

The battle in Pakistan: A Predictive Study on Possible American, Pakistan and Taliban Responses

Jorge Martinez Jr.

IN504 D001 Spring 2009

Introduction

As the war on terrorism reaches the century mark, Pakistan is once again, in a critical situation. With the Pakistani military taking an aggressive stance against the Taliban, and the United States constantly crossing their borders to chase suspected terrorist, **Pakistan becomes a possible single point of failure in the war.** Pakistan had always been a critical piece of the puzzle due to its location. It shares the southern border of Afghanistan, the western border of India, an eastern border with Iran and a small southern border with China.

Pakistan has had its own turmoil with India and the threat of nuclear weapons lingers. Pakistan's inability to gain full control of the region that runs along the Durand Line, poses a strategic dilemma in that that land would be the staging area in the case that India was to invade them. The main problem that Pakistan faces now is a problem that they created by allowing tribes to seek refuge and govern themselves. In recent times the Taliban has created a rumble

in that they have shown inclination to attaining nuclear power. As the Taliban seeks to increase its power and size the capital of Pakistan and its nuclear program seem a perfect target. With the Taliban seeking refuge in the region that encompasses the FATA, NWFP and the Swat Valley they grow close in proximity to Islamabad the capital of Pakistan and the location of their nuclear weapons programs. The Pakistan Taliban shows signs of its predecessor the Taliban in Afghanistan that if they are not controlled it could lead to Pakistan losing territorial ownership as well as spread of old conservative Islamic ways known as the sharia.

The jihad continues to fuel Muslim extremist ideals in the Middle East (South West Asia) the Taliban continues to seek shelter in one region, the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. This line is also known as the Durand Line. As the evolution of what became known as a tragic day in the United States, rumors of nefarious personalities traveling in a region known as the North Western Frontier Province. This area has been a hot zone for terrorist since the United States took arms against terrorist factions around the world due to its proximity to Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). This area is often frequented by terrorist because of the constant change in power and it is unmonitored or governed. Pakistan is where most of the land lies and so does a sovereign region for many tribes that have remained free of western society. As the United States entered the region many terrorist aligned with the Taliban were suspected of seeking refuge with these tribes. The amount of time dedicated to this issue allows for different analytical perspectives to be attained

Literature Review

Due to the increasing battles and the operations against counterinsurgency there are several articles that are being produced about this topic. I will be focusing in on some of those articles for this portion of the paper. An essay written in Contemporary South Asia by Weinbaum and Harder, identifies how Pakistan “In formulating its Afghan policies, Pakistan’s leaders seem often to ignore the long-term and wider implications of their decisions both at home and abroad.” The government of Pakistan has been in turmoil for several years having to give way to several different leaders and attempting to ensure monetary gain in aid from the United States. The authors point out the during the Soviet-Afghan conflict, Pakistan took a stance with the United States that rewarded them however after the Soviets pulled out, interest in the region by the United States was diminished. Pakistan was then forced to deal with the massive Afghan refugees and they began to push their own anti Pashtu Nationalization as the authors convey. Weinbaum and Harder outline how Pakistan in order to control the FATA gave leadership to the maliks who would be elected by an elder counsel to control that tribe. They would report to Islamabad and also be given guidance.

The essay identified the war in Afghanistan began the maliks power was taken by the mullahs, who were religious leaders and in turn began to push the Islamic religion that benefitted the Taliban. Pakistan aided in creating the Taliban in Pakistan by funding madrassas (schools) that were teaching conservative Islamic views. The schools were being run by tribes in the FATA which were

now being lead by the mullahs. Pakistan has been more concerned with its neighbor India and how they will influence Afghanistan that relations with the United States and Afghanistan have suffered. This essay also points out that former president Musharraf had created a situation for Pakistan that will be difficult to undo because most Pakistanis are indifferent to the war in Afghanistan as well as sympathy with the tribes and the Muslim extremist.

One on-line article discussing Pakistan Taliban by Graham Usher outlined a timeline of how the Taliban in Pakistan were able to grow. Usher states that, "For the last 30 years, FATA's isolation has served another purpose: The state has used the region as the launching pad for Pakistan-inspired insurgencies in Afghanistan, with the first coming after the communist coup in Kabul in 1978." Pakistan has shown ulterior motives in assisting the tribal leader in the FATA that are proving to be internally destructive according to the article. Usher goes on to point out that the Talibanization of the FATA began shortly after the atrocities of September 11, 2001. Musharraf, the then president of the Pakistan, had promised the tribes compensation for their assistance in aiding with the capture of terrorist and Taliban from Afghanistan. The United States then pressured Musharraf to conduct an offensive in 2004 that proved to the tribesmen that new power needed to be in place and the maliks begun to lose power amongst the tribes. The offensive was in the minds of the tribesmen as a betrayal because the military had to negotiate with the tribal militants and thus taking power away from the maliks and FATA tie to the political administration. Graham Usher points out that the Taliban utilized this opportunity to turn Pashtu loyalist to

assist in their cause by utilization of the mullahs who had now began to gain power. The article identifies that in 2006 in a need to stabilize the escalated situation between the tribesmen and Pakistani military, Pakistan's government employed Mohammed Jan Orakzai as the governor while the military brought in Jalaluddin Haqqani and Mullah Dadallah. Peace was gained for the moment but through the assistance of Haqqani and some Taliban leaders.

The article also goes on to identify how the interest of the United States does not coincide with those of Pakistan. The US has continued to employ aggressive military operations compromising some the stalemates in the FATA. As new intelligence is identified by the US; it will pursue those leads, many times past the Durand Line and sometimes targeting Pakistani Taliban militants. Usher believes that Pakistan can gain peace by identifying the Pashtun movement and as the leaders of the Taliban so that open negotiations can begin as well as development in the FATA as to progress the population in the region, this can only happen if the United States will assist via aid and scaling back on operations in the region.

