

AL-QAEDA IN PAKISTAN: HOW THIS SAFE HAVEN AND RELATIONSHIP
IMPACTS INSURGENCY AND WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of
The School of Continuing Studies
and of
The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Master of Arts in Liberal Studies

By

Kira Mae McGovern, B.S.

Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.
October 21, 2012

AL-QAEDA IN PAKISTAN: HOW THIS SAFE HAVEN AND RELATIONSHIP IMPACTS THE INSURGENCY AND WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

Kira Mae McGovern, B.S.

MALS Mentor: R. Nicholas Palarino, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

The war in Afghanistan is complex and there is no singular solution to resolve the conflict that exists there. However, there are certain factors that will drastically impact the future of it, especially concerning Afghanistan's relationship with Pakistan. Many argue that it is crucial to factor Pakistan into analysis and the potential of Afghanistan's success. More specifically, al-Qaeda in Pakistan is a top threat to the United States and its interests abroad. Al-Qaeda is resilient and adaptable. The safe haven they are awarded in Pakistan, along with the Taliban and other insurgent groups, creates a challenging situation. This thesis aims to identify the major struggles that stand before the international community concerning resolution in Afghanistan and the future of the war there.

In order to validate my hypothesis, I analyzed and investigated how the presence of al-Qaeda in Pakistan impacts the insurgency and conflict in Afghanistan. First, I examined Pakistan's relationships with Afghanistan, the international community, the Afghan insurgency, and al-Qaeda. Each of these relationships has a significant influence on the current and future situation in Southeast Asia.

Second, the tribes in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) are important to address because they account for the ambiguous area that exists between Afghanistan and Pakistan. This location includes districts in the east, south, and southwest regions of Afghanistan. Due to the large insurgent population, the FATA remains more violent and resistant to international aid, Counterinsurgency (COIN) tactic, and development.

Third, the war in Afghanistan is the longest one the United States has been involved in to date, but we are still trying to implement and develop effective strategies. For the first few years, the United States' focus was slightly off-track and it took time to gain momentum. The delayed understanding has negatively impacted relations with Pakistan, but with the right tactics and focus we can overcome this. My thesis required a lot of research into historical and current literature to understand the role Pakistan can play in the future.

While there is hope for a successful finish to the war in Afghanistan, the correct process is a slow one and Pakistan plays a vital part in many aspects of it. American and international policies must aim to maintain strong, positive ties with Pakistan in order to improve the situation in Afghanistan and the threat of terrorism worldwide.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
<u>PART I. RELATIONSHIPS WITH PAKISTAN</u>	11
CHAPTER 1. PAKISTAN AND THE UNITED STATES	13
CHAPTER 2. PAKISTAN AND INDIA	24
CHAPTER 3. PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN	28
<u>PART II. ISLAMIC EXTREMISM IN PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN</u>	34
CHAPTER 4. AL-QAEDA	41
CHAPTER 5. THE TALIBAN	53
CHAPTER 6. THE FEDERALLY ADMINISTERED TRIBAL AREAS	61
<u>PART III. OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM</u>	64
CHAPTER 7. STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN	68
CHAPTER 8. PAKISTAN AND THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN	80
CONCLUSION	85
REFERENCE LIST	89

INTRODUCTION

The war in Afghanistan is a long-term and complex challenge due to numerous issues that continue to prolong progress. Pakistan's relationships with Afghanistan and the United States remain consistent struggles. As a key player in this war, Pakistan will ultimately help determine the outcome. Relations with Pakistan have been strained throughout this war and the international community's aid to Afghanistan is not viewed favorably. As a result, the situation in Southwest Asia is slow to improve and Pakistan has refused to support international efforts. The country continues to act as a safe haven for insurgents, especially during the winter months when operations are at a seasonal lull.

Despite the losses in manpower and resources, al-Qaeda has remained resilient, establishing areas they can operate in freely, most of which are along the border in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). Consequently, the locations of biggest concern are found in the FATA along the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. This target area plays a major role in Pakistan's relationship with Afghanistan, the international community, the Taliban and al-Qaeda, because it remains a safe haven untouched by the Pakistani government, despite agreements with the United States. This refuge in Pakistan remains a threat to the United States' interests, not only because of the September 11th attacks in 2001, but also due to the impact that al-Qaeda in Pakistan is having on the Taliban and therefore operations in Afghanistan. Analyzing the situation in Pakistan will illuminate the existing and potential challenges that obstruct resolution in Afghanistan, especially those concerning of Islamic extremism.

The intent of this thesis is to enhance understanding of Pakistan's relationship to the war in Afghanistan by addressing the issue of terrorism in the region. Terrorism is a worldwide struggle and can touch even the safest parts of the world. The United States witnessed this on September 11th, 2001 and has been fighting a difficult war in Afghanistan ever since. At this time, there is an association of terrorists embedded in Pakistan and Afghanistan interested in conducting further attacks on American interests at home and abroad (Riedel 2011, 1). Al-Qaeda remains a prominent member of this syndicate and has linked up with the Afghan Taliban, the new Pakistani Taliban, and the Lashkar-e-Tayyibo (LeT). Each of these organizations has been responsible for committing acts of Islamic extremism.

This thesis will not address the LeT in detail, but to summarize, it is a terrorist organization that initially formed in Afghanistan in 1990, but has operated mainly from Pakistan in the Kashmir Valley since then. The group perceives the conflict in Kashmir as a catalyst for a larger global struggle and its main goal is to eradicate Hinduism and Judaism. According to the LeT, Israel and India are deemed "enemies of Pakistan" and their religions "enemies of Islam." Like most terrorist organizations, LeT believes that violent jihad is necessary to restore Islam in spite of its enemies. Since 2009, the group has renounced any global jihad intentions, but is thought to have remained active in the anti-India campaign. The remaining aforementioned organizations, al-Qaeda, the Afghan Taliban, and the Pakistani Taliban, actively operate in Southeast Asia today and are significant actors in Afghanistan's current tumultuous state.

Afghanistan has been the primary battleground for fighting Soviet imperialism and transnational Islamic terrorism. This history has bred an environment that attracts controversy. According to David C. Isby's book, Afghanistan: Graveyard of Empires, there are five main conflicts that exist in Afghanistan. If these are not improved, international terrorism will likely remain a global threat. The first conflict concerns al-Qaeda. Al-Qaeda continues to enable terrorism throughout the world, even though the organization has been significantly reduced in size and strength since 2001. It is important to approach the situation in Southeast Asia with the core goal of disrupting, dismantling, and eventually defeating al-Qaeda (Woodward 2011, 386). Denying and preventing any type of safe haven in Afghanistan or Pakistan will help the United States reach this goal.

Second, the allied insurgencies in Afghanistan and Pakistan create a unitary conflict that is divided only by the border and Pakistani policy. Pakistan offers sanctuary for insurgents, and advises Pakistani insurgents to target interest across the border in Afghanistan instead of locally. This is typical of Pakistani alliances. They provide support when it is beneficial to their own interests. In this case, Pakistan supports insurgency and maintains any relationships with militants while avoiding attacks on their own soil. This is a classic example of "keep your friends close and your enemies closer." Pakistan is renowned for this mentality. Each friend and enemy is used to Pakistan's benefit or there is no purpose for a relationship at all. However, over the years, attacks have increased on Pakistani soil. This shift may be advantageous to Afghan and international interests.

The third conflict pertains to the narcotic trade. If there is only one thing that needs to be unstable in Afghanistan, it is opium. Poppy, and therefore Opium, has an extensive and reliable market. It is an easy crop to grow and harvest in Afghanistan. Plus it maintains state authority, making it a first choice for many farmers. Poppy is harvested in the early spring. This is also the time when the “fighting season” picks up and violence increases in the region. Until there are other strong markets available for farmers, poppy will continue to be a primary crop. A more stable government and society in Afghanistan will help limit opium cultivation and trafficking.

The fourth conflict involves the multi-faceted internal strife within Afghanistan. This is a huge concern resulting from ethno-linguistic divisions, religious practices, warlords and power brokers, political relationships, and gender relationships, to name a few. There are numerous sides to every issue in Afghanistan, producing deep divisions in the population. While the tribes all stem from the same foundations, they have unique language dialects and beliefs. These small differences actually cause a great amount of strife for the overall population. Afghans are somewhat set in their mentality and way of life. Diversity is not valued, although it is common. A Muslim tribe in the FATA will differ greatly from a more modern Muslim living in Kabul City. Women are treated differently depending on the environment as well. It is not uncommon to see a woman dressed in modern clothing in cities like Kabul. However, in the more tribal areas women may be beaten for wearing something other than a full burqa.

The last of the five main conflicts in Afghanistan actually lies within Pakistan. Insurgency in the country is not the sole issue. Pakistan is experiencing a governance

crisis that is affecting Afghans just as much as Pakistanis. Democratic development has been smothered in Pakistan. This is attributed mainly to inconsistency and corruption in the government. Military rulers have overthrown civilian governments time and time again. Civilian leaders have continued to show weakness and lack of credibility. As a result, Pakistanis have become deeply disillusioned with their ruling elite (Jones 2003, xvi). Pakistan, the international community, and Afghanistan would benefit greatly from democratization and development efforts. This is not an easy endeavor, but one that is worthwhile.

It is possible to overcome all these conflicts, but it will take time. The war in Afghanistan has been going on for over ten years, but the issues we are facing are still relatively new. Misconceptions and inappropriate strategies started American involvement off on the wrong foot. The delayed understanding of the war has negatively impacted relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan. Improvements have been made and new policy implemented. As a result, there have been promising developments in Afghanistan, but relations with Pakistan remain strained. There is a lot of history tied to this relationship that limits the possibility for rapid improvement.

According to American standards, an acceptable resolution is still out of reach, despite the plan for a full withdrawal of international assistance in 2014. So the question is raised: Was our involvement in Afghanistan worth it? The goal of this thesis is to benefit those looking for a better understanding of the war, terrorism and insurgency in Southeast Asia and possible outcomes for the future.

From an American perspective, many compare Afghanistan to Vietnam, which is unrealistic. It is true that both wars were unpopular, costly, and threatened domestic political agendas (Isby 2010, 377). However, the war in Afghanistan is not about American problems and divisions. It is about the desperate, but solvable situation in Afghanistan. Instead of focusing on an exit strategy, it is important to prioritize an approach that will obtain success in Afghan conflicts and maintaining American domestic and political priorities. Pulling out of Afghanistan too soon risks undercutting the achievements the United States has made since 2001 (Isby 2010, 377).

American opinion of the war in Afghanistan is important because policy and decision makers want to appeal to the population, especially during election periods. Therefore, it is necessary for the population to really understand the current state of the war and how it has transformed over time. Many Americans rely on the national news for information, but sometimes there is a tendency for American news to focus the turmoil and tragedy. Peace and stability do not make good headlines. Local networks do provide helpful reports, but it is important to go beyond these to learn from international resources, too. Some of the foreign news stations provide a much more coherent and accurate picture of the war. Having a more complete and informed view of the conflict in Pakistan and Afghanistan will facilitate success.

In addition, there are many scholarly publications available from authors in the Afghanistan-Pakistan community. A lot of these sources are cited in this paper and offer a broad illustration of the current situation in Afghanistan and how Pakistan plays a major role in it. As a member of the Afghanistan-Pakistan community for almost three years, I

have served on the Department of Defense's Afghanistan-Pakistan Task Force and deployed to Afghanistan for six months. These experiences have provided a lot of first hand exposure to experts in the field. There are many perspectives, but it generally accepted that Pakistan has an immense role in anything related to Afghanistan. To look at the countries exclusively will hinder progress in either region. I do not claim to be an authority on all things Afghanistan-Pakistan related, but by examining different expert opinions, in addition to factual and historical information, I hope to create an accurate portrayal of the current state of affairs in Southeast Asia. My thesis will be valuable to those looking for a thorough assessment of the war, the key players, and the possible end game.

Once upon a time, Afghanistan was a relatively peaceful country with a weak, but centralized, government (Isby 2010, 373). Unfortunately, in efforts to obtain security and infrastructure, the weak government was easily influenced by neighbors like Pakistan, Iran, and the former Soviet central Asia. Today, Afghanistan relies heavily on the West for these. Instead of turning to other countries for support, Afghanistan needs to gain strength from its population. There is prevalent support for governance and rule of law, despite an aversion to highly centralized control from Kabul (Isby 2010, 373). A desire for peace and security does exist amongst the people. Alas, the Taliban has had success using this to their benefit than the United States. The Taliban has the home field advantage and gathers strength by promising Afghans they can fulfill their desires for a stable country. Afghans know the United States cannot stay forever, nor do they want

that, but this realization only increases local support and the Taliban's resolve. It is imperative to eliminate internal and external support for insurgency.

