

AFGHANISTAN: A FUTURE THREAT TO US INTEREST DUE TO DURAND LINE

by

Sukumar Basu

American Military University

ID: 1007543

(email: dipayal@hotmail.com)

A Research Paper submitted to Dr. Jonathan S. Lockwood of American Military University
for the Masters Degree in Strategic Intelligence program,
IN690 KB Winter 05 – Intelligence Independent Study.

(The cut-off date for information has been kept as that of 15 February 2006)

Kabul, Afghanistan

Date: 20 February 2006

CONTENTS

LIST OF MAPS

Map Showing Durand Line 22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Re-negotiation for Peaceful Settlement (ranking alternate future).86-87

Table 2: The Status Quo (ranking alternate future).....88-89

Table 3: Use of Force (ranking alternate future).....90-91

Table 4: Consequences of Alternate Future number 1--Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the approaches of Afghanistan.....93

Table 5: Consequences of Alternate Future number 3--Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.....95

Table 6: Consequences of Alternate Future number 7--Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.....97

Table 7: Consequences of Alternate Future number 2--Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.....99

Table 8: Consequences of Alternate Future number 9—Pakistan continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.....101

Table 9: Determination of the threat to US interest due to Afghanistan’s involvement in the issue of Durand line.....116

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTERS

INTRODUCTION	1
LAMP TECHNIQUE	4-113
Step 1: Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future	4
Step 2: Specify the national “actors” involved	5
Step 3: Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question	7-63
AN OVERVIEW OF AFGHANISTAN	8-18
A Synopsis.....	8
Geographical Information	11
Climatic Condition	11
Administrative Information	12
Natural Resources and Vegetation	12
Ethnic Groups	13
Economic Condition, Financial Status and Commerce	14
Foreign Relations	15
Security Forces	16
Current Security Issues	16
Analysis on Overview of Afghanistan—Problems Identified...18	
AN OVERVIEW OF DURAND LINE	19-37
Historical Overview and Importance	19
Afghanistan’s Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence	24
Pakistan’s Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence	26

India’s Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence	28
US’s Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence	30
Iran’s Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence	31
Legal Examination of the Dispute in Relation to Int’l Law ..	32
Analysis on Overview of Durand Line—Problems Identified..	36
US INTEREST.....	38-63
US National Interest	38
US National Security Strategy	39
Supplements of US National Security Strategy	43
US International Strategy	46
USAID–US State Department Strategic Plan	47
US Interest in Afghanistan	48
US Mission to Afghanistan and its Policy	50
US Assistance to Afghanistan	52
Current and Projected US National Security Threats	57
Possible Future Threats to US Interest in Afghanistan	59
Step 4: Specify all possible course of action for each actor	63-69
Possible courses of action of Afghanistan	63
Possible courses of action of Pakistan	65
Possible courses of action of India	66
Possible courses of action of Iran	68
Step 5: Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures	69-82

Scenario 1: US accept Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any activities conducted by Pakistan to retain the disputed land.....	70
Scenario 2: US reject Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore supports any activities conducted by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land.....	72
Scenario 3: US adopts neutral stance in the issue of the Durand Line, and therefore supports both Afghanistan and Pakistan to peacefully resolve the issue of the disputed land.....	75
Analysis of the three Scenarios	78
Sub-scenario 1 of Scenario 1: Renegotiated Peaceful Settlement.....	79
Sub-scenario 2 of Scenario 1: The Status Quo	80
Sub-scenario 3 of Scenario 1: Use of Force	81
Step 6: Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario	83
Step 7: Perform a pair wise comparison of all “alternate futures” within the scenario to determine their relative probability	84
Step 8: Rank the “alternate futures” for each scenario from the highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received.....	85-91
Table 1: Re-negotiation for Peaceful Settlement	86-87
Table 2: The Status Quo	88-89
Table 3: Use of Force	90-91
Step 9: Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each “alternate future” in terms of its consequences for the issue in question .	92-102
Alternate Future 1.....	92
Table 4.....	93

Alternate Future 3.....	94
Table 5.....	95
Alternate Future 7.....	96
Table 6.....	97
Alternate Future 2.....	98
Table 7.....	99
Alternate Future 9.....	100
Table 8.....	101
Step 10: Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given “alternate future”	102-104
Alternate Future 1.....	103
Alternate Future 3.....	103
Alternate Future 7.....	103
Alternate Future 2.....	104
Alternate Future 9.....	104
Step 11: Develop indicators for the “focal events”.....	104-111
Alternate Future 1.....	105
Alternate Future 3.....	106
Alternate Future 7.....	107
Alternate Future 2.....	109
Alternate Future 9.....	110
Step 12: State the potential of a given alternate future to “transpose” into another alternate future.	111-113
Alternate Future 1.....	112

Alternate Future 3.....	112
Alternate Future 7.....	113
Alternate Future 2.....	113
Alternate Future 9.....	113
CONCLUSION	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY	120

ABSTRACT

The result of this paper have fully addressed the hypothesis--*the perceptions of the four national “actors--Afghanistan, India, Iran, and Pakistan,” regarding the issue of Durand Line as the international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, differ significantly and will eventually lead to extreme armed conflict resulting in an “all-out-war,” wherein the involvement of Afghanistan in this issue can be considered as Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest.* The analysis uses the twelve step *Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP)* to indicate the most likely “alternate future” as--*Alternate future number 1: Pakistan would continue to renegotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the renegotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan--* within the most likely sub-scenario--*Sub-scenario 1: US support Pakistan’s approach of renegotiated peaceful settlement of the issue--*of the major future scenario--*Scenario 1: US accept Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any approach taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land.* Due to the development of events, the above future would rapidly transpose into other “alternate futures” both within and outside the major “Scenario 1,” wherein the prolongation of the issue would escalate into extreme armed conflict resulting in an “all-out-war” with the possibility of the release of WMD.

Moreover, when one compares the issues rising from Afghanistan’s involvement in the dispute with the elements of the US Interests, it is observed that all most all of the elements are affected or exploited in some form or another. On the other hand, the determination of the threat indicates that Afghanistan’s involvement in the Durand Line issue would have an adverse effect on the US Interest as all the four types of threats--perceived, actual, direct, and indirect—would exist in the near future.

AFGHANISTAN: A FUTURE THREAT TO US INTEREST DUE TO DURAND LINE

INTRODUCTION

Boundaries have always been an issue in this global village. Whether it be in the most developed part of the world or in the worst conflict hit areas, the question of encroachment of border or “questionable border-line” or the safety of the border has always been a prime factor that gives rise to tension of unimaginable attributes—a protracted threat to the national interest and the security of the country. Eventually, this caters towards increasing sub-regional, regional and global instability; not to mention the involvement of the super-powers and/or the rising-powers. In this context, the vast region of South Asia is also engulfed with the vicious tentacles of the border issues, *a breeding ground of conflicts*.

When one takes Afghanistan as an example, it can be seen that the Afghans have lost a lot—time and again the country have been made a part of the “big game,” whether it be during the rules of the monarchs or the present “so called” democratic government. Ultimately the loss has been immense in terms of people, liberty, economy, and overall the “questionable international border identified as the Durand Line.” At this juncture, can any one state for sure that in the near future the Afghans will not push to get the land they have lost during 1893 due to the 100 years treaty resulting from the “strategic political games of Russia and England?” The demarcation of Durand Line by the British through the heart of the Afghan homeland divided not only tribes and families, and rivers and terrain, but also directed the emotions of the simple but courageous Afghans!

The present day Pakistan engulfs the terrain that was demarcated by the Durand Line; in fact, strategically saying after 1993 Pakistanis are operating within the boundaries of

Afghanistan. If there are any values of international treaties, then Afghanistan is sure to go after what they had lost due to exploitation of their then ruler by forces stronger and more cunning. And, if such action is taken by Afghanistan in the near future, after all this country and its people have always been unpredictable, the strategic interest of US will be jeopardized. In other words, the vital US Interests, National Security Strategy, and the US Interest in Afghanistan will have to bear the grave pain of this century—*most probably another Vietnam or Iraq!* The US will then get sucked right into the crust of the new conflict that might eventually lead to a war of new dimension, possibly the release of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or even nuclear catastrophe. Noted it must be that the countries of this region--India, Pakistan, and Iran—is quiet capable of releasing nuclear arsenals; and who knows which other state or non-state actors would be pulled into vertex of this mammoth eruption, if US gets involved!

Coming out from the visualization and the emotions of a possible future war, one needs to look for facts that validate the possibility of the conflict: to analyze whether Afghanistan can become a future threat to the US Interest due to the Durand Line. This research originated to identify any indication, action, circumstances or events that would cause harm or damage to the US Interest in the near future, and if there is any the threat would be identified and the outcomes of this paper would eventually support the US strategic analysts and policy-makers to dig further in this issue for a better strategic initiative that would help stabilize the region from the possibility of future skirmishes or an “all-out-war.”

The “alternate futures” resulting from the issue is an important indicator and warning system (I&W) for the strategic and tactical planners to safeguard the future of the South Asian region. Because an “alternate future” is based on the sum total of interactions of free will, the relative probability of the “alternate futures” will be constantly changing based on how each

national actor behaves as it moves through history.¹ Keeping this in mind, we have to analyze Afghanistan from both the perspective of its past and the present, and also need to identify the perceptions, intentions, and objectives of Afghanistan, India, Iran, Pakistan, and US in regards to the Durand Line issue. This analysis will then be able to identify the trends and patterns of the existing and possible future threat(s) due to Afghanistan's involvement in the Durand Line issue, so that the activities, circumstances, events, persons and actions that may have an adverse effect on US Interest, US National Security Strategy, and US Interest in Afghanistan can be predicted.

To meet the objective of this paper, the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP), a method developed by Dr. Jonathan Lockwood in 1992, has been used.² This method assumes that the future is really nothing more than the sum total of all possible interactions of "free will" on an international scale.³ ⁴ LAMP is designed to give the analyst a more powerful method for organizing all available information, based on the perceptions of the national actors, and using it to make relevant predictions about which alternate future is most likely to occur at a given time.⁵

There are twelve steps in the LAMP method—determining the predictive issue, specifying the actors bearing on the problem, conducting in-depth study of perceptions and intentions of each actor, specifying courses of action for each actor, determining the major scenarios, calculating the number of "alternate futures," doing pair-wise comparison of the futures, rank ordering them, analyzing their consequences, assessing the potential for transposition between

¹ Jonathan S. Lockwood and Kathleen O. Lockwood, *The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP)*, Book of Readings, Vol. 1 (Washington, DC: American Military University, 1994), 6.

² *The LAMP method*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.lamp-method.com/method.html>; Internet; accessed 15 October 2005.

³ Lockwood and Lockwood, *LAMP*, Book of Readings, 4.

⁴ At the individual level, in theory, free will means that each of us has a nearly infinite array of possible alternate futures that lie before us during the course of our lives. See, *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

“alternate futures,” determining the focal events for the futures, and developing indicators for each focal events--which will be used to analyze the stated issue.⁶

This paper is the first of its kind regarding the subject matter, written especially as a basic predictive reference material for US analysts so that proper mitigating actions can be taken to help the South Asian region to maintain its stability. In the paragraphs that follow, the twelve steps of the LAMP technique have been used to come to the conclusion, wherein the information cut-off date has been kept as that of 15 February 2006. Moreover, in the paper, wherever the sources are not quoted, it must be understood that this was done intentionally for security and other unavoidable reasons.

LAMP TECHNIQUE

Step 1: Determine the issue for which the most likely future is to be predicted.

Issue: What is the likelihood and consequences of Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest due to Durand Line?

The purpose of this paper is to determine and evaluate the likelihood and consequences of Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest if in the near future the former tries to reclaim the land lost due to the 100 years (1893-1993 AD) treaty termed as “Durand Line.” Since, the land lost due to the treaty lies in the present day Pakistan, it would be a matter of grave concern to the world’s only superpower—the US—if a level of conflict starts in the region. In fact, the conflict would not only bring Afghanistan and Pakistan facing each other in the battle-zone, but would also suck in the key powers of the region towards a new “cold war.” Then the

⁶ See the 12 steps of LAMP method. See, *The LAMP method*.

million dollar question would be, “Can and will the US remain untouched and unbothered?” The answer, obviously, would be a big “NO”. In this relation, the primary objective of this LAMP paper is to trace out the alternate futures, by incorporating US actions as possible scenarios. This then would lead to identify the focal points and its indicators, and the possibilities of transformation of one future to another.

Step 2: Specify the national “actors” involved.

The four national “actors” that can directly affect the possible alternate futures resulting from the issue of Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest due to Durand Line are mentioned below for better understanding. Each of these four “actors” has their own perceptions, political objectives, and possible courses of action in regards to the issue in hand.

- Afghanistan (AFG) –
At present, President Hamid Karzai personifies this “actor;” at a later date and time in the near future, there is a possibility that there would be another president whom one can term for the purpose of this paper as the “future president of Afghanistan”.
- Pakistan (PAK) –
At present, President Pervez Musaraf personifies this “actor;” at a later date and time in the near future, there is a possibility that there would be another president whom one can term for the purpose of this paper as the “future president of Pakistan”.
- India (IND)-
At present, Prime Minister Dr. Man Mohan Singh personifies this “actor;” at a later date and time in the near future, there is a possibility that there would be another prime minister whom one can term for the purpose of this paper as the “future president of India”.⁷
- Iran (IRN)-
At present, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khameni personifies this “actor;” at a later date and time in the near future in case of Khameni’s death or him being deposed by Assembly of Experts there is a possibility that there would be another

⁷ Though the Head of State in India is the President, according to the Constitution of India the executive power lies on the Prime Minister.

president whom one can term for the purpose of this paper as the “future Supreme Leader of Iran”.^{8 9}

The above four countries are the only ones that can be considered as national “actors” in the Durand Line issue because they have courses of action open to them that can have a direct impact on any “alternate future” resulting from Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest. It also needs to be noted that since this paper is looking at the possibility of the conflict in the near future, the present individuals personifying the national “actors” may or may not exist during the future period; in other words, a total different personality may be personifying the involved actors. In this relation, this paper has termed the future head of the governments/states as “future President or future Prime Minister or future Supreme Leader”.

The other neighboring countries of Afghanistan, though they might be affected by the future issue, does not have “courses of action” open to them that can directly affect the future. Later in time, if there is a change in the stance and the overall environment, a different or an extended study by incorporating the context of this paper can be conducted by including Afghanistan’s other neighboring country(s) as additional national “actors.” Until then, the four national “actors” stated above will be used as the base of study for this paper.

⁸ In contrast with most republics, the effective head of Iran's political establishment is not the president, but rather the Supreme Leader, who is a religious figure selected by an Assembly of Experts. See, *President of Iran*, [Online information from Wikipedia the free encyclopedia]; available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/President_of_Iran; Internet; accessed 31 January 2006.

⁹ The Assembly of Experts of Iran is an 86-member body which convenes twice a year in order to oversee the Supreme Leader. It has the power to supervise, select and dismiss the Supreme Leader. The members should be experts in Islamic jurisprudence, in order to judge whether the actions of the Supreme Leader are consistent with Islamic principles and the requirements of the constitution. Members of the assembly are elected by direct public vote to eight year terms. The candidates are subject to approval by the Guardian Council. See, *Assembly of Experts*, [Online information from Wikipedia the free encyclopedia]; available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assembly_of_Experts; Internet; accessed 31 January 2006.

Step 3: Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.

The perceptions and intentions of the four national “actors” mentioned in step two are really the core for the predictive analysis of the “alternate futures” resulting from the issue of the Durand Line. The primary hypothesis of this paper is that the perceptions of the four main national “actors,” regarding the issue of Durand Line as the international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, differ significantly and will eventually lead to extreme armed conflict resulting in an “all-out-war,” wherein the involvement of Afghanistan in this issue can be considered as Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest. In the process of validating this hypothesis, the following questions have been addressed:

- What is the perception of the Afghanistan regarding the Durand Line?
- What is the perception of Pakistan regarding the Durand Line?
- What is the perception of India regarding the Durand Line?
- What is the perception of Iran regarding the Durand Line?
- What is the perception of US regarding the Durand Line?
- How have these perceptions influenced the behavior of the national “actors” with one another?
- What are the implications of these interacting perceptions for Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest or the likelihood of extreme armed conflict resulting in an all-out-war?

To continue further, the paragraphs under respective headings have been outlined to give an overview of situational analysis of “Afghanistan,” “Durand Line,” and the “US Interest”. During the explanation, emphasis has been given to examine the historical developments, events, and affecting factors; moreover, it will highlight the perceptions and intentions of the four national “actors” taking into consideration the issue of the disputed land due to the Durand Line.

AN OVERVIEW OF AFGHANISTAN

This section provides information about Afghanistan's history, geography, climate, administration, natural resources and vegetation, ethnic groups, economy, finance and commerce, foreign relations, security forces, and the current security issues. The author perceives the information inter-related with the issue in-hand, because of the complicated nature of the country, wherein politics is much more influenced by the afore-mentioned elements. Moreover, the problems identified within this topic would also be outlined.

A synopsis

The chronological history of Afghanistan, not only indicates the internal conflicts due to tribal mechanism, but also brings forth the pain, misery, and the difficulties of the Afghan people in their venture towards the present status. Afghanistan, the land of “rugged politics” and the diverse ethnic groups have seen both the benevolence of democratic reforms and the terror of political purges. From monarchs to warlords and then to constitutional reformers to the extreme political entities, the people of the country have not only experienced the political wraths but the barbaric executions. In addition, the interference of superpowers and the regional neighbors have helped erode the fabric of the society, like its rugged terrain.

When one talks about the problems, it can be seen that the 1978 communist coup and the December 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan began a period marked by dramatic economic decline, social upheaval, and bloodshed.¹⁰ When the Soviet forces departed in February 1989, civil war got enrooted in the crust of the country, which continued through 1996.¹¹ In September

¹⁰ *Doing Business in Afghanistan: A Country Commercial Overview*, Fall 2004, [Online information]; available from http://kabul.usembassy.gov/business_afg.html; Internet; accessed 20 December 2005.

¹¹ Ibid.

1996, after the Taliban came to power, a period of deep international isolation, further economic decline, and another exodus of Afghans to neighboring countries increased.¹²

After the US-led coalition forces ousted the Taliban in late 2001, the Afghans gave a sigh of relief. At this juncture it is important to elaborate the creation and importance of Operations Enduring Freedom (OEF), the Bonn Agreement, and the recent London Conference (The Afghanistan Compact) through which Afghanistan is moving or planning to move towards promoting national reconciliation, peace, stability, and respect for human rights with the help of the international community so that the political future can be achieved in accordance with the principles of Islam, pluralism, and social justice.

The creation of the OEF was the result of the attack on US soil by terrorist on 11 September 2001. In other words, it was the US military solution for the “War against Terrorism.” With a strong determination to destroy terrorist training camps and infrastructure within Afghanistan, to capture Al Qaeda leaders, and to cease terrorist activities in Afghanistan, the US started its campaign from 7 October 2001 with the implementation of both the conventional and unconventional modes of attack in close coordination with the anti-Taliban forces, and backed by whole of US national power, and included contribution from international community--by 2002 the coalition had grown to more than 68 nations.¹³ Seventy-eight days after the combat operations, the Taliban regime had been uprooted and the Afghan interim government was formed.

Similarly, the importance of the Bonn Agreement of 5 December 2001--which was signed between Afghan military commanders, representatives of different ethnic groups, expatriates, and representatives of the exiled monarch Zahir Shah--lies on the Afghan belief that

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

it represents the best chance possible for Afghanistan for an interim power sharing arrangement, the creation of new constitution, and the elections.¹⁴ Though there is no short-term remedy of the problems, but the path generated by the Agreement is of greater value. By the arrangement of the interim power sharing mechanism, which is focused towards ensuring representation from different groups and ethnic communities, the Agreement foresaw a broader-based gender-sensitive, multiethnic and fully representative government functions for the betterment of the Afghan people.¹⁵

The OEF and Bonn Agreement led to the formation of a provisional government (Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan) and then the two elections—the Presidential in October 2004, and the Parliamentary on September 2005. Presently, Mr. Hamid Karzai is the President of Afghanistan, and there are a total of 351 Members of Parliament within the Meshrano Jirga (Upper House) and the Wolesi Jirga (Lower House). But, still the government faces a monumental task of reconstruction, including strengthening the security situation country-wide, provision of basic human needs to the population, development of a functioning government, absorption of up to 3.5 million refugees returning from abroad, and reintegration of Afghanistan into the global marketplace.¹⁶

Very recently, the Afghanistan Compact (London Conference) took place in London from 31 January to 1 February 2006. In this Conference three critical and independent areas of activity have been identified for the five years from its adoption: a) Security; b) Governance, Rule of Law and Human Rights; and c) Economic and Social Development. The Compact also

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

recognizes the scale and complexity of the narcotic challenge, and have set out a clear long-term plan for tackling it. In this relation, pledges for assistance has reached US dollar 10.5 billion.¹⁷

Geographical Information

With a population of around 28.8 million and a total area of 647,500 square kilometers--approximately the size of Texas—Afghanistan is located at north and west of Pakistan and east of Iran, wherein the geographic coordinates are 33 00 N and 65 00 E. This landlocked country, mostly rugged mountains with plains in north and southwest, has 5529 kilometers (km) of land boundaries--76 km with China on the extreme northeast, 936 km with Iran on the west, 2430 km with Pakistan on the east and south, and 1206 km with Tajikistan, 744 km with Turkmenistan, and 137 km with Uzbekistan on the north. The current boundaries were established in the late 19th century in the context of rivalry with Britain and Russia, wherein the country is split east to west by the Hindu Kush mountain range, rising in the east to heights of 24,000 ft (7,315 m). With the exception of the southwest, most of the country is covered by high snow-capped mountains and is traversed by deep valleys.

Climatic Condition

The climate of this country is arid to semiarid with cold winters and hot summers. The wet season generally runs from winter through early spring, but in totality it is a dry country; snow season are from October to April, wherein there is little snow in the lowland deserts of the southwest compared to the north. The average annual precipitation ranges from 2.03 inches at Zaranj in southwest Afghanistan to 39.06 inches in the northeast mountains at North Salang, and

¹⁷ *Joint statement by the Co-Chairs of the London Conference on Afghanistan, 1 February 2006*, [Online information]; available from http://www.unama-afg.org/news/_statement/Others/2006/06feb01-JointStatement-LondonConference.htm; Internet; accessed 5 February 2006.

the temperatures can vary widely, from as cold as 51 degrees below zero F in the north central mountains to as hot as 124 degrees F in the southwestern deserts at Zaranj. Strong winds can blow any time of the year, bringing dust storms in the summer and blizzards in the winter.

Administrative Information

Afghanistan is divided into 34 administrative divisions, 40 watersheds and 5 main river basins. The chief rivers of Afghanistan are the Amu Darya, known in ancient times as the Oxus, on the border of Tajikistan; the Kabul, which flows into the River Indus; the Helmand, the longest river in the country, in the south; and the Harirud, in the west. The lowest point of this country is taken as Amu Darya, which is only 258 m in elevation; whereas, the highest point is Nowshak, with an elevation of 7485 m. The usage of land can be stated as: 12.13% of arable land and 0.22% of permanent crops. Record shows that the country has only 30,000 square kilometers of irrigated land, wherein the current environment issues are soil degradation, overgrazing, deforestation, and desertification. These environmental issues, supported by flooding, drought and the damaging earthquakes that occur in Hindu Kush range create the major concern among the general populace.

Natural Resources and Vegetation

Within the rugged terrain, there are abundant of natural gas, petroleum, coal, copper, chromites, talc, barites, sulfur, lead, zinc, iron ore, salt, precious and semiprecious stones. On the alpine range there are abundant growth of large forest trees such as Cedrus Deodara, Abies excelsa, Pinus longifolia, Pinus Pinaster, Pinus Pinea, larch, yew, hazel, juniper, walnut, wild peach, almond, varieties of rose, honeysuckle, currant, gooseberry, hawthorn, rhododendron, alder, ash, khinjak, Arbor-vitae, and Astragalus. Little lower, one can find wild olive, species of

rock-rose, wild privet, acacias and mimosas, barberry, Zizyphus, Chamaerops humilis, Bignonia, sissu, *Salvadora persica*, verbena, acanthus, and varieties of Gesnerae. In the plains of Kandahar, one can find leguminous thorny plants of the papilionaceous sub-order, such as camel-thorn (*Hedysarum Alhagi*), *Astragalus*, spiny rest-harrow, Mimosae, lipad, certain orchids, several species of *Salsola*, rose bay, the wild laburnum and various Indigoferae. On the other hand, in the cultivated areas due to plantation by Afghans, one can find the mulberry, willow, poplar, and ash trees.

Ethnic Groups

The ethnic groups in terms of percentage distribution around the country--42% Pashtun, 27% Tajik, 9% Hazara, 9% Uzbek, 4% Aimaq, 3% Turkmen, 2% Baluch, and 4% others (Nuristani, Pashai, Pamiri, Kirghiz, Brahui, Quizilbash, Mongols, Arabs, Gujars, Kohistanis, Ismailis, Hindus, Sikhs, Jews, Wakihs, and Jats)--shows the diversity of around 28.8 million Afghans, wherein 35% speaks Pashtun, 50% Dari, 11% Turkic (especially Uzbek and Turkmen), and 4% thirty other minor languages (primarily Baluch and Pashai). Within this diverse ethnicity, 80% of the population is Sunni, 19% Shi'a, and 1% follows other religions. At this stage, it is justified to state that all in all, there are still differences in the data projected by different entities regarding the population and the ethnic figures, which is but a major setback for proper analysis. In totality, the tribal organizations in Afghanistan is very diverse based on respective social structures, except for the small groups who have adopted the cultures of the bigger ones. The Pashtuns, Tajiks, Hazaras and the Uzbeks makes the 87% of the population; the Aimaqs, Turkmens and the Baluch makes the 9%, whereas the rest 3% are comprised of smaller groups. Due to the diversity in the ethnic structure, there is racial tension between Pashtuns and

the other minorities; in fact, the minority groups within the Northern Alliance always cater for the Pashtuns to be divided. In other words, they see strong Pashtun community as a threat to their existence.

