard core realists believe that there is no authority above states to impose rules or counter aggressive states, international institutions are weak, cheating and defection is a common phenomenon which gives birth to security dilemma and causes mistrust.

Cooperation

Robert Keohane defines cooperation by saying that “cooperation means the existence of a degree of policy coordination where actors adjust their behavior to the actual or anticipated preference of others.” For cooperation it is necessary that a state should alter its policies to reduce the negative consequences on or in other

---

words facilitate the goals of other state.\textsuperscript{12} Distinction should be made between cooperation and harmony. Harmony requires complete alignment of interests but cooperation can take place when situation represent a mixture of conflicting and complementary interests.\textsuperscript{13}

**Defection**

Defection is the conscious abandonment of allegiance or duty as to a person, cause, doctrine or a state. In a single round Prisoner’s dilemma temptation for defection is more, even when one state thinks that other state will cooperate because defection has more benefits.

**Reciprocity**

Robert Keohane describes reciprocity as, “exchange of roughly equivalent values in which actions of each party are contingent on the prior actions of the other in such a way that good is returned for good and bad for bad.”\textsuperscript{14} Therefore, reciprocity is the process of interaction between two parties where both are responsive to each other’s actions.


Reassurance

Reassurance can be defined as the process of building trust\textsuperscript{15} i.e. assuring other states of reciprocating cooperation rather than exploiting it. States through such policies adopt measures which minimize mistrust, misperception, increase trust and locked them into cooperation. Mutual reassurance involves two parties and starts from position of mistrust.

Having defined the key terms now I initiate my main argument that Pakistan and Afghanistan were in a situation of Prisoner’s Dilemma during the period 2001-2008, which did not allow them to develop strong and stable relationship to implement joint cooperative strategies. They saw each other in a zero sum relationship where the gain of one was the loss of another. The Prisoner’s Dilemma represented a situation of conflict in which they had to opt a rational choice. i.e. cooperation or defection. They were seeking security but concrete steps for bringing peace and security were lacking on their part. There was lack of harmony and defection was dominant. During the aforementioned period both countries were engaged in negative propaganda and blame game. Afghanistan held Pakistan responsible for the bloodshed and devastation in the country. The former accused Pakistani army of aiding Taliban to launch attacks across the border in Afghanistan. Pakistan in return blamed Afghanistan for the

\textsuperscript{15} Andrew H. Kydd, Trust and Mistrust in International Relations (2005), op.cit. p.184.
insurgency in its tribal areas, Balochistan province and the deteriorating law and order situation in the country.\textsuperscript{16}

Moreover, Karzai’s government banned Pakistani newspapers and their websites. Pakistan’s radio and television programs could hardly be heard.\textsuperscript{17} The reason behind banning Pakistani media was their alleged involvement in the hostile propaganda and undermining Karzai government. Pakistan too banned Afghan channels in response to Karzai’s decision of not permitting Pakistani channels to broadcast programs. Media telecasting Dari and Pashtu channels were allowed in the past but then they were stopped for not having a Pakistan Electronic Media Regularity Authority (PEMRA) license.\textsuperscript{18} The resurgence of Taliban, the various internal and external security issues faced by Karzai’s government and the deteriorating law and order situation in Pakistan deepened mistrust. It strained their already fragile relations; created Prisoner’s Dilemma and impeded the growth of bilateral relations.

In international relations, cooperation without sufficient trust is possible which can be converted into full cooperation and win-win situation by employing right strategies. Cooperation between United States and Pakistan in the war against terrorism, Sino-India and Egypt-Israel cooperation in various fields are examples of states cooperating without trusting each other. In Pak-Afghan case,

there was limited cooperation in diplomatic, economic and security fields but without sufficient trust and defection was dominant. In Prisoner’s Dilemma cooperation is always limited because of mistrust, uncertainty and lack of communication. Pakistan provides transit trade facility to Afghanistan under the Afghan transit trade agreement (ATT).\(^\text{19}\) It plays a pivotal role in Afghanistan’s reconstruction of roads, hospitals, and educational institutions. Moreover, it provides Afghanistan with a market for agriculture commodities (especially food grains and fruits). Both vowed to cooperate in counter terrorism efforts and became part of forums like Tripartite Commission\(^\text{20}\) to counter terrorism. But these efforts must be capitalized upon towards complete cooperation with mutual trust and understanding. Such development will help to stabilize the security and economic situation in both the countries as well as break the Prisoner’s Dilemma.

To study the element of mistrust in Pak-Afghan relations, the post Taliban era has been chosen. The post Taliban period is significant as it has resulted in acrimonious Pak-Afghan relations damaging the internal peace of both the countries. Resurgence of Taliban in Afghanistan; increase in suicide bombing in both countries; NATO’s military incursions in tribal areas of Pakistan (considered as safe havens of terrorists and militants) and growing influence of regional powers in Afghanistan complicated the situation. These developments had

\(^{19}\) ATT was signed in 1965 between Pakistan and Afghanistan under which Pakistan will provide transit facility to land locked Afghanistan.

\(^{20}\) In order to curb the terrorist threat, Pakistan, Afghanistan and the US formed a Tripartite Commission in 2003. The main task of the Commission is to coordinate military efforts in the US-led war against terrorism. See http://www.welpolitik.net/.
negative impact on Pak-Afghan relations and posed serious threat to the regional peace and stability.

There is no denying the fact that a friendly Afghanistan is very much important for Pakistan’s future stability, prosperity, development and vice versa. Through peace, Pakistan can become the nearest and cheapest outlet to the outside world for Afghanistan and Central Asian Republics (CARs). Moreover, it would enable Pakistan to secure new markets for its goods. The energy rich CARs can export their oil and gas via Pakistan and the region would become a prospective energy hub.\textsuperscript{21} For both countries, political and economic development depends upon cooperative relations. They are currently cooperating on war against terrorism which itself has become a major issue of contention because of the mistrust, accusations and misperceptions of each other.

This research, therefore, attempts to highlight causes of trust deficit and its implications for Pak-Afghan ties in the post Taliban era (2001-2008). It seeks to find ways and means for reducing trust gap. It explores the prospects of economic, communication, educational and cultural ties. These being the basic elements in developing trust and confidence. Mistrust and causes of friction, if not removed, will not only complicate the process of maintaining friendly relations but will also threaten an already delicate relationship between the two Muslim neighboring countries. Efforts are needed on the part of both to mend their longstanding issues and enhance their credibility because neighbouring countries

that have so much to gain from mutual cooperation cannot live separately amidst continued animosity even if they so desire.

1.1: Statement of the Problem

Pakistan’s relations with Afghanistan are of immense importance. It not only affects Pakistan relations with the neighboring countries but also leaves its own security and sovereignty at stake. The major hurdle in Pak-Afghan relations is mistrust which is impeding the growth of normal relations, disqualifying them from participating in any meaningful dialogue and hampers cooperation on several fronts. Deep mistrust was observed in the bilateral relationship of the two countries during the period 2001-2008. Pakistan was blamed for chaotic situation in Afghanistan, existence of safe havens for miscreants in Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA)\(^2\) sponsoring terrorism and suicide bombing in Afghanistan. Subsequently, Pakistan blamed Afghanistan for its pro Indian policies, creating insurgency in FATA and Balochistan. The root cause of trust deficit is their

---

\(^2\) Federally administered tribal area (FATA) is of Belgium size, rugged mountainous area with many passes. It is geo strategically very important for Pakistan as it is located close to Pakistan north-western Afghan border. The area comprises of Pashtun tribes who have a history of stiff resistance against British and Soviet invaders. FATA has an area of 27,200 square km and is subdivided into seven regions known as Khyber, Kurram, Bajaur, North, South Waziristan, Mohmand and Orakzai agency and six “frontier regions” i.e. Bannu, D.I Khan, Kohat, Peshawar, Tank and Lakki Marwat. FATA is considered to be a separate entity by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan constitution’s article one. Pakistan’s head of state governs FATA through governor of Khyber Pukhtunkhwa, who administers it through political agent. In the current era, FATA is considered to be the hot bed of global terrorist activities and a safe haven of different militant groups including Al-Qaeda and Islamic movement of Uzbekistan, and Kashmiri Mujahidin. FATA importance increased several fold after 9/11 and it is considered as a safe haven of international terrorism by international community. See Imtiaz Gul, “Afghanistan Imbroglio: Implications for Pakistan Tribal Areas”, Policy Perspective 5:2, (2008), 67. Also see M. Maqbool Khan Wazir, “Geo Politics of FATA After 9/11”, IPRI Journal, xi: 1, (Winter, 2011), 60.
complementary and overlapping objectives. Both are allies in the war against terrorism and this common objective provided them with an opportunity to remove misgivings and strengthen their bilateral relations. For this purpose a Tripartite Commission was established by the Americans in 2003, consisting of military officials of Afghanistan, Pakistan, and United States. Grand Jirga was held in 2007 for removing misgivings. But the trust gap, however was so wide that both could not solve their disputes bilaterally which has allowed regional powers to interfere in their affairs and exploit the situation to their own benefits. Pak-Afghan relations have prospects and challenges. Both countries cannot afford mistrust and hostility which have repeatedly caused negative repercussions on their relations.

1.2: Research Questions

What factors hardened mistrust between the two countries and resulted in acrimonious relationship? What policy adjustments are required to improve their relations and develop trust? What role Tribal areas can play in forging better relations between the two countries? What will be the future of Pak-Afghan relations in the context of trust or mistrust?

23 A complementary objective or interest is one in which two actors have different ends but discover that mutual assistance will enable each actor to achieve his separate objectives, but the links among allies are tenuous once either party has attained its objectives. Moreover the opportunity of misunderstanding is greater within such alliance. Strains develop within such alliances that last for considerable periods. See Raymond F Hopkins & Richard W Mansbach, Structure and Process in International Politics (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973), 309.
1.3: Aims and Objectives of the Study

Following are the objectives of this study:

1. To present historical context of Pak-Afghan relations in terms of mistrust.

2. To evaluate different aspects of Pak-Afghan relations, the factors that account for trust deficit and their implications for their bilateral relations in post Taliban era of 2001-2008.

3. To analyze Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan’s reconstructions and development and the future prospects of cooperation in different fields.

4. To examine the possible role of Afghanistan in developing Pakistan’s relations with Central Asian Republics and existing constraints which hinders the establishment of regional trade and energy corridors.

5. To study future prospects of friendly relations between the two neighboring countries based on a set of recommendations which will help in developing trust and confidence.

1.4: Significance

A number of studies have been carried out from different perspectives on Pak-Afghan relations but little work has been done on the factor of ‘mistrust’ in their relations in the post Taliban era. Earlier works have mostly examined the strength and weakness of Pakistan’s policy towards Afghanistan without specifically
addressing ‘mistrust’ as a root cause of unfriendly relations. J.N. Dixit\textsuperscript{24} takes a close look at 9/11 terrorist attacks, its planning, execution and consequences for Afghanistan. Rizwan Hussain\textsuperscript{25} has given a historical overview of Afghanistan relations with Pakistan, Afghanistan’s civil war, Pakistan’s involvement in backing Taliban, changing facets of Pakistan policy towards Taliban, role of Pakistani military in policy formulation and Pakistan’s continued interest in the region after 9/11.

Musa Khan Jalalzai\textsuperscript{26} gives a lucid political history of Pak-Afghan relations before and after partition. Jihad, civil wars in Afghanistan and US foreign policy objectives are focus of his study. The author precisely explains the Taliban and Post Taliban developments but does not analyze mistrust.

Kamal Matinuddin\textsuperscript{27} gives a fascinating account of Taliban’s movement, reasons of its success and its consequences for Pakistan and other neighboring countries. He examined the role and interests of regional powers and has criticized Pakistan’s policy towards Afghanistan after the emergence of Taliban by arguing that it has not served the country’s long term interests. He emphasized that Pakistan should not try to act alone in Afghanistan and must take into account the interests of its neighbors.

\textsuperscript{26}Musa Khan Jalalzai, \textit{Afghanistan, Central Asia, Pakistan and United States} (Lahore: Bookbiz, 2003).
Ahmed Rashid\textsuperscript{28} study has discussed Taliban’s movement from 1994-1999 and has covered its various aspects in depth. The author focuses mostly on Taliban era and their relations with Pakistan. He examines how Taliban became a part of great game which involved western companies, regional countries, Saudi Arabia and the CIA. He has compared them with 19\textsuperscript{th} century confrontation between Britain and Russia, by tapping primary sources which gives a great deal of originality and good reference material on Taliban. Barnett R. Rubin\textsuperscript{29} in his work examines the chaotic situation in Afghanistan since 1978. He gives a detailed analysis of Communist coup, Mujahidin’s resistance, Taliban, Osama-bin-Laden and throws light on the present day turmoil in Afghanistan and arrives at the conclusion that United States, Pakistan and Saudi interests have created the challenges of today.

There have been a number of other works highlighting various aspects of Pak-Afghan relations. They provide good reference material on Taliban, terrorism and Pakistan’s policy towards Afghanistan, but none of them directly addresses the question of mistrust comprehensively, which has affected their policies toward each other. Therefore, there is a need to look into the factors responsible for the trust deficit and address the questions; why there is mistrust and how it can be reduced if not entirely eliminated.

This research has therefore added a new dimension to the work already done and has tried to develop an understanding of Pak-Afghan mistrust. The study gives historical context of mistrust as well as factors responsible for their mistrust in post Taliban era. It is also accompanied by recommendations to convert their zero sum game into positive sum, remove mistrust and suspicions and facilitate mutual cooperation. This study is significant as it has highlighted the shortcomings of Pakistan’s policy towards Afghanistan which can enable the policy makers to address the issues more effectively and remove purple patches in the bilateral relations of the two Muslim neighboring countries.

1.5: Methodology

The research has been carried out on the established pattern for social sciences i.e. descriptive and analytical approaches to proceed and progress and arrive at the conclusion. For this purpose, both qualitative and quantitative methods have been employed in mixed form. Review of existing literature on Pak-Afghan relations, available primary and secondary sources have been consulted to get a broader perspective on the root causes contributing to mistrust.

The primary data was collected through interviews, agreements and official documents. Personal interviews were conducted with scholars, government officials and people from daily walk of life. The Area Study Center University of Peshawar, The Institute of Policy Research and Strategic Studies, Islamabad, foreign ministry of Pakistan and The Department of Political Science
Peshawar were visited in order to gather secondary data that provided strong base for carrying out research.

The time period chosen for the study is 2001-2008 because during this period change of policies was witnessed in both the countries as well as mistrust was dominant in their relations that stalled every cooperative measure on their part. Moreover, the study relies upon the Prisoner’s Dilemma theory to analyze the nature of Pak-Afghan relations and arrives at a solution for trust building through its repeated reciprocal strategies.

Prisoner’s Dilemma has been adopted because it is a decision making approach. It explains the pros and cons of cooperation and non cooperation else than being innovative and interesting. The theory was adopted during the cold war to trace the origin of mistrust between Soviet Union and United States, eventually opening routes towards detente. It highlighted missed opportunities to end the conflict between the two superpowers. In their relations, mistrust was so dominant that it prevented them from realizing the dividend of cooperation. The two opposing forces in cold war were communism and democracy. Their ideologies created clash and they enacted policies against each other. Security became a dominant factor thereby creating security dilemma between them. Ruling emotions altered people logical thinking. Fear played a role in decision making as is the case in Prisoner’s Dilemma. In fact, the actors prefer cooperation, peace and security but both fear that other side will defect, resultanty they fail to cooperate and the conflict continued until the disintegration of Soviet Union.
Pak-Afghan relations during 2001-2008 depicted the same scenario i.e. interdependent (‘in Jail’ together). The idea of comparative gains and protecting oneself against the other compelled them towards security dilemma. Resultantly, they sought alliances with different countries; relied upon non state actors and supported each other dissidents groups. Afghanistan aligned itself with Pakistan’s arch rival India to protect its interests while Pakistan relied upon non state actors to achieve its objectives which exacerbated the conflict. Thus a pro western government in Afghanistan with a major tilt towards India became a recipe for mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Both were aware that the stakes in cooperation were higher than confrontation but the intensity of mistrust on each other’s cooperative gestures generated conflict. The study shows that if both players interact repeatedly, keep an eye on the shadow of future, they will learn to cooperate as rational thinking will eventually prevail leading towards sustainable trust.

1.6: Chapter Structure

The work is divided into seven chapters. Chapter-1 “Trust and Mistrust: A Case of Pak-Afghan Acrimonious Relations (2001-2008)” includes introduction to the study. It lays down aims and objectives, significance and methodology.

Chapter-2 “The theoretical frame work” provides direction to research and helps in understanding the nature of Pak-Afghan relations and the lack of trust during the period 2001-2008 by applying the theory of Prisoner’s Dilemma.
Chapter-3 “Trust deficit in Pak-Afghan Relations and its implications: A Historical perspective (1947-2001)” highlights the evolution of mistrust between the two countries during the mentioned time period. It mostly focuses on historical reasons of mistrust. It argues that Pakistan’s threat perception from India and Afghanistan’s pro Indian policy since inception of Pakistan planted the seeds of mistrust which were reinforced by the former claim over its territory. Moreover, the study highlights United States quest for energy and routes; power politics and influence in Afghanistan, leading to Pakistan’s support for Taliban which became a strong factor in their mistrust.

Chapter-4 “Mistrust: Issues Straining Pak-Afghan Relations and major developments in Post Taliban era (2001-2008)” discuss developments in Afghanistan and Pakistan in the post Taliban era with emphasis on mistrust. In addition, core issues which inhibited trust and strained Pak-Afghan relations in post Taliban era (2001-2008) are deciphered. Moreover, it identifies the different factors responsible for the resurgence of Taliban, the situation in FATA and its impact on the trust level between the two countries.

Chapter-5 “Regional Geo Politics in Afghanistan and its Impact on Pak-Afghan Relations: A Factor in Mistrust” discuss the growing influence of different actors i.e. Iran, India and United States in Afghanistan and its impact on Pak-Afghan trust level. In addition, it analyses Pakistan’s apprehensions regarding Indian role in Afghanistan and why it wants United States and Afghanistan to counter the Indian influence.
Chapter-6 “Cooperation without Trust: Pakistan’s Role in Afghanistan’s Reconstruction and Future Prospects” examine cooperation between the two countries, major projects undertaken by Pakistan, and potential areas of cooperation between the two counties e.g. Gwadar port and its benefits for Afghanistan. The dividends of normalization for Pakistan will be assessed particularly within the security and energy sectors.

Conclusions which are given in the end not only conclude the study but highlight major findings and suggestions for improving Pak-Afghan relations. It highlights the need to rectify the historical misperception by reforming the domestic decision making process with more emphasis on cooperation rather than confrontation.
Chapter-2

Theoretical Frame Work

In the discipline of international relations trust refers to the readiness to take risk on the behavior of others. Andrew H. Kydd defines trust as a belief that the other side prefers mutual cooperation for its own advantage.\(^{30}\) Trust is a very important factor for long term cooperative relations. If there is an element of trust in bilateral relations cooperation becomes easier but if the element of mistrust is dominant, conflict becomes severe and resolution of contentious issues become difficult. Mistrust increases misperceptions, breeds hostility, and make cooperation costly for the states as none of the parties fulfill their commitments. Consequently, hostility disrupts relations and amplify trust gap making resolution of conflicts difficult.

The work is based on applying the theory of Prisoner’s Dilemma to Pak-Afghan relations. Pak-Afghan relations during the period under study (2001-2008) can be best described as a narrative of mistrust and presents a case of Prisoner’s Dilemma. The two neighbors have remained confrontationist and chose to protect their own interests at the expense of the other. Each played cautious and believed that compromise and engagement will result in a zero sum game, where the gain of one would be the loss of the other. This mindset prevailed in the policy making circles during the post Taliban period (2001-2008). There was

\(^{30}\) Andrew H. Kydd, Trust and Mistrust in International Relations, (2005), op.cit. p. 6.
limited cooperation between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Individual rationality dominated which made them more selfish and less cooperative, resulting in trust deficit. Collective rationality- good for all – took a back seat, as cooperation was suspected to result in losses than a win-win situation for both the neighbors. Their interaction was shaped by the belief that if they cooperated with each other they will lose and become vulnerable both militarily and economically, resulting in strained relations.

They preferred the strategy of defection over cooperation and could not achieve stability in their relations. The dominant strategy is the one that is contrary to the expectation of the other actor. Here it is necessary to understand the concept of mistrust in bilateral relations as explained in the light of realist school of thought which causes Prisoner’s Dilemma. The second section is about the application of two actors Prisoner’s Dilemma theory to Pak-Afghan relations in the (2001-2008) period- where they had two choices, cooperation (C) and defection (D). The latter dominated their relationship and cooperation was minimal during the period under study.

Analyses however show that cooperation yields more pay offs over defection. It builds trust over a period of time and solves deadlock. In addition, the theoretical frame work explains reciprocal strategies which if adopted will enable Pakistan and Afghanistan to break Prisoner’s Dilemma. It will help them to sustain trust and show how they can convert their limited cooperation into full cooperation based on mutual trust. In the current chapter sophisticated route have
been adopted by keeping mathematical modeling minimum. Instead endeavor has been made to explain things theoretically so as to keep argument parsimonious and focused on issues creating dilemma.

2.1: Mistrust in Bilateral Relations and Prisoner’s Dilemma

Mistrust and suspicions are the main elements behind Prisoner’s Dilemma and anarchy. Mistrust is the thinking that the other actor is determined to ruin one’s cooperation rather than repaying it e.g. cold war period can best explain the phenomena where mistrust was the root cause of a conflict between United States and Soviet Union and they resorted to offensive measures against each other. States can live peacefully if both the actors show consent but if they believe that the other side has some hidden agenda and is unwilling to cooperate it leads to conflicts and anarchy\(^{31}\) E.g. Germany during 1930s emerged as a war monger, untrustworthy and invaded neighboring countries which widened the level of mistrust and it became extremely difficult to overcome which culminated into World War II. Afterwards, European countries after World War II moved from conflict to cooperation and overcame mistrust. They increased their level of interaction and cooperation to the highest level by founding NATO and other organizations e.g. European Union strengthened their cooperative relationships which eroded level of mistrust to a great level.\(^{32}\)


Mistrust can hinder cooperation among groups just as it can between two individuals. Scholars such as Thucydides, Thomas Hobbes and John Herz has emphasized the anarchical nature of world politics which creates mistrust among states, prevent cooperation and creates Prisoner’s Dilemma. The views of John Herz who gave the concept of security Dilemma are somehow identical to Thucydides: “What made war inevitable was the growth of Athenian power and the fear which this caused in Sparta.”

Therefore, attaining cooperation in such an environment of mistrust is against reality. In situations of security dilemma, the increase in security of one state is considered a threat by another; thereby it leads to deadlocks and Prisoner’s Dilemma.

The term Security dilemma was used by John Herz in the beginning of cold war. According to him,

“.......groups or individuals living in such a constellation are, concerned about their security from being attacked, subjected, dominated or annihilated by other groups or individual. Striving to attain security from such attacks, they are driven to acquire more and more power in order to escape the impact of the powers of others. This in turn renders the other more secure and compels them to prepare for the worst. Since no one can ever feel secure in such a world of competing units, power competition ensues and the vicious circle of security and power

---

accumulation is on.” As a result it becomes extremely difficult for states to trust each other and largely view other’s intentions negatively.

Scholars have analyzed different reasons of mistrust between the states. Thomas Hobbes analysis of human nature being selfish, aggressive and insecure when applied to international relations says that there is a constant anarchy in international relations because human nature translates itself into state nature which causes conflicts among the states. The pursuit of security and the maximization of power at the expense of other states that causes security dilemma is a permanent feature of IR. It causes mistrust, uncertainty and leads the states to enter into arms race, lowering their trust level even if they want to cooperate with each other. In such a situation, attaining cooperation is most difficult in international politics. The adversary’s military power, geography and its aims and objectives are the underlying factors which create uncertainty and ultimately mistrust. It compels states to adopt hard line policies which often have disastrous consequences.

However, in the later part of cold war structural realist like Kenneth Waltz held international system responsible for anarchy among states. According to him, international system is anarchical and uncertainty is a common phenomenon.

---

36 Brian C. Schamidt, op.cit. p.16.
Therefore, there is little room for trust. In such circumstances the states are responsible for its own well being and existence as no other power will come to guarantee its existence. Intentions of the state cannot be predicted, interpreted and suspicions cannot be brought down to a minimum level. The threat perception is common and all time phenomenon at the root of which is mistrust.\textsuperscript{38} Kenneth Waltz structural realism gives birth to two concepts i.e. offensive and defensive realism, giving useful accounts of trust and mistrust.

Hardcore realists or offensive realists believe that there is a deep rooted, incoercible mistrust between states that prevent states from cooperation and causes conflicts. The main proponent of this view is John Mearsheimer. He says “there is little room for trust among states because a state may be unable to recover if its trust is betrayed. Each state must guarantee its own survival since no other actor will provide its security. All other states are potential threats, and no international institution is capable of enforcing order or punishing powerful aggressors.”\textsuperscript{39} In international system all states are suspicious of each other. They are capable to strike against each other. Therefore, it is quite natural that states must be suspicious of the other states and mistrust each other.

He believes “Intentions are impossible to divine with 100 percent certainty.”\textsuperscript{40} Further he says, “The best way for a state to survive in anarchy is to

\textsuperscript{38} Andrew Kydd, \textit{International Organization} (Spring, 2000), 326.
take advantage of other states and gain power at their expense.\textsuperscript{41} He along with other offensive realists believes that it is not possible for the states to trust each other. All the states compete for security and maximum power. Their conflicting interests compel them to enter into arm race to secure them. Therefore, it becomes natural for the states to mistrust each other.\textsuperscript{42} They believe that intentions of other states are always unclear and the cause of this is mistrust. Therefore, mistrust and anarchy are permanent unlike power.\textsuperscript{43} Offensive realists in other words hold that parity of power is responsible for insecurity and mistrust.\textsuperscript{44} They view mistrust as a permanent feature of international relations which shapes the behavior of the states and compels them to maximize the power at the cost of other states.

Defensive realists such as Robert Jervis do not consider mistrust a static phenomenon and rather calls it a changeable phenomenon. At one point of time it is high enough to maintain cooperation while some time it is at the lowest ebb that causes conflicts. They believe that some states trust each other fair enough to cooperate and enter into agreements and can have normal relations. While there are other states who have deep rooted mistrust of each other which leads to security dilemma. Moreover, defensive realists think that offensive-defensive balance affects uncertainty and mistrust. Conflicts arise when offensive

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid; p. 36.
\textsuperscript{43} Andrew Kydd, \textit{Trust and Mistrust in International Relations} (2005), 14.
advantages are greater in contrast to defensive advantage. Likewise cooperation and trust develops when defensive advantages are more than offensive gains.\(^{45}\)

In other words soft core realists or defensive realists believe that states do not trust each other because of anarchic world system and uncertainty about the intentions of other countries. But they can achieve cooperation on the bases of reciprocity. Signals of good intentions, monitoring each other actions and retaliation against defection or cheating can compel them to cooperate.\(^{46}\)

Countries cooperate when they interact without fear; when they are aware of each other vulnerabilities and fulfill each other expectations. Past dealings between the states also influence their future relationship. Therefore, if a particular state is considered to be a threat it will continue to be thought of as such until it takes significant steps to prove otherwise.

2.2: Trust and Prisoner’s Dilemma

The Prisoner’s Dilemma theory engages researchers into studies about trust. It is used in game theory which shows the nature of interaction between mutually suspicious actors. The two actors may not cooperate if it is in their interest to do so. It was originally developed by Merril Flood and Melvin Drescher in 1950.\(^{47}\)

\(^{45}\)Ibid. p. 156.
\(^{46}\)Ibid. p. 3.
Later during the same year, Albert W. Tucker incorporated hypothetical rewards which were explained by a simple story. Two thieves were arrested in a crime. They were put in separate cells, were not allowed to communicate with each other and were interrogated separately. The prosecutor offers each of them a choice i.e. the thief who gives testimony against the other thief will be released. Each prisoner is faced with a dilemma either to hide the evidence or disclose it. If they defect and give testimony against each other, they will receive a harsh punishment. If both cooperate and confess the crime they will receive a punishment less severe because of the lack of evidence. Their behavior here shows that they are collaborating against the police. The situation here presents a dilemma, which lie in the fact that both prisoners has an option between two choices, but they are unable to come up with the best outcome because they do not know about the strategy of the other partner. Each player holds a dominant strategy i.e. to give evidence against the other, and thus in equilibrium each receives a harsh punishment, but both would be better off if each remains silent.\footnote{David S. Kidder., and Noah D. Oppenheim, The Intellectual Devotional: Revive Your Mind, Complete your Education and Roam Confidently with the Cultured Class (New York: Rodale, 2006), 340.}
The dilemma in Pak-Afghan relations parallels that of Prisoner’s Dilemma mentioned above. They are in jail. They want to maximize their gains without any concern for the other pay off and end up in zero sum game. Under the rule of PD game, Pakistan and Afghanistan have two choices i.e. to cooperate or to defect, no matter what strategy other adopts. Compromise or cooperation yields better results than defection. When both defects they do worse than when both cooperates. Herein lies the dilemma. The order of the preferences available to them is, to compromise and solve their political disputes, secondly, to continue their hostile course and defect. If Afghanistan compromise unilaterally, Pakistan will have two choices i.e. to cooperate or to defect. Obviously none of them will be better off by defecting.

Prisoner’s Dilemma offers insight into any social, economic or political situation that involves individuals who have different goals or choices. It studies interactions or situation of conflict and cooperation between two or more individuals or countries called players; formulates hypotheses about their
behavior and predicts future outcome. Moreover, it studies options and expected outcomes in any situation which guide the policy makers to study the influence of their strategies; enable them to enact such strategies which will be helpful in achieving their objectives and avoid confrontations.

It can be played in two ways either it can be played once in which the prisoners choose to betray each other for short term benefits and the result will be zero sum game or it can be played repeatedly for the long term benefits as a result of cooperation. In this regard the outcome will be non-zero sum game.

International cooperation can be termed as Prisoner’s Dilemma game played repeatedly, also known as ‘Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma’. States will logically forget the desire to betray each other for immediate benefits at least not because the other side is betraying. This shows there is strong temptation for states to cooperate and increase their cooperation over period of time. Through repeated interactions and cooperation in various fields countries can reduce mistrust and hostility between them and enhance their long term mutual benefits and security. Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma leads to trust between actors from repeated interactions. It predicts the outcome of next interaction, removes unpredictability, reveal their interests and build trust by maximizing mutual benefits.

---

In a single round Prisoner’s Dilemma game defection is the leading strategy between states. It means it is in their interest to defect even if one side thinks the other will cooperate. As a result it is difficult to achieve cooperation between two states. Uncertainty is permanent both the actors look at each other with suspicions none of the side will reciprocate the cooperative behavior of the first actor.\(^{50}\)

In iterated or repeated Prisoner’s Dilemma cooperation can be achieved if actors keep in mind the future benefits because they will believe that defection will cause retaliation. The future benefits are made attractive which continues the long term cooperation, else the actors will choose cooperation over defection.\(^{51}\) Similarly, Axelrod holds that one of the characteristic of repeated Prisoner’s Dilemma is its clarity i.e. it’s simple and sustains long term cooperation. The feedback on cooperation and defection is immediate.\(^{52}\)

### 2.3: Pak-Afghan Relations and Prisoner’s Dilemma

Prisoner’s Dilemma theory is suited to analyze nature of Pak-Afghan relations. There are several issues which created Prisoner’s Dilemma for Pakistan and Afghanistan during the period under study where they preferred non-cooperative behavior over cooperation. The studies show that mistrust and suspicions were the main reasons of their troubled relations. It has contributed to


\(^{51}\) Ibid. p. 10.

the overall trust deficit thus putting them in a situation of Prisoner’s Dilemma. Robert Jervis highlights that when two rival states interact in a situation of Prisoner’s Dilemma, one state always look at the cooperative measure of the other with doubt; anything that is preferred is always viewed with doubt. In addition, if one actor takes keen interest in an issue it will lead the adversary to develop a policy against the expectations of the former.53

Pakistan and Afghanistan are culturally, historically and religiously linked. The location of both the countries is such that war and peace can affect South Asian, Central Asian and other countries including regional and global. If one country is facing insurgency and deteriorated law and order situation, the other cannot expect peace and security. Therefore, it can be said that stability of South Asian and Central Asian countries depends upon stable Pak-Afghan relations.54 But mistrust has been dominant in their relations which have kept their ties strained during most part of the history. Both countries used all means to attain their objectives but not cooperation. Each actor took independent decisions, did not have complete information about the other actor intentions and uncertainty remained dominant. In Prisoner’s Dilemma countries’ strategy is the result of past experiences of mistrust preventing them from bilateral cooperation.

The period 2001 to 2008 is marked by limited cooperation between Afghanistan and Pakistan which on and off stalemated their relations. There

---

existed a minimum degree of trust which enabled both countries to enter into agreements and cooperation could be seen on economic side but there existed deadlocks on political front. Dead lock in bilateral relations occurs when actors stop to cooperate, because of security dilemma, competition or stalemate, even when rewards are greater. There are several reasons which prevented reconciliation i.e. Afghanistan claim on Pakistani territory, politics of interference, attitude of policy makers and absence of norms and multilateral institutions. In addition, the resurgence of Taliban, various internal and external security issues faced by Karzai’s government and the deteriorating law and order situation in Pakistan strained their bilateral ties.

The entrenched cause of their dilemma has been the Durand line issue and Afghanistan’s claim over Pakistani territory. This historical legacy affected even the post Taliban era, as Hamid Karzai’s government refused to validate the Durand Line. Afghanistan believes that it was signed with British India, not with the government of Pakistan and rejects its legal status. Pakistan on the other hand has always considered Durand line a settled issue. Pakistan believes that successive Afghan government followed his highness Amir Abdur Rahman and confirmed the validity of the line during different time periods. In addition, the latter citing the clauses of International law reiterates that international law does not accept the unilateral renouncement of boundary line. Therefore, be it a declaration of Loya Jirga of 1949 or parliament of Hamid Karzai unilateral

---

declarations on renouncing Durand line has no value. In such a scenario
disagreement over the Durand line presented dilemma and they resorted to
destabilizing measures by supporting each other dissident groups.

Hallison Wagner highlights that countries do not cooperate and prefer
mutual defection over mutual cooperation. The main logic behind their non
cooperation is not that they cannot overcome Prisoner’s Dilemma but because
they are facing dead locks on number of issues.

This is true in the case of both Pakistan and Afghanistan; both desire to
overcome their long standing deadlocks but are entangled in a manner that has
restricted them to move forward on various fronts. Moreover, the policy makers
and the society in Pakistan and Afghanistan is such that the conflicts between the
two countries are seen as a 'zero-sum' game. These beliefs have also been further
reinforced by the fact that the nature of the 'game' between the two countries has
forced the policy makers to defect. They have justified their acts of defection by
blaming the other side for not giving up their strong stances on major issues of
confrontation. They do not want to lose to the other side, thereby the Prisoner’s
Dilemma continued, strengthening mutual mistrust. In addition, the role of
individual policy makers; their beliefs and ideology in determining the
preferences towards each other cannot be overlooked.

56 Rizwan Hussain, Pakistan and the Emergence of Islamic Militancy in Afghanistan (2005), Op.
cit. p. 65.
Adding to it, Pakistan’s quest to have a friendly government with maximum Pushtun representation in Afghanistan that would prevent Afghanistan from raising the Pushtunistan issue and accept Durand line caused destabilizing affects. Afghanistan considered this quest of Pakistan as interference in its internal affairs and shaped its attitude towards Pakistan based on mistrust. Such behavior stalled cooperative measures and created misperceptions about each other intentions which even remained dominant in post Taliban era. Be it both countries cooperation in war on terrorism, security and border management.

Moreover, in the past and during the period under study, both the countries interfered in each other politics and provided support to each other dissident groups on quid-pro-quo base. Afghanistan provided support to Baloch and Pushtun nationalists while Pakistan provided support to Islamists and relied on religious slogans and leaders which deteriorated their relations and caused mistrust. In post Taliban Afghanistan, Pakistan accused Afghanistan of providing support to Baloch nationalists and blaming it of allowing India to forge insurgency in Pakistan. In return, Afghanistan blamed Pakistan of tolerating Taliban, wielding its strategic assets against it by supporting non state actors.

Accusations and counter accusation to achieve their objectives without keeping into account the collective rationality further created dilemma in their relations. As a result, despite pledges of friendly relations by both countries, the Prisoner’s Dilemma overshadowed the cooperative dealings aggravated by external actors and domestic compulsions. Mistrust leading to Prisoner’s
Dilemma is socially constructed. Ruling emotions altered people logical thinking. Fear and quest for security remained dominant. The government as well as the people in the wake of ongoing security situation thinks of Pakistan as an interventionist country leaving no opportunity to intervene in Afghanistan. Such ill feelings have increased mistrust and influenced the attitude of both the countries.

Both countries expressed their desire several times to work closely but this verbal commitment did not translate into actual behavior. They were engaged in negative propaganda, blame game and their bilateral relations were marred by mistrust. Afghanistan held Pakistan responsible for the bloodshed and devastation in the country, while Pakistan blamed Afghanistan for the insurgency in its tribal areas and the deteriorating law and order situation. The Afghan government has been accusing Pakistan Army of backing Taliban to launch attacks across the border in Afghanistan.  

Therefore, the dilemma is the manifestation of the danger both perceived from each other.

Pakistan in the mentioned period did take some measures i.e. established check posts, proposed fencing and mining which were rejected by Karzai as his government did not recognize the Durand line. Both Pakistan and Afghanistan are security seekers but real steps for bringing harmony and peace had been missing on their part. This heightened the quotient of mistrust and created Prisoner’s Dilemma. Both sought alliances with different countries to protect their interests.

---

Afghanistan got closer to India, which is Pakistan’s main adversary in the region. India and Pakistan have been at odd, over Afghanistan since decades. For Pakistan, Afghanistan is a strategic base to counter India from reaching oil rich CARs. On the contrary, a compliant pro-Indian Afghan regime would exert pressure on Pakistan thus resulting in Pakistan’s strategic defeat. Karzai government allowed India to establish consulates in provinces near Pak-Afghan border i.e. Herat, Kandahar, Jalalabad and Mazar Sharif. India proposed building dams on Kunar and Kabul rivers which Pakistan believes will deprive it of important water resource. Such a situation has also added to Pakistan-Afghanistan Prisoner’s Dilemma. Therefore, a pro-Indian government became a recipe for never ending mistrust and dilemma in the period under study. Pakistan is suspicious of growing India-Afghanistan relations which has deadlocked their fragile relations.

Afghanistan gave India greater role which increased Pakistan security dilemma. As a result, Pakistan decried for a minimum Indian role limited to reconstruction only. This behavior on the part of both disrupted cooperation. Therefore, Pakistan and Afghanistan have two choices either to pursue cooperation (stop propaganda, blame game, end aiding insurgents and give more concession) or pursue hostile relations (interfere in each other internal affairs, support different insurgent groups). If both countries remain committed to cooperation this will result in large pay offs and increased economic activity. If they continue to provide sanctuaries to each other dissident groups, fomenting insurgency in each other countries it will lead to deteriorated relations and
significantly destabilize both the countries. However, if one country tries to cooperate and the other country adopts a policy of antagonism, then the cooperative country will be punished greatly whereas the non cooperative country will align itself with other countries and will see internal improvements. Defection as explained earlier is the dominant strategy. Engaging them into cooperation is a complicated task but it is the only way out for their stable relations in the future.

The nature of the game linked with 'Prisoner’s Dilemma' is such that in the long run logical thinking will prevail. Pakistan and Afghanistan cannot fully achieve their desired objectives. They have to compromise on several fronts i.e. they have to cooperate and compromise on solution of Durand line, Pushtunistan issue and each others’ strategic sensitivities in order to build trust. It is hypothesized that repeated interaction on all fronts is the best strategy for cooperative relations. Pakistan realizes that in order to secure its western flank and to secure trade routes to Central Asia in quest for oil and gas in the wake of current energy crises it needs to work closely with Afghanistan; while Afghanistan being land locked will benefit from repeated interaction.

In Prisoner’s Dilemma a third actor like United States, can play a vital role by facilitating Pakistan and Afghanistan to communicate clearly and encourage them to collaborate and work together. Whatever happens in Afghanistan has a direct impact on Pakistan’s security and vice versa. Policy makers on both sides should realize that cooperation have better pay-offs. 'Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma'
considers the nature of the conflict to be a positive sum game, as it is a win-win situation for both the countries. The first and foremost thing in Pak-Afghan cooperative relations is to transform the game from a 'zero-sum' to a 'non-zero sum'. Realist in zero sum game stress upon keeping the strategies secret to put their opponents off guard. In contrast, in non zero sum game it is important to achieve the cooperation of the other actor, for which it is important to publicize the strategic intentions.\textsuperscript{59}

In order to come out of this dilemma, transparency and consistent policies need to be adopted. This will signal positively to other actor which will help build confidence and show the willingness of the other to cooperate.\textsuperscript{60} In addition, it can be hypothesized that the policy of reciprocity and reassurance in the form of governmental dialogues and mediation can succeed in reducing conflict and inculcating mutual trust. They can help start cooperation. The economic integration of the region can change their limited cooperation into full cooperation, solve Prisoner’s Dilemma and end their rivalry.

\textbf{2.4: Can Pakistan and Afghanistan Break the Prisoner’s Dilemma?}

Pakistan and Afghanistan can break the Prisoner’s Dilemma through reciprocal and repeated interactions, which can build trust over a period of time. Development of trust is a rational task and cannot be built in a shorter span of

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid. p. 114.
time, as a lot of risk taking and anxiety management is required on the part of
trustee.

Repeated plays of Prisoner’s Dilemma are called Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma as mentioned earlier. It is said to analyze relationship between actors and develop trust through repeated interactions between the mutually suspicious actors. The Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma studies the long term decision making where the actors have shared future and interaction. This phenomenon can best be seen in Pak-Afghan Relations. Central question which can be addressed under Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma is; how trust can be developed between Pakistan and Afghanistan having strained relations. Pakistan and Afghanistan shares a future and their fate is linked with each other. For development of trust they have to interact repeatedly. Robert Jervis highlights,

“What makes it possible for cooperation to emerge is the fact that the players might meet again. This possibility means that the choices made today not only determine the outcome of this move but can also influence the later choice of the players. The future can therefore cast a shadow back upon the present and thereby affect the current strategic situation.”

Prisoner’s Dilemma revolves around the pay off that evolves from making different decisions. Individual policy makers their thinking and ideologies shape the preferences towards each other. In order to achieve cooperation Pakistan and

---

Afghanistan need to alter the pay offs in such a way that cooperation becomes a first choice and collective rationality prevails.

Countries can benefit from cheating only in the short run. They cannot benefit from cheating in long term relationship. The best option is to alter the pay off and make defection less attractive by applying reciprocal strategies where they can copy each other’s cooperative actions. Cooperation may be sustained through strategies such as reciprocity and reassurance. Interacting repeatedly, taking risks and successful implementation of commitments reinforce the motivation of trusting actor to rely upon each other and enlarge the scope of cooperation.

Reciprocity is a principle which is attached to every international law\(^6^2\), works in international trade where it is a central theme of GATT and can be effectively used for invoking cooperation and building trust between states.\(^6^3\) Robert Axelrod, Robert Keohane and Goldstein analyses provided that reciprocity can be used for trust building in long term by examining the interactions among the states by using iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma. Rajmaira while referring to Robert Axelrod believes that daily monitoring is important for reciprocity to work among adversaries which ultimately leads to cooperation. It reduces conflicts by evolving cooperation over a period of time for short term as well as for long term.\(^6^4\) The reason why the countries do not cooperate in Prisoner’s Dilemma is

because it does not give them chance to communicate with each other therefore their motives and interests are unclear to each other. But the strategy of continued and persistent interactions which Axelrod called tit for tat is effective, simple and sustains cooperation. Wilson maintains that it is predictable and consistent. He holds that “when rewards are applied consistently and promptly to desired behavior and punishments to undesired behavior, behavior can be controlled very effectively.”

Robert Axelrod argues that states can cooperate if they practice reciprocity. He says that reciprocity is the major strategy to enforce agreements and uses Prisoner’s Dilemma game to explain the behavior. He believes that when a game is played again and again players can retaliate against each other defection which will make deception unacceptable and will lead to cooperation. Axelrod further argues that cooperation does not necessarily need trust. “There is no need to assume trust between the players; the use of reciprocity can be enough to make defection unproductive.” In international politics reciprocity can lead to wars and conflicts as well as to cooperation and collaboration especially when actors of the game have different perception of the past experiences.

One of the reasons for strained Pak-Afghan relations and Prisoner’s Dilemma is that both are of the view that none of them is reciprocating; instead

---


they are taking benefit of their restraints. Pakistan believes that it established greater number of check posts than Afghanistan, conducted numerous military operations to prevent cross border infiltration but this act was not reciprocated; Afghanistan continued supporting Baloch and militants who escaped from military operations in Pakistan; like Maulana Fazlullah who escaped from military operation in Swat Valley is said to have taken refuge in Afghanistan. Same views of aiding insurgencies are also held by Afghanistan which inhibited trust.

The main way to reduce mistrust and practice reciprocity is through signaling. Signals will convey Afghanistan’s intentions to Pakistan or vice versa. If Afghanistan shows its real motives of seeking security it will lessen Pakistan’s threat perception and gradually prevent it from adopting hard line policies. Glasner holds,

“A country in quest of security should be worried about whether its adversary understands that its intentions are benign. Uncertainty about the states motives or even worse, the incorrect belief that the state is motivated by greed.......will increase the adversary insecurities which in turn will reduce state’s own security. Thus structural realism proposes that the state should be very interested in signifying that the intentions are benevolent.”

Sending cooperative signals play

---


an important role in diminishing the fears. Once the fear diminishes; cooperation starts and trust gap reduces.

People to people contact between Pakistan and Afghanistan including artists, musicians, journalists, traders, researchers may pave path for talks on entrenched issues i.e. water rights, smuggling/drug trafficking, transit trade etc. The importance of people to people contact can be gauged from the fact that they play an important role in conflict resolution which sometimes official negotiations are unable to de escalate the conflicts. It changes the perception of the people and builds bridges between them. T.C. Shelling highlights that states can reduce mutual mistrust if they enter into small agreements first where mutual risks are less. In this way states will be able to check credibility level without taking much risk. Gradually following this technique states will gather much needed information about each other’s intentions and credibility before entering into large and risky agreements. Therefore, starting negotiations and entering into small agreements over water rights, smuggling/drug trafficking, transit trade will improve the environment for entering into large agreements on deep rooted issues.\(^{70}\)

In addition, reciprocity in trade relations, giving each other trading benefits can further augment their relations. Pakistan trade with CARs is still at embryonic phase. Afghanistan relies on Pakistan’s port for its trade with the outside world. Permitting Pakistan to develop uninterrupted trade with CARs will
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generate sizeable revenue for Afghanistan thereby creating an economic interdependence between them. Moreover, power asymmetry in Pak-Afghan relations can play a positive role in overcoming mistrust. Pakistan being a powerful state than Afghanistan can set an agenda for initiating a relation based on full cooperation, which Afghanistan can negotiate with the former leading towards full mutual cooperation. Afghanistan has not yet developed modern economy and is aid dependent. It is rich in natural resources but deficit in technical knowhow. Decades of war destroyed its water as well as transport infrastructure. Therefore, the former may be willing to reduce conflict if Pakistan help Afghanistan in developing its economy and infrastructure.