Pakistan is the insurgency's greatest support, whether that is the intention or not. To really understand the impact Pakistan has in Afghanistan, it is important to answer questions concerning the relationship and support Pakistan provides, to include: how does Pakistan support al-Qaeda; what does the relationship between the Afghan and Pakistani governments, people, and extremist groups look like; and what are the roles and positions of the tribes in the FATA? It is also important to look at al-Qaeda's connections, interests, and involvements in Afghanistan. This includes ties with the Taliban, and how this insurgency operates, strategizes, and gains support. Focusing on these issues will shed light on the nagging question on American minds: what does the future of the war in Afghanistan look like?

Ultimately, the situation in Pakistan must be controlled or it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find success in Afghanistan. Pakistan's relationships can be evaluated historically and in present terms to help support this hypothesis. By examining Pakistan's relationship with Afghanistan over time it is interesting to see how it developed into what it is today. Pakistan initially pursued an alliance with Afghanistan to satisfy selfish strategic opportunities. Afghanistan was weak and malleable. An alliance allowed Pakistan to transform Afghanistan however it pleased and ensured more security against India. Pakistan's history with India is responsible for most of the country's strategic decisions. After three wars, Pakistan constantly preys on any opportunity to find a new powerful friend to back them against India. Therefore, it is also

important to understand the Pakistan-India relationship and how it has influenced Pakistani actions since 1947.

The relationship with Afghanistan offered Pakistan more security in case India decided to expand, but this affiliation also led to Pakistan's attachment to Afghan affairs after the Taliban took control. Today, Pakistan still offers safe haven for Afghan insurgents, despite the bond made with the United States after the September 11th attacks. An alliance with the United States is very important to Pakistan, because of the economic and military aid it affords. However, this relationship has been fluctuating for years with both sides unsatisfied by the other. The United States needs Pakistan to achieve its goals in Afghanistan, but success is unlikely while the relationship between the two countries is strained.

In 2009, when President Obama inherited the war in Afghanistan, he took over the bipartisan consensus that the war was necessary and "one that must be won to prevent serious international consequences for years to come" (Isby 2010, 375). He announced new implementation guidance for both Afghanistan and Pakistan. "President Obama's Final Orders for Afghanistan Pakistan Strategy" focuses on the need to deny the safe haven to al-Qaeda and prevent the Taliban from overthrowing the Afghan government (Woodward 2011, 385). At the end of 2009, top American Intel officials in Afghanistan determined that the insurgency was becoming more effective, warning the Taliban's "organizational capabilities and operational reach are quantitatively and geographically expanding" (Bergen 2011, 333). The risk of security incidents in 2010 was also estimated to be higher than the previous year.

On December 1st, 2009, President Obama made a speech on the new policy at West Point Academy. He said “I make this decision because our security is at stake in Afghanistan and Pakistan. This is the epicenter of the violent extremism practices by al-Qaeda. It is from here where we were attacked on 9/11, and it is from here that new attacks are being plotted as I speak.” President Obama referred to that speech as the most emotional he had ever made, in terms of how he felt about the situation (Bergen 2011, 333). The speech was addressed to a group of cadets and many would likely be stationed in Afghanistan in the near future, with the potential of not returning.

In this address, President Obama also mentioned a drawdown of forces to begin in July 2011. That left a year and a half to turn the American responsibilities over to the Afghans. This was definitely not enough time, especially using counterinsurgency techniques. President Bush’s administration introduced COIN in 2006 to focus strategy on building relations with Afghans by “winning hearts and minds.” Appealing to the people increased the potential to degrade the Taliban and build sufficient Afghan capacity to secure and govern their own country (Woodward 2011, 386). Once this is achieved, the United States can start reducing military aid to Afghanistan. To accomplish this, Afghan solutions must be part of the process, because the population must be capable of maintaining their own security. International support through policy, training, and influence will help Afghanistan overcome the current state of conflict, but, at the end of the day, the United States and coalition partners are merely supporting roles in this Afghan story.

PART I. RELATIONSHIPS WITH PAKISTAN

Pakistan is both an ally in the war on terror, and in some sense, a battleground of the war on terror.

- Stephen Hadley, National Security Advisor 2005-2009

Since its creation Pakistan's development has been turbulent and impeded by military governments and dictatorships. Pakistan's largest city has witnessed thousands of politically motivated murders over the years (Jones 2003, xii). The economy remains stunted and education lacking, as half the population illiterate. In addition, Pakistan's proximity to nations like Afghanistan, Iran, India, and China has made the country a hotbed for violence and controversy. Half of Pakistan's territory was lost over the course of three wars with India. Yet, the struggle over land in Kashmir continues today. Islamic extremists use Pakistan as a safe haven, which has led to an increase of violence in the region. And to top it off, Pakistan developed a successful nuclear program that has attracted dangerous attention.

All these factors warrant Pakistan a lot of international interest and concern. Tension is incredibly volatile due to the chronic instability of countries, like Pakistan. Over the years, the consistent conflict in Pakistan encouraged the growth of militant Islam, drained economic resources, and fueled insecurity with India (Jones 2003, xii). Stability and positive growth in Pakistan are crucial to combat worldwide threats and the future of terrorism.

Pakistan's sense of vulnerability has kept the country on the lookout for powerful "friends" (Jones 2003, xiv). Pakistan relies on the support from influential countries to maintain whatever stability it can. However, Pakistan wants to reap the

benefits of these alliances without giving much in return. The United States has been a major player in many Pakistani conflicts over the years, but the relationship is inconsistent. During the Cold War Pakistan's first military ruler, Ayub Khan, called the United States its "most allied ally" (Jones 2003, xiv). After the Soviet invasion twenty years later, General Zia-al-Haq, the head of state at that time, made sure Pakistan assisted the United States in the fight against communism. Then, in 2001, within hours of the September 11th attacks, Pakistan's ruler, General Pervez Musharraf, aligned his country with the United States and supposedly abandoned all ties with al-Qaeda and the Taliban (Jones 2003, xiv). Pakistan will take any opportunity to gain alliance with a country like the United States, despite strong feelings of dislike, to increase its arsenal of world power. India has tried to undermine this desperate search for foreign friends, but Pakistan has continued to be a central asset in issues that concern the international community.

Pakistan has been a strategic element for the international community to utilize in the past. Today, the country is a hub for worldwide threats, which has created some interesting dynamics for Pakistani relations with the United States and international community, primarily concerning the ongoing crisis in Afghanistan. If the situation in Pakistan is not improved, the international community may have more complicated and serious issues to deal with in the future.

CHAPTER 1

PAKISTAN AND THE UNITED STATES

Pakistan's relationship with the United States has been a tumultuous one. American interests and policies towards Afghanistan and Pakistan fluctuate based on current events in the region. This has created tension with the local governments and populations concerning the United States' legitimacy and commitment to these countries. In some cases American policies have benefited enemies instead of achieving what was initially intended. As a result, the United States government has appeared to undermine civil government in Pakistan, side with military dictators, and encourage the rise of the same extremist movements that threaten America abroad and at home (Riedel 2011, 3).

While it is never the intent to reinforce negative aspects of Pakistan, it is important to understand the complex relationship that has existed over decades. Pakistan has always been a key strategic country for the United States, but it has also been a mystery. Throughout its development, Pakistan has been forced to cope with events related to conspiracy, unsolved assassinations, and terrorism (Riedel 2011, 3). An alliance with a country like this is difficult and requires a lot of care and attention to sustain. The United States provided some of this throughout major conflicts in the region, but perhaps not as consistently as it should.

There are two significant features of the relationship between the United States and Pakistan. First, this association is discontinuous. Interest is shown in Pakistan when it is advantageous to the United States. Pakistan benefits from this interest by acquiring resources and political support in the contest with India (Cohen 2004, 304). Second, the

off and on alliance has made the Pakistan government, specifically the army, weary of American support. The United States provided military training to the Pakistani army, which gave them an understanding of America, but did not make generals and soldiers ‘pro-American’ (Cohen 2004, 304). In fact, this military support increased dislike for the United States within the civilian population. After years of dictatorships under military rule, the population was averse to this type of leadership. Pakistanis interpreted the training offered to the military as an alliance perpetuating the army’s role in Pakistan. This is just one example of how the relationship between the United States and Pakistan is viewed differently on each side.

Pakistan believes that the United States has continually displayed betrayal, promising much and delivering little (Riedel 2011, 123). In the United States Pakistan is viewed as deceitful, saying one thing and doing another. The conflicting ideas of what this relationship should accomplish are a major source of frustration. Pakistan would like to concentrate on the threat India poses, while the United States wants to focus on Pakistan’s role in global dangers like communism and terrorism (Riedel 2011, 123). These priorities have remained constant over the years and they will not change overnight or even in the next few years. It will take time to move past the legacy of the American ties with Pakistan and focus on future policy needs that reflect lessons from the past (Riedel 2011, 123). Building policy on the principle of providing steady support for democracy in Pakistan should be a new priority, even if the United States does not completely agree with some developments in the government. Pakistan has the potential to become a “terrorist production factory” if it fails as a state (Cohen 2004, 305). The

United States needs to learn from mistakes to improve current concerns and neutralize radical Islamic extremists in Pakistan.

For sixty-four years the United States has proven to be inconsistent and an unreliable friend to Pakistan (Riedel 2011, 122). The United States has a pattern of engaging and withdrawing from Pakistan based on American interests. This is understandable, but has allowed Pakistan to become more of an enemy than friend. At one time Pakistan was “the most allied of allies” to America (Cohen 2004, 302). In the early 1950s the United States supported Pakistan when India chose nonalignment. Pakistan needed outside support and the United States pounced on the opportunity. Pakistan is a Muslim state, geographically located near two of the world’s largest communist powers. An alliance with Pakistan was crucial to American interests in the 1950s and in return Pakistan received the military stability it desperately needed.

The partnership started to unravel in the 1960s as Pakistan turned to China for aid and the United States demonstrated support for India. The Kashmir dispute was hot at this time and American attempts failed to reconcile interests for Pakistan. As a result, the alliance fell dormant for awhile. The relationship has continued in this pattern for many years. It was restored briefly in 1970 after Pakistan facilitated an opening to Beijing, China for the United States, and then hit an all time low in 1979 as a result of General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq’s coup for presidency two years earlier. During the coup two years earlier, American buildings were burned and Pakistan’s image as a friend to the United States was severely damaged.

A second alliance developed between the nations when Pakistan supported crucial anti-Soviet operations in Afghanistan (Cohen 2004, 302). This caused a reversal in American policy once again. With Pakistan's help, the United States had defeated the Soviet Fortieth Red Army in Afghanistan (Riedel 2011, 3). This victory was followed by the end of the Soviet Union and Cold War. The United States then turned attention to other interests because Pakistan seemed to be doing well. It was headed for democracy and conflicts with neighboring countries had subsided (Cohen 2004, 303). However, between 1988 and 1996 Pakistan's situation declined significantly. Democratic institutions deteriorated, the country incurred massive debt, and radical Islamic parties continued to gain ground. Instead of becoming a stable nation it turned into a hostile and fanatic one, eager to host groups like al-Qaeda (Riedel 2011, 3). On top of all that, Pakistan was in the process of developing a nuclear program.

The nuclear program finally started to receive attention in 1996 when the United States noticed a link between Pakistan and extremist organizations like the Taliban and al-Qaeda. Before 1996, the United States distanced itself from the newly nuclear and failing country. A connection with extremist groups poses a worldwide threat and interest was once again directed at Pakistan. Until 1998 the United States was also disengaged with Afghanistan, another failing state. In 1998 al-Qaeda attacked American embassies. It became apparent during this time that Al-Qaeda was gaining more power in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The time had come for the world to renew interest in the region. The United Nations Security Council tried to issue sanctions on Pakistan in the

years leading to September 11th, 2001, but these were unsuccessful and only strained relations between Pakistan and the United States more.

However, the third official United States-Pakistan alliance developed as a result of the September 11th attacks. After the attacks, the United States lifted the sanctions put on Pakistan and began providing aid in exchange for Pakistan's cooperation with the War in Afghanistan. The United States wanted Pakistan to act as a partner in war efforts and for tracking down Taliban and al-Qaeda leaders hiding in the country (Cohen 2004, 304). Economic and military aid started flowing into Pakistan from the United States. In June 2003, the American government offered Pakistan 3.2 billion dollars through a five-year economic and military aid package that would begin in 2004 (Cohen 2004, 304). This offer included provisions regarding nuclear proliferation, democratization, and cooperation with terrorism. These provisions were consistent with American priorities. The United States wanted Pakistan to cut ties with Afghan jihadists, contain the nuclear program, establish democratic political order, avert an India-Pakistan crisis, and slow the narcotics trade, yet many of these issues still exist today (Cohen 2004, 302). Sadly, these issues still exist today.