Economic Condition, Financial Status, and Trade and Commerce

Afghanistan's economy is primarily made up of agriculture (65% of Gross Domestic Product or GDP), light industry (20%) and trade (15%).¹⁸ During the last three years, the country has scored notable successes on the economic front, though not reliable: an estimated 16% growth rate for 2003-2004, following a growth rate of 20% for 2002-2003; maintained a high degree of macroeconomic stability with inflation at less than 10%; and successfully introduced a new, freely-exchangeable currency (the Afghani).¹⁹ According to the International Monetary Fund, the GDP is estimated at US dollar 4.4 billion, and GDP per capita at about US dollar 250 per year.²⁰ Unfortunately, opium production makes up a large portion of Afghanistan's unofficial GDP. Though US and other partners are addressing this problem, there is but slow progress.²¹

In regards to trade, Afghanistan currently has the lowest tariffs of all countries in the region.²² The US, EU, Japan and India all extended Generalized System of Preference-type trade privileges to Afghanistan in 2003, providing ample scope to favorable Afghan export potential.²³ In addition, the government concluded two trilateral transit and trade agreements (Afghanistan-Iran-India and Afghanistan-Iran-Tajikistan) and four bilateral transit and trade agreements (with Iran, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and India).²⁴ Moreover, Pakistan is

¹⁸ *Doing Business in Afghanistan: A Country Commercial Overview.*

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

Afghanistan's largest trading partner, although legitimate trade has been hampered by rampant smuggling and trade barriers against Afghan products and trucks.²⁵ Unemployment is a major concern, with rates running as high as 50% in Kabul and even higher outside of the capital; the average monthly salary in Kabul is about US dollar 75-100 per month, with wages much lower outside the capital.²⁶ Due to the increase in the cost of living, the general populace does face hard time to take care of their big and extended family.

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) released its “Country Strategy and Program for Afghanistan” on August 2004, covering the period 2004-2006; lending assistance amounts to US dollar 170 million in 2004 that covers the agricultural, financial, transport and communications sectors.²⁷ In 2005-2006, total lending assistance is to be US dollar 400 million that will cover the agricultural and natural resources, energy, law and transport, and communications sectors.²⁸ In addition, total non-lending assistance (in the form of Technical Assistance Grants) for 2004 was amounted to US dollar 10 million, and total non-lending assistance for 2005-2006 will be US dollar 20 million.²⁹ The government’s major concern in this area is that the financial assistance is not being able to get funneled to the core of the society because of exploitation by international implementing bodies; therefore, the government wants all development related assistance to channel through government entities.

Likewise, in February 2002, the World Bank reopened its office in Kabul, and has been working closely with the government and bilateral and multilateral development agencies to help ensure that international assistance is well coordinated and efficient.³⁰ In other words, World

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

Bank administers the multi-donor Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF), which provides coordinated financing of unfunded priority expenditures in Afghanistan's reconstruction program.

Foreign Relations

Before the Soviet invasion, Afghanistan pursued a foreign policy of neutrality and non-alignment, but after the December 1979 invasion, the foreign policy mirrored that of the Soviet Union. After the fall of the Taliban, a new horizon opened in the chapter of foreign relations of Afghanistan. In December 2002, the six nations that border Afghanistan signed a 'Good Neighbor' Declaration, in which they pledged to respect Afghanistan's independence and territorial integrity. In this relation, Afghanistan-Pakistan are still engaged in dialogue to resolve bilateral issues, Iran-Afghanistan and Iran-Russia relations have improved, Iran-Tajikistan closer ties are being sought by the present government, whereas on the UN front there has been an incredible role being played for the development of the country through the establishment of United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) and other UN agencies.³¹ But, though all instances for the betterment of foreign policy is being made, the allegation both within and outside the country is that the "Afghanistan government is but a puppet of the US, and therefore all strategic decisions are not made in Kabul but in fact in Washington."

Security Forces

Afghan security forces can be basically categorized into three components. First, the Afghan National Police (ANP) with 53,000 personnel falls under Ministry of Interior (MoI). Out

³¹ Bureau of South Asian Affairs, US State Department, *Afghanistan: Background Note*, December 2005, [Online information]; available from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm#travel>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

of 53,000, only 32,000 have been newly trained, whereas the rest are former policemen yet to receive the new orientation training. Second, the Afghan National Army (ANA) with around 21,000 personnel falls under Ministry of Defense (MoD). The last component is the National Directorate of Security (NDS) which conducts intelligence operations within and outside the border of Afghanistan; wherein its image with the population is very poor—the population takes this body as an entity above the law that undermines the legal constitutional rights of the people.

The security forces have not yet been able to come out of a set-mind generating from the “past” mentality. Though Afghans are very strong in body and mind and are willing to sacrifice themselves for the country, but the professional fighting standards of the security forces alongside with adequate manpower and other resources does not exist—though US and other countries are trying to tackle these limitations. It can be understood that for a certain period the limitations can be tackled, but the sustainability would be a big problem.

The ANP though undergoing a reform is still not at the par to meet the new and emerging challenges, mostly due to again “set mentality,” corruption, lack of professional integrity, and above all “factionalism.” The ANP still has not developed itself to a Law Enforcement Agency, in other words its actions still represent those that of a para-military force. The attitude of the population towards the ANP is still full of suspicion and avoidance.

Current Security Issues

The threat in Afghanistan is originated from the mixture of isolated and interlinked state and non-state actors at the local, national, regional and trans-national levels. The trends and patterns of the threat over the last year not only points towards violent attacks on international military forces, UN and assistance community staff, and government officials increasing, but

also has occurred in the regions/provinces long considered relatively secure. The following threat elements do exist that may undermine any national or international activities within Afghanistan:

- i. Anti-government elements, principally Taliban, HiG and Al Qaeda around east, south, and south-east;

The context of terrorism/extremism, the Taliban hardliners who have been pushed into exile along the Pakistan border continue to orchestrate insurgent activities in an attempt to undermine the efforts of the central government, maintaining a large base of support from local communities within Afghanistan who are yet to feel the effects of the new government. Despite the support of coalition and government forces stability has remained elusive, with insurgents slipping across the border to regroup during offensive operations. Most analysts view efforts by the Government of Pakistan to curb this type of activity as theatre, with insurgent movement between the two countries proving difficult to control. The areas most affected by this problem are the East, South East and South of the country bordering Pakistan.

- ii. Local tribal, ethnic or factional disputes around west, north, and north-east;

In regards to factionalism, Afghanistan remains a country dominated by warlords and private armies, and despite the efforts of the central government and the international community to address this problem, progress in this area has been painstakingly slow. It was originally envisaged that a country wide disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) program could be implemented prior to elections; however this program has been highly politicized and is presently running well behind schedule. The control of government security forces rarely extends beyond the city limits of major centers and in most cases these forces are undermanned and poorly equipped posing little or no deterrence to local powerbrokers. Rivalries often lead to violence as groups fight for influence and control of lucrative smuggling and drug trade that moves through the country. This problem is most prevalent in the West, North West, North and North East of the country, but is also present in other areas.

- iii. Criminal activity or banditry almost all over the country.

When one talks about Criminality, crime in Afghanistan is not considered to be a significant threat, however depending on the area of operations it does obviously exist. The country is awash with weapons yet despite frequent reports of crime in local communities. Analysts foresee an escalation of criminal activities in the days ahead, as expectation of people arise which cannot be met immediately.

Analysis on Overview of Afghanistan—Problems Identified

The intent of this portion is to present the analysis of the in-depth study conducted in regards to the section “Overview of Afghanistan.” When the available information about Afghanistan’s history, geography, climate, administration, natural resources and vegetation, ethnic groups, economy, finance and commerce, foreign relations, security forces, and the current security issues are analyzed, one can state the following problems:

- Afghanistan is a landlocked and dry country having diverse ethnic community, less arable land having major environmental issues, and is vulnerable to flooding, drought and earthquakes.
- Afghanistan has faced and still has the seeds of internal conflict, pain and misery, difficulties, political purges, upheaval, civil war, coup, invasion, interference from regional and super powers.
- Afghanistan has non-reliable economic growth and higher level of unemployment, wherein opium market makes a large portion of GDP.
- Afghanistan has the lowest tariff, and the trade is highly affected by smuggling and trade barriers.
- Afghan government institutions are rampant with corruption and rugged politics.
- Afghanistan still faces the problems and challenges of reconstruction, strengthening security, fulfilling the human needs of the population, development of the functioning government, absorption of 3.5 million refugees, reintegration to global market, reconciliation, respect for human rights, effective rule of law, narcotics, and economic and social development.
- Afghanistan is still discussing bilateral issues with Pakistan.
- Afghan security forces still need to be strengthened, because indications does exist that they still don’t have effective control of the country.
- Afghanistan faces threats from state and non-state actors—terrorism/extremism, factionalism, and criminalism.
- The former Taliban are still regrouping and orchestrating anti-government activities.
- The radical fundamentalist behavior still exists among the hard-core Mullahs, who are still running the society with their conservative views.
- The majority of the women in Afghanistan are still thought to be the property of men and only meant for to be confined inside the four walls of the house.
- Government of Pakistan not doing enough to curb cross-border anti-government activities directed towards Afghan government.
- Afghanistan can still not be considered being a country having peace and stability.

AN OVERVIEW OF DURAND LINE

This section provides information about the historical overview and importance of Durand Line, and also projects the perceptions, intentions, and influences of Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, US, and Iran in regards to this Line. Later, the problems identified within the area of this topic would also be outlined for a better understanding of the threat perception.

Historical Overview and Importance

Before the start of the Sikh and British rule, Afghanistan and Pakistan were one country under the Durrani Empire. The claim of Afghanistan on Pakistan is not based on common ethnicity of tribes on both sides of the Durand Line but on the boundaries of the erstwhile Durrani Empire.³² If Russia and England were not successful in their political “games” in Afghanistan, the landscape of Afghanistan would be different.

History of the Durand Line goes back to the Treaty of Gandumak, signed in May 1879 between British Major Louis Cavagnari and the Afghan Amir Mohammad Ya'qub Khan during the Second Anglo-Afghan War of 1879-80.³³ According to provisions of the Gandumak Agreement, the British were to maintain a military and diplomatic presence in Afghanistan and control its foreign policy, wherein Britain was also granted jurisdictional control of the three strategically significant frontier districts of Kurram, Sibi, and Pishin.³⁴ But, as the Gandumak plan failed to achieve peace, the British opted to leave Afghanistan, but to ensure that it remained

³² Abid Ullah Jan, *Union of Pakistan and Afghanistan: Impossible or Inevitable?* 2005, [Online article from London Institute of South Asia, The Independent Center for Strategic Studies and Analysis]; available from http://www.icssa.org/Afghan_pak_Union.htm; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

³³ *RFE/RL Afghanistan Report*, [Online report of 7 August 2003, Volume 2, Number 28]; available from <http://72.14.207.104/search?q=cache:BHRpxfENcmIJ:www.kabul-reconstructions.net/images/durand1.pdf+%22Durand+Line%22&hl=en&gl=np&ct=clnk&cd=45>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

a buffer state between their own Indian empire and the Russian empire in Central Asia.³⁵ Later in the years, when Abdul Rahman became the Amir the British sought to keep the Russians out of the area and the Amir inside a geographically defined Afghanistan.³⁶ This actually led to the British strategy of introducing the Durand Line.

The 12 November 1893 Durand line--approximately 750 mile long--was drawn by the British and signed into a treaty with Afghan ruler Amir Abdur Rahaman and the foreign secretary of the colonial government of India Sir Mortimer Durand.³⁷ This Line dividing the Pashtun people became controversial to both Afghanistan and Pakistan, and caused difficulties--the line took little note of ethnographic, and sometimes not even topographical, factors. Tribes, villages were divided; from the Afghan point of view, it had serious drawbacks and put a final end to any hopes of stretching Afghanistan's frontiers to the Arabian Sea.³⁸ During Abdur Rahman's rule, due to this Line and as the British held many passes, they were in a position to block the migration routes used by the considerable population of nomad Kuchis.³⁹ Ultimately, any hope of creating a state that would include the totality of Pashtun nation was also dashed; see *Map 1* below indicating the area Pashtunistan. Due to the ongoing issue there were Pashtun rising, which took years of heavy fighting before the rising was suppressed--Abdur Rahaman was never forgiven by the Afghans for accepting the Durand Line.⁴⁰

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Abid Ullah Jan.

³⁸ Martin Ewans, *Afghanistan: A Short History of Its People and Politics* (New York, NY: HarperCollinsPublishers, 2002), 78-79.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.



Map 1: Durand Line⁴¹

The English version of the context of the Agreement of Durand Line that snatched away a major strategic ground from the Afghans by the British Colonial India is provided below:⁴²

1. The eastern and southern frontier of his Highness's dominions, from Wakhan to the Persian border, shall follow the line shown in the map attached to this agreement (See Map 1).
2. The 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 Birmal tract as shown in the detailed map already given to his Highness, who relinquishes his claim to the rest of the Waziri country and Dawar. His Highness also relinquishes his claim to Chageh.

⁴¹ *Durand Line*, [Online information from Afghanistan's Web Site]; available from <http://www.afghanistans.com/Information/History/Durandline.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁴² *Durand Line Agreement*, 12 November 1893, [Online information from Khyber.org]; available from <http://www.khyber.org/pashtohistory/treaties/durandagreement.shtml>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

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. At this part of the frontier the line will be drawn as follows:

From the crest of the Khwaja Amran range near the Psha 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 half-way 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 south-wards, will rejoin the Khwaja Amran 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 goodwill 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 the friendly spirit in which His 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.

In July 1947, when British offered a sole choice for joining India or Pakistan—the referendum was boycotted by the Congress Party, but in the settled areas of North West Frontier

Province (NWFP), of the more than half the electorate who voted less than a quarter of one percent were against joining Pakistan.⁴³ The Afghans protested vigorously and, when there protests were unheeded, achieved the distinction of being the only country to vote against Pakistan's admission to the UN.⁴⁴ After the partition, though the Pakistanis governed the Tribal areas more lightly, the demand for "Pastunistan" articulated by June 1947 "Red Shirt" movement that was fully supported by Afghanistan continued.⁴⁵

On the other hand, the international community suspected that the Afghans ultimate aim was to incorporate the Tribal Agencies into Afghanistan and perhaps the whole NWFP.⁴⁶ The "Pastunistan" issue created a logger head between the two countries—Pakistan and Afghanistan—due to which a fierce propaganda was developed.⁴⁷

Without the Durand Line, the landscape of Afghanistan would have included the crest of the Khwaja Amran range near the Psha Kotal, Murgha Chaman, Sharobo spring, Lashkar Dand, areas around Mian Baldak, and turning south-wards to Khwaja Amran range, Gwasha, and Shorawak. The disputed land was legally to be returned to Afghanistan in 1993 after the expiry of the 100 year old Durand Treaty; but nothing has been done until date.⁴⁸ This is the major concern and the issue within the region—a peaceful settlement of the dispute or an "all-out-war" the eventual result.

⁴³ Martin Ewans, 106-108.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 88

Afghanistan's Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence

The perceptions, intentions, and influence of Afghanistan in regards to Durand Line and other strategic issues can be observed from the text mentioned below:^{49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56}

- The assessment of outsiders that Afghans no more love Pakistanis is correct.
- Pakistan has played into the US hands to serve its agenda in Afghanistan.
- Afghans associated with the Northern Alliance complain that the Pakistani government propped up the Taliban on the directives from Washington.
- The Pashtun are angry that the Taliban were abandoned as readily as persons of a different mindset came to power in Washington.
- The Afghanistan President, Mr. Hamid Karzai, has already rejected President Musaraf's idea for building a fence delineating the Afghanistan/Pakistan border as "impracticable and un-implementable as families live on both sides of the line and any artificial barriers like fencing would permanently divide them."
- The Afghans see the Pakistani move to convert the controversial line into a permanent international border under the pretext of stopping cross-border terrorism by enlisting the support of the US.
- The Afghan Interior Ministry, responsible for controlling cross-border terrorism, has said that "the border between the two countries has to be properly decided and delineated first as per international norms before considering any fencing proposal."
- The dominant Northern Alliance elements in the Karzai government want the Durand Line to become an obstacle to the reunification of the Pashtun nation against them, something that appeared to have happened under the Taliban.
- The present day Afghan government says that the agreement reached between their King Abdur Rahman Khan and British colonial official Sir Henry Mortimer Durand in 1893 was for 100 years only and has expired in 1993.
- The Afghans are now asking the US to renegotiate the border, and some Afghan officials have already issued a new map that shows such major Pakistani cities as Peshawar and Quetta in Afghanistan.

⁴⁹ Abid Ullah Jan.

⁵⁰ *Durand Line*, [Online article from Answers.com]; available from <http://www.answers.com/topic/durand-line>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁵¹ Abid Ullah Jan.

⁵² *Government and Politics: Overview of Current Political Situation in Afghanistan*, [Online information from Afghanistan online]; available from <http://www.afghan-web.com/politics/overview.html>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁵³ Nathan, *The Israeli-Indian Shadow War Against*, 17 September 2003, [Online information]; available from <http://www.registan.net/?p=3116>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁵⁴ Gurinder Randhawa, *Disputed Durand Line: Pakistan's fencing plan disturbs Afghans*, [Online information from The Tribune Online Edition]; available from <http://www.tribuneindia.com/2005/20051226/edit.htm#4>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁵⁵ Martin Ewans, 106-108.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

- Pakistan supported the Taliban regime militarily and financially.
- Pakistan, led by General Maseera, tried to influence the future stability of the Afghan government by attempting to secretly sabotage the talks in Bonn by flaring up ethnic issues.
- Pakistani government wanted to use the Taliban to restore the so-called "sanctity of the Durand Line", which separates Afghanistan and Pakistan. The objective was to rule Afghanistan by proxy, hence giving them a strategic depth against their South Asian rival India.
- The third Anglo-Afghan war of 1919 saw the cancellation of all treaties, including the Durand Line and the Rawalpindi Treaty of 8 August 1919, acknowledging complete independence of Afghanistan. On November 22, 1921, a new treaty between the two "sovereign" governments was signed and later ratified on 6 February 1922, in Kabul. There is no reference to the Durand Line in this treaty and the successive Afghan governments never recognized the Line. Afghanistan's legislative Shura nullified all treaties with British India on 26 July 1949. The 1949 Loya Jirga (Afghan Grand Assembly) in Kabul also endorsed it by declaring support for Pashtunistan. At the same time, across the border, the Fakir of Ipi, was declared by a tribal gathering to be the President of an independent Pashtunistan.
- The internal Afghanistan angle to the Durand Line issue is very significant as the Pashtuns in present Afghanistan constitute the dominant ethnic entity accounting for about 29 per cent of the total population. The present Karzai government, having predominantly Pashtun representation, cannot think of accepting a permanent division of the Pashtuns into two.
- The ethnic minorities of the Northern Areas like the Tajiks, Uzbeks and Hazaras, who are the worst enemies of Pakistan, having suffered at its hands, are the best supporters of the Durand Line as the permanent border since the inclusion of the NWFP in Afghanistan would further cement the domination of the Pashtuns by pushing up their majority to near absolute. They oppose vehemently any proposal to disturb the status quo.
- The fencing proposal and Durand Line acceptance is likely to be a hot issue in the coming days.

Pakistan's Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence

The perceptions, intentions, and influence of Pakistan in regards to Durand Line and other strategic issues can be observed from the text mentioned below:^{57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65}

- For last many years and during Taliban era, Pakistan had been trying without success to get Afghan Warlords and Taliban to sign a renewal contract of the Durand Line Treaty. One of the reasons Pakistan faced problems with the Kabul rulers right from its inception was Kabul's claim over the North West Frontier Province (NWFP); Kabul never accepted that line or the fact that the NWFP is part of Pakistan.
- On September 2005, Pakistani President Pervez Musharaf called for the building of a fence delineating the Afghanistan/Pakistan border. He have been meting with opposition from Pashtunistan and Afghanistan who view the border as illegitimate.
- Islamabad is planning to re-negotiate its Durand Line border with Kabul; the declared intention is to demarcate and patrol the entire border with Afghanistan to prevent terrorists/Taliban from freely crossing over into Pakistan.
- The inter-provincial conference also considered the new "India factor" in Afghanistan; under the Karzai government, India has been allowed to open its embassy in Kabul as well as its consulates in Kandahar and Jalalabad. Needless to say, an Islamabad that is unused to having any Indian presence in Afghanistan since 1989 is upset about being in a nutcracker position.
- After the defeat of the Taliban, the new government in Kabul is heavily represented by elements who were, and remain, friendly towards India.

⁵⁷ *Durand Line Map*, [Online Map from Afghanistan's Web Site]; available from <http://www.afghanistans.com/Information/History/Durandline.htm>; Internet; accessed 5 December 2005.

⁵⁸ *Going Back to Durand Line*, 18 July 2003, [Online article from Daily Times Pakistan]; available from <http://www.e-ariana.com/ariana/eariana.nsf/0/6A61D11D3A17F19C87256D6700754428?OpenDocument>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁵⁹ *America Feels Entangled in Durand Line*, 29 August 2003, [Online information from Dawn the Internet Edition]; available from <http://www.dawn.com/2003/08/29/top5.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁶⁰ *Pakistan: Foreign Policy Experts Criticize Change in Pakistan's Afghan Policy*, 1 September 2003, [Online information from Global News Wire, US Dept of Commerce, World News Connection]; available from http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=e09255584ddecbd2cd69b761f727a28a&_docnum=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=e86a64cebf6de3c444d4977c6ff92cfe; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

⁶¹ Martin Ewans, 106-108.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Daniel Lak, *Analysis: Powerful Cross Border Bonds*, 29 September 2001, [Online report from BBC]; available from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1570571.stm; Internet; accessed 20 December 2005.

⁶⁴ Gurinder Randhawa.

⁶⁵ "Hidden" hands busy to create wedge between Pakistan, Afghanistan over Durand Line, [Online report from Urdu Times] available from <http://www.urdutimes.com/englishnews/2003/09/16/en9/>; Internet; accessed 20 December 2005.

- Pakistan's Taliban policy was linked by its military strategists to the doctrine of Strategic Depth vis-à-vis India, compensating for the lack of width of its own territory in case there was a war with India.
- Pursuing strategic depth, Pakistan backed Mullah Umar's Taliban against the Northern Alliance and placed its under-cover officers in all the big cities of Afghanistan in the guise of consular staff.
- Pakistan wants Durand Line because it can no longer take in an unknown number of refugees every time there is conflict inside Afghanistan.
- Pakistan was punished by its neglect of the Durand Line in the 2002 election when the MMA bagged the Pashtun-nationalist vote and now threatens the country with a fresh wave of internal Talibanisation and external isolation.
- Islamabad has already rejected the demarcation request of Afghanistan by saying that the Durand Line is a settled issue and it has no desire to re-open it.
- Pakistani officials are believed to have complained to the US that they believe India is using its influence on the Northern Alliance, which dominates the present government in Kabul and has close ties to New Delhi, to revive an old and settled issue.
- Dr Hasan Askari Rizvi, a specialist in international affairs, has said that the Pakistan-Afghanistan relations will leave a negative impact on these countries in the future--the first reason is that the security along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border was the most important issue for the Pakistani and US forces, which are present in Afghanistan.
- India has set up consulates in Afghanistan while the RAW (Research and Analysis Wing) has set up 20 units at different places in Afghanistan.
- The Afghan Government has given away 60 percent of the contracts (for different projects) along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border to India.
- The fundamental issue is that the Afghans are depending upon Russian maps, which are not authentic. Pakistan is offering British maps in regards to Durand Line.
- It is the responsibility of the US to get the issue resolved in accordance with the reality.
- In 1950 and 1951 incursions took place across the frontier, diplomatic relations were severed between Afghanistan/Pakistan, and at one stage Pakistan imposed a blockade on petroleum products destined for Afghanistan. This gave rise to Soviet influence in Afghanistan.
- According to Pakistani security sources, Israel and India aim to further their aims on Pakistan's western border with Afghanistan. Under the guise of non-governmental organizations, they are coordinating with Pakistani Pashtun nationalists and providing them with resources to promote the idea of a "Pashtun land" and revive the contentious issue of the Durand Line.
- To this day, the tribal areas are seen by Islamabad as a source of guns, drugs and Islamic revivalism, where Pakistani law has no authority.
- Pakistan is also trying to use the Tripartite Commission consisting of Afghanistan, Pakistan and the US, which is meeting every alternate month, to sort out mutual issues along the frontier.

- Pakistanis claim that though the Durand Line is not mentioned in the 1921 treaty, Article 5 infers that Indo-Afghan frontier is accepted by Afghanistan as it existed between the successive Kabul rulers and the British.
- The Pakistani establishment and its agencies like the Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) feel that a peaceful, stable and strong Afghanistan will again assert rightful ownership over the NWFP by dumping the “unjust and now defunct” Durand Line.
- Indian intelligence has the biggest presence in Afghanistan.
- Reports indicate that three Israelis and four Indian are working in the office of Security Chief of Kabul located in Qilla Fatehullah with the assignment to update the map of Afghanistan, especially the bordering provinces along Pakistan, obviously with a view to causing doubts about the Durand Line.

India’s Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence

The perceptions, intentions, and influence of India in regards to Durand Line and other strategic issues can be observed from the text mentioned below:^{66 67 68 69 70 71}

- Mohan Guruswamy of *Deccan Chronicle* wrote: “It is now only a question of time before the demand for the reunification of all their people becomes a rallying call for the Pashtun nation. Even the internal dynamics within Afghanistan demand it. There is much unfinished business here.”
- Pakistan's close relations with Afghanistan in general and the Taliban in particular are normally seen only in religious fundamentalist terms, wherein it is claimed that it is driven by anti-secular and anti-India ideology.
- The two principle reasons for Pakistan’s proactive Afghan policy are: first, to preserve Pakistan's western border and, second, to provide ‘strategic depth’ against India. In fact, it is more likely that Pakistan is using the ‘Islamic’ garb to veil the significant national and strategic interests that it has in Afghanistan.
- Every government in Islamabad military and non-military has desperately tried to reach a bilateral agreement with successive regimes in Kabul to

⁶⁶ Abid Ullah Jan.

⁶⁷ W.P.S. Sindhu, *Why the Durand Line is important*, 16 November 1999, [Online information from Indian Express]; available from <http://www.expressindia.com/ie/daily/19991116/ieX19059.html>; Internet; accessed 20 December 2005.

⁶⁸ Dr. G. Rauf Roashan, *The Unholy Durand Line, Buffering the Buffer*, [Online article]; available from <http://users.tns.net/~mroashan/politics/countrycorner/CCorner2/DR081101.htm>; Internet; accessed 20 December 2005.

⁶⁹ *Pakistan: Foreign Policy Experts Criticize Change in Pakistan’s Afghan Policy*.

⁷⁰ M B Naqvi, *Indo-Pakistan Rivalry In Afghanistan Intensifies*, 6 September 2005, [Online report from Inter Press Service, Countercurrents.org]; available from <http://www.countercurrents.org/afgan-naqvi060905.htm>; Internet; accessed 20 December 2005.

⁷¹ “Hidden” hands busy to create wedge between Pakistan, Afghanistan over Durand Line.

convert the Durand Line into the international border, but without any success.