Pakistan and Afghanistan are rational and asymmetrical actors having shared future. They have choices between cooperation (C) and defection (D). In Prisoner’s Dilemma the pay off in defection is higher than cooperation; therefore there is always temptation for defection. Whatever strategy one party chooses the other will choose defection. In Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma game both party can play over again and again e.g. in round 1 and 2 Pakistan and Afghanistan choose to cooperate by using strategy of reciprocity and both are rewarded. In round three Afghanistan choose to defect and profit more as a result trust is damaged, in round four which instigates both to defect. Defection inflicts loss because the defector is punished. Both lose as a result they choose in next rounds to cooperate as it yields more benefits. Both the players if play it again and again will learn about cooperation as rational thinking will prevail which will lead to trust
Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma Game

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Cooperation; D: Defection, No. of Players: 2(Afghanistan, Pakistan), Reward: 3 points, Defection: 5 points, Mutual Defection: 1 point, Bad Pay off: 0, No. of Rounds: 6

Another policy which emphasizes repeated interaction and builds trust is policy of reassurance. Mutual reassurance is another name of trust building. In 1960 Charles Osgood and Amitai Etzogoni worked on reassurance and devised strategies which they called Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) which included conciliatory acts, clear communication of preferences and intentions and retaliation in case of defection for minimizing mistrust between Soviet Union and United States that was caused by arm race between them. It works more in reducing misperceptions and mistrust because it is sophisticated and less costly than deterrence. Reassurance policy reduces misperception by verbal reassurances and contains such methods which rivals can use to minimize coercion and seeks to coax the rival that diplomacy has more gains than coercion. Recent researches favor reassurance and criticize deterrence theory.

Different past researches show that deterrence often fails despite the fact how carefully it is implemented. It represents power struggle between rivals, more

---

costly in nature and often provokes rivals to adopt more aggressive policies and increase their threat perception.

To build trust, reassurance policy emphasizes more on formal and informal institutions. It emphasizes more on communication and information sharing if not directly with the mediation of third party. Future wars or conflicts cannot be avoided. They will be caused by bad structural and institutional arrangements. Pak-Afghan conflict can be avoided through the use of institutions which will mediate between them and look for long term benefits. Establishing regimes and institutionalizing their relations can play a vital role in promoting cooperative relations. 72

Robert Keohane maintains that evading military conflict in Europe after the cold war depends greatly on the notion of a continuous pattern of institutional cooperation. 73 Consistency in cooperation efforts leads to dependency. The creation of regional institutions will act as mediators between Pakistan and Afghanistan and become a remedy of mistrust and promotion of transparent actions. Hostility and mistrust is reduced completely and state power is enhanced.

---

Chapter-3

Trust Deficit in Pak-Afghan Relations and its Implications: A Historical Perspective (1947-2001)

The element of mistrust in Pak-Afghan relations is not a new phenomenon. In fact it has a long history. Dr Christopher Snidden believes mistrust to be an intense feeling founded on a deep lasting sense of having been hurt by the measures carried out by the other state.\textsuperscript{74} When applied to Pak-Afghan relations, their mistrust is the result of destabilizing measures carried out by both the countries. Their bilateral relations have been frail and problematic, based on mutual mistrust and acrimony, which have discouraged the two countries to forge closer ties.

The study highlight that there were different historic reasons for mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan. They considered their geographic proximity as a liability. Their common border has always been a cause of political difference and perceived each other as a problematic neighbor. Their divergent outlook about the border, their conflicting interests, and Afghanistan’s claim on Pakistan’s Pushtun territory deepened mutual mistrust and made it logical for them to be suspicious of each other’s policy objectives. Successive governments in Afghanistan raised the territorial claims and questioned the validity of Pak-Afghan border which caused anxiety and insecurity of the latter.

\textsuperscript{74} Pakistan Security Research Unit, “The India-Pakistan Peace Process: Overcoming the Trust Deficit”, Policy Brief no. 20, (Oct 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2007), 5.
On the contrary, successive Pakistani leaders had pathological mistrust of Afghan nationalism. As a result, both the neighboring countries instead of using normal diplomatic channels to solve their bilateral issues resorted to hostile propaganda, casted negative statements against each other and supported each other dissident groups. Their non cooperative attitude gave birth to policies responsible for creating instability and conflicts which hardened mistrust and embittered masses.

In addition, Pakistan has always seen its relations with Afghanistan through the lens of hostility with India. Afghanistan’s tilt towards India and its intimate relations with Soviet Russia were considered by Pakistan as a security threat, impeded growth of normal bilateral relations and created mistrust. India which is considered an arch rival by Pakistan had more say in Afghanistan which led to interventionist polices by Pakistan. As a result the latter decided to support different Afghan religious leaders i.e. Gulbadin Hikmatyar (Hezb-e-Islami), Ahmad Shah Massoud, Burhanuddin Rabbani (Jamat-e-Islami) and, Abdul Rab Rasul Sayyaf (Islamic Union for the Liberation of Afghanistan) who opposed their government policies of modernism. Pakistan’s aim behind supporting them was to gain an influence against India and to pressurize Afghanistan to quit her claims on Pakistan’s territory.

Marvin G. Weinbaum Professor at Middle East Institute Washington D.C noted that the mistrust between Afghanistan and Pakistan has dissimilar ideological foundations. The basic principle and raison d'etre of the Pakistani state
is an Islamic unity that is expected to transcend geographic and ethnic division. Traditionally, the Afghan state has formed its legitimacy in satisfying and balancing the interests of the ethnic and tribal communities. The relationship between ethnicity and politics has been virtually reversed from one state to the other. Both sides played to a weakness in the other. Because of the ethnic-regional cleavages in Pakistan, Afghans have tried to exploit Pushtun nationalism in Pakistan by championing the cause of a Pushtunistan. In turn, Pakistan has traditionally weighed in as a defender of Afghan Pushtuns preeminence in that country's ethnic balancing. Pakistan has not supported Pushtun nationalism. To the contrary, it has tried to suppress nationalism and for that reason has promoted pan Islamic forces.

Therefore, Pakistan which came into being as an ideological state has feared India. It has viewed any backing of its ethnic groups by India or Afghanistan as a treachery and denial of Pakistani state. Moreover, it has perceived Afghan good relations with India and its support for Baloch and Pushtun interests with suspicion and threat to Pakistan existence.

In addition, many Afghans believe that most of the empires have been governed either from New Delhi or Kabul, not from Islamabad. They firmly believe that Afghanistan and India share more history than Pakistan and that’s the reason of their innate relations. Such believes of Afghans are viewed by Pakistan

---

75 Marvin G. Weinbaum, (Professor at Middle-East Institute Washington D.C), Interview by the researcher, August 4th, 2013.
76 Ibid.
as an attempt by India and Afghanistan to destabilize Pakistan which deepened Pakistan’s mistrust and led to the Pakistan’s interference in Afghanistan. Moreover, the then President Zia-ul-Haq’s\(^{77}\) role during Afghan-Soviet war by funding madrassas\(^{78}\), militant organizations and their leaders which promoted extremism and warlordism in Afghanistan, is highly resented by Afghans and shaped their hostile perception.

Tanvir Ahmad Khan a former diplomat who also served in Pakistan’s mission in Kabul observed that Afghan people’s hostility toward Pakistan is more in Afghanistan than in India. “In India you will hardly come across any hostile feelings if you go there but if you go north of Kabul you can see it in the people’s eyes.”\(^{79}\) In addition, some Pakistani analysts like Rahimullah Yousafzai believe that since Pakistan’s inception, its larger size was viewed by Afghan policy makers as a threat resulting in latter’s resistance to Pakistan’s membership in the United Nations.\(^{80}\) They saw Pakistan through a realist lens in which democratic Pakistan vis-a-vis Afghan monarchy was considered a threat in the Hobesian world.

---

\(^{77}\) General Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq (1924-1988) was Pakistan’s President 1978-1988. He was an important Islamising influence on Pakistan during his rule (which overlapped with Afghan Jihad) and was killed in an air crash on august 17, 1988. See Alex Strick Van and Felix Kuehn, \textit{An Enemy WE Created: The Myth of the Taliban/Al-qaida Merger in Afghanistan} (London: Hurst and Company, 2012), 494.

\(^{78}\) Madrassas is a plural of Madrassa meaning religious school common in southern Afghanistan and Pakistan as the first choice for education (especially for the rural poor). Schools are by and large for boys only, although girls are educated in some, and the syllabus mainly constitutes a full outline of religious sciences, often including the expectations that graduates will learn various holy books by heart. Ibid. p. 431.


\(^{80}\) Rahimullah Yousafzai, (Journalist and Author), Interview by the researcher, Jan 26\(^{th}\), 2013.
The primary objective of this chapter is to present the historical perspective of Pak-Afghan mistrust in a chronological manner. Moving in this order provides a broader and deeper base to understand current and future policies. In addition, it helps to understand the events systematically. Moreover, it examines the nature of relationship between Pakistan and Afghanistan, the factors that strained their relations and their implications for both the neighbors. It focuses on the evaluation of Pakistan’s relations with Taliban and major drawbacks in its policy. Understanding flaws in Pak-Taliban policy will be helpful in formulating future policy based on mutual trust.

3.1: Pak-Afghan Relations: Genesis of Mistrust

The roots of mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan lie in history. Historically, the nature of Pak-Afghan relations is characterized by mistrust and suspicions. Since 1947 both countries have been at logger heads and have interfered in each other’s affairs which increased mutual trust deficit. There are two interconnected, historical raisons d’être which created impasse i.e. Durand line –the joint but undecided border and the Afghan backing for the “Pushtunistan” issue which has influenced the foreign policy of both countries. The claims on Durand line and the Pushtunistan movement continued in different capacities in different eras and shaped the perception of Pakistan regarding Afghanistan. Both the issues were articulated by Afghanistan’s policy makers in such a way to gain influence and power against Pakistan. Resultantly, Pakistan resorted to bring instability in the region to suppress the Pushtunistan movement
or the invalidity of Durand line. Afghanistan since the beginning has found it difficult to discuss the border issue because of its over commitment to the issue and larger public passion towards it. Therefore, Afghanistan exaggerated the issue to a large extent that it was a land lawfully belonging to them. Though Kabul uncompromising backing of the issue made it vulnerable increased its economic and political reliance on Soviet Union, consequently leading to its invasion in 1979. On the contrary, Pakistan formed on ideological basis having different ethnic groups, feared that further disintegration after the East Pakistan (Provincial State of Pakistan) in 1971 might end the Pakistani state altogether which increased its sensitivities several fold.

3.1.1: Durand Line Issue: Historical Reason of Pak-Afghan Mistrust

“Frontiers are the chief anxiety of nearly every foreign office in the civilized world and the subject of four out of five treaties concluded.....Frontier policy is of the first practical importance, and has a more profound effect upon the peace or warfare of nations than any other factor political or economic.”

Lord Curzon, University of Oxford, 1907

Since Pakistan’s inception in 1947, Durand line has remained a protracted issue and a cause of hostility between the two neighboring countries which kept their relations tense and has led to the Pashtunistan movement on the external front.\textsuperscript{81} Durand line claim by Afghanistan became a security issue and increased Pakistan’s intervention in Afghanistan which heightened mutual mistrust. In the past it led to insurrections, skirmishes and tribal uprisings between the two countries. Britishers during their rule over the Indian subcontinent drew three lines on map i.e. Mac Mohan line between India and China; Redcliff line between India and Pakistan and Durand line between Afghanistan and Pakistan. All these lines became a source of conflict as the time went by.\textsuperscript{82}

The Durand Line is a 2,240 km long boundary line between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The agreement was signed at Kabul between the British government and his highness Amir Abdul Rehman Khan of Afghanistan, on November 12\textsuperscript{th}, 1893. The Agreement has been inherited by Pakistan as the successor state of the

\textsuperscript{82} Mohammad Saleem Mazhar and Naheed S. Goraya, “Border Issue between Pakistan and Afghanistan”, South Asian Studies, 24: 2, (July-Dec, 2009), 204-205.
British India. As a result of this line tribal areas which later became part of Pakistan came under British rule. On Pakistan side the Durand line include the territory of Balochistan province, North West Frontier Province (now called Khyber Pukhtunkhwa but at the time of research it was NWFP therefore, NWFP has been used in the entire thesis) and FATA. On the contrary, the frontier on the Afghan side extends from Nuristan province in the north east to Nimruz in South East. The existence of the Durand Line is not as obvious to the inhabitants because it is not clearly demarcated on the ground as it appears on the maps. As a result, the local inhabitants along the Durand Line have never paid much attention to it and remain unaware of its reality. The people of this region cross the Durand Line at will and do not treat it as a boundary.

The Durand Line runs through many villages located on the bordering area dividing them between Afghanistan and Pakistan. People here enjoy similar culture, traditions, and customs. They have family bonds extending across the Durand Line due to marriages between the tribes and clans. Many local residents have their homes in Pakistan and land or property in Afghanistan or vice versa. Kabul never accepted Durand line or the fact that NWFP is a part of Pakistan.

After 1947, Kabul government approached Pakistan demanding reformation of the Durand line to avoid a divide of Pushtun tribes. This proposal was rejected by Pakistan on the ground that border cannot be restructured or nullified because the Vienna Convention on Succession of States on Respect of
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Treaties (VCSSRT) have unanimously endorsed *uti possidetis juris*, which says that bilateral treaties with or between colonial powers pass on to the descendant sovereign states. Therefore, Afghanistan cannot restructure or change the Durand line. This refusal led to a deep and continuous distrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan leading to rivalry, suspicions, and resentment.

Afghans believe that the Durand Line agreement was concluded for 100 years and validity of Durand line expired in 1993. Secondly they believe, Durand line was demarcated by force. It was imposed on the country by the Britishers. Thirdly, all the agreements concluded with the British government have become dead and illegal after the emergence of Pakistan because the agreement was originally concluded with British Indian authorities not with Pakistani authorities.

“The treaties are binding on the governments not on the subjects, and that Pakistan cannot inherit the rights of an extinguish person i.e. the British in India.” Pakistan rejects Afghanistan point of view and believes that the decision of Loya Jirga (grand assembly of tribal elders) may have legal value inside the country itself, but they cannot invalidate the legal aspect of international laws. International agreements once concluded can be revoked unilaterally and not bilaterally. Unless otherwise provided in the concluded treaty about its duration, the treaty becomes permanent in nature. This is applicable to the Durand line treaty agreement.

International laws do not lay down the maximum life period of one hundred years for an internationally concluded border agreement between two states, when a fixed period of validity has not been mentioned in its text.\(^87\) The transfer of power from one country to another i.e. from Britain to Pakistan did not change the legal status of the Durand line. The law *res transit cum sua onere*\(^88\), decodes that all agreements of the extinct state regarding the border line stay legitimate. In addition, all the obligations arise from such treaties of the extinct state pass on to the absorbing state.\(^89\) Therefore, the legal status of Durand line remains the same even after the birth of Pakistan.

### 3.1.2: Pushtunistan Issue and Pak-Afghan Mutual Mistrust

![Pushtunistan Map](http://easterncampaign.com/2008/05/05/cartographic-paranoia)

Source: [http://easterncampaign.com/2008/05/05/cartographic-paranoia](http://easterncampaign.com/2008/05/05/cartographic-paranoia).
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\(^88\) The ceded territory passes to the new sovereign with any burdens and obligations that may be locally connected with the territory. See Bolesaw Adam Boczak, *International Law: A Dictionary* (USA: Scare Crow Press Inc, 2005), 210.

Pushtunistan issue is an extension of Durand line issue. When Pakistan came into being Afghanistan argued that Pakistan should give the Pushtun areas the option to become independent as a separate entity called Pushtunistan (land of Pushtuns) rather than giving the latter an option to join India or Pakistan. Afghanistan believed that once independent of Pakistan’s control the Pushtun areas would join the Pushtun dominant Afghanistan (increasing the Pushtun proportion in Afghanistan). From Pakistan’s point of view Afghanistan was demanding greater part of Pakistan’s territory which was unacceptable to it which soon became an issue of mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan.  

Pakistan after its inception took over the functions of British India government in formulating the Afghan policy. While Afghanistan questioned the emergence of Pakistan by refusing to recognize it and then laid claims on its territory which increased Pakistan insecurity at birth, who already believed that India is against the partition and is struggling to undo it. This belief was further reinforced when Afghanistan forged closer ties with India. The existence of Kashmir dispute was used by Afghanistan to come closer to India. Because of

---

91 Ibid. p. 161.
92 Kashmir dispute is a territorial dispute between India and Pakistan over the region of Kashmir which is a Muslim majority state. The dispute has led both the countries to enter into three wars in 1948, 1965 and 1971. After the partition of Indian subcontinent, India forced Raja Hari Singh who was a Hindu ruler of a Muslim majority state Kashmir to accede to India and landed its troops which resulted war between India and Pakistan. When the war between the two countries intensified India took the matter to United Nations Security Council where a resolution was passed asking both the countries to stop war and hold plebiscite in Kashmir which has not been held to this date. Both countries entered into war again in 1965 and in 1971 which resulted in the disintegration of Pakistan and formation of state of Bangladesh. Both countries consider Kashmir dispute the main issue between them and a cause of mistrust.
Kashmir dispute, Pundit Nehru viewed the Pushtunistan issue from a sympathetic point of view. As a *quid pro quo*, Prime Minister Sardar Muhammad Daud lent support to India in its dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir.\(^93\) India helped Afghanistan to keep up its propaganda against Pakistan which served its interests. Louis Dupree illustrates Indian connection as follows,

“I was amongst those who were in Pakistan and Afghanistan immediately after partition in 1947; I looked into what was happening in Kabul. There was a group of Indians there controlling Kabul Radio, and they were the ones who invented the term Pushtunistan.”\(^94\)

In 1951 Indian government hosted “Pushtun Jirga” in Delhi where Sardar Najibullah Khan made anti Pakistani speech broadcasted by All India Radio.\(^95\) Moreover, in 1967 United Pushtun Front (UPF) was formed in Delhi under the leadership of Chand Khana, Indian minister to support demand for Pushtunistan.\(^96\)

The factors which shaped Afghanistan policy towards Pakistan can better be described by Ayub Khan in his book *Friends not Masters* (1967) that, when Pakistan came into being there were two fears in the mind of Afghan monarchs. The first was created by Indian constant propaganda that Pakistan as a separate entity would not survive for long and would soon disintegrate. Afghan rulers
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considered it to be true and laid claims on Pakistan’s territory. The second fear was in the mind of Afghan monarchs who believed that if Pakistan survived it would be a democratic country which can pose a threat to the legitimacy of Afghan monarchs. As a result, they laid claim on Pakistan Pushtun territory called Pushtunistan. Therefore, it seems that Afghan monarchs feared that a strong democratic country in the neighborhood would pose a threat to the Afghan rulers.

In addition, Peshawar relatively was in a better economic condition than Kabul. Thus, it was a source of dissatisfaction for Pushtuns of Afghanistan who shared ethnic bonds with Pakistan’s Pushtuns, therefore creating unrest in Pakistan. This phenomenon is better explained theoretically by Robert Jervis,

“when there are believed to be tight linkages between domestic and foreign policy or between the domestic policies of two states the quest for security may drive states to interfere pre-emptively in the domestic politics of others in order to provide an ideological buffer zone.” Afghanistan actively engaged itself in Pakistan by forging alliance with Pushtun nationalists so as to create ideological alliance and to push Pakistan to accept Durand line.

Olaf Caroe noted that the temptation for Peshawar has always been an obsession which was found deep in the ruling elites of Afghanistan, who were the direct heirs of Peshawari Sardars. King Zahir Shah and his prominent ministers

were the great grand sons of Sultan Mahmood Khan. After the inception of Pakistan in 1947, when the British decided to withdraw, Afghanistan put these aspirations into an official claim over the Pushtun territories as well as on Indus.\textsuperscript{100} Therefore, from 1947 till 1979 Pushtunistan issue soured their relations and caused mistrust. Afghanistan once dedicated itself to the issue, found it extremely difficult to withdraw its claim which then became a major element of Afghan’s foreign policy. Another rationale which prompted Afghanistan to make claims on Pakistan’s territory was a longing for an outlet to the sea.\textsuperscript{101} The Pushtun including traders were the leading cultural group in Afghanistan state apparatus, long desired to have an access to warm waters to make possible smooth trade and to divert attention of Afghan people from internal problems. Therefore, they raised Pushtunistan issue.\textsuperscript{102} The then prime minister Hashim Khan of Afghanistan in an interview to the news daily \textit{Statesman} in 1947 stated,

“If a sovereign Pushtunistan cannot be established, the frontier province should join Afghanistan. Our neighbor Pakistan will realize that our country with its population and trade needs an opening to the sea, which is necessary…..if the countries of the world wish peace and justice…..it will be easy for us to get an outlet.”\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{101} Khursheed Hassan, “Pak-Afghan Relations”, \textit{Asian Survey}, 2:7, (Sep, 1962), 14.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. p.15.
Therefore, keeping all the above mentioned factors into account, relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan had a discouraging beginning. When Pakistan applied for the membership to the United Nations on September 30, 1947 Afghanistan, a member of the UN since November 19, 1946 casted negative vote against Pakistan’s membership. This was actually the first act of distrust between the two Muslim neighboring countries in spite of having much in common. While explaining his country’s attitude, the Afghan representative Abdul Hussein Khan Aziz stated,

“Afghanistan vigorously shares in triumph of the citizens of Pakistan in their freedom. We have deep value for Pakistan. May Pakistan prosper. The Afghanistan delegation doesn’t wish to resist the membership of Pakistan in this large organization, but it is with the immense disappointment that we are incapable at this time to vote for Pakistan. This sorrowful situation is due to the fact that we do not recognize the North West Frontier as a part of Pakistan so long as the people of North West Frontier have not been given a chance free from any kind of pressure and I repeat free from any kind of pressure, to conclude for themselves whether they wish to be independent or to become part of Pakistan.”

In addition, vague demands were raised for independent Balochistan free from Pakistani control by integrating Baloch territories in Pakistan and Iran with Baloch areas in Afghanistan. In this regard the most vocal supporter of this

demand was Sardar Daud. From Pakistan point of view Afghanistan claim on sizable Pakistani territory was not rational and lack clarity. Afghanistan claim did not generate any international backing. It had a small population of 12 million at that point in time and a small army which could not pose threat to Pakistan. But it did add to overall insecurity and increased quotient of mistrust. Afghanistan friendly relations with India and demands on Pakistan territory created security dilemma and required strong military preparedness.  

Rahimullah Yousafzai an expert over Afghanistan shares the same view by saying that Pak-Afghan relations have been strained ever since the birth of Pakistan. Afghanistan rejected the Durand line as a legitimate border and was the Muslim neighboring country in the region that voted against the Pakistan membership in UN on the question of self determination of Pushtun population on Pakistan side of the border.

However, Afghan representative in February, 1948 withdrew his negative vote by saying that his country want to resolve dispute with Pakistan through diplomatic channels and showed willingness to establish diplomatic ties with the latter but their relations remained strained. Both the countries resorted to fierce propaganda duels which contributed to increasing mistrust between the two neighbors.
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106 Rahimullah Yousafzai, Interview by the researcher, 26th, 2013.
Pakistan opened a Radio Free Afghanistan at Quetta in 1949 and initiated broadcasting propaganda campaign.\textsuperscript{108} While Afghanistan supported insurgents to cause unrest in adjacent Balochistan and NWFP. There were frequent cross border attacks by regular Afghan troops in the tribal areas of NWFP and adjacent region of Balochistan during 1949-1950, which caused sporadic skirmishes with Pakistani paramilitary border security forces in June 1949.\textsuperscript{109} Tensions had risen severely in 1949 when Pakistan Air Force bombed the village of Moghulgai, inside Afghanistan, which according to Afghans was an intended act.\textsuperscript{110} Pakistan later claimed that the bombing was a mistake and agreed to pay compensation. The Afghans however, refused payment, and decided to keep the issue open and on 26 July Loya Jirga (an assembly of regional leaders and tribal chiefs in Afghanistan) decided to give support to Pushtunistan issue and declared the 1893 Durand Line Agreement, and all other treaties related to the status of Pushtun null and void.\textsuperscript{111}

Throughout 1950’s and 1960’s there were reports of hit and run activities including attacks on military persons, destruction of buildings, bridges and electricity poles, telephone lines were cut, Pushtunistan flags were hoisted at several places around Chaman, after which the miscreant would run and cross the border to Afghanistan. Afghan government supported exiles, provided them money and land for carrying out sabotage activities in Pakistan. Pakistan also

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid. p. 491.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid. p. 492.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid. p. 492.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid. p. 492.
supported sabotage activities to inflict damages on Afghanistan i.e. telephone lines were cut off and school buildings were damaged in Afghanistan. Jaffar Achakzai who was a prominent activist in Pushtunistan movement highlighted that government of both the countries supported the rebellious activities in each other’s territory by supplying “money, books and bombs” which strained their relations.\textsuperscript{112}

In 1951 three Afghan based Pushtun columns crossed the border with the aim to raise Pushtunistan flag on the river Indus. In return Pakistan protested and imposed blockade on transit goods. Afghanistan denied any link with the Afghan based Pushtun columns and called them freedom fighters striving to liberate their Pushtun brothers. Three times US mediated between them but all in vain and both sides failed to agree for one reason or another.\textsuperscript{113} Moreover, in 1953 it was reported by commissioner of Quetta that a Maulvi (Cleric) with his followers crossed the Pak-Afghan border established a camp at a border area called Shorawak (valley in southern Kandahar province) to carry sabotage activities in Pakistan. Later, he was appointed as judge in Islamic court in Shorawak with a stipend of 200 Afghanis.\textsuperscript{114}

Afghanistan’s dispute with Pakistan over Pushtunistan thereby became a main foreign policy matter for the officials. Afghan beauracracy highlighted different versions of their government positions regarding the issue ranging from

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid. p. 493.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid. p. 55.
the right of self-determination for the Pakistani Pushtuns to the unification of the North West Frontier Province, extending to river Indus with Afghanistan. They even went to the extent of including Balochistan in their claims on Pakistani territory.\textsuperscript{115}

The then Afghan Prime Minister Sardar Daud openly supported the issue and soon it led to Cold war rivalry between the two super powers i.e. Soviet Union and United States.\textsuperscript{116} From a geo-strategic point of view Pakistan feared that a pro India Afghanistan on its borders would leave their country encircled by its enemies. In such an insecure environment of trust deficit Pakistan aligned itself with the US by joining military defense pacts in order to balance Indian influence. Pakistan joined the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) in 1954-1955, which increased Soviet’s security fears and they decided that Afghanistan should be brought closer.\textsuperscript{117}

Sardar Daud illustrated US military aid to Pakistan as a serious threat to the defense and stability of Afghanistan and turned to Soviet Union for aid and assistance, thereby strengthening Pakistan’s distrust. Soviet Union provided assistance and helped to challenge the legitimacy of Durand line and enabled Afghanistan to adopt a more irredentist claim regarding Pushtunistan. As a result Durand line and Pushtunistan became cold war issues between the two power

\textsuperscript{117} Tahir Amin, \textit{Afghanistan Crises: Implications and Options for Muslim World, Iran and Pakistan} (Islamabad: Institute of Policy Research, 1982), 54.
blocs which embittered Pak-Afghan relations and exacerbated distrust. Soviet Union decided to fully support Afghanistan on Pushtunistan issue and India on Kashmir issue.

Bulganin\textsuperscript{118} in December 1955, on his visit to Kabul expressed that they have full sympathy for Afghanistan stance to the Pushtunistan problem. He further highlighted that the Pushtun should be consulted on the resolution to the problem. Similarly, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev (the then premier of Soviet Union) during his visit to Kabul stated in 1960 that the appropriate and rational technique to decrease tension and to assure peace (in the Pushtun issue) is to apply the principle of self determination as a solution to the problem.\textsuperscript{119}

In 1955, Pak-Afghan relations deteriorated alarmingly with an increased propaganda when the government of Pakistan restructured its administrative system and merged all the provinces of West Pakistan into a single unit. The aim was to correct in theory, the imbalance in power sharing between East and West Pakistan (which became Bangladesh in 1971). The move was unpopular in Afghanistan. It deteriorated relations and caused border clashes. Prime Minister Daud condemned one unit plan and declared the move as an attempt to absorb and alienate the Pushtuns of the Frontier province by destroying their autonomy and pledged greater support for the Pushtunistan cause. His open criticism of one unit plan encouraged mobs to attack Pakistan’s embassy in Kabul in April 1955, and

\textsuperscript{118} Nikolai Alexandrovich Bulganin was a prominent Soviet politician who served as a premier of Soviet Union from 1955-1958.

raided Pakistani consulates in Kandahar and Jalalabad which caused severe damages.\textsuperscript{120}

Pakistan took serious notice of the incident and blamed Afghanistan for the attacks. The then premier Mohammad Ali Bogra condemned the attacks on the embassy and elaborated that Afghan rulers were misguided if they believed that they can humiliate Pakistan by threats and aggressive demonstrations.\textsuperscript{121} On the other hand, Afghan embassy in Karachi denied the charges that the attack on Pakistan embassy was supported by the Afghan government and promised greater compensation by the government for the damages. But the only expression of apology was not considered enough by Pakistan and it demanded of holding a military parade and saluting the flag, which was rejected by the Afghan government.\textsuperscript{122} Pakistani government in the first week of May 1955 notified Afghanistan of the worse consequences, that it would break diplomatic relations until there was a refurbishment of broken goods and an explanation for an assault. Strain of diplomatic relations was soon witnessed. As a consequence Afghanistan commanded armed mobilization, which was barred by Pakistan’s restraint.\textsuperscript{123}

Moreover, insurgency in Balochistan increased when the governor of Kandahar (Afghanistan) contacted mullahs in Balochistan and convinced them to declare Jihad Holy war against Pakistan. It was reported that Afghanistan was

\begin{itemize}
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providing money to *maliks* (elders) in border region to oppose one unit plan and sponsor sabotage activities. Baloch nationalist leaders like Prince Abdul Karim (younger brother of Khan of Kalat) and Ustoman Gal\(^\text{124}\) (People’s Party) took money to oppose one unit and sponsor sabotage activities.\(^\text{125}\) As a result, Pakistani government retaliated by supporting mob attack on Afghan embassy in Peshawar closed down its consulates and suspended Afghanistan’s transit trade through Pakistan which deteriorated Afghan economy.\(^\text{126}\)

Pakistan’s suspension of Afghan transit trade benefited Soviet Union and it came closer to Afghanistan. During one month from Oct-Nov 1961, Soviet planes daily left for Kabul carrying more than 100 tons of Afghan fruit, providing outlet for Afghanistan agriculture export. The growing Soviet Afghan alliance alarmed Pakistan and intensified mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan.\(^\text{127}\) Pakistan believed that Soviet can use hostile Afghanistan to dismember Pakistan. Moreover, Afghanistan dependence on Soviet Union made it more vulnerable to its expansionist desires and increased the risk of Soviet rebellion through Afghan army that were directed, made operational, and instructed by Soviet advisors. Daud without any doubt conceived this threat but

---

\(^{124}\) Ustoman Gal (People’s Party) ethno nationalist party was formed in 1955 by Prince Abdul Karim who was younger brother of Khan of Kalat. Ustoman Gal was opposed to one unit plan and demanded the formation of unified Baluchistan Province. See Selig Harrison, *In Afghanistan’s Shadow: Baluch Nationalism and Soviet Temptations* (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1981), 27.


believed that he could handle it through his army loyal to him, the patriotism of the Afghan citizens and the natural mistrust with which Afghans looked at Russians.  

In October 1958, the Pakistani military under Ayub Khan staged a coup d’état, captured power and declared martial law in the country. General Ayub a Pushtun himself was more rigid than his predecessors with regard to Pushtunistan issue. He took stiff course against Afghanistan and warned Afghanistan about Pakistan’s ability to capture Kabul within few hours if the Afghan government did not give up their policies.

In August 1960, Pakistan’s relations with Afghanistan deteriorated once again, when Daud sent Afghan troops and armed tribes men across the border to support a small feudatory Prince, the Khan of Bajaur, which was thwarted by regular Pakistan’s armed forces. Pakistan once again suspended all Afghan transit trade facilities thus hindering US aid projects that had been started to reduce Kabul dependence on Moscow.

Strained relations with Pakistan damaged Daud’s reliability and deteriorated the Afghan economy. Three times transit trade was suspended because of border closure with Pakistan, which stopped Afghan trade, halted 200 truckloads of imports and exports; shattered its economy badly and led to the

131 Syed Abdul Quddus, Afghanistan and Pakistan: A Geopolitical Study (Lahore: Feroz Sons, 1982), 40.
Daud’s removal from his office. In March, 1963 Daud stepped down, and diplomatic relations were reestablished in May 1963 through the good offices of the Shah of Iran. Dr. Yousaf a commoner was appointed as a Prime Minister in place of Sardar Daud, who had been one of the main supporters of Pushtunistan issue.

Relations between 1964-1972 remained normal, not hostile as in the 1950s. From 1933-1963 King Zahir Shah was only a figure head. When he ascended after his father death i.e. King Nadir Shah he was only 19 years old; too young to rule the country. At first, his uncles and then Daud actually ruled the country in his name. In 1963 the members of royal family advised King Zahir Shah to take control of the country himself. Daud’s stubborn policies towards Pakistan and its dependence on the Soviet Union were creating fears in royal family. They feared that, Afghanistan’s inflexible attitude towards Pakistan and its reliance on Soviet Union could cause harm to Afghanistan and considered Afghan reliance on USSR undesirable.

Diplomatic relations were restored after Daud resignation once again but Pushtunistan was still a main hurdle in the establishment of friendly relations. In 1964, Zahir Shah called a Loya Jirga during which various delegates spoke out on the issue keeping the irritant in Pakistan-Afghanistan relations alive. The new

---

policy therefore, was to maintain moral support for Pushtunistan without jeopardizing Afghanistan’s economic or diplomatic interests.\textsuperscript{136}

In Pakistan, President Ayub stepped down in 1969 after demonstration against his rule. Ayub transferred power to the army chief General Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan. In 1971 Pakistan fought an unsuccessful war with India over East Pakistan. India was supporting Bengalis against West Pakistan which led to the surrender of Pakistan forces. On 16 Dec 1971, East Pakistan ceased to exist and the state of Bangladesh was born which shook the foundation of Pakistan and demoralized Pakistan’s army. Pakistan was founded on the basis of Islamic unity. The 1971 war strengthened the fact that ethnicity can shake religious unity and can pose a security threat. This particular mind set played a vital role in deteriorating Pakistan’s relations with Afghanistan in the period 1973-1975.\textsuperscript{137}

After Daud left power in 1963, the Afghan state machinery had made a continuous effort to pay little attention to Pushtunistan issue and to keep ties with Pakistan as friendly as possible. In 1973, with the formation of East Pakistan and West Pakistan into Bangladesh and Pakistan respectively, there was a clear

\textsuperscript{137} Rizwan Hussain, \textit{Pakistan and the Emergence of Islamic Militancy in Afghanistan}. (2005), op. cit. p. 75.
opportunity for further weakening the already somewhat insecure government in Islamabad.  

After the formation of Bangladesh, the leadership responsibility of West Pakistan was transferred to Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, the leader of Pakistan People Party (PPP). Bhutto was the main architect of Afghan policy. He was determined to change the direction of Afghanistan policy towards Pakistan by bringing them on negotiating table. He was of the view that Pakistan’s security depends more on cooperation with Iran and Afghanistan. Thus, after becoming president and martial law administrator the first country he visited was Afghanistan. Bhutto got well with Afghan monarch and several agreements were concluded on economic cooperation. But these steps did not inhibit the Afghan media, especially Radio Afghanistan, from frequently demanding Pushtunistan independence.

Sardar Daud in July, 1973 staged a bloodless coup, overthrew his cousin King Zahir Shah when he was in Europe and proclaimed himself a President. Pushtunistan was the main validation presented for the coup. Daud maintained that Zahir Shah had not adequately exploited Islamabad’s military and political

---

failing to its benefit mainly after the disintegration of Pakistan. Immediately after seizing power, Daud revived the political dispute with Pakistan and got renewed support from Soviet Union. He at a conference referred to “Pushtunistan” as an inconvertible reality. He provided the Baloch and Pushtun insurgents with small weaponry. He allowed Baloch insurgents calling themselves “Pararí” (a Baloch word used for a person with grievances which cannot be solved with talks) to establish guerrilla camps adjacent to the Afghan-Pakistan border. Officially Daud government called them refugee camps. Those who escaped army operation in Balochistan were provided safe haven in Kabul which gave Pakistan the reason to increase its engagement in Afghanistan.

Prominent rebels’ leaders who escaped to Afghanistan were Asfandyar Wali Khan, Ajmal Khattak, Sardar Ataullah Mengal, Sardar Khair Bakhsh Marri. On August 30, 1973 Daud’s government celebrated Pushtunistan day. Kabul’s main square, known as Pushtunistan square was the main place for demonstrations where Pushtunistan flag was hoisted. In response Pakistan charged Afghanistan of recruiting 15,000 Baloch and Pushtun insurgents for a “People war.”

---

Afghanistan’s all out support to Pushtun and Baloch insurgents caused immense security threats to Pakistan. As a result Pakistan’s Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, condemned the new Kabul regime as anti Pakistani and anti-Islamic. A massive propaganda war was initiated by Pakistan, portraying Pakistan a vulnerable victim and Mohammad Daud as an evil marauder bowed on destroying Pakistan. In addition, he was also charged of being behind the uprisings in Balochistan and disruptions in NWFP that started in 1973.¹⁴⁷

The Afghan media also reacted strongly to contain Pakistan’s propaganda movement against Afghanistan in the best possible way which was getting stronger with the passage of time and becoming extremely dangerous.\textsuperscript{148}

3.1.3: Afghanistan’s Islamist movement and Pakistan Support to Islamists:

A Contributory Factor in Pak-Afghan Mistrust

Pakistan support to Islamists contributed to trust deficit between the two countries. It increased suspicions; brought Afghanistan closer to the Soviet Union and deteriorated Pak-Afghan relations to a large extent. Daud after capturing power not only forced the monarch to abandon the country but he also detained, killed and expelled various traditionalists and Islamists. More than 600 Islamists were assassinated during Daud tenure. Former Prime minister Mohammad Hashim Maiwandwal who was a traditionalist was killed in police custody. Professor Ghulam Mohammad Niyazi who was a prominent Islamist and founder of Jamat Islami was jailed and later killed. While several other Islamists leaders fled to Peshawar. Prominent among them was Professor Burhanudin Rabbani\textsuperscript{149} (Jamat e Islami), his supporter Ahmad Shah Masoud and Gulbadin Hikmatyar, founder of Hezb-i- Islami (Party of Islam).

Islamists wanted to transform Afghan society and develop a modern political ideology based on Islam. It originated in 1958 in response to the way the state run its affairs. The Islamists were intellectuals who emerged from state

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid. p. 112.

\textsuperscript{149} Burhanudin Rabbani was a Tajik from Badakhshan who succeeded Nayazi; the latter was founder of Jamat-e-Islami and executed by Daud. He had a Sufi background and attended a state Madrassa before going to study and graduate at Al-Azhar in Cairo. \textit{See} Angelo Rasanayagam, \textit{Afghanistan: A Modern History} (New York: London, 2003), 103.
education system or Muslim colleges. A group of scholars studying at Kabul University went to Al-Azhar University Cairo to complete their education where they came under the influence of Muslim Brotherhood or Akhwanul Muslimeen\textsuperscript{150} and got inspired by the writings of Sayyed Qutb.\textsuperscript{151} Later they came back and started teaching at Islamic faculty of Law at Kabul University and spread the writings of Egyptian scholars through translations and publications.\textsuperscript{152} Daud considered Islamists a major threat to his government. They were against Soviets, West foreign interference in their country, communism and Pushtun nationalism.\textsuperscript{153} Immediately after coup, Daud started arresting Islamists as a result they fled to Peshawar and took refuge there.\textsuperscript{154}

During that period more than fifty Islamists escaped to Pakistan where Prime Minister Bhutto used them to weaken and destabilize Daud government by incorporating them in his forward policy. Bhutto supported Islamists for strategic rather than ideological reasons. Young Afghan student leaders Gulbadin Hikmatyar and Ahmad Shah Masoud had the ability to strike against Daud’s regime. They came regularly to Pakistan for briefings and were put on the pay roll of the frontier constabulary. Pakistan trained some 5000 Afghan dissidents in

\textsuperscript{150} Akhwanul Muslimeen was established in Egypt in 1928 with the idea to bring Islamic Revolution and establish an Islamic State. The head of Ikhwan was Hassan Al Bana. Islamist rejected nationalism, tribal divide, ethnicity, and feudal class system. They wanted new Muslim universalization which would unite the Muslim into one Ummah. See Ahmed Rashid, \textit{Taliban: Islam Oil and the New Great Game in Central Asia} (New York: IB Taurus & Co, 2000), 86.

\textsuperscript{151} Sayyid Qutb was an Egyptian writer who was one of the most important figures in modern Sunni resurrection. For details see http://www.bratinica.com/EB checked/topic/487747/Sayyid-Qutub.


\textsuperscript{153} Ibid. p. 71.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid. p. 75.
secret military camps in warfare, wireless communication and guerrilla activities. Pakistan’s embassy in Kabul in 1974 was provided with a list of 1,331 Afghans nationals and their families for monthly stipends.\textsuperscript{155} In addition, they were provided money for propaganda purpose against the communist government and for transforming public opinion in the favor of Pakistan. Small weaponry, typewriters, photocopying machine and stationary were also provided to the leaders so that they could print and give out propaganda material.\textsuperscript{156} In 1974 the dissidents planned a coup with the help of Pakistan but Daud discovered their plan and imprisoned those involved. In July, 1975 Afghan Islamists attempted an uprising in Panjshir Valley\textsuperscript{157} in response to bomb attacks in Pakistan, attacked two police stations and succeeded in keeping most of the valley for three days but they failed and fled back to Pakistan. Daud blamed Pakistan for coordinating the insurgency.\textsuperscript{158} Panjshir was a very difficult area; the reason Pakistan chose it for guerrilla activities were to teach a lesson to Afghan rulers that Pakistan can go to any extent. Nasirullah Baber associated with Afghan affairs during Bhutto era stated in the book by Intiaz Gul “The Unholy Nexus: Pak-Afghan Relations under the Taliban”

“We had a small operation in Panjshir in August 1975, a time when there were so many bomb attacks in Pakistan, probably by the Afghan insurgents. So
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we thought we must give a message to Afghan Ruler Daud and I personally advised Mr. Bhutto to do something....We also wanted to assess the level of training of these people who had been training since 1973.”

Thus, relationship in 1970 commenced with each country supporting the other rebels on a tit-for-tat basis.

In 1976, the domestic security situation in both the countries deteriorated to alarming level as a result both decided to seek reconciliation. They exchanged high profile visits and agreed on solving their differences including long standing Pushtunistan issue. These efforts diffused their tensions, revived trust and normalized their relations to a great extent. As a result transit trade between Pakistan and Afghanistan started flourishing efficiently and both the countries decided to restore air service between them, which had been suspended since early 1974.

Unfortunately Bhutto was toppled by the military on July 5, 1977. The chief of army staff, General Zia–ul-Haq took over as chief marshal law administrator. Martial law was proclaimed in the country, and political activities were banned. Zia ul Haq maintained Bhutto’s legacy and adopted his course. He visited Kabul in Oct, 1977 and showed his determination to normalize Pak-Afghan relations by removing all the obstacles impeding the growth of normal

---

162 Ibid. p. 140.
bilateral relations. In response Daud paid a return visit in March 1978. The
Baloch insurgency came to an end and by the end of 1978 the situation became
normal. Baloch and Pushtun leaders expressed their satisfaction at the
improvement of relations but unfortunately the communist coup in April 1978,
reversed all the efforts towards reconciliation started by Mohammad Daud and
Zia-ul-Haq who came so close to decide the long standing dispute between the
two neighbors. 163

3.1.4: Revival of Pushtunistan Rhetoric and Mistrust

Soviets fully supported Khalq and Parcham faction of the People's Democratic
Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) leading to communist bloody coup which
threatened Pakistan’s security and revived interventionist policies which widened
mistrust. After communists rose to power, the Pushtunistan rhetoric was revived.
The governments of Nur Mohammad Taraki and then Hafizullah Amin had no
other choice but to legitimize their governments by pressing hard for Afghan
nationalism, so as to defend the right of Pushtuns and Balochis to self
determination.164

Adopting the course of earlier governments, Taraki refused the validity of
Durand line in the beginning. He was of the view that Afghanistan cannot
abandon its support to the Pushtuns and Balochis under the pressure of the

164Selig Harrison, In Afghanistan Shadow: Baluch Nationalism and Soviet Temptations (New
insurgent activities supported by Pakistan.\textsuperscript{165} However, he reiterated the need that Afghanistan and Pakistan should try to decide their differences through understanding and dialogue and showed his country desire for friendly relations with Pakistan.\textsuperscript{166} It was expected that a dialogue would soon be started to resolve the longstanding issues but he was removed.

After Taraki was removed from power on September 14, 1979 because of his infamous economic and social reforms provoking armed resistance in the country, Hafizullah Amin as a president promised to support Pushtun nationalism. In his first speech as a president he declared that, the people inhabiting the areas lying between the rivers Amu and Abasin were geographical, culture and racial entity whose homeland was Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{167} Amin like other leaders soon came to terms with Pakistan and gave up his nationalist rhetoric. He realized that without compromising on some of his demands he could not stop Pakistan, China and America from supporting the disenchanted elements. Amin tried to normalize relations with Pakistan. However, he backed off from his new stance soon and continued his earlier position on Pushtunistan. He encouraged the activism of Pakistani political exiles, among them prominent figure was Mir Murtaza Bhutto, the son of former Prime minister Zulfıqar Ali Bhutto and head of Al-Zulfıqar

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid, p.143.  
which was the militant wing of Pakistan’s People Party. The aim of the organization was to destabilize Zia-Ul-Haq’s regime.\textsuperscript{168}

The Afghan government was once again toppled in a coup backed by Soviet forces. Babrak Karmal of Parcham faction ascended to power with Soviet support and Hafizullah Amin was killed. Eighty thousand troops entered Afghanistan to protect communist government in Afghanistan on 27 Dec, 1979. On the eve of the Soviet invasion, the Pushtunistan issue remained the bone of contention and a constant source of tension between Pakistan and Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{169}

In an address to the nation Babrak Karmal however made it clear that all political issues including Pushtunistan will be solved through negotiations.\textsuperscript{170} But he was unable to keep law and order situation intact in the country because of rebellious activities against his government. His writ of government hardly exceeded Kabul. In order to calm down the nation he approached Mullahs and gave a concept of “unity government” but he failed in his strategy and Afghan crises overshadowed Pushtunistan problem.\textsuperscript{171}

Soviet invasion changed the political scenario of the region and posed a great threat to Pakistan’s security. In order to deal with the scenario in Afghanistan, Pakistan had three alternatives. i.e. to accept status quo, to provide support to resistance groups against Soviet Union, to use diplomatic channels and
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mobilize international community to exert pressure on Soviet Union to withdraw along with secretly supporting resistance groups.\textsuperscript{172} Ex-foreign Secretary of Pakistan, Abdul Sattar described the situation in the following words:

“A profound sense of apprehension was provoked in Pakistan by the Soviet military intervention. Unexpectedly, the buffer vanished and if the Soviet rulers strengthened their control in Afghanistan they could use it as launching pad to reach the warm waters of the Arabian Sea. Pakistan could not afford to comply in the Soviet intervention. But neither could it manage a conflict with a super power. Islamabad therefore, decided on the middle course, keeping away from row but raising a low pitched voice of concern and protest.”\textsuperscript{173}

Pakistan decided to adopt the third path by using every forum against Soviet Union along with mobilizing Mujahidin (Soldiers of God). Meanwhile Islamists who were already in exile in Pakistan announced Jihad against communist government in Kabul and Soviet forces. They setup camps in Peshawar and in the adjacent areas from where they coordinated their activities against communist government in Kabul to destabilize it. President Zia-ul-Haq declared Pakistan a front line state and adopted a strategy of indirectly confronting the Soviets by supporting the Mujahidin.\textsuperscript{174}
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Soviet invasion came as a blessing for General Zia by giving him an opportunity to get rid of Pushtunistan issue for ever by pursuing strategic depth policy i.e. establishing a Pakistan friendly Pushtun government in Kabul, to modernize his army through foreign assistance, to offset Indian designs and to legitimize his government. It was believed that Pakistan friendly government in Kabul would provide Pakistan much needed strategic depth against its main adversary India. Pakistan’s lengthened geography, the lack of space, depth and hinterland prevents its armed forces ability to fight a protracted war with India, while a friendly government would give Kashmir’s Mujahidin a ground from where they could be organized, funded and armed.\textsuperscript{175} The concept of strategic depth which later became Pakistan’s foreign policy central pillar was first coined by chief of army staff General Mirza Aslam Beg in 1989. The concept emphasized the need for spreading Pakistan’s military persons and assets in Afghanistan more than the Indian military capability. Afghanistan after Soviet withdrawal was an ideal place to gain much needed depth against India.\textsuperscript{176}

Some analysts also believe that apart from military version of strategic depth there is also another version which is averse to military concept of strategic depth i.e. Pakistan wants to strengthen its relations with the Muslim countries i.e. Turkey, Iran Middle Eastern, Central Asian Republics through Afghanistan so as

\textsuperscript{175} Ahmed Rashid, \textit{Taliban, Islam, Oil and the Great Game in Central Asia} (London: Taurus Publishers, 2000), 186.
to create an Islamic bloc visa-v India. Since its inception Pakistan is struggling to create such a block and has not been successful so far.\textsuperscript{177}

It was because of this policy that even a divided and weak Afghanistan was favored over a strong, pro Indian Afghanistan. This geostrategic gesture adopted as a result of Indian threat perception was viewed by Afghan as Pakistan’s endeavor to make Afghanistan its fifth province and increased their suspicions. In order to achieve strategic depth Zia-ul-Haq followed a policy of active interference in Afghanistan by influencing politics, which increased trust deficit and suspicions of Afghan people, ruined Pakistan’s image and had disastrous consequences of talibanization and militancy in both the countries.\textsuperscript{178}

For this purpose Zia-ul-Haq approached US with his strategy of facilitating and organizing Afghan Mujahidin against Soviets. Initially the plan was rejected by US as ineffective and futile. But later on the CIA, the British M16, and the Saudi intelligence agencies agreed to collaborate closely with Pakistan’s ISI to prevent creation of communist Afghanistan and started providing arms and ammunition to the Afghan Mujahidin.\textsuperscript{179} During Jimmy Carter administration, US offered $400 million economic and military aid for the year 1980-1981 which was rejected by President Zia. By keeping in view Pakistan’s need, the offer was considered trivial, which was then increased by President

\textsuperscript{178} Imran Khan, “The Trans Afghans Pipelines: From Pipelines Planes to Pipeline Dreams”, Central Asia, no. 65, (Winter, 2009), 66.
Ronald Reagan to $3.2 billion military and economic aid for the period of five years funneled through CIA, in a program called *Operation Cyclone*.\(^{180}\) In 1981 the amount of aid which Pakistan received was $60 million annually reached to $400 million in 1984.\(^{181}\)

Training camps were established in areas adjacent to Peshawar. Unregulated, inaccessible, rugged and vast tribal areas became safe havens for Jihadis all over the world to meet, get training and equip them to fight in Afghanistan.\(^{182}\) From 1982-1992, 35000 Muslim fundamentalists from different Muslim countries came to take part in jihad. While ten thousand came to study in Pakistani Madrassas. \(^{183}\)

As a result, 100000 foreign Muslim fundamentalists were involved in Afghan war. Training camps established in Pakistan and Afghanistan became virtual universities for promoting extremism in Muslim countries like Egypt Yemen, Sudan, Jordan, the Philippines, Algeria and Bangladesh.\(^{184}\) Late in 1985, the Mujahidin were active in and around Kabul, launching rocket attacks and conducting operations against the communist. US aid to Pakistan was channeled
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through ISI. The leading recipient of aid was Hizb-e-Islami of Gulbadin Hikmatyar because of its contacts with Pakistan based Jamate-Islami.