In 2004, the United States started using drone attacks against al-Qaeda in Pakistan. Some Pakistanis are happy when al-Qaeda or Taliban commanders are killed in these attacks, but most see the drone operations as an infringement on Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity (Riedel 2011, 125). Most of these attacks focused on the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), where many radical Islamic groups felt comfortable hiding out. Pakistanis were notified of any drone activity at first, but this

had to change when it was realized that targets were being alerted of upcoming attacks. Pakistan was not as trustworthy as Americans expected and the relationship suffered more strain, yet again. Pakistan retaliated by putting restrictions on anything they could. The border between Pakistan and Afghanistan is important to war efforts, so Pakistanis have used the border to control the United States. This hostility remains because Pakistanis are upset with American involvement despite the aid provided to the country. Unfortunately, over the years the relationship between Pakistan and the United States continues to get worse instead of better, but Pakistan's influence over wartime efforts remains just as powerful. The United States has to placate Pakistan often to ensure productivity and success for operations in Afghanistan.

2007 was a critical year. By the spring it was obvious that the alliance was failing and militants were continuing to regroup in the FATA without consequence (Bergen 2011, 261). Despite the expensive American aid provided to Pakistan for the "War on Terror," the Taliban and al-Qaeda remained headquartered there. President Musharraf's dictator ways and inability to decrease militant occupation in Pakistan did not live up to expectations of the alliance. In July 2007, sixteen American Intel agencies signed off on a National Intelligence Estimate. It concluded that al-Qaeda had been able to protect and regenerate key elements of their attack capabilities due to a safe haven in Pakistan's FATA, operational lieutenants, and its top leadership (Bergen 2011, 261).

The United States also decided to support the return of Benazir Bhutto, former Pakistan prime minister and leader of the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), one of the two leading political parties in Pakistan (Bergen 2011, 262). Bhutto was chased from

Pakistan a decade earlier when President Musharraf made corruption charges against her. In 2007, Bhutto fit American ideals for the future of relations with Pakistan. Pakistan needed democracy and she could potentially lead the country in the right directions. Under American pressure, President Musharraf dropped the corruption charges against Bhutto scheduled an election for February 2008. Bhutto was able to return to Pakistan and campaign for the PPP. Years ago, Bhutto's government played an instrumental role in the rise of the Taliban, but she returned to Pakistan intent on cracking down on al-Qaeda and the local insurgencies (Bergen 2011, 262).

Bhutto's threats caused a series of assassination attempts on her life. The first was on October 19th, 2007, in Karachi. Two suicide bombers targeted Bhutto when she returned from exile. This was the deadliest attack in Pakistan's history, killing one hundred and forty people, but Bhutto survived. She was targeted again on December 27th in Rawalpindi. This time the gunman was successful.

A change in Pakistan leadership finally occurred in September 2008 when Benazir Bhutto's widower, Asif Ali Zardari, took office. A few months later President Obama was elected and he inherited what had become "the forgotten war of the twenty-first century" (Riedel 2011, 2-3). American interests were still active in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but Iraq was pulling more focus. It was time to refresh and start taking actions to improve the situation in Southwest Asia.

In 2009, the Kerry-Lugar bill was passed to triple aid to Pakistan. President Obama said the intent of the legislation was to "build schools and roads and hospitals and strengthen Pakistani democracy... so to avoid mistakes of the past." Pakistanis did not

respond positively to this new bill. In fact, they denounced it. They thought the bill had conditions because it called for a full examination of A.Q. Khan's history of nuclear proliferation and for an end of any support to extremist organizations (Riedel 2011, 123). The United States was offering a large amount of economic aid to a country on the other side of the world with the bill, but this was overlooked by Pakistan.

Senator John Kerry issued a statement claiming there were no conditions to the aid, but condemnation continued, mostly from General Kayani of the Pakistani army and the Inter-Intelligence Service (ISI). Both organizations were especially offended by the criticism of their ties to terror and proliferation (Riedel 2011, 123). This is yet another example of how American intentions in Pakistan have been misconstrued and disparaged. Pakistanis know they have the upper hand because the United States needs their support in Afghanistan. They are much easier to work with when something is required from the United States in return. Pakistanis want to determine their own future, whether that supports global Islamic jihad or a strong and healthy democracy (Riedel 2011, 121).

After the summer floods in 2010, the international community realized problems in Pakistan were becoming too much to handle with so much invested in Afghanistan. The United States backed off to allow Pakistan to develop without the interference from outside policy, but this did not gain Pakistani approval either.

Many polls have been conducted to understand the climate in Pakistan. In 2009 the University of Maryland found that two-thirds of Pakistan viewed President Obama's administration negatively. This poll was done a few months after President Obama announced his new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, which reemphasized that "the

United States has great respect for the Pakistani people.” He also said “they have a rich history and have struggled against long odds to sustain their democracy.” President Obama did not have the positive impact he intended on Pakistan.

The University of Maryland poll also showed seventy percent of Pakistan viewed the United States as a negative player on the world stage. The majority believed the United States only supports democracy as a means to control Pakistan’s government. Sixty percent share al-Qaeda’s opinion of the United States as a country hostile to Islam, but only twenty-five percent actually supported the September 11th attacks. Another poll done by Gallup Pakistan in 2011 showed similar results. Half of those sampled consider the United States a great danger to Pakistan, outpolling India, the Taliban, and al-Qaeda as a threat. “Any country that outpolls India as the bad guy in Pakistan is surely in a deep hole” (Riedel 2011, 122).

A survey done by Pew in 2010 showed eight percent of Pakistanis had confidence in President Obama while eighteen percent put their assurance in Osama bin Laden. A follow-up poll, conducted a month later, yielded results showing fifty-nine percent of the country considered the United States as an enemy. These results demonstrate a deep distrust of American intentions and President Obama, despite his announcement supporting democracy in Pakistan and a fresh start to the United States-Pakistan alliance (Riedel 2011, 122). It has been extremely challenging for the United States to overcome negative opinions in Pakistan, especially due to propaganda in the media blaming America for all Pakistani problems. Newspapers and television programs are very anti-American. The United States must be perceived more favorably by the population in

order to help Pakistan with issues, like the jihadist infrastructure and lack of a democratic government.

For any policy to succeed, Pakistani views towards Americans have to be understood. Many find the United States “fickle and unreliable,” only offering Pakistan help when it is beneficial to American interests. However, while Pakistanis dislike American involvement in their country they also fear an alliance between the United States and India. Any support towards Pakistan’s enemies, like India and Israel, creates discomfort. Pakistanis are very tuned into American affairs and they examine every movement and policy, looking for a potential impact on their country. The Iraq invasion was regarded as an anti-Muslim act by Pakistanis and, as a result, the offensive became a model for an American attack on Pakistan itself (Cohen 2004, 327-328).

Pakistan intends to maintain America’s perception that the country is critical to stability and strategic cooperation in the region of Southwest Asia, but they also do not want the United States involved in Pakistani affairs (Cohen 2004, 327). Pakistan aims to appeal to short-term fears with hope to establish a “relationship of mutual dependency in which Pakistani obligations are minimal and American ones are substantial” (Cohen 2004, 327). It is important to keep this in mind in order to develop effective policies in the future.

The first objective for American policy towards Pakistan must focus on reversing the distrust that exists between the two countries. The polls and Pakistani press consistently reinforce how significant the negative view of United States is in Pakistan (Riedel 2011, 121-122). Therefore, the United States needs to work with Pakistan to

improve pessimistic attitudes for the future. Consistency and unconditional support must be offered to Pakistan to improve tactics against terrorism and proliferation and to build a strong government free of corruption. A cooperative outlook for the future gives this alliance a better chance for success. There is a lot of historical damage to recover from, but mutual need can lead to mutual understanding and mutual benefits in the future. “Mutual” is key to this relationship. Neither side of this alliance has ever really trusted the other. Both countries will be content and successful in meeting their objectives if relations are improved through understanding and support. Ultimately, a strong relationship between the United States and Pakistan will make a difference in the war in Afghanistan and the threat of terrorism worldwide.

CHAPTER 2

PAKISTAN AND INDIA

Pakistan and India share a long history wrought with animosity since independence from Britain was established in 1947. When they separated, Pakistan became a national homeland for areas with a Muslim majority and India evolved into a secular nation that was primarily Hindu, with some Muslims, Sikhs, and Christians (Johnson 2012). This division led to an outbreak of violence between Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs as approximately seventeen million people rushed to join the country of their choice. This was one of the largest population exchanges in history and resulted in more than one million deaths (Johnson 2012). Meanwhile, the governments of India and Pakistan were dividing assets from British India. These included money, weapons, treasures, and minor resources, including items as small as paper clips (Johnson 2012).

Overall, the biggest issue was the division of land. After Britain ceded its rule on these territories, 562 independent “princely states” were left to choose independence or allegiance with Pakistan or India. Violent battles for land ensued between Pakistan and India. Kashmir was a primary focus of this competition because of its strategic location and size. The contest over Kashmir continues today, despite three Indian-Pakistani wars in 1947, 1965, and 1971 to establish ownership of the coveted territory. Kashmir was considered a “princely state” with a Muslim population of over ninety percent. Initially, the state’s government chose to align with India. However, in 1947, the Maharaja of Kashmir was a British appointee, not a hereditary ruler, and therefore he had no right to choose Kashmir’s fate.

The Maharaja's role in Kashmir when British India was given independence definitely complicated things. When given the choice, the Maharaja of Kashmir joined India and requested assistance from the Indian Army to combat Pashtun troublemakers causing riots and agitation in Kashmir. India supplied aid when Pakistan attacked. Although, Pakistan argues the agitators were actually local Kashmiris who did not want to be a part of India. India claims ownership of Kashmir mainly because of the Maharaja's decades old decision to side with India. Additionally, India claims the Pakistani government's support to insurgents is due to its relationship with Afghanistan and Kashmir should not be aligned with either volatile country.

Pakistan currently controls one third of Kashmir which include Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas of Gilgit-Baltistan. These areas are thinly populated and economically underdeveloped. Pakistanis believe all of Kashmir belongs to them, except for areas occupied by China. China has occupied the Aksai Chin area since the 1962 Sino-Indian war and the Trans-Karakoram area since it was ceded by Pakistan in 1965. These areas are almost uninhabited and China basically stays out of the conflict now, except when providing assistance to the Pakistani nuclear program. India currently controls two thirds of Kashmir including the Kashmir Valley, Jammu and Ladakh. The majority of the Kashmir population inhabits these areas. India asserts ownership of all Kashmir territory, including the part Pakistan ceded to China.

Pakistan argues that Kashmir is culturally and religiously aligned with Pakistan. Due to the large population of Muslims in Kashmir, Pakistan claims that many are bound to India against their will. Realistically, Kashmiris in the Indian controlled territories

would like independence from both countries. There are some who wish to join Pakistan, but very few want to stay in India. Those who do are often new to the country, primarily Hindu, and lack heredity links to Kashmir. No one on the Pakistani side of Kashmir wants to join India. Pakistan areas have a higher standard of living and the people are financially better off there. Even so, there are Kashmiris living in Pakistan territory who would like to have independence. In fact, many Kashmiris support a separatist movement away from both countries and hope for independence in the future. Scholars tend to agree that Pakistan has a stronger case, but ultimately, Kashmir is entitled to the independence it desires.

A solution for Kashmir needs to evolve in a region-centered process of negotiation (Cohen 2004, 323). Both sides should be encouraged by a third party, possibly the United States, to think about the future of this conflict and how a solution will benefit everyone involved. Any peace process between India and Pakistan must redefine the issue from its fossilized debate over sovereignty, law, and constitutional rights (Cohen 2004, 323). The ultimate goal is to improve the lives of Kashmiris and establish a strong foundation for a mutually beneficial alliance between India and Pakistan in the future.

Many Kashmiri lives have been negatively impacted by Pakistani-supported terrorists and Indian law enforcement and military operations. It is important to resolve the conflict over Kashmir not only to emphasis human rights as a priority, but also to combat some of the fundamental issues that exist in Pakistan, primarily concerning the historical attitude of tolerance for militants. The Kashmir conflict is actually considered

to be a cause of radical Muslims in Pakistan. This conflict is deep-rooted and it will be difficult to resolve, but it is extremely important to try and reach meet worldwide priorities and goals.

India and Pakistan will likely require outside assistance to move forward. If peace is not established soon, there is a chance the countries will end up in another war with each other. The United States has the ability to act as a facilitator in the peace process. This role will benefit American interests in addition to regional and global ones. American support for peace between India and Pakistan can help undercut the Islamic extremists in the Kashmir conflict and decrease the army's central role in Pakistan (Cohen 2004, 322).