In the Economist, President Barack Obama is quoted saying, "killing Pakistan from within" when discussing the Taliban and other jihadist movements. This is a sentiment that is not felt by all according to the article. Some feel that by continuing to go after the Taliban, the war will not end. Giving militants a sharia, will allow for the fighting to stop. The Pakistan Taliban much like the one that was once prominent in Afghanistan shares the same kinship, Pashtun, as well as ideology. The article builds its case on the past events of ceasefires that have

proven to be unsuccessful due to America's inability to gain control in Afghanistan. As the resistance from NWFP carries out into Waziristan, Pakistanis are becoming more and more concerned as to gaining peace, unlike the FATA, it poses more of a problem because of the tourist attractions as well as the spread of radical Islamic ideals. The article discusses how the Pakistani military launched a recent offensive after Taliban militants claimed victory over the Buner Valley. This fight still continues.

Due to spread of the fight for land by militants the United States will, "It will come with a lot more money, including \$1.5 billion a year in non-military aid over the next five years. The article also states that the United States views Pakistan as a serious threat. The United States has even opposed all negotiations to include the ceasefire in the SWAT valley. The reason that it has been met with such opposition was that several times during former Pakistan President Musharraf, the ceasefires were broken by ground generals who wanted to stop fighting with the insurgents due to sympathetic reasons. The article highlighted that "...since 2001, despite lavish American sponsorship, including \$10 billion in military aid, Pakistan has only become more turbulent and violent." In recent conferences with the United States and the "friends of Pakistan" will be looking for better accountability of monetary expenditure that comes from aid, whether for military or not. The article points out that the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) has been drawn in on speculation of guiding and approving many of the deals by field generals and going against the Government's wishes.

The Economist points out that as the Pakistani government has been unable to control all of its regions many like the Swatis (those from the Swat Valley) are ready and more inclined to accept rule under the sharia. In a recent failure the government was unable to dismantle a group which the ISI had trained and created. The group known as the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LET), allowing most of the schools, dispensaries and hospitals are still in tact and possibly being ran by those who were not arrested. The arrest of the mid-level members can only after external pressure was placed on Pakistan. Pakistan is losing control and the favor of its people as the military continues to clash with its governmental needs and orders. This makes the country unruly and unstable.

In an article, posted on Yale On-line from the Yale Globe, by Leonard Spector addresses the growing concern over the ability of the Taliban being able to cross into Islamabad and possibly taking over one of several nuclear facilities that Pakistan has built. Several of the scientist and militants that guard the facilities are sympathizers with the causes of the militants and that can facilitate the accessibility to gain nuclear control. The author warns that Pakistan needs to ready its posture for possible attacks on one or more of the facilities for which the idea is not far fetched. The Taliban are famous for unconventional attacks that do not take into consideration civilian casualties. With their unconventional means Spector also warns that the roads on which the supplies travel can pose logistical issues. The Taliban can cut off the vehicle routes taking them for themselves and also creating depletion in Pakistan's supplies.

Spector also identifies that the fear is not in the inability of Pakistan to lose nuclear power as in the ability being gained by the Taliban. Pakistan has not been successful in keeping the Taliban under control. Spector points out that that is why there is such a fear as to how close the recent battles are going. As they get closer to Islamabad so does the threat of the Pakistani government being overruled. The United States on the other hand continues to flood Pakistan with money in hopes that it will aid in the controlling of its country. President Obama is coupling his efforts with Afghani President Karzai and Pakistan's President Zardaki. Spector ends his article by stating that the true threat will be abolished only with what transcends on the battlefield.

The last article comes from Micheal Ware, it was posted on CNN.com. The title of the Article and this is why it was integrated into this report is, "Official: Pakistan can help broker U.S.-Taliban talks." The article identifies a commander of the Taliban, Mullah Omar, as the one person that can aid the United States and Pakistan in brokering a political and economical deal. Mullah Omar is the one person that will be willing to talk since he is still in communication with the Pakistan's ISI. The article states that Pakistan wants to bring the United States with the Taliban to the table. Ware identifies via a series of quotes that the United States is pleased that Pakistan is finally acknowledging that they have been in contact with Taliban leaders since much speculation has been surrounding this very issue. The Taliban, in the article, wish to disassociate them from Al-Qaeda a terrorist organization that claimed responsibility for several act of terror against the United States.

These five articles provide a prelude as to the current situation and some brief history for the actors and perceptions. The information is not to give a full global perspective but more of a view of the information that will be discussed in this paper. The articles also identified some issues that are essential for this research paper.

Actors & Perceptions

The world stood still as President Bhutto had been assassinated and the possibility of taking a stand against the Taliban and make change in this region seemed as it had once again regressed. After a brief stint by her predecessor and then her successor Musharraf, Bhutto's family took the front stage by taking office in several key positions. The United States would increase personnel and be able to press an aggressive offensive along the border of Afghanistan. The Taliban on the other hand stood to possibly gain land in vulnerable areas known as the SWAT valley, FATA and North/South Warizistan. The power struggle for the region continues to drive the policy that governs Pakistan internally as well as the global relationships with those of interest in the war against terrorist factions. Currently the fight for power continues in the region between Pakistan and the Taliban with the United States providing a heavy influence. The actors identified for the paper are as those preciously stated Pakistan, the Taliban and the United States of America.

Pakistan

The main player of this analysis is the Pakistan and how their aggressiveness against the Taliban will be the deciding factor for possible control

of the region for them and the United States. Pakistan's political leaders will drive the country either forward or will continue to stay stagnant against the terrorist regimes that share land. As Pakistan continues to mount operations in the region against the Taliban the threat of its neighbor India looms as they are a few years removed from having gone into a major conflict. The inability of Pakistan to look into the future when brokering deals with the Pashtun led Taliban have created a state of fighting that Pakistan needs to be settled in order to utilize the tribal fighters and land in the case that India was to attack. Pakistan is the key in this analysis for they will swing the war on terrorism. Their location and size proves to be its limiting factor in controlling the region coupled with temporary ceasefires and the inability to control their military.

Economics

Pakistan, an impoverished and underdeveloped country, has suffered from decades of internal political disputes, low levels of foreign investment, and declining exports of manufactures. (CIA Factbook, 2009) Pakistan is has implemented the Monetary Fund Standby Arrangement of Nov 2008 to help deal with all of it budgetary and economic issues. Although there was a small spike of hope in the GDP in 2001 there has been a continued digression that has increased inflation. As the instability continues in Pakistan their money continues to drop in value. It major exporting partners are the US, UAE, Afghanistan, China and the UK. The economy of Pakistan will fund and determine the size of the operation that will be mounted against an area that is normally allowed to govern

itself. The fact that it exports with the US and Afghanistan it also makes them have a vested interest in the war across the border.