Hikmatyar was also assisting Osma Bin Ladin who along with Abdullah Azam were training, financing Afghan’s Arab fighters known as “Maktabul Khidmat” or Afghan service bureau which later became Al-qaida, established in 1984 to fight against Soviets and to spread the message of Jihad. They also established office at Peshawar, NWFP financed by Osama-bin-Ladin and funds from Middle Eastern and Western countries.

Hikmatyar was a Kharotai Pushtun of Gilzai tribe from Kundus, northern Afghanistan. The Kharuti tribe was also a client clan of Hotakis who claim themselves to be Ghilzais. There are some Pushtuns who do not believe Kharoti to be full Pushtuns by cast and their status is low relatively than other tribes. He was anti communist and strong supporter of Islamic insurgency in Kashmir. In addition, Hikmatyar’s Hizbe Islami was the most organized, disciplined group having relation of trust and confidence with Pakistan’s military, including ISI, Saudi Arabia, and other Muslim countries and had operated on all fronts. The party was well organized. Its members would use cards that would show

---

186 Abdullah Azzam was a Palestinian Professor migrated to Saudi Arabia teaching at Jeddah University. His teaching had great influence on Osama Bin Ladin. Later he came to Afghanistan to fight against Soviets. *See* Mark Cutis, *Secret Affairs: Britain Collusion with Radical Islam* (London: Serpents Tail, 2010), 140-141.
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membership status i.e. those who were part of the party before 1975 unrest; those who joined the party between 1975 and communist coup in 1978; and those became part of the party after the coup. Hizb-e-Islami also used to hold election and only the first category would vote. They elected Hikmatyar in 1986 election. Moreover, the Mujahidin were bound to follow their party not their commanders who could be transferred by Hikmatyar any time. Hizb also possessed weapons which in other parties were the assets of the commander.\footnote{Barnett R. Rubbin, \textit{The Fragmentation of Afghanistan: State Formation and Collapse in International System}, (1995), Op.cit. p. 214.}

Pakistan supported different Islamic Pashtun factions in Afghanistan since 1970 instead of modern democratic parties. In addition, Pakistan worked to support the regime in Afghanistan that would decrease Pakistan’s internal security threat rising from Afghanistan by countering nationalistic agenda of the tribes stretched along Pak-Afghan border which would ultimately enhance the former’s internal security. To achieve this end, Pakistan started supporting Islamists groups by providing them training and fund which Pakistan received from United States to counter Soviet Union. Pakistan also worked to suppress local support for Afghanistan’s aspiration of denouncing Durand line and Pashtun nationalists groups gaining strength that may raise creation of Pashtunistan by merging some territories of Afghanistan and Pakistan. For this reason Pakistan started relying on Hizb-e-Islami led by Gulbadin Hikmatyar a Pashtun group, that was working for the creation of Islamist state rather than nationalist state. He got aid and
support for achieving this end from Pakistan. Moreover, Pakistan put its support behind Hikmatyar because President Zia-Ul-Haq very well understood the incident of “Black September” in 1970, which influenced his calculations regarding his support to Hikmatyar. Black September was the code assigned to a rebellion by Palestinians in Jordan led by the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). This rebellion was harshly suppressed with the assistance from Pakistani troops under the supervision of the then Brigadier Zia ul-Haq. President Zia who was aware of substantial refugee population in Pakistan and the danger of supporting a charismatic Afghan nationalistic leadership in exile which could in return turn tables on Pakistan. Therefore, he did not want that threat to take practical shape and avoided reliance on secular nationalist parties.

The Soviet invasion turned out against the expectation of Kremlin leadership. It was the longest, costliest, and largest military operation in Soviet history and they decided to withdraw. Afghanistan proved to be a bleeding wound and 1989 saw the withdrawal of Soviet forces and loss of American interest in Afghanistan. Pakistan had still not achieved its goal of friendly government in Afghanistan and kept intervening in Afghanistan politics. The then Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto during her tenure in 1989 approved a military operation masterminded by General Hamid Gul to capture Jalalabad, which is the fourth largest urban area situated at a distance of only 40 miles away from Khyber Pass.

which turned out to be a failure for Pakistan’s military because of miscalculations and added to trust deficit.\textsuperscript{193}

After the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan as a result of Geneva accords in 1988 and the fall of Najibullah government in 1992, the Mujahidin and the ISI felt proud and started to believe that they had defeated a super power. Throughout the war period against the Red Army, Pakistan had been convincing Mujahidin to form an alliance and a broad based government. But internal squabbles including tribal hostility and ethnic differences, had barred them from any agreement. The triumph over a world power resulted to be a pyrrhic victory as the Mujahidin soon got entangled in bloody feuds among themselves.\textsuperscript{194} Pakistan wanted Mujahidin to form a broad based government friendly to Pakistan but could not succeed because they were unable to reconcile their differences; as a result Pakistan failed to achieve its objectives. The factional fighting among the Mujahidin groups created an opportunity for external elements to exploit Afghanistan’s internal situation to their advantage, thus creating a conflict of interests among regional and global forces.

Here a point to note is that, historically Afghanistan had a conservative Muslim society. Sharia interpreted by tribal customs was practiced by them. Afghanistan has been tolerant of the other Muslim sects. Until 1992, all the other sects including Hindus, Sikhs, and Jews contributed a huge share to the Afghan’s

economy and there was no concept of sectarianism. But Soviet withdrawal followed by civil war saw sectarianism a major rift. Islam was a unifying force became a dangerous weapon in the hands of Mujahidin and then Taliban. One group was played against another in a way which was beyond comprehension. Pakistan enabled them to sign the Peshawar Accord and Islamabad Accord in 1992 and 1993 respectively but first Sibghatullah Mujadadi and later Burhanuddin Rabbani refused to step down as provided by the agreements. Mujahidin failed to reconcile their political differences and their factional fighting plagued the new government headed by Burhanuddin Rabbani and contributed to its overthrow. Rabbani’s government was not considered to be friendly government in Islamabad. Pakistan had strong reservation against it, because it was perceived to be friendlier towards India. However, Rabbani government made some significant contacts with India, Russia and Central Asian states which were considered against the interest of Pakistan and increased Pakistan’s mistrust.

In addition, there was mistrust between Ahmad Shah Massoud and Pakistan, which can be traced back to 1984 when ISI tagged him a Russian agent and stopped assisting him. He was suspected of fake operations against Russia.

---

196 Mujahedin leaders signed the Peshawar Accord on April 24th, 1992 agreeing to a power-sharing period of transitional rule leading to elections. Hekmatyar was not a signatory. It introduced rotating presidency. Sibghatullah Mujjadadi and Burhanuddin Rabbani were appointed to head a leadership council. It was agreed that the transfer of power would take place within two months but instead of cooperation they were locked in confrontation. See Musa Khan Jalalzai, *Taliban and the New Great Game in Afghanistan* (Lahore: Dua Publications, 2002), 69.
197 Islamabad Accord was signed on March 7, 1993 to quell violent clash between Rabbani and Gulbadin Hikmatyar. This accord culminated in the appointment of Hekmatyar as a Prim Minister and Rabbani as President until September 1994. Ibid. p. 69.
without harming them and letting them carry their supplies to Kabul. An ISI official describing this behavior stated that,

“We found out that he had stopped fighting the Afghan army in March 1984, and was striking deals with the Russians. He had entered into a truce with them under which he left the Panjshir valley, and made his base in the Farkhar valley of Takhar province. This ran against the overall policy of the Mujahiddin Alliance and created several suspicions about him.”\(^{199}\) Therefore, mistrust on Rabbani government and Ahmad Shah Massoud compelled Pakistan to nurture Taliban\(^{200}\) with Saudi and CIA help and launched them in Afghanistan.

3.2: Pakistan’s Support to Taliban and its Impact on Pak-Afghan Relations

Pakistan Pushtun centric polices manifested in Pakistan’s support to Mujahidin and then Taliban to halt Pushtun nationalism exacerbated mistrust between the two countries. Pakistan former army Chief Mirza Aslam Baig declared that Pakistan desires stability and peace in Kabul along with a valid share in governance of Afghanistan to Pushtuns who constitute a majority.\(^{201}\) Pakistan who has always been fearful of Pushtun nationalism created proxies in the shape of Mujahidin and then Taliban to lead pro Pakistan friendly Pushtun groups. Pakistan reliance on Taliban to enhance its security thereby caused the state to

---


\(^{200}\) Taliban plural form of ‘Talib’. It is used to refer to religious students, mainly those who are graduates of madrassas.

lose the good will of Afghans. Taliban controlled ninety percent of Afghanistan by late 1990’s, played havoc with the state structure and politically alienated other ethnic groups. This resulted in the grouping together of non Pushtuns against the Taliban. Few Afghan students interviewed at University of Peshawar highlighted that Pakistan was seen as a patron of Taliban in Afghanistan in 1994 that added to the sufferings of Afghan people and shaped their perception. They went on saying that Taliban are still considered to be one of the problems and blamed Pakistan intelligence’s for sponsoring them. 202

Pakistan support to Taliban in 1990s created mistrust between the two countries. Dr Ijaz Khan, contends that majority of Afghans believe that Pakistan supported Taliban; they stayed alive with Pakistani backing which created Afghan’s mistrust of Pakistan. 203

The surfacing of Taliban was not a sudden incident. Their rise had solid roots in the regional and international politics of the 1980s and 1990s. Their downfall too, dependent upon the critical change in the international politics. 204 The Taliban movement trace its origin to the misrule by the Afghan Mujahidin from 1992-1996. It was a reaction to the cruelties and corruption carried out by

202 Asad Islami, Javaid and Izatullah (Afghan students at University of Peshawar), Interview by the researcher, Feb 22nd, 2013.
203 Dr. Ijaz Khan, (Chairman Department of International Relations, University Of Peshawar Khyber Pukhtunkhwa), Nov 21st, 2011.
the Mujahidin commanders who carved out fiefdoms and made life miserable for their unfortunate subjects.²⁰⁵

Thousand of Afghans lost their lives in an effort to gain power among Mujahidin. The war exhausted Afghans lost confidence and faith in their leaders who were forming and breaching deals and could not reconcile their difference. They were unable to make a broad based government and bring peace. The social fabric of the country was completely destroyed. War lordism, violence, militancy, smuggling, corruption, and looting were common in the country. There was misconduct, lawlessness and confusion all over the country, with the exemption of the six Northern provinces ruled by the Uzbek General, Abdul Rashid Dostum. Afghanistan had become a failed state like Somalia, Rwanda and Burundi. Apparently the physical boundaries were present and the country did indeed still have a flag, a national anthem, a government of sorts, membership of the United Nations, and embassies abroad, but the writ of the government was not present even inside the capital. There was a financial crisis and Rabbani had no money to pay his army.²⁰⁶

Pakistan was also becoming concerned that Turkey and Iran were forging durable commercial ties with Central Asia and that of Iran in particular, looked set to create an important outlook for Central Asian trade to the Indian ocean via

Banderabbas, thus contending with Karachi.\textsuperscript{207} It was against this background that the Taliban emerged. Pakistan’s foreign policy goals ever since the struggle for power among the different Afghan militia commenced have been to ensure: lasting peace in Afghanistan; a compliant regime on its western borders; dignified repatriation of Afghan refugees; to reach Central Asian markets; and to open up a safe corridor for the oil and gas pipeline from Turkmenistan to the Arabian Sea.\textsuperscript{208}

In 1993, Benazir Bhutto again voted as a Prime Minister of Pakistan, followed a market oriented policy rather than a militaristic tactical approach towards Afghanistan. Contrary to Zia, Bhutto administration attempted to influence Afghanistan because of its importance as an economic high way connecting Pakistan to Central Asia as well as a strategic support base in military conflicts against India. Thus, this new policy was a combination of General Zia pan Islamism and Bhutto’s Market oriented policy.\textsuperscript{209} She appointed Gen. Naseerullah Baber\textsuperscript{210} as an interior minister. Baber began to move Pakistan away from its reliance on Hekmatyar as an agent of Pakistan’s influence, a policy that he had begun in 1974 as a Zulfiqar Ali’s Bhutto governor of NWFP. At that time moderates in the Pakistan's foreign policy elites led by then minister of State for economic affairs Sardar Asif Ali after the breakup of Soviet Union maintained, that focus of Pakistan’s foreign policy should be on its North West


\textsuperscript{208} Ibid. p. 141.


\textsuperscript{210} General Naseerullah Baber - A Pushtun military man and PPP loyalist, served in Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto Tenure in 1990’s as an advisor on Afghanistan.
borders. It should be opening trade with Central Asian Republics and not an Islamic campaign. General Baber appears to have adopted this policy.\textsuperscript{211}

Taliban attracted the attention of world community as well as Pakistan in 1994, when a small group majority of them were madrassa students, under the leadership of Mullah Omar raided on the area of local warlord who was involved in several unethical activities i.e. plundering, killing and innumerable rapes. Similar raids were witnessed against other commanders and soon they acquired the status of social reformist. In a little span of time, they were noticed by Pakistan as capable force to achieve some of its foreign policy objectives for which it was struggling for a decade. i.e. to open up routes to Central Asia and set up a regime in Kabul welcoming to its interests.\textsuperscript{212} Taliban were also favored over Mujahidin because they were Pushtun, they were united, able to restore peace in Afghanistan and willing to support Pakistan’s military aim not just in Afghanistan but even in Kashmir.

Pakistan in order to test their military expertise chose a group of Taliban to escort a convoy taking medicine and food to CARs from Pakistan. During the journey Taliban put stiff resistance against battle hardened former warlords, local commanders and proved their abilities as a force. Soon they embarked upon series of attacks against warlords and captured majority of Afghanistan by


Pakistan recognized Taliban government on 25 May, 1997. On the occasion the then foreign minister of Pakistan, Gohar Ayub expressed its support for Taliban regime in the following words:

“We feel that the new government fulfills all criteria for de jure recognition as it is now in effective control of most of the territory of Afghanistan and is representative of all ethnic groups in that country.” Pakistan anticipated that once it will recognize the Taliban government, others will also do the same, but only Saudi Arabia and UAE did so.

Prominent characters in the Taliban were Afghans. Pakistan provided financial assistance to Taliban and their operations, organized training for Taliban troops, directed their guerrilla activities, provided arms, ammunition, fuel and on several instances directly offered combat support. National Banks in Taliban vicinity were permitted to open up. Utility stores were constructed in Afghanistan. Free medical teams were sent to Afghanistan. Afghan cell administered by Naseerullah Khan Babar was formed to coordinate Afghan affairs. Islamabad patronage for Taliban was interpreted in different ways by different analysts. Some considered it a persistent searching for strategic depth in the occasion of conventional warfare between India and Pakistan. Others saw it motivated by economic concerns. There are many who defended the policy in terms of ethnic

---

factors i.e. necessity for Afghanistan to be governed by Pushtun, but not those Pushtun having nationalist aspirations.\textsuperscript{218} Pakistan backed Taliban on ethnic links between Afghan Pushtun and Pakistani Pushtuns which constitute Pakistan’s largest ethnic group. Moreover, Pak-Taliban policy was shaped by its fear of revival of Pushtunistan issue.

Pakistan founded its policy towards Taliban on effective engagement which was entirely promoted by Robin L. Raphel\textsuperscript{219} who served US. Assistant Secretary of State. She contended that “Taliban is entirely local movement despite the fact that their polices reflects extremism, but the finest way to control them is to engage them.”\textsuperscript{220} In its first two years, the movement fascinated the interest of United States but Taliban regime soon shown ambitions beyond the securing of pipeline route for foreigners sponsors.

Pak-Taliban relations were based on wrong footings. It was an alliance constructed on arms without having any ideology. Pakistan believed that Taliban would prove to be a guarantor of peace; would establish a government friendly towards Pakistan and will emerge as a force which will recognize the disputed Pak-Afghan boundary line i.e. Durand Line as well as will prevent Pushtun nationalism. Taliban failed to fulfill Pakistan’s political objectives and went in opposite direction which increased Pakistan sense of insecurity and created trust

\textsuperscript{219} Robin L. Raphel served as US Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs under President Clinton from 1993-1997.
deficit. They refused to recognize Durand line and could not halt Afghan claim on NWFP. They increased Pushtun nationalism, provided safe havens to Sunni extremists groups who were against Shias, leading to Talibanization of Pakistan and showed an intention to declare Pakistan a Sunni state through revolution.\(^{221}\)

Pakistan relations with Taliban were also seen with suspicions by ordinary Afghans. They were embittered about Islamabad’s interference in supporting various warring groups and playing havoc with the state structure. Pakistan relations with Taliban were based on policy of effective engagement which proved problematic and was totally contradictory. Taliban proved to be unpredictable, uncontrollable, and difficult to deal with and started proving detrimental to Pakistan’s economic and physical security which could be accredited to short comings in its Afghan policy, and isolated Pakistan from rest of the world.

Taliban were anti modernism. They imposed strict Sharia law and brutally enforced medieval Islamic practices. Public appearance of women were prohibited they were not allowed to go outside without male escort. They had no access to work, education and basic health facilities which affected the urban population who enjoyed a level of progress and emancipation. Sports, culture activities were banned and famous Buddha statue of Bamyan was bombed, which antagonized the world at large and angered the Buddhists. Human rights abuses were often reported. Killing opponents rather than working for reconciliation.

caused disappointments. They rejected Iran, Shiites, failed to exercise moderation in handling minorities and started displaying an independent attitude which pushed them towards international isolation.

Indeed, one issue that damaged the Taliban and resulted in the collapse of their regime was Osama bin Laden. Mullah Omer invited Laden to live in Kandahar. He was the most wanted man by US as he declared Jihad against Israel and US. He shifted to Afghanistan from Sudan in May 1996. On August 8, 1998 US embassies were bombed in Kenya and Tanzania and the US thought of no other suspect than bin Laden. Bill Clinton declared him public enemy number one.\(^{222}\)

Throughout 2000-01, as Taliban strengthened their regime in Afghanistan, Osama bin Laden and Mullah Mohhamad Omar started to work together. Though disliked by the international community, Mullah Omar found bin Laden having a well funded international network of militants and intellectuals devoted to jihad.\(^{223}\) Al-qaida pragmatically expanded its connection through regional and international actors. In this regard Talibanization of Afghanistan was the first step towards Talibanization of the region but the main obstacle was Ahmed Shah Masoud of northern alliance who controlled only 20 percent of Afghanistan.\(^{224}\) Osama bin Laden showed his worth to his Taliban hosts and assassinated Ahmed

\(^{223}\) Stephen Tanner, *Afghanistan: A Military History From Alexander the Great to the Fall of Taliban* (2003), op. cit. p. 287.
Shah Masoud in an interview to Algerian journalists. Two days later, in response to Al-qaida attacks on Washington Dc and New York converted Afghanistan into an active war zone between Al-qaida multinational fighters and US-led coalition forces.\textsuperscript{225}

\subsection{3.2.1: Pak-Taliban Policy: Implications and Drawbacks}

Pakistan’s interventionist strategy of supporting Taliban laid negative impact on its security. On the external front Pakistan’s relations with northern alliance as well as regional countries deteriorated and widened trust deficit. Taliban increased Iran sense of encirclement by Sunni Muslim states and became a major cause of deterioration of relations with Shiite Iran. The UN, on several occasions, criticized the policies of Taliban, especially the use of force. The UN urged Taliban for a broad consensus, which was acceptable to sections of the Afghan society. Pakistan on one hand supported the UN concerns but on the other hand it provided help to Taliban regime at all levels\textsuperscript{226}. India also took an anti Taliban position. On 15 Oct, 1996 the Indian foreign minister announced that India does not intend to recognize Taliban and would continue to support the government headed by Rabbani. He added that, under the conditions of continuing foreign interference in Afghanistan, the official recognition of Taliban would mean consent to foreign interference.\textsuperscript{227} Pak-Taliban nexus was unacceptable to Russia and Central Asian States too. Central Asian States showed concern over the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{225} Ibid. p. 115.
\end{itemize}
spread of Taliban creed in the region.\textsuperscript{228} By recognizing Taliban Pakistan isolated itself regionally and internationally. Internally the fall out of interventionist policy is Talibanization of Pakistan’s own society, social unrest and militancy in FATA. It deteriorated law and order situation and increased Jihadi infrastructure/Jihadi groups such as Lashkar-e- Tayaba, Hizbul-Mujahidden, Lashkar-e-Jhangvi etc which have established links with Al-qaida and has given birth to international terrorism. Moreover, it created sectarian havoc at home.

The Taliban genesis is associated with the rise of hundreds of Madrassas in Pakistan which were funded by conservative Gulf States and by local Pakistani Islamic Parties and had a traditional fixed curriculum based on Deobandi interpretation of Sunni Islam. The spread of Madrassa education created coherent religious zealots with an extremely restricted view of the world. These groups not only created cadres for Kashmir Jihad but were also active in fighting along the Taliban and domestically they indulged in frequent massacre of Pakistani Shiites.\textsuperscript{229} Taliban also became an exemplary model of governing for many Pakistanis who are suffering from corruption on the part of government and has resulted in Tehreek-e-Taliban-Pakistan (TTP) which caused talibanization of Pakistan and rise of extremism.\textsuperscript{230} The Tehreek-e- Nafaz-e- Sharit-e- Mohammadi (TNSM) which was once active in Malakand agency on the borders of Afghanistan cited the Taliban as a model for Pakistan and Maulana Sami-ul-Haq

\textsuperscript{228} Rizwan Hussain, Pakistan and the Emergence of Islamic Militancy in Afghanistan (2005), Op. cit. p.208.  
\textsuperscript{229} Ibid. pp. 210-213.  
of the Jamiat-e-Ulema-e- Pakistan openly advocated that Pakistan needed a Taliban movement. Such feelings could one day sway the illiterate inhabitants against the government.  

Taliban succeeded in overrunning whole of Afghanistan but could not maintain their rule because they were seen to be acting on behalf of the foreign government. Pakistan directly involved itself in Taliban which proved detrimental. Instead if it had work in coordination with other regional powers and stakeholders and took into account their concerns it would have reached a viable solution. Pakistan openly pursued pro Pushtun policy which angered adjacent neighboring states who had strong reservations towards the policy.

As a result it lost hopes of peace settlement with Ahmed Shah Massoud, Professor Rabbani and even Hekmatyar. Overtly recognizing pro-Pushtun support, Pakistan seemed to be disregarding and sidelining Afghanistan's other ethnic groups and the stakes of the other Central Asian Republics, who supported their co-ethnics in Afghanistan. In fact, other neighboring states also continued ethnic biased policies. Iran extended support to Shia co-religionists, the Hazaras, Tajikistan backed Afghan Tajiks and Uzbekistan supported Afghan Uzbeks. But none among them have openly confessed an ethnically biased policy towards Afghanistan. Pakistan policy left no space to the security interests of the neighboring countries that increased interference in Afghanistan. Pakistan

---

considers itself as having authentic security interests in Afghanistan but is not ready to see that other countries have similar objectives as well.\textsuperscript{232}

Pak-Taliban policy also failed because of lack of coordination between different state institutions. There seemed little coordination between ISI, Foreign office, the ministry of interior and military. They made decisions without seeking recommendations from each other.\textsuperscript{233} During Benazir’s Bhutto government in 90's a case in point is, that General Naseerullah Baber, who was the head of ministry of interior, was intentionally ignoring ISI and the army of making important decisions out of the believe that these groups were having cohorts from Zia’s era. Politically, Miss Bhutto inclined towards JUI in order to out deal Nawaz Sharif,\textsuperscript{234} Jamiat-e- Islami and Hizbe Islami (Hekmatyar).

Hence, ISI and interior ministry were having their own Afghan policies in which ISI role was dominant. The result was lack of coherence.\textsuperscript{235} It was like a state within a state. Therefore, what lacking was a highest decision making body that could craft and execute a policy. It tried to keep with itself exclusively the country Afghan’s policy. Similarly, Pakistan was treating Afghanistan as another province which was not appreciated by Afghanistan. ISI efficiently ignored Pakistan Foreign Ministry, which had no role in policy making towards the Taliban. The foreign ministry ineptness abridged Pakistan’s capability to offset

\textsuperscript{234} Nawaz Sharif, head of Pakistan Muslim League (N) who remained Prim Minter in 1996-1999.
\textsuperscript{235} Khawar Hussain, Pakistan’s Afghan Policy (Naval Post Graduate Thesis: California, 2005).
the aggressive disapproval from the neighboring countries of Islamabad patronage for the Taliban.236

Pak-Taliban policy was overambitious. Pakistan neither had the domestic, economic and political stability nor did it have resources to maintain such an ambitious foreign policy. Islamabad course of action was as much motivated by corruption, internal strife and incompetence as it was a rigorous endeavor to promote a Pashtun agenda in Afghanistan. Taliban had become masters of the game by using the difference of voices within Pakistani establishment to their benefit, thereby extorting the utmost concessions from the latter without paying any political benefit in return. Therefore, as an alternative to use its influence over Taliban, to put pressure on them on important political and social issues, Pakistan lost its ability as well as reverence which was there in the heart of many Afghans, built up over two decades of unfailing backing for the Afghan Mujahidin and Afghan people.

3.3: Conclusion

Historically, Pak-Afghan mistrust is a result of bitter British colonial legacy when they left their colonies in South Asia with territorial disputes, continuing rivalries, Afghan irredentism, the malpracticing on both sides of handling issues, the colonial mindset of Pakistan’s decision makers in dealing with Afghanistan after its independence and its struggle to shape Afghanistan

destiny after Soviet withdrawal by playing one faction against another so as to make Afghanistan its satellite state. Therefore, an objective analysis of their relations allocates blame equally and rejects a self righteous attitude on both sides’
Trust is built over a period of time through cooperation, collaboration and through intimacy between the governments, which ultimately leads to the intimacy between groups and the people. It can also be built by adopting policy of restrain and by solving issues politically, diplomatically showing some flexibility without resorting to military means. Afghanistan’s early aggressive policies towards Pakistan were the demonstration of the fact that it was not ready to see Pakistan into the role that the latter inherited from the British India.

Since Pakistan’s inception Afghanistan adopted a hostile policy towards Pakistan based on misconceptions in response to which Pakistan also adopted offensive measures and stubborn policies which deteriorated their relations to a great extent. The hostile statements against each other, propaganda, supporting each other dissidents groups on quid pro quo bases consequently produced environment of mistrust among their public and leadership. The history of Pak-Afghan relations highlights the fact that both the countries offered safe havens to each other dissidents group which generated bitterness and mistrust. Afghanistan provided shelter to Pushtun leaders which intensified in 1970s when Kabul provided shelter to Marri Baloch tribes who ran away from Pakistan’s military operation in response to nationalistic insurgency in Balochistan and then to Al Zulfiqar to destabilize Zia-ul-haq regime. As a result, Pakistan supported
madrassas along Pak- Afghan border, weaponized and promoted extremism, provided shelter to fundamentalists such as Ahmed Shah Massud, Gulbadin Hikmatyar by increasing their financial assistance. Pakistan’s Islamist party Jamat-e-islami, towards which Zia-ul haq was more inclined established close links with Afghan Islamist parties with backing from military establishment influenced Afghan politics and prevented modern and progressive parties to emerge and take part in Afghan politics.

In addition, Pakistan’s tilt towards Pushtuns leaders especially in Afghanistan in the shape of Mujahidin in the 1980s and later Taliban aggravated their hostility and impacted their policies. Pakistan took sides, favored Hekmatyar, who was a Gilzai Pushtun from North having limited links to the Pushtun of South (anti Pushtunistan) and played no attention to forces which emerged by 1992-93 such as Dostum, Ismail Khan in Herat, other Shuras working in the country and Ahmed Shah Masoud (Tajik), who turned against Pakistan. To sum up, instead of supporting pro-democratic forces, extending equal treatment to the country and working towards establishing a broad based government, Pakistan played favorites.

Therefore, Taliban rejected to acknowledge the dictates of Pakistan which played no role in uniting them. They called Pakistan interventionist country and increased their tilt towards India many folds and strengthened the assumption that Afghanistan would let India use its soil against Pakistan. Many leaders in Afghanistan especially non Pushtun started thinking that Pakistan is an
aggressive, expansionist and interventionist country leaving no opportunity to interfere in Afghanistan’s internal affairs, which influenced the perception of many Afghans.

Since Pakistan’s inception to 1978 Pakistan policy towards Afghanistan was defensive. Pakistan during this period succeeded in engaging Afghanistan effectively. During Afghan war Pakistan policy towards Afghanistan was withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Afghanistan and establishment of pro Pakistan pliant regime in Afghanistan. As far as the first objective is concerned Pakistan succeeded in achieving it and failed in achieving the second. Hosting Afghan refugees did provide Pakistan to gain influence in Afghanistan but after Soviet withdrawal Pakistan policy was confused and gave birth to warlordism, sectarianism and militancy in Afghanistan which widened Pakistan’s mistrust among general public in Afghanistan and they started holding Pakistan responsible for every atrocity.

After Soviet withdrawal, the US ignored the region which created power vacuum and gave green signal to the neighboring countries i.e Pakistan, Iran, Russia to fill the vacuum and exploit the situation to their advantage which caused civil war and then emergence of Taliban in the region. Pakistan Taliban policy was also a failure and soon mistrust developed in their relations. Taliban did bring peace to Afghanistan but Pakistan wrongly assumed that Taliban will recognize Durand line and will drop Pushtunistan issue once for all.
Pakistan in order to achieve its objective of friendly Afghan government gave Taliban maximum support without any check which can be considered as interference in country internal affairs, which overpowered them and later created problems for Pakistan. They established links with transport mafia, tribal maliks, refugee camp officials, society, and political parties like JUI and Pakistan People’s Party which enabled them to defy government and even ISI. Taliban never relied upon keeping ties with just one Pakistani lobby. They had contacts with other prominent lobbies and groups in border regions than most Pakistani lobbies. When Pakistan asked Taliban to moderate their policies on social political issues and hand over Osama bin Laden they simply refused and defied Pakistan’s advises.

Pakistan policy from Soviet invasion to September 2001 has been blamed for its inability to play a positive role in maintaining peace and stability in Afghanistan. After 9/11 incident Pakistan policy underwent change and it abandoned Taliban. New political setup emerged in Afghanistan dominated by Northern alliance. Pakistan continued its struggle of establishing friendly relations. But despite high profile visits of the head of states and friendly gestures, their relations remained strained.
Chapter-4

Mistrust: Issues Straining Pak-Afghan Relations and Major Developments in Post Taliban Era

Mistrust was dominant in Post Taliban Pak-Afghan relations (2001-2008). The events of 9/11 altered the world politics dramatically affecting Pak-Afghan relations too. Taliban’s government was toppled in a short period of six weeks when attacked by US led Coalition forces and northern alliance. Pakistan aligned itself with United States, joined US-led War on Terror where its policy met U-turn, and provided full intelligence and logistic support. A new environment was created in which Pakistan and Afghanistan had to come closer.

On Dec 7, 2004 Hamid Karzai became the first elected President of Afghanistan which had far reaching consequences for Pakistan. Pakistan recognized the new government, offered significant amount of aid to develop friendly relations with Afghanistan. However, bilateral relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan during the period 2001-2008 showed heightened mistrust and acrimony. The issue of militants’ safe havens in Pakistan’s tribal areas, cross border infiltration leading to border disputes, deteriorating security situation, terrorism, suicide bombing and difference of opinion on how to counter insurgency caused discord between them in post Taliban setup. Blame game and negative statements were being cast by both the governments which strengthened
their misperception and mistrust of each other. Keeping past relationship in view Afghanistan considered every act of terrorism executed by ISI and Pakistan’s Military while Pakistan denied such charges and in return blamed Afghanistan for the unrest in FATA, NWFP and Balochistan.

Dr. Nasreen Ghafan, believes, that Pak-Afghan mistrust has its roots in the history but Hamid Karzai government has not forgotten the recent political history of Pakistan’s all out support for the Taliban. How the latter took refuge across the border and carried out the insurgency with passive support of Pakistan, despite official denials has contributed and highlighted mistrust. In addition, lack of confidence was seen which arose from suspicions. Karzai northern alliance dominated government after coming into power established friendly relations with India which threatened Pakistani interest and sowed the seeds of mistrust. Marvin G. Weinbaum contends that,

"Pak-Afghan mistrust in post Taliban is the result of Afghans perception that Pakistan is treating their country as its backyard to achieve ‘strategic depth’ against India. Until 2001, Pakistan supported the Taliban against their Northern Alliance adversaries comprised of non-Pashtun ethnicities. After the United States military intervention in Afghanistan, Pakistan provided a safe haven to a Taliban insurgency that has continued to carry out attacks against foreign and Kabul government targets inside Afghanistan. Pakistan for its part sees Afghanistan as too welcoming of Indian influence and giving support to Indian strategic designs

237 Dr. Nasreen Ghafan, (Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar), Interview by the researcher, August 7th, 2011.
on Pakistan. Pakistan still takes seriously that no Afghan regime has ever recognized their common border. Mistrust grows from a lingering fear that Afghan nationalists seek to dismember Pakistan through their championing of a Pushtun state. “Therefore, the legacy of Durand line, Pushtunistan issue and Karzai welcoming attitude towards Indians hardened Pak-Afghan mistrust in post Taliban Afghanistan and disrupted their relations.

This chapter begins by evaluating the issues responsible for strained relations and look into ways to build up enduring relationship between the two neighbors, which may help them in overcoming their current complex relations.

---

238 Marvin G. Weinbaum, (Professor at Middle-East Institute Washington D.C), online interview by the researcher, March 27th, 2013.


One of the many issues, responsible for deteriorating Pak-Afghan relations during period 2001-2008 was the resurgence of Taliban, terrorism on both sides of the Pak-Afghan border and safe havens of militants in FATA. Mistrust in the fight against ousted Taliban, Al-Qaeda and safe havens in FATA not only complicated Pak-Afghan relations but also widened trust gap. After US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 about hundred CIA officers, 350 Special Forces soldiers and
1500 Afghans toppled the Taliban government in less than three months duration in the Operation Enduring Freedom. During the operation some of the Taliban’s radical leaders and supporters were killed or taken prisoners, some laid down their arms and blended into Pushtun villages in southern and eastern Afghanistan, while thousand of Taliban, Al-qaida and their foreign militants including Tajiks, Uzbeks and Chechens crossed the border into Pakistan and took refuge in FATA, parts of Khyber Pukhtunkwa i.e. Chitral, Dir, Mansehra, Mardan, Swat, Malakand and Balochistan, where they organized themselves and worked for Taliban goals i.e. to launch a renewed Jihad against the foreign occupation and Afghan government.

Rahimullah Yousafzai believes that organized attempt was lacking on the part of Taliban and they fled to the areas where they were confident that they will find refuge. Former President Pervez Musharraf believed that there were 500-600 foreign militants present in FATA till 2008.

After fleeing from United States attacks, local Pushtuns welcomed them under Pushtunwali code. Initially, their movement could not be stopped immediately because of the limited state authority in FATA as well as porous border with Afghanistan. These two factors proved an incentive for them to

---

241 Pushtunwali is a Pushtun conduct guideline. It has some tenants that include justice, hospitality, self-respect, independence, forgiveness and tolerance. It controls a Pushtun life, preserve law and order in the society and its self regulating. According to its fourth principle hospitality (melmastia, which means protection and refuge to anyone who seeks it) protection was granted to the militants. See Thomas H. Jhonson and M Chris Mason, “No Sign Till the Burst of Fire: Understanding Pak-Afghan Frontier”, International Security, 32:4, (Spring, 2008), 59-60.
organize themselves and strike back. Small number of Pakistan’s military soldiers and poorly equipped frontier constabulary drawn from tribal areas were unable to stop their movement along the border. Officially, there are two routes used for cross border daily traffic i.e. Torkham in the north and Chaman in south in addition to twenty other cross border passing. All these routes are guarded by levies, FIA officials, Khasadars (tribal police who patrol without uniform and report to political agent), and custom officials. In addition to these known routes there are 111 illegal crossings in the north while 229 crossing points in the south which are frequently used by nomads, smugglers and other locals without any monitoring by Pakistan and Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{242}

Taliban laid low initially because of absence of fundamental structure and hierarchy with which to align themselves but when they felt absence of state authority and United States diverting its attention towards Iraq, they spent the next few years in regrouping and rearming themselves. Iraq war in 2003, diverted US attention from instability in Afghanistan. It drew away resources from and attention that was required to crush Al-qaida and develop various sectors of Afghanistan. In addition, it gave an opportunity to Taliban to organize as a force.

Taliban after regrouping themselves waged a mix nature of war, which was neither a limited war nor a total war but in reality a combination of the two. It may be called unlimited if time frame is considered. They will continue to fight until they accomplish their goals i.e. evacuation of foreign troops and military

\textsuperscript{242} Ibid. p. 44.
plus political dominance. It can be termed total war because they are using all means available to them. But the war space was limited to Pakistan and Afghanistan which made it limited in nature.243

The resurgence of Taliban can be traced back to 2002. Occasional attacks were noticed in the first seven months of 2002. In the beginning remnants of Al-qaida and Taliban fighting for survival were held responsible for the violent incidents. They planted mines along the road sides, launched rocket attacks on US bases and targeted even helicopters. Their activities continued throughout 2003.244 Their biggest victory was elimination of government influence in parts of Zabul, and Eastern Paktia. Soon they gained strong hold in some areas of Urzgan and Kandahar province. In addition, they entered the areas close to Kandahar city and Northern Helmand. They gradually eliminated government influence from much of Southern Ghazni, Paktia, Paktika, Khost and from Southern and Central Helmand. Gradually their activities spread to Farah province where they murdered government officials and judges. Farah Province was occupied because of its closeness with Helmand.245 By late 2007, they established communication and supply lines in the west, Ghazni province South East of capital, in Kapisa

245 Ibid. p. 5.
province in North East of the Kabul and in Wardik province where they established a network against the coalition forces and Afghans.  

Whatever happens in Afghanistan has direct impact on Pakistan. Soon FATA became the main focus as it was harboring Taliban and Al-qaida. NATO officers believed that there were Taliban activities and shuras operating in Balochistan and FATA. They believed that the July 7, 2005 bombing in London also had FATA connection. Pakistan’s then President denied about Al-qaida and Taliban presence. Then President Musharraf was of the view that agencies responsible for security had completely destroyed Al-qaida backbone by disrupting their communication links and propaganda machinery. It was isolated, having no command and control system. Therefore, he stressed that accusations against Pakistan were baseless.

John Negro Ponte the then US intelligence chief at a Senate Intelligence Committee hearing on Jan 11 2007 said, FATA was the main “source and center of terrorism.” Afghanistan and US also believed that despite Pakistani government turning its back on Taliban, sympathy for Taliban runs deep in Balochistan and NWFP which turns Pakistan’s tribal areas into safe havens of Al-qaida and renewed Taliban insurgency.

---

247 Ahmad Rashid, Descent into Chaos (USA: Penguine Books, 2008), 279.
248 Ibid. p. 69.
249 Hafeez Malik, US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), 32.
Three areas were marked by American analysts in Pakistan where the Taliban high command and Gulbadin Hikmatyar were safely hiding and mentored insurgency in Afghanistan i.e. Quetta and Balochistan were the areas which provided safe havens to senior Taliban commanders. From there they carried out insurgency in provinces of Helmand, Kandahar, Uruzgan, and Zabul. Miran Shah in North Waziristan was another place which they identified was the hideout of Jalaludin Haqqani and his sons. From there they operated resulting in militancy in Kabul, Khost, Logar, Paktia and Paktika (Eastern areas of Afghanistan). It was believed that Haqqani network introduced suicide bombing in Afghanistan and was responsible for numerous terrorists' attack including the suicide bombing on Serena Hotel, Kabul in January 2008, and the July 2008 attacks on the Indian embassy in Kabul. Bajaur and Peshawar was considered the head quarter of Gulbadin Hikmatyar who was a main figure behind violence in Afghan provinces of Kapsia, Kunar, Laghman, Nangrahar, and Nuristan.

Taliban by 2006, established close contacts with insurgents in Iraq through internet and face to face meetings who passed information on the making of

---

250 Maulana Jalaludin Haqqani, 61 years old is a Pushtun cleric and Fighter, migrated from Paktia Province of Afghanistan. He was a Mujahidin leader during Afghan-Soviet war and was on CIA payroll for waging Jihad against Soviets and assisting Osama Bin Ladin, who was preparing his own Mujahidin army to fight Soviets. He also had good relations with Saudi Arab and ISI. After Soviet war he served as a minister of tribal affairs in the Taliban government. Following the fall of Taliban by US, he became a main actor in the Taliban movement. Several times he was offered Afghanistan’s Premier ship and other high ranks by Karzai but he refused and preferred a life of a guerrilla. In 2008, US attacked Haqqani compound in Miranshah, capital of North Waziristan for forging insurgency in Afghanistan and attempting to kill Hamid Karzai but he survived US attack and mostly females died in that attack. Currently, he is known for the attacks on US and NATO forces in Afghanistan and introducing suicide bombing. See Sabir Shah, “The Beliefs, Myths and Reality about Jalaludin Haqqani-1”, The News International, Sep 28, 2011, 9.

251 Voice of America, Sep 30, 2011.

improvised explosive devices, time bombs, homemade bombs and suicide attacks. They met likeminded Iraqi jihadis in Pakistan and received training in Iraq and learnt training common in Iraq.\textsuperscript{253} Thus, 2006 became the deadliest year of fighting in Afghanistan since 2001 war. Lt. Gen. Michael D. Mapels, who remained director of the US Defense Intelligence Agency, in his report to the Senate Armed services committee on February 28, 2006 stated that between 2004 and 2005 attacks within Afghanistan by miscreants were up 20 percent; number of suicide bombings doubled almost four fold and reliance on make shift bombs similar to those used in Iraq had doubled. He highlighted that suicide attacks against government increased from 33 in the entire 2001-2005 timeframe to 131 in 2006, and 154 in 2007. Kabul, Baghlam, Kandahar and Spin Boldak were the cities most affected by the suicide bombing.\textsuperscript{254} As Taliban activities in Afghanistan increased police was the main target. Their loss of life was more than Afghanistan national army and other western forces. From May 2006-May 2007, 406 policemen were killed as compared to 170 Afghanistan national army. While in June 2007, 67 policemen were killed.\textsuperscript{255}

Pakistan faced 63 suicide attacks leaving 20155 civilians killed in 2008, since 2001. These attacks were mostly owned by Taliban and other militant groups in tribal areas. The militant groups forged close ties with Taliban and cooperated with one another to execute suicide attacks which posted the biggest

\textsuperscript{253} Seth Jones, \textit{Afghanistan’s Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad} (spring, 2008), Op. cit. p. 35.
threat to Pakistan stability. By 2007, the militants grew into a formidable force and extended their activities to adjacent districts of Tank, D.I Khan, Bannu, Peshawar, Mardan, Charsadda Swat, Dir and Kohistan. Most of the areas they resorted to impose conservative version of Islam. They banned girls from attending schools, bombed schools, barbers’ shops, music and video shops.

The Taliban’s movement in Pakistan called “Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan” (TTP) was formed in 2007. TTP is a union of diverse Taliban splinter and criminal groups having representatives from Tribal areas of Pakistan, from settled districts adjoining FATA as well as from militant organizations across the country including Sipah Sahaba (SSP), Lashkar-e-Jhangvi (LEJ), Harkatul Jihad Islami (HUJI), Jaish Mohammad (JEM), and Lashkar-e-Tayaba (LET).

The movement is anti shiia, anti democracy, anti sufism and inclined towards Takfirism which is an off shoot of Saudi Salafism. The movement

---


258 Takfirism is an ideology of Muslim writer Ibn-e- Tamayah that advocates war against the non Muslims and using force against Muslims who do not agree with the fundamental tenants of Islam or do not stand against the unIslamic rule. This ideology forces Taliban to attack Pakistan’s army, because they consider them the same by allying itself with US. In other words, TTP is the organization of militants groups who share “Takfir” ideology. It is also believed that most Taliban factions have close association with Al-qaida. Aiman Zahawri is said to be staunch supporter of Takfir Ideology. Ibid. p. 154.

259 The word Salafism is derived from Salaf meaning ‘pious ancestors’. It was a religious, social reformist movement began in Egypt, led by Jamal al-Din al-Afghani (1839-1897), Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905) and Rashid Rida (1865-1935) entered Saudi society during King Faisal tenure in 1970’s. The aim of Salafism is to change the society through Islamic preaching known as Dawat. They emphasized adherence to Quran/ Sunna, upholding unity of Ummah; reinterpreting Islam with modern realities and to rid Muslims of old practices known as Taqleed (which they held to be unquestioning imitation of precedent). They emphasized restoration of Islamic doctrines
was formed under the leadership of Baithullah Mehsud as a consequence of Pakistan’s U-turn policy against jihadi organizations; its involvement in the war on terrorism; Lal Masjid operation\textsuperscript{261} and military operations in tribal areas. Its objective was to stop government from supporting US and allied forces. They targeted civilians so as to turn the society against the government and to pressurize the state to stop its involvement in the war.