Although stability in Pakistan mainly concerns international interests outside South Asia, the peace process appeals to Indian interests as well. The United States and India have a great relationship and assistance to reach a resolution with Pakistan may allow for wider strategic coordination and stronger economic ties (Cohen 2004, 305). It is in America's best interest to prevent another India-Pakistan war and help this hostile relationship reach a point of stability and harmony. The less turmoil that exists in South Asia the more hope there is for a successful end to the War in Afghanistan.

CHAPTER 3

PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN

Pakistan and Afghanistan have a long standing and complex relationship. Therefore, it is important to address this relationship when developing comprehensive policy toward either country (Cohen 2004, 323-324). During the Cold War, Pakistan's main interest in Afghanistan concerned the border conflicts along the Durand Line. The Durand Line is the poorly defined border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, where the Federally Administrated Tribal Areas (FATA) are located. For years, the ambiguity and tension over this border is the primary reason Pakistan has any interest in Afghanistan.

After the Soviet empire crumbled, Central Asia became vital for economic development. Pakistan was facing an economic downturn and saw Central Asia as a new market for selling goods and services (Nojumi 2002, 183). In exchange, Pakistan offered access to the Indian Ocean and set sights on Afghanistan as a strategic element for regional development. Pakistani leaders expanded interests in Afghanistan beyond the border and focused on developing a long-term alliance between the neighboring countries. Afghanistan not only appealed to Pakistan as a critical partner in the conflict with India, but as a key piece for connecting with the emerging Central Asian market (Nojumi 2002, 184). Pakistan approached this goal by increasing political influence in Afghanistan with attempts to establish a friendly and trustworthy national government for Afghanistan.

During the Cold War years, General Zia politicized Islam in an effort to create and lead a pan-Islamic movement in the region. As the movement progressed,

Afghanistan was identified as an extension of Pakistan and an additional support against any resistance in Central Asian states. General Zia's policy benefited Afghanistan because it aimed to solve the conflict over the Durand Line. The goal was to create a pan-Islamic government in Afghanistan, dedicated to Pakistan under the "banner of Islamic brotherhood" (Nojumi 2002, 183). Pakistan hoped Afghans would focus on this relationship instead of their own nationalism and political independence.

Pakistan wanted to control Afghanistan and use this neighbor to further Pakistani objectives. To do this, General Zia's government counteracted any political growth in Afghanistan that did not align with the pan-Islamic movement. Those who opposed the movement became the subject of Pakistan hostility, which resulted in mass kidnappings, mysterious disappearances, and assassinations (Nojumi 2002, 184). Pakistan maintained its hold in Afghanistan until the unexpected appearance of the Taliban insurgency. The Taliban emerged from the regime Pakistan had nurtured, yet insurgent commanders did not abide by General Zia's pan-Islamic doctrine. Afghan political activists who were pressured into the pro-pan-Islamic parties found the new group appealing (Nojumi 2002, 184). As a result, the rise of the Taliban put a cramp in Pakistan's plans for Afghanistan.

However, Pakistan did not want to lose its hold in Afghanistan. Pakistan knew that an "independent Afghanistan with a sophisticated army, dominated by those political and military leaders who were not committed to Pakistan's pan-Islamism" would be a considerable threat (Nojumi 2002, 185). If this government took hold, Pakistan feared it would be cut off from Central Asia and an Afghanistan-India alliance in the Kashmir battle could potentially evolve. Pakistan tried to push Afghanistan away from the jihadist

government, but the Taliban took over anyway. Pakistan decided it was still better to have Afghanistan as an ally rather than an enemy. Opposing the new Islamic State of Afghanistan could possibly reopen the Durand Line disputes. Therefore, the Pakistani alliance with the Taliban formed and became the most powerful external influence in Afghanistan (Nojumi 2002, 185).

The new alliance and influence in Afghanistan had a significant effect on Pakistanis. The Taliban was tied into government ministries and local communities and this directly impacted the social and political behavior of Pakistan. Under Taliban rule, sharia law was enforced in Afghanistan. Consequently, this practice crossed the border and was adopted by Pakistanis as well. The sharia form of governing was intriguing to those who felt mistreated by years of corruption and deceit under the Pakistani government. From these feelings the Pakistani Taliban emerged. Islamic extremism was taking over both Afghanistan and Pakistan, tying the two countries together more than ever before.

Afghanistan's economy suffered greatly from Pakistani and Taliban involvement in the country. Drug trafficking and crime monopolized production as Afghanistan fell deeper into instability. Cross-border operations between Pakistan and Afghanistan developed when the drug trade increased and the funds from these endeavors have accounted for much of the insurgency's funding during the War in Afghanistan. Ultimately, Pakistan's strategic interest in Afghanistan has led to an unintended long-term involvement. This "alliance" weakened Pakistan's security and stability.

America's War on Terror created an interesting dynamic to the relationship between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Pakistan's alliance with the United States demands that terrorism and extremist Islamic groups will be actively opposed by the government and population. However, Pakistan continues to view Afghanistan as a "client state" that will prove to be beneficial to Pakistan in the conflict with India (Cohen 2004, 323-324). Pakistan's paranoia about India strengthens bonds with Afghanistan because Pakistanis believe this alliance will prevent India from expanding into Afghanistan. So Pakistan continues to play two sides, balancing American and Afghan interests in an attempt to achieve whatever is in Pakistan's best interest.

Despite Pakistan's declarations of support for the United States after the September 11th attacks, Taliban and al-Qaeda commanders still manage to find sanctuary across the border. After the September 11th attacks, Osama bin Laden and his top deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, disappeared into Pakistan and off the American radar (Bergen 2011, 70). Pakistan has been tied to al-Qaeda since the 1980's and the Taliban since the 1990's, offering aid and refuge when necessary (Bergen 2011, 247). In the winter of 2001 to 2002, al-Qaeda and Taliban leaders rebased themselves in Pakistan following their expulsion from Afghanistan, because both organizations feel at home in Pakistan.

Al-Qaeda was founded by bin Laden in the Pakistani city of Peshawar in 1988 and several Taliban leaders attended the Haqqani madrassa, known as the Harvard of the Taliban, just outside of Peshawar (Bergen 2011, 148). This support continues today and is a significant challenge for the international community to overcome for the war in Afghanistan.

American policy must prevent Afghanistan from being overrun by corruption and insurgency, without removing Pakistani support to the Afghan government. The process of nation and state building in Afghanistan needs to continue, along with efforts to strengthen security (Cohen 2004, 324). In terms of an Afghan collapse, the radicalization of large areas in Pakistan and the re-Talibanization of Afghanistan pose the greatest threats (Cohen 2004, 324). As long as groups like the Taliban and al-Qaeda maintain support in areas like the FATA, Afghanistan will be at risk.

Unfortunately, the situation in Pakistan is not improving and the safe haven for the Taliban and al-Qaeda remains, but Pakistan has made attempts to improve Islamic extremism in the region. In 2006, President General Musharraf wanted to convince Pakistan he was the only one who could improve circumstances in the country. He had no intention of giving up his leadership position in Pakistan. President Musharraf and declared emergency rule and made a deal with the Taliban in the tribal areas of North Waziristan along the Afghan border (Bergen 2011, 260).

The deal was intended to deflect the Talibanization of people in the tribal areas in an attempt to eradicate al-Qaeda and Taliban in the region. Funds were given to militant leaders to repay any loans taken from al-Qaeda as a way to diminish any reliance on the extremist groups (Bergen 2011, 260). Ultimately, this “peace” deal was unsuccessful as the first. President Zardari has not done much better during his tenure. He has allowed support to continue to Afghan based organizations like the Taliban and al-Qaeda despite disapproval from the international community. Pakistani attempts to meet international priorities cannot continue in this manner.

History has shown that Afghanistan and Pakistan are difficult countries to have an allegiance to. Pakistan consistently manipulates others to obtain strategic benefits, while Afghanistan clings to corruption and turmoil. The two countries are now woven so intricately together that the War in Afghanistan is irreparable without fixing issues in Pakistan as well. The current complex challenges need to be addressed. Patterns in Pakistani relations have emerged and these lessons can ensure the establishment and acceptance of productive policies in the future. Success is possible if the current conflicts are handled correctly and with an open mind. Pakistanis and Afghans must make decisions they feel secure with, even if these do not always meet Western standards. The countries will learn to build and maintain successful governments, economies, and securities if current issues in Afghanistan and Pakistan are handled correctly.

PART II. ISLAMIC EXTREMISM IN PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN

Only jihad can bring peace to the world.

- Baitullah Mehsud, leader of the Pakistani Taliban in 2007

Pakistan, the second largest Muslim country in the world, is the birthplace of global Islamic jihad. It remains at the center of it today, functioning almost as a jihadist enclave. It is a worldwide threat for militants to be headquartered in a country facing political crisis with the fastest growing nuclear arsenal in the world (Riedel 2011, 3). This combination paints a scary picture for the future of terrorism. While Pakistan is capable of putting a stop to al-Qaeda and insurgency within its border, the country has failed to eradicate these threats, opting to often provide support instead. Pakistan has declared allegiance to the wrong countries and organizations time and time again. Pakistan's status as a nuclear country has only caused the international community more worry.

It is a realistic concern that nuclear capabilities could fall into the wrong hands via Pakistan. For example, months before the September 11th attacks, veteran's of Pakistan's nuclear program met with Osama bin Laden in Kandahar, Afghanistan, to discuss pressing interests in atomic weapons (Bergen 2011, 247-248). In addition, A.Q. Khan, the father of Pakistan's nuclear program, sold nuclear weapon technology to Libya's dictator Muammar Ghaddafi (Bergen 2011, 247-248). Pakistan faces the most intense terrorism threat of any nuclear country. The potential infiltration of Pakistani security services by terrorists and insurgents is an immediate and worldwide concern. Al-Qaeda seek weapons of mass destruction and may view Pakistan as the most viable source for

obtaining them (Isby 2010, 125-126). The relationship between these two entities must be dissolved.

In the winter of 2001, al-Qaeda and Taliban leadership were expelled from Afghanistan, so they rebased in Pakistan. Al-Qaeda and the Taliban initially avoided the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) between Afghanistan and Pakistan, opting for busier cities where it was easier to hide out, but returned to this dangerous region later because of the support and geographical advantage it offers. Around this time, Karachi, a barely governable megacity along Pakistan's southern coast, turned into a hub for jihadist violence, perpetuated by an alliance between al-Qaeda, Kashmiri militants, and Sunni sectarian fanatics (Bergen 2011, 248). Support for these groups not only fueled the conflict with India, but it created a state sanctioned jihad movement and a "strategic depth" doctrine to ensure the existence of a pliant, pro-Pakistan Afghan state on the western border in case India attacked from the east (Bergen 2011, 248). As a result, al-Qaeda and Taliban leadership used this relationship to their benefit and moved over the border into Pakistan to avoid the United States military in Afghanistan.

One of the major reasons al-Qaeda and the Taliban rebased in Pakistan is because of the ongoing conflict with India, especially concerning Kashmir. This struggle over territory was critical to the rise of the Pakistani military-jihadi mentality. The Pakistani government supported the rise of Kashmiri militant groups with the ability to infiltrate Indian-held Kashmir and tie down Indian soldiers (Bergen 2011, 248). Therefore, Pakistan was reluctant to rein in militants due to the perceived need to support anyone involved in the struggle for Kashmir. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan,

once argued that Muslim and Hindus constituted two separate nations unable to live together as one (Jones 2003, xv). It is believed that Jinnah aimed to create a country where Muslims could live safely and without Hindu dominance, when he made Pakistan an Islamic state. Since Pakistan officially claimed independence in 1947, it has fought to keep its Islamic roots intact, even if that meant supporting extremists.

Radical Islam advanced drastically during General Zia ul Haq's dictatorship, in the 1980s. Consequently, militant groups in Pakistan are well organized, armed, and financed today. In 1999, the decade of civilian rule ended as General Pervez Musharraf became Pakistan's president and he occupied this position in the years directly following September 11th, 2001. Musharraf was very popular during his first year, but that gradually decreased. In an attempt to take over the Northwest Frontier Province he rigged an election in 2002 so religious parties would do better in the polls. He also tried to extend his presidency for five years by altering referendum (Bergen 2011, 256). These actions damaged his initial popularity and portrayed him as a power hungry dictator, similar to many presidents who had come before him.