- Despite propping up several pro-Pakistan regimes in Kabul, Islamabad was unable to get any of them to endorse the Durand Line as the international border.
- In 1996, when the Durand agreement and line completed a century, it was considered to have lapsed. Consequently, Pakistan's de jure western border ceased to exist.
- According to a recent US Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare report Islamabad has always been anxious to secure a docile Pashtun-dominated government in Kabul.
- The Pakistani doctrine calls for a dispersal of Pakistan's military assets in Afghanistan beyond the Durand Line and well beyond the current offensive capabilities of the Indian military. This would ensure the protection of Pakistan's military hardware.
- Pakistan's leadership is now using the convenient "Islamic" label not only to take along the Taliban fundamentalists but also to cover its own strategic and military involvement in Afghanistan.
- It is important to realize that Islamabad's strategy to counter India is not driven by religious and fundamentalist rhetoric but by cold military logic.
- Pakistani military government had even staged situations of conflict in the border areas in order to drive its point home for recognition of the border.
- India believes that it can restore the old and traditional trade relations with Afghanistan.
- India has been using Afghanistan as a base to put pressure on Pakistan, and it is still doing so.
- There are certain tribes, which will join India to put pressure on Pakistan. Therefore, it is in India's interest to restore its influence that came to an end in 1979 with the arrival of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.
- As of now, India enjoys support in Kabul from not only Karzai and his cabinet but many political elements that fought the Taliban, especially the Northern Alliance that was supported by Iran, the US and its allies and continues to be friendly towards India.

US's Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence

The perceptions, intentions, and influence of US in regards to Durand Line can be observed from the text mentioned below, but the details perception in regards to strategic issues will be outlined under the section “US Interest”:^{72 73}

- The Americans want the border made firm against the Al Qaeda and Taliban terrorists trying to evade the dragnet in Afghanistan.
- The Durand Line boundary remains in effect today as a fully legal, international boundary recognized by nearly all nations.
- The US Department of State documents and spokespersons have recently confirmed that the Durand Line, like virtually all international boundaries, has no expiration date.
- The line has come under special attention of late, as the area has become notorious for Taliban fighters and terrorists freely traveling back and forth, finding safety and shelter in the autonomous Pashtun regions of northwestern Pakistan.
- Ludwig W. Adamec of the US Department of Near Eastern Studies, in an article in 1998 titled “Greater Afghanistan, A Missed Chance,” wrote that the areas previously under Afghanistan rule “were not given the right to vote for independence or union with Afghanistan--the choice was rather for union with Pakistan or India.”
- The US finds itself embroiled in a 100-year-old dispute between Afghanistan and Pakistan but does not have the expertise or the desire to resolve it.
- The issue has already caused several skirmishes between Pakistan and Afghanistan and has forced the US to form a tripartite commission to resolve border disputes between its two allies.
- Officials in Washington say that in the previous meetings the US administration had made it clear to both sides that it has no desire to get involved in re-negotiating a deal made more than 100 years ago between Afghanistan and Britain.
- The commission has established a hotline between Pakistan and Afghanistan to prevent further armed clashes between the two countries. The hotline also allows the two US allies to stay in touch with US military officials based in the region.
- Kabul has officially asked the US to use its influence on Pakistan to force it to re-demarcate the Durand Line.

⁷² Abid Ullah Jan.

⁷³ *America Feels Entangled in Durand Line Issue.*

Iran's Perceptions, Intentions, and Influence

The perceptions, intentions, and influence of Iran in regards to Durand Line and other strategic issues can be observed from the text mentioned below:^{74 75 76}

- Iran will seek other ways to undermine the US position--for example, by improving their military capabilities relative to their neighbors and by using what we call asymmetric means--ranging from the increased use of terrorism to developing weapons of mass destruction--in order to subvert or intimidate US allies, undermine the confidence of US friends and allies in US military presence, and eventually expel US from the region.
- Iran does not want any forces to come to the bordering area, which can create problems for Iran.
- Iran is concerned about Herat [in Afghanistan] and the surrounding region.
- Iran has enjoyed traditionally good relations with the Northern Alliance [of Afghanistan].
- Iran has said that the Northern Alliance has a military wing while Karzai's influence is limited to Kabul, Kandahar, and a few big cities.
- Karzai's influences in the cities are dependent on the presence of the US and foreign forces; even Karzai's security system is in the hands of the US.
- Iran complains that Pakistan had been supporting the Taliban. That is why they look at Pakistan with suspicion. That is also why they want to reduce the Pakistani influence in Afghanistan.
- Iran, like Russia, has an abiding interest in Afghanistan and that is to prevent Pakistan from getting access, and facilitating the American right of entry, to the oil deposits of the Caspian Sea.
- Iran supports the Shia Hazaras and is not happy at the idea of a Sunni government in Kabul.
- Iran would not be too displeased if there is continuing instability in Afghanistan, because that would lessen the attraction of an oil pipeline, to transport the Caspian Sea crude, through Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- Iranian interests are purely economical and such; Iran is an interested party and does not wish to be absent from participating in any discussions debating the future of Afghanistan.

⁷⁴ *Statement by Acting Director of Central Intelligence Agency George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Hearing on current and projected National Security Threats to the US, 5 February 1997*, [Online information]; available from http://www.fas.org/irp/cia/product/dci_testimony_020597.html; Internet; accessed 1 January 2006.

⁷⁵ *Pakistan: Foreign Policy Experts Criticize Change in Pakistan's Afghan Policy*.

⁷⁶ F.R. Khan, *A Decision to Regret*, 21 October 2001, A report made available from a friend of the author on 2 January 2006.

Legal Examination of the Dispute in relation to the International Law

To examine whether the Afghan denouncement of Durand Line through its Parliament in 1949 and its present stance is within the legal boundaries of international law—Vienna Convention on Law of Treaties—one needs to answer the question of whether “The Convention is applicable to the Durand Line treaty?” and if YES, then whether “Afghanistan can get out of the treaty?”

The Convention in its Article 2.1 (a), (b), and (d) clearly indicates that “treaty” means an international agreement concluded between States in written form and governed by international law, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation; “ratification”, “acceptance”, “approval” and “accession” mean in each case the international act so named whereby a State establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty; and “reservation” means a unilateral statement, however phrased or named, made by a State, when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty, whereby it purports to exclude or to modify the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty in their application to that State.⁷⁷

If the above-mentioned is the definition of “treaty” and its bounding elements, then it can be very well stated that Afghanistan had made a treaty with the British Colonial India, wherein there was no indication of any reservations in the part of both the parties, and above all it was a written agreement as required to legalize in accordance with the Article 3, 11 and 12 of the Convention.⁷⁸ But again, can a treaty made before the existence of the Convention, be binded by the international law? In pretext of the “natural theory of law,” no punishment can be given by making a new law—the new law can only be applicable to “the actions” only after the

⁷⁷ *Vienna Convention on Law of Treaties*, [Online information]; available from <http://members.yline.com/~waltergehr/trea/wvkengl.html>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

implementation. So is it in accordance to the “natural theory of law” to bind Afghanistan with the Convention which came many years later after the Durand Line treaty? This is something for the international jurists to probe into, which is basically not the main thrust of this paper.

On the other hand, if one considers Afghanistan binded by the Convention—by whatsoever reason the learned jurists can come to—it can still be stated that as the 1893 Durand Line treaty has not been amended nor modified in the years to come to obtain the continuity of the legal status, as reflected in the Part IV of the Convention that deals with “Amendment and modification of treaties,” it can be considered void after 1993.⁷⁹ In this relations, the opinion seems to be divided—some jurists state that when a treaty is silent on its duration Afghanistan has no right to denounce the treaty; whereas, others state that just because the duration is not stated it does not mean that the right is thereby taken away--in their opinion, it exists under customary international law in any case.

The jurists of the later opinion take Article 62 of the Convention—that deals with the principle of *rebus sic stantibus* or change of circumstances which unambiguously states that this factor cannot be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty establishing a boundary—to conclude that Afghanistan is not entitled under international law to denounce or withdraw from the Durand Agreement as it has no validity in international law.⁸⁰ But, the author wants to indicate the 100 year period mentioned for the treaty to stay in force, if this is so, either the treaty had to be revived or ratified during and before the completion of 100 years (1993 AD) or in plain terms it can be understood as being void.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

A different mode of analysis of whether Afghanistan can void the treaty can be conducted by taking into account the Part V of the Convention that reflects the ways a State can invalidate, terminate and suspend the operations of a treaty:⁸¹

- a) Article 49, if Afghanistan induced to conclude a treaty by the fraudulent conduct of British Colonial India;

[Author's Comment: The history indicates that the treaty was made in English for Abdur Rahaman and Mortimer Durand to sign, wherein it is found that Abdur Rahaman did not understand English.]

- b) Article 50, if the expression of Afghanistan for the treaty's consent was procured through the corruption of its representative directly or indirectly negotiating with the British Colonial India;

[Author's Comment: The history indicates that "financial subsidies" to be given to Abdur Rahaman by the British is mentioned in the treaty, not to mention how much more or who else did receive further "subsidies".]

- c) Article 51, if the expression of Afghanistan's consent to be bound by a treaty was procured by the coercion of its representative through acts or threats directed against them by the British Colonial India;

[Author's Comment: The elements of coercion do exist during the period because of the ongoing disputes, wars, and also since the British Colonial Indian power was in its peak.]

- d) Article 52, the Durand Line treaty would be void if its conclusion was procured by the threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the UN;

[Author's Comment: The UN Charter was not in existence during the period, and no ratifications of the treaty have been done in the years ahead.]

- e) Article 53, Durand Line treaty would be void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicted with a peremptory norm of general international law;

[Author's Comment: Dividing a country from the basic access to the sea because of geo-political influence and interference in the internal and foreign policy matters of a sovereign Afghanistan during the period of the treaty can be considered as violation of the general international law.]

⁸¹ Ibid.

- f) Article 54, if both parties terminate or withdraw the provisions;
- [Author's Comment: There is presently no existence of British Colonial India; and also in the past no such termination has occurred.]
- g) Article 59, if there is a later treaty related to Durand Line;
- [Author's Comment: No further treaties or ratifications have been made in regards to the Durand Line.]
- h) Article 60, if Durand Line treaty was breached;
- [Author's Comment: The land obtained through the Durand Line treaty between Afghanistan and British Colonial India was later handed over through a "said to be referendum" to Pakistan after its independence.]
- i) Article 62, fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty unless, the existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty, and the effect of the change is radically to transform the extent of obligations still to be performed under the treaty. But, a fundamental change of circumstances may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty, if the treaty establishes a boundary or if the fundamental change is the result of a breach by the party invoking it either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.
- [Author's Comment: The treaty was for the period of 100 years, but was not ratified for its continuity. But since the Article 62 speaks about "boundary treaties may not be invoked," the author recommends that the International Court of Justice has now to be engaged to clarify so that the dispute can be settled.]

On the another hand, wherein Afghanistan is suggesting that Afghanistan and India can terminate the Durand Line treaty, it can be stated that nor can it be terminated by Afghanistan acting alone or together with India because the latter is not a successor to British India in relation to the treaty in question; only Pakistan and Afghanistan can do so through mutual consent. This then indicates the root cause of the dispute in hand of one trying to void the treaty while the other

trying to retain its legality—but the time has come for taking this matter to the International Court of Justice to conclude two aspects. First, whether the Durand Line treaty can be binded by the Convention which came years later, if “Yes,” can the treaty be considered as void because of the breaches or does it have a legal status?

Analysis on Overview of Durand Line—Problems Identified

The intent of this portion is to present the analysis of the in-depth study conducted in regards to the section “Overview of Durand Line.” When the available information about the history and importance of the Durand Line, and the perceptions, intention and objectives of Afghanistan, Iran, India, Pakistan, and US is analyzed, one can state the following problems:

- History indicates that the Durand Line is a strategic political game implemented by the British, wherein they wanted to influence or control the Afghan foreign policy.
- The Durand Line made Afghanistan a landlocked country, divided the Pashtuns, tribes, and villages.
- Due to Durand Line, heavy uprising, fighting, and propaganda campaign have been conducted from both ends—Pakistan and Afghanistan—not to mention the involvement of India, Iran, and US.
- In the context of Afghanistan, there are two views generating—one from the Pashtuns, while other from the ethnic minorities (former Northern Alliance). Pashtuns want to regain the land Afghanistan has lost due to the Durand line; whereas, the ethnic minorities, who fear Pashtun domination, want the present status quo to continue or the Durand Line to become the permanent border so that this will keep-away the reunification of Pashtuns. The present President of Afghanistan, Mr. Karzai has rejected the Pakistani President Musaraf’s idea of building fence on the border, stating that they first of all want the border dispute to be properly decided and delineated. In this relation, Afghanistan is asking US to renegotiate the border issue with Pakistan.
- In the context of India, a strong thinking exists that it is a matter of time after which the Afghans would move to get what they have lost. India also sees the Pakistan-Afghanistan relation as anti-secular and anti-Indian strategy, wherein Pakistan wants to preserve its doctrine of “strategic depth” and to safeguard its military hardware from the offensive capabilities of India. Moreover, India sees Pakistan as doing its best to have a pro-Pakistani government in Afghanistan; this is being countered by the Indians by using the friendly elements within Afghanistan to put pressure on Pakistan. India further sees the existence of Duran

Line as ceased as that of 1993; wherein it smells rat in the involvement of US in this issue.

- In the context of Pakistan, President Musarraf has called for building fence along the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan stating that the Durand Line is a settled issue. Pakistan considers Durand Line as a threat to its doctrine of 'strategic depth,' and further states that India is influencing Afghanistan in this issue through the Northern Alliance and friendly elements within Afghanistan. Pakistan government has also seen that if the Durand Line issue is not resolved, the votes of Pashtun-nationalist will be lost, as it did in 2002 elections. On another hand, Pakistan does not want to see a peaceful, stable and strong Afghanistan, as it would lead to the reclaiming of the land within the Durand Line. Taking all these into consideration, Pakistan has been requesting US to influence Afghanistan to accept the Durand Line as the boundary between the two countries.
- In the context of Iran, the views are different. Iran doesn't want US intervention and thinks that the present Karzai government does not have a hold of the country. Iran has good relation with the Northern Alliance and considers Pakistanis as the problem because of their role in supporting the Talibans. Moreover, Iran is using all its assets to reduce the influence of Pakistan in Afghanistan, wherein Iran supports Sia Hazaras and does not like the idea of Sunni government in Kabul. Above all, Iran would not be displeased to have an instable Afghanistan as this would lead to strengthen Iranian interest of oil-pipe diplomacy. Similarly, Iran doesn't want to be left aloof from any discussion in regards to Afghanistan.
- In regards to the US, the Bush administration wants a firm border. US think that the Durand Line is fully legal international boundary. Though US is embroiled in this dispute, it does not have the expertise or desire to resolve it. But to solve the issue of border dispute between Afghanistan and Pakistan, the US has formed a tripartite Commission—including Afghanistan, Pakistan and US—wherein it has stated clearly that US does not want to renegotiate the 100-year old deal.
- In regards to the legal standing in accordance to the Vienna Convention on Law of Treaties, one can say that it is high time that the International Court of Justice be involved to conclude the legal standing—does the Durand Line treaty be considered as binded by the Convention that came years later? If "Yes," have there been any breaches to consider the treaty as void or does the treaty still maintain a legal status quo. In the view of the author, since 100 years has elapsed and also because there are indications of breaches in relation to the Convention, the treaty "may be considered as void," until unless stated otherwise by a competent court—in this case the International Court of Justice.

US INTEREST

This section provides sufficient details to indicate how the US National Interest guides the *US National Security Strategy* in the international arena—the ultimate objective being to safeguard the continental US from the ongoing or possible future threats. In addition, it will outline how the US Interest towards Afghanistan is guided by the elements of the national interest and strategy, wherein the mission of the US Embassy in Afghanistan is to assist the country's development as a stable, independent and democratic nation, which can contribute positively to regional stability. To achieve these objectives, further explanation has been provided on the different types of US assistance that is being provided to Afghanistan, in concurrence with the main strategy, so that at a later stage during assessing the threat scenario it would be easier for the LAMP paper to verify if the US Interest is under stake due to Afghanistan being involved in the Durand Line issue; and if it is, what are the consequences?

US National Interest

US National Interest can be termed as the interest beyond the shores of continental US. The *Commission on National Interest* recognized that there are a hierarchy of national interests, with "vital" being the most important: "The *vital national interest of the US* is to continue to exist and to maintain intact the political institutions that protect the freedoms and lives of its citizens; these are the interests for which the nation would be willing to spill American blood and spend vast amounts of its treasure, even if no one else in the world thought it is a good idea and

is willing to join the cause.”⁸² The Commission identified five *vital national interests of US*, based on which national security strategies are made:⁸³

1. To prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical attacks on the US;
2. To prevent the emergence of a hostile dominating power or group of powers abroad;
3. To prevent the emergence of a hostile power on US borders or in control of the seas nearby;
4. To prevent the catastrophic collapse of major global systems, including trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, the environment; and
5. To ensure the survival of US allies.

US National Security Strategy

Based on the vital national interests, the *US National Security Strategy* of September 2002, which is based on three pillars--defending the peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes, preserving the peace by fostering an era of good relations among the world's great powers, and extending the peace by seeking to extend the benefits of freedom and prosperity across the globe--has been outlined with distinct clear goals of political and economic freedom, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity.⁸⁴ This strategy allows US to use the unparalleled strength and influence to create a balance of power that favors freedom; as the President says in the cover letter: we seek to create the "conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and

⁸² James A. Thomson, Chief Executive Officer of RAND, *To Provide for the Common Defense: Issues in Technology and Defense Strategy for Future National Security*, 5 February 1997, [Online information]; available from <http://www.ciaonet.org/book/ras01/ras01be.html>; Internet; accessed 5 January 2006.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ *Dr. Condoleezza Rice Discusses President's National Security Strategy*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021001-6.html>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

challenges of political and economic liberty.” To achieve these goals, the US conducts the following activities:^{85 86}

1. Champions aspirations for human dignity—

America stands firmly for the non-negotiable demands of human dignity--the rule of law, limits on the absolute power of the state, free speech, freedom of worship, equal justice, respect for women, religious and ethnic tolerance, and respect for private property. To gain these attributes, the US speaks out honestly about violations of the non-negotiable demands of human dignity using US voice and vote in international institutions to advance freedom; use US foreign aid to promote freedom and support those who struggle non-violently for it, ensuring that nations moving toward democracy are rewarded for the steps they take; make freedom and the development of democratic institutions key themes in US bilateral relations, seek solidarity and cooperation from other democracies while US press governments that deny human rights to move toward a better future; and take special efforts to promote freedom of religion and conscience and defend it from encroachment by repressive governments.

2. Strengthens alliances to defeat global terrorism and works to prevent attacks against the nation and friends--

The US makes no concessions to terrorist demands and strikes no deals with them, and does not make any distinction between terrorists and those who knowingly harbor or provide aid to them. To meet the objective, the US tries to disrupt, destroy, and disable terrorist organizations of global reach, not only she but also by coordinating efforts through regional partners. To meet the desired end-state, the US targets the terrorist organizations by: a) direct and continuous action using all the elements of national and international power, wherein the immediate action will be those terrorist organizations of global reach and any terrorist or state sponsor of terrorism which attempts to gain or use weapons of mass destruction or their precursors; b) defending the US, the American people, and [US] interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches [US] borders, wherein the US constantly strives to enlist the support of the international community but will not hesitate to act alone in self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists; and c) denying further sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists by convincing or compelling states to accept their sovereign responsibilities, wherein US also uses war of ideas to win the battle against international terrorism through influence, support, focus, and effective diplomacy.

⁸⁵ *The National Security Strategy of United States of America: Overview of America's International Security*, [Online Information]; available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss1.html>; Internet; accessed 5 January 2006.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

3. Works with others to defuse regional conflicts--

To avoid disputes to escalate, minimize human suffering, and stabilize the faltering states the US works with friends and partners to alleviate suffering and restore stability. To meet the global objectives, the US uses actions—direct or indirect—as required through political, economic, and military resources.

4. Prevents enemies from threatening US, allies, and friends, with weapons of mass destruction--

To combat the new threat of weapons of mass destruction from rogue states and terrorists, the US strategy includes—a) *Proactive counter proliferation efforts*, wherein the US deter and defend against the threat before it is unleashed; b) *Strengthened nonproliferation efforts to prevent rogue states and terrorists from acquiring the materials, technologies, and expertise necessary for weapons of mass destruction*, wherein US enhances diplomacy, arms control, multilateral export controls, and threat reduction assistance that impede states and terrorists seeking WMD, and when necessary, interdict enabling technologies and materials; c) *Effective consequence management to respond to the effects of WMD use, whether by terrorists or hostile states*, wherein minimizing the effects of WMD use against people will help deter those who possess such weapons, dissuade those who seek to acquire them by persuading enemies that they cannot attain their desired ends, and prepares US to respond to the effects of WMD use against US forces abroad, and to help friends and allies if they are attacked.

5. Ignites a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade--

US promotes economic growth and economic freedom beyond America's shores by the use of the strategy of economic engagement with other countries to underscore the benefits of policies that generate higher productivity and sustained economic growth, including--a) pro-growth legal and regulatory policies to encourage business investment, innovation, and entrepreneurial activity; b) tax policies, particularly lower marginal tax rates, that improve incentives for work and investment; c) rule of law and intolerance of corruption so that people are confident that they will be able to enjoy the fruits of their economic endeavors; d) strong financial systems that allow capital to be put to its most efficient use; e) sound fiscal policies to support business activity; f) investments in health and education that improve the well-being and skills of the labor force and population as a whole; and g) free trade that provides new avenues for growth and fosters the diffusion of technologies and ideas that increase productivity and opportunity.

6. Expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy--

Where governments have implemented real policy changes, the US provides significant new levels of assistance. The US pursues to--a) Provide resources to

aid countries that have met the challenge of national reform; b) Improve the effectiveness of the World Bank and other development banks in raising living standards; c) Insist upon measurable results to ensure that development assistance is actually making a difference in the lives of the world's poor; d) Increase the amount of development assistance that is provided in the form of grants instead of loans; e) Open societies to commerce and investment; f) Secure public health; g) Emphasize education; and h) Continue to aid agricultural development.

7. Develops agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power-

America implements its strategies by organizing coalitions of states able and willing to promote a balance of power that favors freedom. Effective coalition leadership requires clear priorities, an appreciation of others' interests, and consistent consultations among partners with a spirit of humility.

8. Transforms America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century--

The major institutions of American national security were designed in a different era to meet different requirements. Therefore, US is transforming all its national security apparatus—a) US armed forces must be able to overcome a host of operational challenges by having overseas presence, handling contingencies, using modern approaches to war so that US can assure allies and friends, dissuade future military competition, deter threats against US interests and friends, and decisively defeat any adversary if deterrence fails; b) Intelligence Community must build new capabilities to handle the new and emerging threat, be appropriately integrated with US defense and law enforcement systems and coordinated with allies and friends, protect the capabilities, strengthen intelligence warning and analysis to provide integrated threat assessments for national and homeland security, and ensure the proper fusion of information between intelligence and law enforcement; c) To strengthen the diplomacy, the Department of State must strengthen its role of reaching out to other countries for better relations and forwarding the public information efforts that can help people around the world learn about and understand America; d) Ensure that the [US] efforts to meet global security commitments and protect Americans are not impaired by the potential for investigations, inquiry, or prosecution by the International Criminal Court, whose jurisdiction does not extend to Americas; e) Ensure the right level and allocation of government spending on national security; f) US will adjust to and thrive on the new condition of life which has become vulnerable to terrorism. g) In exercising leadership, the US will respect the values, judgment, and interests of friends and partners, wherein the US will not allow the disagreements to obscure the US determination to secure together; and h) The strength of the national security of the [US] begins within the country--it is in the skills of [US] people, the dynamism of [US] economy, and the resilience of [US] institutions.

Supplements of US National Security Strategy

The Bush Administration's supplement to its *National Security Strategy* that relates to the core study area of this paper has been elaborated below for further understanding:

1. US National Strategy for Homeland Security-

The US National Strategy for Homeland Security of July 2002 is targeted towards mobilizing and organizing [US] to secure the homeland from terrorist attacks. This Strategy defines "homeland security" and identifies a strategic framework based on three national objectives. In order of priority, these are: (1) preventing terrorist attacks within the US, (2) reducing America's vulnerability to terrorism, and (3) minimizing the damage and recovering from attacks that do occur. To attain these objectives, this Strategy aligns [US] homeland security efforts into six critical mission areas: intelligence and warning, border and transportation security, domestic counterterrorism, protecting critical infrastructures and key assets, defending against catastrophic terrorism, and emergency preparedness and response.⁸⁷

2. US Counterterrorism Strategy (US National Strategy for Combating Terrorism)-

The US Counterterrorism Strategy released by the National Security Council (NSC) on 14 February 2003, calls for frequent and relentless strikes against terrorists and can be considered as a tool to enhance the National Security through which the terrorist organizations can be disputed, degraded and ultimately destroyed. The intent of the strategy is to stop terrorist attacks--by defeating terrorists and their organizations; denying sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists; diminishing the underlying conditions the terrorists seek to exploit, and defending US citizens, its interests and friends and allies--around the world and ultimately create an international environment inhospitable to terrorists and all those who support them.⁸⁸

3. US National Strategy for Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction-

There are three pillars of the US National Strategy for Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) of December 2002 are—Counter proliferation to Combat WMD use, Strengthen Nonproliferation to Combat WMD Proliferation, and Consequence Management to respond to WMD use. To integrate the three pillars, the enabling functions—improved intelligence collection and analysis,

⁸⁷ *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, [Online information]; available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

⁸⁸ *US National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030214-7.html - 29.9KB>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

research and development, strengthening international cooperation, and targeted strategies against proliferates—play a critical role.⁸⁹

4. US National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace-

The US National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace of February 2003 is an implementing component of the *National Strategy for Homeland Security* and is complemented by a *National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets*. The objectives of this Strategy are to: a) Prevent cyber attacks against America's critical infrastructures; b) Reduce national vulnerability to cyber attacks; and c) Minimize damage and recovery time from cyber attacks that do occur. Similarly, this Strategy articulates five national priorities including: a) A National Cyberspace Security Response System; b) A National Cyberspace Security Threat and Vulnerability Reduction Program; c) A National Cyberspace Security Awareness and Training Program; d) Securing Governments' Cyberspace; and e) National Security and International Cyberspace Security Cooperation.⁹⁰

5. US National Strategy for Protecting Critical Infrastructures-

The National Strategy of Homeland Security categorizes critical infrastructure as agriculture, food, water, public health, emergency services, government, defense industrial base, information and technology, energy, transportation, banking and finance, chemical industry and hazardous materials, and postal and shipping. Likewise, Key Assets represent individual targets whose destruction could cause large-scale injury, death, or destruction of property, and/or profoundly damage [US] national prestige, and confidence--includes such facilities as nuclear power plants, dams, and hazardous materials storage facilities, assets of symbolic value and attractions.