In Afghanistan, Afghan Taliban strategy was to cause limited damage to civilians and targeted mostly NATO and Afghan security forces.\textsuperscript{262} Pakistani Taliban did not succeed in dissociating Pakistan from United States war on terrorism, though they did inflict losses on government in terms of suicide to pure form and rejected authority of later interpretation. Moreover, salafist view salaf an eternal model for all succeeding Muslim generations in their beliefs, exegesis, method of worship and mannerisms. See Alex S.V. Linschoten and Felix Kuehn, \textit{An Enemy We Created: The Myth Of Taliban/Al Qaeda Merger in Afghanistan} (London: Hurst and Company, 2012), 434.

\textsuperscript{260}Baitullah Mehsud was from Mehsud tribe of South Waziristan. He had under his control 20000 Taliban militants mostly from Mehsud tribe. He was killed in American missile strike on 25 August, 2009. Baithullah came to world attention after “Red Mosque Siege” in capital Islamabad in which militant madrassa students occupied “Red Mosque” who were said to be loyal to him. The militants were forcibly ejected by Pakistan security forces. The capture of Red Mosque then gave birth to larger Taliban alliances known as “Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan” of which Baithullah became its leader. In Dec, 2007 he was accused of killing former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto which was denied by him. See \textit{BBC News}, August 25\textsuperscript{th}, 2009. Retrieved July 29\textsuperscript{th}, 2011 from \textit{BBC News}, website: http//:www.bbc.co.uk.

\textsuperscript{261}Lal Masjid known as Red Bricked Mosque is situated in Islamabad. Lal Masjid operation was started in July, 2007 by Pakistan army against militants hiding in the mosque which resulted in killing number of civilians, militants, students and army personals. In addition, it unfolded an era of terrorism and suicide bombing inside the country. Operation was launched in response to provocative acts by Lal Masjid authorities, which the government called challenging the writ of the state. The Masjid authorities backed by its students demanded imposition of Sharia law in the country, called Musharraf government unIslamic, involved in the abduction of Policemen and issued religious pronouncements against the government’s involvement in US war on terror. See Amir Mir, \textit{Talibanization of Pakistan: From 9/11 to 26/11 and Beyond} (New Delhi: Pentagon Press, 2010), 211-220.

\textsuperscript{262}Ehsan Mahmood Khan, \textit{A Strategic Perspective on Taliban Warfare} (March 22, 2010), Op. cit. p.3.
bombing, collateral damages and internal displacements in the area of operations (previously explained).

Pakistan relations with Afghanistan remained strained even after becoming a partner in War on Terror because of the fragile security situation in both the countries. The Taliban including Afghan, foreign and other extremist groups once active in Afghanistan founded safe havens in tribal areas where they were joined by Pakistani Taliban and they declared war against Afghan government and NATO forces and soon became active in Pakistan. In Pakistan Taliban enhanced their activities to other tribal areas as well as to adjoining areas. In Kurram agency there was sectarian violence initiated by Taliban and their supporters. In Khyber agency there were attacks on NATO and their containers. The government tried to counter TTP in Khyber and Bajur agency by forming tribal lashkars which further enhanced militancy and gave birth to militants like Mangal Bagh, head of Lashkar-e Islam in Khyber agency involved in Talibanization of the agency.

The allies in War on Terror started forcing Pakistan to take aggressive actions in tribal areas where Taliban were providing support to Afghan Taliban. Pakistan in response, pressed hard on its losses in War on Terror and threat emanating from it to its security and survival. Pakistan believed that it was facing

---

acts of terrorism more than any other country because Taliban equated Pakistan with coalition forces, United States and executed terrorist’s attacks since 2004.265

Traditionally, Pakistan used extremism as a tool to gain foothold in Afghanistan which weakened its own ability to maintain its writ in the tribal areas that proved detrimental to its existence, sovereignty and stability. Pakistan in response to do more rhetoric did deploy 800000 security forces in tribal areas, started military operations to combat militancy but that proved futile. It suffered heavy casualties, increased terrorism and militancy which demoralized it. Pakistan army trained for conventional wars failed to put stiff resistance and fight a guerrilla war. Moreover, deployment of force negatively affected administrative apparatus. The governor who was responsible for the administration of tribal areas on behalf of president of Pakistan was taken over by military commander. The presence of political agent became ceremonial. Military was not aware of tribal set up which could have been successfully employed to find a solution to peace. The military emphasized more on force rather than political or diplomatic channels that political agent mostly uses to achieve his ends. As a result, when the tribal administrative apparatus diminished it caused a vacuum for the radicals in FATA to support Taliban.266

In addition, Pakistan lacked counter insurgency capabilities, resources, equipment and training. There was a lack of coordination among intelligence

266 M.Maqbool Khan Wazir, op. cit. p. 67.
agencies and law enforcing agencies, capacity building of law enforcement agencies and lacked measures to ban militants’ groups operating across the country or curbed their terrorism financing. As a result, it resorted to peace agreements with the militants. Pakistan aim behind striking peace deals was to split the militants i.e. to separate foreign militants including Arabs and Central Asian from the local Taliban. In this regard it succeeded in 2003 and 2006 in Waziristan by isolating Al-qaida but these agreements emboldened and empowered militants, mullah and Taliban. They gained time to regroup and launch renewed attacks in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

268 Under immense US pressure to do more about militants the government launched operation “Mezan” in 2002 in South Waziristan by deploying 2500 troops for the first time since 1947. The operation failed and second round of deployment started in 2004 as a result of operation “Kalusha” in Wana, South Waziristan which also proved futile. The militants inflicted heavy casualties on Pak-army and took some of them to hostage that demoralized Pakistan army and soon they resorted to peace agreements. The first agreement signed was “Shakai agreement” signed at Shaki, South Wazirstan dominated by (Ahmadzai Wazir tribe) with Commander Naik Mohammad and other militants on March 27th, 2004 which ultimately failed. The agreement called for the non interference of army in the tribal internal affairs by staying in the cantonment areas; local militant groups will not attack government of Pakistan officials or property; the foreigners living in Fata must register themselves with the government. All the other successive agreements were signed on the pattern of Shakai agreement. The deal failed soon because the government insisted on registration of foreigners while Nek Mohammad refused the presence of foreigners or their handing over to the government. The militancy soon started spreading to Mehsud tribe of South Waziristan and to calm Mehsud tribe government signed peace agreement known as “Sararogha peace deal” with Baithullah Mehsud on Feb, 2005 which also met the same fate. In 2005, the militancy spread to Uthmanzai Wazir areas of North Waziristan and a 16 points peace deal was signed with the militants of North Waziristan known as “Miranshah Peace deal” on Sep 5, 2006. The militancy then started spreading to Provincialy Administered Tribal Areas (PATA) which include Dir Swat, Bunair and Shangla. As a result to curb increasing militancy in Swat the government started operation in 2007 which failed badly and the first peace deal was signed with Sufi Mohammad in Feb, 2008 followed by the second peace agreement which was signed on May, 2008 with the militants operating under Mullah Fazlullah which also failed. See Sohail Habib Taj, “Analysis of Peace Agreements with Militants and Lesson for the Future”, Conflict and Peace Studies, 4:1,(Jan-March 2011), 53-63.
Terrorism Fatalities in Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Civilians</th>
<th>Security Force Personnel</th>
<th>Terrorists/Insurgents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>3598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>3906</td>
<td>6715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Pakistan resorted to military operations when Taliban refused to lay down their arms. The militancy extended from South Waziristan to North Waziristan and soon engulfed rest of NWFP during 2001-2008. The militants attacked civilians, security forces including army, frontier constabulary and police. They carried out attacks in different regions of NWFP including FATA, provincially administered tribal areas (PATA) such as Dir, Swat, Buner and Malakand region and inflicted heavy human casualties mentioned in the table above. These military operations however failed to yield results and caused more damages (explained in chapter-5). Resultantly, army ended up by signing peace agreements with the militants. However, these peace agreements emboldened miscreants, showed
weaknesses on part of military and government. The militants made new recruits during this period and gained confidence with its ability to strike back against Pakistan’s army.

4.1.1: Blame Game and Mistrust

In 2006, with the deadly insurgency in Afghanistan, Kabul government became deeply suspicious of Pakistan. The most unsafe and unstable rebel areas in Afghanistan were those provinces flanking the Pakistan bordering provinces of Balochistan, NWFP and FATA. All of these border territories were marked as “extreme risk/hostile” or “high risk/hostile” territories by the United Nations.\(^{270}\) These areas show the highest illiteracy, poverty, and violence rate in Pakistan and obtain small development support from federal government. In 2006, NWFP, obtained only US$34 million in federal aid and development grants in contrast to Punjab’s US$210 million. Punjab, for many reasons already has the healthiest growth rate and economic indicators in Pakistan.\(^{271}\) In the wake of increased insurgency in Afghanistan, soon Afghan government and US started blaming Pakistan for violence and not doing enough to control terrorism.

Kabul blamed Pakistan for resurgence of Taliban. The former accused ISI and Pakistan army of abetting Taliban, providing them financial assistance, intelligence, medical allowances to wounded Taliban, arms and ammunition to launch attacks and suicide bombing across the border. Moreover, Rtd. Colonel


\(^{271}\) Ibid. p.109.
Imam and Rtd. General Hamid Gul once active in Afghan politics were blamed for delivering provocative speeches at public and military institutions, pressing hard for waging Jihad against US and Afghan Government. Pakistan denied these charges and blamed Afghanistan for the unrest in Pakistan.272

Hamid Karzai started accusing Pakistani government for turning blind eye and even threatened of hot pursuit of Taliban into tribal belt by saying that the problem was not Taliban. The problem was Pakistan. “The state of Pakistan is supporting the Taliban, so we presume if there is still any Taliban that are being supported by a state element.”273 On 13 Dec, 2006 Karzai again made Pakistan responsible for making trouble and made it clear that, Pakistan should discontinue its hostility against Afghanistan and the Pushtuns. He further said, “In reality these (suicide) attacks are a message from the Pakistani government to scare us.”274

Pakistan rejected these charges and then President Pervez Musharraf in a news conference held on February 2nd, 2007 said, that it was from Afghanistan under the leadership of Mullah Omer, Jalaluddin Haqqani, Gulbadin Hikmatyar and Mullah Dadullah. He also put aside the accusation that Pakistan intelligence agency or army was encouraging an increasingly deadly insurgency in the

neighbouring country. The exchange of bitter words strengthened, when Karzai said that failure to bring peace would be devastating for the region and accused Pakistan of trying to “enslave” the Afghan people. He reiterated that Pakistan has not abandoned the idea of making Afghan people its slaves. He held Pakistani government responsible for the despotism rather than the people of Pakistan.

On another occasion while inaugurating Bacha Khan Complex in Jalalabad Hamid Karzai said “Relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan could be improved, if the former brings reforms to its policy and stop throwing dust in the eyes of the world.” Afghanistan even used media to show the testimony of Taliban prisoners to reveal Pakistan’s ISI involvement in growing insurgency in Afghanistan. Officially, Pakistan banned Jihadi outfits and was fighting them but no major turnaround in Pakistan strategy was observed during 2001-2008, as Taliban continued their activities. They operated without any check in major cities as none of the prominent Taliban commander was arrested during the aforementioned period. They openly raised funds for their cause in the mosques. Pakistan denied all these charges and blamed Afghanistan for letting India use its soil for creating insurgency in Pakistan’s NWFP and Balochistan province to which India denied.

The then President Musharraf accused Afghanistan by saying that India’s objectives in Afghanistan were very obvious, nothing more than to offend Pakistan. He further went on saying that reason behind opening consulates in Jalalabad and Kandahar, were nothing than to harm Pakistan and doing something upsetting it.\textsuperscript{278}

The Afghan government firmly believed that Pakistan behavior was consistent with its behavior in the past especially in 1990s where ISI was backing insurgencies and supporting anti government groups who would move into areas where government hold was weak to create unrest and destabilize the government. Despite Pakistani denials there is no doubt in the fact that ISI expanded and became independent in its dealings during Zia-ul-Haq rule to direct Afghan jihad. Since then it has become a strong entity and often go beyond its defined parameters.\textsuperscript{279}

Resurgence of Taliban severely strained Pak-Afghan relations and increased Afghan suspicions of Pakistan several fold. According to UN Sept, 2006 report on the security situation of Afghanistan, fragile and corrupt Afghan institutions were responsible for the resurgence of Taliban in southern part of Afghanistan. Despite spending billions of dollars on Afghan national army and police, Afghan government failed to provide basic facilities in rural areas of the

\textsuperscript{278} Ahmad Rashid, \textit{Descent into Chaos} (USA: Penguin Inc, 2008), 229.
\textsuperscript{279} Amir Mir, \textit{Talibanization of Pakistan: From 9/11 to 26/11 and Beyond} (New Delhi: Pentagon Press, 2010), 394-395.
country to guard local Afghans which led to insurgency and violence.\textsuperscript{280} The UN Secretary General pointed out that militants were Afghans trained within Afghanistan. They were motivated by poverty, illiteracy and dissatisfied with their status in society. These local militants were not ideologically motivated, and were ready to extricate themselves from the fighting if they were provided with basic necessities.\textsuperscript{281} Asian Foundation conducted a survey in Afghanistan in 2004 and later in 2006 which revealed a fact that the Afghan people were disenchanted with the governance and its failures.\textsuperscript{282}

Secondly, due to vested interests of drug dealers and smugglers, violence in Afghanistan continued. Militancy is a means of financial sustainability and maintenance of military power. Illicit trade acts as a catalyst to forge violence in many ways.\textsuperscript{283} Insurgents gained financially from protecting drug convoys and taxing drugs. While traffickers in turn received protection. There were vested interests in thwarting the consolidation of government’s authority. This situation was clearly verified in Helmand province which demonstrated worst violence of 2006.\textsuperscript{284} The zone was the safe haven of 42\% of the country’s total poppy


\textsuperscript{281} Ibid. p. 3.


\textsuperscript{284} Ibid. p.13.
cultivation.\textsuperscript{285} Most of the government officials seemed less committed to good governance and rule of law and seemed more committed to drug trade.

Another factor of constant unrest and insurgency was Pushtun isolation and their annoyance over representation. United States ‘War on Terror’ harmfully influenced the political balance and skewed power away from the majority of Pushtuns. Therefore, that was one rationale why Taliban as a force was not retreating regardless of heavy military operations by NATO forces. Afghan polity is an uneven unit because of its ethnic dynamics and the Pushtun Afghans were discontented with the post Taliban situation where they were excluded from political process. As long as they are excluded from power the Pushtuns would be seeking other alternatives, that present them a ground to raise their voice and objections, which include Taliban and warlords struggling against the centre authority.\textsuperscript{286}

Foreign presence and the use of military means and their conduct also play an important role in fuelling insurgency. The stories of mistreatment of prisoners in American custody undermined trust in security forces. That might not have led people to take up arms but surely diminished the chances of people cooperating to root out rogue elements.\textsuperscript{287} Foreign presence provoked Taliban insurgency. In the south and east, the dominant Pushtun tribes were doubtful of foreign military presence on their land and were hesitant to stand with them against the Taliban

\textsuperscript{285} Ibid. p.13.
\textsuperscript{286} Arshi Saleem Hashmi, “Five Years on: Resurgence of Taliban and the Fate of Afghanistan”, \textit{Regional Studies}, xxv: 1, (Winter, 2006-07), 29-30.
\textsuperscript{287} Ibid. p. 45.
who were mostly from their own clan.\textsuperscript{288} The lesson learnt from foreign invasion of Afghanistan in past is that it is easy to invade the country but difficult to control and get out of it with success.

Afghanistan has always been ultra conservative and religious nation. Any attempt to modernization has met stiff resistance. King Amanullah introduced radical reforms including curtailing the powers of the clergy, giving women rights, prompting democracy and imposing official dress code led to his desposition in 1929. Therefore, any effort to modernize the society will be met with resistance and insurgencies by clergy and tribesmen. The ill advised American policy of pushing the Afghan government to westernize the conservative Afghan society in undue haste is perceived by common Afghans as American roadmap for their culture colonization.\textsuperscript{289}

The formation of the United National Front (UNF) which presented a latest version of Northern alliance under the leadership of Afghanistan Burhanuddin Rabbani threatened President Karzai. As a result, he established \textit{Hizb-e-Jamhuri Khwahan} (Republican Party) to oppose the United National Front. Therefore, the insecurity in Afghanistan expanded beyond the issue of resurgence of Talibin or the presence of Al-qaida.\textsuperscript{290} Last but not the least, the interests of the neighboring countries and their hand in sponsoring violence cannot be ruled out including Iran, Pakistan, Russia and India. Iran is skeptical of

\textsuperscript{290} \textit{Statesman}, July 18, 2008.
US role, Pakistan is not happy of Indian growing influence and the mushrooming of Indian consulates in Afghanistan. Central Asian countries and Russia have their own concerns. It is therefore, unwise to blame and accuse only Pakistan of harboring and sponsoring terrorism and Taliban insurgency without addressing other major issues and factors responsible for sponsoring violence.

Pakistan and Afghanistan considered that insurgency in their country originated from cross border movement of Taliban and other militant groups with the support of their respective governments. Blame game did fulfill the domestic policy of the governments but public opinion in both the countries is changing. They started believing that their government by externalizing the issues was hiding their own short comings.\textsuperscript{291} President Musharraf to legitimate his rule, and gain international aid did exaggerate threat of terrorism from within and threat arising out of Afghanistan in the shape of its tilt towards India. While on the other hand, Karzai government to hide his short comings of establishing writ of the government beyond Kabul, addressing the concerns of all ethnic groups in Afghanistan and failure to eradicate corruption and develop modern economy started blaming Pakistan to divert the attentions of masses from real problems. Regional based competition, strategic culture of Pakistan and Afghanistan of blaming each other and narrow outlook of the dominant elites who hypothesized threat perception of each other.

4.2: Post Taliban Status of Durand Line Issue

In post Taliban period the security situation posed great concern to both countries as well as to international community. It led to safe havens in border region of both countries as well as to border skirmishes which highlighted the importance of recognition of the Durand line. The issue of Durand line is not unimportant and subsidiary in fact it has become a hurdle to bring stability in both the countries. The significance of Durand Line in the US-led war on terror cannot be ignored because it has brought the porous nature of border to the lime light. After the US war on terror the remnant Taliban and Al-qaida elements escaped and took refuge in Pakistani Tribal areas near Pak-Afghan border from where they launched guerrilla activities as aforementioned.

As a result, in early 2003, the border clashes occurred causing causalities on both side of the border due to the poor demarcation of the border leading to anti Pakistan demonstrations in Kandahar, Laghman, Mazar-i-Sharif, Urozgan, Kabul, and the ransacking of Pakistani Embassy in Kabul which strained Pak-Afghan relations. These border clashes between Afghanistan and Pakistani troops created mistrust and misunderstandings. The border skirmishes took place instantly after the deployment of Pakistani troops in the Mohmand agency (one of the tribal areas), to obstruct the movement of Taliban and Al-qaida militants from Afghanistan. Afghan tribesmen held Pakistani troops responsible for setting up check posts deep inside the Afghan land.

\[292\] Ibid. pp. 204-207.
Resultantly, Pakistani army spokesman accused the Afghan warlords and tribesman for attack on Pakistan’s troops saying that a pro-government military official of the Nangrahar province was backing the attacks. Pakistani officials refused any border infiltration and maintained that Pakistan’s troops are working on its own soil. Islamabad held Indian consulates in Qandahar and Jalalabad responsible for producing tension between Afghanistan and Pakistan tagging them “safe haven of RAW” involved in insurgent activities in Pakistan. Afghan President Hamid Karzai reiterated that Pakistan should alter its stance towards his country and stop sponsoring cross-border infiltration by extremists which deteriorated their relations.  

The repercussion of border skirmishes was that the issue of the Durand Line was emphasized. Afghan administration asked the United States to resolve the Durand Line issue. The U.S in response presented an option to both countries to relocate border check posts and turn down the offer to take up the Durand line issue. Pakistan maintains the position that Durand Line is a closed chapter and that the border is not debatable. The intensity of mistrust both countries have showed that continuous misperception about the Durand line rests amongst the hard core issues that could make dealings difficult in the future in an already unfriendly environment. During the period 2001-2008, whenever the question of Durand line has been put up, the government of Afghan President Karzai has stayed away from giving any policy statement, preferably wanting to solve the
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issue via parliament. He reiterated in an interview to Radio Liberty that “The Afghan nation, and not Hamid Karzai, would have to decide the issue of Durand line”. However, asking the Parliament to resolve the issue does not assure a nonviolent solution to the disagreement on an entrenched issue between them. A case in point is that the Afghan parliament in 1949 passed a resolution reproving the treaty inked by Afghan government and British India thereby calling the boundary a false and fabricated line. Therefore, referring it to the Afghan parliament again means that Afghan government regards it unsolved.\textsuperscript{295}

On the contrary, government of Pakistan maintains that the question of Durand line is a closed chapter. There is no agreement of free movement across the border and no plans to renegotiate the Durand Line, which is a proper Pak-Afghan border. It is accepted and it is confirmable via latest technical means. Moreover, it is defined on maps and both sides are aware where the line between Pakistan and Afghanistan is.\textsuperscript{296}

There is a likelihood that raising the issue between the two countries stalemate Pak-Afghan relations and increases trust deficit. Both countries maintain their own point of view and have different maps of the Durand line. Pakistan use British map, while Afghanistan uses Russian map drawn decades ago. By looking at the view point of both the countries, it can be judged that Pakistan wants to keep the status quo while Afghanistan intentions are unclear


\textsuperscript{296} \textit{Daily Dawn}, July 26\textsuperscript{th}, 2003.
and its actions during different periods were not consistent. It is because of this disputed border Karzai accused Pakistan of cross border infiltration time and again. Despite its reservations to the boundary line, it has always dealt it as an international boundary line when comes the matter of international travelers and transit trade. Moreover, the future of South Asia depends upon the western frontier of Pakistan which in terms of its location is considered a razor edge.

### 4.3: Transit Trade Issue/ Smuggling

Illegal transit of goods and smuggling has contributed to conflict and mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Lack of smooth working trade procedures and speedy trade disputes settlement has caused trade tension between the two countries and has plagued economic development. Afghanistan is a land locked country. The country is mountainous and produces little goods for domestic use and relies on import from Pakistan. They signed the Afghan Transit Trade Agreement (ATTA) in 1965, enabling Afghanistan to transport through Pakistan without paying any charges or custom duties of any kind on transit traffic with the exception of charges for shipping and the expenditures of service provided. Under ATTA, five transit routes are available to Afghanistan for transit from Pakistan. These include.\(^{297}\)

- Peshawer-Torkham & vice versa
- Chaman-Spinboldak & vice versa

• Ghulam Khan

• Port Qasim

• Port Karachi

This agreement has never been implemented smoothly, to a large extent it has been abused by certain elements who tried to import goods only to send them back covertly into Pakistan through Pak-Afghan porous border which caused damage to Pakistani industrialists and economic growth.

Pakistan became the major trading partner of Afghanistan in the post Taliban era. Up to 80 percent of the supplies for NATO forces, went through the seaport of Karachi to Afghanistan. Coalition Forces were heavily dependent on Pakistan, as the country provided not only the shortest but also the most economical and politically viable access point. Moreover, after the ouster of Taliban a billion dollar reconstruction process was initiated in Afghanistan which increased Pakistan exports to Afghanistan. A large part of reconstruction demand such as cement and electrical products were provided by Pakistan. Pakistan’s local industries and companies fulfilled Afghanistan’s demand for medical and food items such as drinking water, medicine, wheat, livestock, dairy products and other agriculture products during 2001-2008.298

Smuggling into Pakistan is attributed to Afghan Transit Trade. The goods destined for selling into Afghanistan are smuggled back into Pakistan causing

heavy revenue loss to latter. Its annual volume has been estimated about five to six billion dollars, about 70% of the total smuggling causing a revenue loss of about 2.5 billion dollars annually.\textsuperscript{299}

“The Afghan Transit Trade (ATT) is usually connected with smuggling. Even counter insurgency operations by the US led forces in the areas and the sealing of Pak-Afghan border failed to make any evident dent in the nefarious activities which are still going on causing huge set back to Pakistan’s economy.” elaborated Nauman Wazir, a Pakistani based industrialist.\textsuperscript{300}

Absence of economic opportunities and activities, weak economic and legal institutions, limited writ of the government, corruption, vast mountainous terrain and 141 natural passes provide an ideal environment for cross border movement and smuggling of goods which are freely available at Bara markets (markets of contrabands) that are flourishing in different parts of the country. Chain of “Hundi\textsuperscript{301}”, transit trade, smuggling is eating away the economic base of Pakistan. Islamabad therefore, several times terminated this facility or attempted to manage list of items that Afghanistan can import via Pakistan due to smuggling.

In the wake of power outages in Pakistan, tremendous demand for power generators, torches, rechargeable lights developed in the country. The ATT

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{299} Daily Times, Jan 23, 2010.
\textsuperscript{300} The Express Tribune, July 18, 2011.
\textsuperscript{301} Hundi or Hawala is informal transfer of money on performance and honor of huge network of money brokers which are mostly located in Middle East, Africa and Asia. It is used mostly for migrant workers’ remittances to their countries of origin. http://www.reference.com
\end{flushleft}
importers imported electric generators, uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system, dry cells, torches and tube lights etc in bulks and inundated these goods back into Pakistani markets which caused damages to Pakistani manufacturers and importers. In response Pakistan put 17 items on negative list of ATTA in 1996 and added another 7 items to the negative list in 2000-2001. The twenty four items on negative list included black tea, tyres, television sets, refrigerators, air conditioners, VCR/VCP (video cassette recorder, video cassette player). Apparently imported for consumption in Afghanistan, the 24 items placed in list were destined for ultimate consumption in the Pakistani market as Afghanistan market did not have the capacity to absorb those goods in such a massive quantity.

In 2003 and 2004 Pakistan keeping in view the geo political situation revised the negative list and deleted 18 and then 14 items from the negative list approved by ECC (Economic Coordination Committee of the Cabinet). But despite the ban, the smuggling of few items continued as smugglers found alternate routes i.e. air routes from Dubai, Bander Abbas (Iran), Vladivostok in Russia, India and UAE for their imports and eventually these goods were smuggled through porous border into Pakistan. People involved in smuggling use different routes and methods. One of the method is that truck carrying goods to Afghanistan cross the border, pay custom duties to Afghan authorities and then enter back Pakistan via Torkham check post on Pak-Afghan border with the tacit

consent of customs and border officials after bribing them. Second route from Afghanistan is Shalman area where the goods smuggled back into Pakistan by trucks, vans and even boats through Kabul River. Third route is Gorko a town in Nangarhar province bordering Pakistan’s Landi Kotal Tehsil. Contrabands are laid on camel’s back or donkeys to Pakistan. It has been revealed by different sources that there are about 200 store houses in the area to store contrabands. Currently, this route is not functional because of security situation.303

“Traders import cloth from China, Japan and Korea to Afghanistan through Karachi port. It is then smuggled back to Bara markets in different parts of the country through Torkham border after bribing Rs. 200,000 to 300,000 to custom and border officials. Janullah, who sells cloth at Peshawar Saddar bazaar elaborated.304 Bara markets are full of consumer items including clothes, cosmetics, electronic items, spare parts, food items, oil, ghee and weapons that come from Afghanistan. Despite the fact that a large number of Frontier Corps (FC) and Khassadar force are positioned at the Torkham border gate, smuggling of a variety of goods from and to Pakistan continues negatively affecting the economy. In addition, it also includes improvised explosive material being smuggled via Afghanistan to Pakistan which has increased militancy and created fear among general masses. Explosive materials aid militants to make bombs, suicide jackets and explosive-laden vehicles. Militancy which includes ethnic and

304 Janullah, (cloth merchant at Saddar Bazaar Peshawar), Interview by the researcher, July 24th, 2011.
sectarian violence, target killing of intellectuals and government officials has increased between 2006-2008.

The report suggests that main reasons behind militancy are easy availability of weapons. Some of these weapons are locally made while others are smuggled from Afghanistan into Balochistan through Nushki and Chagai (towns in Afghanistan, south west of Quetta). From Balochistan these weapons are further smuggled into Karachi (Sind) via Chaman Pishin and Qila Abdullah in Balochistan. Security agencies admit the fact that Afghan refugee’s camps and their own government officials are playing a pivotal role in arms smuggling which has intensified militancy in Pakistan.305

When asked a question from a custom official that why security agencies allow Bara markets to flourish despite being aware of illegal nature of business there. He responded by saying that lack of political will, corruption in which high ups are involved is responsible for the menace. In addition, lack of resources and reluctance to clamp down on smugglers as it will start a new war are other important reasons. He held corruption the biggest threat behind flourishing of Bara markets in different parts of the country in which officials as well as provincial government is involved.306

Till the time of research, new proposals like complementary tariff structures to eliminate the smuggling margins were offered by Pakistan. While the

306 Ubaidullah, (Deputy Collector Customs), Interview by the researcher, Dec 12th, 2012.
Afghan side had been demanding a totally unregulated access under the ATTA. Pakistan wants to build contact, cooperation and trade relations with CARs and have asked Afghanistan to provide transit trade facility to reach CARS while Afghanistan have asked Pakistan to provide transit facility to import from India which is not liked by the business community in Pakistan.

They believe that if Pakistan allows transit route to India to reach Afghanistan, and Middle Eastern countries it would badly impact industrial sector as Indian goods will be smuggled back to Pakistan. They emphasize that Pakistan should also be allowed transit facility through India to reach other countries like Nepal and Bhutan if Afghanistan is demanding transit facility for India.

4.4: Drug Trafficking

Drug trafficking is challenge for Pak-Afghan relations and has created discord between them. Drug trafficking has played an important role in fuelling insurgency, destabilization, international terrorism and exacerbating the conflicts. Pakistan sees Afghanistan a narco state where the world 90% opium is grown. Its geostrategic location, geographical proximity and porous border play an important role in narco-trafficking from Afghanistan. Pakistan blames Afghan government for not taking a hard-line on poppy cultivation and giving it a secondary importance in counter insurgency strategies in post Taliban setup.

---

One of the biggest challenges faced by Afghanistan after the ouster of Taliban is the horrendous increase in poppy cultivation and its trafficking. Poppy is converted into heroin in laboratories at different places in Afghanistan. Local administrators and senior military officers take a share of the profit as it is transported through the provinces to the international market which has halted reconstruction process and economic development. It has caused warlordism, militancy, corruption, poor law and order situation in Afghanistan.\(^\text{308}\)

Karzai government in an effort to eradicate poppy cultivation and stop trafficking, formulated National Drug Control Strategy (NDCS) in 2003, in consultation with Britain and US for Afghanistan based on four assumptions; i.e. to dismantle drug trade by disrupting drug traffickers’ network and their supporters; to reduce demand for drugs, to develop and strengthen state institutions at central and provincial level; to address problems of drug users and to strengthen legal rural likelihood.\(^\text{309}\) In addition, he appealed farmers to declare “Holy war” on drugs at Berlin conference in 2004, but his appeal did not bear any fruit. Moreover, he established the Afghan ministry of counter narcotics that convicted 90 drug lords and passed counter narcotics legislation in 2005.\(^\text{310}\) The government failed to achieve success in eradicating drug production and it’s trafficking because the policies were not fully implemented. It lacked support from different actors involved in counter narcotics and could not provide


\(^{310}\) Ibid.
alternative livelihood to farmers. In addition, corruption, weak monitory system and implementation strategies reduced its effectiveness.

Afghanistan is the largest opium producing country. In 1950’s when poppy cultivation was banned in Iran, Afghanistan became the chief opium producing country. Iran was Afghanistan’s main market in the beginning. But in 1970’s when western demand for Afghanistan drugs increased Pakistan and Afghanistan became the main supplier to the international market.\(^\text{311}\) During and after Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan poppy cultivation increased. In the late 1980’s Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran became a leading producer of opium; replaced the golden triangle of Laos, Mayanmar, and Thailand in opium production and earned the title “Golden Crescent”. Large scale opium production in Pakistan started in 1986 when it produced 800 tons of opium per year and 70% heroin supply came from Pakistan. Afghan war lords planted the crop in Southern Afghanistan that produced opium paste which would be sent to international markets via Pakistan to finance the Afghan war. The ISI and CIA officials ignored the activities and used the money to sponsor militancy in Afghanistan so as to achieve their war objectives.\(^\text{312}\)

Moreover, as the countries formal economy shattered due to civil war in the country, Opium became chief source of generating revenue for local administration and military. Some Mujahidin commanders became directly


involved in the drug trade to generate income and finance their military operations. Pakistan ISI also allegedly said to have links with trade including production and trafficking to US and other European countries.\textsuperscript{313} In 2003, Opium cultivation in Afghanistan rose from 150,000 acres to 510,000 acres in 2004; in 2005, it touched 104,000 hectares; in 2006 it increased to 161,000 hectares and eventually to 193,000 hectares in 2007. The territory which is used for opium currently has increased than the territory for coca cultivation in Latin America i.e. Colombia, Bolivia and Peru combined.\textsuperscript{314} Favorable weather conditions produced opium yields (42.5 kg per hectare) higher than 2006 (37kg/ha). As a result, in 2007 Afghanistan cultivated an unexpected 8,200 tons of opium (34% more than in 2006), which made it the world’s major drug provider thereby producing 93 percent of world opium.

Afghanistan today left aside China of nineteen century that had a population at that time 15 times larger than Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{315} A report launched by UN Office on drugs and crimes titled “The Use of Poppy Cultivation is an Instrument to Reduce Poverty” in 2003-2004 concluded that the factors that drive farmers to cultivate opium are; extreme poverty in the country; greater pay off s of the drug and the absence of credit system.\textsuperscript{316}

\textsuperscript{314} UDOC, “Afghanistan Opium Survey” (Oct, 2007), P.iii. see also Daily Times, Jan 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2005. 
\textsuperscript{315} Ibid. p.13. 
Drug trafficking from Afghanistan to Pakistan has stalemated both countries efforts to develop their relations on solid footings, because drug money is used to sponsor militancy. Pakistan’s geographic location next to Afghanistan put the country in a susceptible position in terms of drug trafficking as well as drug abuse. Pakistan is one of the main countries for drugs transit from Afghanistan and has created serious problems for Pakistan. Drug enters from Afghanistan to Pakistan through Balochistan and NWFP. It has highly affected Pakistan’s security as well as its society. It has increased number of drug addicts. A survey conducted in 2004, revealed five million drug addicts in the country. In addition to drug addiction it has also increased the spread of Human Immune Deficiency Virus (HIV). In 2004, National AIDS control Program revealed 7.6% AIDS increase than 4% in 2003 which increases every year with the rise in Afghan narco-trade. Moreover it has allowed for crime rates, gang warfare, corruption and organizations that operate outside law. Problems have been complicated in Karachi and Quetta where it has resulted in gang warfare. The gangs fight for control of smugglers depot, supply routes and profits from drug trade.\footnote{Peter Chalk, “Pakistan Tackles Impact of Afghan Opium Trade”, Retrieved Feb 17th, 2013 from Christine Fair, website: \url{http://www.hom.comcast.net/~christinefair/pub/}.}

Afghanistan and Pakistan are inseparably linked in drug trade. Drugs produced in Afghanistan come to border areas where government authority is weak. Waziristan, NWFP and Swat are becoming fertile grounds for drug smuggling. Drug money is considered to be the main source of financial funding
for extremists, securing trade routes, promoting militancy and insurgency in both Afghanistan and in Pakistan which poses threat to the stability of both the countries. As a result both the countries blame each other for allowing each other’s soil for sponsoring militancy and terrorism.

In Afghanistan, the total export value of opium and heroin being trafficked to neighboring countries in 2007 is $US 4 billion, an increase of 29% over 2006. That means that opium now accounts for more than half (53%) of the country’s licit GDP. Afghan war lords make huge profits from controlling the opium trade who in turn used it to maintain military power, sustain instability within Afghanistan and sponsoring terrorists’ attacks in the neighboring countries. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in the Afghanistan opium survey-2005 clearly states that “There is a nexus between drug traffickers and war lordism.” Provinces which are controlled by war lords are suitable for trafficking. War lords are either been elected to, or have placed their supporters in parliament who keep a blind eye on their activities.

Mr. Sherzada Akhund former governor of Helmand province, encouraged farmers to grow more poppy before he was removed from his office. Thomas Scweich who remained US coordinator for counter narcotics and justice reform in Afghanistan resigned in 2008 argued that not only Taliban who were the enemies of Karzai government generated revenue from the drug trade, but also his

---

supporters did the same. A case in point is that press reports in 2008 charged Ahmed Wali Karzai (President Karzai brother) of his being involved in drugs trafficking which was denied by him and President Karzai. Moreover, an article in Daily Afghanistan published in June 2005 revealed that in Afghanistan government officials notified people not to grow poppies and asked that poppy fields should be destroyed, but they supported farmers to cultivate poppy via many means because the government officials generated more of their money from poppy cultivation.

Therefore, it is clear from the above analysis that post Taliban ministers are involved in drug trade and have set permissive conditions for poppy cultivation. Surprisingly, entire Afghanistan 50% opium comes from one single province-Helmand. This southern province of Afghanistan has become the world’s largest place of illicit drugs crossing Columbia for coca, Morocco for cannabis and Myanmar for opium.

All the efforts by international community to eliminate poppy cultivation have failed. American endeavor to convince the Afghan government to utilize crop dusters to destroy opium have been turned down on the ground that this would be harmful for environment, other crops and for human health. Karzai government attitude towards formulating a comprehensive anti narcotics strategy

---

showed that he considered it counterproductive to counter insurgency and establishing the writ of the government. Some American official believed that the stance which he adopted was because the election was due in April 2005 and he didn’t want to annoy rural voters who were expected to take part in election. Afghan government and CIA resisted from destroying the crop and seriously initiating the measures to curb the trade, the main source of Afghan people livelihood, out of the fear that they will lose the support of local population making them pro Taliban. Secondly, it will divert the US attention from war on terror.

Former assistant secretary of state for international narcotics and law enforcement, Robert B Charles, contends that money from drug trafficking are funding the Taliban. They are the ones who once barred opium cultivation. He further highlights that the profits are also shared by the Hezb-i-Islami faction led by Gulbuddin Hekmatyar.

Some circles in Pakistan believe that in order to take advantage from the chaos and insecurity in Afghanistan, India has established four Consulates in Kandahar, Mazar-i-Sharif, Herat and Jalalabad, in addition to an oversized Embassy in Kabul, which has made the diplomatic representation of India the largest in Afghanistan. Largest even than that of the United States. Keeping in view the security and socio economic situation in Afghanistan, there exists no business or consular validation for India to open a consulate in the remote and

---
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small Iranian town to Zahidan on the border of Balochistan province of Pakistan. It is believed that these Indian consulates are strengthening and forging links with the Afghan warlords sympathetic to northern alliance and drug dealers who are working to promote drug culture, ethnic and sectarian incidents in Pakistan. In this regard, recruitment to these forces are being given by Indian intelligence agency RAW’s agents in the Indian consulates on Pak-Afghan border. In addition, financing for violence and terrorism against Pakistan is provided through drug money. These charges are denied by Indian and Afghan government but the increasing poppy yield does raise several doubts about the seriousness of the Afghan’s government efforts that have the potential to stall counter insurgency efforts and Pak-Afghan relations.

The narco-trafficking from Afghanistan to Pakistan is not only waning writ of the state but also strengthening the bond among drug traffickers, criminal groups, insurgents and Taliban. Consequently, this linkage of drugs, crime, and insurgents posed stiff resistance to counter terrorism operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan’s tribal areas. This constitutes major challenge to both countries because the nexus of the drug trade that support the conflict is not countered in either Afghanistan or Pakistan.

4.5: Refugee Repatriation

Refugees issue is the legacy of Afghan conflicts and has affected Pak-Afghan relations as more people cross into Pakistan illegally than those repatriated with the cooperation of UNHCR. They mix with the local population, move freely across the country and indulge in all types of crimes and other illegal activities. There is a growing sense in Pakistan that the Afghan refugees have become a burden the country should not be required to carry. Pakistan is frustrated with the toll they are taking on the country.

For lasting peace between Pakistan and Afghanistan it is necessary to settle refuge issue. Pakistan believes that Afghans are responsible for crime and are undermining Pakistan’s security. In Pakistan, Afghan refugees and their camps remained a breeding ground for militants who are poor and unemployed. Their source of inspiration has mostly been the commander of a militant organization and feels proud to be affiliated with any such militant organization so as to earn money and wage holy war. Currently, Pakistan is facing economic and security implications because of the presence of Afghan refugees. They have provided easy recruits to the militant organizations who have declared war against the state or are involved in anti state activities; drug trafficking, arms proliferation and target killing posing a serious security threat.

Pakistan is not signatory of *UN Convention relating to the Status of Refugees 1951*, or 1967 protocol but has played host to more than 3 million
Afghan refugees. Pakistan allowed them to set up their businesses in different sectors, provided them with food, shelter and clothing which brought its own resources i.e. agriculture, livestock, wildlife, forests, rivers under immense strain. Moreover, as time went by the foreign aid for refugees stopped arriving and its internal resources got drained.

In March, 2002 a joint survey was conducted by government of Pakistan and UNHCR that revealed the figure of Afghan Refugees population in Pakistan. The census result showed that there are 3049,268 Afghan refugees living in Pakistan. Among them 42% lives in camps and 58 %lives in urban areas. Majority among them were Pushtuns which made 81% of the population. While the remaining were Tajiks, Uzbeks, Turkmens and other ethnic groups. After the fall of Taliban government and formation of Hamid Karzai government, it was believed that the refugees residing in Pakistan would go back to their country but they kept coming back due to economic hardships and lack of security.

Pakistan is now reluctant to host remaining two million Afghan refugees and has adopted close door policy towards them. At present majority of Afghan refugees are Pushtun ethnic group and live outside refugee camps. In March, 2003 UNHCR, Pakistan and Afghanistan signed a tripartite agreement to ensure dignified repatriation of Afghan refugees. According to the agreement, UNHCR would assist Pakistan with the voluntary repatriation of the Afghan refugees.

---

Pakistan also agreed to adopt a phased approach to the repatriation.\textsuperscript{327} But the repatriation program came to halt several times in 2004; during Feb because of tough weather conditions, in June due to insurgency in Balochistan which halted field operations; and in October due to Presidential election in Afghanistan. In addition, uncertain security situation back home also made repatriation difficult.\textsuperscript{328} Many Afghan refugees face dire situation when they return home. According to UN figures returning citizens face 35 \% lower access to land and unemployment is 63 \%.\textsuperscript{329}

Pakistan hosted Afghan refugees for more than 20 years and now has adopted a harsh attitude towards them for several reasons i.e. Pakistan's deteriorating economy 2) lack of international financial support for the refugees, which officials say has strained Pakistan’s already fragile economy; 3) Increase in social problems, such as prostitution, drug use and trafficking which has earned a bad name for Pakistan internationally because drugs to international markets go via Pakistani ports.

Most of the Afghan refugees transferred their opium production to Pakistan’s tribal areas of Pakistan during Soviet war time and established laboratories for converting opium into heroin as a result of which number of Heroin addicts increased in Pakistan. In 1982 there were 100000 heroin addicts in Pakistan which increased to 450000 in 1986, and in 1987 it reached the figure

\textsuperscript{327} Ibid. 83-85.
\textsuperscript{328} Ibid. p. 87.
657,842. There is also increase in crimes rate, anti government activities, which the Pakistani officials says are not solely caused by Afghan refugees. But actually their arrival has deteriorated the situation.\textsuperscript{330}

Pakistan’s permanent representative Munir Akram wrote to UN Security Council that the issue of cross-border infiltration is closely associated with the presence of Afghan refugees in Pakistan. These camps have often given rise to objection that they provide safe haven to adverse elements and Taliban.\textsuperscript{331} Most of the government officials believe that refugees pose security threat. They brought militancy and Kalashnikov culture to the region. The existence of small arms and militancy have caused deteriorating security situation.

The environmental implications of these refugee camps are also colossal. The jungles have disappeared, epidemic diseases have increased. Demographics in Balochistan are also threatened. In Feb, 2008 elections ethnic Hazaras from refugee camps from Afghanistan won three seats in Balochistan. Furthermore many districts in Balochistan are ruled by councilors from Afghanistan which is alarming.\textsuperscript{332} Most of the Afghan refugees are also involved in smuggling towards which government is paying little attention.

\textsuperscript{330} Nasreen Ghufran, “Afghan Migration Threat or Opportunity for Pakistan”, BIJSS Journal, 31:2, (April, 2010), 130.
Bara Markets or smugglers markets are flourishing in the country where contrabands at cheap prices are easily available in which along with the locals’ refugees are also involved. The Bara (a market for foreign contrabands in the Khyber tribal agency bordering Afghanistan) or Karkhano markets.

**Karkhano (Bara Market)**


Janay, a 50-year-old Afghan refugee living at Nasir Bagh Peshawar, lost his one hand and leg in a landmine explosion near Kabul in 1994 and now make his both ends meet by smuggling tea on his wheel chair from Bara. “When I came from Afghanistan as a refugee, I obtained aid from the

---

334 The Karkhano market established in 1985 has 4,500 shops, owned by both Pakistani and Afghan traders. The shops do booming business. Everything from electronic goods to air conditioners, clothes, cosmetics, automobile spares, even tyres, is from outside Pakistan. Here prices are cheaper than anywhere else, attracting shoppers from all over the country. *see* Ashfaq Yousafzai, “Smugglers Profit from Landlocked Afghanistan”, Retrieved July14th, 2011 from IPS News, website: http://www.ipsnews.net/index.asp.
Commissionerate of Afghan Refugees but now foreign aid to Afghan refugees has stopped. In this situation the only option left with me is to work for smugglers by carrying goods for them. He maintained that it is not an easy job because he has to operate the wheel chair with his hands for 10 to 15 miles. He elaborated further that in northern areas Dir, Swat and Mansehra there are Afghan refugees who are involved in Timber smuggling which is a very lucrative business.\footnote{Janay, (Afghan Refugee), Interview by the researcher, Feb 23, 2012.}

In addition, Shoaib Nosherwani, Balochistan then Minister for Home and Tribal Affairs, held Afghans accountable for disorder in Balochistan Province on April 26, 2006. He expressed hope to extract clues from an Afghan militant, known as Muhammad Sayyed who was caught for allegedly trying to place a bomb in a bus station in Quetta on April 23.\footnote{RFERL/Newline, “Pakistan Provincial Official Says Afghan Responsible for Insecurity”, Retrieved Nov 26th, 2010 from RFERL News, website: www.rferl.org/newsline/2006/04/6-SWA/swa-280406.asp.} Mr Nosherwani also pointed to a blast caused by explosive materials in a residence that was owned by an Afghan national, asking the Pakistani government to repatriate the Afghan refugees as soon as possible.\footnote{Ibid.}

Pakistan government from Oct 2006 to Feb, 2007 initiated a four month program to register Afghan refugees. The aim was to make a demographic record of Afghan refugees for their development, security and their dignified return. The fact was UNHCR and the government wanted to make a strategy to repatriate the remaining Afghan refugees. According to the campaign the term ‘Refugee’ will
not be used for the Afghans instead they will be called Afghan citizens emphasizing their non refugee status.\textsuperscript{338}

The registration was completed effectively which discovered that most of the refugees do not want to go back to their country in the current state of affairs. They do not want to return in their near future.\textsuperscript{339} According to UNODC report April 2009, one million unregistered refugees are living in Pakistan facing an uncertain future. UNHCR will not provide them any assistance and will not be considered as refugees but illegal migrants who will face harassment and forced repatriation.\textsuperscript{340}

Pakistan believes it’s high time for refugees to go back and take part in Afghanistan’s reconstruction otherwise they can be used as potential recruits by militants. As there is limited monitoring of refugee camps the militants can use these camps as safe havens. There is unrest among people against Afghans refugees, and most of the time they are held responsible for drugs, militancy, violence, smuggling and sectarian killings though many Pakistanis are also associated.\textsuperscript{341} Western media has also pointed out that Ramzi Yousaef who was a man behind terrorist attack on world trade center in 1993 and Khalid Sheikh Mohammad who was a mentor behind 9/11 attacks lived and was recruited in refugee camps.\textsuperscript{342}

\textsuperscript{339} Ibid. p.123.
Government of Pakistan has decided to ensure dignified repatriation of Afghan refugees. Many believe that refugee repatriation may ease pressure from Pakistan but it can produce new problems. Poor economic and security situation back home, may lead to their joining hands with Taliban for survival. Rahimullah Yousafzai believes that Pakistan wants to repatriate them as it will ease the pressure on the economy, security and social fabric of the country. However, one cannot generalize that in future they will be joining hands with the Taliban against Pakistan because of poor conditions prevailing in their home country. Those who have tilt towards the Taliban and their ideology are having close ties with them while remaining even in Pakistan. Refugees expect peace and a normal life after return. Joining hands with Taliban will deprive them of both.