Despite his devious power plays for the presidency, Musharraf had progressive plans for Pakistan. He wanted to dismantle the legacy General Zia ul Haq left behind by downplaying the role of religion that directly challenges the interests of well-entrenched and highly motivated elements of Pakistani society (Jones 2003, xv). On January 12th, 2002, Musharraf addressed his nation in a speech claiming Pakistan would no longer tolerate organizations that practice terrorism in the name of religion (Bergen 2011, 256). If achieved, this policy could be beneficial for Pakistan and international security as a

whole (Jones 2003, xv). Unfortunately, Musharraf's attempts to revitalize the nation failed and al-Qaeda's impact in Pakistan has grown considerably since 2001 (Isby 2010, 125). He became the target of numerous assassination attempts and eventually retired on August 18th, 2008, after facing impeachment.

After Musharraf stepped down as president, Pakistan held an election selecting Asif Ali Zardari as the new president. Zardari is the widower of Benazir Bhutto, the former prime minister of Pakistan and founder of the Pakistan People's Party. Bhutto was assassinated in December 2007 after nine years of exile. Before her death, Bhutto was convinced the Pakistani security services were involved in the plots against her (Isby 2010, 125). Zardari took office on September 9th, 2008. The peaceful demonstrations and the February 2008 elections demonstrate a widespread support for rational, competent, and effective society in Pakistan (Isby 2010, 388). Most Pakistanis prefer to live in a moderate, modern, tolerant, and stable society vice a theocracy (Jones 2003, xv). In the past, military power offered rationality and competence, but the latter years of General Musharraf's government discredited this as the economy declined, insurgency rose, and terrorism appeared to be a response to American policies (Isby 2010, 388). The radical Muslim parties offer an alternative to Pakistan's typically dysfunctional politics, but they would also lead to sharia law as a governing factor. Sharia law will never meet international standards for a democratic and successful state.

In its first year, the civilian government survived many of the crises inherited from Musharraf's era and the military took action against Pakistani insurgents in areas along the border of Afghanistan (Isby 2010, 372). Despite some initial progress, the

political system is still suffering and the threat of state failure remains a concern. The security and aid policies implemented by the United States need to guarantee that Pakistan remains viable in order to achieve success in the region (Isby 2010, 372). Winning the “hearts and minds” of the population, a method reinforced by the Counterinsurgency (COIN) policy, is critical. Unfortunately, the insurgents and terrorists have been more successful getting their message out to the population. In countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan it is important to gain the popularity of the people to really make a difference and it is critical for the official government to demonstrate effectiveness. The insurgency cannot seem more appealing than the official government. Therefore, communication with the public is extremely important for political success. The Taliban has easy access to the Afghan population, unlike the international community. It is important to leverage unpopularity in the communities to increase resistance to the insurgency. The Taliban also understands this and does it regularly, promising Afghans that they will remain when the international community inevitably leaves.

Some believe the war in Afghanistan could have ended in 2002, but the focus on Iraq prevented a quick resolution. The war started off strong and promising. In less than one hundred days the United States and coalition allies helped the Northern Alliance topple the Taliban’s Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan (Riedel 2011, 2-3). Then, instead of putting more focus on Afghanistan and Pakistan in the early years, the United States became tied up in Iraq. Meanwhile, the Taliban and al-Qaeda were allowed the time needed to recover from setbacks in 2001 and establish headquarters in Pakistan. By

2009, they established a secure safe haven there and were threatening the stability of the southern and eastern areas of Afghanistan (Riedel 2011, 3).

Even though Afghan insurgents and al-Qaeda found sanctuary within its borders, Pakistan continued to provide targeting support to the United States for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) attacks to support operations on the ground. The United States began using drones to attack insurgents and al-Qaeda in Pakistan, mostly in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) (Riedel 2011, 125). The initial policy ensured the Pakistanis had advance notice of any drone activity. This changed when it was clear the targets were being tipped off. This change in policy seriously strained the relationship between the United States and Pakistan, and led to closures at the border to prevent American supplies from entering Afghanistan through Pakistan. The closures have added more stress on Americans serving in Afghanistan. While some Pakistanis support the United States drone operations and are pleased when al-Qaeda or Taliban leadership is killed, the majority of the population thinks they are an infringement on Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity (Riedel 2011, 125). Rebuilding trust, while combating the terrorist enemy is a policy challenge that is difficult to solve in a region like Pakistan.

The Pakistani government must be held responsible for its tolerance of radical Islam and those who have preached violence in Pakistan and across the borders in India and Afghanistan (Cohen 2004, 317). To do this, ties with radical parties need to be severed and mainstream, democratic parties built up in both Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Both countries have a responsibility to ensure a successful future for the country and the population.

When President Obama took office he conducted a ten week review process of Afghanistan with top national security officials and key political advisors. While Afghanistan, al-Qaeda, and the Taliban were obvious topics to discuss, the issue of Pakistan continued to creep in. Many have said that Afghanistan cannot be examined without also looking at Pakistan. The two entities are directly tied together. The review process addressed the relationship between events in Afghanistan and those in Pakistan, the relationship between al-Qaeda and the Taliban, and the future of al-Qaeda if the Taliban is given more power in Afghanistan. Over the years since 2001 the Taliban has become more closely aligned with al-Qaeda's ideology and tactics rather than less (Bergen 2011, 322). In addition, terrorist attacks in Pakistan have increased since 2007. Vice President Biden has pushed for American aid to be funneled more directly to Pakistan. "We have al-Qaeda Central in Pakistan, nuclear weapons in Pakistan, the Afghan leadership in Pakistan, and yet our resourcing is thirsty to one in favor of Afghanistan over Pakistan. Does this make strategic sense?"

CHAPTER 4

AL-QAEDA

Al-Qaeda's mission is to force the world to conform to Islamic ideology and achieve global jihad by any means possible. Therefore, killing innocent bystanders and civilians is religiously justifiable for this mission. Osama bin Laden, the mastermind behind the devastating attacks on September 11th, 2001, created and led al-Qaeda for almost two decades until his assassination in May 2011. Al-Qaeda has never sought to become a mass organization, even though it operates on a multinational level.

Bin Laden has encouraged violence against Americans from the start and despite the severe blow to the organization in 2001 al-Qaeda continues to prepare for even larger terrorist attacks against the United States and other Western enemies to maintain an image as the force striking back at those who are waging war on Islam (Isby 2010, 126). Members believe a Christian-Jewish alliance is conspiring to eradicate Islam based on the partnership between Israel and the United States (Al-Zarqawi 2005). It is likely the next al-Qaeda driven terrorist attack in the United States or Western Europe will be traced back to Pakistan in some way (Isby 2010, 126).

Al-Qaeda does not tolerate diversity well. Since its conception around August 1988, al-Qaeda has planned and orchestrated numerous attacks on civilian and military targets. Al-Qaeda techniques generally include suicide attacks and simultaneous bombings of different targets (Wright 2006). The September 11th terrorist attacks were the most devastating in American history and are an example of these methods. After September 11th, the Global War on Terrorism was initiated, leading to the eventual

decline of the al-Qaeda organization. As al-Qaeda lost more ground, bin Laden's following dwindled. Many of those who once pledged loyalty to bin Laden no longer claimed allegiance to the terrorist organization and many of those who remained faithful are now in prison, hiding, or dead.

There has been some debate over al-Qaeda's recent identity as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO). Al-Qaeda will be referred to as a FTO for the purposes of this thesis because it was identified as such by seventeen organizations, including the United Nations Security Council. The debate exists as a result of the drastic changes the organization has undergone since 2001. After the 2005 London bombings, Sir Ian Blair, Metropolitan Police Commissioner, said "al-Qaeda is not an organization. Al-Qaeda is a way of working."

This is also supported by the claim that al-Qaeda has evolved into more of a "brand name" since the leaders have become geographically isolated. Regional groups take on the name "al-Qaeda," but many experts in the field of terrorism believe that the global jihad movement is not driven by Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda followers at every level. Current al-Qaeda operations have little connection with each other. Marc Sagemand, a former CIA officer, believes al-Qaeda is now a "loose label for a movement that seems to target the West." Even the BBC documentary, *The Power of Nightmares*, called existing al-Qaeda a "small clique of close associates." Alternatively, others like Bruce Hoffman, the Director of the Center for Peace and Security Studies at Georgetown University, claim we are still dealing with a clear adversary with a strategic approach.

The radical movement developed during the Islamic revival. Some have argued that the author Sayyid Qutb directly influenced the creation of al-Qaeda (Wright 2006). He preached the lack of sharia law in the Muslim world revert them to pre-Islamic ignorance known as *jahiliyyah*. In order to restore Islam righteous, he believed Muslims needed to establish true Islamic states, implement sharia and remove non-Muslim influences, like socialism or nationalism (Wright 2006). Bin Laden's close friend Mohammed Janal Khalifa said "Islam is different from any other religion; it is a way of life. We [Khalifa and bin Laden] were trying to understand what Islam has to say about how we eat, who we marry, how we talk. We read Sayyid Qutb. He was the one who most affected our generation" (Qutb 2003, 24). One of the most powerful affects Qutb had on people was the idea that many who claim to be Muslims are not and this provides jihadists "a legal loophole around the prohibition of killing another Muslim" and made it "a religious obligation" to execute self-proclaimed Muslims (Eikmeier 2007). Qutb's influence on bin Laden definitely played a role in the establishment of al-Qaeda.

The name "al-Qaeda" loosely means "the base." This is appropriate as the organization was established through a training camp called "al-Qaeda." Military training camps have played an important part in al-Qaeda's history. In 1987, bin Laden and Abdullah Azzam, co-establishers of the Maktab al-Khidamat from which al-Qaeda evolved, began setting up camps. These camps were a response to the Soviet war in Afghanistan and were originally meant to prepare foreign recruits for the Afghan war front. After al-Qaeda was established, these camps were used for proper military training. In 2006, it was estimated several thousand al-Qaeda commanders were

embedded in forty countries commanding insurgent forces (CNN 2001). In addition to incredible numbers of military and combat trained members, sixty-two percent have also received university training. These skills make al-Qaeda capable of intelligent and well-planned attacks.

Al-Qaeda has carried out six terrorist attacks. Four of these were aimed at the United States. In 1998, bin Laden issued a *fatwa*, meaning a binding religious edict, stating as follows:

The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies—civilians and military—is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque [in Jerusalem] and the holy mosque [in Makka] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim. This is in accordance with the words of Almighty Allah, 'and fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together,' and 'fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in God' (PBS 1998).

Bin Laden basically called on Muslims to kill Americans and their allies whenever and wherever possible. This *fatwa* justifies killing in accordance with Islamic law and the attacks that followed are the result of this edict.

Although al-Qaeda did not originally take responsibility for the September 11th attacks, bin Laden did make statements praising the event. He said the United States was actively oppressing Muslims at home and globally in locations like Palestine and Kashmir. This was the beginning of the end for al-Qaeda. They woke a “sleeping giant” who now had sights set on an enemy. The September 11th attacks happened on America’s home front impacting not only the entire nation, but the international community as well. Osama bin Laden did not claim responsibility until 2004 when it was

proven that al-Qaeda was to blame. By that time, the international community was already well into the war in Afghanistan.

America responded to al-Qaeda militarily with the Global War on Terrorism. The United States planned to overthrow Afghanistan's Taliban government because they were thought to be harboring al-Qaeda. In May 1996, Osama bin Laden fled to Afghanistan after the Sudan expelled him from the country in an attempt to win international favor. The international community was worried that bin Laden financed violent Islamic terrorist groups across the Middle East and, as a result, the Sudan wanted to cut all ties with him (Coll 2004, 9). Osama bin Laden's native country, Saudi Arabia, had already stripped him of citizenship years before. Afghanistan was one of the few places he could turn to. The government barely functioned, the Islamist warlords functioned freely and the impoverished people were apt to welcome any wealthy sheikh bearing gifts (Coll 2004, 9).

When bin Laden arrived in Afghanistan he was harboring a lot of anger towards those responsible for his exile. He primarily blamed Americans and that summer he publicly sanctioned large scale violence against them for the first time, issuing an open call for war titled "The Declaration of Jihad on the Americans Occupying the Country of the Two Sacred Places" (Coll 2004, 10). The country of the Two Sacred Places is Saudi Arabia, where more than five thousand American soldiers and airmen were based at the time. Osama bin Laden asked his followers to attack them and Israelis to cause as much damage as possible (Coll 2004, 10).

The United States was unsure of bin Laden's new location, until William Perry, the United States Secretary of Defense at the time, received a poem signed "From the Peaks for the Hindu Kush, Afghanistan." The United States directed focus on Afghanistan and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) reestablished intelligence collection against bin Laden there (Coll 2004, 10).