Politics

The current political situation in Pakistan is reminiscent of that in the governments in the past. Currently the President, Asif Zardari, the husband of former President Bhutto who was assassinated in December 2007. The stand of the President Zardari is concern over “huge amounts of land” (Economist, 2009) that the Taliban holds. The Prime Minister is Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani. Both men have suffered under the wrath of former President Musharraf. This makes this political force different and brings the hope of change. The military still poses a political issues in that most of the members are still sympathizers of the Taliban and a very important political force.

National Security Concerns

Pakistanis national concerns are broken down into two themes internal and external. The internal is fueled by crime and corruption as well as the battle for land with the area in known as the FATA. The FATA has harbored terrorist many of which are displaying acts of aggression towards the government currently. In the past the military was able to fend off much of those acts by brokering deals with the tribal leaders, deals that were not always sanctioned by the government. The inability to properly run a government with out external aid or total control of their military leaves them susceptible to regime changes of which have been frequent in the past.

The second concern is external due to the growing concern that India who is their neighbor will come and occupy their land. The growing concerns it that India will engage in trading with Afghanistan and have occupation on both sides of Pakistan. India and Pakistan have been in constant turmoil of over creating nuclear weapons and caused several conflicts over that very issue. The constant need to explore nuclear weapons and the production of them also makes them a target to those wanting to attain that technology.

The United States

The United States presence in the SW Asia continues to take liberties with the border that outlines Pakistan's tribal areas. Since there is no distinct line of where Afghanistan ends and Pakistan begins, the United States utilizes drones to attack suspected terrorist that seek refuge in the area. As the United States continues to progress with its new Presidential Cabinet, the economy continues to suffer. The United States has spread itself in the region which can create security vulnerabilities due to the size of military presence in Afghanistan as well as the amount of spending that it will take to sustain such a force. Politically if the United States does not pursue a better relationship with Pakistan it could prove to be costly in the campaign against terrorism.

Economics

The US owns and runs leading and most technologically powerful economy in the world. The US has a global market strategy that allows for importing and exporting of several goods. The drawback to this is that the foreign markets are often more stringent on American good that the US is on theirs.

Domestically America faces issues that deal with comparable pay raises, health insurance coverage, and other benefits. The war in March-April 2003 between a US-led coalition and Iraq, and the subsequent occupation of Iraq, required major shifts in national resources to the military. (CIA Factbook, 2009) Oil has become an issue as well with soaring prices and the inability to continue importing such goods. With all of its problems the new President and Congress passed a stimulus package, the largest known to the US of 780 billion dollars. With the war in Afghanistan the United States at this point does not appear to be poised to handle these types of expenses. Foreign Aid may not be as freely available which can have an impact on Pakistani relationships.

Politics

The United States has often flexed its political will in order to attain the help and the attention of other countries. Currently the new President Barack Obama has taken to talks all over the region expressing concern over the putting an end to the war on terror. The United States has in the past provided information that some may say was misleading in regards to occupation and overthrowing of the Iraqi regime that cause several mass atrocities as well as deprived its people of freedoms. The United States also provide information that allowed for cross border operations in Pakistan and also convinced the Pakistani government, at the time headed by President Musharraf, to employ operations against the Taliban in which assisted in turning the overwhelming control of the Taliban in the FATA. The one thing that the politically the US has with the

Pakistani government is that it approves the aid that is needed to build their military as well as battle insurgents in their most vulnerable areas.

National Security Concerns

The United States is in constant vigilance over another attack against it by terrorist. A war that is about to hit the century mark has been waged against terror without a foreseeable end. The massive losses to the US military places on demand of enacting the National Guard as well as the federal reservist program leaving the US limit in self defense militarily. The recent departure of Iraq as well as economic troubles questions the ability of the US to sustain such an operation as a war on terror. In regards to Pakistan, US President Barack Obama discussed his need to create a trilateral composed of Afghanistan, Pakistan and the US in order to develop a strategy that will put an end to Al-Qaeda and networks like it that want to disrupt the government in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Taliban

Pakistan in the past has been able to bring the Taliban to ceasefire resolutions under the Presidency of Musharraf. As he is no longer in power and neither is the maliks in the tribal region The Taliban stands to win if the United States or Pakistan fails to gain control of the war and sustain them to smaller regions. If the Taliban were to gain control of the region the United states can find themselves fighting the same enemy that they initially defeated in Afghanistan. The Taliban has shown its force in the past by taking over the Northern sections of Afghanistan and sustaining conservative Muslim ideals over

the people in the region. The Taliban's nonconventional ways pose's national concerns for everyone in the region. The fact that they gain monetary support from extremist and drugs also poses an issue in ensuring they can sustain campaigns. Recruitment is also a determining factor for them.

National Security Concerns

The entire world is threatened by the factions such as the Taliban because of their ties to Al-Qaeda networks who are determined to disrupt western ideology via means of terror. As far as the Taliban goes is want to implement a world way of thinking that is guided my Muslim beliefs. The more that the United States and Pakistan launch offensives against them they are security is threatened. The way that the Taliban sees it is that they have been displaced so many times that they believe the FATA is their home as are the regions around it and they will attempt to push the sharia law for all to abide by. The Taliban rely on money that is brought in from illegal trading which posses a security concern for them in that it other counternarcotics agencies are dissolving those means there they do not have the money to buy the ammunition to compact America and Pakistan.

Research Design

For this study the LAMP method (the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction) will be utilized. Predictive analysis is not an easy methodology but the LAMP method offers a structured and calculated manner that will compliment this research. The method developed by Dr. Lockwood utilizes several processes that will allow for a predictive analysis to be attained. However LAMP's primary

differentiation from other predictive methods is the recognition of the importance of “free will” on potential events (Lockwood & Lockwood, 1993). The LAMP method was constructed with the understanding that the situations are scenarios and that at any one point those opinions and thought can change to change course of the analysis. The organization of the method also provides only the intention of determining possible future actions. The analyst will have to take into account various actions and actors that will affect the scenario and how those actions will be possible. The LAMP method does have several limitations in that it is not a future event but a possibility of one based on the parameters and criteria that the analyst has determined based on the studies of the actors that were chosen for the specific issue being analyzed.