In this relation, the US National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructure and Key Assts of February 2003 is the strategy that identifies a clear set of national goals and objectives and outlines the guiding principles that will underpin [US] efforts to secure the infrastructures and assets vital to [US] national security, governance, public health and safety, economy, and public confidence. This *Strategy* also provides a unifying organization and identifies specific initiatives to drive [US] near-term national protection priorities and inform the resource allocation process. Most importantly, it establishes a foundation for building and fostering the cooperative environment in which government, industry, and private citizens can carry out their respective protection responsibilities more effectively and efficiently. There are eight guiding principles underpin this *Strategy*: a) Assure public safety, public confidence, and services; b) Establish responsibility and accountability; c) Encourage and facilitate partnering among all levels of government and between government and industry; d)

⁸⁹ *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*, [Online Information]; available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/WMDStrategy.pdf>; Internet; accessed 27 December 2005.

⁹⁰ *US National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace*, [Online Information]; available from www.whitehouse.gov/pcipb/cyberspace_strategy.pdf; Internet; accessed 27 December 2005.

Encourage market solutions wherever possible and compensate for market failure with focused government intervention; e) Facilitate meaningful information sharing; f) Foster international cooperation; g) Develop technologies and expertise to combat terrorist threats; and h) Safeguard privacy and constitutional freedoms.⁹¹

6. US National Strategy for Maritime Security-

The US National Strategy for Maritime Security of September 2005 is focused upon the secure use of the world's ocean for the safety and economic security of the US. This Strategy aligns all Federal government maritime security programs and initiatives into a comprehensive and cohesive national effort involving appropriate Federal, State, local, and private sector entities for a comprehensive national effort to promote global economic stability and protect legitimate activities while preventing hostile or illegal acts within the maritime domain. In addition to this Strategy, the Departments have developed eight supporting plans to address the specific threats and challenges of the maritime environment: a) National Plan to Achieve Domain Awareness; b) Global Maritime Intelligence Integration Plan; c) Interim Maritime Operational Threat Response Plan; d) International Outreach and Coordination Strategy; e) Maritime Infrastructure Recovery Plan; f) Maritime Transportation System Security Plan; g) Maritime Commerce Security Plan; and h) Domestic Outreach Plan.⁹²

7. US Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement-

The US National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement of 1995 offers a bold vision to national defense from the emerging realities. In other words, the US military is required not only to protect the US and its citizens from direct threats, but also to help maintain peace and stability in regions critical to US interests by preparing itself to conduct the following types of operations as indicated in the National Security Strategy.⁹³

i) Deter and Defeat Aggression in Major Regional Conflicts—

To deter and defeat aggression in major regional conflicts, the US forces must be capable of offsetting the military power of regional states with interests opposed to those of the US and its allies. To do this, the US by itself or in concert with regional allies, be able to project and sustain US power in two major regional conflicts that occur nearly simultaneously.

⁹¹ *US National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets*, [Online Information]; available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/pcipb/physical_strategy.pdf; Internet; accessed 27 December 2005.

⁹² *US National Strategy for Maritime Security*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/maritime-security.html>; Internet; accessed 27 December 2005.

⁹³ *Maintaining Military Advantage Through Science and Technology Investment, A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, 1995 [Online article]; available from <http://www.ostp.gov/html/nssts/html/chapt2.html>; Internet; accessed 27 December 2005.

ii) Provide Credible Overseas Presence—

Some US forces must be forwardly deployed or stationed in key overseas regions in peacetime. These deployments contribute to a more stable and secure international environment by demonstrating US commitment, deterring aggression, and underwriting important bilateral and multilateral security relationships. Forward stationing and periodic deployments also permit US forces to gain familiarity with overseas operating environments, promote joint and combined training among friendly forces, improve interoperability with friendly forces throughout the world, and respond in a timely manner to crises.

iii) Conduct Contingency Operations—

The US must be prepared to undertake a wide range of contingency operations in support of US interests. These operations include smaller-scale combat operations, multilateral peace operations, noncombatant evacuations, counter-terrorism activities, and humanitarian and disaster relief operations.

iv) Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction—

While the US is redoubling its efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and associated missile delivery systems, it must at the same time improve the military capabilities to deter and prevent the effective use of these weapons. For this, the pursuance of measures like--sustaining adequate retaliatory capabilities and increasing the capabilities to defend against weapons of mass destruction, to locate and neutralize or destroy them before they are used during a conflict, and to fight in an environment in which such weapons have been used--is the utmost necessity.

US International Strategy

Guided by the “vital national interests” and the “National Security Strategy,” the US has formulated its “International Strategy,” which is focused towards defeating the threats to the nation, allies, and friends. This strategy caters:⁹⁴

- to promote balance of power that favors freedom;
- to defeat the threats of “failing states;” and
- to defeat catastrophic technologies in the hands of embittered few.

⁹⁴ *The National Security Strategy of United States of America.*

The above strategy is in the broader global perspective; but, when one considers the Asia-Pacific region, it can be stated that US concerns in this area do exist due to--proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; missile technology; ethnic conflict; territorial disputes; threats of terrorism; international crime; drug trafficking; and potential for major war(s).⁹⁵ Therefore, the US continues to monitor carefully the developments, and prepares for contingencies so that peace and prosperity can be maintained in this region.

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)--US State Department Strategic Plan

As US enters the 21st century, the principal aims of Department of State and USAID are enrooted in the *President's National Security Strategy* and its three underlying and interdependent components--diplomacy, development, and defense.⁹⁶ In this relation, the USAID and US State Department has published a joint Strategic Development Goals for FY 2004-2009, which ensures that that diplomatic efforts (foreign policy) and development programs are fully aligned to advance the *President's National Security Strategy*, wherein their combined strengths will be centered on four strategic objectives: a) achieving peace and security (within this objective the strategic goals are—regional stability, counterterrorism, homeland security, weapons of mass destruction, international crime and drugs, and American citizens); b) advancing sustainable development and global interests (within this objective the strategic goals are democracy and human rights, economic prosperity and security, social and environmental issues, and humanitarian responses); c) promoting international understanding (within this

⁹⁵ Andrew Scobell and Larry M. Wortzel, *The Asia-Pacific in the US National Security Calculus for a New Millenium*, March 2000, [Online information]; available from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/PUB71.pdf>; Internet; accessed 2 January 2006.

⁹⁶ *USAID Policy*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/>; Internet; accessed 2 January 2006.

objective the strategic goals is public diplomacy and public affairs), and d) strengthening diplomatic and program capabilities (within this objective the strategic goal is management and organizational excellence).⁹⁷

In meeting the strategic objectives and interrelated goals, the Department and USAID are committed to protect US national interests and advance peace, security, and sustainable development. While they apply these principles globally, they state that the focus will be on the following key priorities during the timeframe of the plan: a) Arab-Israeli Peace; b) A stable and democratic Iraq; c) Democracy and economic freedom in the Muslim world; d) A stable and democratic Afghanistan; e) Reduction of the North Korean threat to the region and world; f) Reduction of tensions between India and Pakistan g) Drug eradication and democracy in the Andean region; h) Strengthened alliances and partnerships; i) A more effective and accountable United Nations (UN); j) HIV/AIDS Prevention, treatment and care; k) Reduced threat of famine; l) Accountable development assistance; and m) Aligning diplomacy and development assistance.⁹⁸

US Interest in Afghanistan

The US Interest in Afghanistan is a small portion that falls under the greater spectrum of the US National Interest. To elaborate this topic of high value, it can be stated that the US Interest in Afghanistan can be best categorized within the under-mentioned three groups that are based on the gravity of the Interest:

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ *US State Department and USAID Strategic Plan 2004-2009*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/>; Internet; accessed 2 January 2006.

1. Overt US Interests in Afghanistan-

- Stable and democratic Afghanistan
- Representative democracy
- Improved quality of life

To achieve the above overt US Interests in Afghanistan so that peace and stability is acquired, it is stated in the US strategy that the US State Department, USAID and international donors will require a continued commitment to four objectives: a) Afghanistan must establish internal and external security to ensure economic reconstruction, political stability, and stem the rise in opium production; b) US must work to establish a stable, effective, and broadly representative central government; c) Economic development must bolster this new government and reduce dependence on donors; and d) US must help the people of Afghanistan meet their critical humanitarian needs while reconstruction proceeds.⁹⁹

2. Covert US Interests in Afghanistan-

- Oil
- Anti-communism
- Dominance within the region

Afghanistan has long had a key place in US plans to secure control of the vast but landlocked oil and gas reserves of Central Asia. In the case of the great natural gas and oil fields of Turkmenistan, immediately north of Afghanistan, the US government has for a decade strongly supported plans by US-led business groups for both an oil pipeline from Turkmenistan to the Arabian Sea via Afghanistan and a gas pipeline from Turkmenistan across Afghanistan to Pakistan. Such pipelines would serve important US interests: a) drawing the Central Asian oil states away from the Russian sphere of influence and establishing the foundation for a strong US position; b) thwarting the development of Iranian regional influence by limiting Turkmenistan-Iranian gas links and thwarting a plan for a Turkmenistan-Iran oil pipeline to the Arabian Sea; c) diversify US sources of oil and gas, and, by increasing production sources, help keep prices low; d) benefiting US oil and construction companies with growing interests in the region; and e) providing a basis for much-needed economic prosperity in the region, which might provide a basis for political stability.¹⁰⁰

When a pro-Soviet regime came to power in Afghanistan through a popular uprising, the US immediately tried to destabilize it and allied itself

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Richard Tanter, *Pipeline Politics: Oil, gas and the US interest in Afghanistan*, [Online report]; available from <http://www.zmag.org/tanteroil.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

with right-wingers in the Taliban who violently opposed the government's plan to educate *all* women and girls and to outlaw child marriages. Still today, the Taliban exists both because the US *directly* helped create it and because capitalism gave rise to the economic and political conditions which fueled religious fundamentalism in the area.¹⁰¹

3. Strategic Development Interest in Afghanistan-

On 1 December 2005, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Government of the United States of America signed a Memorandum of Understanding on four Strategic Objective Grant Agreements (US Government has committed USD 479.6 million for this year, whereas Afghan government has contributed USD 199.2 million).¹⁰² The five-year Strategic Development Plan, which is jointly formulated by the US State Department and the USAID, has the following Strategic Objectives based on the mixture of overt and covert US Interests within Afghanistan;

- Better educated and healthier population,
- Thriving economy led by private sector,
- Democratic government with broad citizen participation, and
- Program support for each of the other objectives (includes expanding activities to the provinces, ICT and communications, women's issues, internally displaced persons, capacity building and work with demobilized ex-combatants).

US Mission to Afghanistan and its Policy

The management relationship of US with Afghan government and the people of the country is called diplomacy, which is vital to the US Interest in that it is the way in which the State Department formulates, implements, and represents to Afghanistan the foreign policy goals of the President. In this regards, the State Department through the US Embassy in Afghanistan caters to fulfill the four main foreign policy goals—protect the US and its citizens; advance democracy, human rights, and other global interests; promote international understanding of

¹⁰¹ Freedom Socialist Party Australia, *No to the War on Afghanistan!* 22 October 2001, [Online information from FSP International Executive Committee statement on the war]; available from <http://www.socialism.com/currents/iestatement.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹⁰² US Embassy Afghanistan, *Press Release 2005*, [Online information]; available from http://kabul.usembassy.gov/agreement_120105.html; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

American values and policies; and support US diplomats, government officials and all other personnel at home and abroad who makes these goals a reality.¹⁰³ To fulfill these goals, the State Department has the authority to negotiate and conclude agreements and treaties, coordinate and support activities of other US agencies, host official visits and leads interagency coordination and manages the allocation of resources for foreign relations. In this venture, State Department uses diplomacy to keep local conflicts from becoming wider wars that may harm US interests; it supports the developing democracy in Afghanistan. To summarize, one can say that the Ambassador and the US Embassy team uses diplomacy to—prevent war; keep dangerous weapons out of dangerous hands; advance democracy, human rights, and the rule of law; open up economic opportunities for Americans; fight terrorism; keep drugs out of the US; promote the safety of Americans abroad; combat poverty; help refugees; create a healthier Afghanistan and the world; and pursue US interests at the United Nations.¹⁰⁴

The first US Minister to Afghanistan, Mr. William H. Hornibrook resident at Tehran [Iran], presented Credentials on 4 May 1935 as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary. On 6 June 1942, Legation Kabul was opened, wherein Charles W. Thayer was appointed as Charge d’Affaires, a.i. Then after, only on 6 May 1948, the Legation was elevated to Embassy status where Ely E. Palmer was appointed as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. After operating for years, on 30 January 1989, the US Embassy in Kabul was closed due to the conflict situation; opening again as a US Liaison Office on 17 December 2001 after the fall of the Taliban. After recognizing the Interim Authority of Afghanistan on 22 December 2001, Mr. Ryan Crocker was appointed Charge d’Affaires, a.i. on 2 January 2002.

¹⁰³ Bureau of Public Affairs, US Department of State, *Diplomacy: The US Department of State at Work*, 25 May 2005 Report.

¹⁰⁴ *Diplomacy at Work: A US Embassy*, [Online information]; available from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/c6177.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

After this, smooth change of Ambassadors have occurred—Mr. Robert Patrick John Finn was the Ambassador from 3 April 2002 to 1 August 2003, Dr. Zalmay Khalizad from 24 November 2003 to 20 June 2005, and at present Mr. Ronald E. Neuman has taken over the charge.¹⁰⁵

US Assistance to Afghanistan

The US has been providing assistance to Afghan people since very long. The first extensive American contact with Afghanistan was made by Josiah Harlan, an adventurer from Pennsylvania who was an adviser in Afghan politics in the 1830s and reputedly inspired Rudyard Kipling's story "The Man Who Would be King."¹⁰⁶ From 1950 to 1979, US foreign assistance provided Afghanistan with more than US dollar 500 million in loans, grants, and surplus agricultural commodities to develop transportation facilities, increase agricultural production, expand the educational system, stimulate industry, and improve government administration.¹⁰⁷ In February 1979, US Ambassador Adolph "Spike" Dubs was murdered in Kabul after Afghan security forces burst in on his kidnapers, which resulted in a reduced bilateral assistance and terminated a small military training program--all remaining assistance agreements were ended after the December 1979 Soviet invasion.¹⁰⁸

During the period of Soviet occupation, the US provided about US dollar 3 billion in military and economic assistance to Afghans and the resistance movement.¹⁰⁹ In 1985, the US

¹⁰⁵ *US Embassy Afghanistan*, [Online information on US Embassy Afghanistan website]; available from <http://kabul.usembassy.gov/>; Internet; accessed from December 2005 to February 2006.

¹⁰⁶ *US-Afghan Relations, Background Note: Afghanistan, December 2005*, [Online information from Bureau of South Asian Affairs, US State Department]; available from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm#travel>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

began a cross-border aid program for Afghanistan, through which aid was distributed in Afghanistan, via US aid workers in Pakistan and Non-governmental Organizations (NGO).¹¹⁰

Immediately after the fall of Taliban, President Bush announced that humanitarian and reconstruction aid to the Afghan people would total to about US dollar 815 million for FY2002, which included Foreign Military Financing (FMF) funds devoted to the establishment and training of an Afghan National Army.¹¹¹

Similarly, in accordance to the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, a total of US dollar 3.47 billion was appropriated: a) US dollar 60 million in total counter-narcotics assistance for FY2003-Fy2006; b) US dollar 30 million in assistance for political development, including national, regional, and local elections for FY2003-2005; c) US dollar 80 million total to benefit women and for Afghan human rights oversight for FY2003-FY2006; d) US dollar 1.7 billion in humanitarian and development aid for Fy2003-FY2006; e) US dollar 300 million for an Enterprise Fund; f) US dollar 300 million in draw-downs of defense articles and services for Afghanistan and regional militaries; and f) US dollar 1 billion for FY2003-FY2004 to expand International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF) if such an expansion takes place.¹¹²

In the same way, the Bush Administration spent about US dollar 820 million for Afghan programs in FY2003. In addition, the Administration pledged Afghanistan additional US dollar 80 million for road reconstruction, as part of an international pledge of US dollar 180 million.¹¹³

For the FY 2004, US pledged around US dollar 2.8 billion including the supplemental fund--US dollar 150 million in FMF (for the Afghan National Army); US dollar 150 million for Defense Administration; US dollar 150 million in Economic Support Fund (ESF); US dollar 21

¹¹⁰ *Doing Business in Afghanistan, A Country Commercial Overview*, Fall 2004, [Online information]; available from http://kabul.usembassy.gov/business_afg.html; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid.

million for child survival programs; US dollar 40 million for counter-narcotics; US dollar 20 million for peacekeeping; US dollar 19 million for Anti-terrorism and demining; US dollar 600,000 for International Military Education and Training Funds (IMET); US dollar 395 million for humanitarian aid, reconstruction, road building, and other development projects; US dollar 4.5 million for Afghan Human Rights Commission; US dollar 2.5 million for the Afghan Judicial Reform Commission; US dollar 10 million for the Ministry of Women's Affairs; US dollar 2.5 million to compensate the families of accidental victims of US military operations in Afghanistan; US dollar 405 million for Afghanistan reconstruction and other assistance; US dollar 181 million for road projects, including completion of the Kabul-Kandahar-Herat major highway; US dollar 190 million for education programs and rehabilitation of the power generation infrastructure.¹¹⁴

Presently, the Afghanistan Reconstruction Group (ARG) at the US Embassy, Kabul, plays a key role in both defining and leading the Mission's response to that challenge. They represent a broad array of specialized, highly applicable skills acquired during their rise to top positions in manufacturing, transportation, law, finance, banking, education, health care, natural resources, privatizations, private sector development and agriculture sectors, and works closely with USAID, and all other Mission offices, as well as the Combined Forces Command (CFC) to conceive, shape and execute the most effective programs for the US contribution to the reconstruction effort underway in Afghanistan.¹¹⁵ The assistance can be seen funneling through: USAID, US Trade and Development Agency (USTDA), Afghan Investment and Reconstruction Task Force (AIRTF), etc.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

USAID has taken a leading role in Afghanistan's reconstruction effort, wherein it focuses on health clinics and basic health services, school construction and education programs, revitalizing agricultural through irrigation systems, farm-to-market roads, market centers, and better technology, and infrastructure, including the Kabul-Kandahar-Herat highway.¹¹⁶

Likewise, the USTDA, which advances economic development and US commercial interests in developing and middle-income countries, moved quickly to establish its program in Afghanistan--already has approved funding of about US dollar 5 million for activities in that country, especially projects in telecommunications, civil aviation, oil and gas, higher education, private sector development, and power.¹¹⁷

Similarly, to facilitate US company participation in the Afghanistan reconstruction effort, the US Department of Commerce created the Afghanistan Investment and Reconstruction Task Force (AIRTF) to support US private sector involvement in reconstruction and to contribute to US government efforts to promote bilateral trade and investment.¹¹⁸

According to the State Department fact sheet issued on 1 February 2006 during the London Conference on Afghanistan, the US is the leading donor to Afghanistan, committing increasing amounts of financial resources to Afghan reconstruction, including significant governance, reconstruction and security assistance.¹¹⁹ Prior to this issue, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice on 31 January had announced US dollar 1.1 billion in additional US aid to

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Conference on Afghanistan is a gathering of high-level government delegations and representatives from international organizations to chart the future of international engagement with Afghanistan. In this Conference, called Compact, more than 60 governments gathered in London to endorse Afghanistan's development plan for the coming five years. The Compact involves commitments to specific, achievable goals in security, governance, economic and social development and counter-narcotics. See, Phillip Kurata, *Afghanistan, international community announce new development plan*, [Online report from Washington File Staff Writer]; available from <http://usinfo.state.gov/sa/Archive/2006/Jan/31-20833.html>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2006.

support reconstruction in Afghanistan; this pledge adds to more than US dollar 10.3 billion in US security and reconstruction assistance to Afghanistan between FY2001 and FY 2006.¹²⁰

For sustainable growth, the US is launching an initiative called “Business Building Bridges,” a US dollar 500,000 grant from the US Trade and Development Agency, to foster the private sector of the Afghan economy.¹²¹ In other words, this initiative will strengthen the economic and commercial linkages between the US and Afghanistan, thus making the country attractive for foreign investment.¹²²

One another recent development indicates the US pledging to cancel all of the debt, approximately US dollar 108 million, owed to it by Afghanistan; the US thinks that this cancellation of debt will strongly contribute to the development of Afghanistan’s trade, investment, and other economic ties with its major creditors and with the rest of the world.¹²³

In addition to providing US foreign assistance, the US Treasury Department has unblocked over US dollar 145 million in assets of Afghan government-owned banking entities that were frozen under US sanctions imposed on the Taliban in 1999.¹²⁴ Between FY2002 and FY2003, the US agreed to provide US dollar 100 million in credit for US investment in Afghanistan, provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC).¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Philip Kurata, *United States Pledges \$1.1 Billion More for Afghan Reconstruction*, [Online information Washington File Staff Writer]; available from <http://usinfo.state.gov/sa/Archive/2006/Jan/31-20833.html>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2006.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Sean McCormack, *Debt Cancellation for Afghanistan*, 7 February 2006, [Online Press Statement of Spokesman, Washington DC]; available from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2006/60501.htm>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2006.

¹²⁴ *Doing Business in Afghanistan, A Country Commercial Overview*.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

Current and Projected US National Security Threats

As uncertainty is the main characteristics of today's strategic environment, prediction with precision is near to impossible. Still, one can very much state the emerging challenges that US faces as threat to its interest and national security are:¹²⁶

- The mature challenges;
 - Threat from failing states,
 - Several key states face basic decisions about their roles in global and regional politics, economics, and security, and the pace and direction of their own internal evolution. Over time, some rising powers may be able to threaten the US and partners directly, rival US in key areas of military and technological competition, or threaten US interests by pursuing dominance over key regions. In other cases, if adverse economic, political, and demographic trends continue, large capable states could become dangerously unstable and increasingly ungovernable, creating significant future challenges,
 - Problem states will continue to undermine regional stability and threaten US interests, and
 - The non-state actors like terrorists, insurgents, paramilitaries, and criminals will seek to undermine the legitimate governance of some states and to challenge the US and its interests.

- The exploitation of US vulnerabilities;
 - Capacity to address global security challenges alone is insufficient,
 - Some allies and partners will decide not to act together or will lack the capacity to act together,
 - US leading position in world affairs will continue to breed unease, a degree of resentment, and resistance,
 - US strength as a nation state will continue to be challenged by those who employ a strategy of the weak using international fora, judicial processes, and terrorism,
 - US and their allies will be the principal targets of extremism and terrorism, and
 - Natural forces of inertia and resistance to change will constrain military transformation.

¹²⁶ National Defense Strategy of the United States of America, [Online information from Global Security Org]; available from http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/nds-usa_mar2005_ib.htm; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

- US will contend the following particular challenges; and
 - Though US has no global peer, US will have competitors and enemies-state and non state,
 - Key international actors may choose strategic paths contrary to the interests of the US,
 - Crises related to political stability and governance will pose significant security challenges. Some of these may threaten fundamental interests of the US, requiring a military response, and
 - Internationally-even among the US closest partners-threats will be perceived differently, and consensus may be difficult to achieve.

- An array of traditional, irregular, catastrophic, and disruptive capabilities and methods.

On 5 February 1997, the Acting Director of CIA George J. Tenet gave a statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Hearing on Current and Projected National Security Threats to the US. The synopsis of the statement is given below for clarity:

After the Second World War, the political, military, and ideological challenges that threatened to undermine the hard fought victory and undercut the dreams of a more hopeful world have ended or receded. In their place, however, a far more complex situation that holds at least five critical challenges have evolved: 1) The continuing transformation of Russia and the evolution in China, and the roles each will play beyond their borders, 2) Those states--North Korea, Iran, Iraq--whose hostile policies can undermine regional stability, 3) Transnational issues that cut across nations and regions, which include terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international drug trafficking and the growth in international organized crime, and threats to [US] information systems, 4) Those regional hotspots--such as the Middle East, the South Asian subcontinent, Bosnia, and the Aegean--which carry a high potential for conflict, and 5) The states and regions buffeted by human misery and suffering on a large scale--states involved in, or unable to cope with, ethnic and civil conflict, forced migration, refugee flows, and the resulting potential for large scale deaths from disease and starvation.¹²⁷

¹²⁷ *Statement by Acting Director of Central Intelligence Agency George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Hearing on current and projected National Security Threats to the US, 5 February 1997, [Online information]; available from http://www.fas.org/irp/cia/product/dci_testimony_020597.html; Internet; accessed 1 January 2006.*

Possible Future Threats to US Interest in Afghanistan

Taking into account the fragile nature of Afghanistan the possible future threats to US interest in Afghanistan can be taken as or arising from:^{128 129 130 131 132 133}

- Press reports indicate that Umar has been meeting with Taliban commanders in an effort to reorganize and invigorate the Taliban's anti-US and anti-Afghan government combat operations;
- Despite the overwhelming defeat of the Taliban, small Taliban and Al Qaeda groups reportedly continue to operate throughout Afghanistan;
- Despite the optimistic statements from some US commanders, Taliban fighters show increased signs of regrouping in the south and east, and stepped up rocket and small arms attacks on US, Afghan, international security force, and international relief and reconstruction workers;
- Increased activities in bombing, suicide attacks, etc.
- Bin Laden is still on large on/near Afghan-Pakistan Border;
- Gulbuddin Hikmatyar has allied with and is trying to rally Taliban and Al Qaeda remnants against US forces and the Karzai government.
- The Bush Administration says that the Kabul government is slowly expanding its authority and its capabilities. However, the regional governors continue to exercise substantial power;
- Some Afghan officials are said to be skeptical of some aspects of the US plan, maintaining that this will remind Afghans of the Soviet "shadow ministers"

¹²⁸ Kenneth Katzman, *Afghanistan: Current issues and U.S. policy*, 5 January 2004, [Online information from Congressional Research Service]; available from http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=67db50d8a8c255abfb74de90d5b4e6e6&_docnum=2&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=8289e684e29af5d624f060394cc68445; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹²⁹ *Briefing, Remarks by Zalmay Khalizad*, US Ambassador to Afghanistan, 27 October 2004, [Online Information from SAIS Washington DC, State Department]; available from http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=8b76aa696e28beeda8fb6e9dfecfc236&_docnum=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=168b1a6188665784d5dc58c619615873; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹³⁰ *Hearing of the House International Relations Committee, United States Policy In Afghanistan*, of William B. Taylor, Coordinator For Afghanistan, Department Of State; Marybeth Long, Deputy Assistant Secretary For Counter narcotics, Department Of Defense; James Kunder, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau For Asia and The Near East, Agency For International Development; Charlotte Ponticelli, Senior Coordinator, Office of International Women's Issues, Department of State, at 2172 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 2 June 2004 [Online information]; available from http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=42e228a61453d765f14a390014a75083&_docnum=8&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=906eeae292d5800f21c4d72681ec6087; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹³¹ Ted Galen Carpenter, *How the Drug War in Afghanistan Undermines America's War on Terror*, 10 November 2004, [Online information from the Cato Institute in Washington DC, an eight-paged Foreign Policy Briefing Paper No. 84]; available from https://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2607; Internet; accessed 27 December 2005.