4.6: Water Resource Issue

“Fierce completion for fresh water may well become a source of conflict and wars in the future”. Kofi Anan, March 2011

Water conflicts often occurred in bilateral relations which become a cause of mistrust and hampers development of normal bilateral relations. Water related conflicts breakout between the states over insufficient access to water in terms of quantity and quality. In developing countries water management is extremely complicated and needs reliable information, strong water sharing institutions, administrative capabilities, needs meteorological, hydrological and socio economic data which is mostly lacking with them. In addition, gap among riparian
to formulate, explain and legitimize data often cause mistrust which halts growth of normal bilateral relations.  

Rahimullah Yousafzai believes that currently there is no water sharing treaty between Pakistan and Afghanistan which has the potential to deteriorate their relations and lay dangerous repercussions on regional stability. He added, that because of economic regression in Afghanistan it is not able to initiate energy production but as the economic turnaround takes place in Afghanistan its water usage will increase which may lead to water conflict and spoil their relations. The increasing demand for water, the insufficient management of water resources, lack of forums for dialogues, data sharing mechanisms and historic mistrust form a challenge to regional peace, cooperation and have a potential to deteriorate Pak-Afghan relations.

Decades of war destroyed Afghanistan infrastructure and water storage capacity for irrigation purposes. There are nine rivers which are shared by both the countries including Kabul River on which twelve dams are proposed by India which will have water storage capacity of 4.7 Million Acre Feet (MAF), 25% more than that of Mangla Dam which will have negative fallout for Pakistan.

---


344 Rahimullah Yousafzai, Interview by the researcher, Nov 26th, 2013.

345 Mangla Dam is also called earth dam on Jhelum River Pakistan which originates from Indian held Kashmir completed in 1967 is one of the two main structures in Indus basin Project. (The other is Tarbela dam). The Mangla Dam rises 453 feet (138 m) above ground level, is about 10,300 feet (3,140 m) wide at its crest, and has a volume of 85,500,000 cubic yards (65,400,000 cubic meters).
and seems to influence the foreign policy of Pakistan, Afghanistan and India. Financial assistance for constructing Dams will be provided by World Bank which will cost $7.079 billion.\textsuperscript{346} The total annual water flow in these rivers is about 18.3 million acres feet. In which river Kabul contributes 16.5 (maf); while River Chitral (which has origin in Pakistan, becomes river Kunar after entering Afghanistan and joins Kabul River at Jalalabad and then re enters Warsak Dam Pakistan) makes 8.5 (maf).\textsuperscript{347} This gives Pakistan the status of upper riparian as well as lower riparian. While makes Afghanistan the middle riparian. Many Afghans believe that Afghanistan is the upper riparian because Kabul river enters Pakistan down the stream after fulfilling irrigation purpose of areas adjacent to Peshawar before joining Indus river at Attack and Khairabad. Analysts believe that at the time of conflict upper riparian states have upper hand in sharing water of joint basin.\textsuperscript{348} Since there is absence of water treaty therefore there is a possibility of water dispute between these two countries which can have dangerous repercussion.

According to the reports four dams will be built in Panjshir sub-basin, four dams are to be constructed in upper Kabul sub-basin and four more dams will be

---
\textsuperscript{346} *The Express Tribune*, June 22, 2011.
\textsuperscript{347} *Daily Dawn*, April 20, 2011.
built in the lower Kabul sub-basin. These include the Totumdara project which will generate 200 MW of electricity and have water storage capacity of 332510 acres feet, Barak project which will generate 100 MW of electricity and store 429830 acres feet of water, Panjshir (100 MW) project with the capacity to store 1054300 acres feet of water and Baghdara (210 MW) project with the capacity to store 324400 acres feet of water. In addition dams in Logar Upper Kabul sub-basin on the Kabul River include the Haijana project (72 MW) with water storage capacity of 178420 acres feet, Kajab (15 MW) project with water storage capacity of 324400 acres feet, Tangi Wadag (56 MW) project with capacity to store 283850 acres feet and $51m Gat (86 MW) project with water storage capacity of 405500 acres feet. Dams in the Lower Kabul sub-basin, includ the $442 million Sarobi project (210 MW) with the capacity to store 324400 acres feet of water, Laghman project (1251 MW) with water storage capacity of 233568 acres feet, and Kunar 94.8 MW and Kama projects (11.5 MW).\textsuperscript{349} Afghanistan will need water for irrigation as well as for electricity. Once the economic activity and the reconstruction of the above mentioned dams start in Afghanistan it is going to create rift in Pak-Afghan relations.

Water resource issue is another issue which has the potential to crop up between Pakistan and Afghanistan in the future and further deteriorate the already fragile trust level between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Experts believe there is a lack of proactive policy on part of Pakistan to work for an agreement, by taking

\textsuperscript{349} \textit{The News International}, May 12, 2011.
advantage of US presence in the region to make possible Pak-Afghan consultation on a bilateral water agreement. In addition, there is also lack of multidisciplinary and fact finding working group to decide hydrological knowledge base related to Kabul river basin so as to evaluate a hydro power and agriculture progress plans that have an effect on both the countries.

4.7: Conclusion

There are several issues (discussed above) which are stalling Pak-Afghan relations and cause mistrust. The chapter concludes that if these issues are not addressed mistrust will grow further. The period 2001-2008 saw FATA as a hub of militants consisting of Afghan Taliban, Pakistani Taliban, Al-qaida, sectarian groups such as Sipah Sahaba, Lashkara Jangvi and Tehrik-e-Jaferia, anti Indian groups such as Laskar-e-Taiba, Jaish Mohammad and Harkatul Mujahiddin which created violence and social unrest inside the country. Coupled with the problem was resurgence of Taliban, suicide bombing, drone attacks which caused collateral damages and civilian deaths in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Taliban movement is not like the one which was operating in Afghanistan in 1990s. The movement is highly fragmented and decentralized in Pakistan, contains different factions mentioned above which is making it difficult for Pakistan to exert control over them.

Increasing corruption, Pushtun alienation, poor governance, opium production, presence of foreign troops and refugee crises are factors which led to
Taliban resurgence in Afghanistan. While in Pakistan its alignment with US, military operations, flawed counterinsurgency strategies, weak law enforcing agencies, weak administrative system in FATA and lack of advanced equipment to fight terrorism have deteriorated situation resulting in increased militancy.

Several times northern alliance blamed Pakistan army and ISI for patronizing Taliban and letting its soil used by Al-qaida. It is believed that Pakistani government gave selective support to USA in war against terrorism and secretly Pakistan is backing certain section of Taliban who are in the favor of Jihad in Afghanistan and resist from attacking Pakistani state. So that after US withdrawal pro Pakistan government emerges in Afghanistan. Despite the fact that Taliban previously did not agree to recognize Durand line.

Pakistan direct involvement in Afghanistan of manipulating its politics after ouster of Taliban declined but the legacy of mistrust between the countries continued because past dealings overshadowed their current dealings. Pakistan has the history of supporting different Afghan factions in the shape of Mujahidin and then Taliban in Afghanistan. Pakistan helped them with money, arms and planning. Though after 9/11 Pakistan abandoned its support to Taliban and started working with US and international community to suppress militancy but it has failed so far. International community and US efforts to pressurize Pakistan by offering sticks and carrots not to tolerate militancy is a failure and have produced mix results. Pakistan has been successful to weaken Al-qaida but not Taliban.
Taliban is now a reality and formidable force and have a potential to destabilize the country.

Though all of the above mentioned issues are of vital importance and need to be dealt and resolved carefully. The major issue between them which is responsible for mistrust is Durand line issue which has given birth to other additional problems such as safe havens smuggling and drug trafficking. As long as some compromise is not reached on border issue, irritants would continue leading to severity of relationship and widening mistrust. The reluctance of Afghanistan to recognize the Durand Line as the formal boundary line between Pakistan and Afghanistan and the failure of the two countries to resolve the issue and build consensus is an obstacle to almost all the problems and mistrust present between the two neighbors. Keeping in mind the current insurgency and unrest in Afghanistan and Pakistan this is the high time for the U.S, UN and international community to help both states to solve their long standing border issue and reach some compromise. Though, resolving the border row would not instantly resolve the unrest in both states but it would assist in reducing friction and the quotient of mistrust between the two countries. The next chapter is an extension of the current chapter which will cover external interference in Afghanistan which has created environment of mistrust and impacted Pak-Afghan relations.
Chapter-5

Regional Geo-Politics in Afghanistan and its Impact on Pak-Afghan Relations: A Factor in Mistrust

External interference in Afghanistan’s internal politics is the biggest challenge to its stability. Afghanistan has a long history of foreign interventions. It is among the most unfortunate state of the world, known for the foreign armies crossing its borders to full fill their imperial and commercial goals. In much of 19th and 20th century it remained a battle field and centre of attention for the great game between Czarist Russia and the British Empire, for enhancing their influence in Central and South Asia. Iran Russia, Pakistan, India, China and Saudi Arabia in 20th century also attempted to expand their authority across Afghanistan to resource rich Central Asia, through strategies that instilled competition thereby casting shadow on every stabilizing effort.

History has shaped Afghanistan’s place in world politics. It had been an important passage of trade and conquest between Europe, Persia, Central Asia, South and East Asia. Afghanistan had hardly been administered as an integrated unit under the influence of local population during much of the country’s history. In reality in the past, it had been ruled as a part of the territory of one of its neighbors.\(^\text{350}\) In the contemporary age, Afghanistan can be termed as a huge chunk of stony land bordered by neighbours who send their hostility and conflict

onto its terrain.\textsuperscript{351} There have never been a strong central or elected government in Afghanistan whose writ could be uniformly present in all parts of the country. Consequently, neighbours exploit the situation to their own advantage and send their proxy wars to Afghanistan. Be it British-India and Soviet Union rivalry in the past, or Pakistan-India rivalry at present or a new great game. All regional countries are struggling to use Afghanistan as a battle ground to settle their scores against each other.

Afghanistan is positioned at the cross roads of Central, South and Far East which enhances its significance several times in and outside the region. Afghanistan’s position at the crossroads of three most important powers Iran, Pakistan and China while the other two major powers Russia and India located at the short distance from Afghanistan makes it vulnerable to the outside interference.\textsuperscript{352} Afghanistan exists in a conflicting zone. Interests of different countries are involved in Afghanistan. No state in its neighborhood near or far is ready to permit other states to achieve predominance in Afghanistan. Such a behavior has destroyed greater part of Afghanistan. Blame for much of the political instability and plight of its people goes to the external powers, struggling hard to attain their strategic, ideological and economic objectives in the country.

Pak-Afghan relations cannot be understood without highlighting conflicting regional and international interests involved in Afghanistan. The


\textsuperscript{352} Kamal Matinuddin, \textit{The Taliban Phenomena} (1999), op.cit. p. 2.
chapter focuses on how external powers with competing interests have engaged themselves in Afghanistan in the post 9/11 which has impacted Pak-Afghan relations. India, Iran and US factors are discussed because their role like Pakistan is critical in stabilizing Afghanistan, and have direct bearing on Pak-Afghan relations. Saudi Arabia and Russia roles have not been discussed because their interests align with US, while China’s policy on Afghanistan remains narrowly defined.

Following the over throw of Taliban’s regime, United States main aim has been to dismantle terrorists’ network and implements its policies in Afghanistan.\(^{353}\) Iran being Pakistan's main competitor in Afghanistan, skeptical of US policy in the region, has also vital interests in Afghanistan for which it has been actively involved in Afghanistan since 2001. India which is Pakistan’s main rival wants to make Afghanistan its sphere of influence by countering Pakistan’s influence. On the contrary, Pakistan also has stakes in regional foreign policy and wants to achieve its wide range of objectives, mostly driven by stable government in Afghanistan including all stake holders and countering Indian influence. Consequently, the presence of different national interests has made Afghanistan a central stage of new great game among regional and international actors.\(^{354}\)


Highlighting conflicting interests of external factors will be helpful in evolving a regional based approach for bringing peace in Afghanistan which will have positive impact on Pak-Afghan relations.

5.1: United States Factor in Pak-Afghan Relations

United States is playing a leading role in Afghanistan. Its presence upset the parity of power in the region by making it difficult for the regional actors to set the pattern of their future relations in the regional context. For China, Iran, Russia the long term presence of the super power in the region is against the strategic and economic interests. For Pakistan, US-India cooperation is against its economic and strategic interests, making it difficult to set the pattern of its political discourse with them impacting Pak-Afghan relations.

Before Soviet invasion, Afghanistan was an area of little importance for United States. Its interests grew many folds when Soviet Russia its main adversary attacked Afghanistan. US immediately indirectly involved itself in Afghan war by giving military aid to Mujahidin via Pakistan. Soviet departure in 1989 and its collapse after a year declined United States interests in the region. Barnett R. Rubin stated, that the whole international community had no plan of action for Kabul from 1992-1994.\(^{355}\)

Afghanistan lost the importance it achieved at the eve of Soviet occupation. But its contiguity with Iran and Central Asia meant it was not

completely ignored by United States. United States had stakes in Afghanistan in
1990 and it did show concern when opium cultivation in Afghanistan increased
and it turned into a safe haven of global terrorists. These stakes were however
given little attention and all the attention by policy crafters was diverted to chalk
out a policy which could maintain peace in Afghanistan.\footnote{Ijaz Khan, Pakistan’s Strategic Culture and Foreign policy Making: A Study of Pakistan’s Post 9/11 Afghan Policy Change (2007), Op. cit. p. 31.} After Soviet withdrawal, United States left the country to local powers resulting in the rise of
Taliban. In the beginning i.e. from 1994-96 United States seem to be supporting
Taliban via Pakistan and Saudi Arabia and did not condemn them during that

She ignored Taliban’s draconian policies and gave importance to its
broader goals and supported them for several important reasons i.e. for countering
Russian and Iranian influence; maintenance of peace and stability in Afghanistan,
paving a path for the comeback of former King Zahir Shah, dismantling terrorists
training camps, eliminating opium, securing trade routes to Central Asia oil and
gas reserves and implementing “Union Oil Company of California” project
(UNOCAL). But Taliban failed to fulfill United States expectations. They did not
take into account United States political interests thereby provided safe havens to
Osama bin laden who was known for anti United States activities. He was known
for bombing of United States embassies in Tanzania and Kenya in 1999 and also refused to implement UNOCAL project.\(^{358}\)

Under immense feminist movement pressure in 1997 against Taliban, Clinton government started turning its back on Taliban and blamed them for their strict interpretation of Islam and repressive policies towards women and minorities. Liberal American women supported Bill Clinton’s election campaign during 1996. Especially, Hollywood female actors were the main supporters, and in such a situation it was not possible for Clinton government to antagonize liberal American women.\(^{359}\)

After 9/11 terrorist attacks by Al-qaida on New York and Washington D.C, United States held Al-qaida responsible for the attacks which was provided safe haven by Taliban regime in Afghanistan. On the eve of 9/11 Pakistan-United States relations were far from friendly. Pakistan was facing economic sanctions and democracy related sanctions by United States under which Pakistan was not entitled to receive United States economic and military aid. Pakistan’s economy was in shambles and under the quagmire of debts. United States after the incident of 9/11 was in need to gain Pakistan’s support as it needed air routes, bases and logistic for carrying out its operation in Afghanistan. As most of the equipment, the combatant helicopters and troops came from ships in the Indian Ocean.


Pakistan bordered both the Indian Ocean and Afghanistan, provided the shortest and most viable route for supplies.

For Pakistan, Afghanistan has always been an area of vital significance for its security. The former has regarded Afghanistan as an offshoot of its policy towards India. Its foreign policy makers have long endeavored to have peace and stability on its western borders with Afghanistan as a result of insecurity on its eastern flank with India and regarded it as a matter of utmost importance to have a pliant regime in Kabul. 9/11 changed geopolitical landscape. US President George Bush in a speech to joint session of Congress on Sept 20, 2001 declared categorically, “Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us or with the terrorists.” On 14 September, 2001, Congress passed a resolution allowing the President of United States to exercise force against the perpetrators of terrorism including nations, organizations, states or individuals responsible for attacks or nurturing the terrorists to attack. Such scenario left Islamabad with no other option than to alter its Afghan policy of supporting Taliban.

United States used coercive diplomacy offered Pakistan with incentives as well as threats as a consequence it took a U-turn policy towards Taliban, became a frontline state in the war against terrorism and supported the US against Taliban and Al-qaida network in the tribal areas of Pakistan and Afghanistan.

---

361 Hafeez Malik, *US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan: The Imperial Dimension* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), 186.
According to United States government report on US policy towards Afghanistan and Pakistan, the core objectives of US are: to dismantle extremist and terrorists’ networks and Al-qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan so as to save United States from Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism, to establish a more reliable, strong and stable government in Afghanistan that can safeguard the interests of Afghans, to develop strong Afghan armed forces, that can fight terrorism without United States assistance, to involve international community in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Afghanistan.\(^{362}\)

Some analysts also believe that United States seems to have objectives beyond dismantling terrorists’ net work. In fact, United States is competing with Russia and China to gain sway and promote democracy in CARs and beyond. For this reason it established bases in Central Asian Republics.\(^{363}\) United States established bases in Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan as well as provided around US$ 394 million in 2002 to these countries. The most important United States interest in these Central Asian Republics is their hydro carbon possessions. The oil in the Caspian Sea area is in large quantity and of fine quality. The Caspian Sea has the largest world unexploited fossil fuel reserves. Turkmenistan has 6.5 million tons of oil and 5.5 trillion cubic meters of gas- constituting it fourth in terms of known gas reserves.\(^{364}\)

\(^{364}\) Ibid.
Ijaz Khan Professor at International Relations Department University of Peshawar listed the following factors for Pakistan’s renewed importance amongst United States policy maker i.e. Pakistan’s geographical location, its long and porous border with Afghanistan and its active involvement in Afghanistan since Soviet-Afghan war. In addition, it was the only country in the region which recognized Taliban government and had contact and diplomatic relations with them. Moreover, after the 9/11 terrorists attacks on United States and with the launching of War on terror, Pakistan posed security threat to United States because of the possession of nuclear weapons and its links with terrorism.\textsuperscript{365} Coupled with them, United States-Iran relations were worsening because of Iran uranium enrichment program; United States needed Pakistan’s cooperation in case of future crises with Iran.\textsuperscript{366}

Dr. Ijaz Khan in \textit{Turkish Journal of International Relations} pointed out, that there was not any real or fundamental change in Pakistan’s foreign policy towards Afghanistan; rather it was a short term policy shift. Basic aim of Pakistan’s policy towards Afghanistan was to support a regime (which is subordinate to it and would not be friendly to its arch rival India and competitor Iran) that can achieve peace and bring stability to Afghanistan. Consequently, Pakistan would be able to reach CARs. India would be denied access to gain influence and the Durand line issue would be solved according to its dictates. He further elaborated that the short term change of policy was adopted to clearly out

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Dr. Ijaz Khan, Interview by the researcher, May, 2010.
\item Hafeez Malik, \textit{US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan: The Imperial Dimension} (2008), Opcit. p. 36.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
deal Indian designs and the understanding that persistent backing to Taliban would mean Pakistan would be a target in the looming military action against Taliban and Al-qaida. The threat of diplomatic isolation, sectarianism, extremism and Talibanization of Pakistan taking shape of terrorism was felt by Musharraf even before Al-qaida attacks on United States i.e. Taliban refused to destroy Buddha statues and hand over Osama bin Laden to Pakistan or any other country which brought embarrassment and alarmed President Musharraf. Taliban government became a role model for extremist groups in Pakistan and they also wanted to establish Taliban type regime in Pakistan, for this reason they forged alliance with the clerics and jihadi groups and was getting stronger day by day. Sectarianism increased taking shape of terrorism, and he pointed out the threats publically several times. Musharraf in an address on June 5, 2001 stated that “… Our conduct internally and externally had led the world to regard us as terrorists.”

After 9/11 in a changed political landscape Pakistan abandoned its relation with Taliban. The then President Musharraf in a speech to the Pakistani nation on 20 September, 2001 declared that Pakistan was going through vulnerable situation and it had completely altered its course; stopped supporting Taliban and promised greater cooperation and collaboration with the United States which impacted geopolitics in the region.

368 Najmuddin Sheikh, “Challenges and Opportunities for Pakistan’s Foreign Policy in the Changed Global Environment” Margella Papers (Islamabad: National Defence Collage, 2004), 1-12.
“Pakistan is facing an extremely delicate situation; and in opinion, it is the most delicate phase since 1971. At this moment, our decisions may have far reaching and wide repercussions. The expansion and span of these decisions are very wide…..the worst result God forbid, may endanger our territorial integrity and survival. Our critical concern may be harmed…..I mean that our nuclear strength and our Kashmir cause may be harmed.”

The above cited words by Musharraf indicated the country’s national security in broader sense including economic and social stability and referred to a new era in security framework. Musharraf decision to abandon Taliban and alignment with US showed U-turn policy towards Afghanistan, keeping in view country’s delicate economic, social political situation. In my perspective given the ground realities at the time, Musharraf policy change was a rational choice.

His decision, to change the Afghan policy was necessary for achieving core objectives i.e. ensuring countries security and stability, economic revival and long term economic development, the protection of Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal and permanent settlement of Kashmir dispute. He also gave the slogan of ‘Pakistan first’. That motto was construed as a move towards a realistic foreign policy in which prioritizing Pakistan’s security interests at all cost was on the top agenda.

---

Pakistan may have accomplished some of the objectives cited above or it may achieve it in the near future. But this cannot be stated about Kashmir.\(^{371}\)

Immediately after 9/11 terrorists’ attacks Collin Powell (then US secretary of state) handed over Pakistan a list of demands which Pakistan agreed to. It asked Pakistan to: end support to Al-qaida and its members coming into Pakistan from Afghanistan, give US access to strategically important Pakistani air and naval bases, give United States air and landing rights, share important information and intelligence, condemn terrorists attack on United States and stop state sponsored terrorism, stop proving logistic support to Taliban and cross border infiltration of Taliban, stop patronizing Taliban, refrain from keeping any diplomatic relations with them and support US to dismantle Taliban and Al-qaida.\(^{372}\)

Pakistan took measures against the fundamentalist Islamic groups and militant organizations to limit the influence of Mullahs, detained their leaders and dismantled their financial networks. *Sipah-i-Sahaba, Jaish-i-Mohammad, Tehrik-Jaferia*, and *Tehrik-i-Nifaz-i-Shariat- Mohammadi* were banned.\(^{373}\) Moreover, Pakistan dysfunctional Anti terrorists’ courts introduced by former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif were made functional again.\(^{374}\) To reciprocate, United States legitimizied Musharraf’s dictatorial rule, provided Pakistan economic aid and


\(^{373}\) Ibid. pp. 222-224.

removed different nuclear test related and democracy sanctions i.e. the Symington amendment (imposed in 1978), the Pressler amendment (1990) and the Glenn amendment (1998). According to Glenn amendment US will not entertain applications for loan from Pakistan which is on US Sanction list. Removing such sanctions meant gratifying Pakistan generously. US provided financial assistance worth 1.2 billion for year 2002-2003 and pledged security and military aid. United States also revived Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan Gas and oil pipeline project which is a direct outcome of the changed Pakistan decision. Pakistan, got non NATO ally status, re-entered into Common Wealth, membership of which was suspended as a result of Musharraf Coup in Oct, 1999.377

President Bush called President Musharraf a “courageous leader” who put his life in danger to flush out Al-qaida elements. The then Secretary of State Condolezza Rice who visited Pakistan in March, 2005 said that Pakistan “has come an enormously long way….This is not the Pakistan of September 11. It is not even the Pakistan of 2002.”378 Pakistan army took aggressive action against Taliban in Swat valley and FATA which they called hub of Taliban activists coming from Afghanistan to strengthen their force in Pakistan.379 Controversial South Waziristan operation started in Feb, 2004 in which Pakistan army fought against Taliban and foreign militants (Al-qaida jihadi’s) hiding in FATA of

---

375 Besma Momani, “The IMF, the US War on Terrorism and Pakistan” Asian Affairs, 3:1, (Spring, 2004), 44.
376 Ijaz Khan, Pakistan’s Strategic Culture and Foreign policy Making (2007), op. cit. pp.80-81.
377 Ibid. p. 80.
Waziristan (an autonomous region) which was deeply resented by tribesmen and they consider it an intervention by Pakistan army in their affairs. In Jan, 2005 Pakistan claimed of inflicting heavy losses on Al-qaida by capturing 600 foreign militants out of 6000. The then President Musharaf also declared that Pakistan captured more Al-qaida members than US did. Pakistan arrested Abu Zubaidah (Al-qaida commander under Osama Bin laden) in March 2002, Ramzi bin al Shibh(most wanted in Sept 11 terrorist attacks) in Sept 2002, Khalid Sheikh Mohammad( master mind of different Al-qaida attacks including one on World Trade Centre) in March 2003 and Abu Firaj al Libi in 2005.

Pakistan’s South Waziristan operation was started in haste. It lacked pre-planning. Army miscalculated the actual situation and severity of problem in which 200 Pakistani soldiers lost their lives. Pakistan’s army realized that it was faced with the enemy which was strong, trained, financially motivated, effectively relying on propaganda and enjoying local support. They would mix up with local population in towns as well as in villages where army could not take action because of the fear of collateral damage. In the wake of heavy casualties on Pakistan army as well as civilian losses, operations were stopped and peace deals were struck to pacify Taliban which proved futile as (explained in chapter-3).

In addition, the militants in FATA resorted to brutal tactics against those who would leak any information about them to government agencies. They killed

---

200 government installed maliks in the places where army withdrew after completing operations. The increasing unrest in the country showed strong lacuna in the country administrative apparatus. Successive military take over’s, political instability and lack in consistency in policies weakened and deteriorated the efficiency of administration as a result militancy grew to urban areas and PATA. Local administration was not able to tackle the situation effectively as the most they could do was to order using force. Police was not trained to fight terrorism and lacked modern equipment.

As a result, people started questioning the efficacy of military operations in FATA, deployment of troops against its own people and calling it US war. In 2006, the security situation in Afghanistan deteriorated to a dangerous level, United States and Afghan forces unable to put an end to insurgency and violent activities resulting in suicide bombing both in Pakistan and Afghanistan which deteriorated their relations. US including its media and Afghanistan believed that Pakistan was operating against some and not all the militant groups especially Afghan Taliban who take refuge in FATA and avoid attacking Army.

Wall Street Journal in 2003 reported, that Afghan government, United States army officials and diplomats in Pakistan and Afghanistan believed that some section of Pakistan’s ISI and Islamist parties were patronizing Taliban so that they could organize themselves. Because majority of attacks they faced came from militant groups based in Pakistan which showed that Pakistan policy was to

---

383 Ibid. p. 226.
raid on non Afghans in Al-qaida living in Pakistan just to show some level of cooperation with US, despite the fact that Pakistan had pledged support for Hamid Karzai’s government. In reality, however, the former was working to destabilize his regime and erode counter terrorism efforts in Afghanistan. The report further dwell upon that United States restrained from putting up the issue and adopted silence on the matter out of fear. They did not want to weaken President Musharraf rule who was supporting and strengthening religious parties in NWFP in an effort to support Afghan and Pakistan’s Taliban. In this regard Pakistan actively supported them in Oct 2003 general elections by rigging them, released heads of terrorist organization from jail. All the above mentioned actions were taken so that Musharraf can show the Americans that he was under terrorists’ threat and needed greater support.

Pakistan on the contrary denied these charges and was of the view that US had not deployed enough forces to curb insurgency and seal the borders from Afghan side as well as United States is also playing double game targeting some militants and leaving the rest. United States bombarded Maulvi Nazir hideout leaving Baithulah Mehsud to weaken Pakistan. Many believe that because of its confrontation with India and mistrust of United States which Pakistan considers a fair weather friend, the Pakistani establishment did not severe its links with some Taliban sections. Pakistan considers Taliban as strategic assets in the end game

---

385 Ibid.
when United States will leave Afghanistan. On the contrary, Pakistan maintained that its policy is clear hold and develop the areas where armed forces have conducted operations. Until and unless it completely consolidates its position in areas which are cleared of militants, it cannot open other fronts. Hassan Abbas a well known political analyst noted that in order to chalk out response to United States war on terrorism Pakistan army top commanders met on Sep14, 2001 in which most of them agreed to abandon Afghan Taliban. While a section of army officers like Jamshaid Gulzar, Muzzafar Usmani, and Mohsin Aziz disagreed with the new policy and wanted to support Taliban. To them after having spent so much time and resources over Taliban it was unwise to leave them. Eventually, policy of abandoning Taliban was agreed upon in the meeting. But apparently acting against them Pakistan did maintain some connections with them through religious parties like JUI to use them as a strategic asset in the future. This approach was merely a consequence of dichotomy present over the role of religion in state affairs.  

Moreover, some circles in Pakistan laid emphasis that a root of insurgency was from Kabul. The militants from Swat and FATA took refuge in Afghanistan from where they carried attacks on Pakistan. The case in point is the coalition forces decided in 2009 to remove some check points under the new strategy which was to stop fight with Taliban in the border region as it is better to secure population centers. That action was taken when Pakistan army was undergoing

---

387 Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis, *Wither Pakistan: Growing Instability and Implications for India.* (New Delh: Institute for Defence and Strategic Studies, June, 2010), 62
operation in Swat and Bajaur agency against militants. The move generated suspicions and was a great set back to Pakistan cooperation. Many calling it a deliberate move to let Taliban enter in border areas. In addition, the former believes that Kabul should extend writ of the government, improve intelligence sharing and establish additional check posts. Moreover, the Afghan national army (ANA) comprising of 80,000 troops mostly from non Pushtun ethnicity were not properly trained, could not patrol effectively and were not welcomed in Pushtun provinces which was adding to insurgency.

In 2004, in response to Pakistan’s government inability to govern FATA and control insurgency United States started military incursions and drone attacks----most of the time one-sided, which increased terrorism and suicide bombing many folds; caused civilians casualties, collateral damage, negative feelings against United States and Pakistani government; many started calling it a puppet government dancing to the tunes of United States and caused attacks on NATO containers carrying spare parts, vehicles, fuel and food items as a backlash. The aim of these attacks were to cut NATO supply lines to land locked Afghanistan as 70 to 80 percent NATO supply passed through Khyber Pukhtunkwa and Balochistan. These attacks increased whenever drone attacks on tribal areas had increased. Pakistan on occasion raised protests calling it violation of sovereignty and blocked NATO supply routes, but some circles in Pakistan

believed that there was a secret agreement between United States and Pakistan’s military that allows United States predator attacks on foreign militants in Pakistan.

Pakistani analyst considered United States presence in the region, her operation against Taliban as source of regional instability and impacted Afghanistan-Pakistan ties to a larger extent. In 2002, only two suicide bombing were reported in Pakistan but its number increased to 59 in 2008. Drone attacks had been a reason of difference between United States and Pakistan. Regarding drone attacks Pakistan put some reservations. i.e. Pakistan resisted expansion of drone attacks beyond the tribal areas as well as Balochistan that United States considered the safe havens of Afghan Taliban. United States in counter insurgency strategy heavily relied on drone attacks in Pakistan, which increased several folds when Barak Obama rose to power in 2009. United States by using drone succeeded in disbursing some of Al-qaida leadership from FATA but it has failed to eliminate Taliban insurgency. Till the date of this research drone attacks effectively weakened Al-qaida but not without some negative fall outs. It increased public demonstrations, civilian casualties, collateral damages and militants’ agitation against the law enforcing agencies. As a result numbers of people joined the rank and files of militant organizations. In addition, it worked in remote areas but dislodging militants from urban centers leaves a question mark.

Baithullah Mehsud the then head of TTP in an interview to a foreign journalist revealed that after forming TTP, in the beginning he faced problems in
finding recruits for suicide bombing but United States drone attacks solved his problem. He pointed out that he spent three months trying to employ and only got 10-15 individuals, but one United States drone attack and he got 150 volunteers.\textsuperscript{390} United States believed that the presence of militants in tribal areas posed a challenge to United States ongoing war against terrorism. According to Pentagon, safe havens in Pakistan’s tribal areas represent the maximum challenge to the long term stability and security of Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{391} Pentagon clearly signaled Pakistan that if it was not able to control safe havens, United States preserved the right to take unilateral action to remove Taliban, Al-qaida strong holds and protect itself which clearly signified extension of fight outside Afghanistan’s border into Pakistan.

Amnesty International’s Director of Asia Pacific Sam Zarifi elaborated, that it was plainly uncertain what rules of engagement the CIA adopted in Pakistan. It was also vague how the US was investigating the impact of attacks in order to assess their impact and observance with international law.\textsuperscript{392} David Galula who is counter insurgency expert believes that using military force is a very blunt tool to beat terrorists groups. It may be able to infiltrate and occupy an area that terrorists groups use frequently, and if it is well upheld may reduce terrorist’s activity for short term. Once situation in an area becomes unsustainable for terrorists, they simply relocate to another area and the problem remains

\textsuperscript{390} Shuja Nawaz, \textit{FATA-A Most Dangerous Place} (Jan, 2009), op. cit. p.18.
\textsuperscript{392} \textit{Asian Tribune} August 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2011.
vague.\textsuperscript{393} Too much reliance on military force is sometimes costly and cannot bring the desired results as it alienates the population because of its heavy handed nature, generates ill will against the government and help terrorists in finding recruits. Till 2008 United States and Pakistan were relying on military force.

Pakistan believed that United States strategy towards Afghanistan lacked clarity and consistency which was not only threatening Pakistan’s interests in Afghanistan but also deteriorated peace in Afghanistan. Pakistan policy makers saw absence of coordination between United States civilian and military authority on Afghanistan. Civilian authority was in favor of reconciliation with different stake holders in Afghanistan while Pentagon was in support of military solution. There was a belief that too much emphasis on military component deteriorated security situation in Afghanistan as well as in Pakistan by unifying extremists.\textsuperscript{394}

United States several times admitted Pakistan sacrifices in the War on Terror but it repeated “do more” rhetoric thus wanted Pakistan to dismantle safe havens in tribal areas on one hand, and on another hand it several times tried to open direct talks with stake holders in Afghanistan so as to reduce its reliance on Pakistan.\textsuperscript{395} While Pakistan believed that without involving it, no peace talks could be successful. Although Pakistan aligned itself with United States in the war on terrorism but there was a deep mistrust visible in their relations and many


\textsuperscript{395} Ibid. p. 3.
considered United States a fair weather friend. There is a widespread believe in Pakistan that America is a friend as long as interests are served and it’s not genuinely interested in partnership with Pakistan and defeating Taliban; rather interested in prolonging conflict for reasons ranging from dominating Central Asia to controlling Balochistan so as to counter Iran and China from there.

Retd Major Dr. Khalil-ur-Rehman in his article *Balochistan: The Strategic Pearl* highlighted that attraction for Balochistan in United States calculus is its virgin coast line, vast hinterland with small population, secular culture, mineral resources, Iran-Pakistan gas pipeline, rising China and revanchist Russia. 396

Former United States ambassador to Pakistan Robert Oklay expressed his views by saying that due to the past United States abandonment of Pakistan, the history of relations between Pakistan and United States is complicated. He highlighted that if any new United States policy towards Pakistan has to be formulated, it must be against realistic outlook, where basic nature of the factors that determine Pakistani strategic priorities and culture have to be taken in due account.397 Despite mistrust, Pakistan leadership supported the American efforts to restore unity and stability in Afghanistan, it feared that if that country again disintegrated, it will have to deal with not only renewed Pushtun nationalism but also with the renewed Iranian and Indian intervention to bring their favorite elements to power in Afghanistan which may pose serious problems for

Islamabad. But at the same time Pakistan also feared that long term United States presence in Afghanistan would create unease among regional actors and Taliban and will lead to prolonging insurgency. Many in Afghanistan believed that if United States stays for long the former will enjoy long term economic, military and civilian aid. United States will prevent regional countries from interfering in Afghanistan. But United States counter terrorism strategies showed some deficiencies which resulted in resurgence and unifying extremist forces against it. As a result it failed in achieving its objectives of eradicating Al-qaida and Taliban. It did weaken Al-qaida in Tribal areas but their Ideology survived and it emerged in North Africa countries, Yemen and Iraq while Taliban appeared as a reality and strong force against them.

5.2: Iran Factor in Pak-Afghan Relations

Iran interest in Afghanistan is embedded in history. Dusht-e-lut (Khurasan) which is a part of Iran comprised of Meshed, Herat, Balkh, and Merve (Turkmenistan) remained a part of Iran until it was conquered by Gilzai Pushtuns in 17th century. In 1737, Nadir Shah Army marched and captured Afghanistan. After his death Ahmed Shah Abdali rose to power and controlled area around Kandahar and started moving towards Kabul. At that time the dividing line between Afghanistan and Persia was the Hindu Kush. In 19th century British and Russia agreed upon Oxus River to be the boundary line between Persia and Afghanistan. The present day boundary was marked by Britishers in 18th century which divided the territory

---

inhibited by Persian into two. Therefore, the Persian influence can be seen in Herat.\textsuperscript{399}

Iran got actively involved in Afghanistan politics after the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. It condemned Soviet occupation and called it violation of principle of non interference. To counter Soviet influence, it worked with various Mujahidin groups, including the Northern Alliance of Tajik, Uzbek, and Hazara militias. Until 1993, Pakistan and Iran worked closely to achieve a remedy to Afghanistan quagmire which began with Soviet invasion. After Soviet withdrawal they patronized their favorites on the basis of ethnicity. Pakistan supported \textit{Hezb-e-Islami} of Hekmatyar, (a pushtun sunni group) favorite of ISI and then Taliban. Pakistan believed that Hekmatyar would establish friendly relations with Pakistan and would provide much strategic depth against India. When Hekmatyar failed to maintain peace Pakistan started supporting Taliban. Mean while, Iran supported Shia and Persian speaking groups i.e. \textit{Herkat-i-Islami} and Hazara \textit{Nasr party} (which later on was united into \textit{Hezb-i-Wahdat}) and \textit{Jamat-i-Islami}, so as to achieve greater representation of Shiites in the government. Resultantly, regional powers supporting different factions caused civil war and chaos in Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{400}

After the Taliban took power in 1996, from the Iran’s point of view there were four objectives behind Taliban creation i.e. to counter Iran in the region, to
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facilitate securing trade routes to CARs through them, to promote Wahabism\textsuperscript{401} which is a direct threat to Iran and to promote a surrogate government in Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{402} Taliban, who were Sunni radical Pushtuns, came with the ideology that was anti Iran and anti Shiite. Therefore, when they started dominating Afghanistan Iran felt threatened and considered their government as an economic and ideological threat. Traditionally, Iran long opposed Pushtun fundamentalism because it is Sunni dominated. For this matter of fact, throughout 1980s and after Taliban came to power, Iran supported Shia parties. In 1998, Taliban captured Mazar Sharif, killed hundreds of Hazara Shia community and nine Iranian diplomats. Such treatment of Taliban alarmed Iran and compelled them to mobilize its troops to attack Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{403} In addition, Pakistan support to Taliban government brought India and Iran closer to each other, made them allies and they started supporting anti Taliban alliance i.e. northern alliance because of Taliban’s anti Shia and anti Iran posture.

Two neighboring countries supporting two different factions caused mistrust and made it difficult to achieve harmonious relations. Their relations saw gradual improvement after the fall of Taliban when US led coalition forces and northern alliance toppled their regime. Both countries supported the US-led

\textsuperscript{401}Wahabism is a strict Islamic interpretation of Islam as advocated by Mohammad ibn Abdul Wahab, a Hanbali scholar living in Saudi Arabia during the eighteen century. He emphasized tawheed (oneness) and proposed a return to an idealized Islamic past by reliance on Quran and Hadith, rejected medieval interpretation of Islam and jurisprudence. Note that there is certain interchangeability between the terms Salafi and Wahabi. See Alex Strict Van Linchoten and Felix Kuehn, An Enemy We Created (London: Hurst and Company, 2012), 436.
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War on Terror but soon misgivings in their relations came to the surface about their role in post Taliban Afghanistan. Regardless of the fact, that Iran engage Pakistan for economy and developing its energy sector but Pakistan alleged links with sunni fundamentalists groups having anti Shia outlook such as Jundallah and Sipah Sahaba lay negative effect on their ties.

President Pervez Musharraf U-turn policy towards Taliban was welcomed by Iranian officials. They fully backed the Bonn agreement under UN patronage which brought forth well-known Afghans to prepare a roadmap for the governance of war devastated country as well as signed the 'Kabul Declaration on Good Neighborly Relations' along with Pakistan and other regional countries in 2002, which showed Iran willingness to support regional back solution to Afghanistan quagmire. But Iran shortly felt itself surrounded by US forces in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Central Asia and the Persian Gulf.

In post 9/11 Afghanistan, Iran is investing and taking active part in constructing Afghanistan transport infrastructure, opening up trade corridors and border posts. Afghanistan is an ideal export market for Iran. In 2006, four percent of Iran’s total exports went to Afghanistan, which generated more than $503 million in revenue. Iran reconstruction is more visible in eastern Afghanistan Herat province and it is trying to expand it to the rest of Afghanistan.
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Iran’s commitment to develop Afghanistan’s infrastructure i.e. developing its road rail links between Iran and Central Asia, showed Iran’s willingness of long term presence and broadening its economic, political cultural and religious ties with Afghanistan. For this purpose, it is cooperating with India to develop alternate trade and transit routes that do not pass through Pakistan because of their rivalry to limit Afghanistan dependence on Pakistan and enhance its dependence on Iran. In the post Taliban Afghanistan, India and Iran cooperation in economic and military fields grew many folds which Pakistan considered detrimental to their bilateral relations.\(^{407}\) Afghanistan is a gateway to Central Asia, both Iran and India are striving to gain preponderance of influence in the Afghanistan as well as in Central Asia. In this regard both are facilitating Afghanistan to use Chahbahar port for exports and imports instead of Pakistani port of Karachi.

There is no denying fact that both Iran and Pakistan pledged to support Karzai government. But the conflicting interests over Afghanistan due to Iran and Pakistan strategic imperatives led the country to formulate their foreign policy vis-a-vis each other which highlighted fault lines in their bilateral relations.

Iran policy in Afghanistan is driven by its desire to gain foot hold in the CARs which is possible only if there is a friendly government in Afghanistan (preferably non Pushtun), peaceful borders with Afghanistan and minimum influence in Afghanistan of any outsider power which is a threat to its foreign policy objectives. Moreover, protection of Shia and Persian speaking population

in Afghanistan is another important factor in Iran foreign policy. Iran considers itself, historically bound to protect the rights and security of Shia minority, to create a Tajik belt across north western Afghanistan as a link to Persian speaking Tajikistan and assure the world that for access to Central Asia via Afghanistan, Iran is a better option than Pakistan which would otherwise gain a monopoly of oil from Central Asia.\footnote{\textit{Daily Dawn}, Dec 3, 1998.}

Iran and Pakistan are struggling to achieve their foreign policy objectives which have made Kabul a battle ground. Iran has reservations over US and NATO troop’s presence in Afghanistan and blames it for continued instability in the region which may end if the latter withdraws from Afghanistan. Iran believes that United States is using Pakistan and Afghanistan as a launching pad for clandestine activities to support Baloch or Sunni Islamist militant group in Iran such as \textit{Jundullah}. While Pakistan has concern over growing India-Iran relations in Afghanistan in different fields which is a direct threat to Pakistan’s objectives in Afghanistan as well as to its Kashmir policy.

Iran pursued a multi pronged strategy in post Taliban Afghanistan. On one hand, it focused on reconstruction and rehabilitation of Afghanistan to achieve stability so as to gain foot hold in Afghanistan’s western provinces i.e. (Herat, Nimroz and Farah) for commercial and trade purposes. On the other hand, it started struggling to support any party no matter which sect it belongs to
pressurize Afghan government to distance itself from Washington. Some analyst believes that Iran maintains some links with Taliban to gain leverage over United States and Afghanistan central government.

In 2007, Washington Post reported that Iran was supplying sophisticated arms to the Taliban in western Afghanistan. Iran denied such backing for the militants, but Afghan government officials with no authentic data asserted that intelligence reports hold up the debate that the Al-Quds force of the Islamic revolutionary guards’ corps (IRGC) was providing some improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other supplies to insurgents combating in Western Afghanistan. In addition, in Afghanistan UK military seized two arms consignments from Iran to Afghanistan's Helmand province. The intercepted deliveries to Afghanistan included rocket-propelled grenades, 107mm mortars, explosives and small arms which prove that it keeps some links with militants to sabotage US efforts to achieve stability and foothold in Afghanistan.

Iran, does not want Taliban to gain power in Afghanistan and become strong because of its bad relation with Taliban in the past and their anti Shiia outlook, but it does not want the United States to feel secure and gain upper hand in Afghanistan either. It is also working to counter United States efforts of achieving its foreign policy goals so as to ensure withdrawal of United States
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troops which will help it in making Afghanistan its area of influence as far as possible and will bring Afghanistan closer to Tehran for its transit trade routes.

5.3: India Factor in Pak-Afghan Relations

Since independence Pakistan-Afghanistan relations has been impacted by Indian threat perception, which made security an important determinant of Pakistan’s foreign policy. Security dilemma created mistrust between Pakistan and India. The security perception of Pakistan evolved by the experiences of freedom movement during which much of the blood was shed; strengthened the belief that India had not acknowledged the formation of Pakistan and will never leave an opportunity to undo it. This psyche further reinforced when India captured Hyderabad, Junagarh and Kashmir. Muslim League played an important role in the partition of subcontinent. Its leadership, who became refugees after partition, came from the areas which did not become part of Pakistan. They played an important role in creating India’s threat perception which impacted Pakistan-Afghanistan relations by making it a ground of India-Pakistan rivalry.