There are 12 steps that are utilized in developing the analysis and predications. The combination of the way in which the actors will react to possible scenarios is the ultimate outcome of the LAMP method. Here are the 12 steps of this method:

1. Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future.
2. Specify the national “actors” involved.
3. Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.
4. Specify all *possible* courses of action for each actor.
5. Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.

6. Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario.
7. Perform a “pairwise comparison” of all alternate futures to determine their relative probability.
8. Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received.
9. Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.
10. State the potential of a given alternate future to “transpose” into another alternate future.
11. Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given alternate future.
12. Develop indicators for the focal events

The LAMP process lends itself to this particular issue, in part because of the wide variation of paths of each of the interested actors. Ensuring that the right information is attained is also another plus of this method. The LAMP method relies on the data that is gained by the analyst in order to determine the scenarios. The analyst must proceed with caution when developing this type of analysis because often times one can bring their own personal biases into the equation without really intending to do so. One can become self absorbed in one outcome that it will render the rest of the alternate solution less possible. The analyst will have to spend plenty of time ensuring that the information is current and reliable and valid. Searching for opinion based information can really

hinder the analysis as well as providing a paper that gives scenarios that are not attainable or that are not valid given the current situation of the actors or possible courses of action.

Potential Courses of Action for Interested Actors

The two most influencing players in the region are Pakistan and the Taliban. The United States plays a vital role as well but the true solution lies in the hands of the relationship between Pakistan and the tribal leaders. For the LAMP analysis to work one needs to understand that the outcomes of each actor are generalized due to the fact that predicting the future is not possible. The LAMP will utilize these courses and couple them with scenarios. For the Taliban there are few courses it can take. The Taliban can continue fighting against Pakistan for land and continue to attack the United States as it crosses the Durand Line. It is important to consider all possible scenarios, if one does not, a biased prediction of possible events or alternate futures could make the paper less credible.

Major Scenarios

This analysis will cover the possible scenarios that are possible in the region along the Durand Line. The power struggle between the Taliban, Pakistan and the US will guide the development of possible courses of action. Those actions will be tested against the scenarios. Each actor will approach the scenarios differently and the scenarios will take on different meanings for each actor involved. The interest of the United States will not be those of the Taliban and that is why all alternate futures based on the scenario and actions need to be

explored. The main focus of the actions will center on the ability to control the region that is made up of the FATA, NWFP, and Swat valley. These are the areas that are currently being challenged for in Pakistan.

Permutations of Behavior

In order to determine the amount of alternate futures the LAMP method has devised a formula. The formula is a basic equation that couples the actors and the courses of actions. The equation for the LAMP method is $X^Y = Z$. The X equals the number of actions created for each actor the Y equals the number of actors involved and Z equals the total number of alternate futures that will be compared to one another. In this analysis there are three possible courses of action for each interested actor. The equation for this analysis becomes $3^3 = 27$, meaning there are 27 alternate futures. The next step is to create a table of alternate future combinations, which will then be used to perform a pair wise comparison.

Abbreviations used to identify alternate future scenarios in all tables to follow:

Continue Operations = CF

Use political influence to reach an agreement = PI

Scale back/withdraw Forces = SB

The three scenarios will likewise be identified by abbreviations:

Scenario 1 = Pakistan Gains control of region (PG)

Scenario 2 = The Taliban Gain control of the region (TC)

Scenario 3 = The US retracts aid for Pakistan (UP)

Table I – Alternate Future Permutations

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan
1	CF	CF	CF
2	CF	CF	PI
3	CF	PI	CF
4	PI	CF	CF
5	CF	PI	PI
6	PI	CF	PI
7	PI	PI	CF
8	PI	PI	PI
9	CF	CF	SB
10	CF	SB	CF
11	SB	CF	CF
12	CF	SB	SB
13	SB	CF	SB
14	SB	SB	CF
15	SB	SB	SB
16	PI	PI	SB
17	PI	SB	PI
18	SB	PI	PI
19	SB	SB	PI
20	PI	SB	SB
21	SB	PI	SB
22	CF	SB	PI
23	CF	PI	SB
24	PI	SB	CF
25	PI	CF	SB
26	SB	PI	CF
27	SB	CF	PI

Pairwise Comparisons for Each Scenario

The Alternate Futures Table (Table 1) can be utilized in order to construct the pairwise comparison. Each pairwise will be matched with a specific scenario. A pairwise comparison is, very simply a way of comparing the likelihood of each alternate future against each other possible future. The equation for determining how many pairwise comparisons are necessary is: $X = (n-1) + (n-2) \dots + (n-n)$. For this analysis n equals 27, therefore X equals 351 pairwise comparisons to be made for each scenario. After the tables are constructed three additional tables will be added based on the maximum votes in

order to differentiate the pairwise alternate futures that are more possible of occurring based on the scenario and the courses of action to be taken by each of the actors involved for this analysis .

Tables 2 through 4 contain the voting results from the pairwise comparisons made of all alternate future related to each of the three scenarios posed by Iran.