¹³² *Business in Afghanistan Warlordism, Reconstruction, and Ethnic Harmony*, April 2003 [Online Special Report 105 from United States Institute of Peace]; available from <http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr105.html>; Internet; accessed 15 December 2005.

¹³³ Kanchan Lakshman, *Afghanistan Pakistan: New "Great Game,"* 27 June 2005, [Online report from South Asian Intelligence Review, Volume 3, No. 50]; available from http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/sair/Archives/3_50.htm; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

that largely ran the Afghan government during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and will make Karzai appear beholden to the US;

- Fears of urban terrorism and instability in major cities have been present since the fall of the Taliban;
- A section of the House version of the regular FY2004 foreign aid authorization bill (H.R. 1950) calls on the Bush Administration to step up US efforts to ensure security in Afghanistan. The "findings" section of the provision asserts that the US-led reconstruction effort in Afghanistan is in jeopardy because of a lack of security throughout Afghanistan and the limited writ of the US-backed central government in Kabul;
- Some observers say that the new government is re-imposing some Islamic restrictions that characterized Taliban rule, including the code of criminal punishments stipulated in Islamic law;
- Afghanistan remains a conservative society, and many Afghans frown on women exercising substantial political and economic rights, limiting women's willingness and ability to participate in the full range of political and economic activities;
- A UN report, issued on 8 August 2003, said that about 500,000 Afghans are involved in Afghanistan's narcotics production and trafficking chain. On January 31, 2003, the Bush Administration determined that Afghanistan was a major drug transit or illicit drug producing country;
- Challenge of finishing the Taliban and other armed violent opposition;
- Challenge of opium market;
- Across the Afghan government and economy, there is a crisis of capacity;
- Challenge of building and strengthening the habits and institutions associated with democracy, both in government and society;
- The continuing influence of local commanders, more commonly known as warlords, undermines the ability of the central government to implement the rule of law;
- The most disturbing for the long term future of the country is the lack of security and international funding for reconstruction, which have severely impeded the development of moderate political forces, successful voter registration efforts, and serious disarmament demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants;
- The narcotics industry benefits extremist and terrorist groups, including the Taliban, the Hezb-i-Islami Gulbuddin, commonly known as the HIG, and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, sometimes referred to as the IMU, to undermine the stability of a central representative government in Afghanistan and that many of these groups in fact work with al Qaeda;
- Some of the key traffickers may be able to apply their increased profits to strengthening the military capabilities of the forces that they control, and that this development may undermine our efforts to promote long term stability in Afghanistan;
- The US putting increased pressure on the Karzai government to crack down on drug cultivation would eventually lead to the unstable hold of political power;

- The use of US soldiers as anti-drug crusaders will divert them from the real enemy—Al Qaeda and Taliban;
- The re-emergence of warlords after the ouster of the Taliban is partly related to the US decision to support regional commanders (who could help American military objectives) with money and weapons during the campaign after September 11 rather than supporting a central authority;
- Misbalance of ethnic dynamics. One of the effects of the American military intervention has been to tilt the balance of ethno-political power away from the majority Pashtuns in Afghanistan. Nonetheless, political reconstruction cannot take place without addressing the genuine concerns of the Pashtuns: concerns about security, participation, and representation;
- There was a general consensus that the international community has been long on promises, short on delivery;
- Pakistan is noticeably seeking to regain the foothold it lost after the Taliban route in Afghanistan, and is reframing its quest for “strategic depth”. Pending a US “solution” or “exit”, the Pakistani leadership will continue to seek means to recover leverage in Afghanistan.

On 19 June 2003, M. Hassan Nouri, President of Rivertech Inc. gave a Congressional Testimony on US Policy in Afghanistan in regards to the challenges facing the US in its strategy to reconstruct and stabilize Afghanistan. In Nouri's view, after Afghanistan was liberated from the Taliban's, the US vision projected to the entire world of Afghanistan was of a stable civil society and a growing economy. But, instead the world is now seeing Afghan people protesting in the streets of Kabul, the current government carrying scars of being loyal to US, production of narcotics is rampant (twice as that during the Taliban era), and there is a continuity of terrorism. Nouri stated to the US House International Committee that the reconstruction program of Afghanistan must be implemented parallel to the re-creation of the state with the assistance of the international community and not just US. Nouri also cautioned that if violence in Afghanistan remains the norm of life, it can quickly spread and become routine in the region and the Middle East, which then would pose enormous risks to the US and its allies.¹³⁴

¹³⁴ *US Policy in Afghanistan, US House Intl Relations Committee, Congressional Testimonies given by Hassan Nouri, Barnett Rubin, Peter Tomsen, Larry Goodson, Bernard Frahi, and Norman Leatherwood, 21 Jun 2003,*

Likewise, another testimony given to the US House International Relations Committee on 19 June 2003 by Dr. Barnett R. Rubin, Director of Studies Center on International Cooperation New York University, indicated that after the defeat of the Taliban, anger is rising in Afghanistan at the slow pace of reconstruction. According to Afghan government figures, only 16 percent of the total disbursements (including for humanitarian purposes) had passed through channels controlled by the struggling Afghan government and had thus failed to build that government's capacity or legitimacy. Dr. Rubin recommends that unless first priority is given to security all recovery efforts will prove futile. Dr. Rubin indicates what an anti-American demonstrator in downtown Kabul said, "The US captured Afghanistan and did nothing for the people." To add, a fax from one listener of pledges made for the reconstruction of Afghanistan states, "Someone said that Afghanistan has received US dollar 1.7 billion from US dollar 4.8 billion promised aid in Tokyo conference which as said has been spent for reconstruction, but so far we have not seen any basic change in the people's daily life."¹³⁵

At the Afghan High-Level Strategic Forum in Brussels on 17 March 2003, Finance Minister Ghani articulated the alternatives that could result from different courses of action and pressed the donor countries to take bold steps. He laid out three scenarios for Afghanistan for five years: a) Afghanistan might be stable and relatively prosperous, Western-friendly, with an international orientation; b) Afghanistan could become another failed development project as it would lurch from crisis to crisis with intermittent successes; and 3) Afghanistan could become a narco-mafia state, wherein criminal syndicates would take over the mining, oil, and gas industries, as the drug trade expanded throughout the region.¹³⁶

[Online information from Capitol Hill]; available from <http://www.afgha.com/?af=article&sid=34467>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

On the other hand, Maj. Gen. Eric T. Olson of Combined Joint Task Force 76 stated during February 2005 that the future challenges of US in Afghanistan can be taken as: a) The remnants of Taliban; b) Al Qaeda influence; c) Fighting insurgents in such a way that the general populace is not alienated; d) Projecting that the coalition forces are to support the central government; e) To conduct combat operations with minimal collateral damage; f) Reintegrating former Taliban fighters into the civic life; g) Disarming militias; h) Recovery of Afghan economy; i) Meet the expectation of the population; j) Narcotic challenges; and k) To continue to fight against the anti-government elements.¹³⁷

Step 4: Specify all possible courses of action for each actor.

The possible courses of action open to each of the four “actors” regarding the issue of Durand Line (disputed land) as the international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan are:

A. Afghanistan-

a. Accepts Durand Line as international border (AIB).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Afghanistan, either personified by President Hamid Karzai or in the near future by the “future president of Afghanistan,” accepts the Durand Line as the international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan without any pre-condition(s) and on the basis of “as it is and where it is”. This strategy aims at accepting the morality and legality of the treaty done during 1893, and the binding conditions of the international legal apparatus—the *Vienna Convention on Law of Treaties*.

This situation would arise if Afghanistan is unable to re-negotiate the disputed land due to legal bindings; or, wants to maintain peace in the region; or, if and when the issue is brought to the attention of the International Court of Justice, the Court gives its verdict in favor of Durand Line stating “Afghanistan to comply”; or, the Government of Afghanistan takes this decision through a referendum wherein the people

¹³⁷ Julian E. Barnes, *Maj. Gen. Eric T. Olson discusses past successes and future challenges in Afghanistan*, 26 February 2005, [Online information from US News]; available from <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/news/articles/050226/26olson.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 January 2006.

of the country says so; or, the National Assembly of Afghanistan unanimously decides so; or, the US, India, Iran and other international community puts unbearable pressure to do so; or, Pakistan convinces Afghanistan to do so in its national interest; or, if the sovereignty and the integrity of Afghanistan is under threat if not accepted; or, the Northern Alliance within Afghanistan creates adequate pressure within Afghanistan to do so.

b. Continue re-negotiation for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land (CRS).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Afghanistan, either personified by President Hamid Karzai or in the near future by the “future president of Afghanistan,” rejects the Durand Line as international border but continues to move forward for a re-negotiated peaceful settlement to regain the disputed land, or the creation of a properly decided and delineated new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan that will not once again divide families on either side, and above-all provide Afghanistan access to the Arabian Sea. In this relation, Afghanistan might initiate, respond or participate to re-negotiate the disputed land from Pakistan requesting support from US, India, Iran, and/or other international community; or, supports the initiation, responding, and participation to peace-talks for a negotiated settlement made jointly or independently by Pakistan, US, India, Iran, and/or any other stake-holders; or, involves the International Court of Justice for favorable verdict so that pressure can be put to get back the disputed land.

This situation would arise if Afghanistan rejects the Durand Line as international boundary but wants the continuity of peace in the region; or, the US, India, Iran, or any other stake-holders put adequate pressure on Afghanistan for a negotiated peaceful settlement; or, the Afghan National Assembly or the people through referendum dictates the Government of Afghanistan for a legal solution by involving the International Court of Justice; or, Afghanistan sees that the present Durand Line issue can never be resolved without a mutual understanding for a new border which is acceptable to both Afghanistan and Pakistan.

c. Attempt to seize the disputed land by force (ASF).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Afghanistan, either personified by President Hamid Karzai or in the near future by the “future president of Afghanistan,” rejects the Durand Line as international border and attempts to seize by force the disputed land through conventional or unconventional means.

This situation would arise if Afghanistan ignores the international community and moves towards using force to cross the present border to

seize the disputed land; or, requests US, India, Iran and any other stakeholders to support overtly or covertly the use of force by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land that is within the boundaries of the present day Pakistan; or, US, Iran, India, or any other stake-holders jointly or independently provoke and support Afghanistan overtly or covertly to use force against Pakistan to regain the disputed land; or, if Afghanistan retaliates after Pakistan forcefully moves towards making Afghanistan accept the Durand Line as international border; or, the National Assembly of Afghanistan unanimously decides to dictate the Government of Afghanistan to forcefully regain the disputed land; or, the population votes through referendum for a forceful take over of the disputed land.

B. Pakistan-

a. Returns the disputed land to Afghanistan (RDL).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Pakistan, either personified by President Pervez Musaraf or in the near future by the “future president of Pakistan,” decides to return the disputed land to Afghanistan. This strategy aims at a peaceful settlement of the dispute, without any pre-condition(s).

This situation would arise if Pakistan is unable to re-negotiate the disputed land due to legal bindings; or, wants to maintain peace in the region; or, the International Court of Justice gives its verdict in favor of Afghanistan, if and when the issue is brought to the attention of the Court; or, the Government of Pakistan takes this decision through a referendum wherein the people of Pakistan says so; or, the Parliament of Pakistan unanimously decides so; or, the US, India, Iran and other international community puts unbearable pressure to do so; or, Afghanistan convinces Pakistan to do so in its national interest; or, if the sovereignty and the integrity of Pakistan is under threat if this is not accepted; or, the Pashtuns of the disputed land creates adequate pressure to do so; or, Afghanistan doesn't sign the continuation of Durand Line treaty; or, the pro-Pakistan activities fails within the boundaries of Afghanistan.

b. Continue re-negotiation for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land (CRS).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Pakistan, either personified by President Pervez Musaraf or in the near future by the “future president of Pakistan,” continues accepting the Durand Line as international border and moves forward for a re-negotiated peaceful settlement to retain the disputed land, or a properly decided and delineated new border between Pakistan and Afghanistan that will not create a vacuum in Pakistan's doctrine of “strategic depth” to counter India.

This situation would arise, if Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to re-negotiate retainment of the disputed land, requesting support from US, India, Iran, and/or other international community; or, supports the initiation, responding, and participation to peace-talks for a re-negotiated settlement made jointly or independently by Afghanistan, US, India, Iran, and/or any other stake-holders; or, involves the International Court of Justice for a favorable verdict so that pressure can be put to continue retaining the disputed land and term it as a “matter settled”; or, Pakistan considers Durand Line as international boundary but wants the continuity of peace in the region; or, the US, India, Iran or any other stake-holders pressures Pakistan for a re-negotiated peaceful settlement; or, Pakistan sees that the present Durand Line issue can never be resolved without a mutual understanding for a new border which is acceptable to both Pakistan and Afghanistan, without endangering its national interest and security.

- c. Attempt to build a fence to demarcate the Durand Line and to use force if required (AFF).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Pakistan, either personified by President Pervez Musaraf or in the near future by the “future president of Pakistan,” continues accepting the Durand Line as international border and attempts to build a fence—to use force if required--to delineate the controversial Durand Line into a permanent international border.

This situation would arise, if Pakistan ignores the international community and moves towards using force to build a fence to delineate the controversial line into a permanent international border; or, requests US, India, Iran and any other stake-holders to support overtly or covertly the use of force to build the fence; or, US, Iran, India, or any other stake-holders jointly or independently provokes and supports Pakistan overtly or covertly to use force to build the fence; or, if Pakistan retaliates after Afghanistan forcefully moves to regain the disputed land; or, the Parliament of Pakistan unanimously decides so; or, the population of Pakistan through referendum dictates the Government of Pakistan to forcefully build the fence to retain the disputed land; or, Pashtuns in the disputed land pressurizes Pakistan to build such fence.

C. India-

- a. Support the approaches taken by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land (SAA)

This course of action represents the situation wherein India, either personified by Prime Minister Dr. Man Mohan Singh or in the near future

by the “future Prime Minister of India,” rejects the Durand Line as an international border and thus supports--via every available means--any decisions made by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land.

This situation would arise, if India analyzes that partnering with Afghanistan is in her national interest; or, friends and allies of India provokes or requests India to do so for her betterment; or, India wants to exploit the vulnerabilities to retain herself as regional power; or, India takes this chance to exploit Afghanistan’s vulnerabilities; or, to counter the Pakistani ideology of “anti-India” and “anti-secularism”; or, to counter the Pakistani doctrine of “strategic depth”; or, to counter the Pakistani motive of “Islamic grab”; or, to counter the pro-Pakistani government in Afghanistan; or, to maintain and continue with the old and traditional relationship with Afghanistan; or, jointly collaborates with US and/or Iran to support Afghanistan.

b. Support the approaches taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land (SAP).

This course of action represents the situation wherein India, either personified by Prime Minister Dr. Man Mohan Singh or in the near future by the “future Prime Minister of India,” accepts the Durand Line as an international border and thus supports--via every available means--any decisions made by Pakistan to retain the disputed line.

This situation might arise, if India analyzes that partnering with Pakistan is in her national interest; or, friends and allies of India provokes or requests India to do so for her betterment; or, India wants to exploit the vulnerabilities to retain herself as regional power; or, take this chance to exploit Pakistani vulnerabilities for her own interest; or, jointly collaborates with US and/or Iran to support Pakistan.

c. Take Neutral Approach on the issue of Durand Line (TNA).

This course of action represents the situation wherein India, either personified by Prime Minister Dr. Man Mohan Singh or in the near future by the “future Prime Minister of India,” stays neutral in the issue of Durand Line. In other words, India does not support anyone overtly or covertly in regards to the issue.

This situation would arise, if India ignores or rejects any call of support—overt or covert--from Afghanistan or Pakistan or any other stake-holders to resolve the issue; or, supports either of the countries in dispute stating that this is an internal matter of the respective countries

D. Iran-

- a. Support the approaches taken by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land (SAA).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Iran, personified by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khameni or the “future Supreme Leader of Iran,” rejects the Durand Line as an international border and thus supports--via every available means--any decisions made by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land.

This situation would arise, if Iran analyzes that partnering with Afghanistan is in her national interest; or, friends and allies of provokes or requests to do so for her betterment; or, Iran wants to take this chance to exploit Afghanistan’s vulnerabilities; or, to counter the Pakistanis who they think are the main problem of Afghanistan; or, to reduce Pakistani influence in Afghanistan; or, jointly collaborates with India to support Afghanistan.

- b. Support the approaches taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land (SAP).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Iran, personified by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khameni or the “future Supreme Leader of Iran,” accepts the Durand Line as an international border and thus supports --via every available means--any decisions made by Pakistan to retain the disputed line.

This situation would arise, if Iran analyzes that partnering with Pakistan is in her national interest; or, friends and allies provokes or requests to do so for her betterment; or, Iran wants to take this chance to exploit Pakistani vulnerabilities; or, wants to undermine US; or, Iran is not in support of the Sunni government in Afghanistan; or, Iran supports the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan who do not want the Pashtuns to integrate; or, likes the continuity of instability in Afghanistan so that “oil-pipe” game does not flourish; or, jointly collaborates with India to support Afghanistan.

- c. Take Neutral Approach (TNA).

This course of action represents the situation wherein Iran, personified by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khameni or the “future Supreme Leader of Iran,” stays neutral in the issue of Durand Line. In other words, Iran does not support anyone overtly or covertly in this regard.

This situation would arise, if Iran ignores or rejects any call of support—overt or covert—from Afghanistan or Pakistan or any other stake-holders

to solve the issue; or, supports either of the countries in dispute stating that this is an internal matter of the respective countries.

Step 5: Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.

The purpose of the “scenario” is to provide major assumption that will influence the courses of action of all “national actors” concerned, and to account for an “additional actor” without having to calculate it as part of the permutations for the alternate futures,¹³⁸ this paper has incorporated the three possible “US courses of action” in regards to the Durand Line issue as the “major scenarios”—wherein each scenario has three “sub-scenarios”—within which the “alternate futures” would be compared at a later stage. In this relation, the following are the three “major scenarios” based on the possible “US courses of action:”

Scenario 1: US accept Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any approach taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land.

This is the “worst case” future scenario of the three projected outcomes for the Durand Line issue because of the possible alliance of India and Iran in support of Afghanistan, whereas US supports Pakistan; the grave problem being nuclear capabilities of both India and Iran would be facing the nuclear capabilities of both US and Pakistan, which cannot be contained. This scenario presupposes that US accepts Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore actively supports any approach—up to the use of force—taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land within its boundaries or responds to the request of Pakistan to help retain the disputed land.

This scenario would happen in the very near future if the issue of Durand Line is not resolved by mutual agreement between the two countries—Afghanistan and Pakistan; or, the

¹³⁸ Jonathan S. Lockwood and Kathleen O. Lockwood, 34-36.

world community fails to convince the two countries to resolve the issue mutually; or, the US suspects India and/or Iran provoking Afghanistan to regain the land forcefully; or, US respects the legal verdict in favor of Pakistan; or, the International Court of Justice has provided a verdict in the favor of Pakistan but Afghanistan still rejects this; or, Afghanistan attacks to seize the disputed land; or, to put pressure on Pakistan there is an escalation of cross-border insurgent activities from the Afghan side in the territories of Pakistan; or, US recognizes that it is necessary to maintain the geo-political power balance between India and Pakistan in the context of India trying to control the regional power base; or, US recognizes that Iran is trying to exploit the vulnerabilities; or, US foresees that its Interest, National Security Strategy, and the Interest in Afghanistan are under grave threat if they don't support Pakistan in this matter. Therefore, the only way to stop this scenario from happening is when Afghanistan accepts Durand Line as an international border, or Pakistan returns the disputed land to Afghanistan.

The implications of this scenario on the five elements of US Interest, three pillars of US National Security Strategy, and three groups of US Interest in Afghanistan would be very dangerous, as under these conditions, the full form of regional stability is unlikely to survive. Pakistan's attempt to regain the disputed land with or without the help of US will foster the rise of conflict with Afghanistan; not to mention India and Iran being pulled into the vertex of the problem. Since, India and Iran does not like Pakistan's active involvement in issues of Afghanistan, obviously there would be overt and covert modes of operations launched to counter the US-Pakistan alliance. In this respect, India and Iran may use this "need" as a bargaining chip, for a longer term approach to encircle and isolate Pakistan.

On the other hand, Afghanistan would strive to maintain its identity or expand the influence by seeking support from anti-US and anti-Pakistan state and non-state actors to tackle

the new problem of US-Pakistan alliance in the issue of the disputed land. As Afghanistan is still under influence from the remnants of Talibans and Al Qaeda, the generating scenario would help nourish these elements to bolster towards a new radical beginning. Ultimately, the problems both within and outside Afghanistan, created through its approaches to regain the disputed land, would have an adverse impact on the US Interest. In the long run, the build-up of the negative situation would accelerate the conflict that may lead to an “all-out-war” in the region--*possibility of the use of nuclear weapons, as except Afghanistan all other actors have nuclear capabilities.* In this context, *Afghanistan would become the threat to US Interest due to Durand Line* because of the approach taken by the US in relation to tackling the issue and above all the way Afghanistan would be dealing to counter the US-Pakistan alliance.

The question then would be, “How likely is the scenario to happen in the near future?” Looking at the perception of the US towards the Durand Line issue, the approach of US to fully support Pakistan to regain the disputed land is not likely at present. But, the adverse or covert activities of India, Iran, and Afghanistan jointly or independently would create a new spectrum of threat in the region that would undermine US Interest, which is presently what is happening—Pakistan voicing strongly on certain Pak-Afghanistan issues, the build-up of Indian diplomacy within Afghanistan, Iran’s concern regarding Pakistan trying to influence Afghanistan, and above all the a stronger approach being taken by Afghanistan in regards to Pak-Afghanistan issues. Therefore, to counter this emerging threat US would eventually get fully involved in the issue via supporting Pakistan--as it accepts Durand Line as an international border without expiry date--thus resulting in the advancement of this scenario, after-all US is very concerned of Indian and Iranian activities in the region. This future major “scenario” can be further

categorized into three “sub-scenarios”—*US support re-negotiated peaceful settlement, status quo*, and *US support the use of force*--based on the type of support provided to Pakistan by US.

Scenario 2: US reject Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any approach taken by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land.

This is the “next-to-worst case” future scenario because of the possible alliance of India, Iran, and US in support of Afghanistan whereas Pakistan would be alone; the gravity of the problem being less than that of “Scenario 1” because nuclear capabilities of US, India and Iran would be facing the nuclear capability of Pakistan alone, which can be contained through effective coordination. This scenario presupposes that US rejects Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore actively supports any decisions—up to the use of force—made by Afghanistan to regain the disputed land or responds to the request of Afghanistan to help regain the disputed land.

This scenario would happen in the very near future if the issue of Durand Line is not resolved by mutual agreement between the two countries—Afghanistan and Pakistan; or, the world community fails to convince the two countries to resolve the issue mutually; or, the US suspects Pakistan being provoked by other state and non-state actors to retain the land forcefully; or, US respects the legal verdict in favor of Afghanistan; or, the International Court of Justice has provided a verdict in the favor of Afghanistan but Pakistan still rejects this; or, Pakistan forceful wants to fence the Durand line into a permanent border; or, to put pressure on Afghanistan there is an escalation of cross-border insurgent activities from the Pakistani side in the territories of Afghanistan; or, US recognizes that it is necessary to maintain the geo-political power balance between Afghanistan and Pakistan in the context of Pakistan trying to control the regional power

base; or, US recognizes that Pakistan is trying to exploit the vulnerabilities; or, US foresees that its Interest, National Security Strategy, and the Interest in Afghanistan are under grave threat if they don't support Afghanistan in this matter. Therefore, the only way to stop this scenario from happening is when Afghanistan accepts Durand Line as an international border, or Pakistan returns the disputed land to Afghanistan.

The implications of this scenario on the five elements of US Interest, three pillars of US National Security Strategy, and three groups of US Interest in Afghanistan would be very dangerous, as under these conditions, the full form of regional stability is unlikely to survive. Afghanistan's attempt to regain the disputed land with or without the help of US and others would foster the rise of conflict with Pakistan; not to mention other states and non-state actors being pulled into the vertex of the problem. Since, India and Iran does not like Pakistan's active involvement in issues of Afghanistan, obviously there would be overt and covert modes of operations launched to counter the Pakistanis, and above all a full-fledged support to the Afghans. In this respect, supporting state and non-state actors would use this "need" as a bargaining chip on matters that would later be harmful to US Interest.

On the other hand, due to the activity of Afghanistan, Pakistan would strive to maintain its identity or expand the influence by seeking support from anti-US and/or anti-Iran and/or anti-Indian states and non-state actors to tackle the new problem of US-Afghanistan-Iran-India alliance in the issue of the disputed land. As Pakistan is still under influence of radical Islamic fundamentalists, the generating scenario would help nourish these elements to bolster towards a new extremist beginning. Ultimately, the problems both within and outside Pakistan, created through its approaches to retain the disputed land, would have an adverse impact on the vital Interest of US. In the long run, the build-up of the situation would accelerate the conflict that

may lead to an “all-out-war” in the region--*possibility of use of nuclear weapons, as except Afghanistan all other actors have nuclear capabilities*. Though the possibility of the use of nuclear weapon can be contained in this scenario because of Pakistan standing alone in its fight and surrounded by countries with nuclear capabilities, the release can never be underestimated. In this context, *Afghanistan would become the threat to US Interest due to Durand Line* because of the approach taken by the US in relation to tackling the issue and above all the way Pakistan would be dealing to counter the US-Afghanistan alliance.

The question then would be, “How likely is the scenario to happen in the near future?” Looking at the perceptions of the US towards the Durand Line issue, the approach of US to fully support Afghanistan to regain the disputed land is not likely at present. But, the conduct of adverse activities by Pakistan jointly or independently with the help of other rogue states and non-state actors would create a new spectrum of threat in the region that would undermine US Interest; and above all there is always a “bullying” role being played in this region by India and Iran. Therefore, to counter this emerging threat US would get fully involved in the issue via supporting Afghanistan, thus resulting in the advancement of this scenario, after-all US is very concerned of stability in the region. This future major “scenario” can be further categorized into three “sub-scenarios”—*US support renegotiated peaceful settlement, status quo, and US support use of force*— based on the type of support provided to Afghanistan by US.

Scenario 3: US adopts neutral stance in the issue of the Durand Line, and therefore supports both Afghanistan and Pakistan to peacefully resolve the issue of the disputed Land.