India-Pakistan rivalry in Afghanistan is not new and has its origin in history. After the partition of subcontinent, India had good relations with Afghanistan’s Zahir Shah’s reign than Pakistan except for a short rupture during 1965 Pakistan-India conflict. In addition, India maintained good relations with successive Afghan communist puppet governments because they did not share
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Islamist ideology shared by majority of Afghan Jihadi groups backed by Pakistan and United States. Moreover, India disliked Pakistan’s military superiority and was more tilted towards Soviet Union to provide military equipment.\textsuperscript{415} Jawaharlal Nehru on one occasion commented on India-Afghan relations said that “Since India’s inception, we are getting closer for multiple reasons. We share common memory and whenever it was possible to renew them, we have renewed them and then there is our mutual interest which is our rivalry towards Pakistan which is a prominent actor.”\textsuperscript{416}

During Soviet Afghan war (1979-1988) India cooperated and supported Soviet Russia. After their withdrawal Dr. Najibullah (whose family was living in India during and after Afghan war) became head of state received Indian support. In 1992, Mujahidin took power in Afghanistan which forced Najibullah to take refuge in UN complex. He remained confined there for four years until Taliban captured power and hanged him to death.\textsuperscript{417}

India’s influence and diplomatic presence during Taliban era was marginalized because of Taliban’s anti India outlook and their support for Kashmiri Jihad by allowing jihadi camps in the areas controlled by them. About 80,000 to 10,000 Pakistanis were recruited in camps in Afghanistan for Jihad in

\textsuperscript{415} Nicholas Howenstein, Sumit Ganguly, “Pakistan & Afghanistan: Domestic Pressures and Regional Threats: India-Pakistan Rivalry in Afghanistan”, Journal of International Affairs, 127-140.
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Kashmir between 1994-1999.\textsuperscript{418} In 1997 Indian ministry of home affairs in a report declared \textit{Harkat-ul-Ansar} which was one of the fundamental organizations, supported by Pakistan was operating in Taliban controlled area. Moreover, India was threatened by the spillover effect of the Taliban rule and felt that if Taliban style government proved successful in Afghanistan, they may turn to India to sabotage the secular and democratic nature of their society.\textsuperscript{419} As a result, India started supporting Northern alliance. The 9/11 Al-qaida terrorists attacks on US came as a blessing for India in terms of its bilateral ties with Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{420} The fall of Taliban in 2001 was seen by India as a golden opportunity to enhance the operations in Afghanistan many fold which was not liked by Pakistan because of the trust deficit between Pakistan and India. Pakistan believes that India has been struggling since the birth of Pakistan to stop Pakistan and Afghanistan from keeping stable relations with each other. It was because of India propaganda that Pakistan would no longer exist as a country, Kabul polled negative vote at the United Nations on membership question of the latter. Afterwards together with Soviet Union, it supported King Zahir Shah to support the Pushtunistan issue.\textsuperscript{421}

The Indian government played host to the families of important Northern Alliance leaders when they were on the run due to Taliban onslaught on their strong hold in northern Afghanistan. Those leaders came back in power after the
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collapse of the Taliban regime returned the favor by helping India to establish its foothold in their country.\textsuperscript{422}

Daud Mauridon who is the senior advisor to Afghan Foreign ministry expressed his views on India-Pakistan competition that a very sensitive game is being played between them. He believes that Afghanistan is at cross roads between Central, South and Middle East and since centuries it has been a stage for regional countries power play. He further elaborated that Afghanistan does not want to be forced to choose between Pakistan and India.\textsuperscript{423} Afghanistan is equally important for both the countries. Pakistan considers Afghanistan a natural ally with whom it shares longest border while India considers Afghanistan a source for expanding its regional influence and its security. “We want the stabilization of Afghanistan because it is directly related to our security. Plain and simple”, expressed by Jayant Prasad, Indian ambassador to Afghanistan. Alexander Thier of United States Institute for Peace (USIP), stressing on India-Afghanistan relations says “India is looking to ensure that other countries in the region favor or at least are neutral in its conflict with Pakistan.”\textsuperscript{424}

After Hamid Karzai government took charge of Afghanistan, India was the first country to send a diplomatic mission to Kabul, Ministry of external affairs and a medical team drawn from the armed forces landed at Bagram airfield in Parvan province of Afghanistan near Kabul in expression of India’s solidarity.

\textsuperscript{422}Ijaz Khan.\textit{Pakistan’s Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy Making} (2007), Op. cit. p. 69.
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with the people of Afghanistan. S.M. Lamba special envoy to Afghanistan led the team. He explored the possibility of reopening the Indian embassy which was abandoned in Sept 1996 when Kabul fell to the Taliban.\footnote{L. R Reddy, \textit{Inside Afghanistan-End of Taliban Era} (New Delhi: APH Publishing, Cooperation 2002), 284.} The embassy formal opening took place in Dec 2001 with Jaswant Singh, then India’s Minister for External Affairs, performing the honor, and terming the period of its closure “A painful gap of more than five years.” The pain he referred to had been inflicted by Pakistan. In India's point of view the speedy reopening of its embassy in Kabul represent the start of a new era in its relations with Afghanistan.\footnote{Aly Zaman, “India’s Increased Involvement in Afghanistan & Central Asia: Implications for Pakistan” [Online Edition], \textit{IPRI Journal}, 3:2, (2002), Retrieved on July 4\textsuperscript{th}, 2009 from Islamabad Policy Research Institute, website: \url{http://www.ipripak.org/journal}.}

5.3.1: India’s Objectives in Afghanistan

Afghanistan has always been focus of India’s regional policy because of its geo strategic location, its latent hostility towards Pakistan and for economic reasons. India has several aims in Afghanistan; some of the Indian objectives in Afghanistan are; to support Pakistan’s Afghan adversaries and contain Taliban with the view to counter balancing Pakistan’s help to Kashmiries and other insurgencies in India.\footnote{Qadir Bakhsh Balouch. & Abdul Hafeez Khan Niazi, “Indian Encroachment in Afghanistan: A New Imperialism in the Making”, \textit{The Dialogue}, 3:1 18, (Jan-March, 2008).} Secondly, to support democratization and pro-India government in Afghanistan. This will suppress resurgence of Taliban and other religious and extremist movements. Resurgence of Islamic independent movement and their success have the potential to undermine the social fabric of India by providing a vent to oppressed minorities particularly the Sikhs and
Kashmiri Muslims.\textsuperscript{428} Thirdly, to gain dominant position in Afghanistan and Central Asian republics and to counter Pakistan’s sway in the region, by promoting its own interests inside and outside Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{429}

For this purpose India opened consulates near Pak-Afghan border i.e. Herat, Kandahar, Jalalabad and Mazar-e-Sharif. Diplomatic presence of India is larger than other countries in Afghanistan. Mostly consulates are opened along FATA and Balochistan border. Pakistan is uneasy over the Indian consulates, in addition to the embassy in Kabul. Moreover, India sent 300 commandos to Kandahar to protect their citizens in post Taliban set up which was viewed by Pakistan with doubt. Pakistan’s concern is that, reconstruction workers from other countries are also present in Afghanistan but it has not allowed commandos from other countries to protect them.\textsuperscript{430}

Pakistan believe that India through these consulates is involved in covert activities such as terrorism in FATA, NWFP and in Balochistan aiming at destabilizing Pakistan and it is building anti Pakistan scenario on Afghanistan’s soil, which is aggravating bilateral relations and spoiling the environment of trust.\textsuperscript{431}

\textsuperscript{428} Ibid. p.18.  
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Consulates protect the commercial interests as well as protect and promote the interests of its citizens who are residing in that area. Indubitably, India is involved in the reconstruction of Afghanistan, but its trading activities as well as the presence of its citizens in the areas where the consulates are opened are minimum. In addition, some Pakistani circle highlights that under US patronage these consulates are suppressing Pushtuns by depriving them of their share of authority and are promoting the stakes of other minority groups such as Hazaras, Panjshiri, Tajiks and Uzbeks. This particular behavior could be gauged by officers’ posts in all the security services, particularly army and training for governmental posts. Minority groups especially Panjshiri Tajiks were preferred over Pushtuns and were given economic opportunities.

A serving army officer on condition of secrecy verified that Indian Research and Analysis Wing (RAW) agents were backing and providing weaponry to Swat and Waziristan’s Taliban in Pakistan. In order to contain Taliban and Pakistan’s sway in Afghanistan, India built up the defense mechanism of the Northern Alliance by giving them high-altitude combatant equipment worth of $10 million via its Research and Analysis Wing (RAW) as well as provided technical guidance to the Northern Alliance.
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Pakistan believes that some local and foreign elements inside Afghanistan are vigorously involved in backing the miscreants in Balochistan and NWFP province.\textsuperscript{436} In this regard, Pakistan provided evidence of Brahimdagh Bugti (son of Akbar Bugti) staying in Afghan intelligence house in Kabul, Photographs of his visit to Delhi and some instructions which showed his links with insurgency in Balochistan.\textsuperscript{437} Most of the people in Balochistan are distressed over the induction of non-Balochis in the developmental projects. They are also aggrieved over the unjust division of royalties produced from the natural resources in their province. India is exploiting the already fragile situation as it has interest in Balochistan which is important future gas pipeline route, full of natural resources. A leading journalist and expert on terrorism, Hamid Mir is of the view that India should talk about Balochistan situation with Pakistan because peace in Balochistan will eventually advantage India.\textsuperscript{438}

Balochistan is Pakistan’s strategic heartland making Pakistan one of the most strategically important and sensitive places in the world. Balochistan is Pakistan solitaire diamond making it central to the heartland i.e. Central Asia and is part of Rimland i.e. Arabian Sea coastline. With Gwadar and other ports of Balochistan as part of Rimland, the southern strategic route to Central Asia originates from Balochistan making it critical for India. By fomenting trouble and
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unrest in Balochistan, the Indians are attempting to delink Pakistan, China and Gwadar from Central Asia containing Pakistan’s strategic and economic potential because the future of Pakistan upcoming generations is in Balochistan.439

Rehman Malik, Pakistan’s then interior minister directly charged India and Afghanistan for backing the Baloch National Army. He also charged the Baloch Liberation Army (BLA) for the abduction of UNHCR official John Solecki. He went to the extent that BLA aims to attract world attention for their separation’s movement. Malik was bent upon, that Brahmandagh Bugti, the son of former BLA leader Nawab Akbar Bugti, was recruiting militants in training camps in Afghanistan.440 In the situation of large public suicide bombings in Balochistan, NWFPK and other parts of the country, that cause large number of civilian casualties, one section of Pakistani population believes Indo-US-Israeli hand in sponsoring terrorism in Pakistan. They hold that the launching pad for carrying out such activities is Afghanistan and the aim is to weaken Pakistani compliance to exploit the minerals, metals gas and strategic wealth of Balochistan thus to undermine it economically and politically; roll back its nuclear program and to deprive it from its nuclear asset.

Moreover, another important objective of India in Afghanistan is to tap Central Asian energy resources and to develop Afghanistan as a land bridge between Central Asia and India. Indian economy is growing by leaps and bounds with which comes growing energy demands. CARs oil and gas resources make it

439 Major Dr. Khalil-ur-Rehman, (Retd Army Official), Interview by the researcher, Jan 12th, 2013.
440 Ibid.
extremely important for India to forge a relationship with Afghanistan based on cooperation. The Afghan president, Hamid Karzai, on his official visit to India in April 2006, invited Indian companies to invest in Afghanistan. He said that people of Afghanistan will be highly pleased for Indian companies in Afghanistan to manufacture their commodities and to have Afghanistan as a center for those goods in Central Asia.\(^{441}\) In this regard, India is investing in constructing roads and infrastructure linking Afghanistan with Central Asian States. India proposed Salma Dam project in Herat province on river Hirakud along with constructing Dams on Kabul and Kunar River in Afghanistan (explained in chap 4) which Pakistan believe to deprive it of water resources. Pakistan believes that proposed dam will have serious implications for its water supply as it flows through Kabul River into the Indus at Attock.\(^{442}\)

In addition, Indian oil companies are active in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. In March 2007, India completed the renovation of a military base at Ayani in Tajikistan: the renewal commenced in 2002 and completed at a cost of US$10 million.\(^{443}\) India is the fourth country after US, Germany, Russia to have a base at Central Asia, According to Indian journalist Suda Ramachandaran, maintaining a base at Ayani will let India respond quickly to any danger arising from unstable Afghanistan. It gives India important facility to insert Special Forces when situation demand on the occasion of military conflict with Pakistan. It will
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increase India’s ability to hit Pakistan from Tajikistan and will help India’s mounting interests in Central Asia. According to Indian intelligence sources, India after the fall of Taliban decided to maintain influence in Afghanistan and to counter Pakistan’s interference in Afghanistan. For this reason it renovated a base at Ayani/Farkhor, Tajikistan.

Pakistan doesn’t allow its soil to be used by India for transportation of goods to Afghanistan. Therefore, maintaining a base at Ayani will help India to air lift necessary relief items from Ayani to Farkhor and then to Afghanistan. Apart from Pakistan’s dimension attached to Ayani bases it will also help India to increase its influence in Central Asia. According to western analyst Frank Cook that “Increasing India’s role in Afghanistan through diplomatic efforts and reconstruction projects is a source of worry for Pakistan. India’s presence could lead to a strategic encirclement of Pakistan.” Therefore, Indian presence is a source of concern for Pakistan geo-strategic and geo political reasons and can hamper Pakistan’s effort against terrorism. There are chances that India presence deteriorates regional tensions as Pakistan will not allow Indian strategic encirclement and can resort to counter measures.
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5.3.2: India Role in Afghanistan Reconstruction: Indo- Pak Competition in Afghanistan

Pakistan altered its Afghan policy under pressure rather than its will. Apart from US pressure, Indian factor which is very important in Pakistan security calculus played a role in shaping Pak-Afghan policy. India, immediately after 9/11 offered to provide unconditional support to US in a global war against terrorism. Indian then prime minister Atal Behari Vajpayee in a letter to US president expressed that India would provide whatever support the US wanted, including military bases in its global war against terrorism. Soon India declared its offer of providing support in war against terrorism which alarmed Pakistan.

Moreover, after 9/11 India was pressurizing US to declare Pakistan a rouge state and to take action against freedom fighters in Kashmir which India considers terrorists. To discourage Indian efforts, Pakistan changed its Afghan policy and aligned itself with US. Pakistan still wants to have pliant regime in Afghanistan but it is apprehensive of growing Indo-Afghan friendship. As growing Indian influence in Afghanistan will limit Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan. Although, Afghanistan and India established trading relations and Pakistan has allowed both countries to trade but has refused to allow transit route to India because of mistrust between them for transportation of its goods to Afghanistan. Pakistan asserts that Indian commodities to Afghanistan via its territory will have serious security implications and would lay negative impact on
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the Kashmir policy of Pakistan. In addition, to prevent smuggling it cannot allow goods to be routed through Pakistani territory that have lower import duties than Pakistan in Afghanistan.

India is playing a major role in Afghanistan’s reconstruction and is the sixth major donor to Afghanistan. It presented buses and airplanes to Afghanistan, sponsoring lunch programs in schools, undertook the construction of the parliament building in Kabul as well as strategically important new roads. The Afghan government enjoys outstanding ties with New Delhi which has added to Pakistan’s paranoia. After the fall of the Taliban government India entered Afghanistan to get back its influence in Afghanistan which it lost during Taliban rule. For this purpose it adopted policy of soft power. According to Joseph Nye soft power is the capability to obtain what one desire through attraction rather than intimidation or money. It crops up from the charm of a country’s political ideas, policies and culture. When ones policies are considered as justifiable in the opinion of others, soft power is increased. Applying this definition on India’s role in Afghanistan one can gauge that India is struggling to increase her influence in Central and South Asia. The demonstration of India pursuing soft power can be seen on several fronts which is viewed by Pakistan with suspicion.

India pledged 100 million dollars in aid at Tokyo conference on reconstruction of Afghanistan held in Jan 2002, at the same time it also offered
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help in the improvement of rail-road links, hospitals, schools and information technology. On Dec 2001, before the interim government officially took power, plane loads of aid from New Delhi were sent to Kabul. Besides medicines, grains and other commodities the cargo carrying relief goods also contained Hindi films and music cassettes, signifying India’s longing to use its culture weapons in the fight for authority in Afghanistan. India also pledged to export million tons of wheat by the end of 2001 and its airlines recommenced flights to Kabul and Mazar Sharif. Several Indian training programs were initiated for the Afghans in journalism, accounting, and policing.\textsuperscript{453} India moved in Afghanistan, without any delay with humanitarian assistance after the departure of the Taliban from Kabul. It made the Indira Gandhi Children's Hospital in Kabul operational again by sending medicines and doctors to run it. An artificial limb (the Jaipur Foot) center was established to help out those Afghans who lost their limbs to landmines.\textsuperscript{454}

Things started moving fast on political front too. A number of senior members of the Afghan interim arrangement, such as Interior Minister Younis Qanooni and Foreign Minister Abdullah Abdullah, paid a visit to India before the interim administration started functioning. Mr. Qanooni is said to have demanded India's help in setting up a national security force in Afghanistan even. Later on December 12, Indian then Home Minister L K Advani declared that India would

\textsuperscript{454} Suda Ramachandaran, “Afghanistan, Pakistan loss is India’s Gain”, Retrieved on July 7\textsuperscript{th}, 2009 from Asia times on line, website: http://www.atimes.com/atimes/archives/2_1_2002.html.
send off senior police officials to Afghanistan to act as advisors on organizing law-enforcement institutions.\textsuperscript{455}

On economic front, India designed a preferential trade agreement with Afghanistan to encourage the supply of Afghan products to India, as well as to assist Indian private companies to take part in the reconstruction of Afghanistan. According to the terms of agreement India planned to build a 130-200 km road from Chahbahar port\textsuperscript{456} in Iran to Kabul to speed up the transport of Indian commodities to Afghanistan and to export three items from Afghanistan: i.e. fresh fruits, dry fruits, medicine and herbs.\textsuperscript{457}

The road was to connect Dilaram in South-western Afghanistan to Zahidan and Chahbahar on the Arabian Sea to give the landlocked nation access to maritime trade through Iran thereby reducing Afghanistan’s dependence on Gwader port in Pakistan, which includes strategic and commercial variables of the New Great Game. Pakistan felt threatened by the construction of strategic routes by India which undermines Pakistan struggle for Central Asian prospects. Therefore, made several rockets attacks to halt development on the project which eventually was completed by Jan, 2009 inaugurated by Hamid Karzai and FM

\textsuperscript{455} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{456} Chahbahar Port is situated on the Makran Coast of the Sistan and Baluchistan of Iran and is officially declared as a free trade and industrial zone by the Iranian government. The port has been developed by India. It is the closest and best access point to the Indian Ocean. Its location is at the most secure and closet route to Central Asia and Afghanistan market. See E-paper The Financial Daily International \url{http://www.thefinancialdailyinternational.com}, Retrieved on June 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2010.
Pranab Mukarjee. Political analyst Ahmed Rashid notes that India reconstruction policy for Afghanistan was planned in such a way to gain influence over every sector of Afghan society, to win heart and minds of Afghans, gain the highest political benefit and weaken Pakistani authority.

Afghanistan is important for both India and Pakistan for economic, security and strategic reasons. India considers Afghanistan its strategic ally and considers it cheaper to engage Pakistan in Afghanistan rather than in Kashmir. As Indian influence grows in Afghanistan Pakistan will look for alternatives to counter balance India. The former believes that in the name of reconstruction India wants to capture its markets, resources and encircle Pakistan by establishing civil and military relations with Afghanistan.

Pakistan reconstruction in Afghanistan in comparison to India (which is explained in next chap) is less. Indian enormous humanitarian aid its reconstruction and capacity building efforts aim at enhancing economic, military and political cooperation can marginalize Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan and can have serious economic and security implications. Pakistan believes that by linking Afghanistan with Iranian port Chahbahar, India is limiting importance of Gwadar port for Afghanistan and Central Asian Republics. Pakistan believes that India fears that Gwadar port in Balochistan is not only important from commercial and

---

trade point of view but its significance is several fold from military point of view which makes Balochistan geo strategically and geo politically important and threatens India.

Mujeeb Angar who is an Afghan correspondent at Radio liberty highlights that “like any other country, India has the right to have diplomatic relations and presence in Afghanistan. Traditionally, India has always had sizable diplomatic and commercial presence in Afghanistan. The Afghans have valued their ties to India as a necessary counterweight to what is perceived to be an overbearing Pakistani neighbor.” 461

India and Pakistan both are struggling in post Taliban Afghanistan for gaining greater say and influence in Afghanistan. India is enhancing its influence in Afghanistan through its development investment and has undertaken capital intensive projects. It pledged for constructing Dams, developing Afghanistan communication infrastructure and linking Afghanistan trade corridor with Iran. 462

Therefore, India in lieu of these financial investments and capital intensive projects has gained political influence, came closer to Afghanistan government and may be getting greater support for its permanent seat in UN Security Council from the latter in the future. Alternatively, Pakistan is using its geographical contiguity, transit trade, financial aid to enhance its influence in Afghanistan. In this regard, it is preventing India to gain similar kind of advantage by denying it

461 Mujeeburehman Angar, (Correspondent at Radio free Europe/Radio Liberty), Interview by the researcher, Jan 22nd, 2013.
the right to use Pakistani territory for exporting its goods to Afghanistan. Ganguly and Howenstein in their work on Indo-Pak competition deciphered that Afghanistan look at Pakistan’s investment and aid with suspicions because of the latter support for Taliban. India has actively embarked upon the policy of gaining greater influence which is interpreted by Pakistan as a strategic encirclement. Here Kabul government is attentive of their rivalry but it is keeping relations with both actors to garner much benefit as possible.463

Both India and Pakistan are using Afghanistan as a proxy battle field. Pakistan considers Afghanistan its immediate neighbor which gives it a natural right to have more say in its politics and considers India its arch rival in Afghanistan. Pakistani military president, General Zia in 1988 said,

“We have earned the right to have [in Kabul] a power which is very friendly to us. We have taken risks as a frontline state, and we will not permit a return to the prewar situation, marked by large Indian and Soviet influence in Afghan claims on our own territory.” After the laps of twenty years, this quote still identifies how Pakistan analyzes its link with Afghanistan.464

In addition, there is reluctance on the part of Afghanistan and United States to curtail Indian growing influence in Afghanistan which is going beyond reconstruction in Afghanistan which has created mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan as well as between United States and Pakistan. India believes that it can reach Central Asia through Afghanistan since air route is not viable. To
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achieve this goal its working since Taliban ouster to gain influence in Afghanistan, by strengthening ties with Afghanistan war lords and will go to any extent to prevent Islamic militancy, Taliban governments which is threatening its regional ambitions and security, protect its interests and contain anti-India block emerging from Pakistan. While Pakistan believes that supporting Pushtun is the one of the few options available to gain influence in the Afghanistan.

5.4: Conclusion

Afghanistan has been a victim of regional and extra regional interference since centuries. Regardless the existence of international coalition forces in Afghanistan and the pledges of the United States, United Kingdom, and NATO to support the autonomy, territorial integrity, and sovereignty of Afghanistan, the country is still prone to the intervention by neighboring countries, which has the possibility to either ruin or promote Afghanistan’s stability.

War in Afghanistan brought foreign forces in the region which has exacerbated the ethnic divide and has added to political fragility in the country. It is believed that Musharraf government after calculating international community response to terrorism changed its policy towards Taliban but some section of ISI kept supporting Afghan Taliban. They believed that United States will leave the region and Pakistan will have to face the brunt of Indian activities. Afghanistan holds Pakistan responsible for every atrocity in Afghanistan, though the stakes of different countries are involved in the country and all are struggling to achieve
their foreign policy objectives. It is not only Pakistan and Taliban who are endeavoring to establish pliable regime or to establish Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, but there are also those who under the name of Taliban are struggling to achieve their own agenda i.e. dissident political figures, tribal rivals, foreign actors not limited to Pakistan, their financial network, war lords and drug lords. These insurgents caused violence and instability in the country and challenged the writ of the government which gave opportunity to the external powers to exploit the situation to their own advantage.

Iran’s policy towards Afghanistan is determined by the quest to acquire influence in Afghanistan by reaching Central Asia. For this reason it has left no opportunity to participate in Afghanistan’s reconstruction and developing its economy. In terms of security Iran is skeptical about United States gaining influence in Afghanistan. While US think Iran is threatening regional peace because of Iran’s quest to acquire nuclear weapons. As far as India factor is concerned, action taken by India to enhance its security or to gain preponderance, causes reaction by Pakistan which destabilizes the regional balance.

In addition, Afghanistan is an occupied country with the military, intelligence and economic presence of more than forty countries. The same is true in case of Indian financial and intelligence manifestations in Afghanistan. Regardless of the Indo-Pakistan posturing in the form of confidence building measures including social and culture exchanges and limited trade---the Kashmir dispute, the arm race, the Indian interference in Balochistan and rivalry over Afghanistan reflects
on the operational foreign policies of both countries which has made harmonious Pak-Afghan relations difficult.

United States have a long term agenda in Afghanistan. United States did bring some stability to Afghanistan but this may not last in the long run. It will not exit from Afghanistan in haste in the near future, as it did in the past after Soviet withdrawal in 1989. It may withdraw physically but it will maintain some bases and show its presence limited to advisory role in Afghanistan to oversee operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It will not consider Afghanistan as an area of least importance and will bring this strategically vital region under its control by dismantling Al-qaida and terrorist networks primarily reconciling with some section of Taliban and making Central Asia, South Asia and Persian Gulf its area of influence. From the American point of view active engagement is better to build a secure future.

Indubitably, all the neighboring countries of the region have interests in Afghanistan’s stability. Lasting peace and prosperity probably has deep implications on the region at large. The Kabul Declaration was inked by the regional countries including Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, China, Iran and Pakistan in 2002, reiterating their loyalty to productive and accommodating mutual relationships founded on the principle of territorial integrity, mutual respect, friendly relations, co-operation and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The significance of regional backed solutions is being wildly recognized by the neighboring countries. But the state of affairs in the region
continues to be challenging and daunting. Stable Afghanistan is in the interests of all regional and international powers as well as guarantor of peace in Pakistan as both countries are inextricably linked. Disintegrated and chaotic developments will have domino effects on its neighbors and no country far and near will escape from the spillover of any chaotic development. Keeping in view the multiethnic society and multiple interests of regional and international actors, Afghanistan foreign policy makers have to learn the balancing act.

Pakistan along the political stakes also has economic stakes. For this reason it is playing a role in Afghanistan’s reconstruction without trust. This needs to be turned into complete cooperation, trust and understanding. The next chapter will discuss Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan’s reconstruction and the potential areas of cooperation between the two countries which can lead to interdependence and full cooperation in every aspect of life.
Chapter-6

Cooperation without Trust: Pakistan’s Role in Afghanistan’s Reconstruction and Future Prospects

Trust is very important if not necessary element for cooperation. For bilateral cooperation it is must that countries choose mutual cooperation over mutual defection. It is believed that the policy of mutual cooperation brings benefits. However, there are some scholars like Karen Cooke and Russell Hardin Levi who believe that trust is not necessary for cooperation and can be enhanced through institutional arrangements. They are of the view that element of trust is important at interpersonal level but not important to make complex society perform effectively and productively. In such a scenario institutional arrangements play an important role to increase people to people contact, promote trade and initiate several joint efforts and promote interdependence.\textsuperscript{465} Consequently, trust develops over a period of time through mutual interdependence and through reciprocal trust worthiness.\textsuperscript{466} Once trust is developed it can turn limited cooperation into full cooperation binding two adversaries into stable relations.

Trust is indubitably an important element in cooperation and smooth functioning of bilateral relations but mutual cooperation can take place without trust through various strategies i.e. economic integration, institutional and
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monitoring mechanisms, political leadership and through repeated interactions. Rival neighbors can overcome conflicts and reach an understanding in areas of common interests e.g. United States and Soviet Union went from being enemies to limited partners and agreed on arms control.

Studying Pak-Afghan relations and evaluating its different aspects revealed multiple factors responsible for their mistrust i.e. Durand line issue, Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan, FATA factor and Pakistan’s interventionist policies to manipulate Afghan politics to its own advantage. Despite the above factors responsible for mistrust, the bilateral trade between the two and Pakistan’s share in Afghanistan’s reconstruction and rehabilitation shows a certain level of cooperation. Greater interactions between the two countries can lead to economic interdependence leaving a positive impact on their political relationship. Initiation and completion of different economic and developmental projects, keeping in consideration the demand and capacity of both the states will bring them closer. Sharing the costs and benefits of economic projects will help the policy makers of both the countries to work for the maintenance of peaceful borders and seek logical reasons for maintaining cooperation. Convergence of economic interests can drive both the countries towards mutual cooperation and economic interdependence. Once Pakistan and Afghanistan start reliance on one another for economic reasons it will empower their political cooperation.

---

Pakistan is the largest trading partner of Afghanistan, while Afghanistan is the third largest export market for Pakistan. The official and unofficial trade between Pakistan and Afghanistan is $4.0 billion a year. While official exports to Afghanistan is $2.0 billion a year. Pakistan’s goods are popular in Afghanistan and it can be gauged from the fact that many Afghan refugees who have returned home, who have studied and lived in Pakistan, favor Pakistani products, especially medicines which are relatively expensive than Indians medicines. Therefore, Afghan transit trade through Pakistan is considered to be the back bone of the Afghan economy while access to CARs through Afghanistan is the long cherished goal of Pakistan.

Afghanistan is going through reconstruction and there is dire need of funding and exploring new avenues for its economy. The country is full of unexplored natural resources and has world largest reserves of copper and iron ore. It contains untapped deposits of oil, gas, coal and valuable gem stones. Afghanistan contains 1.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, 95 million barrels of oil reserves and 400 MT of coal which can be exported to Pakistan to overcome its energy crises.468 Once the situation in Afghanistan improves it will result in trading activity which will require shortest and cheapest trade routes, which Pakistan can provide and can become a hub of trading activities.

Pakistan current population is 180 million; the working population constitutes 53% which is between the ages of 20 and above, wants access to better

---

job opportunities. Pakistan policy makers cannot stay aloof to the increasing employment demands of the young population. Pakistan in the current scenario has to increase its trade links with the neighboring countries especially Afghanistan, CARs and China which can further be extended to other countries. Pakistan can convert its illicit trade into licit by generating economic opportunity zones in the border land which will increase people to people contact and will create job opportunities. It was in the commercial interest of Pakistan to support Taliban in Afghanistan in 1994. The same commercial interests can suppress insurgency and generate economic interdependence between the two countries which will shape their relationship based on mutual trust and can lead to peace and stability in the region.

Afghanistan is a dry, craggy, land locked country roughly the size of Texas. War has destroyed the country for the last thirty years.\(^\text{469}\) It has destroyed law and order situation, crippled economic infrastructure in rural as well as in urban areas, adversely affected the social norms and values, ravaged the security apparatus and administrative organs. The focus of the government is building reconciliation, building civil society, its capacity building and building state institutions to render services to people. In this regard the role of Pakistan is very important as it can successfully contribute towards speedy recovery work.

The close linkages between the social fabrics of the two will make the recovery work advantageous for both.

The post Taliban era has generated new avenues for economic cooperation and integration between South and Central Asia. Facilitation of Pak-Afghan cooperation requires investment in diverse fields by Pakistan including education, health, energy sector (natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines) and infrastructure development (including road, rail lines, bridges and mountain tunnels). This will ensure greater connectivity of Pakistan with Afghanistan and beyond and significantly contribute towards the long term stability in Afghanistan. In addition, enhanced people to people contact can achieve greater cooperation. Many people interviewed including Afghans and Pakistanis emphasized the need to bridge the trust deficit and highlighted the need that cooperation is necessary at implementation level not only at political level. They believed that increased cooperation in trade and business sector, security, energy and on water issue can put an end to trust deficit.

This current chapter examines the magnitude of Pak-Afghan cooperation in post Taliban era. It also dwells upon the future prospects for political relations, constructive role Pakistan can play to build Afghanistan and enhance cooperation. It seeks to find ways and means for reducing the trust gap. It also explores the prospects of economic, communication, educational and cultural ties. These are important elements in developing trust and confidence. The initial section of the chapter covers how political transition in post Taliban period took place and
funding was raised for the reconstruction of Afghanistan. It then proceeds by evaluating Pak-Afghan economic, security and diplomatic relations. Their cooperation at different levels including Pakistan’s share in Afghanistan’s reconstruction; major projects undertaken and its impacts are discussed. The second section covers potential areas of cooperation between the two countries. Gwadar port and its benefits for Afghanistan; Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan’s entry into SAARC and ECO and finally the importance of land access to CARs via Afghanistan are highlighted.

6.1: Bonn Agreement: A Step towards Political Transition and Afghanistan’s Reconstruction

Pakistan participated in Bonn conference on 5th Dec, 2001 which laid down the framework for political and constitutional transition in Afghanistan. The negotiations concluded with the adoption of an agreement on 5 Dec, 2001, provisional arrangements in Afghanistan pending the “Re-establishment of Permanent Government institutions”, consisting of three principal texts and three annexes, which were endorsed the following day by the UN Security Council in resolution 1383.  

Islamabad welcomed the installation of an Afghan interim administration as part of the Bonn agreement signed between four major Afghan groups, namely, the Northern Alliance, the Rome Group (supporters of Former King Zahir Shah), the Cyprus Group (prominent Afghan émigrés) and the Peshawar Group (moderate Mujahidin factions).  

---

good wishes to the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and his special representative Lakhdar Brahimi by expressing that mutual tolerance is important for tranquility and stability in Afghanistan after decades of turmoil and war. Pakistan narrated the Bonn conference as a "propitious moment for an end to the travails of Afghan people". "Pakistan too has borne heavy economic and social costs as a result of the Afghan conflict," Foreign Ministry spokesman Aziz Ahmed Khan said.⁴⁷¹

When the Loya Jirga was convened in June 2002, Hamid Karzai was selected by a large majority of delegates to lead the two years transitional authority. A thirty five member commission set about drafting a new constitution in consultations with Afghans around the country. The draft was then presented to the second Loya Jirga in Dec, 2003. After prolong and contentious debate, the Loya Jirga approved the new constitution in Jan, 2004 and it was decided that election would be held in June 2004. The elections were postponed until autumn 2004 due to security problems and difficulties in registering Afghan voters.⁴⁷²

In Oct, 2004 elections were held and Hamid Karzai became the first democratically elected president of Afghanistan. The challenges before the Karzai administration were enormous i.e. reconstruction of the entire infrastructure, rehabilitation of internally displaced people and refugees to their places of domicile, territorial integrity, removal of land mines, facilitation of relief work,
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provision of social services, justice, democracy, end of violence and human rights.

The elections were successfully held on time. No major insurgent attacks were noted during this period. To facilitate the participation of Afghans refugees living in Pakistan, in the presidential election of 2005, the government (Pakistan) played a very positive role by signing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in July, 2004 with Afghanistan and UN assistance mission in Afghanistan which enabled Afghans to own the political process.\footnote{Imtiaz Gul, “Pak-Afghan Relationship: From Conflict to Cooperation”, \textit{Journal of Afghan Studies}, volume 1, (June-August, 2004), 105.} In addition, Pakistan fully contributed in the election process by keeping check on important crossing points against any mishap. After the Bonn agreement, Afghanistan got international attention, economic and political support to ensure speedy recovery but certain factors laid negative effect on the efficacy of Bonn agreement.\footnote{Riaz Mohammad Khan, \textit{Afghanistan and Pakistan: Conflict, Extremism and Resistance to Modernity} (2011), Op. cit. p. 102.}

The first and foremost factor was the absence of Taliban and hardliner Mujahidin some of them could have been incorporated to support the central government. Bonn agreement did provide short term stability and initiated political process but Taliban were still there, weakened but not fully eliminated. Abdul Rashid Dostum, Ismail Khan and Abdul Rab Rasool Sayyaf, former war lords who dominated Karzai government were least interested in strengthening Karzai government and its key institutions. Instead they were more concerned
about their positions in their area of influence which weakened Bonn targets.\textsuperscript{475} Secondly, the success of Bonn Conference made USA believe that Afghanistan will soon be a stable democratic country through international community efforts. It started shifting its attention towards Iraq which proved disastrous for Afghanistan’s stability.\textsuperscript{476}

Another important factor which limited post Bonn government success was the United Nations resolution against Taliban which bracketed them with Al-qaida and imposed sanctions against them. Taliban movement was indigenous movement including local Afghans weary of decades of war. Their oppressive government may have angered the educated Afghans and non Pushtuns alike but for the majority of rural populace who faced brutalities of Afghan war lords and instability, the Taliban came as a blessing. By the imposition of sanctions UN actually alienated the Taliban and closed the door of reconciliation with them. This action compelled them to reorganize themselves under the leadership of mullah Omer and Jalaluddin Haqqani in south eastern Afghanistan with the objective to destabilize Karzai government.\textsuperscript{477}

6.2: Pakistan’s Role in Afghanistan’s Reconstruction

The Soviet-Afghan war in 1979, continuous civil war, protracted drought, instability and US-Taliban war destroyed the country’s frail economy, its infrastructure and human resource base. Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan’s
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reconstruction, in its stability, peace and prosperity can be a means for rapprochement and forging closer links between the two countries.

Rebuilding war torn infrastructure, maintaining security for all particularly those involved in the reconstruction and rehabilitation was an enormous task for the Karzai government and essential for attaining development. In this regard, Pakistan’s role as a next door neighbor was very important. Major funding for Afghanistan’s reconstruction was raised through International conference on reconstruction of Afghanistan held in Tokyo in Jan 2002. The primary motive was to do a basic needs-assessment of foreign funding for Afghanistan’s reconstruction. In this regard, UNDP and the World Bank anticipated that the rebuilding would need $1.7 b in the first year, $10 b over five years and $15 b in the next ten years. Some political analysts estimated the total cost of reconstruction close to $30 bn. The conference promised $1.8 b against the assessed need of $1.7 b for 2002, facilitating the UN agencies, relief and rehabilitation organizations and Afghan Interim authority, to begin their work.478

The Tokyo Conference was very significant constituting the biggest ever assembly of donors. It was attended by 62 world governments and 21 donor organizations. Some donors made multi years pledges. While some offered support without specific monitory value. All donors unanimously decided to help and reconstruct the war-torn country. Following the Bonn and Tokyo conferences, expectations were high that the country would soon be back on the track of peace,

reconstruction, democracy and development to eventually end the decades-long miseries of the Afghan nation.\textsuperscript{479} Reconstruction on large scale did start in Afghanistan during the period 2001-2008, but the goal of achieving peace and stability in Afghanistan could not be materialized because of worse security situation.

At Tokyo, Pakistan committed $100 million dollars for Afghanistan reconstruction and rehabilitation which was a positive development in Pak-Afghan relations.\textsuperscript{480} Pakistan doubled the aid it offered in 2002, to $200 million in 2005 and provided extensive assistance in humanitarian sphere. Pakistan calculated that by reconstructing Afghanistan, it can benefit in many key sectors such as agriculture, banking, construction, education, health, industry, trade and transportation etc. Moreover, investing in reconstruction will augment its construction and material manufacturing industry, banking sector, telecommunications, pharmaceutical and surgical industry.

Following are the details of the grants announced by some major participants including Pakistan.\textsuperscript{481}
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Pakistan vowed to play a front line role in the war against terrorism. At the same time it promised to fully support and cooperate in the reconstruction of physical infrastructure i.e. building its communication infrastructure, improving its health, education sector and restoration of peace in Afghanistan which will encourage trade, economic growth and will broaden the horizon for commercial activities.

In order to re-gain its influence, Pakistan decided to use soft power and started building Afghanistan’s health and education sector; investing in capacity building programs and technical trainings. Soft power is the use of peaceful way
of managing conflicts and enhancing economic cooperation. The importance of soft power has increased in today’s century of globalization over military means of promoting interests. Pakistan main aim behind soft power was to shape public opinion, consolidate good will at the level of common people in Afghanistan and lead to the growth of a vibrant civil society which in turn will play a major role in building social and cultural bridges, suppressing militancy and changing the nature of Pak-Afghan relations. While on the other hand, upgradation of Afghanistan’s transport infrastructure has the potential to increase Pak-Afghan trade.

Promotion of Pak-Afghan trade has far reaching benefits for both the countries. It has the potential to increase government revenue, growth rate and create job opportunities for the young Afghan population. But Pak-Afghan trade cannot flourish as long as there are poor communication links. Currently, investment in transportation infrastructure is needed in Afghanistan which will decrease transportation costs and increase Pak-Afghan connectivity in the region. Moreover, it will ultimately lead to development, refugee integration, stability and economic integration. World Bank report on regional trade between Afghanistan and its neighbors’ (2004) clearly pointed out that “developing countries with poor transport networks and poorly developed logistics systems face more logistic costs” which ultimately increase 50% sale price of basic commodities such as grains etc. 

482 Afghanistan current transport infrastructure is worn out and has not
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been rehabilitated over the past twenty years. There is a dire need to develop transport infrastructure which will reduce travel cost between the neighboring countries, enhance trade and generate trade revenues.

Major projects undertaken by Pakistan include capacity building, health, communication and education programs. Details of some of the completed and ongoing programs are as follows:

**6.2.1: Communication**

Pakistan is focusing on developing infrastructure, provision of road links and better communication facilities to enhance trade relations with Afghanistan and Central Asian Republics, thus integrating the whole region. It has initiated a project of connecting the region by rehabilitating key national highways in sub-regional corridor and developing infrastructure in Afghanistan which will cost Rs 27.34 billion. Torkham-Jalalabad road is a key link between the two nations to smooth the progress of Afghan transit trade and a move towards Pakistan road access to Central Asian States. It is a turning point in bilateral relations and an effort to promote mutual trust and harmony. The dual lane road was completed in 2006, by the Frontier Works Organization (FWO) of Pakistan’s army at a cost of $34.42 million a part of a $250 million grant Pakistan pledged to extend to
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Afghanistan over five years.\textsuperscript{484} The completion of this route has revived Torkham Jalalabad bus service which is a positive development.

In 2005, Pakistan started national trade corridor upgrading plan to develop trade links, energy and transport corridors with Afghanistan, China Central Asian Republics and Iran by enhancing regional connectivity.\textsuperscript{485} Chaman-Spin Boldak Rail link costing $12 million has been approved by both the sides. The memorandum of understanding prepared by Pak Ministry of railways was signed with the Afghan team, headed by Deputy Minister on May 23, 2007. Pak Railways has been asked to start the work after fulfilling certain technicalities.\textsuperscript{486} In addition, two roads in Jalalabad, one of 32 Km and the other 25 Km has been completed. The project was worth $4 million.\textsuperscript{487} Developing Afghanistan communication sector will not only connect the cities but will pave the path for stable and peaceful region.

6.2.2: Health

There is dearth of hospitals in Afghanistan. Health sector is in bad shape and needs much investment. Pakistan provides free medical treatment to Afghans in its government’s hospitals. Over 90% Afghans visit Pakistan for medical treatment. 40% patients in Peshawar major hospitals are Afghans while 50%
patients in Quetta hospitals are Afghans.\textsuperscript{488} Pakistan pledged to construct a 150 bed Jinnah Hospital (Kabul) along with Thalaecimia Center at an estimated cost of Rs 1200 million. For this purpose the Afghan government has provided 25 acres of land.\textsuperscript{489} Nishtar Kidney Center (Jalalabad) was completed in summer 2010 with the cost of Rs.395 million. The doctors and paramedics working in the hospital were trained in Pakistan. Zia-ul-Haq Artificial Limb Center (Badakhshah), 50 bed Al-Shifa Eye Hospital (Gardez), 50 bed Al-Shifa eye hospital (Kunduz), Syed Ahmed Shaheed Hospital, 200 bed Naib Amanullah Khan Hospital (Logar) are some major projects under construction. In addition, Pakistan plans to build dispensaries all over Afghanistan for which the government has allocated funds.\textsuperscript{490} By investing in the future of Afghan youth and children in health and education sectors and developing its social security system, Pakistan can reverse Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan, strengthen its economy and civil society.

Social security is the evolving concept in enhancing cooperation between the countries. Pakistan’s main target is to develop a social security system that will enable the deprived population to gain access to basic health and education and to change their perception of Pakistan as a domineering and aggressive country.
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6.2.3: Education

Education is not only vital for promoting progress and development but also a fundamental human right. In addition, education plays a major role in the consolidation of peace process itself.\(^{491}\) Access to basic education and higher education is the main focus of Pakistan’s government. Pakistan has completed Allama Iqbal Faculty of Arts at Kabul with the cost of Rs.411.256m. Liaqat Ali Khan Engineering Faculty Block in Balkh University (Mazar Sharif) is almost complete with the cost of Rs. 6000 million. Rehman Baba School in Kabul has been renovated and completed with the cost of Rs 2 million. In education sector, some other contributions include donation of 300,000 student kits in 2005, provision of 2800 advanced computer systems to various organizations in 2004 and 2,000 scholarships for Afghan students to undertake higher studies in Pakistan.\(^{492}\)

In addition, 28,000 Afghans have been educated from Pakistan in last thirty years. 6000 are currently studying in colleges and universities. Moreover, 50,000 children of Afghan refugees are enrolled in schools in Pakistan. Afghan graduates from Pakistan are being paid good salaries in Afghanistan. They are now working at prestigious government offices, NGOs and other organizations.\(^{493}\) The government of Pakistan has allowed different Afghan NGOs to establish schools based on Afghan curricula. Currently, 428 primary and high schools are working
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in different cities in Pakistan.\textsuperscript{494} Developing Afghan education sector will build productive and long term cooperative relationship between the two countries.

In order to understand magnitude of cooperation in their bilateral relations it is necessary to evaluate their diplomatic, security and economic relations in post Taliban era which will elucidate challenges in bilateral cooperation and identify prospects of future cooperation.


The bilateral relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan in the post Taliban era (2001-2008) were strained despite moments of expressions of good neighborly gestures and sentiments by the leaders of the two countries. There was limited cooperation without trust in diplomatic, security and economic relations. Pakistan and Afghanistan had been engaged in regular diplomatic consultations since the interim government was established in Afghanistan. After the ouster of Taliban, Pakistan had to give up the idea of installing a regime of its choice, to dictate terms to Kabul and adopted a hands-off policy.\textsuperscript{495} Pakistan recognized the Hamid Karzai government by keeping in view the fact that a strong and stable Afghanistan is important for Pakistan. Hamid Karzai visited Pakistan in Feb, 2002, followed by President Pervez Musharraf return visit in April, 2002 to lay down the foundation of renewed bilateral relationship. Several visits had been exchanged by the two heads of states but their relations deteriorated in 2005 and

\textsuperscript{494} Ibid. p.16.
2006 with Taliban’s resurgence, their recourse to suicide bombing and with the ascendance of northern alliance dominated government, which was against the expectations of Pakistan. Parliamentarians from both the countries also exchanged visits and met at conferences in Islamabad and Kabul. But no serious efforts were witnessed to institutionalize their interaction so that the parliamentarians of the two countries could exchange future visits and share ideas on regular bases.496

In April, 2007 through the good office of Turkish President Abdullah Gul “Ankara Declaration” was signed between the presidents of Pakistan and Afghanistan in an effort to end the blame game and create an environment of trust between the two states. The head of states of Afghanistan and Pakistan reiterated the need to continue dialogue, cooperation and collaboration in every field of life. Both leaders vowed to respect each other sovereignty, territorial integrity and to follow policy of non interference in their relations. They promised to work jointly for attaining good neighborly relations based on trust and cooperation. In addition, they agreed to establish a joint working group including Turkey to supervise the relations. But the intensity of mistrust was so high that third party mediation didn’t bear fruit.

In order to bring sustainable peace, initiative was taken to convene Pak-Afghan joint peace Jirga in Kabul from August 9th -August 12th, 2007 in which 700 people from all walks of life participated. The participants agreed to convene other mini Jirgas, so as to open a channel of people to people dialogue and

expedite the process of peace in the region. In Peace Jirga old actors like Abdul Rab Rasool Sayaf, Professor Burhanudin Rabbani, Syed Ahmad Gilani, Ismail Khan, Abdul Rashid Dostaum and Pir Sayed Mujadadi participated. It was co-chaired by Abdullah Abdullah from Afghanistan and then Interior Minister Ahmed Khan Sherpao from Pakistan. It was also attended by the President and Prime minister of Pakistan. But people taking part in Jirga were handpicked by their governments. Speakers from Afghan side blamed Pakistan for the ongoing insurgency in their country while President of Pakistan blamed Afghanistan for the trouble inside his country. Jirga also lacked participation of Pushtun representatives fighting coalition forces along with Taliban and Al-qaida in the region. Tribal elders who had entered into peace agreements with Musharraf were also not invited which reduced its value.497

Final declaration of the Jirga condemned Terrorism in all its forms and manifestation faced by both the countries. The participants suggested that both the countries should make war on terror an important part of their national and security policy thereby not allowing terrorist and militants in their countries.498 Finally, Pervez Musharraf highlighted the importance of mutual trust in the fight against terrorism by saying that in place of accusing Pakistan, Afghanistan should trust Pakistan.499 Despite promises of mini Jirgas by both sides nothing materialized into action and the idea of mini Jirgas were not realized. President

Musharraf got entangled in domestic politics and later resigned. The prominent figures who participated in Jirga like Aftab Ahmed Khan Sherpao lost elections. Afghans also paid little attention towards convening Jirgas on the pattern of grand Jirga.

There is no denying the fact that security constraints hinder regional cooperation. Pakistan in post Taliban period agreed on security cooperation with Afghan government which was later challenged by militants fighting on both sides of Pak-Afghan border. In order to exert tight control over the border areas and flush out militants Pakistan started military operations, cracked down on Al-qaida, started sharing intelligence with Afghan government and allowed logistic supplies to Afghanistan via Chaman and Torkham. However these efforts did not contain the insurgency that continued and strained their bilateral ties.