Table 2

Alternate Futures Table
 Scenario 1 = Pakistan Controls Region (PG)

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	15
2	CF	CF	PI	17
3	CF	PI	CF	11
4	PI	CF	CF	11
5	CF	PI	PI	20
6	PI	CF	PI	23
7	PI	PI	CF	10
8	PI	PI	PI	25
9	CF	CF	SB	17
10	CF	SB	CF	9
11	SB	CF	CF	13
12	CF	SB	SB	6
13	SB	CF	SB	14
14	SB	SB	CF	0
15	SB	SB	SB	8
16	PI	PI	SB	13
17	PI	SB	PI	18
18	SB	PI	PI	22
19	SB	SB	PI	11
20	PI	SB	SB	12
21	SB	PI	SB	9
22	CF	SB	PI	10
23	CF	PI	SB	8
24	PI	SB	CF	2

25	PI	CF	SB	22
26	SB	PI	CF	5
27	SB	CF	PI	20

351

CF = Continue Operations
 PI = Use political influence to reach an agreement
 SB = Scale back/withdraw Forces

Table 3

Alternate Futures Table
 Scenario 2 = The Taliban Gain control of the region (TC)

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	26
2	CF	CF	PI	23
3	CF	PI	CF	20
4	PI	CF	CF	19
5	CF	PI	PI	17
6	PI	CF	PI	18
7	PI	PI	CF	17
8	PI	PI	PI	15
9	CF	CF	SB	13
10	CF	SB	CF	14
11	SB	CF	CF	21
12	CF	SB	SB	7
13	SB	CF	SB	13
14	SB	SB	CF	12
15	SB	SB	SB	0
16	PI	PI	SB	16
17	PI	SB	PI	9
18	SB	PI	PI	23
19	SB	SB	PI	3
20	PI	SB	SB	5
21	SB	PI	SB	4
22	CF	SB	PI	9
23	CF	PI	SB	5
24	PI	SB	CF	11
25	PI	CF	SB	12
26	SB	PI	CF	9
27	SB	CF	PI	10

351

CF = Continue Operations
 PI = Use political influence to reach an agreement

SB = Scale back/withdraw Forces

Table 4

Alternate Futures Table
 Scenario 3 – US stops aid to Pakistan

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	23
2	CF	CF	PI	22
3	CF	PI	CF	15
4	PI	CF	CF	10
5	CF	PI	PI	24
6	PI	CF	PI	13
7	PI	PI	CF	21
8	PI	PI	PI	19
9	CF	CF	SB	10
10	CF	SB	CF	15
11	SB	CF	CF	12
12	CF	SB	SB	10
13	SB	CF	SB	9
14	SB	SB	CF	2
15	SB	SB	SB	5
16	PI	PI	SB	15
17	PI	SB	PI	18
18	SB	PI	PI	19
19	SB	SB	PI	15
20	PI	SB	SB	5
21	SB	PI	SB	13
22	CF	SB	PI	12
23	CF	PI	SB	18
24	PI	SB	CF	8
25	PI	CF	SB	4
26	SB	PI	CF	8
27	SB	CF	PI	6

351

CF = Continue Operations
 PI = Use political influence to reach an agreement
 SB = Scale back/withdraw Forces

Using the voting results from the pairwise PImparisons PIntained in Tables 2 through 4, it is now possible to rank the scenarios in order of probability (highest to lowest) thereby determining what is most likely to happen given each specific scenario posed by Iran.

Ranking the Alternate Futures

These three tables 2, 3 and 4 identified each alternate future and the number of votes that those same alternate futures received in the pairwise comparison. In order to get a better picture of what alternate futures are more possible a ranking will need to take place. The alternate futures will be ranked from the highest to the lowest based on the number of votes. Tables 5, 6 and 7 will represent those rankings.

Table 5

Alternate Futures Table

Scenario 1 = Pakistan Controls Region (PG)

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan	Votes
8	PI	PI	PI	25
6	PI	CF	PI	23
18	SB	PI	PI	22
25	PI	CF	SB	22
5	CF	PI	PI	20
27	SB	CF	PI	20
17	PI	SB	PI	18
2	CF	CF	PI	17
9	CF	CF	SB	17
1	CF	CF	CF	15
13	SB	CF	SB	14
11	SB	CF	CF	13
16	PI	PI	SB	13
20	PI	SB	SB	12
3	CF	PI	CF	11
4	PI	CF	CF	11
19	SB	SB	PI	11
7	PI	PI	CF	10
22	CF	SB	PI	10
10	CF	SB	CF	9
21	SB	PI	SB	9
15	SB	SB	SB	8
23	CF	PI	SB	8
12	CF	SB	SB	6
26	SB	PI	CF	5
24	PI	SB	CF	2
14	SB	SB	CF	0

CF = Continue Operations
 PI = Use political influence to reach an agreement
 SB = Scale back/withdraw Forces

Table 6

Alternate Futures Table
 Scenario 2 - No Ploperation with International Agencies – NC

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	26
2	CF	CF	PI	23
18	SB	PI	PI	23
11	SB	CF	CF	21
3	CF	PI	CF	20
4	PI	CF	CF	19
6	PI	CF	PI	18
5	CF	PI	PI	17
7	PI	PI	CF	17
16	PI	PI	SB	16
8	PI	PI	PI	15
10	CF	SB	CF	14
9	CF	CF	SB	13
13	SB	CF	SB	13
14	SB	SB	CF	12
25	PI	CF	SB	12
24	PI	SB	CF	11
27	SB	CF	PI	10
17	PI	SB	PI	9
22	CF	SB	PI	9
26	SB	PI	CF	9
12	CF	SB	SB	7
20	PI	SB	SB	5
23	CF	PI	SB	5
21	SB	PI	SB	4
19	SB	SB	PI	3
15	SB	SB	SB	0

351

CF = Continue Operations
 PI = Use political influence to reach an agreement
 SB = Scale back/withdraw Forces

Table 7

Alternate Futures Table
 Scenario 3 - Openly Develop a Nuclear Weapons Program - NW

Possible Future #	United States	Taliban	Pakistan	Votes
5	CF	PI	PI	24
1	CF	CF	CF	23
2	CF	CF	PI	22
8	PI	PI	PI	21
7	PI	PI	CF	19
18	SB	PI	PI	19
17	PI	SB	PI	18
23	CF	PI	SB	18
3	CF	PI	CF	15
10	CF	SB	CF	15
16	PI	PI	SB	15
19	SB	SB	PI	15
6	PI	CF	PI	13
21	SB	PI	SB	13
11	SB	CF	CF	12
22	CF	SB	PI	12
4	PI	CF	CF	10
9	CF	CF	SB	10
12	CF	SB	SB	10
13	SB	CF	SB	9
24	PI	SB	CF	8
26	SB	PI	CF	8
27	SB	CF	PI	6
15	SB	SB	SB	5
20	PI	SB	SB	5
25	PI	CF	SB	4
14	SB	SB	CF	2
5	CF	PI	PI	24

351

CF = Continue Operations
 PI = Use political influence to reach an agreement
 SB = Scale back/withdraw Forces

Analysis of Alternate Futures

Scenario 1 – Pakistan controls the region

Scenario 1 placed the Pakistan in control of the region along the Durand Line known as the FATA, SWAT and the NWFP. This scenario was developed

by the need of Pakistan to control the border during this time of war in Afghanistan. The scenario places the government of Pakistan in control but also the military united on one goal and that is to ensure that the Taliban and militant Islamist are not creating more safe heavens for terrorist coming across the border.