This is the “best case” future scenario from the standpoint of the issue in hand, because it caters for a peaceful settlement of the issue by coming to a mutual understanding, *after all*

Afghanistan and Pakistan are allies of US. This scenario presupposes that US takes a neutral stand on the issue of the Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore supports any decisions or re-negotiation jointly or independently made by Afghanistan and/or Pakistan to resolve the issue peacefully by themselves and/or with the support of others; or, responds to the request made jointly or independently by Afghanistan or Pakistan for a peaceful resolution. On the other hand, if either of the two countries or both of them decides to use force to regain or retain the disputed land, US moves forwards in trying to convince both the parties not to do so. In all these above activities US makes sure that it do not speak for and against the Durand Line as an international border. This strategy is aimed at trying to solve the issue through a neutral stance by supporting both the parties to come to a peaceful or re-negotiated solution.

Though the present events in the region continue to support this scenario, wherein all the parties involved are trying to get a peaceful resolution to the Durand Line issue, US has already given indication that it supports the Durand Line as an international border. This indication is but a pathway for this scenario to transform to “Scenario 1”. Presently, “Scenario 3” is continuing and in the very near future would stretch towards either pole of the conflict if the issue is not resolved very soon by mutual agreement between the two countries—Afghanistan and Pakistan; or, the world community fails to convince both the two countries to resolve the issue mutually; or, the US suspects that there can be no mutual agreement between the two parties in dispute for a consensus to resolve the issue and therefore moves in to convince both the parties; or, US considers both the parties as allies and caters to support both of them for a peaceful re-settlement of the issue; or, US intervenes to convince both the parties of the impact because Pakistan and/or Afghanistan are trying to use force to regain or retain the disputed land due to being provoked by

other state and non-state actors; or, US moves in to convince both the parties to respects the legal verdict; or, if Pakistan forcefully wants to fence the Durand line into a permanent border US steps in to convince Pakistan not to do so without the consent of Afghanistan; or, if Afghanistan forceful wants to regain the disputed land, US moves in to convince Afghanistan not to do so; or, US foresees that its Interest, National Security Strategy, and the Interest in the region are under grave threat if US does not move in to convince both the parties towards a peaceful re-settlement of the issue; or, US moves in to convince the parties so that the regional powers do not get sucked into the conflict; or, US moves in to convince all the parties so that the issue do not turn into an “all-out-war”; or, US cater for peaceful re-settlement of the issue by supporting both the parties, so that while supporting US do not become a part of the problem that can impact US Interest and National Security Strategy. Therefore, the only way to stop this scenario from happening is when Afghanistan accepts Durand Line as an international border, or Pakistan returns the disputed land to Afghanistan without any pre-condition(s).

The implications of this scenario on the five elements of US Interest, three pillars of US National Security Strategy, and three groups of US Interest in Afghanistan carries a certain level of threat because of the transformation capability of this scenario. Presently, there already exists a “verbal tension” between Afghanistan and Pakistan. It should also be noted that India and Iran does not like Pakistan’s active involvement in issues related to Afghanistan. In this context, *Afghanistan would still pose some sort of threat to US Interest due to Durand Line* because of the ongoing “silent conflict” between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The question then would be, “How likely is the scenario to continue in the near future?” Looking at the perceptions of the US towards the Durand Line issue, it is seen that US wants a peaceful settlement. Therefore, it can be stated that the present situation in regards to Durand

Line issue can be said to exist under this scenario, *Scenario 3*. But, the adverse activities of Afghanistan and/or Pakistan conducted jointly or independently with the help of other rogue states or other regional states and non-state actors would create a new spectrum of threat in the region that would undermine US Interest. Therefore, to counter this emerging threat the US getting fully involved in the issue by either supporting Afghanistan or Pakistan does exist. This future major “scenario” can be further categorized into three “sub-scenarios”—*US support renegotiated peaceful settlement, status quo, and US support use of force*—based on the technique of “convincing” used by US. If all “sub-scenarios” are exhausted, this major scenario has the potential to transform either into “Scenario 1” or “Scenario 2”, depending on the approaches taken by Afghanistan, Pakistan or the other states in the region.

ANALYSIS OF THE THREE SCENARIOS

Taking the above-aspects into consideration, the LAMP technique has been used to predict the “alternate futures” resulting from *Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest due to Durand Line issue*. The developing events, perceptions, and activities among the four actors--Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, and Iran--continue to indicate towards “Scenario 1”--*US accept Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any approach taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land*--though at this date and time the expectations are there that it would still remain within “Scenario 3”--*US adopts neutral stance in the issue of the Durand Line, and therefore support both Afghanistan and Pakistan to peacefully resolve the issue of the disputed Land*.

Based on the type of support provided by US to Pakistan within the “Scenario 1,” the three future “sub-scenarios” that could occur are: *US support Pakistan’s approach of re-negotiated peaceful settlement*, *Status quo*, and *US support Pakistan’s approach of use of force*. The paragraphs below elaborate the three future “sub-scenarios” within the major “Scenario 1”:

Sub-scenario 1: US Support Pakistan’s approach of Re-negotiated Peaceful Settlement.

This is the “best-case-sub-scenario” (Sub-scenario 1) within the “worst-case-major-scenario” (Scenario 1) for the Durand Line issue because only US supports Pakistan’s approach of “re-negotiated peaceful settlement”. As this “sub-scenario” is US support driven for a peaceful settlement of the issue, all possible peaceful support is provided by US to Pakistan to retain the disputed land or re-negotiate for a properly decided, delineated and acceptable new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

This “sub-scenario” would happen in the very near future within “Scenario 1” if the issue of Durand Line is not resolved by mutual agreement between the two countries—Afghanistan and Pakistan; or, the world community fails to convince the two countries to resolve the issue mutually; or, Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to re-negotiate retainment of the disputed land, requesting support from US, India, Iran, and/or other international community; or, Pakistan supports the initiation, responding, and participation to peace-talks for a re-negotiated settlement made jointly or independently by Afghanistan, US, India, Iran, and/or any other stake-holders; or, Pakistan involves the International Court of Justice for a favorable verdict so that pressure can be built to continue retaining the disputed land and thus term it as a “matter settled”; or, Pakistan considers Durand Line as international boundary but wants the continuity of peace in

the region; or, the US, India, Iran or any other stake-holders pressures Pakistan for a re-negotiated peaceful settlement; or, Pakistan sees that the present Durand Line issue can never be resolved without a mutual understanding for a new border which is acceptable to both Pakistan and Afghanistan, without endangering its national interest and security; or, US sees that its high time to move in for a re-negotiated peaceful settlement without which the US Interest of regional stability would be jeopardized; or, US analyzes that this “sub-scenario” might move towards “Sub-scenario 3” of “Scenario 1” in support is not provided.

The implications of this scenario on the five elements of US Interest, three pillars of US National Security Strategy, and three groups of US Interest in Afghanistan carries a certain level of threat because of the transformation capability of this “sub-scenario. Though US cater for a re-negotiated peaceful settlement of the issue which is acceptable to both the parties, the activities of the regional power bases-India and Iran--would have relatively strong impact on US activities. This is so because of the possibility of regional powers trying to create some sort of disturbance during the negotiation process—after all a stable Afghanistan and Pakistan is not in the interest of some countries of the region.

This “sub-scenario” is very likely to happen in the near future, as US has pretty much confirmed the legality of the Durand Line, and thus wants to see the borders of both the countries secured. On the other hand, if due to the disturbances created by the regional powers during the period of negotiation, or over ambition in the part of Afghanistan or Pakistan, or, radical and fundamentalist elements trying to disrupt peace activity, or, internal dynamics of both the countries direct the either/both of the Governments for a different scenario can eventually transform this “sub-scenario” to “Sub-scenario 3”.

Sub-scenario 2: The Status Quo.

This future “sub-scenario” (Sub-scenario 2) is the transient sub-scenario within the “worst-case-major-scenario” (Scenario 1) for the Durand Line issue. As this “sub-scenario” is US support driven for the settlement of the Durand Line issue, the mode of US support plays a critical role for the transformation of this “sub-scenario” from one to another. In other words, if the US supports Pakistan’s approach for a “re-negotiated peaceful settlement of the issue,” then this “sub-scenario” would transform to “Sub-scenario 1” within “Scenario 1,” whereas, if the US supports Pakistan’s approach for a “use of force to retain the disputed land,” then this “sub-scenario” would transform to “Sub-scenario 3” within “Scenario 1”.

The duration taken for one “sub-scenario” to transform to another can be considered as the period this “sub-scenario” would be active, wherein the then situation existing at that particular date and time can be considered the happenings within this sub-scenario. On the other hand, the implications of this “sub-scenario” on the US Interest would depend on the transformation it takes--if it transforms to “Sub-scenario 1” then the impact would be lighter or else there would be grave impact on US Interest.

Sub-scenario 3: US Support Pakistan’s approach of Use of Force.

This is the “worst-case-sub-scenario” (Sub-scenario 3) within the “worst-case-major-scenario” (Scenario 1) for the Durand Line issue because the US strategy to support Pakistan’s approach of “use of force to retain the disputed land” will create instability in the region. As this “sub-scenario” is US support driven for the use of force to retain the disputed land, grave problems within the region would occur that would eventually lead to a major crisis, *a total disaster*.

This “sub-scenario” would happen in the near future within “Scenario 1” if the issue of Durand Line is not resolved by mutual agreement between the two countries—Afghanistan and Pakistan; or, the world community fails to convince the two countries to resolve the issue mutually; or, US fails to support the renegotiation for a peaceful settlement; or, if Pakistan ignores the international community and moves towards using force to build a fence to delineate the controversial line into a permanent international border; or, requests US, India, Iran and any other stake-holders to support overtly or covertly the use of force to build the fence; or, US, Iran, India, or any other stake-holders jointly or independently provokes and supports Pakistan overtly or covertly to use force to build the fence; or, if Pakistan retaliates after Afghanistan forcefully moves to regain the disputed land; or, the Parliament of Pakistan unanimously decides so; or, the population of Pakistan through referendum dictates the Government of Pakistan to forcefully build the fence to retain the disputed land; or, the Pashtuns in the disputed land pressurizes Pakistan to build such fence.

The implications of this scenario on the five elements of US Interest, three pillars of US National Security Strategy, and three groups of US Interest in Afghanistan carries an extreme level of threat because of the forceful nature of this “sub-scenario. The US support of Pakistan’s decision on the use of force to retain the disputed land would be countered by other regional powers. In this circumstance, both Afghanistan and Pakistan would be in the brink of war, supported on either side by countries equipped with nuclear weapons. Moreover, both India and Iran would not be happy to have a headache in the region; after all they already claim that US and Pakistan are interfering with the region, and especially Afghanistan. Therefore, the US has to be very careful in this “sub-scenario” as there would be a possibility of an “all-out-war,” and even the usage of nuclear weapon. In other words, the US Interest would be in grave danger due

to this “sub-scenario”. Though this “sub-scenario” is unlikely to occur in the near future as US wants the region to be free of conflict, still the chances of escalation of the conflict towards this “sub-scenario” do exist. This “sub-scenario” has the potentiality of transforming to “Sub-scenario 1,” within “Scenario 1” if Pakistan decides to withdraw the use of force; but it would all depend on how much force has been used and to what extent the damage has been inflicted—in other words, *future unknown*.

Step 6: Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario.

The general formula for computing the number of alternate futures is $X^y=Z$. Where ‘X’ equals the number of courses of action open to each actor and ‘y’ equals the total number of national actors involved; thus, ‘Z’ will equal the total number of alternate futures to be compared.¹³⁹

It is evident that now there could be a significantly greater number of possible alternate futures, depending on how each actor decides to pursue its destiny.¹⁴⁰ In this LAMP paper, there are four actors and three courses of action opened to each actor. Therefore,

$$Z = X^y$$

Since, in this paper X is equal to 4 and y is equal to 4,

$$Z = 4^4 \quad \text{or,} \quad Z = 256$$

¹³⁹ Ibid., 38.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 4.

Therefore, the total number of alternate futures is 81 for each future “sub-scenarios” within the “major scenarios”. In this LAMP paper it is found that out of 81 alternate futures for each “sub-scenario,” 45 of them (alternate futures 37 to 81) are “bizarre” because their combinations are not logically possible, as indicated in the *Tables 1, 2, and 3 under Step 8* of this paper. All these illogical alternate futures have been given “0” as the number of votes for their ranking. On the other hand, it is found that only 36 alternate futures are logical for ranking purposes.

Step 7: Perform a pair wise comparison of all “alternate futures” within the scenario to determine their relative probability.

Here the alternate futures are analyzed two at a time, always assuming that the two futures being compared at the moment are the only ones that exist.¹⁴¹ All the logical futures for each “sub-scenarios” are numbered 1 through 36. “Alternate Future” number 1 has been compared to “Alternate Future” number 2 based on all the information that the writer is aware of until the information cut-off date as of 15 February 2006, and the future deemed “most likely to occur” has been given one vote. “Alternate Future” number 1 has been then compared to “alternate future” number 3, 4, and so on in the same way until all the “alternate futures” are compared within that “sub-scenario”. Then after, the “alternate future” number 2 has been compared with “alternate future” number 3, 4 and so on in the same way. This pair wise comparison of “alternate futures” was then repeated for the other “sub-scenarios”.¹⁴² The formula used for the number of pair wise comparisons is expressed below:

$$X = (n-1) + (n-2) \dots + (n-n)$$

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 40.

¹⁴² Ibid.

Here n equals the total number of alternate futures to be analyzed, and X equals the total number of pair wise comparisons that must be performed.¹⁴³ In this LAMP paper,

$$X = (36-1) + (36-2) \dots + (36-36) \quad \text{or} \quad X = 35 + 34 \dots + 0 \quad \text{or} \quad X = 630$$

Therefore, the total vote necessary is 630 for each respective “sub-scenarios”. This step has been clearly shown under *Step 8, Tables 1, 2, and 3* respectively, where all the thirty-six logical “alternate futures,” have been compared among each other to avoid the temptation for ruling out certain futures. This approach has been taken so that the strength of the LAMP technique continues and the entire range of possibilities is considered.

Step 8: Rank the “alternate futures” for each scenario from the highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received.

The *Steps 7 and 8* have been combined in *Tables 1, 2 and 3* respectively, where the “alternate futures” of the respective “Sub-scenarios 1, 2, and 3” within the major “Scenario 1” have been rank ordered from “most likely” to “least likely” based upon the number of votes received. Since, the information cut-off date for this paper is 15 February 2006 the ranking of the “alternate futures” has been done according to the information available until that date. Because of the dynamic, constantly changing nature of the universe of “alternate futures,” the periodical “revote” of the alternate futures must be done to account for the new information received.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 44.

Sub-scenario 1: US Support Pakistan's approach of Re-negotiated Peaceful Settlement.					
Possible Future Number	Afghanistan	Pakistan	India	Iran	Number of Votes
1	CRS	CRS	SAA	SAA	35
3	CRS	CRS	SAA	TNA	34
7	CRS	CRS	TNA	SAA	33
2	CRS	CRS	SAA	SAP	32
9	CRS	CRS	TNA	TNA	31
6	CRS	CRS	SAP	TNA	29
4	CRS	CRS	SAP	SAA	28
5	CRS	CRS	SAP	SAP	26
8	CRS	CRS	TNA	SAP	25
19	ASF	CRS	SAA	SAA	25
12	CRS	ASF	SAA	TNA	25
28	ASF	ASF	SAA	SAA	24
21	ASF	CRS	SAA	TNA	22
25	ASF	CRS	TNA	SAA	22
36	ASF	ASF	TNA	TNA	21
27	ASF	CRS	TNA	TNA	20
30	ASF	ASF	SAA	TNA	20
34	ASF	ASF	TNA	SAA	19
16	CRS	ASF	TNA	SAA	17
18	CRS	ASF	TNA	TNA	17
20	ASF	CRS	SAA	SAP	16
10	CRS	ASF	SAA	SAA	15
11	CRS	ASF	SAA	SAP	12
13	CRS	ASF	SAP	SAA	10
17	CRS	ASF	TNA	SAP	10
24	ASF	CRS	SAP	TNA	9
26	ASF	CRS	TNA	SAP	9
22	ASF	CRS	SAP	SAA	8
29	ASF	ASF	SAA	SAP	8
31	ASF	ASF	SAP	SAA	7
35	ASF	ASF	TNA	SAP	6
15	CRS	ASF	SAP	TNA	5
23	ASF	CRS	SAP	SAP	4
33	ASF	ASF	SAP	TNA	3
14	CRS	ASF	SAP	SAP	2
32	ASF	ASF	SAP	SAP	1
37 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
38 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
39 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
40 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
41 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
42 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	TNA	0

43 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
44 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
45 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	TNA	0
46 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	SAA	0
47 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	SAP	0
48 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	TNA	0
49 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	SAA	0
50 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	SAP	0
51 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	TNA	0
52 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	SAA	0
53 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	SAP	0
54 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	TNA	0
55 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	SAA	0
56 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	SAP	0
57 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	TNA	0
58 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	SAA	0
59 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	SAP	0
60 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	TNA	0
61 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	SAA	0
62 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	SAP	0
63 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	TNA	0
64 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
65 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
66 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
67 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
68 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
69 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	TNA	0
70 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
71 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
72 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	TNA	0
73 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
74 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
75 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
76 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
77 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
78 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	TNA	0
79 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
80 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
81 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	TNA	0

AIB = Accepts as international border
CRS = Continue re-negotiation for a peaceful settlement
ASF = Attempt to seize by force / build fence by force
RDL = Returns disputed land to Afghanistan
SAA = Support the approach of Afghanistan
SAP = Support the approach of Pakistan
TNA = Take neutral approach
Note: The futures receiving '0' votes are not logical

Table 1: Sub-scenario 1--US Support Pakistan's approach of Re-negotiated Peaceful Settlement.

Sub-scenario 2: The Status Quo					
Possible Future Number	Afghanistan	Pakistan	India	Iran	Number of Votes
9	CRS	CRS	TNA	TNA	35
3	CRS	CRS	SAA	TNA	34
7	CRS	CRS	TNA	SAA	33
1	CRS	CRS	SAA	SAA	32
2	CRS	CRS	SAA	SAP	31
8	CRS	CRS	TNA	SAP	30
4	CRS	CRS	SAP	SAA	29
6	CRS	CRS	SAP	TNA	28
5	CRS	CRS	SAP	SAP	27
19	ASF	CRS	SAA	SAA	26
20	ASF	CRS	SAA	SAP	25
21	ASF	CRS	SAA	TNA	24
25	ASF	CRS	TNA	SAA	23
27	ASF	CRS	TNA	TNA	23
22	ASF	CRS	SAP	SAA	22
26	ASF	CRS	TNA	SAP	22
23	ASF	CRS	SAP	SAP	20
24	ASF	CRS	SAP	TNA	18
10	CRS	ASF	SAA	SAA	16
12	CRS	ASF	SAA	TNA	15
16	CRS	ASF	TNA	SAA	14
11	CRS	ASF	SAA	SAP	13
18	CRS	ASF	TNA	TNA	13
13	CRS	ASF	SAP	SAA	10
17	CRS	ASF	TNA	SAP	10
15	CRS	ASF	SAP	TNA	9
14	CRS	ASF	SAP	SAP	8
28	ASF	ASF	SAA	SAA	7
36	ASF	ASF	TNA	TNA	7
31	ASF	ASF	SAP	SAA	6
30	ASF	ASF	SAA	TNA	5
34	ASF	ASF	TNA	SAA	5
33	ASF	ASF	SAP	TNA	4
29	ASF	ASF	SAA	SAP	3
35	ASF	ASF	TNA	SAP	2
32	ASF	ASF	SAP	SAP	1
37 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
38 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
39 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
40 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
41 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
42 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	TNA	0

43 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
44 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
45 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	TNA	0
46 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	SAA	0
47 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	SAP	0
48 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	TNA	0
49 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	SAA	0
50 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	SAP	0
51 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	TNA	0
52 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	SAA	0
53 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	SAP	0
54 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	TNA	0
55 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	SAA	0
56 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	SAP	0
57 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	TNA	0
58 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	SAA	0
59 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	SAP	0
60 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	TNA	0
61 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	SAA	0
62 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	SAP	0
63 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	TNA	0
64 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
65 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
66 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
67 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
68 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
69 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	TNA	0
70 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
71 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
72 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	TNA	0
73 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
74 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
75 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
76 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
77 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
78 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	TNA	0
79 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
80 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
81 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	TNA	0

AIB = Accepts as international border
CRS = Continue re-negotiation for a peaceful settlement
ASF = Attempt to seize by force / build fence by force
RDL = Returns disputed land to Afghanistan
SAA = Support the approach of Afghanistan
SAP = Support the approach of Pakistan
TNA = Take neutral approach

Note: The futures receiving '0' votes are not logical

Table 2: Sub-scenario 2--The Status Quo.

Sub-scenario 3: US Support Pakistan's approach of Use of Force					
Possible Future Number	Afghanistan	Pakistan	India	Iran	Number of Votes
10	CRS	ASF	SAA	SAA	35
12	CRS	ASF	SAA	TNA	34
16	CRS	ASF	TNA	SAA	33
11	CRS	ASF	SAA	SAP	32
18	CRS	ASF	TNA	TNA	31
17	CRS	ASF	TNA	SAP	30
28	ASF	ASF	SAA	SAA	30
30	ASF	ASF	SAA	TNA	28
13	CRS	ASF	SAP	SAA	25
29	ASF	ASF	SAA	SAP	25
34	ASF	ASF	TNA	SAA	25
35	ASF	ASF	TNA	SAP	25
36	ASF	ASF	TNA	TNA	24
31	ASF	ASF	SAP	SAA	23
14	CRS	ASF	SAP	SAP	20
15	CRS	ASF	SAP	TNA	20
32	ASF	ASF	SAP	SAP	20
33	ASF	ASF	SAP	TNA	20
19	ASF	CRS	SAA	SAA	19
20	ASF	CRS	SAA	SAP	18
21	ASF	CRS	SAA	TNA	18
25	ASF	CRS	TNA	SAA	16
26	ASF	CRS	TNA	SAP	10
27	ASF	CRS	TNA	TNA	8
1	CRS	CRS	SAA	SAA	7
9	CRS	CRS	TNA	TNA	7
22	ASF	CRS	SAP	SAA	7
23	ASF	CRS	SAP	SAP	7
24	ASF	CRS	SAP	TNA	7
4	CRS	CRS	SAP	SAA	6
3	CRS	CRS	SAA	TNA	5
7	CRS	CRS	TNA	SAA	5
6	CRS	CRS	SAP	TNA	4
2	CRS	CRS	SAA	SAP	3
8	CRS	CRS	TNA	SAP	2
5	CRS	CRS	SAP	SAP	1
37 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
38 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
39 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
40 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
41 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
42 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	SAP	TNA	0

43 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
44 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
45 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	RDL	TNA	TNA	0
46 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	SAA	0
47 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	SAP	0
48 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAA	TNA	0
49 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	SAA	0
50 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	SAP	0
51 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	SAP	TNA	0
52 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	SAA	0
53 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	SAP	0
54 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	CRS	TNA	TNA	0
55 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	SAA	0
56 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	SAP	0
57 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAA	TNA	0
58 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	SAA	0
59 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	SAP	0
60 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	SAP	TNA	0
61 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	SAA	0
62 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	SAP	0
63 (Logically Not Possible)	AIB	ASF	TNA	TNA	0
64 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
65 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
66 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
67 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
68 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
69 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	SAP	TNA	0
70 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
71 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
72 (Logically Not Possible)	CRS	RDL	TNA	TNA	0
73 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	SAA	0
74 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	SAP	0
75 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAA	TNA	0
76 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	SAA	0
77 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	SAP	0
78 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	SAP	TNA	0
79 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	SAA	0
80 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	SAP	0
81 (Logically Not Possible)	ASF	RDL	TNA	TNA	0

AIB = Accepts as international border
CRS = Continue re-negotiation for a peaceful settlement
ASF = Attempt to seize by force / build fence by force
RDL = Returns disputed land to Afghanistan
SAA = Support the approach of Afghanistan
SAP = Support the approach of Pakistan
TNA = Take neutral approach

Note: The futures receiving '0' votes are not logical

Table 3: Sub-scenario 3--US Support Pakistan's approach of Use of Force.

Step 9: Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each “alternate future” in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.

The most likely “alternate futures” would be analyzed, assuming that each future actually happens.¹⁴⁵ Before talking about “alternate futures,” one has to look at the broader aspect prior to narrowing it down to the specifics. The two “primary alternate futures” that can happen in relation to Afghanistan, Durand Line issue, and US Interest are: a) *Afghanistan would become a future threat to US Interest due to Durand Line issue*; or b) *Afghanistan would not become a future threat to US Interest due to Durand Line issue*. This section would analyze whether the elements of US Interest, National Security Strategy, and Interest in Afghanistan are under threat from Afghanistan itself—due to its involvement in the Durand Line issue--in each of the most likely “alternate futures” generating within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1”.

In these circumstances, the five alternate futures (Step 8, Table 1) deemed “most likely” and ranked-ordered according to the votes received within the “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1” have been summarized below for better understanding. These “most likely alternate futures” basically answer the question--*What is the likelihood and consequences of Afghanistan becoming a future threat to the US Interest?*--given the information available as of the 15 February 2006:

Alternate Future number 1: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

This “alternate future” is the most likely one with line of least resistance within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1” and shows the closest resemblance to the present state of situation between Afghanistan and Pakistan. The below-outlined table has been incorporated to analyze

¹⁴⁵ *The LAMP Method.*

whether within this “alternate future,” Afghanistan would become a threat to US Interest, and if “Yes,” What would be its consequences?”

Alternate Future number 1: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the approaches of Afghanistan.			
TOPIC	ELEMENTS	DOES THREAT TO US INTEREST FROM AFGHANISTAN EXIST DUE TO DURAND LINE ISSUE?	
		YES/NO	TYPE
Vital US Interests	To prevent, deter and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical attacks on US	YES	US-Pakistan alliance (both with nuclear capability) <u>versus</u> Afghanistan-India-Iran alliance (India and Iran with nuclear capability).
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile dominating power or group of powers abroad	YES	The Afghanistan-India-Iran alliance indicates the emergence of dominating/group of power(s) in the region.
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile power on US border or in control of the seas nearby	YES	Due to US-Pakistan alliance, the possibility of Indian military activity in the Arabian sea, and the increase of anti-US sentiment among the Afghan community in the continental US.
	To prevent the catastrophic collapse of major global systems, including trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, & environment	YES	The “cold shoulder” mentality due to the US-Pakistan and Afghanistan-India-Iran alliance would have an impact on the regional systems.
	To ensure the survival of US allies	YES	Since, presently Afghanistan has been considered as an US ally, the approach of US to support Pakistan would create a fracture in the US-Afghanistan relation.
US National Security Strategy	Defending the peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes	YES	Since, there are still the remnants of Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and also the Northern Alliance which is closer to India and Iran, Afghanistan’s future government might exploit these circumstances to conduct cross-border attacks and other subversive activities within the border of Pakistan.
	Preserving the peace by fostering an era of good relations amongst the world’s powers	YES	US supporting Pakistan, would not be taken as positive by India—one of the regional powers.
	Extending the peace by seeking to extend the benefits of freedom and prosperity across the globe	YES	If the negotiation fails, because of the variation in the alliances, then the US goal of extending peace would be jeopardized.
US Interest in Afghanistan	<u>Overt Interests:</u> A stable, independent, and democratic nation, which contributes positively to regional stability	YES	Afghanistan would become unstable, influenced by other states, which would not be able to contribute positively to regional stability.
	<u>Covert Interests:</u> US cater for oil, anti-communism, and dominance within the region	YES	The anti-US mentality which would develop in Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would have an impact on the US covert interests—the possibility does exist that the former communists would exploit the vulnerabilities.
	<u>Strategic Development Interests:</u> Better educated & healthier population, thriving economy led by private sector, democratic government with broad citizen participation, & program support for above	YES	The anti-US redbrick within Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would focus on how to counter it rather than move towards meeting the US strategic development interests.