Both countries accused each other of cross border infiltration as an instrument of their regional policy, which hampered cooperation. In order to remove misgivings Americans established tripartite commission including Pakistan, Afghanistan and US senior army officials to coordinate military activities and intelligence gathering. Additional working groups were established to focus on coordination of border security operations and intelligence sharing. The major aim of tripartite commission was to forge cooperation, confidence and
reduce mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The commission faced several challenges and did not succeed in reducing mistrust and foster cooperation.\textsuperscript{500}

A case in point is that when in May 2007, a US soldier was killed by Pakistan Frontier constabulary, immediately after a tripartite commission meeting which was held to stop Pak-Afghan border clashes. Pakistan army blamed on miscreants which US and Afghan army rejected. In Jan 2008, there was a suicide attack on Serena Hotel in Kabul, Afghanistan followed by April 2008, suicide attack on President Karzai which he survived. Afghan government blamed ISI and Pakistan military aiding these attacks. Pakistan threatened to withdraw from the commission and later on stopped attending its meeting after Feb, 2008. No meeting took place between Afghanistan, Pakistan, ISAF, and NATO.

Despite the promises of non interference and respecting each other sovereignty in Ankara and Grand Jirga, Karzai threatened to enter the territory of Pakistan in hot pursuit of Taliban. It was soon followed by NATO military incursions in Pakistan which reversed all cooperative measures taken by them. It left the efficacy of tripartite commission in doubt and proved that the tripartite commission was not effective in solving bilateral disputes and forging mutual trust.\textsuperscript{501}

In order to stop cross border infiltrations and redress Afghanistan grievances Pakistan offered mining and fencing the border and setting up

\textsuperscript{500} Keith Crane., Christine Fair., Christopher s and Sameer Puri, Pakistan: Can the US Secure an Insecure State (US: Rand Cooperation, 2010), 155-156.

\textsuperscript{501} Ibid. pp. 155-156.
biometric system on Chaman border, Check posts in FATA and Balochistan Province. Riaz Mohammad Khan, the then foreign secretary of Pakistan in a news briefing at Islamabad said that to selectively fence the Pak-Afghan border, the Pakistan army has been assigned to chalk out modalities. The offer was immediately rejected by Kabul on the ground of being impractical. “Fencing the border is neither helpful nor practical. That’s why we are against it. The border is not where the problem lies.” Karzai rejected the idea by putting up strong criticism against it. He was of the view that mines cannot avert terrorism nor stop cross border infiltration by militants who come and kill and then flee. He was of the view that mines or fencing the border will only divide people and tribes living on both sides of the border. “Instead of helping it will increase people miseries by causing difficulty in to and fro movement, in trade and meeting each other.”

The decision of fencing and mining the border was also criticized at national level by human rights organizations, UN and political parties in Afghanistan, while in Pakistan there was mixed reaction. National groups in NWFP and Balochistan called the offer, “detrimental to the social and economic interests of the ethnic Pushtun tribes.” While the government considered it necessary to stop cross border terrorism and improve Pak-Afghan relations. Thus,
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Pakistan’s idea to fence the border was conceived by Afghans as finely disguised effort to approve an unacceptable territorial status quo.\textsuperscript{506} Pakistan idea of fencing raised Afghanistan vulnerability regarding Durand line. Pakistan introduced biometric cards to check cross border movement of the people on Chaman border of Quetta but Afghan official would tear up the card which was later dropped by Pakistan for lack of interest by Afghan side. In addition, Pakistan army selected 75 km border in Waziristan and same length was selected at Balochistan-Afghan border for fencing which was partially completed but soon the idea was dropped because no attention was paid by Afghan government and international community.\textsuperscript{507} Pakistan did establish visa system, check posts and biometric cards system but the cooperation between them is limited because an important precondition of controlling border effectively is a recognized border. Neither Pakistan nor Afghanistan has full control over the border. In fact both have surrendered border to drug dealers, smugglers and Taliban operating in the region.\textsuperscript{508}

Despite having misperception in political relations, Pak-Afghan trade shows a certain degree of cooperation between the two countries. Afghanistan terrain is mountainous and has little industrial base. The country produces little food and other goods of domestic use. It is mostly dependent on its neighbors for bilateral trade i.e. Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Iran. Afghanistan


\textsuperscript{508}Rahimullah Yousafzai, Interview by the researcher, January 26, 2013.
imports food grains, vegetables, edible oil, petroleum products, medical equipments, and wood and construction material from Pakistan.

Afghanistan is an important export market for Pakistan. In post Taliban era, Pakistan’s exports to Afghanistan increased several fold because of reconstruction activities in Afghanistan as well coalition forces reconstruction demands in Afghanistan. Fuels, oils, distillation products accounts for 29% of Pakistan’s export to Afghanistan. Plaster lime, cement, earth stone, cereals and salt make 11%; vegetable fat oil, iron, steel makes 6-7%. The volume of bilateral trade between Pakistan and Afghanistan increased from $169 million in 2000-2001 to $1.2 billion in 2005-2006. However, it showed down-ward trend in 2006-2007 because Pakistan lost market to Indian and Iranian goods but it has a strong potential to increase.\(^\text{509}\)

On the other hand, Pakistan also provides export market to Afghanistan. Afghanistan total export to Pakistan in year 2002 were worth $ 26 million comprising mostly of dry fruits, carpets, fresh fruits, wool spices and seeds. In 2005-2006 handicrafts and carpets were Afghanistan’s main export to Pakistan followed by dry fruits, botanical medicine animal skin. According to IMF data in 2005-2006, Pakistan was the major importer of Afghanistan’s carpets i.e. 85% Afghan carpet was exported to Pakistan.\(^\text{510}\) This shows how both countries are


dependent upon each other. Afghanistan having an agriculture economy is dependent upon Pakistan for essentials goods. Pakistan holds largest share in Afghanistan market followed by Iran and India, while Afghanistan is the third largest trading partner of Pakistan after China and United States.

To evaluate Pak-Afghan economic relations it is worth mentioning that the governments of both the countries have taken several steps to strengthen their economic relations after the fall of Taliban. The then foreign minister of Pakistan Khursheed Kasuri in an address at the German Council on foreign relations on April 26, 2006 stated that,

“Pakistan have direct stake in progress and stability of Afghanistan. Enhancing economic relations with Afghanistan suits Pakistan’s interest of proactive economic diplomacy with more stress on geo economics rather than geo politics. This behavior is also obvious in Pakistan’s growing economic relations with China.”

Pak-Afghan Joint Economic Commission (JEC) was established in 2002, which provided great opportunity to both the countries to boost their bilateral trade. It provided opportunity for both the countries to renew their trade ties and make new plans to strengthen economic collaboration and cooperation.

The two countries agreed to revive transit trade agreement, signed an investment protection treaty to create an investment friendly environment. In
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addition, they signed MoU for construction of high ways in Afghanistan with the collaboration of Pakistan. Pakistan’s Bank Al-Falah, Habib Bank and National Bank are operating in Afghanistan to finance trade. Pakistani medicine companies have also captured markets in Afghanistan. Some medicine companies are exporting their entire production to Afghanistan instead of selling it domestically. Moreover, there is large number of Pakistani laborers’ and professionals working in different sectors i.e. in banks, hospitals, and consultancies.\textsuperscript{513}

Pakistan is facing acute unemployment problem. According to a report by Pakistan Economy Watch (PEW) over the past ten years starting from 2001 the unemployment has seen an upward turn i.e. 50.4\% from 46.8\%.\textsuperscript{514} Several factors are involved in aggravating the problem i.e. growing population and less job opportunities, poor industrial infrastructure, energy crises, technical backwardness and poor economic growth. Karachi is the biggest industrial base but unfortunately investors are not willing to invest in Karachi due to unrest over the past few years which has forced large number of Pakistanis seeking jobs in other countries including Afghanistan because of the attractive salaries. His Excellency Mohammad Sadiq Ambassador to Afghanistan in an interview conducted for the study revealed that Afghanistan is the largest export market for Pakistan and have created 3.5 million jobs in Pakistan while those Pakistanis who are working in Afghanistan make the figure 100,000.\textsuperscript{515} The figure quoted by ambassador was

\textsuperscript{513} The News International, Feb 27\textsuperscript{th}, 2007.  
\textsuperscript{514} Express Tribune, August 25\textsuperscript{th}, 2012.  
\textsuperscript{515} Mohammad Sadiq, (Ambassador of Pakistan to Afghanistan), Interview by the researcher, April 18, 2013.
official figure of registered Pakistanis. In addition, to the registered Pakistanis there is also a chunk of unregistered Pakistani workers in Afghanistan. In a personal communication with Imtiaz Khan, who is the local resident of Malakand district NWFP, revealed that previously worked at a local NGO making only fifteen thousand per month which was not sufficient to meet the needs of his family. Therefore, he moved to Afghanistan for better prospects and now he is working at a foreign construction company getting a handsome salary (undisclosed) to meet his family needs.\textsuperscript{516}

Moreover, at the time of this research both sides also agreed to open trade route in Waziristan to ensure free flow of goods in case Torkham border is closed which will facilitate transit trade. Pakistan set up 9 extra custom stations in the border areas as well as granted 100 million dollars to upgrade hospitals and schools in Afghanistan. Pakistan has also pledged to set up a ware house and heavy terminals at the border, for boosting Afghanistan transit trade. Pakistan agreed to lower port charges by 50\% and railway charges by 25\% during period 2001-2008. In addition, Pakistan authorized national logistic cell to Afghanistan transit supplies and affirmed Port Qasim and Gwadar to be an additional entry points for Afghanistan goods.\textsuperscript{517}

Moreover, to boost trade the federation of Afghanistan Chamber of Commerce and Industry signed memorandum of understanding with its Pakistani

\textsuperscript{516} Imtiaz Khan, (local resident of Malakand agency working at Kandahar), Interview by the researcher, July 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2012.

\textsuperscript{517} Ibid.
counterpart in 2008 to set up the Pak-Afghan Chamber of Commerce and Industry (PACCI). The PACCI scope consists of information exchange regarding economic cooperation, trade, and services between the two countries. In addition, the regime will draft recommendations for encouraging useful cooperative economic relations between the two countries and would present it to their governments. 518

The Joint Chamber of Commerce will also encourage private investments in both the countries and let people of both countries to establish trade relations which will bring prosperity and stability in the region. Despite these initiations taken there are certain challenges which are affecting normal conduct of trade i.e. badly planned and poorly administered border port stations and extended waiting hours at ports which create illegal payment dealings. In addition, truck-to-truck transshipment at the border is another serious issue which augments managing expenditures, transportation times and the danger of cargo loss and damage. There is no role defined for the Afghan truckers in transit (at the exception of the Peshawar route) as trucking is entirely given by the transit countries. Moreover, high-prices demanded by trucking cartels; standard means of transport are lowered and defective formal financial and insurance systems. 519

Efforts were also made by international NGOs to forge cooperation between journalists and state media in both Pakistan and Afghanistan. Endeavors

were made to facilitate cooperation between private media in Afghanistan and Pakistan by organizing trainings of media personnel and journalists. A number of interviews revealed that cooperation can be enhanced through culture exchanges and people to people contacts. Pakistan television shows, pushto movies and dramas are watched with interest in Afghanistan. Likewise, Afghanistan pushtu songs and singers are popular in Pakistan. Ashraf Ali Director FATA Research Center Islamabad is of the view that people to people contact cannot overcome trust deficit over night but they bear fruit over a long term and provide a platform for meaningful non political engagements.\(^5\)

Dr. Fakhr-ul-Islam Associate Professor at Pakistan Study Center University of Peshawar believes that there are several prospects which can remove mistrust between Pakistan and Afghanistan. “Enhanced engagements between the two countries including exchange visits especially cultural, religious, educational, and tribal; giving Afghan students admissions in Pakistani institutions; signing MoUs with universities especially NWFP universities; establishing Pakistan centers/corners in universities and libraries could be a few of many areas to manipulate better relations between the two countries,” he elaborated.\(^6\)

As part of the capacity building programs offered by Pakistan, 9 Afghan diplomats were trained at the Foreign Services Academy Islamabad in addition to

\(^{5}\) Ashraf Ali, (Director FATA Research Center, Islamabad), Interview by the researcher, Dec 11\(^{th}\) 2011.

\(^{6}\) Dr Fakhr-ul-Islam. (Associate Professor Pakistan Studies Center), Interview by the researcher, May 24, 2011.
20 Afghan legal experts trained at International Islamic University during 2001-2008.\footnote{Ibid.} Moreover, Pakistan trained 1250 Afghan police personnel at National Police Academy, offered training of Afghan officials and students in its institutions and trained 500 Afghans in agriculture sector for different courses during the period 2001-2008, while some completed post graduation from Agriculture University Peshawar.\footnote{Mohamad Sadiq. Op. cit. p. 8-9.}

**6.4: Possible Avenues of Cooperation**

**6.4.1: Gwadar Port and its Prospects for Pakistan and Afghanistan**

Globalization is a process which has shrunk the world into a global village. The important component of this phenomenon is regional integration. Central and South Asia are the two vital parts of the world; the former is rich in natural resources i.e. oil and gas while the latter is rapidly developing with scarce energy resources. The development of transport infrastructure i.e. road and rail links will increase their connectivity with the outside world and enhance trade. In this regard, Gwadar Port has the prospects to emerge as a trade and energy transportation hub.\footnote{Zahid Anwar, “Gwadar Sea Port Emergence as a Regional Trade and Transportation Hub: Prospects and Problems”, Journal of Political Studies, 1:2, (April 28, 2008), 97.}

The meaning of Gwadar in local language is a fishing village located on the southwestern coast of Pakistan, in Balochistan province which is the largest province of Pakistan in terms of territory. The province has borders which touches
Iran and Afghanistan to the west. Gwadar is 72 km away from Iranian border and 320 km away from Cape-al-Had of Oman. Strategically it is located at the tip of Straits of Hormuz/Persian Gulf in Gwadar east bay.\textsuperscript{525}

Its location at the junction of three important regions i.e. the oil rich Middle East, thickly inhabited Pakistan and economically rising, resource laden territory of Central Asia increases its importance several folds and leaves no room for pondering that this small coastal fishing village can serve as a future hub for international sea borne trade, business activities and can generate billion of dollars in revenue, jobs as well as strengthen its defense. Gwadar port being built with Chinese help will lead in a new era of socio economic development in Pakistan and in Balochistan which is the most backward province of Pakistan and will play an important role in the uplift of its people. Afghanistan will be one of the direct beneficiaries of the Gwadar port by accessing it for trade and royalties. Afghanistan former finance Minister Ashraf Ghani (2002-2004) also offered his country’s support for the development of the Gwadar port saying it would act as a gateway to the prosperity of entire region.\textsuperscript{526} The construction of a deep sea-port in Balochistan’s coastal city of Gwadar will give an enormous boost to the volume of Pak-Afghan trade. Pakistan's Communication Minister Shamim Siddiqi in an interview to Afghan news \textit{Pajhwok} in 2005 emphasized that the 'bilateral trade between the neighboring countries would reach billions of dollars once the sea-port is completed in the province bordering Afghanistan'. Siddiqi went to the

\textsuperscript{525} Ibid. p. 98.
\textsuperscript{526} \textit{The Dawn}, August 5, 2003.
extent that developing transport infrastructure in Gwadar would be beneficial for Afghanistan in shape of establishing strong trade ties with Pakistan, China, Iran, India and Middle Eastern countries.\textsuperscript{527}

Afghan transit trade has increased many folds since 2001 and her trade is likely to grow as peace and prosperity returns. Bulks of ATT originate from Dubai. Dubai is nearer to Gwadar than Karachi. If ATT is rerouted it will not only reduce the traveling time but will also reduce freight charges which will in turn make end product cheaper for the consumer in Afghanistan and reduce foreign exchange spending on freight charges.\textsuperscript{528}

Balochistan has an interesting demographic distribution. Area north and north east of Quetta is dwelled by Pushtuns who constitute approximately 38\% of Balochistan’s 7 million populations. With ATT passing in its whole length through Baloch dominated area (Pishin, Chamn, or Qamerudin Karez) both countries will develop an economic interdependence which in turn will bring trust and understanding to relationship between the two Muslim neighboring countries.

Their interests would be intertwining, with no group dictating or harming interests of other.\textsuperscript{529} Gwadar will provide shortest and cost effective transit trade to Afghanistan. It will double job opportunities as well as boost imports and exports. It will improve security situation in the bordering areas of Balochistan

\textsuperscript{529} Ibid.
and Pakistan will get an access to Central Asian Republics. Moreover, it can benefit Afghanistan to export copper to Beijing and international markets apart from job creation and revenue generating in the form of taxes and royalties. China is investing about US $3 billion in a copper mining project in Logar Province, Afghanistan.

6.4.1: Afghanistan in SAARC and ECO: Prospects and Its Impact on Pak-Afghan Relations

Trust can be developed through economic integration in which regional organizations play an important role. They can reduce mistrust and facilitate regional cooperation by promoting interdependence via people to people contact and joint ventures. Pakistan and Afghanistan being members of regional organizations can help in developing closer linkages between South Asia and Central Asia and can connect all stakeholders to promote peace and stability.

South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was a result of regionalism; a concept which is gaining grounds globally, established in
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532 The idea of SAARC was conceived by the former Bangladeshi President Zia–ur –Rehman in 1985 as a result of regionalism concept, which is a major source of peace, stability, corporation and interconnectedness in different parts of the world. It is also a source of expanding infrastructure linkages including rail and roads, regional markets, cross border trading and energy trading. SAARC was a step towards regionalism. In the beginning, SAARC was concentrating more on promoting cooperation on non-economic issues like sports, culture and education, as these issues create less political disagreements and are generally uncontroversial. The only concrete economic issue that the member states agreed upon during the initial days of the association was the desire to fight poverty in the region; as a result it established an independent commission to investigate the matter in 1991. Apart from this, during the first decade of SAARC’s activities, hardly any measures were taken to enhance economic cooperation in the region. It was
1985, comprises of Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan.

Since 1985 Afghanistan showed its willingness to become a part of the grouping when SAARC was formed with seven members but civil war and political instability kept it isolated. Afghanistan is the eighth member and was included in SAARC during the 13th Summit of SAARC, held in Dhaka on 12 - 13 November, 2005. It was officially included in all the SAARC agreements, declaration, and legal documents by a Joint Declaration in the 14 SAARC Summit held in Delhi in 2007. Pakistan fully supported and welcomed the inclusion of Afghanistan in SAARC. The then Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz representing Pakistan at the summit declared Afghanistan “a natural and indispensable member” of the SAARC community. Pakistan believes that Afghanistan will play its valuable role to enrich and strengthen the organization.

SAARC which is the most populous regional forum in the world, with some 1.47 billion people represented, will provide Pakistan and Afghanistan a platform for dialogue to solve their long standing issues, build trust and improve their relations. In addition they can use SAARC for information sharing, police cooperation, intelligence sharing and devising regional strategies to deal with major issues. i.e. terrorism and drug trafficking. Drugs come to South Asia from only during the second decade of SAARC that economic cooperation became the main agenda with the signing of SAARC Preferential Trading Arrangement (SAPTA) on April 11, 1993. See The Katmando Post, July 1, 2010.  
\(^5\)\(^3\)\(^3\) The Daily Star, March 15th, 2008.  
Afghanistan. SAARC can take measures to curb drug trafficking from Afghanistan to the rest of the world by developing a common strategy. Moreover, Afghanistan can benefit from SAARC development fund which can be used for investment in education health and capacity building of its state’s institutions.

The expansion of SAARC by including Afghanistan and giving it a full membership and including China, Japan, South Korea, Iran, the US, and the EU as observer status is considered as a great achievement in the history of this association. Iran has applied for full membership of SAARC, but it will not be allowed to join it until the international row over the Iranian nuclear program is resolved. The bond between the 10 countries is likely to grow with the inclusion of China and Iran as observers in SAARC. Both these important countries share border with Pakistan and Afghanistan too. It will pave path for strengthening regional cooperation, trade liberalization and improving people-to-people contacts in South Asia, which will be beneficial to all.

Afghanistan has joined SAARC amidst certain hopes from the organization. The foreign minister of Afghanistan while addressing the forum, expressed that Afghanistan will look for foreign investment in the country and will provide transit facilities between the South and Central Asian countries. Above all, Afghanistan will seek assistance from the SAARC member countries.
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to join counterterrorism circles. Inclusion of Afghanistan will enhance inter and intra regional connectivity via Pakistan thereby increasing trade and energy cooperation between South Asia and Central Asia.

There are some short comings that are hindering the effectiveness of this organization of this organization. Mistrust between member countries, insecurity of smaller states regarding India, political differences between member states (major among them India-Pakistan row over Kashmir and Durand line between Pakistan and Afghanistan) are eroding the usefulness of organization but some positive developments during the past years showed that forum has the potential to improve its efficacy which will lay positive impact on Pak-Afghan relations. Since 2003, Pak-India relations showed stabilization, efforts in the field of terrorism, the agreement of South Asia Preferential Trade agreement (SAPTA) signed in 1993, South Asia Free Trade Area agreement (SAFTA) signed in 2004, and the inclusion of number of states as observers show that it has the potential to emerge as a vibrant and action oriented entity.

Marvin G. Weinbaum argues that Afghanistan is participating in the SAARC in order to further the progress in regional cooperation and integration. As such regional grouping at the heart of Asia is committed to work towards creation of economically viable Afghanistan. He recognizes the pivotal role that Pakistan can play in planning greater regional economic integration that contributes towards

---

that goal. Few Afghan students interviewed revealed that Afghans have expectations from SAARC parliaments. They are key to forging mutual trust and understanding by playing their role in solving bilateral dispute between Pakistan and Afghanistan; promoting people to people contacts especially parliamentarians and building better perception of each other’s view points.

Another organization which has the potential to bring them together is Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO). Afghanistan and Pakistan are the members of the ECO since 1992. All the ECO countries including Pakistan and Afghanistan share common culture and historic similarities. They can use ECO platform, their existing infrastructure and business contacts to resolve their differences and give boost to their economic and culture relationship. Ten member states of ECO are Muslim states and have a potential to emerge as the world largest Islamic common market. For Afghanistan, the main reason for joining ECO are the ECO plans for economic development, communication and other infrastructure development.

ECO transit and transport frame work agreement (TTFA) has already entered into force. It provides a complete road map for establishing transport links across the region. Both Pakistan and Afghanistan are the signatory of TTFA, if the agreement is implemented without any delay it will enhance regional commerce. They have also signed Economic Cooperation Organization Trade agreement (ECOTA) which is the realization of removing trade barriers by the year 2015.

\[537\] Marvin G. Weinbaum, Interview by the researcher, March 27th, 2013.
\[538\] Afghans students, Interview by the researcher, University of Peshawar, Feb 22nd, 2013.
The agreement provides for the reduction of tariffs to 15% and gradual increase in the positive list of goods. The ECOTA has the potential to draw foreign investments in the form of Multinational Corporations to the region. The nature of multinationals is that they treat the region as one whole integrated block rather than small segmented countries. Such an approach goes against the advantage of those developing countries which are not the part of any regional organization in comparison to those countries that are the part of ECO integration treaties.539

At present only four countries have ratified ECOTA while the other member countries have not yet signed it because they do not agree with anti dumping measures. There are also prospects of free trade but it is obstructed by poor transport network, instability, ethnic and territorial disputes between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Challenges are many but so are opportunities as mentioned above.

6.4.2: Pakistan Energy Crises and Importance of CARs via Afghanistan

Central Asian Republics, (Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan) are stretched over an area of 1.6 million square miles and are at the junction of Europe, Middle East and South Asia. The disintegration of Soviet Union and the emergence of CARs have increased importance of Afghanistan for Pakistan. Afghanistan shares border with three Central Asian Republics i.e. Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. For Pakistan, Afghanistan is a gate
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way to CARs. The main objectives that Pakistan can achieve through peace and stability in Afghanistan is to become a nearest and shortest energy route for the landlocked CARs and Afghanistan. The sea ports of Karachi, Port Qasim and Gwadar Port, will enhance its influence in the West and South Asia. It can also secure new markets for its exports. CARs have population of 60 million which represents a considerable consumer market. Moreover, it can get status of energy hub for the region.\textsuperscript{540}

Pakistan recognized CARs after the end of cold war and the dismemberment of Soviet Union on Dec 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1991 as soon as it emerged on world map and established diplomatic contacts. Initially, its efforts to gain foothold in the region failed because of its unclear foreign policy objectives but it remained a prominent actor in the region. Pakistan is positioned at the junction of Central and South Asia which makes it extremely difficult for CARs to avoid its geographic and strategic significance.\textsuperscript{541} Islamabad is closer to Tashkent and takes less than hour to reach there by air. Dushanbe is only one hour away from Islamabad. The land route to Dushanbe via Afghanistan is at a distance of 2720 km from Karachi as compared to Bandar Abbas (Iranian Port) which is 3400 km away; Vladivostok (Russian Port city) is 9,500km and Rostov (Russian port city)

\textsuperscript{541} Meena Singh Roy, “Pakistan Strategies in Central Asia”, Strategic Analysis, 30:4, (Oct, 2006).
is 4200 km far off which increases the importance of Pakistan for CARs several folds.  

Since 1992 to 2005, several agreements of bilateral cooperation have been signed between Pakistan and CARs, covering important sectors of economy i.e. trade, tourism, culture and economic through institutionalized mechanism. Joint economic commission (JEC) has been established with all the CARs. Pakistan provides technical assistance to CARs under special technical assistance program initiated in 1992. The aim of this program is to offer different courses in English language, banking and accountancy. In order to enhance trade and gain foothold in the region, Pakistan embarked upon a program of developing road-rail links and improving the communication infrastructure. Efforts are under way to connect Turkmenistan to Pakistan through Afghanistan by developing rail links. Efforts are also under way to provide transit trade facility via Karakorum highway between China, Pakistan, Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan. Murgab Kulma road connecting Tajikistan to China through Karakorum highway is another development which will enhance transit trade.

Stability and trust in Pak-Afghan relations will not only help Pakistan to revive its links with CARs but will enable Pakistan to start joint ventures to meet its growing energy needs. Pakistan’s economy is growing which increases energy

---
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consumption and strain available energy resources. Currently, Pakistan is facing serious energy crises. Demand exceeds supply and load shedding is a day to day trend. The government of Pakistan has failed to take timely action to increase thermal and hydel energy generation. To meet the demands the government has to import fuel which caused balance of payment deficit and poses a serious challenge. Natural gas is one of the primary energy sources in Pakistan and its demand is increasing, for this purpose government is taking into account importing energy from Iran and Central Asian Republics in addition to using other sources of energy such as hydel, coal, nuclear, wind and solar energy.

Central Asian Republics

Source: www.lib.utexas.edu
6.4.3: Trans-Afghan Gas pipeline (TAPI) and its Implications

TAPI pipeline consisting of Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan and India is a part of the US grand plan to establish a regional energy network extending from Almaty to New Delhi. Central Asia, with profusion of existing and possible oil, electricity and gas resources can rally the rising load of South Asia and play a vital role towards regional economic integration. The project will cost $8 billion for which World Bank has offered support.

TAPI is a project which surfaced as an American plan in early 1990 to export Turkmenistan gas to international markets. During Taliban’s government two oil companies UNOCAL (American firm) and Bridas (Argentinean firm) contended for the project. UNOCAL was in the lead formed (CentGas) to build a 790 mile (1,271 kilometer) pipeline to link Turkmenistan with Pakistan. Turkmenistan has one of the largest reserves exceeding 25 trillion cubic feet. The company also considered incorporating New Delhi in proposed project. The US government was in the favor of UNOCAL and participated in the Six-plus-Two conferences (the six countries bordering Afghanistan plus the US and Russia) from 1997 to 2001 to persuade the Taliban to form a broad based national government.
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Taliban at that time controlled 90% of Afghanistan. UNOCAL stated to Congress that “it cannot begin construction until an internationally recognized Afghanistan government is in place. For the project to advance, it must have international financing, government-to-government agreements and government-to-consortium agreements.”\textsuperscript{549} Therefore, no progress was made until 2001 when Taliban government was toppled by US and northern alliance.

It is calculated that the pipeline will take $3 to 5 trillion oil and natural gas from the Caspian Sea basin through Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Four thermal power houses and two oil refineries with a 1,000 MW power will be constructed for shipment of gas to other Asian markets. Pakistan’s government has granted the contract for laying down the TAPI gas pipeline project to US-based International Oil Company (IOC).\textsuperscript{550}

According to the Asian Development Bank feasibility studies of Turkmenistan, Afghanistan and Pakistan natural gas pipeline project 2002, the TAP project will be a revolutionary effort to connect energy starved economies of South Asia to the natural gas rich CARs. It will supply cheaper and cleaner energy to the consumers; produce income that can be utilized for developing social sectors; bring about regional stability through joint ownership of the project and has long and extensive repercussions for the states involved and for the region as a whole.\textsuperscript{551}

\textsuperscript{549} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{551} Asian Development Bank Feasibility Studies, Dec 2002.
The geographical proximity, commercial viability, energy profits and geo economics are conducive and complimentary. Pakistan and India are energy deficit. The proven oil and gas reserves of Turkmenistan is 25 trillion cubic meters which makes it a gas gusher while Pakistan which is energy deficit and has a gas intensive economy make it a gas guzzler. Since 1980 to 2007 its gas demand has increased from 300 billion cubic feet to 1,088 billion cubic feet. Incorporating India will further boost the prospects of the project. In addition, the route is suitable logistically. Routing across the southern-eastern Afghanistan to southern western Pakistan province Balochistan, the TAP will combine the gas deficit region which makes 5640 km; reaching Gwadar Port for further distribution to international markets increases its viability.\(^{552}\)

The initiation and completion of the various Pak-Central Asian projects will have a colossal impact on regional trust and stability, in general and Afghanistan’s stability in particular and will start an era of reconstruction and prosperity in Afghanistan. The constructive economic linkages of Afghanistan, CARS and Pakistan will lead to develop strong ties between Afghanistan and CARs on one hand and Pakistan and Afghanistan on other hand irrespective of which government is in place in Afghanistan.\(^{553}\)

The proposed TAPI pipeline will pay dividends to all four participating countries and would advance cooperation. For Turkmenistan, it will generate


revenue and multiplication of export routes. For India and Pakistan, it would meet growing energy demands. In Afghanistan, it would offer revenue for infrastructure development and gas for commercial purposes. In addition, the possibility for export to other countries via Pakistani port of Gwadar is an additional advantage. TAPI is in line with the US stated policy of connecting Central and South Asia and expansion of export routes for Turkmen gas. For a number of other countries, TAPI could present business prospects in building and operation of the pipeline.554

TAPI Project

Source: www.google.com/location_map_tapi_project.html

6.5: Conclusion

After evaluating different aspects of Pak-Afghan relations, the study shows that the significance of Pakistan and Afghanistan for each other cannot be overlooked. Their economic, political and strategic quests depend upon stable and mutually cooperative relations. Without economic, geostrategic and political considerations they cannot achieve their long term regional and international objectives.

Despite having mistrust, both countries attach greater importance to their economic relations which is clear from the growing magnitude of bilateral trade, statements of their leadership, Pakistan’s interest in building Afghanistan’s infrastructure and number of economic agreements (mentioned above). Pakistan’s reconstruction in Afghanistan is less as compared to the other donors and mistrust in their political relations is also high but Pakistan’s reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan have the potential to leave a positive impact on Afghanistan’s economy and change the latter’s perception by convincing Afghans that it is not pursuing interventionist policies in Afghanistan. Unless that happens, increased aid and more cosmetic efforts can have only a very limited impact in terms of improving Pakistan’s image.

Apart from trade, Gwadar Port is another avenue of cooperation which link Afghanistan with Pakistan. Energy serves another critical link. CARs are sufficient in hydrocarbon resources which are possible if there is stability in...
Afghanistan and Pakistan province Balochistan. The proposed TAPI project is a hope to meet energy needs of Pakistan and boost relations between the two. The larger economic incorporation of SAARC and ECO on the European Union model has the potential to amplify the joint-cooperative outcome for Afghanistan and Pakistan. An increase in volume of trade will not only benefit the two countries enormously, it will also generate stake in a supportive relationship, which can serve as the foundation for long-term stable relationship between the two countries.
Chapter-7

Conclusions

This final chapter of the thesis presents conclusion of the study and attempts to answer that mistrust can be overcome and trust can be forged between rivals. The aim of the study has been to evaluate different aspects of Pak-Afghan relations, in addition to pointing out the factors that account for trust deficit in their bilateral relations in post Taliban era. Historically, Afghanistan’s claim on Pakistan’s territory, suspicions and Pakistan’s interventionist policies caused trust deficit. In post Taliban Afghanistan, several issues including resurgence of Taliban, safe havens in tribal areas and blame game are responsible for the strained relations. Pakistan has blamed Afghanistan for the cooperation between the Indian and Afghan intelligence agencies- Research and Analysis Wing (RAW) and Riyast-e-Amniyat-i-Mill (RAM) to destabilize it. Afghan government holds Pakistan responsible for Taliban insurgency that has caused unrest and deepened mistrust.

The study concludes that to build trust the foremost thing is that both Pakistan and Afghanistan overcome their troubled past and move ahead through dialogues and negotiations on various issues, transparency, reciprocity and confidence building measures. The need is to develop binding mechanism that assures non interference in the internal affairs of each other and long term stable relationship.
There is a need to review Pakistan’s policy towards Afghanistan. There are different policies options available for Pakistan. Economic interdependence, culture, religious traditions, and ethnicity can play positive role in engaging them into cooperation. Afghanistan and Pakistan must make progress on a number of critical fronts if, over the next decade, they are to become reasonably cooperative and peaceful neighbors. Progress on each front will likely require extraordinary political will in both capitals, sustained positive international involvement in the region, supportive publics and strong leadership.

There is no doubt that implementation of policies require effective leadership. In addition, Pakistan policy towards Afghanistan should be analyzed in the context of South Asian security web in which Afghanistan is the off shoot of Pakistan’s policy towards India. Solving the Kashmir problem can positively impact on Pak-Afghan relations. Both the countries have made Afghanistan a proxy battle field to settle their scores and for enhancing their regional standing. Moreover, the study highlights that there is regional/international dimension attached to Pak-Afghan relations. Be it Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, civil war in Afghanistan, Taliban ascendancy to power in Afghanistan, or present day war on terror all the events involve regional and international actors. Therefore, strategies for normalizing relations and incorporating trust, it should not only focus on bilateral relations but it should involve all regional and international actors.
7.1: Recommendations for Short and Long Term Measures in Pakistan’s Political Structure

The study gives a set of recommendations consisting of short term and long term changes which is possible within existing political structure i.e. improved trade, extensive people to people interaction, Gwadar port and Reconstruction opportunity zones. In addition, it also recommends some fundamental structural changes to be entailed in Pakistan’s political and social institutions.

A look at Pakistan’s history reveals the fact that it’s a state nation rather than a nation state created by colonial powers. The aim is security rather than welfare of its citizens, justifies jihadist culture, dictatorship, and poor track record of human development for achieving greater security against hostile neighbors i.e. India and Afghanistan. It has land dispute with India over Kashmir and Durand line issue with Afghanistan which puts it under constant security threat. Pakistan is still locked in old assumption ignoring the new realities and therefore, has based its policy towards Afghanistan on British-India historical perception of Afghanistan which emphasized friendly Afghanistan necessary for the survival of British India. For achieving this goal, Pakistan started relying on proxies which was against the historical lessons where external meddling has never proved successful. Moreover, Pakistan since its inception has not had strong security arrangement to safeguard its interests against India in Kashmir. Therefore, it relied on militant groups who came from tribal areas to fight under the guidance of Pakistan military officers. In 1965 war it relied on proxies in Operation Grand
Slam and Operation Gibraltar. As the time went by, the connections between military and militants increased and their bond strengthened especially during President Zia-ul- Haq’s rule. Pakistan army actively used them in Indian held Kashmir and Afghanistan from 1979-2001 which radicalized its society, state and ruined its institutions.

Historically, Pakistan policy was based on strategic interests and recognition of Durand line. Pakistan started its strategic depth policy to counter Indian control of Kashmir. Two more objectives were added i.e. support a government which is friendly enough to Pakistan to counter India and help it in reaching Central Asia. For this reason, it supported Pushtuns to achieve foreign policy objectives. In 1980 it relied on Gilzai Pushtuns i.e. Hizb-e- Islami of Hikmatyar in Afghanistan and Jamat-e- Islami to implement its Afghan policy backed by China, US and Saudi Arabia, instead of relying on power sharing agreement including all ethnic groups which continued till 1994. When Hikmatyar failed to unite all Gilzai Pushtuns against other ethnic groups in Afghanistan, Pakistan embarked upon a more ambitious, over stretched policy and started supporting Taliban, majority of whom were Durrans having Deobandi ideology which is strict in interpretations. In the post cold war decade of 1990s, US lost its interest in the region and Pakistan did not have resources to back such a policy which ultimately failed and isolated Pakistan internationally.

9/11 changed Pak-Afghan relations dramatically as US declared war on Al-qaida and Taliban which put Pakistan in difficult situation i.e. whether to side
with Taliban; being declared as a terrorist state leading to economic sanctions or abandon Taliban and align itself with US. Pakistan rationally calculated costs and benefits of the decision and aligned itself with US for the protection of its vital interests (explained in chapter five) Any miscalculation on part of Pakistan would have put Pakistan into diplomatic isolation and strategic disaster.

In addition, Pak-Afghan policy was also driven by the need to prevent Afghanistan from coming closer to India i.e. India should not have political and military influence in Afghanistan and to control it strategically but 9/11 incidence changed that. Indian gained foot hold in Afghanistan and Pakistan is trying to counter it. India interlinked its interests with Afghans by taking active part in Afghanistan reconstruction, thereby making it difficult for other countries to separate it from Afghanistan. India active role in Afghanistan is not out of generosity but to win hearts and mind of Afghans so as to reach CARs through Afghanistan.

In the post 9/11 period, Pakistan recognized Hamid Karzai government and offered aid and assistance. Pakistan’s past image of supporting Taliban in man and material to fight with their co-ethnics and religious rivals created uncertainty and did make it difficult to be accepted as a friend. But both countries assessed the situation, showed pragmatism, exchanged visits and assured each other of cooperation which prevented Pak-Afghan relations from getting worse. Pakistan role in Afghan elections, Turkey mediation leading to Ankara declaration, Pak-Afghan Jirga, exchange of high profile visits and signing of
various agreements (explained in chap 6) had positive impact on their relations but as security situation in both countries deteriorated both resorted to blame game which eroded their relations and intensified mistrust. Pakistan’s inability to control safe havens in FATA, cross border infiltration in countries, suicide bombing and terrorism had negative impact on Pak-Afghan relations and widened mistrust. The study reveals FATA as a safe haven of extremism and terrorism causing instability in both Pakistan and Afghanistan. US and Afghanistan continuously blamed Pakistan for aiding Taliban in FATA and for cross border infiltration. Pakistan did deploy troops and initiated military operations to counter Taliban infiltration along Pak-Afghan border but the soft border, free movement and the safe havens in the shape of refugee camps made it impossible for the Pakistani army to control them. In addition, Pakistan army miscalculated the seriousness of the problem, was ill equipped, unaware of the rugged and mountainous terrain. Pakistan’s army was combating guerrilla warfare. Therefore, it resorted to bombardment of enemy targets which caused collateral damages and added to the anger of local tribesmen. As a result they resorted to revenge which is part of the Pukhtunwali code of conduct which increased unrest in tribal areas.

Pakistan’s inability to control the situation gave US an opportunity to adopt a new strategy – using drones to attack the targets. Drone attacks were approved secretly by Pakistan as media reports unveiled later on. Drone attacks caused severe collateral damages and deaths of civilians which increased attacks on NATO supply as a back lash. International community generally believes that
Pakistan did ban different militant organizations and froze their bank accounts but at some level some sections of ISI and military support extremism and militancy such as groups like Lashkar-e Taiba, Afghan Taliban, Haqqani network, and former Mujahidin leader Gulbadin Hikmatyar directly and indirectly as a part of its decade old policy of using proxies against its neighbors. ISI has allowed them to regroup even at the expense of country’s international reputation and safety of their citizens as these groups are sometimes against the national interests of Pakistan. 2008 Mumbai attacks were linked to Pakistan militant group Lashkar-e Taiba and ISI as the American intelligence agency claimed to have tapped ISI communication with LET. The aim of supporting extremism is to gain preponderant influence in Afghanistan once US forces leaves Afghanistan. Pakistan has been traditionally supporting Islamist groups in Afghanistan who prevented secular Pushtun nationalist from emerging in Afghanistan for the sake of Muslim solidarity to neutralize old Afghanistan claims on Pushtun territories of Pakistan. In an effort to achieve this policy goal Pakistan has radicalized Afghan as well as its own society. As a result many people believe that Pakistan is the victim of its own policies which the government has denied.

Being a front line state and US ally, it faced the brunt of Taliban activities and suffered politically and economically. It suffered heavy civilian casualties, collateral damages and lost lives of its soldiers. In addition, it weakened government position as it could not focus on other issues i.e. social uplift of people, faced internal displacement of people in areas of military operations
against the militants and eroded people’s trust. Mistrust increased between Afghanistan and Pakistan. It was considered a hot bed of terrorism and associated with exporting extremism and terrorism. Majority of ordinary Afghans from different walks of life, who were interviewed for the study think that Pakistan has pursued double policy towards Afghanistan, on one hand it is supporting friendly relations for economic reasons but on the other it is supporting militants groups and using terrorism as a means to promote its interests in Afghanistan which is contradictory to the first one and has created mistrust in Pak-Afghan relations.

Pakistan in post Taliban setup was worried about Northern Alliance’s domination in the parliament and Pushtun alienation. In addition, growing Indian influence in Afghanistan and Indo-US partnership was worrisome. Indo-US civil nuclear deal agreement July 27, 2007 and promoting its cause of attaining permanent seat in UN’s Security Council was considered by Pakistan as a ‘move of encirclement’ and made it difficult for Pakistan to achieve its foreign policy objectives. Therefore, it softened its policy on Afghan Taliban as they are considered friendly Taliban, not involved in attacking Pakistan’s army or civilians, for containing India-Northern Alliance and focus its attention on capturing Al-qaida, foreigners and other militant groups who challenged the writ of the government by targeting state and civilians. Pakistan also repeatedly asked for increasing Pushtun representation which Afghanistan considered continuation of its strategic depth policy and interference in Afghanistan’s internal affairs.
These dual policies affected Pakistan internationally and increased mistrust and suspicious of regional countries.

Secondly, Durand line has strained their relations. Taliban and Al-qaida used it for conducting operations against US but US has failed to use the porous border successfully against war on terrorism. Unless and until there are defined entry points and well guarded security posts, curbing terrorism and extremism is difficult to achieve. Pak-Afghan border is a soft border mountainous and have weak governments on both sides. Daily movement can be regulated and can be effectively managed through mutual cooperation, consultation, better communication and by creating opportunity zones. At present when the intensity of mistrust is high between the two countries urging Afghanistan to recognize Durand line seems unrealistic. If the issue is looked through Afghan perspective and the previous Afghan government’s stances on it, pressurizing Afghanistan to recognize Durand line will spark protests and demonstrations from public and opposition parties which will endanger Afghanistan internal security and rebuilding efforts. Therefore, at this stage priority should be given to internal development while looking for acceptable solution. The first step in order to progress on the issue is an acknowledgement by both sides that solution is needed, followed by a transparent high powered peaceful dialogue to reach a common ground. Secondly, stabilizing politics through economics is another method of solving entrenched issue.
A trade program should be devised with the aim to remove mistrust and build confidence. Trade would strengthen democracy in both countries, would facilitate Pakistan access to Central Asia and Afghanistan access to sea and Gwadar port. In addition it will also have positive impact on reducing ethnic tensions and strengthening national identity. With the passage of time all these measures will pave the path for formal recognition.

Settling the border dispute would help to stop irredentism that threatens to swallow much of Pakistan’s northwest for the creation of an ethnic Pushtun state (Pushtunistan) or a “Greater Afghanistan.” In turn, it would also undo some of Pakistan’s insecurities emerging from Afghanistan; and thus help to replace the historically prevalent cynicism with much-needed confidence in the two countries.

Progress on Durand line will also settle Pushtunistan issue. It would offer the framework within which a much better coordinated struggle against the use of the border region as a safe haven by the Taliban and Al-qaida can be launched. In addition cross-border infiltration from Pakistan Tribal areas and Balochistan would decline and the present movement of refugees would be controlled. Moreover recognition of the border will pave the path for trust building. It will ensure peace and will lead towards economic development. Solving the long standing issue will break the political dead lock Pak-Afghan relations and will also lead towards strong India-Pakistan relations because it will ease Pakistan’s sense of encirclement by India and its India security threat perception. It will help
address Afghanistan grave concerns about the administrative structure, lack of government’s writ and safe havens in FATA.

After resolving border issue both the countries can curb militancy and terrorism by taking action to disrupt illicit financial flows to Taliban and militants which they receive from narco-trafficking and external sources by engaging countries which are potential sources of financing insurgents. In this regard international community can help Pakistan and Afghanistan by strengthening their counterterrorism capabilities, law enforcing agencies and to develop a system to contain militants’ propaganda. But all these efforts have to be supported by reforms in FATA which will extend government’s writ in those areas. It will allow political parties to compete which will in turn lead to the improvement of situation in FATA. Stable relations between the two countries cannot be achieved until and unless the Durand issue and FATA inclusion into legal and political system of rest of Pakistan is achieved.

The recommendations mentioned above require restructuring of Pakistan’s foreign policy towards Afghanistan. Restructuring policy does not mean abandoning Taliban and alliance with US. It means structural changes in foreign policy i.e. changing the environment in which Pak-Afghan policy is made, coupled with reforms at different level and institutionalizing the decision making. Pakistan should seriously work for non interference policy. It should abandon the policy of appeasement of militants. Show the commitment to establish the writ of the government in areas of conflict and work for mainstreaming of FATA.
Afghanistan owes its trade and social support to the liberal passage policies of Pakistan. Both have close religious and ethnic links. Pakistan provided protection to the three million Afghan refugees that fled after the Soviet invasion. Keeping the commonalities in view it is suggested that Pak-Afghan policy emphasize the need to switch from confrontation to cooperation. Economic factors, trade, and people to people contact should be driving Pakistan’s foreign policy rather than security. Moreover, there is an economic inequality between the two countries.

Afghanistan is poor as compared to Pakistan. Bilateral trade shows a level of cooperation between the two countries which can lead to interdependence. If both the countries tie up their economy it will lead to trust. Both the countries can take full advantage of each other markets cheap labor, technical assistance, infrastructure which can increase their income and trust. Enhancing trade is very important because it will produce a lobby that will support cooperation and cordial relations with Afghanistan. Islamabad has an interest in seeing the current government in Kabul headed by Hamid Karzai extend its writ over larger parts of the country. The later development would benefit Pakistan because it would then open up the land route to oil and gas rich Central Asia. Trade is slowed down by smuggling, heavy duties, security and poor infrastructure. But the trade figures between the two countries can grow with good governance and improved security situation in the tribal areas. Reconstruction Opportunity Zones (ROZs) can be established in the border areas so as the local products get access to international
markets, which will boost the local economies. These opportunities all over FATA will be instrumental in raising the living standard of people. The ROZs if implemented properly will offer tariff free treatment to a number of commodities, such as textile and garments send overseas from selected areas of Pakistan to USA. It would provide Pakistan with an opportunity to increase its exports to USA and encourage economic activities in the under developed FATA. Likewise it will address the problem of unemployment and will discourage the people from joining the ranks and file of militant organizations thereby leaving a positive impact of Pak-Afghan relations.

Policy of strategic depth should be abandoned for deep economic interests i.e. access to markets, trade corridors and access to energy pipelines. Two projects can change the destiny of the region and can have positive impact on Pak-Afghan relations and over all trust level. One is TAPI and other is Gwadar sea port. The TAPI pipeline which will supply more than 30 billion cubic feet will go from Turkmenistan through Afghanistan to Pakistan and India which will necessitate cooperation between the neighboring countries by increasing trade revenues and better relations. At present security issues i.e. unrest in Balochistan and Afghanistan insurgency, political issues are slowing down investments and progress on TAPI.