The LAMP method resulted in four potential responses; the response of “Pakistan Controls Region” that received over 21 votes after comparing the alternate futures one by one. I prioritized futures and will analyze possible outcomes based on the results that were rendered in this step of the LAMP method.

Alternate Future #8: *Pakistan takes control over the region that includes the FATA, SWAT and NWFP via political influence to reach an agreement from the United States and the Taliban.* Alternate Future #8 received 25 votes, this show that this pair wise is more likely to happen than the other 27 alternate futures. Although this future is not like what the current stat of the country is like there are some indicators that it can be. The United States would have political influence over Pakistan and it has proven so in many ceasefires that had been agreed upon the tribal leaders and the Pakistan. The Tribal leaders are currently being influenced by the mullahs and hence the reason that the Taliban reigns free but that is not to say that Pakistan cannot entice them as they have in the past to come to an agreement. Given up the region is one thing Pakistan does not want to do but if they are in control of the region they will be able to enforce, like in the past, some of the maliks and the mullahs in the region. Pakistan has the military

to take control of the region but it is in their best interest not to take it by force rather work out an agreement that will benefit the Pashtuns and themselves.

One way to work out the agreement is to recognize the Pashtuns are a region that will fall under Pakistani rule. Pakistan could be providing growth in the areas that are most in need and continue to expand on the tourist areas that currently flourish. Graham Usher pointed this out in his essay. The way to take over the Taliban is to get to the heart of what makes up the group and those are the Pashtuns who will be more inclined to come under some form of rule and have a voice since that is what they are fighting for now.

Alternate Future #6: *Pakistan and the United States continue to push political influence in the region as the Taliban continue to fight against Pakistan's control of the region.* This alternate scored a total of 23 votes and making it the second most possible alternate under the scenario of Pakistani regional control. In this scenario Pakistan would have the upper hand and be able to extend a peaceful resolution to the Taliban. The United States would hesitate at first but in the end with the war in Afghanistan and the possibility to have an agreement that could benefit them with cross border relations and hunting terrorist they would be inclined to reach an agreement. The United States also has to look at the benefit of being able to exchange terrorist for political and monetary gains.

The Taliban would continue to fight for any agreement, as they have seen in the past, will end badly for them. The Taliban would not just be willing to give up the ground that they live on that would continue with them fighting. By having control Pakistan could once again implement some form of government that

would allow for those tribes in the region to prosper from via means of industry and overall economic growth. Although this alternate would not be an easy one to come to I believe that Pakistan would rather handle things in a political manner.

Alternate Future #18: *The United States scales back in lieu of Pakistan control and Pakistan and the Taliban enter into political negotiations and agreements.* In this alternate future Pakistan finds itself once again in the mist of negotiations. Much like the alternate future #8, the benefit of entering negotiations with the Taliban would be a much better outcome for Pakistan. In this alternate one thing has changed the scaling back of US forces in the region. This would likely aid the negotiation process for both the Taliban and Pakistan. In the past the United States has proven to be the one element that continues to spoil whatever ceasefire the Taliban and Pakistan have come to terms with. It is American aggressive tactics that have forced Pakistan to march an offensive in 2004 with the promises of having intelligence that pinpointed high level terrorist in Pakistan.

The one other factor that would have to fall in place for this alternate is the ability of Pakistan to control its military. In the past military generals would form agreements with the Taliban leaders circumventing the maliks, who were in charge; and cause a ripple in authority not to mention more fighting amongst the tribes resulting in innocent people being killed. Although most of the maliks in the region had been killed and the mullahs are the reigning influence in the region, Pakistan can still attempt to bring them to the table and recognize new leadership that would be reporting back to the capital as before. If Pakistan

presents to the elders in the tribal community that the US would scale back operation then that bit of peace in the region could prove to be a step in the right direction for all involved in this process. As this scenario is presented Pakistan would be in control of the region and would have the upper hand in negotiation and hopefully the ear of the tribal elders and the Taliban leaders.

Alternate Future #25: *With the control of the region being controlled by Pakistan they decide to scale back operations as the Taliban attempt political influence and the United States continues the fight.* This alternate presents the United States as the aggressor as the other two actors exercise other options. The Taliban could attempt to reach an agreement to gain the favor of the people as well as get closer to the capital of Pakistan where the nuclear weapons are. In the stance of Pakistan the regional control is theirs so the amount of fighting and operations to be conducted can be scaled down. The United States on the other hand will continue to hunt and capture suspected terrorist that have crossed over the border and into the newly controlled region. This alternate is different from the previous three in that only one actor really stands to gain anything. The United States would not really be impacted by this scenario since it will continue with operations and would essentially have to come to terms with Pakistan about cross border operations. If the Taliban comes to an agreement with Pakistan that could ultimately lead to an agreement with the United States thus scaling operation back for America. Pakistan would be able to utilize military funding in other needed areas such as aiding growth in the region where the Taliban lives. The Taliban would stand to gain the most since they could negotiate for

sovereignty as well as gain sympathy from the public in that they unlike the Taliban in Afghanistan did not attack the United States.

and I would also like to mention that 2 other alternate futures rendered 20 votes they were 5 and 27.

Scenario 2 – the Taliban gains regional Control

In this scenario the Taliban gains control of the region that encompasses the NWFP, SWAT and the FATA. This scenario would possible cause Pakistan to split into two and cause monumental problems for the United States as they continue to pursue the war on terrorism. The Taliban would be able to harbor terrorist as they saw fit as well as create a Pashtunian government and country. Some say that the Taliban in Pakistan has already accomplished its own independent country within the borders of Pakistan. This scenario is really important in the aspect that if this were to come to fruition the safety of Pakistan's nuclear weapons would become a new issue in that region. Gaining control for the Taliban may be just a small step in regaining what territory was lost by the Taliban in Afghanistan, not to mention a full safe haven and hope for foreign fighting cells around the world.