Table 4: Consequences of Alternate Future number 1- Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the approaches of Afghanistan.

The above analysis indicates that in this “alternate future,” Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest does exist because all of the elements of US Interest, US National Security Strategy and US Interest in Afghanistan are at risk due to Afghanistan’s involvement in the Durand Line issue. Though the impact would not be seen immediately, but the prolonging nature of “re-negotiation effort” would make the situation vulnerable for “various entities” to exploit it against US Interest. In these circumstances, the consequences of this “alternate future” would be further competition in nuclear front, deteriorating economic condition, instable political spectrum, social chaos, regional instability, class struggles, and increase in anti-US rhetoric activities which would lead towards a new “cold war.”

Alternate Future number 3: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.

This “alternate future” is the second most likely one within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1,” wherein Afghanistan would be fully supported by India, but Iran would take a neutral stance on a “wait and see policy.” The below-outlined table has been incorporated to analyze whether due to this “alternate future,” Afghanistan would become a future threat to US Interest, and if “Yes,” What would be its consequences?

Alternate Future number 3: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.			
TOPIC	ELEMENTS	DOES THREAT TO US INTEREST FROM AFGHANISTAN EXIST DUE TO DURAND LINE ISSUE?	
		YES/NO	TYPE
Vital US Interests	To prevent, deter and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical attacks on US	YES	US-Pakistan alliance (both with nuclear capability) versus Afghanistan-India alliance (India with nuclear capability). Iran with nuclear capability & having anti-US stand & using “wait and see” policy would later alliance with Afghanistan.
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile dominating power or group of powers abroad	YES	The Afghanistan-India alliance indicates the emergence of dominating/group of power(s) in the region. Later, this may be true for Iran also.
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile power on US border or in control of the seas nearby	YES	Due to US-Pakistan alliance, the possibility of Indian military activity in the Arabian sea, and the increase of anti-US sentiment among the Afghan community in the continental US.
	To prevent the catastrophic collapse of major global systems, including trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and environment	YES	The “cold shoulder” mentality due to the US-Pakistan and Afghanistan-India alliance would have an impact on the regional stems, wherein Iran may join in India-Afghan alliance in future.
	To ensure the survival of US allies	YES	As presently Afghanistan is considered as an US ally, the approach of US to support Pakistan would create a fracture in the US-Afghanistan relation.
US National Security Strategy	Defending the peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes	YES	Since, there are still the remnants of Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan, and also the Northern Alliance which is closer to India, Afghanistan’s future government might exploit these circumstances to conduct cross-border attacks and other subversive activities within the border of Pakistan. Likewise, Iran which is taking a neutral stance but is very near to Northern Alliance may join in later with Afghanistan-India alliance.
	Preserving the peace by fostering an era of good relations amongst the world’s powers	YES	US supporting Pakistan, would not be taken as positive by India—one of the regional powers.
	Extending the peace by seeking to extend the benefits of freedom and prosperity across the globe	YES	If the negotiation fails, because of the variation in the alliances, then the US goal of extending peace would be jeopardized.
US Interest in Afghanistan	<u>Overt Interests:</u> A stable, independent, and democratic nation, which contributes positively to regional stability	YES	Afghanistan would become unstable, influenced by other states, which would not be able to contribute positively to regional stability.
	<u>Covert Interests:</u> US cater for oil, anti-communism, and dominance within the region	YES	The anti-US mentality which would develop in Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would have an impact on the US covert interests—the possibility does exist that the former communists would exploit the vulnerabilities.
	<u>Strategic Development Interests:</u> Better educated and healthier population, thriving economy led by private sector, democratic government with broad citizen participation, and program support	YES	The anti-US redbrick within Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would focus on how to counter it rather than move towards meeting the US strategic development interests.

Table 5: Consequences of Alternate Future number 3--Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.

The above analysis indicates that in this “alternate future,” Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest does exist because all of the elements of US Interest, US National Security Strategy and US Interest in Afghanistan are at risk due to Afghanistan’s involvement in the Durand Line issue. Though the impact would not be as within “alternate future 1,” but Iran’s “wait and see” policy and later getting aligned according to the circumstances would further deteriorate the threat scenario. The prolonging nature of “re-negotiation effort” among the two countries one backed by US while the other by India, wherein Iran would be “watching,” would make the situation vulnerable and thus exploitation against US Interest. In these circumstances, the consequences of this “alternate future” would be instable economic condition, questionable political spectrum, social disturbances, a question mark of the future of regional stability, increases in anti-US rhetoric and activities, and Iran’s covert activities while using “wait and see” policy would lead towards a increased threat to US interest.

Alternate Future number 7: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.

This “alternate future” is the third most likely one within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1,” wherein Afghanistan would be fully supported by Iran, but India would take a neutral stance on a “wait and see policy.” The below-outlined table has been incorporated to analyze whether due to this “alternate future,” Afghanistan would become a future threat to US Interest, and if “Yes,” What would be its consequences?

Alternate Future number 7: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.			
TOPIC	ELEMENTS	DOES THREAT TO US INTEREST FROM AFGHANISTAN EXIST DUE TO DURAND LINE ISSUE?	
		YES/NO	TYPE
Vital US Interests	To prevent, deter and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical attacks on US	YES	US-Pakistan alliance (both with nuclear capability) <u>versus</u> Afghanistan-Iran alliance (Iran with nuclear capability). India with nuclear capability and being a regional power & using “wait and see” policy would later move into alliance with Afghanistan.
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile dominating power or group of powers abroad	YES	The Afghanistan-Iran alliance indicates the emergence of dominating/group of power(s) in the region. Later this may be true for India also.
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile power on US border or in control of the seas nearby	YES	Due to US-Pakistan alliance, the possibility of Indian military activity in the Arabian sea for “watching” activities, and the anti-US sentiment among the Afghan community in continental US.
	To prevent the catastrophic collapse of major global systems, including trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and environment	YES	The “cold shoulder” mentality due to the US-Pakistan and Afghanistan-Iran alliance would have an impact on the regional systems, wherein India may join in Iran–Afghan alliance later in the future.
	To ensure the survival of US allies	YES	As Afghanistan is considered as an US ally, the approach of US to support Pakistan would create a fracture in the US-Afghanistan relation.
US National Security Strategy	Defending the peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes	YES	Since, there are still the remnants of Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and also the Northern Alliance which is closer to Iran, Afghanistan’s future government might exploit these circumstances to conduct cross-border attacks and other subversive activities within the border of Pakistan. Likewise, India which is taking a neutral stance but is very near to Northern Alliance may join in later with Afghanistan-Iran alliance.
	Preserving the peace by fostering an era of good relations amongst the world’s greatest powers	YES	US supporting Pakistan, would not be taken as positive by Iran—one of the critics of US.
	Extending the peace by seeking to extend the benefits of freedom and prosperity across the globe	YES	If the negotiation fails, because of the variation in the alliances, then the US goal of extending peace would be jeopardized.
US Interest in Afghanistan	<u>Overt Interests:</u> A stable, independent, and democratic nation, which contributes positively to regional stability	YES	Afghanistan would become unstable, influenced by other states, which would not be able to contribute positively to regional stability.
	<u>Covert Interests:</u> US cater for oil, anti-communism, and dominance within the region	YES	The anti-US mentality which would develop in Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would have an impact on the US covert interests—the possibility does exist that the former communists would exploit the vulnerability.
	<u>Strategic Development Interests:</u> Better educated and healthier population, thriving economy led by private sector, democratic government with broad citizen participation, and program support	YES	The anti-US redbrick within Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would focus on how to counter it rather than move towards meeting the US strategic development interests.

Table 6: Consequences of Alternate Future number 7--Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.

The above analysis indicates that in this “alternate future,” Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest does exist because all of the elements of US Interest, US National Security Strategy and US Interest in Afghanistan are at risk due to Afghanistan’s involvement in the Durand Line issue. Though the impact would not be as within “alternate future 1,” but India’s “wait and see” policy and later getting aligned according to the circumstances would further deteriorate the threat scenario. The prolonging nature of “re-negotiation effort” among the two countries one backed by US while the other by Iran, wherein India would be “watching,” would make the situation vulnerable and thus exploitation of US Interest would be possible. In these circumstances, the consequences of this “alternate future” would be instable economic condition, questionable political spectrum, social disturbances, a question mark of the future of regional stability, increases in anti-US rhetoric and activities, and India’s covert activities while using “wait and see” policy would lead towards a increased threat to US interest.

Alternate Future number 2: Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

This alternate future is the fourth most likely one within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1”, wherein Afghanistan would be fully supported by India, but Iran would support Pakistan. The below-outlined table has been incorporated to analyze whether due to this “alternate future,” Afghanistan would become a future threat to US Interest, and if “Yes,” What would be its consequences?

Alternate Future number 2: Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.			
TOPIC	ELEMENTS	DOES THREAT TO US INTEREST FROM AFGHANISTAN EXIST DUE TO DURAND LINE ISSUE?	
		YES/NO	TYPE
Vital US Interests	To prevent, deter and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical attacks on US	YES	US-Pakistan-Iran alliance (all three with nuclear capability) <i>versus</i> Afghanistan-India alliance (India with nuclear capability).
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile dominating power or group of powers abroad	YES	The Afghanistan-India and Pakistan-Iran alliance indicates the emergence of dominating/group of power(s) in the region.
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile power on US border or in control of the seas nearby	YES	Due to US-Pakistan-Iran alliance, the possibility of increase in Indian military activity in the Arabian sea, and the anti-US sentiment among the Afghan community in the continental US.
	To prevent the catastrophic collapse of major global systems, including trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and environment	YES	The “cold shoulder” mentality due to the US-Pakistan-Iran and Afghanistan-India alliance would have an impact on the regional systems.
	To ensure the survival of US allies	YES	Since, Afghanistan is considered as an US ally, the approach of US to support Pakistan would create a fracture in the US-Afghanistan relation.
US National Security Strategy	Defending the peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes	YES	Since, there are still the remnants of Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan, the future government of Afghanistan might exploit these circumstances to conduct cross-border attacks and other subversive activities within the border of Pakistan.
	Preserving the peace by fostering an era of good relations amongst the world’s greatest powers	YES	US supporting Pakistan-Iran alliance would not be taken positively by India.
	Extending the peace by seeking to extend the benefits of freedom and prosperity across the globe	YES	If the negotiation fails, because of the variation in the alliances, then the US goal of extending peace would be jeopardized.
US Interest in Afghanistan	<u>Overt Interests:</u> A stable, independent, and democratic nation, which contributes positively to regional stability	YES	Afghanistan would become unstable, influenced by other states, which would not be able to contribute positively to regional stability.
	<u>Covert Interests:</u> US cater for oil, anti-communism, and dominance within the region	YES	The anti-US mentality which would develop in Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan-Iran alliance would have an impact on the US covert interests—the possibility does exist that the former communists would exploit the vulnerability.
	<u>Strategic Development Interests:</u> Better educated and healthier population, thriving economy led by private sector, democratic government with broad citizen participation, and program support	YES	The anti-US redbrick within Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan-Iran alliance would focus on how to counter it rather than move towards meeting the US strategic development interests.

Table 7: Consequences of Alternate Future number 2--Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

The above analysis indicates that in this “alternate future,” Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest does exist because all of the elements of US Interest, US National Security Strategy and US Interest in Afghanistan are at risk due to Afghanistan’s involvement in the Durand Line issue. The prolonging nature of “re-negotiation effort” among the two countries one backed by US and Iran while the other by India would make the situation vulnerable and thus exploitation of US Interest would be possible. In these circumstances, the consequences of this “alternate future” would be instable economic condition, questionable political spectrum, social disturbances, a question mark of the future of regional stability, increases in anti-US rhetoric and activities, and India’s covert activities to undermine US-Pakistan-Iran alliance.

Alternate Future number 9: Pakistan continues to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.

This “alternate future” is the last most likely one within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1”, wherein Afghanistan is neither supported by India or Iran. The below-outlined table has been incorporated to analyze whether due to this “alternate future,” Afghanistan would become a future threat to US Interest, and if “Yes,” What would be its consequences?

Alternate Future number 9: Pakistan continues to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.			
TOPIC	ELEMENTS	DOES THREAT TO US INTEREST FROM AFGHANISTAN EXIST DUE TO DURAND LINE ISSUE?	
		YES/NO	TYPE
Vital US Interests	To prevent, deter and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical attacks on US	NO	US-Pakistan (both with nuclear capability) <u>versus</u> Afghanistan (no nuclear capability).
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile dominating power or group of powers abroad	YES	The Afghanistan <u>versus</u> US-Pakistan indicates the emergence of dominating/group of power(s) in the region, as Iran and India would be in the position of “wait and see.”
	To prevent the emergence of a hostile power on US border or in control of the seas nearby	YES	The Indian military would be “watching” on the Arabian Sea for development of activities.
	To prevent the catastrophic collapse of major global systems, including trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and environment	YES	The “cold shoulder” mentality between Afghanistan and Pakistan would have an impact on the regional systems.
	To ensure the survival of US allies	YES	Since, Afghanistan is considered as an US ally, the approach of US to support Pakistan would create a fracture in the US-Afghanistan relation.
US National Security Strategy	Defending the peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes	YES	Since, there are still the remnants of Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan, the future government of Afghanistan might exploit these circumstances to conduct cross-border attacks and other subversive activities within the border of Pakistan.
	Preserving the peace by fostering an era of good relations amongst the world’s greatest powers	YES	US supporting Pakistan, would not be taken as positive by India and Iran.
	Extending the peace by seeking to extend the benefits of freedom and prosperity across the globe	YES	If the negotiation fails, because of the variation in the alliances, then the US goal of extending peace would be jeopardized.
US Interest in Afghanistan	<u>Overt Interests:</u> A stable, independent, and democratic nation, which contributes positively to regional stability	YES	Afghanistan would become unstable, influenced by other states, which would not be able to contribute positively to regional stability.
	<u>Covert Interests:</u> US cater for oil, anti-communism, and dominance within the region	YES	The anti-US mentality which would develop in Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan would have an impact on the US covert interests—the possibility does exist that the former communists would exploit the vulnerability.
	<u>Strategic Development Interests:</u> Better educated and healthier population, thriving economy led by private sector, democratic government with broad citizen participation, and program support for the objectives	YES	The anti-US redbrick within Afghanistan due to US-Pakistan alliance would focus on how to counter it rather than move towards meeting the US strategic development interests.

Table 8: Consequences of Alternate Future number 9--Pakistan continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.

The above analysis indicates that in this “alternate future,” Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest does exist because all most all of the elements of US Interest, US National Security Strategy and US Interest in Afghanistan are at risk due to Afghanistan’s involvement in the Durand Line issue. The prolonging nature of “re-negotiation effort” among the two countries, while India and Iran keep a silent approach of “wait and see” would make the situation vulnerable and thus exploitation of US Interest would be possible. In these circumstances, the consequences of this “alternate future” would be deteriorating economic condition, questionable political spectrum, social disturbances, a question mark of the future of regional stability, increases in anti-US rhetoric and activities, and Iran and India’s covert activities to undermine US-Pakistan alliance.

Step 10: Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given “alternate future”.

A “focal event” is an occurrence of sufficient magnitude that it changes the relative probability of the universe of alternate futures; the most likely future would have no or fewest focal events leading into it, whereas, the least likely futures would have more focal events leading to it.¹⁴⁶ Therefore, the “focal events” that must occur at present in order to bring about the five most likely “alternate future” in the “Sub-scenario 1” of major “Scenario 1” are as follows:

¹⁴⁶ Jonathan S. Lockwood and Kathleen O. Lockwood, 55.

Alternate Future number 1: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

The focal events of “alternate future number 1” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- US supports Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land.
- Afghanistan has good relation with India and Iran

Alternate Future number 3: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.

The focal events of “alternate future number 3” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- US support Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line.
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land.
- Afghanistan has good relation with India.

Alternate Future number 7: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.

The focal events of “alternate future number 7” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- US support Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line.
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land.
- Afghanistan has good relation with Iran.

Alternate Future number 2: Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

The focal events of “alternate future number 2” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- US support Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line.
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land.
- Pakistan has good relation with Iran.
- Afghanistan has good relation with India.

Alternate Future number 9: Pakistan continues to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.

The focal events of “alternate future number 9” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- US support Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line.
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land.

Step 11: Develop indicators for the “focal events”.

For each focal event associated with an “alternate future,” it is possible to develop a list of “indicators” that such an event either has occurred or is about to occur, which the analyst must periodically “revote.”¹⁴⁷ Therefore, the “indicators” for each “focal events” for the five most likely “alternate futures” in “Sub-scenario 1” of the major “Scenario 1” are as follows:

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 56.

Alternate Future number 1: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

The focal events and its indicators for “alternate future number 1” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Pakistan accepts Durand Line
 - US accepts Durand Line
 - India rejects Durand Line
 - Iran rejects Durand Line
 - Afghanistan rejects Durand Line
- US supports Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Openly states the support
 - Provides morale, financial, technical, and hardware assistance to tackle the issue
 - Forms a Commission to overlook the issue
 - Uses its influence to seek renegotiation from Afghanistan
 - Opens channels of dialogue with India and/or Iran in this issue
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Initiates, responds, or participates for a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan to retain the disputed land
 - Initiates, responds or participates to a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan for a properly decided and delineated new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan that is agreeable to both
 - Responds to the call of peaceful renegotiation made by Afghanistan
 - Requests support from US and/or Iran and/or India to support the renegotiation process
 - Involves the International Court of Justice for a verdict favorable to its decision
 - Decides to move in accordance with the recommendation give by US and/or Iran and /or India for a peaceful renegotiation of the issue
 - The people of Pakistan through referendum cater for this process
 - The Parliament of Pakistan dictates the Pakistan Government to move on this process
 - Friendly interaction between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Exchange of special envoys between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Suspension of hostile activities in the bordering areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan

- Continuous discussion about resolving the issue peacefully with/without the help of other stake-holders
- Afghanistan has good relation with India and Iran, wherein the indicators would be-
 - India and Iran openly supports Afghanistan's approach of peaceful renegotiation with Pakistan for resolving the issue of the disputed land
 - Increase of trade and commerce with India and Iran
 - India and Iran supporting development work within Afghanistan
 - India and/or Iran opening their Consulates in other parts of Afghanistan
 - Exchange of cultural and other activities of Afghanistan with India and Iran
 - India and Iran providing financial, security, and other forms of assistance to Afghanistan
 - Pro-Indian government in Kabul
 - Pro-Iranian government in Kabul

Alternate Future number 3: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.

The focal events and its indicators for “alternate future number 3” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Pakistan accepts Durand Line
 - US accepts Durand Line
 - India rejects Durand Line
 - Iran takes a neutral posture
 - Afghanistan rejects Durand Line
- US supports Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Openly states the support
 - Provides morale, financial, technical, and hardware assistance to tackle the issue
 - Forms a Commission to overlook the issue
 - Uses its influence to seek renegotiation form Afghanistan
 - Opens channels of dialogue with India and/or Iran in this issue
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein the indicators would be-

- Initiates, responds, or participates for a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan to retain the disputed land
 - Initiates, responds or participates to a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan for a properly decided and delineated new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan that is agreeable to both
 - Responds to the call of peaceful renegotiation made by Afghanistan
 - Requests support from US and/or Iran and/or India to support the renegotiation process
 - Involves the International Court of Justice for a verdict favorable to its decision
 - Decides to move in accordance with the recommendation give by US and/or Iran and /or India for a peaceful renegotiation of the issue
 - The people of Pakistan through referendum cater for this process
 - The Parliament of Pakistan dictates the Pakistan Government to move on this process
 - Friendly interaction between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Exchange of special envoys between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Suspension of hostile activites in the bordering areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Continuous discussion about resolving the issue peacefully with/without the help of other stake-holders
- Afghanistan has good relation with India, wherein the indicators would be-
 - India openly supports Afghanistan’s approach of peaceful renegotiation with Pakistan for resolving the issue of the disputed land
 - Increase of trade and commerce with India
 - India supporting development work within Afghanistan
 - India opening their Consulates in other parts of Afghanistan
 - Exchange of cultural and other activities of Afghanistan with India
 - India providing financial, security, and other forms of assistance to Afghanistan
 - Pro-Indian government in Kabul

Alternate Future number 7: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.

The focal events and its indicators for “alternate future number 7” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Pakistan accepts Durand Line
 - US accepts Durand Line

- India takes a neutral posture
- Iran rejects Durand Line
- Afghanistan rejects Durand Line
- US supports Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Openly states the support
 - Provides morale, financial, technical, and hardware assistance to tackle the issue
 - Forms a Commission to overlook the issue
 - Uses its influence to seek renegotiation from Afghanistan
 - Opens channels of dialogue with India and/or Iran in this issue
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Initiates, responds, or participates for a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan to retain the disputed land
 - Initiates, responds or participates to a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan for a properly decided and delineated new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan that is agreeable to both
 - Responds to the call of peaceful renegotiation made by Afghanistan
 - Requests support from US and/or Iran and/or India to support the renegotiation process
 - Involves the International Court of Justice for favorable verdict
 - Decides to move in accordance with the recommendation give by US and/or Iran and /or India for a peaceful renegotiation of the issue
 - The people of Pakistan through referendum cater for this process
 - The Parliament of Pakistan dictates the Pakistan Government to move on this process
 - Friendly interaction between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Exchange of special envoys between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Suspension of hostile activities in the bordering areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Continuous discussion about resolving the issue peacefully with/without the help of other stake-holders
- Afghanistan has good relation with Iran, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Iran openly supports Afghanistan's approach of peaceful renegotiation with Pakistan for resolving the issue of the disputed land
 - Increase of trade and commerce with Iran
 - Iran supporting development work within Afghanistan
 - Iran opening their Consulates in other parts of Afghanistan
 - Exchange of cultural and other activities of Afghanistan with Iran
 - Iran providing financial, security, and other forms of assistance to Afghanistan
 - Pro-Iranian government in Kabul

Alternate Future number 2: Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

The focal events and its indicators for “alternate future number 2” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Pakistan accepts Durand Line
 - US accepts Durand Line
 - India rejects Durand Line
 - Iran accepts Durand Line
 - Afghanistan rejects Durand Line
- US supports Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Openly states the support
 - Provides morale, financial, technical, and hardware assistance to tackle the issue
 - Forms a Commission to overlook the issue
 - Uses its influence to seek renegotiation from Afghanistan
 - Opens channels of dialogue with India and/or Iran in this issue
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Initiates, responds, or participates for a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan to retain the disputed land
 - Initiates, responds or participates to a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan for a properly decided and delineated new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan that is agreeable to both
 - Responds to the call of peaceful renegotiation made by Afghanistan
 - Requests support from US and/or Iran and/or India to support the renegotiation process
 - Involves the International Court of Justice for a verdict favorable to its decision
 - Decides to move in accordance with the recommendation give by US and/or Iran and /or India for a peaceful renegotiation of the issue
 - The people of Pakistan through referendum cater for this process
 - The Parliament of Pakistan dictates the Pakistan Government to move on this process
 - Friendly interaction between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Exchange of special envoys between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Suspension of hostile activities in the bordering areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan

- Continuous discussion about resolving the issue peacefully with/without the help of other stake-holders
- Pakistan has good relation with Iran, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Iran openly supports Pakistan’s approach of peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan for resolving the issue of the disputed land
 - Increase of trade and commerce with Iran
 - Iran supporting development work within Pakistan
 - Iran opening their Consulates in other parts of Pakistan
 - Exchange of cultural and other activities of Pakistan with Iran
 - Iran providing financial, security, and other forms of assistance to Pakistan
 - Pro-Iranian government in Islamabad
- Afghanistan has good relation with India, wherein the indicators would be-
 - India openly supports Afghanistan’s approach of peaceful renegotiation with Pakistan for resolving the issue of the disputed land
 - Increase of trade and commerce with India
 - India supporting development work within Afghanistan
 - India opening their Consulates in other parts of Afghanistan
 - Exchange of cultural and other activities of Afghanistan with India
 - India providing financial, security, and other forms of assistance to Afghanistan
 - Pro-Indian government in Kabul

Alternate Future number 9: Pakistan continues to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.

The focal events and its indicators for “alternate future number 9” are:

- Acceptance or rejection or Neutral posture taken by key-actors on the issue of Durand Line as international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Pakistan accepts Durand Line
 - US accepts Durand Line
 - India takes a neutral posture
 - Iran takes a neutral posture
 - Afghanistan rejects Durand Line
- US supports Pakistan on the issue of Durand Line, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Openly states the support
 - Provides morale, financial, technical, and hardware assistance to tackle the issue

- Forms a Commission to overlook the issue
- Uses its influence to seek renegotiation from Afghanistan
- Opens channels of dialogue with India and/or Iran in this issue
- Pakistan initiates, responds or participates to a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein the indicators would be-
 - Initiates, responds, or participates for a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan to retain the disputed land
 - Initiates, responds or participates to a peaceful renegotiation with Afghanistan for a properly decided and delineated new border between Afghanistan and Pakistan that is agreeable to both
 - Responds to the call of peaceful renegotiation made by Afghanistan
 - Requests support from US and/or Iran and/or India to support the renegotiation process
 - Involves the International Court of Justice for a verdict favorable to its decision
 - Decides to move in accordance with the recommendation give by US and/or Iran and /or India for a peaceful renegotiation of the issue
 - The people of Pakistan through referendum cater for this process
 - The Parliament of Pakistan dictates the Pakistan Government to move on this process
 - Friendly interaction between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Exchange of special envoys between Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Suspension of hostile activites in the bordering areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan
 - Continuous discussion about resolving the issue peacefully with/without the help of other stake-holders

Step 12: State the potential of a given alternate future to “transpose” into another alternate future.

Transposition is a highly abstract concept; and when “alternate futures” share common focal events and indicators, there is a potential for transposition.¹⁴⁸ Therefore, the five most likely “alternate futures” within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1” that can transpose into another “alternate future(s)” within any “Sub-scenarios” of major “Scenarios” are as follows:

¹⁴⁸ *The LAMP Method.*

Alternate Future number 1: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

This “alternate future” has potential to transpose for a short duration to the “most likely alternate future number 2” within “Sub-scenario 2” and then after to the “most likely alternate future number 10” within “Sub-scenario 3” of “Scenario 1,” if Afghanistan does not respond to Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the Durand Line issue. On the other hand, if Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the issue is properly dealt by Afghanistan, then the issue would be resolved, wherein the threat to US Interest would be negated.