The other important project which can be used for overcoming mistrust is Gwadar port which will increase Pak-Afghan transit trade several folds, making them interdependent. Iran’s Chahbahar port is a counter weight to Pakistan’s
Gwadar port in terms of strategic importance and trade potentials. Afghanistan’s reliance on Chahbahar port and the development of infrastructure connecting Afghanistan with Iran i.e. Zerange-Delaram high way is increasing Pakistan’s misperceptions that Afghanistan along with India and Iran is trying to undermine the importance of Gwadar port which is deteriorating the environment of trust and increasing Pakistan’s insecurities. It is recommended that Afghanistan should realize the importance of Gwadar port to Pakistan and use it as a factor for stabilizing relations. Afghanistan should not heavily rely on it or should not use it as an alternate but as a complimentary port. The need is to connect Gwadar port to Afghanistan through road and rail so as to attract investment. So far Pakistan has failed to provide land for port’s expansion and constructing motor way link which should be made speedy to utilize the potentials of the port. The road was constructed to increase economic growth rate of Pakistan and to provide shortest possible route from Arabian Sea to CARs and Afghanistan. Pakistan wants Afghanistan to play a role in helping Central Asian Republics to reach Gwadar port and increase its utility. Moreover, it is not rational that Pakistan should be dictating, but rather achieve balancing and transparency in its relations with both the countries.

Pakistan strategic depth policy has promoted radicalization, depletion of resources and isolated Pakistan. Pakistan should not rely on supporting extremism as a strategic tool. The only force Pakistan should rely on is people of Afghanistan as it will determine Pakistan’s image in the eyes of Afghans.
Pakistan’s foreign policy makers should formulate people centric policies. Its role in Afghanistan should be economic and development oriented which will earn good will of people of Afghanistan. In addition, Pakistan’s investment in reconstruction, building and improving Afghanistan transit routes will reduce travel time and cost will build confidence of investors.

Pakistan need to increase people to people informal exchanges, which includes student exchange programs, sports activities, media cooperation which will generate a vibrant civil society enhance mutual cultural understanding and tolerance. Pakistani machinery, manpower and expertise could play an important part in any future rebuilding effort, and its ports and transport sector could receive a major boost. It should gain trust of all Afghan factions i.e. Northern Alliance and Pashtun nationalists and should work for peace process rather than taking sides and manipulating it. All ethnic groups Pashtun, Hazaras, Sunni, and Shia should be treated equally and developmental work should be expanded to non Pashtuns areas. Is development taking place only in Pashtun areas. Giving preference to one community over another causes hatred and violence.

Moreover, the current Pakistan-India rivalry is not on Kashmir but their respective influence in Afghanistan. India is considered as a regional power having more stable democracy and vigorous economy than Pakistan. Afghanistan wants to ensure aid and economic support. Exerting pressure on Afghanistan to annoy India is against ground realities. Therefore, it should quit Indian centric polices in Afghanistan, adopt a middle course and only work for establishing
good relations with Afghanistan by actively participating in Afghanistan’s reconstruction and development work. This will prevent it from going into the orbit of India. Pakistan by keeping the avenue of peaceful dialogues open with India will prevent India from causing instability in Balochistan and FATA. Moreover Pak-India cooperation in Afghanistan will pave the path for official trade by reducing illegal trade, smuggling, terrorism creating more employment opportunities and thereby paving access to Central Asian energy sources and its markets which will benefit public and private sectors in both Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Playing zero sum game has harmed both the countries. Both countries should make sincere efforts to stabilize their relations by formulating such polices which can promote peace and prosperity in the region. All the changes will be useful if the state capacity to fight militancy and extremism is strengthened. Pakistan criminal system must be reformed especially “anti terrorists’ act 1997”. The act has been amended several times since 1997 through presidential ordinances but it still has weaknesses. The law is enacted for the whole country but it is not applicable in FATA. Secondly, it has not been successful in achieving its objectives of punishing terrorists and controlling the activities of banned organizations. Many terrorists are set free by courts because of lack of evidence.

Pakistan anti terrorism courts (ATCs) established as a result of anti terrorism law is poorly administered, underfunded, lack transparency and is outdated which makes the trails of militants impossible. In many circumstances
terrorist areas were cleared but the weak judicial and political system has enhanced the growth of terrorism. Interrogators are not trained on scientific lines. Access to basic data, modern investigation tools including scientific data collection techniques are missing. Prosecutors are not involved in interrogation and are not poorly trained. Moreover, corruption by intelligence agencies, outside interferences especially of military intelligence agency and coercion are common practices. Militants are mostly released on bail and their cases remain in courts for years. Terrorism cases often produce evidences. The cases in point are the June 2008 Danish embassy bombing and the September 2008 Marriot Hotel, (Islamabad) bombing. In addition, the government policy of defeating terrorism by using military force, hasty peace agreements, have produced little success. Unlawful detention, disappearances and extra judicial killings have caused instability.

There should be greater civilian control over anti-terrorism policy. Civilian law enforcement agencies must be strengthened and better equipped. A highly powerful system of witness protection, prosecutors, interrogation team and judges should be ensured. Investigation capacity of police should be strengthened and computerized; data collection, DNA analysis, finger printing collecting systems and forensic laboratories should be modernized and established in different provinces. High qualified staff having good salaries should be hired for forensic labs. Bail law should be strictly enforced. Bails should be allowed when there are well founded grounds to believe that prisoners would not commit further
crimes. All militant groups working in any capacity, there sources of finance should be banned and monitored as many militant organizations work under different names after even banning.

Banks should be prohibited to give any financial assistance in the shape of loans to any banned militant organization. All discriminatory laws on the basis of religion sect and gender must be disbanded. Most importantly writ of the state should be established in NWFP, FATA, Southern Punjab and rural Sindh.

Pakistan government has failed to achieve goal of stable democracy and united Pakistan because of its demographic inequalities, political instability and short term policies. As a consequence it has not been able to achieve a goal of establishing strong institutions which have caused instability in Pakistan which can be felt in its relations with the neighboring countries. Therefore it is highly recommended that political reforms must be introduced in the country including political parties’ reforms.

Political parties play a very important role in democracies and policy making process. De-arming and reforming them is very necessary in current circumstances. Pakistan is a multi-party and multi-ethnic state. Political parties have failed to establish their credibility and to deliver goods to the general public because of corruption lack of transparency, accountability, discipline and internal democratization in political parties. In Pakistan no political party has succeeded to
bring change in foreign policy making and decision making which is dominated by bureaucracy.

The government and international community should work to bring forward parties that are more democratic in orientation rather than ideological, secular and moderate which in turn will work for democratization in the country rather than ruling a country. From 2001 to 2008 jihadi and religious parties dominated political scene and filled the power vacuum as the main stream parties were sidelined by president Musharraf. He relied on religious parties which threatened the security of the country by promoting extremism, despite him being committed to eradicate terrorism and extremism. The government must involve the political parties in decision making process. They can also give inputs regarding issues and policy making. All political parties must have experts, researchers who can analyze the situation and give their inputs rather than relying only on party workers. Moreover, it is high time to de-arm political parties.

In 2002-2007 Sind government issued 85 thousand licenses to the workers of Pakistan People Party, Awami National Party and Mutahida Qomi Movement. According to the sources in the home department there is no check on supplying, buying or making of weapons which has made it easy for the people to acquire illegal arms. Most of them are issued on the quota of home ministers, home secretary, MPA and other high ups and allied parties.\textsuperscript{555} Illegal arms increase

militancy in the society. Therefore, the government should devise a mechanism to dis-arm all political parties.

All the policies require consistency because of unstable democracy consistency is missing. Military dictatorships have played havoc with the country by relying on religious parties and preventing secular moderate parties from emerging. Zia introduced the concept of Islamization i.e. to enforce Islamic system which affected the whole society (by bringing drug and Klashankov culture), political, sectarian situation, constitutionalism and rule of Law in the country. He manipulated the role of religion in politics and misguided young generations whom he used as a Mujahidin in Soviet Afghan war 1979 to legitimize his rule (as there was no political backing for his rule) denounced the work of his predecessors and strengthened the identity of Pakistan. It was during this period that Zia introduced the training of armed forces, as a source of rescue and allied himself and military with Islamists groups. Whole education curricula was Islamized, revised and rewritten in Zia-ul-Haq era; concept of Jihad was elaborated and included in course books. War, use of force, military rule, Jihad, martyrdom was encouraged which provoked violence and unrest in the country. The material was included in such a manner which encouraged the students to be hostile to other social groups. e.g there was too much emphasis on the ideology and religious identity of Pakistan which created hatred against India and Hindus. For Pakistan incorporating pragmatism and rationality in domestic and foreign
policy is the best choice. In addition, changes should be brought in laws which were introduced in a country as a part and parcel of Islamization process.

For countering extremism, rational thinking and tolerance should prevail and emphasis should be more on socio economic and education development. In Pakistan education is not compulsory. Backward areas lack government schools where madrassas have filled the vacuum which provide free education as well as food and clothing. Most of the madrassas are funded with the donations of wealthy countries like Saudi Arabia and Gulf states. In the absence of state interventions in madrassas’ curricula most of these madrassas offer courses on religion excluding science, computer and other modern secular subjects which contributed to extremism. Their main focus is on Jihad and use of force and narrow brand of Islam. They do not teach mutual coexistence with other social groups instead they preach to fight against Shias, other sects and preach extremism.

Extremism is a mindset that cannot be changed overnight. Imparting quality education to the nation can counter the culture of Jihad and extremism. Here the need is to rewrite the text books. The task of formulating text books lies with the federal ministry of education and provincial text book boards. They should develop such curriculum which enhances students’ analytical and critical skills. Reforms were carried out by HEC in 2003 in which whole curricula was revised but the need is that it should be further improved by including instructional content making it according to the international standards. Greater budget allocations for education are required. Districts, villages where bulks of madrassas
are working should be identified. Instead of providing funds to modernize them should be converted into government schools. Efforts should be made for strengthening government institutions and their capacity building.

In this regard, Saudi Arabia which is the birth place of Islam and has enormous financial resources can play a role by bridging gap between Islamic tradition orthodox thinking and global demands. Saudi Arabia can involve the Muslim scholars from all over the world to interpret Islamic perceptions and norms in the light of transformed circumstances of Muslim societies. It has to persuade its clergy to be more active in containing the extremist and Takfiri doctrine. The study concludes that Takfirim which is the off shoot of Saudi Salafism has promoted extremism and terrorism in Pakistan. The followers of Takfiri ideology believe in killing other Muslims due to ideological or religious differences.

The study shows that TTP is inclined towards Takfirim and have declared war on state of Pakistan by targeting Pakistan’s army, Shiites and moderate Deobandis (explained in Chapter-4). The government should work for promoting such ideologies which are moderate and have no political dimension attached to it. Some believe that Sufism can promote tolerance in the society as it emphasizes self purification and has no political dimension attached to it. But the problem is that educated class as well as majority of religious parties following Deobandi ideology does not approve singing, dancing and chanting on graves. President Musharraf did introduce the strategy of enlightened moderation to neutralize
extremist tendency but that failed. Therefore, the need is that government should work seriously and devises well thought counter extremist policy based on intellectual interventions by considering different aspects to neutralize extremist rigid ideologies.

Moreover, decision making process must be institutionalized. The way Pakistan gave support to Taliban and then withdrew it despite allocation of considerable resources to them, showed lack of systematic decision making system. Pakistan has always taken decisions in response to Indian threat perception or neutralizing Indian threats. Indian factor played a role in Pakistan abandoning Taliban as India offered unconditional support to US war on terrorism. Minor adjustments to policy make sense but changing the overall policy by ruling elites without making any sort of consultation show weakness of the decision making system.

Formulation of a foreign policy is a complex task and involves different actors. No country can make foreign policy in isolation as all the countries are affected by events in the region and at international level. In Pakistan, there is no proper democratic mechanism, debate, consensus building, experts to analyze different aspects of a policy and proactive approach in place for decision making. Decision making is based on adhocism, reactive to specific circumstances, short term ignoring the long term perspective. The system must be democratized and open, involving participation from parliament, civil societies, political parties,
ethnic groups, media and academia rather than involving one group of people or institution making decisions.

Moreover, in order to mend Pakistan’s conflictual approach in the region it’s necessary to resolve civil-military relations. Civil military row has impacted Pak-Afghan relations. Afghan fears that ISI and military are not under the control of Pakistan government and play an important role in destabilizing Afghan government by manipulating its politics via non state actors. Therefore, there must be military aloofness from politics, while Foreign office and civilian role must be enhanced in decision making and policy making. Historically there is a conflict between military and civilian bureaucracy over security decision making, role of religion in politics, socio economic reforms, and provincial autonomy. Army considers itself more organized, disciplined and a guardian of Pakistani state. In addition, threat perception from India has not allowed other institutions to grow and resulted in poor civil military relations.

In Pakistan, foreign office controls some aspects of foreign policy i.e. strategic and political and not those related to defense and security. Military high command and intelligence agency ISI, controls policies related to India, Afghanistan and to some extent Iran. The role of academia in providing inputs to policy making cannot be ignored but unfortunately in Pakistan there is lack of coordination between academia and foreign office. There is lack of knowledge on policy making and its implementation as a result of backwardness, ignorance and stereotype thinking which has not changed much since independence of Pakistan.
Government established different research institutions i.e. Area Study Center, Strategic Studies and Regional Studies departments which work under Ministry of Information to conduct research on different foreign policy issues but foreign office has not established any coordination with them to take inputs. More researchers, and experts should be involved in its policy making sector. Parliament must be strengthened. It has limited role in policy making because of military domination.

The need is to strengthen democratic government and civilian led institutions. Pakistan People’s Party (PPP) government did try to show some civilian supremacy over army by bringing ISI under civilian control but the move failed because it was taken in haste which made army to react as a result PPP government had to reverse the decision.

7.2: How Mistrust can be overcome?: Trust Making Process

The study shows that Pak-Afghan relations in post Taliban era were victim of mistrust and misperceptions. Past interventionist policies provided basis for such fears and affected their relations during the period 2001-2008 by creating security dilemma thereby both states felt insecure in relation to each other, which exacerbated the conflict. In order to break Prisoner’s Dilemma there are two policy options which can be used by policy makers for forging trust and overcoming mistrust.
7.2.1: Policy of Reassurance

Taliban regime was toppled down in short period of six weeks but objective to have friendly relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan could not be materialized during the period (2001-2008). The fact can be illustrated by Afghanistan blaming Pakistan and vice-versa for destabilizing and interfering in each other’s countries. In addition, Pakistan’s inability to control FATA and Balochistan provided room for the terrorist groups to establish themselves in these areas and launch cross border infiltration in Afghanistan to carry out attacks. They strengthened Afghanistan suspicions of Pakistan to make the former a satellite state. Pakistan and Afghanistan have conflicting interests. They first have to assure each other that despite their differences on specific issues their long time intentions are not harmful and the best way to achieve this end is by adopting the policy of reassurance. Policy makers of both the country can give a thought to policy of reassurance by taking small conciliatory steps to initiate the process and limit the risk of exploitation. This includes putting an end to hostile statements against each other. Then moving towards negotiations on favorable conditions for transit trade, improving transport infrastructure, speeding reconstruction work and undertaking technical projects. In addition, establishing border management regimes and track two diplomacy can go a long way in building confidence. Once the mistrust and fear diminishes then both can send larger signals by moving towards entrenched issues of Durand line and Pushtun nationalism.
Pakistan has to take confidence building measures where it will guarantee that it will not use non state actors to fulfill its security aspirations. In return, Afghanistan will focus on cooperative initiatives. This is a win-win situation. But if both focus on supporting each other’s dissident groups and forging insurgency both will lose. Confidence building through military engagement is the most distinguished way of enhancing cooperation. Pakistan army training Afghan army can build trust. In addition solving Durand line issue will also be breakthrough in their relations. To patrol the border effectively, to cooperate on joint training exercises and information sharing will be a step forward towards enhancing trust. One way of reassurance is to gather a group of notables, Afghan and Pakistani governmental and nongovernmental stake holders including security establishment, interior ministry and military personnel of both the countries whose task should be to research and interpret the major causes of contentions in a transparent manner i.e. Durand line, security, insurgency, safe havens, trade, transit, and water rights which have eroded their relations. The exercise will lead towards mutually agreed factual frame work and a solid ground for long term engagement. The findings can provide a road map for future dialogues on issues of discord. Pakistan and Afghanistan through strategic dialogues can find the sources of mistrust, and take necessary measures of reassurance.

Repeated interaction and reassurance on issues responsible for hostility can enhance political and economic relations. It can turn limited partnership into full partnership leading towards confidence building and trust. Through
interaction and reassurance both countries will be able to predict the outcome of
next interaction which will lead to trust. In this regard implementation of any
program of cooperation at any level requires firm political commitment on both
sides. It is crucial that the political commitment is translated into policy and
necessary administrative measures i.e. to respect each other sovereignty, territorial
integrity and achieve better coordination in cross border infiltration which is the
root cause of their heightened mistrust.

Moreover, Afghanistan must ensure that its soil will not be used against
Pakistan and has zero level tolerance for militancy. Afghanistan should make
serious efforts to integrate insurgents into mainstream life through public
diplomacy. In this regard Afghanistan leadership must play a positive role by
bringing different Afghan factions together irrespective of ethnicity. It is
important to establish high powered peace council for negotiating with them,
offering them incentives and focusing on economic development in areas where
militants hold sway. In addition, the government of Afghanistan must devise a
comprehensive strategy containing military and political components so that
militants realize that Afghan government is committed to contain militancy. By
taking serious initiatives Pakistan will shift its focus towards maintaining stable
relations with Afghanistan rather than searching for compliant regime in
Afghanistan.

Reassurance policies must reduce mistrust. In order to implement it,
synchronization of economic, political and security policies is important.
Moreover, policy steps in areas which lead towards destabilization and threatens 
reassurance policy must be avoided. i.e. both should stop treating each other as a 
hostile neighbors and understand each other perceptions. Both should reassure 
each other through concrete policies followed by verbal reassurance that they are 
not holding any aggressive intentions. In addition, they should stop supporting 
each other dissident groups for achieving their objectives. Moreover, Pakistan 
should endeavor to drive out the perception that it is in quest of strategic depth in 
Afghanistan or manipulating Afghanistan internal affairs for its own objectives.

To develop trust, both countries should follow a consistent policy, because 
people observe and judge state actions in different circumstances which reveal its 
real motives. In addition, through policy of reassurance Pakistan should drive 
away overstated perceptions of enmity and misconceptions of other ethnic groups 
and their leaders by diplomatically engaging them. Therefore, Pakistani officials 
must ensure their meetings with non Pushtun leaders and members of parliament 
to develop a conducive environment for cooperation with other co-ethnics.

7.2.2: Policy of Reciprocity

Reciprocity reinforces trust and can be successfully employed by Pakistan and 
Afghanistan where cooperation would meet with cooperation and defection with 
retaliation. By adopting such policy they will delegitimize defection and will 
make it more costly. Reciprocity requires little strategic planning and works 
effectively when one side is more powerful than the other side i.e. when power is 
asymmetrical (as in the case of Pakistan and Afghanistan) and so is their foreign
policy behavior. Pakistan is larger than Afghanistan. In terms of economic and technological development Pakistan is ahead of Afghanistan. Given the asymmetry, Afghanistan may be ready to enter into different peace agreements and reduce confrontation but may not increase cooperation. Both did cooperate but it was limited (meeting between government officials, cultural exchanges, agreements on technical and economic matters) as suspicions, fear and misperceptions were dominant which was creating hurdles in peace, stability and moving towards full cooperation. History has proved this point e.g. whenever Afghanistan adopted interventionist policies and caused unrest in Balochistan or tribal areas Pakistan retaliated with interventionist policies. In 1971 and 1965 when Pakistan military was demoralized, Afghanistan did not take any advantage of exploiting Pakistan weaknesses or attacking Pakistan which eased threat perception from India and its quest for pliant regime in Afghanistan. Afghanistan such an attitude played a great role in building trust and strengthening their relations.

Pak-Afghan cooperation can be achieved through reciprocity by establishing regimes, upgrade existing regimes by redressing lacunas and retaliate in case of defection e.g. Illicit trafficking and border management regime will work for gathering information, intelligence sharing, and intelligence led investigations and cross border communication for controlling illicit trafficking and managing border effectively. One of the weaknesses of Pak-Afghan tripartite commission was lack of common counter terrorism strategy
which exacerbated the conflict in both countries; therefore they need to develop a consensus on a common counter terrorism strategy.

Trade regimes comprising of researchers, statisticians and economists, will work for the expansion of trade, infrastructure development, promotion and protection of investment and facilitation of interactions between private investors. Some trade regimes i.e. Joint Economic Commission, Joint Chamber of Commerce established for boosting trade are working effectively but its scope should be expanded by including, planning commissions, anti corruption regime and joint custom regimes. Joint anti-corruption regime can play a major role by making policies and regulations transparent, making laws and granting strict punishments in case of violation. Multi disciplinary fact finding regime having resources, consisting of expertise can be work for water treaty on the pattern of Indus treaty between Pakistan and India which remained intact despite wars and is an exemplary example of water treaty between rival countries.

The study shows that short term reciprocity can establish a norm of cooperation which economic factors can convert into long term stable political relations. Retaliation can deteriorate their relations therefore it is necessary to establish regimes which will institutionalize, monitor and strengthen reciprocity. In addition, reciprocity to work it is necessary to bring structural changes in Pakistan’s foreign policy behavior.

Diplomatic engagement should be facilitated through reciprocal visits of high officials of both countries addressing key issue areas. Exchanges among
parliamentarians can result in cooperation. Reciprocity can produce best results when it is employed for longer period of time. Enforcement of agreements will give a chance to the entire community to punish players who adopt non cooperative behavior. Reciprocity in trade by granting mutual concessions in tariffs, quotas and other trade restrictions will establish more fair rules which if violated can be met with retaliation. In addition it will give birth to economic interdependence which will result in peace and stability. For reciprocity to work Pakistan and Afghanistan must recognize each other’s territorial integrity and interact continuously with a balance level of generosity.

**7.3: Major findings and Recommendations Related to FATA**

The study shows that FATA is the safe haven of militants, smuggled goods, weapons and narcotics. The post 9/11 period saw greater cross border movement, as many Taliban fled to FATA, as it was a safe haven, largely excluded from government’s writ. Their movement was not restricted and in the process links were developed between Afghan Taliban, Pakistan Taliban and different militant groups, which contributed to an insurgent movement operating in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. The study shows that Taliban movement of 1990s was different from Tehreke-e-Taliban Pakistan. Taliban movement in 1990s was a social reformist and politico-religious movement under the leadership of mullah Omar, which was supported by Pakistan (explained in Chap 3). Afghan Taliban emerged as a result of continuous civil war in Afghanistan. Their goal has been to establish “Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan” and caliphate. To achieve their goals
they relied heavily on suicide bombing since 2001. They targeted foreign or NATO forces, attacked reconstruction work and avoided confrontation with the Pakistani state.

On the other hand, TTP is a word which is used for Taliban movement in Pakistan that arose in 2007 from FATA as a result of government policies; consisting of several extremist groups under the leadership of Baithullah Mehsud. Soon it spread in NWFP and targeted the state including the forces and civilians. Both differ in history, goals and targets. TTP is not directly linked with Afghan Taliban movement led by Mullah Omar. However, both Afghan and Pakistani Taliban are the products of Deoband madaris.

In TTP some are focused on religion and political reforms, while other militants who are not part of TTP are inspired from them. They are struggling to create their own space like Mangal Bagh in Khyber agency, Amr Bil Maroof Wa Nahi Anil Munkir (promotion of virtue and prevention of vice), headed by Haji Namdar and Ansarul Islam, led by Qazi Mehboob. In addition, there are some who are criminals and kidnappers in guise of Taliban. Till the date of this research, Pakistan government alleged that TTP received funding from RAW with the approval of Afghan government while Afghan government alleged that Afghan Taliban received funding from Pakistan which heightened their mistrust and disrupted their relations.

The study shows that currently violence and terrorism in FATA is the result of insurgency and war in Afghanistan. Pakistan’s government reliance on
militant groups for boosting its security has strengthened them to an extent that they have now become threats to the stability of the country itself. Many Afghans believe that their country is occupied by outside powers i.e. US led coalition forces and that Pakistan is supporting foreign forces and acting as a front line state. As long as such beliefs continue terrorism and unrest in FATA will continue. Past efforts to bringing peace and stability in FATA failed because of use of force and reliance on military. The study concludes that civilians should be given greater role in counter insurgency efforts. Pakistan army trained for fighting conventional warfare is fighting terrorism which is altogether different from the former.

The failed counter insurgency operations during the period 2001-2008 showed that Pakistan army is not fully prepared to meet the security challenges. The militants after attacking government installations are making use of porous border; successfully cross it and take refuge in Afghanistan. The threat arising from Western Frontier was not as terrible in the history, when there was unfriendly government in Afghanistan as it has become today. Militants attack civilians, military and government installations which has made current security situation more dreadful and the new situation warrant change. The need is that army should be trained to acquire counter insurgency capabilities, fully equipped for fighting all kinds of threats as asymmetrical warfare which includes terrorism as well is now a reality and should be dealt accordingly. Moreover, the government efforts to covertly support Lashkars against militants can only bring
short term peace and may lead to prepare another force that may refuse to disarm when the objectives of defeating militancy are met.

FATA needs consensus based reforms. Prof. Dr Ijaz khan, International Relations Department rightly believes that FATA problem is political rather than developmental. No developmental strategy can work without political change in FATA status. He proposes FATA’s complete political and constitutional incorporation in Pakistan which require change in policy makers mind set by giving priority to FATA political status rather than regional geopolitical ambitions.556

Moreover, the study shows that the continuously changing policies of US, Pakistan and other regional and international actors have added to the problems in FATA. FATA had limited involvement in electoral process till 1997. Adult franchise was introduced in 1997 excluding political parties to operate freely in FATA. Tribal Maliks used to decide its representatives in National Assembly. Currently, it has 12 members in National Assembly and 8 senators but has no representation in provincial assembly because it does not come under its jurisdiction.

In addition Pakistan’s political party act is not extended to FATA. Some parties like Awami National Party, Jamat Islami, Muslim League (Nawaz) are covertly working. If political party act is introduced it will bring secular and

556 Personal communication with Dr. Ijaz Khan, Associate Professor Department of International Relations. 22nd Nov, 2011.
moderate parties in FATA who will bring new ideas and will help in generating pluralistic views which will play an important role in reducing extremism, jihadism and Pashtun nationalism. In addition, it will play a role in preventing people from being trapped into extremist religious parties. Moreover, political parties cannot contest inside FATA which has created sense of deprivation and isolation from mainstream politics.

Kabul’s recognition of the border will be eased if Pakistan decides to integrate FATA into its NWFP province or create a separate province. The current state presence in Pakistan’s tribal areas, which is grounded in colonial era designs, such as the appointment of political agents and the draconian Frontier Crime Regulations, is breeding backwardness. Political agent is responsible for planning and development. But in FATA development is rarely seen because of corruption. Meanwhile, bringing the rule of law to the important provinces of Afghanistan’s south and east will both ease acceptance of a formal boundary and also strengthen links with the government in Kabul.

FATA situation is complex and requires comprehensive solution. There is no quick solution unless people of tribal areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan are taken on board. All the problems have to be addressed at micro level. According to article 145 of the constitution, the governor NWFP is responsible for the decision making and administering FATA, who is answerable to the president only. There is no institutionalized arrangement for the involvement of tribesman in the decision making through their representatives. The sudden change in
government policies cannot rectify the situation on ground or eradicate terrorism completely as whatever policies the government adopts, it will take time but polices must be far sighted. Locals should be strengthened against foreigners. The balance of power has shifted in the favor of militants. The tribal traditional system of administration has been destroyed. The tribal maliks (elders), Khasadars and FC do not have resources which are enjoyed by militants, Taliban and Al-qaida who have weapons, satellite phones and pickup trucks. A vacuum has been created which cannot be filled immediately. But the need is to strengthen locals so that they can deal with the elements and to adopt comprehensive, responsive, participatory not imposed policies and system of governance which can take FATA towards progress and prosperity. Frontier corps should be strengthened and should be provided modern equipment and vehicles. In addition, regular Pakistani army involved in operations in the tribal areas lack know-how and capacities in insurgency warfare. It is a classical force designed for traditional warfare. Therefore, international community must ensure training of forces fighting guerrilla warfare as well supply of hardware. Jirga system should be revived. By institutionalizing it can play an important role in solving the problems between the government and tribes.

Extreme poverty is giving birth to the growing militancy. Efforts should be made by government for starting economic activities by setting up industries. Moreover, education system should be upgraded in FATA. New schools should be built having properly trained local teachers. Women education should also be
given attention as the literacy rate is very low. In this regard international community can help Pakistan by providing funds for upgrading education system in FATA.

7.4: US and International Community

In the post Taliban era, US and coalition forces have not been able to achieve their objectives in Afghanistan. Taliban are still operating and are a strong force. Al-qaïda is fractured but it is still there. Hamid Karzai government is considered corrupt and has not been able to develop strong modern economy for Afghanistan. Moreover, he has not been able to deliver to the masses, neither have secure border; nor has established the writ of the government beyond Kabul. No progress is there on pipeline projects because of weak security situation on ground. The failure of US and coalition forces to secure and stabilize post Taliban Afghanistan showed that there were weaknesses in US political and military strategies.

The region is very important geo-strategically and geo-politically. US should adopt a comprehensive strategy for strengthening the economies of South Asia and for reducing the mistrust between South Asian countries through strategic dialogues and diplomatic manoeuvres. International community headed by US can facilitate efforts towards a legitimized and broad based strong government in Afghanistan. Such a government will focus on positive initiatives by strengthening its institutions so that it can effectively pursue its diplomacy with other countries by diplomatic maneuvers. Moreover, efforts should be increased
to eradicate the availability of small weapons in Afghanistan which has promoted never ending violence in the region. For this purpose it is necessary to curb drug economy and smuggling which finances non state actors.

In addition, to prevent external interference in Afghanistan US being a major power should take diplomatic initiative to implement Kabul declaration in letter and spirit in which all the neighbors promised not to interfere in Afghanistan internal politics. The US should bring the agreement into international frame work so as to strengthen the promise of non interference by neighboring countries including Iran, China, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan Uzbekistan and also the interested parties, Saudi Arabia, EU, US, Japan, and India to ban weapons and all type of military equipment to different Afghan parities and to accept Durand line between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Apart from promoting International agreement the US should also promote regional agreement between neighboring countries to introduce a better mechanism for custom collection, transit trade and border control. This will not only end border interference but will prevent destabilization and will strengthen Afghanistan as a nation state. Therefore all the external powers should work for the stability of Afghanistan and should keep their interests subservient to the stability of Afghanistan.

Moreover, US should take into account that Afghanistan and Pakistan are not the only two actors in the war. There are also other actors such as Iran, China, Russia and India which have their own interests in Afghanistan geopolitics and have history of hostility with US. They consider US long term presence a threat to
their interests. So far US have not come up with a clear policy to develop a consensus between them and stop them from interfering in Afghanistan and Pakistan. In addition, US should work for developing trust between Pakistan and Afghanistan; develop their institutions and minimize reliance on military means. Military and use of force has never been solution to the problem. It should revisit its drone policy, seek for genuine partnership with Pakistan and remove mistrust.

United States and international community should genuinely work to settle Kashmir issue and Durand line issue. Efforts should be made for making composite dialogues successful yielding some results, bringing good relations between India and Pakistan. US and international community should genuinely work to address Pakistan genuine concerns regarding its security, assist Afghanistan to compromise on Durand line issue and long standing Kashmir issue. In addition, Pakistan believes that US is favoring India over Pakistan in Afghanistan which is aggravating their relations. Therefore, US should take Pakistan into confidence while building the trilateral partnership of Afghanistan-India-US.

United States should project its soft power. It should focus on winning hearts and minds of the people. Various regional competing objectives have to be taken into account and reconciled e.g. India-Pakistan regional competition in Afghanistan. In addition US as a super power can play an important role in facilitating sharing of energy resources through pipelines, reconstructing important transit routes between Pakistan and Afghanistan and enhancing regional trade relations.
International community led by US can help by facilitating trust in the region through policies of strategic engagement and by providing political and economic support to different projects and agreements among regional countries and institutions. Moreover, Pakistan along with the regional countries and international community should work for a broad based government including all political forces and factions. In addition, there are number of regional organizations in the region i.e. SCO, ECO, SAARC which can play an important role in building trust, as they are platforms for dialogue and should be used effectively.

Apart from other options to consider for bringing peace in Afghanistan one way is to bring back the country to its well-established and widely respected tradition of neutrality. Successive Afghan rulers emphasized on this policy during 20th century. King Nadir Shah in 1931 stated that, “The best and most fruitful policy that one can imagine for Afghanistan is a policy of neutrality. Afghanistan must give its neighbors assurances of its friendly attitudes while safeguarding the right of reciprocity.557

For Afghanistan, to once again become officially neutral, two things are essential. The Afghans themselves must declare clearly that they will follow firm neutrality in their relations with external powers; and the outside powers must entrust themselves to respect Afghan neutrality and should keep their national interest subservient to Afghanistan’s stability. External players must avoid all temptation to influence the outcome of any intra-Afghan process.
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Appendix - I

The Durand Line Agreement 1883


Whereas certain questions have arisen regarding the frontier of Afghanistan on the side of India, and whereas both His Highness the Amir and Government of India are desirous of settling these questions by a friendly understanding and of fixing the subject between the allied governments, it is hereby agree as follows:

1. The eastern and southern frontier of high highness’s donations from wakhan to the Persian border shall follow the line shown in the map attached to this agreement.

2. The British Government of India will at no time exercise interference in the territories lying beyond this line on the side of Afghanistan, and His Highness the Amir will at no time exercise interference in the territories lying beyond this line on the side of India.

3. The British Government thus agrees to His Highness the Amir retaining Asmar and the valley above it, as far as Chanak. His Highness agrees on the other hand that he will at no time exercise interference in Swat, Bajaur or Chitral, including the Arnawai or Bashgal valley. The British Government also agrees to leave to His Highness the Barnaul tract as shown in the detailed map already given to High Highness, who
relinquishes his claim to the rest of the Waziri country and Dower. His Highness also relinquishes his claim to Chageh [now, Chagai. Ed].

4. The frontier line will hereafter be laid down in detail and demarcated, wherever this may be practicable and desirable, by Joint British and Afghan Commissioners, whose object will be to arrive by mutual understanding at a boundary which shall adhere with the greatest possible exactness to the line shown in the map attached to this agreement, having due regard to the existing local rights of villages adjoining the frontier.

5. With reference to the question of Chaman, the Amir withdraws his objection to the new British Cantonment and concedes to the British Government the rights purchased by him in the Sirkai-Tilerai water. All this part of the frontier, the line will be drawn as follows:

From the crest of Khwaja Imran range near she Pasha Kotal, which remains in British territory, the line will run in such a direction as to leave Murgha Chaman and the Sharobo spring to Afghanistan, and to pass halfway between the New Chaman Fort and the Afghan outpost known locally as Lashkar Dand. The line will then pass half way between the railway station and the hill known as the Mian Baldak, and turning southwards, will rejoin the Khwaja Imran range, leaving the Gwasha Post in British territory, and the road to Shorawak to the west and south of Gwasha in Afghanistan. The British Government will not exercise any interference within half a mile of the road.

6. The above articles of agreement are regarded by the government of India and His Highness the Amir of Afghanistan as a full and satisfactory settlement of all the principal differences of opinion which have arisen between them in regard to the frontier; and both the Government of India and His Highness the Amir undertake that any differences of detail, such as those which will have to be considered hereafter by the officers
appointed to demarcate the boundary line, shall be settled in a friendly spirit, so as to remove for the future as far as possible all causes of doubt and misunderstanding between the two Governments.

7. Being fully satisfied of His Highness’s good-will to the British Government, and wishing to see Afghanistan independent and strong, the Government of India will raise no objection to the purchase and import by His Highness of munitions of war, and they will themselves grant him some help in this respect. Further, in order to mark their sense of Highness the Amir has entered into these negotiations the Government of India undertake to increase by the sum of six lakhs of rupees a year the subsidy of twelve lakhs now granted to His Highness.

(Signed) H. M. Durand
(Signed) Amir Abdul Rahman Khan
Kahn, the 12th November (893)

Note; Original agreement is available in the national archive of Pakistan. This report has been produced from the copy available at the Area Study Centre, Peshawar University.
Appendix-II

THE PESHAWAR ACCORD 1992

Salutation and peace be upon the Great messenger of Allah and his Progeny and Companions. And after that:

The Structure and process for the provisional period of the Islamic State of Afghanistan was formed as wider:

1. It was decided that a 51 persons both’, headed by Hazrat Sahib Sibgatullah Mojeddedi, would go inside Afghanistan so that they could rake over power from the present rulers of Kabul, completely and without any terms and conditions during the two months period. The head of this body will also represent the President ship of the State during these two months. After this period, this body will remain as an Interim Islamic Council, along with (lie Transitional State and Its chairmanship will be held by Hazarat Sahib. The period of this Council, will also be for four months.

2. It was decided that Professor Rabbani will remain as the President of the Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan and the head of the Leadership Council for four mouths. He will commence his work officially when the two months of the transfer of power will have elapsed.

3. The above mentioned period will not be extended even by a day.

4. The Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet will be appointed from the second grade members of the Tanzeemat, at the discretion of the heads of the Tanzeemat.

5. The Prime Minister was assigned to the Hizb-e-Islam, Afghanistan.


8. The Prime Místership and Ministry of Foreign Affairs were assigned to the National Islamic Front.


10. The Supreme Court so Harkat-e-Inqilab-e-Islami Organization.

11. It was also decided that the Leadership Council, in addition to making the division of appointments in she Ministries, will also determine Ministries for Hizb-e-Wahdat. Shoora-e-Etelaf (Council of Coalition) Maulvi Mansoor and other brothers.

12. The total period of this process will be six months. As regards the Transitional Government, the Islamic Council will make a unanimous decision, The period of this Transitional Government will be two years.
Appendix-III

THE ISLAMABAD DECLARATION 1993

Given our submission to the will of Allah Almighty and commitment to seeking guidance from the Holy Quran and Sunnah;

Recalling the glorious success of the epic jihad waged by the valiant Afghan people against foreign occupation:

Desirous of ensuring that the faults of this glorious Jihad bring peace, progress and prosperity for the Afghan people:

Having agreed to bringing armed hostilities to an end,

Recognizing the need for a broad-based Islamic government in which all parties and groups representing all segments of Muslim Afghan society are represented so that the process of political transition can be advanced in an atmosphere of peace, harmony and stability:

Committed to the presentation of unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan;

Recognizing the urgency of rehabilitation and reconstruction of Afghanistan and of facilitating the return of all Afghan refugees;

Committed to promoting peace and security in the region:

Responding to the call of Khadim, Al-Harmain Al-Sharifan. His Majesty King Fahd Bin Abdul Aziz to resolve the differences among Afghan brothers through a peaceful dialogue:
Appreciating the constructive role of good offices of Mr. Muhammad Nawaz Sharif, Prime Minister of Islamic Republic of Pakistan and his sincere efforts to promote peace and conciliation in Afghanistan;

Recognizing the positive support for these efforts extended by the government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Islamic Republic of Iran who have sent their special Envoys for the conciliation talks in Islamabad;

Having undertaken intensive intro-Afghan consultation separately and jointly to consolidate the gains of the glorious Jihad.

All the parties and Groups concerned have agreed as follows.

1. Formation of a government for a period of 18 months in which President Burhanuddin Rabbani would remain President and Eng. Gulbadin Hikmatyar or his nominee would assume the office of Prime Minister. The powers of the President and Prime Minister and his cabinet which have been formulated through mutual consultations will form part of this Accord and is annexed;

2. The cabinet shall be formed by the prime minister in consultations with the president, and leaders of Mujahidin parties within two weeks of the signing of this Accord.

3. The following electoral process is agreed for implementation in a period of not more than 12 months with effect from December 29, 1992:
   a) The immediate formation of an Independent Election commission by all parties with full powers;
   b) The Election commission shall be mandated to hold elections for a Grand Constituent Assembly within 5 months from the date of signature of this Accord,'
c) The duly elected Grand Constituent Assembly shall formulate a
corstitution under which general elections for the president and the
parliament shall be held within the prescribed period to 18 months
mentioned above,

4. A Deface Council comprising two, members from each party will be set
up to, inter alia,

   a) Enable the formation of a national Army:

   b) Take possession of heavy weapons from all parties and sources which
       may be removed from Kabul and other cities and kept out of range to
       ensure the security of the Capital;

   c) Ensure that all roads in Afghanistan are kept open for normal use.

   d) Ensure that State funds shall not be used to finance private armies or
       armed retainers.

5. There shall be immediate and unconditional release of all Afghan
detainees held by the government and different panics during the armed
hostilities.

6. All public and private and residential areas and properties occupied by
different armed groups during the hostilities shall be returned to their
original owners. Effective steps shall be taken to facilitate the return of
displaced persons to their respective homes and locations.

7. An all party committee shall be constituted ted to supervise control over
the monetary system and currency regulations to keep it in conformity
with, existing Afghan banking laws and regulations.

8. A ceasefire shall come into force with immediate effect. After the
formation of the cabinet, there shall be permanent cessation of hostilities.
9. A joined commission comprising representatives of the O/C and of all Afghan parties shall be formed to monitor the ceasefire and cessation of hostilities.

In confirmation of the above accord the following have affixed their signet was hereunder, on Sunday the 7 March 1993 in Islamabad, Pakistan.

Prof Burhan-ud-Din Rabbani
Jamiat-e-Islami
President of the Islamic State of Afghanistan

Signature

Eng. Gulbadin Hakmatyar
Hizb-e-Islami
Signature

Moulvi M. Nabi Muhammadi

Prof. Sibghatullah Mujjadidi
Mahaz-e-Milli
Signature

Htehad-e-Islami
Signature

Sheikh Asif Mohseni
Harkut-e-Islamui
Signature

Ayatullah Fazil
Hizb-e-Wahdnt-e-Islami
Signature
Appendix (IV)

Turkmen-Afghan-Pakistan Gas Pipeline Accord

On 08-06-02 the leaders of Turkmenistan, Afghanistan and Pakistan signed an agreement in Islamabad on 30 May 2002 on a gas pipeline project to transport Turkmen natural gas to Pakistan through Afghanistan. The agreement says that such a pipeline is “vital” to the interests of the peoples of these countries.

It also says that work on a preliminary feasibility study of the project will be carried out and that it will be financed by international financial institutions. The parties to the agreement will choose an international consortium that has experience of carrying out such projects, and the pipeline will be built by, belong to and be used by that consortium.

The Text of the Agreement

Agreement between the government of Turkmenistan, the government of Afghanistan and the government of the Islamic republic of Pakistan on Turkmenistan Afghanistan Pakistan oil and gas pipeline projects.

The government of Turkmenistan (referred to below as the Turkmen side), the government of Afghanistan (referred to below as the Afghan side), which are hereinafter referred to as the parties, acknowledging their cultural ties and common interests; genuinely desiring to strengthen fraternal relations and cooperation between the parties on oil and gas pipeline project; considering that the parties are interested.

In the construction and use of a gas pipeline by a corporate body (hereinafter referred to as the consortium) for the transportation of natural gas from Turkmenistan to Pakistan via the territory of Turkmenistan, and in carrying out a preliminary feasibility study (PFS) of the construction of the gas pipeline by
a corporate body (hereinafter referred to as the consultant), have agreed on the following.

**Article 1**

The parties support the construction of a Turkmenistan Afghanistan Pakistan gas pipeline, viewing it as vital to the interests of the peoples of the countries of the region, and will coordinate the joint activities necessary for carrying out the supply, transportation and use of Turkmen natural gas.

**Article 2**

At the initial stage, the PFS will determine the economics practicability of Turkmenistan Afghanistan Pakistan gas pipeline project and form a basis for it (phase 1). Then, the possibility of extending the gas pipeline to the third county or countries will be considered (phase 2).

In that case Pakistan will act as a link ensuring the uninterrupted transportation of gas to the third countries and will receive payment for gas transportation under an agreement between the Turkmen and Afghan sides or under other agreements concluded between the parties.

The Afghan side is to ensure to the uninterrupted delivery of Turkmen natural gas from Turkmenistan to Pakistan and receive payment for gas transportation under an agreement between the Turkmen and Afghan sides or under other agreements concluded between the parties.

**Article 3**

The sides have agreed to set up a supervisory committee to be headed by the minister of mines and industries from the Afghan side, by the minister of petroleum and natural resources of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan from the Pakistani side, and the minister of oil and gas and mineral resources of Turkmenistan from the Turkmen side.
The committee will consist of three representatives from each side to supervise the drawing up of PFS and consultations with each other about the first and second phases of the project. During the snaking of PFS, the members of the supervisory committee will hold consultations and meetings on a regular basis. The supervisory committee is to present a progress report on the pipeline project at a meeting of the heads of Afghanistan Pakistan, and Pakistan Turkmen in the and cap/tall city of Ashgabat in October 2002.

**Article 4**

The supervisory committee is to study the possibility of building a road and a railway line and also a power transmission line and fiber optic communication between the three countries.

**Article 5**

The Parties have agreed to choose a Consultant for the drawing up of PFS afghan an international tender the work will be financed by international financial institutions.

**Article 6**

The Parties will help and present to the Consultant all available data and technical Information necessary for PFS; The Turkmen side will play a leading role and inform the Parties about all stages of the feasibility study and to hold consultations with the Pakistani and Afghan sides until the Consultant finally defines the main terms of FPS.

**Article 7**

As part of this study, the Consultant may also study of implementing the oil pipeline project from Turkmenistan to Gwadar (Pakistan) via the territory of Afghanistan,
Article 8

The PFS will be a basis for feasibility study and ensuing intergovernmental agreements such as an agreement on the sale and purchase of gas; on agreement with the transit countries; an agreement on the gas pipeline; and other relevant accords.

Article 9

The Parties declare their support for and will make joint efforts to attract an international Consortium that has experience of carrying out such projects. The gas pipeline will be built by and belong to and be used by the international Consortium.

Article 10

The Parties have agreed that Afghanistan enjoys a right of access to the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan gas pipeline to export its [local] natural gas as well as to take gas from this system for domestic use in Afghanistan. The amounts of gas to be exported and received by Afghanistan are to be agreed by the Parties in accordance with the results of PFS.

Article 11

The Parties guarantee the safety of the gas pipeline running through their territories. The Parties acknowledge the Importance of the adoption of an international Convention and other relevant international legal documents under UN aegis to guarantee the security and development of pipeline systems.

The Afghan side is so make the necessary research on the basis of the results of PFS in those parts of the area on its territory where it is planned to carry out confliction work on the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan gas pipeline to detect mines, unexploded rockets or other explosives, booby traps and other devices and to safely remove and (or) blow them up.
The Parties will take all the necessary measures to ensure the security of all foreign personnel who will be present in their territories to carry out work to implement the gas pipeline project.

**Article 12**

Any changes or addenda to this agreement on the gas pipeline will be made through separate tripartite protocols signed up by the Parties and these will be Integral part of this agreement.

**Article 13**

Disagreements concerning the interpretation anti use of this agreement are to be settled through talks and consultations between the Parties.

**Article 14**

This agreement comes into force after internal procedures are completed and it is approved by the Parties. This agreement is valid for three years and can be prolonged with the written consent of the Ponies six months before the expiry of the agreement.

This agreement, done in Turkmen. English and Russian in the city of Islamabad on 30th May. 2002 in three originals in each of these languages, with one for each side, in the event of any different interpretation, the text in English will prevail.

Signed by on behalf of the government of Turkmenistan, Saparmurat Niyazov the president of Turkmenistan. On behalf of the government of Afghanistan, homed-Karzai, the leader of the interim administration of Afghanistan. On behalf of the government of Pakistan, Pervez Musharraf the President of Pakistan.