The CIA waged a campaign to disrupt, capture, or kill Osama bin Laden and it continued in the years leading up to the September 11th attacks. During this time the CIA worked closely with Afghans opposed to bin Laden, including Ahmed Shah Massoud, a military leader in Afghanistan who was given the title "the Afghan who won the Cold War" after Soviet troops withdrew. However, the campaign faced numerous challenges that made it difficult to achieve positive steps. Support from the United States government only went so far due to concerns over boundaries and what was really considered necessary to achieve the objective.

The CIA struggled with the best way to confront bin Laden while attempting to control mutually distrustful alliances with the intelligence services of Saudi Arabia and Pakistan (Coll 2004, 16). As a result, the secretive operations of the CIA officers led to unexplained assumptions and basically backfired. Radical Islam was on the rise in Afghanistan, which created a comfortable sanctuary for bin Laden there (Coll 2004, 16).

In the 1990s, as the Arab-Israeli peace process progressed and al-Qaeda's terrorist offensive grew, there was minimal Western involvement in Afghanistan (Isby 2010, 124). Afghanistan was facing a dangerous movement of armed Islamic radicalism gathering around the Taliban, in addition to the rise of Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda. A "poisonous

coalition” was developing, made up of Pakistani and Arab intelligence agencies, impoverished volunteer fighters from Pakistani religious schools, exiled Central Asian Islamic radicals trying to establish bases in Afghanistan, and wealthy sheikhs from the Persian Gulf (Coll 2004, 12). In 2001, this alliance had a strong hold in Afghanistan and the Taliban refused to turn Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda members over to the United States. These developments in Afghanistan drew in more international interest and eventually led to the war that exists there today. As soon as the United States went after radical Islam in Afghanistan, the Taliban and al-Qaeda training camps were destroyed along with the strength of al-Qaeda’s operating structure.

After al-Qaeda was downsized and Osama bin Laden was forced into hiding, the organization had to use more discreet methods to promote global jihad. The Internet became a primary tool for this. Al-Qaeda’s use of the Internet has “grown more sophisticated, encompassing financing, recruitment, networking, mobilization, publicity, as well as information dissemination, gathering, and sharing” (Iqbal 2010). Multimedia posts on the Internet range from guerilla training videos to stills of victims about to be murdered. The beheading videos of Nick Berg and Daniel Pearl were posted to the web and received a great deal of media attention worldwide. Over time, al-Qaeda learned how to be very crafty on the Internet. Al-Qaeda began using the Internet directly, instead of going through outlets like Al-Jazeera, to avoid any possibility of editing. Websites like Alneda.com and Jihad.net have resisted shut down by strategically shifting content to various servers. These new skills have made it possible for al-Qaeda to stay connected in order to encourage more acts of terror from people.

Al-Qaeda's leadership has refused to negotiate with the international community, thereby hindering the probability of success in the Afghanistan and Pakistan. A refusal to negotiate is a refusal to move towards a solution. "Al-Qaeda's disdain for negotiations and political statements and willingness to kill Muslim civilians and condemn other Muslims as takfir [the practice of a Muslim calling another Muslim a non-believer] are taken together likely to be increasingly divisive" (Isby 2010, 126). Although the Pakistan based al-Qaeda has displayed an incredible ability to adapt and pervade, it has real limitations as a terrorist organization. A commitment to Salafist practices, public executions, and brutality have undercut al-Qaeda's ability to create a viable alternative to current governing arrangements (Isby 2010, 126). This is key to resolution in Afghanistan.

Creating democracy will benefit the country as a whole, but even a "peaceful and affluent democracy with well-developed governmental and social welfare institutions is certainly no barrier against terrorism" (Isby 2010, 124). As long as al-Qaeda feels strong enough to withstand the offenses of the coalition partners they will hold on to what is left. Taking out senior leadership may impact al-Qaeda's willingness to negotiate. New leadership could mean a different perspective and plan for the future.

Almost a decade after the September 11th attacks, Osama bin Laden was finally cornered and killed in Pakistan by American Navy Seals and Central Intelligence Agency operatives. His body was taken into custody and buried at sea to avoid a burial site for followers to build shrines on. This achievement was celebrated worldwide as it marked a significant step towards defeating al-Qaeda entirely. However, as President Obama said

in his announcement on May 1, 2011, “the death of Bin Laden marks the most significant achievement to date in our nation’s effort to defeat Al Qaeda. But his death does not mark the end of our effort. There’s no doubt that al-Qaeda will continue to pursue attacks against us. We must and we will remain vigilant at home and abroad.”

Military bases were put on a higher state of readiness to be prepared for any possible retaliatory attacks, but things remained quiet for the most part. The most significant impact of Osama bin Laden’s death actually involves the relationship between the United States and Pakistan. Relations with Pakistan have been tense, especially surrounding American counterterrorism efforts. Osama bin Laden found safety in Pakistan for almost ten years. This knowledge encouraged the United States to attack suspected terrorist targets in Pakistan, despite disapproval and protests from the Pakistani government.

Osama bin Laden was expected to be hiding in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). This region is known to provide support to al-Qaeda and the Taliban. However, Osama bin Laden was actually located in Abbottabad, the home of a large Pakistani military base and academy. United States military and intelligence learned that a highly valued target was being protected on this Pakistani compound during the summer of 2010. While the intelligence developed with Pakistan’s help, the Pakistani government was not informed of the strike on Abbottabad in advance.

As a result, relations with Pakistan hit a significant low. A few weeks before the strike, the Pakistani military was criticized for failing to act against extremists with ties to al-Qaeda hiding in the tribal areas of North Waziristan. This has remained a significant

challenge for the international community over the years. The support offered by the Afghan and Pakistani governments only extends so far and challenges remain most difficult in the tribal areas along the border. Without continuous and complete support, it is extremely difficult to counter terrorism and insurgency in this region. The international community has a long fight still ahead. Relations with Pakistan need to be reestablished to ensure mutual trust and support between nations going forward.

Combating al-Qaeda is an extremely complicated challenge; mostly due to the Taliban issue. The Taliban-al-Qaeda connection is topic for debate. Many believe al-Qaeda cannot be removed completely without tackling the Taliban. “A Taliban victory would embolden the potential Arab recruits who are reluctant to join a fearful and bottled-up al-Qaeda” (Salam 2009). Al-Qaeda continues to operate and is still committed to killing Americans today, but the organization is now relying on people who lack the sophistication and coordination that existed on September 11th. The fearsome elite spend most of their energy trying to stay alive and “global Islamist insurgency has become highly decentralized” (Salam 2009). Instead, “self-starters” operating independently, but inspired by Osama bin Laden’s ideology make-up today’s Islamic terrorists. At this point, al-Qaeda’s only hope is that the Taliban, a movement nurtured by bin Laden, will help renew its strength by driving the international community out of Afghanistan (Salam 2009).

Osama bin Laden’s death was a significant blow to al-Qaeda. In addition to losing its leader, al-Qaeda’s sermons of anti-Western violence were deemed irrelevant as a wave of political upheaval rolled through the Arab community. Martin S. Indyk, vice

president and director of foreign policy at the Brookings Institution said Bin Laden's death "comes at a time when Al Qaeda's narrative is already very much in doubt in the Arab world. Its narrative was that violence was the way to redeem Arab honor and dignity. But Osama bin Laden and his violence didn't succeed in unseating anybody." Al-Qaeda could operate from other bases in the world, like Yemen or Somalia, but it has little appeal worldwide at this point. Also, it would be hard for al-Qaeda to resist returning to Afghanistan, "the beacon of al-Qaeda as a leader of transnational terrorism" (Isby 2010, 382).

If efforts to establish democracy in Afghanistan fail, this would potentially encourage terrorism's supporters. Despite its limitations and failures al-Qaeda may have "shown the way to the next generation of networked and internationally aligned terrorists" (Isby 2010, 382). Al-Qaeda's ability to operate freely in Afghanistan is not the only threat. Its ability to provide encouragement and lead by example may influence other groups with similar goals and methods.

For years, the American public much progress from the war in Afghanistan, despite large investments of time and money. Osama bin Laden's death proved that the battle against terrorism is moving forward, but there is a lot more to accomplish. Relationships need to be improved and counterterrorism and counterinsurgency efforts must be continued, but each little victory proves that the state of conflict in this region is headed for a promising future free from extreme terror, violence and corruption.

As former president George W. Bush said in response to Osama bin Laden's assassination, "the fight against terror goes on, but tonight America has sent an

unmistakable message: No matter how long it takes, justice will be done.” It may take years to achieve justice and success in Afghanistan, and even then transnational terrorism is likely to remain a worldwide threat, but taking down al-Qaeda will eliminate a significant instigator and inspiration for global jihad.

CHAPTER 5

THE TALIBAN

It took the United States awhile to understand the layers of insurgency in Afghanistan. John Nagl compares the insurgency to an onion (Gehriger 2008). The top layers represent those who are not deeply connected to the cause and they can be reintegrated easily through negotiations and accommodations. The core of the insurgency includes those who have deep ties and usually need to be killed or captured to stop. There are three groups that need to be eradicated in Afghanistan: the Taliban, Pashtun nationalists, and al-Qaeda (Gehriger 2008). The need to handle each group uniquely, instead as “one size fits all” is important (Metz 2007, 80). Insurgencies bring groups together that would likely fight each other if a common enemy did not exist. Many of the foreign insurgents in Afghanistan do not understand the local ways and often exhibit disdain for Afghans, which leads to resentment and violence between insurgencies (Isby 2010, 136). Even Afghans have the potential to turn on each other. In Pashtu regions of Afghanistan there are many tribal and sub-tribal divisions that experience hostility and conflict.

The most influential and historical insurgent group currently operating in Afghanistan is the Taliban. Because the Taliban regime sheltered al-Qaeda before and after September 11th, it is assumed the two organizations are inseparable. This is a misconception as the two groups differ in motivations and operate independent of the other. The Taliban is an indigenous social and political movement that uses intimidation and violence in addition to social services and propaganda to achieve its goals (Salam

2009). The Taliban does not need to be eliminated in order to take down the complete al-Qaeda network. However, it is “hard not to conclude that we need a stable Afghanistan if we really want to prevent the monster from reemerging” (Salam 2009).

Reemergence is the biggest challenge the international community faces with al-Qaeda today. Osama bin Laden had a clean strategy that isolated the Taliban so it would become reliant on al-Qaeda. This naturally gained the Taliban’s support and alliance against the United States and international community. After 9/11, critical years were wasted by only half focusing on the Taliban and local population in Afghanistan. A lot of damage was done in those years. While the United States was preoccupied with Iraq, al-Qaeda and Taliban leadership regrouped in Pakistan. Like al-Qaeda, the Taliban is resilient. Since the 1990s, the sanctuary across the border in Pakistan has provided supplies, funding, and critical support. In 1994, Kabul fell when the “turbaned, eye-shadowed” Taliban leaders overran the city and government in a militia movement from Southern Afghanistan and declared the Qur’an would cleanse the nation of warlords (Coll 2004, 5). Translated, “Taliban” means “students.” During the takeover, the Taliban raised banners in the name of an unusually severe school of Islam, promoting odd rules of personal conduct (Coll 2004, 5). Traveling in new pick-up trucks the Taliban toted weapons and ammunition and quickly took over areas in southern and western Afghanistan.

The fall of Kabul did not concern the United States in 1994. Glyn Davies from the State Department responded to the Taliban takeover with routine pronouncements because no policy was actually in place. “We hope this presents an opportunity for a

process of national reconciliation to begin. We hope very much and expect that the Taliban will respect the rights of all Afghans and that the new authorities will move quickly to restore order and security and to form a representative government on the way to some form of national reconciliation” (Coll 2004, 14-15). When asked about the diplomatic relations between the Taliban and the United States government David provided a vague response that some interpreted as an American endorsement for Taliban rule in countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan (Coll 2004, 15). Things were not off to a good start.

Mullah Omar has been the leader of the Taliban since the initial rise to power in 1994, but over time his authority has changed. The direct, charismatic leadership and dispute resolution he once provided was overrun by the Quetta Shura in 2008 (Isby 2010, 136). The Quetta Shura is made up of numerous high level Taliban members who once held office in the Afghan government. For example, Mullah Abdul Jalil, once the foreign minister in Afghanistan, is reportedly the Quetta Shura’s Minister of the Interior and an advisor to Mullah Omar and (Isby 2010, 138). Maulavi Abdul Latif Mansur, the nominal Minister of Agriculture prior to 2001; Abdul Qabir, the Taliban’s military commander for eastern Afghanistan since 2007; and Mullah Afghan Jan Mu’tasim, the former Minister of Finance, were all reported to be the head of the Quetta Shura at some point in time. Most have also been Mullah Omar’s comrades in arms since the 1980s, with roots tied to the Ghilzay tribes in Durrani province of southern Afghanistan (Isby 2010, 138). They attended the same Deobandi madrassas in the FATA and fought the Soviets together.