Alternate Future number 3: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan but Iran would stay neutral.

This “alternate future” has the potential to transpose to “alternate future number 1” within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1,” if Afghanistan is able to convince Iran to support it or if Iran analyzes the situation for the need to support Afghanistan in regards to Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the Durand Line issue. On the other hand, this “alternate future” would transpose to “alternate future number 2” within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1,” if Pakistan is able to convince Iran for its support or if Iran analyzes the situation for the need to support Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the issue with Afghanistan.

Alternate Future number 7: Pakistan would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein Iran would support the re-negotiated settlement approach of Afghanistan but India would stay neutral.

This “alternate future” has the potential to transpose to “alternate future number 1” within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1,” if Afghanistan is able to convince India for its support or if India analyzes the situation for the need to support Afghanistan in regards to Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the Durand Line issue.

Alternate Future number 2: Pakistan with the support of Iran would continue to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India would support the re-negotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan.

This “alternate future” has the potential to transpose for a short duration to the “alternate future number 2” within “Sub-scenario 2” and then after to the “alternate future number 11” within “Sub-scenario 3” of “Scenario 1,” if Afghanistan does not respond to Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the Durand Line issue.

Alternate Future number 9: Pakistan continues to re-negotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would stay neutral.

This “alternate future” has the potential to transpose to “alternate future numbers 1 or 3 or 7 or 2” within “Sub-scenario 1” of “Scenario 1,” depending upon who from among Afghanistan and Pakistan can convince India and Iran for their support or if India and Iran analyzes the situation for a needs to support either of them in regards to Pakistan’s call for a renegotiated peaceful settlement of the Durand Line issue.

CONCLUSION

This paper addresses the most likely “alternate futures” resulting from the Durand Line issue, where the four national “actors”—Afghanistan, India, Iran, and Pakistan—play a critical role. After an in-depth study of the four actors was conducted, the LAMP method was used to analyze the events, perceptions, intentions, and influence of the actors—the cut-off date of the information used was kept as that of 15 February 2006—to reach the conclusion.

The purpose of the study has been met because the three future major “scenarios” and the three future “sub-scenarios” were identified, wherein eighty-one “alternate futures” were critically analyzed (out of which 45 future were logically not possible) for each of the “sub-scenarios” within “Scenario 1” that led to the identification of five most likely alternate futures: “alternate future numbers 1, 3, 7, 2 and 9.”

Though in overt reality the state of activity in regards to the Durand Line issue is presently within the “Scenario 3: US adopts neutral stance in the issue of Durand Line, and therefore supports both Afghanistan and Pakistan to peacefully resolve the issue of the disputed land,” but the covert and some overt developments among the four “actors” continue to indicate towards “Scenario 3” transforming to “Scenario 1—US accept Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any approach taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land.” But, as US caters to safeguard its vital Interests, National Security Strategy, and the Interest in Afghanistan it can be very well stated that US would do all it can to maintain “Scenario 3” so that it can assist Afghanistan’s development as a stable, independent, and democratic nation, which contributes positively; but this is not possible because of the quickly developing events. Therefore, the transformation is unavoidable; though the US approach for providing support would still be directed towards “Sub-scenario 1: US Support

Pakistan's approach of Renegotiated Peaceful Settlement of the issue." But before, "Sub-scenario 1" is fully observed there would be a small period of time wherein the transient "sub-scenario"—*Sub-scenario 2, The Status Quo* supplemented by the US intention to support Pakistan's decision of re-negotiated peaceful settlement—would be apparent.

The transformation to "Sub-scenario 1" would be fully evident as Pakistan would try to renegotiate the disputed land either by "as it is and where it is" or through renegotiation for a new border acceptable to both Afghanistan and Pakistan. In these circumstances, the other national "actors" would also play a vital role according to their national interest. Therefore, the most likely "alternate future" that would happen in the near future would be--*Alternate future number 1: Pakistan would continue to renegotiate with Afghanistan for a peaceful settlement of the disputed land, wherein India and Iran would support the renegotiated peaceful settlement approach of Afghanistan--within the most likely sub-scenario--Sub-scenario 1: US support Pakistan's approach of renegotiated peaceful settlement of the issue--of the major future scenario--Scenario 1: US accept Durand Line as an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and therefore support any approach taken by Pakistan to retain the disputed land.*

It is also to be noted that due to the fast development of events, the above future would rapidly transpose to other "alternate futures" both within and outside the major "Scenario 1," thus making the peaceful resolution of the issue very grim. In the long run, due to the prolongation of the issue, there would be an escalation of the conflict between the two countries--Afghanistan backed by India and Iran, and Pakistan backed by US--giving rise to extreme armed conflict resulting in an "all-out-war" with the possibility of the release of WMD.

At this juncture, one can provide conclusion by saying that the results of this paper have fully addressed the hypothesis, which was stated during the in-depth study of the issue--*the*

perceptions of the four national “actors,” regarding the issue of Durand Line as the international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, differ significantly and will eventually lead to extreme armed conflict resulting in an “all-out-war,” wherein the involvement of Afghanistan in this issue can be considered as Afghanistan becoming a future threat to US Interest. In other words, when one compares the issues rising from Afghanistan getting involved in the Durand Line dispute with the elements of the vital US Interests, US National Security Strategy, and US Interest in Afghanistan, it is observed that all most all of the elements that are the thrust of US Interest are affected or exploited in some form or another.

On the other hand, the determination of the threat indicates that the activities, circumstances, events, persons, and actions of Afghanistan in relation to its involvement in the Durand Line issue would have an adverse effect on the US Interest as all the four types of threats--perceived, actual, direct, and indirect—would exist in the near future as indicated in the summarized “Table 9” below:

DETERMINATION OF THE THREAT TO US INTEREST DUE TO AFGHANISTAN’S INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE OF DURAND LINE			
PERCEIVED THREATS	ACTUAL THREATS	DIRECT THREATS	INDIRECT THREATS
Due to “Great Game” of the past.	India, Iran, Pakistan, and US have nuclear weapons.	Taliban are reorganizing and invigorating	In the past, Afghanistan protested against Pakistan’s entry to the UN.
Pakistan operating within the boundaries of Afghanistan as Duran Line ceased to exist from 1993.	Supreme Leader of Iran directly threatens US.	Al Qaeda are operating and regrouping.	The demand of Pashtunistan has been supported by Afghanistan.
Afghan people are unpredictable.	Interference of regional powers.	Factionalism and Warlordism.	The disputed land due to Durand Line was supposed to be legally returned by Pakistan to Afghanistan after the completion of 100 years, i.e. in 1993
US would get sucked into new conflict.	Problems in reconstruction in Afghanistan due to security situation.	Criminality.	Pakistan is playing US agenda in Afghanistan.
Possible release of WMD.	Problems in strengthening security in Afghanistan.	Radical and fundamentalism.	Northern Alliance claims that Taliban propped by Pakistan on directive from Washington.
Iran has been threatening.	Problem in basic human needs in Afghanistan.	US wants Afghan-Pakistan border to be firm.	Afghanistan wants properly decided and delineated border.
India does not like intervention.	Problem in the development of	Exploitation of US vulnerabilities.	Afghanistan wants US to re-negotiate the border.

**DETERMINATION OF THE THREAT TO US INTEREST DUE TO
AFGHANISTAN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE OF DURAND LINE**

PERCEIVED THREATS	ACTUAL THREATS	DIRECT THREATS	INDIRECT THREATS
	functioning government in Afghanistan.		
Other states might get involved.	Absorption of 3.5 million refugees is difficult.	Increased activities of attacks.	Afghanistan is already making news maps that include the disputed land.
Future Head of States of Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India can be anti-US.	Problem in integrating Afghanistan into the global market.	Bin Laden on large.	Pakistan takes the disputed land as a Doctrine of Strategic Depth against India.
Tribal differences.	Narcotic becoming an alternate source of GDP.	Gulbudin Hikmatyar aligning with Taliban and Al Qaeda against US.	Pashtun domination.
Afghanistan is made through the politics of internal power sharing and compromises.	Northern Alliance does not want Pashtun to get stronger.	Regional Governors in Afghanistan are holding powers.	Pakistan wants to demarcate the Durand Line.
Mr. Hamid Karzai, President of Afghanistan, perceived as puppet of US.	Afghanistan has lowest tariff rates.	Fear of urban terrorism.	Pakistan states the Durand Line issue is a matter settled.
Afghanistan is a landlocked country, therefore would look for a way to the sea.	Afghanistan faces smuggling, trade barriers, and blockades at the Afghan-Pakistan border.	Crisis of capacity in Afghanistan.	Pakistan complains to US about India using influence on Afghanistan to escalate the Durand Line issue.
Migration of Afghan population due to flood, drought, and earthquakes.	Unemployment rate is high, salary is very low, but the cost of living is high.	Slow pace of reconstruction in Afghanistan.	Pakistan claims that Israel and India are coordinating Pakistani Pashtun Nationalists to promote Pashtun land.
Durand Line as political game.	Afghanistan has border issues with Pakistan.	US operations require minimum collateral damage.	ISI feel that strong and stable Afghanistan will assert ownership of the NWFP.
Afghanistan wants to incorporate Tribal Agencies and NWFP into Afghanistan.	Afghanistan does not have string security forces that can adequately defend the country and the community.	Activities of Anti-government elements.	India states that Afghanistan will pretty soon claim the disputed land.
Afghanistan does not like Pakistan.	Afghan government says the assistance money not being funneled properly through government channels; it's being exploited.	-	India is using Afghanistan to put pressure on Afghanistan; and there are tribes within Afghanistan that will support India.
Afghanistan perceives Pakistan as supporting Taliban.	Corruption is very high.	-	Iran would undermine US Interest in the region.
Afghanistan thinks that Pakistan wanted to sabotage Bonn Agreement.	Control of security forces bad outside Kabul.	-	Iran and India has nuclear capability.
Indian Intelligence Agency (RAW) is active in Afghanistan, conducting anti-Pakistan activities.	Women in Afghanistan are still under bad state.	-	Iran has good relation with Northern Alliance in Afghanistan.
Present Afghan government friendly with India.	Afghanistan states that Durand Line divides	-	Iran complains that Pakistan is supporting Taliban.

DETERMINATION OF THE THREAT TO US INTEREST DUE TO AFGHANISTAN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE OF DURAND LINE			
PERCEIVED THREATS	ACTUAL THREATS	DIRECT THREATS	INDIRECT THREATS
	tribes, communities, and families.		
Pakistan sees the Tribal land as sources of gun, etc.	Afghanistan states that due to Durand Line they don't have access to the sea.	-	Iran's interest in Afghanistan is to prevent Pakistan getting access and facilitate US entry to the oil deposits of Caspian Sea.
India perceives Pakistan activities in Afghanistan and within Pakistan as anti-Indian and anti-secularist directed for an "Islamic Grab."	President Karzai rejected President Musaraf's idea of building fence in the Durand Line.	-	Iran is not happy with Sunni government, they cater for Shia government in Afghanistan.
US perceive that Pakistan wants docile Pashtun dominated government in Afghanistan.	Northern Alliance wants the Durand Line to be obstacle to reunification; so that Pashtuns don't become strong.	-	Iran wants instability in the region.
US perceived Durand Line as legal international border.	Regional missile systems, WMD, ethnic conflict, territorial disputes, drug, terrorism, potential of major wars.	-	Durand Line is a threat to the elements of vital US Interests, National Security Strategy, US Interest in Afghanistan, and US foreign policy.
Afghan treaty with British India is legally binded under Geneva Convention of Laws and Treaties.	-	-	-
Jurists state that Afghanistan is not entitled to denounce or withdraw from Durand Line treaty, as there is no validity in treaties of that dimension.	-	-	-
Afghanistan perceive that Durand Line treaty was made through fraud, corruption, coercion, valid only for 100 years, British India does not exist now, and no further ratifications were done.	-	-	-

Table 9: Determination of the threat to us interest due to Afghanistan's involvement in the issue of Durand line

To conclude, though maximum effort has been given to stay away from biases, the number of "actors" has been kept to the minimum knowing that there are other actors in this issue who are playing an indirect role. This has been the limitation on the author's part because of the excess of "actors" would have increased the number of permutations and combinations in

this paper, which would not have been possible to do it manually. Still, the most probable “actors” that are playing a direct role in this issue have been included. It is recommended that similar studies in this field including different “actors” would be helpful to justify the conclusions reached, or help move towards predicting this issue from a different angle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abid Ullah Jan. *Union of Pakistan and Afghanistan: Impossible or Inevitable?* 2005. Online article from London Institute of South Asia, The Independent Center for Strategic Studies and Analysis. http://www.icssa.org/Afghan_pak_Union.htm. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Afghan Bonn Agreement. Online Information. <http://www.afghangovernment.com/AfghanAgreementBonn.htm>. Accessed 15 May 2005.
- Afghanistan and Drugs. Online information. <http://www.tni.org/reports/drugs/debate3.htm#box2b>. Accessed 21 May 2005.
- Afghanistan Fact Sheet. Online information. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/afghan.html>. Accessed 24 March 2005.
- Afghanistan Geography 2000. Online information. http://www.photius.com/wfb2000/countries/afghanistan/afghanistan_geography.html. Accessed 24 March 2005.
- Afghanistan's Bonn Agreement One Year Later*. Online information. 5 December 2002. <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounder/asia/afghanistan/bonn1yr-bck.htm>. Accessed 18 May 2005.
- Afghanistan's Bonn Agreement One Year Later*. Online information. 5 December 2002. <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounder/asia/afghanistan/bonn1yr-bck.htm>. Accessed 18 May 2005.
- America Feels Entangled in Durand Line*. 29 August 2003. Online information from Dawn the Internet Edition. <http://www.dawn.com/2003/08/29/top5.htm>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Andrew Scobell and Larry M. Wortzel. *The Asia-Pacific in the US National Security Calculus for a New Millenium*. March 2000. Online information. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/PUB71.pdf>. Accessed 2 January 2006.
- Assembly of Experts*. Online information from Wikipedia the free encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assembly_of_Experts. Accessed 31 January 2006.
- Briefing, Remarks by Zalmay Khalizad, US Ambassador to Afghanistan*. 27 October 2004. Online Information from SAIS Washington DC, State Department. http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=8b76aa696e28beeda8fb6e9dfecfc236&_docnum=1&_wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=168b1a6188665784d5dc58c619615873. Accessed 15 January 2006.

Bureau of Public Affairs, US Department of State. *Diplomacy: The US Department of State at Work*. 25 May 2005.

Bureau of South Asian Affairs, US State Department. *Afghanistan: Background Note*. December 2005. Online information. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm#travel>. Accessed 15 January 2006.

Business in Afghanistan Warlordism, Reconstruction, and Ethnic Harmony. April 2003. Online Special Report 105 from United States Institute of Peace. <http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr105.html>. Accessed 15 December 2005.

Climate of Afghanistan. Online information. <http://lwf.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/research/afghan/overview.html>. Accessed 24 March 2005.

Daniel Lak. *Analysis: Powerful Cross Border Bonds*. 29 September 2001. Online report from BBC. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1570571.stm. Accessed 20 December 2005.

Diplomacy at Work: A US Embassy. Online information. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/c6177.htm>. Accessed 15 January 2006.

Doing Business in Afghanistan, A Country Commercial Overview. Fall 2004. Online information. http://kabul.usembassy.gov/business_afg.html. Accessed 15 January 2006.

Doing Business in Afghanistan: A Country Commercial Overview. Fall 2004. Online information. http://kabul.usembassy.gov/business_afg.html. Accessed 20 December 2005.

Dr. Condoleezza Rice Discusses President's National Security Strategy. Online information. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021001-6.html>. Accessed 15 January 2006.

Dr. G. Rauf Roashan. *The Unholy Durand Line, Buffering the Buffer*. Online article. <http://users.tns.net/~mroashan/politics/countrycorner/CCorner2/DR081101.htm>. Accessed 20 December 2005.

Durand Line Agreement. 12 November 1893 Online information from Khyber.org. <http://www.khyber.org/pashtohistory/treaties/durandagreement.shtml>. Accessed 15 December 2005.

Durand Line. Online article from Answers.com. <http://www.answers.com/topic/durand-line>. Accessed 15 December 2005.

- Durand Line*. Online information from Afghanistan's Web Site.
<http://www.afghanistans.com/Information/History/Durandline.htm>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Durand Line Map*. Online Map from Afghanistan's Web Site.
<http://www.afghanistans.com/Information/History/Durandline.htm>. Accessed 5 December 2005.
- Edward Giradet and Jonathan Walter. *Afghanistan: Essential Field Guides to Humanitarian and Conflict Zones*. ICHR, Geneva and Dublin, 1998.
- Ethnic Groups of Afghanistan. Online article. <http://www.afghan-network.net/Ethnic-Groups/>. Accessed 23 March 2005.
- F.R. Khan. *A Decision to Regret*. 21 October 2001. A report made available from a friend of the author on 2 January 2006.
- Federal Research Division, Library of Congress. *Afghanistan: The Great Game, The Rise of Dost Mohammad*. 11 March 2005. Online article. [http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?frd/cstdy:@field\(DOCID+af0011\)](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?frd/cstdy:@field(DOCID+af0011)). Accessed 10 March 2005.
- Federal Research Division. Library of Congress. *Afghanistan: Society and Environment, and Warfare and Civic Culture* section. Online article. [http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?frd/cstdy:@field\(DOCID+af0011\)](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?frd/cstdy:@field(DOCID+af0011)). Accessed 23 March 2005
- Freedom Socialist Party Australia. *No to the War on Afghanistan!* 22 October 2001. Online information from FSP International Executive Committee statement on the war. <http://www.socialism.com/currents/iestatement.htm>. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- Geography of Afghanistan. Online information.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography_of_Afghanistan. Accessed 24 March 2005.
- Going Back to Durand Line*. 18 July 2003. Online article from Daily Times Pakistan.
<http://www.e-ariana.com/ariana/eariana.nsf/0/6A61D11D3A17F19C87256D6700754428?OpenDocument>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Government and Politics: Overview of Current Political Situation in Afghanistan*. Online information from Afghanistan online. <http://www.afghanweb.com/politics/overview.html>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Gurinder Randhawa. *Disputed Durand Line: Pakistan's fencing plan disturbs Afghans*. Online information from The Tribune Online Edition.
<http://www.tribuneindia.com/2005/20051226/edit.htm#4>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Hearing of the House International Relations Committee, United States Policy In Afghanistan, of William B. Taylor, Coordinator For Afghanistan, Department Of State; Marybeth Long,*

- Deputy Assistant Secretary For Counter narcotics, Department Of Defense; James Kunder, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau For Asia and The Near East, Agency For International Development; Charlotte Ponticelli, Senior Coordinator, Office of International Women's Issues, Department of State, at 2172 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.* 2 June 2004. Online information. http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=42e228a61453d765f14a390014a75083&_docnum=8&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=906eeae292d5800f21c4d72681ec6087. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/salrc/afghanistan/materials/maps.html>. Accessed 23 March 2005.
- “Hidden” hands busy to create wedge between Pakistan, Afghanistan over Durand Line. Online report from Urdu Times. <http://www.urdutimes.com/englishnews/2003/09/16/en9/>. Accessed 20 December 2005.
- James A. Thomson, Chief Executive Officer of RAND. *To Provide for the Common Defense: Issues in Technology and Defense Strategy for Future National Security*. 5 February 1997. Online information. <http://www.ciaonet.org/book/ras01/ras01be.html>. Accessed 5 January 2006.
- Joint statement by the Co-Chairs of the London Conference on Afghanistan*. 1 February 2006. Online information. http://www.unama-afg.org/news/_statement/Others/2006/06feb01-JointStatement-LondonConference.htm. Accessed 5 February 2006.
- Jonathan S. Lockwood and Kathleen O. Lockwood. *The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP)*. Book of Readings, Vol. 1. Washington, DC: American Military University, 1994.
- Kanchan Lakshman. *Afghanistan Pakistan: New “Great Game.”* 27 June 2005. Online report from South Asian Intelligence Review, Volume 3, No. 50. http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/sair/Archives/3_50.htm. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- Kenneth Katzman, *Afghanistan: Current issues and U.S. policy*. 5 January 2004. Online information from Congressional Research Service. http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=67db50d8a8c255abfb74de90d5b4e6e6&_docnum=2&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=8289e684e29af5d624f060394cc68445. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- M B Naqvi. *Indo-Pakistan Rivalry In Afghanistan Intensifies*. 6 September 2005. Online report from Inter Press Service, Countercurrents.org. <http://www.countercurrents.org/afgan-naqvi060905.htm>. Accessed 20 December 2005.
- Maintaining Military Advantage Through Science and Technology Investment*, A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, 1995 [online article]; available from <http://www.ostp.gov/html/nssts/html/chapt2.html>; Internet; accessed 15 May 2005.

- Maintaining Military Advantage Through Science and Technology Investment, A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement.* 1995. Online article. <http://www.ostp.gov/html/nssts/html/chapt2.html>. Accessed 27 December 2005.
- Martin Ewans. *Afghanistan: A Short History of Its People and Politics.* HarperCollinsPublishers, 2002, New York.
- Nathan. *The Israeli-Indian Shadow War Against.* 17 September 2003. Online information. <http://www.registan.net/?p=3116>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- National Defense Strategy of the United States of America,* Online information from Global Security Org. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/nds-usa_mar2005_ib.htm. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- National Strategy for Homeland Security.* Online information. http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction.* Online Information. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/WMDStrategy.pdf>. Accessed 27 December 2005.
- Neamatollah Nojumi. *The Rise Of the Taliban In Afghanistan.* New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Operation Enduring Freedom – Afghanistan.* Online information. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/enduring-freedom.htm>. Accessed 15 May 2005.
- Pakistan: Foreign Policy Experts Criticize Change in Pakistan’s Afghan Policy.* 1 September 2003. Online information from Global News Wire, US Dept of Commerce, World News Connection. http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=e09255584ddecdb2cd69b761f727a28a&_docnum=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=e86a64cebf6de3c444d4977c6ff92cfe. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Philip Kurata. *United States Pledges \$1.1 Billion More for Afghan Reconstruction.* Online information Washington File Staff Writer. <http://usinfo.state.gov/sa/Archive/2006/Jan/31-20833.html>. Accessed 5 February 2006.
- Phillip Kurata. *Afghanistan, international community announce new development plan.* Online report from Washington File Staff Writer. <http://usinfo.state.gov/sa/Archive/2006/Jan/31-20833.html>. Accessed 5 February 2006.
- President of Iran.* Online information from Wikipedia the free encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/President_of_Iran. Accessed 31 January 2006.

- RFE/RL Afghanistan Report*. Online report of 7 August 2003, Volume 2, Number 28.
<http://72.14.207.104/search?q=cache:BHRpxfENcmIJ:www.kabul-reconstructions.net/images/durand1.pdf+%22Durand+Line%22&hl=en&gl=np&ct=clnk&cd=45>. Accessed 15 December 2005.
- Richard Tanter. *Pipeline Politics: Oil, gas and the US interest in Afghanistan*. Online report.
<http://www.zmag.org/tanteroil.htm>. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- Sean McCormack. *Debt Cancellation for Afghanistan*. 7 February 2006. Online Press Statement of Spokesman, Washington DC. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2006/60501.htm>. Accessed 5 February 2006.
- Statement by Acting Director of Central Intelligence Agency George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Hearing on current and projected National Security Threats to the US*. 5 February 1997. Online information.
http://www.fas.org/irp/cia/product/dci_testimony_020597.html. Accessed 1 January 2006.
- Statement by Acting Director of Central Intelligence Agency George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Hearing on current and projected National Security Threats to the US*. 5 February 1997. Online information.
http://www.fas.org/irp/cia/product/dci_testimony_020597.html. Accessed 1 January 2006.
- Stephen Tanner. *Afghanistan: A Military History from Alexander the Great to the Fall of the Taliban*. Da Capo Press, New York, 2002.
- Ted Galen Carpenter. *How the Drug War in Afghanistan Undermines America's War on Terror*. 10 November 2004. Online information from the Cato Institute in Washington DC, an eight-paged Foreign Policy Briefing Paper No. 84.
https://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2607. Accessed 27 December 2005.
- The LAMP method*. Online information. <http://www.lamp-method.com/method.html>. Accessed 15 October 2005.
- The National Security Strategy of United States of America: Overview of America's International Security*. Online Information. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss1.html>. Accessed 5 January 2006.
- Tom Armitage. *Afghanistan Leads Again in Heroin Production*. Washington Times, August 12, 2003.
- Tribes of Afghanistan. Online information. <http://www.jamesopie.com/site/tribes2.html>. Accessed 23 March 2005.

- US Embassy Afghanistan*. Online information on US Embassy Afghanistan website. <http://kabul.usembassy.gov/>. Accessed from December 2005 to February 2006.
- US Embassy Afghanistan. *Press Release 2005*. Online information. http://kabul.usembassy.gov/agreement_120105.html. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- US National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*. Online information. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030214-7.html> - 29.9KB. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- US National Strategy for Maritime Security*. Online information. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/maritime-security.html>. Accessed 27 December 2005.
- US National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets*. Online Information. http://www.whitehouse.gov/pcipb/physical_strategy.pdf. Accessed 27 December 2005.
- US National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace*. Online Information. www.whitehouse.gov/pcipb/cyberspace_strategy.pdf. Accessed 27 December 2005.
- US Policy in Afghanistan, US House Intl Relations Committee, Congressional Testimonies given by Hassan Nouri, Barnett Rubin, Peter Tomsen, Larry Goodson, Bernard Frahi, and Norman Leatherwood*. 21 June 2003. Online information from Capitol Hill. <http://www.afgha.com/?af=article&sid=34467>. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- US State Department and USAID Strategic Plan 2004-2009*. Online information. <http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/>. Accessed 2 January 2006.
- US-Afghan Relations, Background Note: Afghanistan, December 2005*. Online information from Bureau of South Asian Affairs, US State Department. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm#travel>. Accessed 15 January 2006.
- USAID Policy*. Online information. <http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/>. Accessed 2 January 2006.
- W.P.S. Sindhu. *Why the Durand Line is important*. 16 November 1999. Online information from Indian Express. <http://www.expressindia.com/ie/daily/19991116/ie19059.html>. Accessed 20 December 2005.
- World Bank report. *Afghanistan: State Building, Sustaining Growth, and Reducing Poverty*. Online report. <http://www.worldbank.org/af>. Accessed 24 March 2005.
- _____. *Afghanistan Country Data Profile* – and *Afghanistan Data at-a-Glance*. At the Data and Statistics on the World Bank. Online report. <http://www.worldbank.org/af>. Accessed 24 March 2005.