Alternate Future #1: *The fighting continues with no outlook.* This alternate future mostly resembles the current state of Pakistan in that there is no outlook to when the current fighting will stop. The Taliban claims victories such as the one in Bunner in April that forces the Pakistani government to take action as to not lose face of allow for the region to be taken over, thus limiting their possible restaging area, in case a war with India was to break out. This alternative is

fueled by the possibility of the Taliban taking control in the region. Taliban control of any region would constitute an aggressive posture by Pakistan as well as the United States. The United States would now have a tougher battle in cross border operations and would more than likely not coordinate with the Pakistani government nor would the current laws that prohibit the US from taking occupation be valid. The war would continue much as it is now as the Taliban appear to have control of FATA and some of the SWAT, yet this is coupled with Pakistan's inability to protect the maliks that it had emplaced to control the region.

Alternate Future #2: *The United States Taliban continue to fight as Pakistan looks to implement a Political solution to reach and agreement.* This solution may seem like a broken record but the Taliban will not stop their unconventional attacks until there signs from the other two actors. The United States in this alternative will continue to pursue aggressive operations that will hinder the ability of Pakistan to gain an agreement that will prove to be useful in gaining peace in that region. Unlike scenario #1 where they are all fighting, Pakistan will try to win favor and end this politically. Pakistan has a vested interest in the region as well as keeping their military strength and that is why they would pursue this course of action. Pakistan knows that without the ability to have a staging area for additional defense it can become vulnerable to India invading it. The United States has shown in the past that it has really no concern about the government of Pakistan but it has a vested interest in capturing suspected terrorist as well as defeating the Taliban. The Taliban will not just turn over land that in this scenario

it has control of. Pakistan will also need to negotiate since they stand the most to lose. With control of any region that Taliban will feel confident enough to challenge Pakistan for the Islamabad where they currently have nuclear weapons that the Taliban wishes to attain.

Alternate Future #18: *The Taliban and Pakistan seek out political means and an agreement that includes the United States to scale back on operations.* Alternate Future #18 presents the United States in a non aggressive mode that could assist negotiations with between the Taliban and Pakistan. In the scenario the controlling body of the region can dictate the terms. One of those terms would be the scaling back of operations by the United States. The United States would comply in that it could focus on the war with Afghanistan. Pakistan would show up to the table of negotiations as it has done in the past and a possible ceasefire would once again be constituted. The table shows that unlike the other alternates where there is much aggression, it showcases the ability of diplomacy as well as the vested interest of other issues. Pakistan does not want to lose regional control but bringing the Taliban to the table would avoid a civil war in Pakistan. A civil war would complicate the war effort for the United States and thus scaling back to focus on the war would behoove them. This alternate future was also presented in scenario #1 and had several limiting factors that had to be accounted for due to the controlling entity in the region.

Alternate Future #11: *The Taliban and Pakistan continue to fight as the United States scales back its operations.* This alternate was beat out by #18 by a small margin. The reason being is that Pakistan has shown in the past that they are

unable to control their field generals and that causes them to lose ground as well as political influence. Pakistan would be more inclined to seek out a political mean so that it could regain control or at least have some influence in the region. Another factor is that if Pakistan fights then so will the Taliban. The Taliban will not relinquish land that they believe that they would be governing as well as the Pashtuns wish to create their own country. Pakistan has tried to avoid such things from happening in the past and they will do so again. That land is too valuable to them and any continued calls for victory such as in Buner will provoke the Pakistani government to seek action against the Taliban.

If the fighting continues between those two actors the United States can scale back its offensive and concentrate on neighboring Afghanistan. With the Taliban, in this scenario, controlling the region, the United States could find them in the mist of another war/conflict. Having pulled troops out of Iraq and relocating them to combat the effort in Afghanistan they would like to avoid another drawn out struggle like Iraq.

Scenario 3 – US cuts aid to Pakistan

Scenario 3 present a different perspective than the previous two in that it does not take into account a sole proprietor of the region. It will examine the possibility of the United States not providing the aid in which Pakistan has become accustomed to and reliant to. The relationship of Pakistan and the United States has relied heavily on monetary contributions and without these luxuries Pakistan will need to rethink their military strategy. Most of the aid that is provided by the United States goes into providing the military of Pakistan the

ability to conduct operations in the region. The economic downturn for the United States can lend itself to this scenario, although most of the money has been allocated the transfer of the money has not taken place and this is why the scenario is being explored. The courses of action will remain the same as the LAMP method entails it to.

Alternate Future #5: *The United States continues to engage in cross border operations against the Taliban as the Pakistan and the Taliban seek political resolution due to the lack of funding coming in from America.* Much like scenario #2 alternate future #18 the Taliban and Pakistan seek to pursue political means to gain an agreement. In the past Pakistan has been able to end operations with ceasefires that were brokered by field general and some by diplomacy. This alternate future received the most votes because; it would be in the best interest of Pakistan to reach an agreement with the Taliban since the funding for their military would be taking a large cut. Pakistan would have to look to budget money from other areas in order to support its military operations. With the ISI having come out and stated that they still have communication with the militant leaders it would be accessible to negotiate an agreement. The United States would continue to pursue terrorists into the Pakistan in an effort to rid the world of Al-Qaeda members and thus would not be as concerned with how Pakistan was attaining aid. In the past some of the money provided by the United States has been budgeted poorly and without proper documentation. Although this alternative future appears difficult to attain based on the scenario Pakistan would

have to look for a way in which to salvage its limited presence and control of the region.