There similar influences created a bond that later led to the creation of the Quetta Shura, the largest decision making body for the Afghan Taliban.

The Quetta Shura is responsible for making strategic decisions, allocating resources, and issuing precise operational orders for the Taliban. It functions as a very practical decision making organization. The Quetta Shura has even held end of year review sessions for Mullah Omar to announce guidance and intent for the future. The organization became more involved in the decision process in 2008 after many mid-level commanders were lost against coalition forces (Isby 2010, 137). Today, the Taliban is a loose coalition, with only Mullah Omar and the Quetta Shura functioning as the central command. This makes negotiations even more difficult. The Taliban has followed al-Qaeda's example and created a franchise of sorts, allowing the "Taliban" name to extend into Pakistan, despite any actual ties to the Pakistan Taliban organization.

When the Taliban first gained control of Afghanistan it set up provincial and district shadow governors, but over the years, many of these governors have been captured or killed. The shadow governments established sharia courts, enforced taxation on the local population, and recruited Afghans for fighting and labor in support of the Taliban. Sharia law was enforced where the Taliban held court, usually in the FATA region. Men were publicly hanged for drinking. Burqa-clad women stoned for "promiscuous" behavior. Executions were filmed for public distribution. Most of the news during this period of heightened violence was propagated by the Taliban itself. International journalists were prevented, by the Pakistani government, from traveling

near the tribal areas due to the high risk of being captured or killed by militants (Bergen 2011, 256).

Prior to the September 11th attacks, the United States did try to eradicate the Taliban threat in Afghanistan, though very unsuccessfully. In October 1999, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution that demanded the Taliban stop providing sanctuary to Osama bin Laden and terrorists. It specifically asked that bin Laden be turned over to coalition forces, but the Taliban ignored these requests. One year later, in December 2000, the United Nations passed another resolution that imposed an arms ban on the Taliban. It also demanded closures of training camps and seizure of assets outside of Afghanistan (Rashid 2009, 18). The intent of this resolution was to stop arms support from Pakistan, but the request did not go over well. Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) created the "Afghan Defense Council" to resist pressure from the United Nations and to rally support for the Taliban. The council consisted of forty different Islamic parties in Pakistan and continued to provide the Taliban with arms, despite the United Nations' resolutions. Consequently, the Security Council issued another resolution that set up monitors along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border in July of 2001 (Rashid 2011, 18).

As a result, the Taliban became more confrontational and escalated tensions with the United Nations. They passed new laws that only made it more difficult for aid agencies to provide any relief or support to the Afghan population. Western-run hospitals were closed and vaccinations refused. Even more restrictions were put on female aid workers in the country. For example, women were no longer allowed to drive cars in Afghanistan. Finally, the Taliban arrested eight Westerners and sixteen Afghans from a

German aid agency for trying to promote Christianity (Rashid 2011, 19). In sharia law this charge is punishable by death. After the September 11th attacks by al-Qaeda, the United States hit Afghanistan hard and the Taliban leaders retreated. They took cover across the border in Pakistan and lost much of their hold on Afghanistan.

It is difficult for Afghanistan to recover from the Taliban rule. For seven years, a violent and bitter insurgency terrorized the population, creating disillusionment and resentment for the future (Isby 2010, 368). Following the Taliban rule, Afghanistan dealt with a war, a corrupt government, and an insurgency that is hanging on with all it has left. The security situation has improved in some districts that were once the site of extensive insurgent operations, but Afghans may not have the resources to rebuild from the wartime devastation or the capabilities to overcome internal divisions within Afghanistan (Isby 2010, 374). Foreign aid can be offered, but will only be beneficial if provided correctly. With international support, the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) have grown in size and effectiveness and with time the Afghan National Army (ANA) and Afghan National Police (ANP) have the potential to operate independently as well (Isby 2010, 369). Success with the security forces will eventually cure widespread corruption and enhance capabilities to defend the population from insurgency.

Some of the Afghan ministries in Kabul have already demonstrated effectiveness and an ability to contain corruption, including the ministries of Finance, Education, and Rural Reconstruction and Development (Isby 2010, 369). Others, like the Ministry of Interior, have made progress by increasing effectiveness, but still struggle with corruption. In February of 2012, after the accidental Qur'an burning on the United States

air field in Bagram, Afghanistan, two Americans were shot and killed, in the Ministry of the Interior, by an Afghan national dressed in an ANA uniform. This type of incident does not happen in a safe and regulated environment. After all these years, some basic struggles to ensure safety have still not been achieved, but the coalition forces are trying.

Although progress is slow, even the least secure districts in the heart of the insurgency are improving. Insurgents are losing ground and Afghans are learning more effective practices for the future. In fact, there is an entire program dedicated to teaching Afghans biometrics and forensics to help establish rule of law and methods for prosecuting criminals. Even the basic concept of individually unique fingerprints is new to the average Afghan citizen. Hopefully these lessons will last once the United States withdraws, but sustainability is a major challenge for the future of Afghanistan.

The Taliban continues to instill fear in the population, but its approach to Islamic practice, lack of regard for the country's well being, and destructive attacks have prevented the organization from gaining Afghan nationalism and Islamic faith, even among the Pashun community (Isby 2010, 369). For insurgencies to be successful they must incorporate political, social, and cultural systems in place with the population. Fear does not gain lasting support, but it is a powerful tactic to use. America's announcements about draw downs in Afghanistan provide the justification the Taliban needs to scare support out of the population and reinforce the idea that once the international community leaves the population will once again have to rely on the Taliban.

Most non-Pashtun Afghans remain peaceful despite the crime, corruption, drug trade, and lack of alternative livelihoods available in the country (Isby 2010, 368). The

Taliban's ability to provide valuable resources to the population has helped retain power as a welcome alternative to unpopular governments. Building a legitimate government with the ability to improve quality of life for Afghan citizens will help to draw remaining supporters away from the Taliban. There are many genuine rationalist and religious leaders who can help build stability in Afghanistan if brought into the process (Isby 2010, 369).

Development programs and economic growth in major cities are progressing. The foreign presence making this possible may be viewed with resentment by some, but is ultimately still accepted. This is mainly because many Afghans believe having outside assistance is preventing another civil war. That is true, but more importantly, foreign aid is getting Afghanistan to a level of stability that Pakistan and other neighbors will not be able to disrupt once external support is gone. It is important for Afghans to find a solution that works best for their country. Letting the people govern and defend themselves will have the most lasting impact on Afghanistan and the insurgency. Every progression and advancement toward a stable in Afghanistan reinforces a future free from insurgency.

CHAPTER 6

THE FEDERALLY ADMINISTERED TRIBAL AREAS

The Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) is the biggest problem region in the Afghanistan-Pakistan conflict. This is where the ambiguous border between the two countries exists. The actual border line, the Durand Line, is not clearly defined and for years the FATA has functioned as a comfort zone for terrorists and insurgents. Primarily Pashtun, the FATA can offer al-Qaeda and the Taliban access to Afghanistan with the Pakistan safe haven a close dash away. The Pashtun tribes in the region are known for ferocity. In fact, the Pashtu word for cousin and enemy are almost identical.

The population in the FATA practices outdated Muslim ideals that the Taliban reinforces. Males are well-armed and females have a literacy rate of only three percent (Bergen 2011, 255). Low-level warfare is a way of life, as feuds between many of the tribes have existed for generations and are genuinely enjoyed. The tribes live on military-like compounds in mud or concrete fortresses surrounded with gun ports and sometimes artillery (Bergen 2011, 255). These factors make the Pashtuns ideal supporters for radical Muslims.

Al-Qaeda core personnel first started to rebuild operations in the FATA in 2001 and have continued to live here over the years, along with militant tribal members and foreign fighters (Bergen 2011, 255). Pakistan tried to improve the situation in the FATA with military operations, but the Pakistani military is trained better for land wars with enemies like India rather than counterinsurgency campaigns (Bergen 2011, 255). Pakistan attempted peace agreements in 2005 and 2006, but these were unsuccessful as

well. These military failures basically permitted militants in the FATA to establish a stronger hold on the region. American involvement was minimal during this time did not help matters. By 2009 the Taliban controlled all of the tribal agencies in the FATA and had settled in some parts of the North-West Frontier Province and Swat, Pakistan's former leading tourist destination (Bergen 2011, 255-256).

Radical Islam runs rampant in the FATA. While a good amount of Pashtuns do not support the insurgency there are still a lot who do despite the fact that the Taliban and militant group members support beheadings and beatings rather than a better life for the population (Isby 2010, 389). The safe haven in Pakistan allows groups like the Taliban and al-Qaeda to continue operations in the FATA without repercussions. Pakistan is considered an ally with the United States, but the unclear border has made coalition efforts difficult in the region. Any little mistake or misconception of American involvement in Pakistan has led to an even more strained and difficult relationship between the countries.

Improving relations with Pakistan is crucial to success in Afghanistan. Strengthening Pakistani civil society in the FATA, through education and development programs and political integration, can improve the region overall and make the necessary changes that military and civilian governments have been unable to accomplish (Isby 2010, 389). The FATA cannot exist as a comfort zone for terrorists and insurgents. This problem area is critical to all parties involved in the war. The side that has control of the region ultimately has the upper hand and without more support from Pakistan, the international

community will find it very difficult to make lasting progress in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas.

PART III. OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

Your mouth cannot be sweet when you talk about honey; you must have honey in your mouth.

- Afghan Phrase

Afghans define nation, peace, and freedom differently than Americans. They see true freedom as only partly secular, believing it lacks meaning if Islam, Sharia law, and the “Afghan way” are not incorporated (Isby 2010, 388). These drastic differences in opinion make it difficult for the United States to connect with Afghanistan. In the ten years since the War in Afghanistan began, numerous strategies have been attempted to make progress and improve the situation there.

The September 11th attacks occurred during President Bush’s first term. When the United States immediately responded the strategy was retaliatory and unfocused. Previous methods were initially attempted, but combating an insurgency is a different battle. Military force is counterproductive. In 2006, the United States finally realized this and chose an alternative strategy. The COIN strategy was adopted to win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. Earning the favor of the population is a productive countermeasure to insurgency. Often an insurgent group is tightly woven into the community. Therefore, a loyalty exists that is tough for an outsider, like the United States to disrupt. COIN has aided progress in Afghanistan, but it is an expensive and lengthy process.

When President Obama took office, he devised “President Obama’s Final Orders for Afghanistan Pakistan Strategy.” The orders were created in support of America’s goal to deny a safe haven to al-Qaeda and prevent the Taliban from overthrowing the

Afghan government (Woodward 2011, 385). To do this, the strategy needs to degrade the Taliban insurgency and increase the effectiveness of Afghanistan's ability to govern itself. The United States pinpointed six operational objectives to focus on. These include: reverse the Taliban's momentum; deny the Taliban access to and control of the population and key production centers and lines of communication; disrupt the Taliban in insecure areas and prevent al-Qaeda from gaining sanctuary; degrade the Taliban to manageable levels for the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF); increase the size potential of the ANSF and local security forces; and build the capacity of the Afghan government with focuses on the ministries of defense and interior (Woodward 2011, 386).

All military and civilian efforts will coordinate to achieve the six objectives. Civilian assistance will focus on dealing with President Karzai's government, while enhancing sub-national governance. It will also counter corruption and implement a post-election compact. The security situation in some districts has improved, even in areas that were previously overrun by widespread insurgent operations. These areas have also seen a decrease in opium cultivation (Isby 2010, 369). A lot of this success stems from the growth of ANSF. Afghan-led reintegration and reconciliation are vital to President Obama's strategy. Initially, the aim was to start removing American troops from Afghanistan in July 2011. Unfortunately, that time came and went before the Afghans demonstrated the capability to maintain a secure and stable government.

Putting Afghanistan on a timeline is risky for a few reasons. First, public announcements about planned draw downs in Afghanistan give the Taliban more

leverage with the population. A key piece of Taliban strategy is based on the fact that the United States will leave and they will always remain. Setting a deadline lets the Taliban know how much longer they need to hold on for a win.

Second, a timeline is unrealistic in counterinsurgency operations. COIN is a long-term investment and it will not succeed if rushed. Time and dedication win over foreign populations and the international community has a lot of history to overcome.

Third, the Afghans have a long way to go before they can offer the security and governance necessary for a complete turnover. Currently, all American responsibilities cannot be handed over to the Afghans because it is likely the Taliban would recover quickly. On March 10th, 2012, it was announced that the Americans will start transitioning the responsibility of the Detention Facility in Parwan to Afghans that April. This facility is currently located on Bagram Air Field and was the site of the accidental Qur'an burning in February 2012. Transitioning control is part of the plan for Afghanistan, but this cannot be forced too early.