Alternate Future #1: *The Fighting continues between all actors as the United States retreats funding to Pakistan.* This alternate also appeared in scenario #2 as the leading vote receiver. Unlike the previous scenario Pakistan would have to fight as a means to survive being taken over by the Taliban. With the Taliban attempting to claim territories close to the capitol and the insistence of the Taliban wanting nuclear power, Pakistan would have no choice but to take arms. The United States pulling back aid would determine the sustainment but also would force Pakistan's hand to take action against the Taliban. The territory is too precious for Pakistan to lose and having the Taliban taking other regions would show Pakistan as a weak nation and susceptible to attacks from India. These are the things that Pakistan does not hence the military reaction to claims of the city of Buner being taken over. Pakistan wasted no time in forming an offensive and showing the world that they were still a force to be reckoned with. This alternate future also identifies the possibility that the battle in this region maybe going on for quite some time.

Alternate Future #2: *The United States continues to battle the Taliban as Pakistan seeks a political resolution to an agreement.* This alternate future is also a repeat offender in scenario #2. The reason in this case that Pakistan would be utilizing political refuse is that they would need to maintain some form as aid could possibly force their hand to seek other than military force to attain peace in the region as well as governmental control. In this situation Pakistan

would have to react in some form or fashion and without the aid of the dollar it could very well be politically. In comparison to alternate future #1 in which it is similar, the funding will determine the ability to conduct operations.

Alternate Future #8: *As the United States pulls back aid the Taliban and the US seek political resolution to an agreement so does Pakistan.* Alternate future #8 is also an outcome in scenario #1. The best thing for Pakistan in this situation is if all other entities are pursuing an agreement they should jump on board. This alternate future came about in that if the United States was going to pull back aid they would be focusing their efforts somewhere else, namely Afghanistan. This would allow for some pressure to come off of the Taliban as well as open a dialogue with the other actors. If the United States would not show that they are supporting Pakistan this would open the type of communication with some members of the Taliban as well as the tribal elders. The lack of support from the United States could open relations as with alternate #11 and #18 in scenario #2.

Conclusion

The situation in Pakistan seems like an endless one and one that keeps repeating itself. The War that was sparked by 9/11 has given light to an old enemy and arose some issues of the ability to govern the regions that lie within Pakistan. Pakistan still deals with external worries such as the possibility of a nuclear war with India. Internal conflicts that have gone unresolved due to poor leadership also threaten the nuclear programs that are needed to defend it. The United States has also presented a challenge in their war with Afghanistan while have led to several ceasefires being stopped.

Pakistan holds the key and is the critical piece to ensuring victory in that part of the world against terrorism. It can be considered a single point of failure for defeating terrorism in Middle East (South West Asia). Gone are the times of President Musharraf who's military place the country into bigger turmoil through corruption and misappropriation of power. The sympathizer in the country will continue to draw the country apart. Pakistan is at a point in which it can gain control of the region both politically and military and also providing the Taliban a different alternative that to associate itself with Al-Qaeda militants as well as saving it capital city. The LAMP method was utilized in order to predict some various outcomes to the future in the region that is made up by the FATA, NWFP and the Swat Valley.

The results were an all or nothing outcome. If the Taliban, Pakistan and the United States come to terms it can serve beneficial to all. If the three countries do not come to a resolution, the fighting will continue for several years to come. Pakistan is the driver in all the alternative futures because it holds more to lose if control of the region is not determined and soon.

Resources

- Gall, Carlotta. "US Questions Pakistan's Will to Stop Taliban," *New York Times*; 23 Apr 2009 available from Internet;
http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/24/world/asia/24pstan.html?_r=2
accessed 20 July 2009.
- Heuer Jr., Richards J. *Psychology of Intelligence Analysis*, Washington DC: CIA Center for the Study of Intelligence. 1999
- Jones, Morgan D. *The Thinker's Toolkit: 14 Powerful Techniques for Problem Solving*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998.
- Lockwood, Jonathon S. and Lockwood, Kathleen O'Brien. *The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP)*, Washington DC: Joint Military Intelligence College. 1994
- Moran, Andrew. "Thousands of Pakistani Protest U.S Presence in the region," *Digital journal*; 8 May 2009 available from Internet;
<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/275065> accessed 20 July 2009.
- Moreau, Ron, Yousafzai, Sami . "Fight Flub," *Newsweek*; 16 Jul 2009 available from Internet; <http://www.newsweek.com/id/207032?from=rss> accessed 23 July 2009.
- Rupram, Mohindra. "More Musharraf" *Harvard International Review* vol 30. 2008, available from EBSCOhost
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=34162468&site=ehost-live> accessed 21 July 2009.
- Spector, Leonard S. "Pakistan, Taliban and Global Security – Part I," *Yale Global*; 8 may 2009 available from Internet;
<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/display.article?id=12349> accessed 25 July 2009.
- Usher, Graham. "Pakistan Taliban," *Middle East Report Online*; 13 Feb 2007 available from Internet; <http://merip.org/mero//mero021307.html> accessed 25 July 2009.
- Unattributed, "A real offensive, or phoney war?," *The Economist*, 30 April 2009, available from Internet;
http://www.economist.com/displayStory.cfm?story_id=13576371;
accessed 18 July 2009.
- Unattributed, "Asia and Far East," *Military Technology* vol 32, 2008, available

- from EBSCOhost;
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&d b=aph&AN=32015411&site=ehost-live> accessed 20 July 2009
- Unattributed, "Pakistan," *Country Report*, Sep 2008, available from EBSCOhost;
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&d b=tsh&AN=34373620&site=ehost-live> accessed 20 July 2009
- Unattributed, "Pakistan," *CIA World Factbook*, 2 July 2009, available from Internet; <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html> accessed 16 July 2009.
- Unattributed "Taliban die'in Pakistan clashes." *BBC News*: 14 July 2009.
Available from Internet
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/8149411.stm accessed on 16 July 2009.
- Ware, Michael. "Official: Pakistan can help Broker U.S.-Taliban talks," *CNN*; 11 Jul 2009 available from Internet;
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/asiapcf/07/10/pakistan.taliban.omar/index.html> accessed 13 July 2009.
- Weinbaum, Marvin G., Harder, Jonathan B. "Pakistan's Afghan policies and their consequences" *Contemporary South Asia* vol 16 Mar 2008 available from EBSCOhost;
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&d b=aph&AN=31192750&site=ehost-live> accessed 22 July 2009