There are great programs in place to teach Afghans the right skills to maintain democracy, establish rule of law, counter corruption, and ensure security for the country. To the United States, success means President Obama's objectives have been achieved through the COIN guidance put forth by President Bush. Although, the current approach is not solely reliant on Counterinsurgency doctrine (Woodward 2011, 386). The new method is more narrowly aligned with defeating al-Qaeda.

American organizations must ensure the appropriate authorities, programs and resources are in place to support Afghan integration and turnover strategies (Woodward

2011, 386). This will require growth of Afghan capabilities, including improved coordination of political and economic assistance from the United States. Stability under Afghan administration will prevent al-Qaeda from finding a safe haven in Afghanistan. Hopefully, this development will also strengthen relations with Pakistan to deny al-Qaeda and the Taliban the safe haven and support they currently thrive on.

CHAPTER 7

STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN

Counterinsurgency strategy, known as COIN, has become the international community's method for handling relations with Pakistan and Afghanistan. This strategy has substantial benefits, but it takes a lot of time to see them take effect. It is important to have a thorough comprehension of COIN to understand what is being done in Afghanistan to combat the terrorism issues and how Pakistan responds to this involvement in Afghanistan. A strong relationship between Pakistan and the United States is required for COIN to be effective. The complicated relationship between Pakistanis and Americans makes it difficult to offer or accept any support for Pakistan to offer support to or accept aid from the United States. At this stage of the war, COIN cannot be successful without Pakistan's assistance.

In 2006, after years battling a complicated enemy in unknown territory, the United States decided to take on the challenge with a new strategy: Army Field Manual 3-24 (COIN) (Von Kuch 2010). COIN involves actions taken by a recognized government of a nation that has been occupied by an insurgency. This particular strategy was adopted by the United States to alter how the military should understand and integrate culture into operations in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. The focus on culture in wartime strategy shifted from being practically irrelevant to a top priority. With this shift more sophisticated cultural tools and information became available to specialized military and defense personnel.

While this strategy has shown predicted signs of success and progress, there are

also some unintended results. For example, political and economic issues have been overlooked at times because COIN strategies are primarily defined around culture. Also, the COIN process is not a quick one and it requires a lot of time, money, and manpower to be successful. As a result, ethical questions have been raised about the war in Afghanistan and the future of NATO's involvement. Negative reporting from the media has increased questions about the morality of the war and whether or not Counterinsurgency will be successful. The implementation of lessons learned from previous COIN missions, especially in the case of Iraq, will be beneficial and provide advantageous to Afghanistan. Past experiences can increase the possibility for the United States to achieve victory in Afghanistan using the COIN strategy. The objective is to remove the Taliban insurgency (along with the remnants of al-Qaeda) and create a stable and self-sustaining country. To do this with COIN, it is important for the United States and allies to win the hearts and minds of the people while overcoming any ethical implications that may arise.

Counterinsurgency is a challenging strategy to execute, because it is not commonly used in warfare. Conventionally, violence is maximized to rapidly defeat the opposing army (Wright 2007). Battling an insurgency is extremely difficult for even the most powerful and advanced militaries, because lethal force needs to be used more discriminately to avoid alienating the population. The United States' military is accustomed to using violent warfare in order to defeat the enemy. After attempting this traditional technique for years in Iraq and Afghanistan with little progress, a change was necessary.

Afghanistan's major insurgency problem lies with the Taliban. Historically, insurgencies rely on internal and external aid in order to be successful. Internally, insurgents depend on the indigenous population for recruits, supplies, and base areas (Thompson 2002, 71-72). External support is required, because insurgents are usually incapable of producing or procuring weapons and equipment (Wright 2007). Neighboring countries often provide this type of external support, in addition to safe havens across borders. While internal and external aid continues, the insurgents are able to recuperate losses and regain strength (Moran 2002, 200-207). Therefore, it is extremely important to eliminate these supports before going after the insurgency's military units.

This is where the theory behind Counterinsurgency comes into play. "To wipe out the insurgents' internal support, it is necessary to protect the people from reprisals, and win the hearts and minds" (Trinquier 2006, 27). As the War in Afghanistan has shown, winning the support of the local people is significant for success. For six years, military operations were conducted without any special regard for the local people. The unreliable and corrupt Afghan government did not offer stability either. The combination of these factors impacted the progress of the war, because Afghans did not trust their government. As a result, they were manipulated by the Taliban. Even if the local populace sympathizes with the government, it will not feel comfortable offering support while a successful insurgency is capable of instilling fear in them.

Right now, Afghanistan's government is battling insurgents for the support of the local people. The government has the United States and coalition forces on its side, but

insurgents have fear and propaganda on theirs. The Taliban gains support by reinforcing the idea that the United States and allies will not be in Afghanistan forever. The main objective of Counterinsurgency is to not only win the hearts and minds of the people, but to ensure that the Afghan government is eventually able to support the population without outside assistance. The saying often used by the defense department goes something like this: "It is better for an Afghan to do something partially correct, than for an American to do it perfect." With this in mind, it is important to positively reinforce any efforts taken by the Afghan government for their own people. This will help a strong and beneficial relationship develop between the government and the country.

Corruption has been a prevalent issue in the Afghan government for years and the population is aware of it. According to General Stanley McChrystal, former commander of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, the drug trade is particularly dangerous, because it has corrupting effects on the Afghan government. Even if the United States is able to subdue the war in Afghanistan, the country will not be stable until the poppy trade is eradicated. Consequently, this is one of the primary focus areas for improvement and President Karzai has made efforts to clamp down on it. Corruption, especially involving the poppy trade is very difficult to eradicate, but the motives are there and the Afghan government wants to gain the trust of the people. Legitimate attempts to improve the lives of the Afghan people will reap positive benefits for a stronger government that can counter the Taliban's efforts effectively.

The Afghan government has not only made great strides at the civilian level. Military and security capabilities have also increased drastically. The Afghan National

Army (ANA), Afghan National Police (ANP), and Afghan Border Police (ABP) are the three primary security forces that exist in Afghanistan. All three have received great support from the government and are steadily increasing in manpower and status. As a result, International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF), comprised of the United States and ally forces, has come to rely on Afghan support in Counterinsurgency operations.

The COIN process in place follows this model: Clear, hold, build. First, ISAF, ANP, ANA, and ABP forces occupy an insurgent controlled area and force the enemy out, thereby detaching the insurgency from the people in the village, district, or province. Once the area is clear, it must be held to prevent the enemy from reoccupying it. This is when it is important to win over the population. Measures must be taken to prevent the people from aiding the insurgency, with the hope they will turn over any remaining insurgents in the area. These measures may include constant surveillance of the people, limits on movement, interrogations, the issuance of identification cards and vehicle registrations, etc. (Wright 2007). Locals may dislike some of these methods, but they are vital to establish effective protection and eventually gain trust. The population will feel safe when all aspects of the insurgency are removed, including any lasting political agents or influences that may have avoided initial expulsion. COIN is most effective when the population is comfortable and willing to offering support to the Afghan government and international community.

Clear, hold, build is a great strategy when executed entirely and correctly. “Build” really reinforces the objective to win the hearts and minds of the people. At this point, trust should already exist between the people and their government, but it may still

be weak. Build requires the sincere effort to listen and address the grievances of the people (Wright 2007). In some cases, the Taliban may have already done this. If this is the case, the Afghan government must build integrity and handle the reforms before the Taliban can deteriorate the legitimacy of the insurgency. Transportation is crucial for villages, as inhabitants often need to move their livelihood (e.g., pomegranates, almonds, etc.) to a city bazaar for sale. Currently, the roads are limited and somewhat dangerous. The Afghan government and allies can gain respect if it ensures security during transport and/or even build new and better roads for the village. Respect leads to legitimacy and as the Afghan government gains more of this, the Taliban's influence recedes.

In addition to the eradication of internal support, it is important to cut off external aid to the Taliban. Prior to the September 11th attacks, al-Qaeda was able to take refuge under Mullah Omar's Taliban. After the attacks in 2001, the United States' launched its military campaign against the Taliban, and al-Qaeda, in Afghanistan. The objective was not only to take down the Taliban regime, but to also prevent al-Qaeda from reestablishing a base in Afghanistan that could be used to plot more attacks against Americans (New America Foundation 2010). As a result, al-Qaeda is now located more on the Southeastern and Eastern borders of Afghanistan, close to the Federally Administrated Tribal Areas (FATA) and the Pakistan border. Al-Qaeda has long standing ties in these regions and a stronger relationship with Pakistan today than with Afghanistan (New America Foundation 2010).

On July 25, 2010, Wikileaks released the "Afghan War Diary, 2004-2010." This "diary" is a compilation of tens of thousands of documents related to Afghanistan and

Pakistan. The documents were shown to the New York Times, Der Spiegel, and other news media. Issues with American-Pakistani relations were addressed in the documents, along with detailed information about civilian and military casualties, combat incidents, operations, and accidents. Not only does information like this fuel the controversy that already exists about operations in Afghanistan, but it counters the productivity of COIN.

In fact, the Wikileaks release of the “Afghan War Diary, 2004-2010” renewed concerns over the United States’ reliance on Pakistan to help battle al-Qaeda and the Taliban, due to information about how Pakistani intelligence has aided the Taliban (Clifton 2010). One report even provides warning that Pakistani agents and al-Qaeda are working on a mission together and another revealed American suspicion that Pakistani officers may have been involved in an alleged plot to assassinate President Karzai (Doble 2010). The accuracy of these documents is not confirmed, but if true, these revelations could seriously undermine the already fragile relationship between the United States and Pakistan (Doble 2010). Support for the United States and NATO allies has decreased over the last year and Pakistanis would like them to leave the region as soon as possible, even if that means the Taliban or al-Qaeda could regain control.

Pakistan is a strategic country for Counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan and the country is supporting insurgents across the Afghan border instead of the United States. This is an example of the significant impact external aid can have on an insurgency. To combat this, the Afghan government has increased the Afghan Border Police (ABP) forces to combat any external aid the Taliban may be receiving in Pakistan and provide greater border security. Provinces bordering Pakistan in the Southeast and

East of Afghanistan are subject to more violence until external aid has declined.

By eliminating internal and external support, insurgencies stand to become extremely vulnerable, but this is not easy to do. In fact, it is extremely difficult to win over hearts and minds and break ties between allies. Consequently, some unintended results occur and ethical questions are raised, not only in relation to Counterinsurgency strategy, but in regards to the war in Afghanistan as a whole. Americans like to see results and COIN is a difficult strategy for many to grasp. Issues of ethics are raised and people start to speak out against the United States' involvement in Afghanistan and Pakistan. However, leaving now would be detrimental to the progress that has been made and to the future of this region.

The reason for waging war against al-Qaeda and the Taliban was a justifiable one. The United States led the war against the Taliban and al-Qaeda in response to the September 11th attacks. According to Just War Theory, this decision to wage war is classified as self-defense and is justified by the right of retaliation to presumably prevent further attacks (Uniacke 2007, 76). Just cause permits retaliation through methods of war if there has been an armed attack against a country and they wish to seek defense against aggression by armed force as well. In addition, the war not only aimed to punish al-Qaeda terrorists, but to help the people of Afghanistan by liberating them from the Taliban and establishing a democracy to offer the population greater freedom and prosperity (Sinnott-Armstrong 2007, 202). Therefore, the war was not solely initiated for preventative reasons, but as a humanitarian intervention for the Afghan people.

Human intervention is defined as the “transboundary use of force for the purpose

of protecting people whose government is egregiously abusing them either directly, or by aiding and permitting extreme mistreatment” (Heinze 2009, 2). According to consequentialist logic, and the concern for human security, the use of force that is harmful to human well-being must only be used in circumstances when the adverse effects will not outweigh those for human well-being (Heinze 2007, 10). Basically, intervention is justified as long as lives are rescued more than they are endangered.

Since Afghanistan struggles with an insurgency, COIN aims to follow Just War Theory by acting as a strategic response to human intervention initiatives and using violence as a last resort. The war in Afghanistan was initiated as a combined effort to preempt further terrorist attacks against Americans and help the Afghan government overcome insurgency. There is a basis for the right of one government to interfere in the affairs of another as long as the principles of the theory prevail (Hulnick and Mattausch 2006, 44). Counterinsurgency was implemented not only as a way to adapt to the culture and environment in Afghanistan, but also to address *jus in bello*, or “the conduct of hostilities,” associated with the processes of decision making in war (Barry 2006, 250).

Most civilians do not pose a threat and therefore should not be intentionally harmed except under rare circumstances when it is unavoidable (Perry 2009, 64). For example, civilians working in a munitions factory endure an additional level of risk due to the nature of the business. However, if many civilians are going to be harmed in an attack, then maybe it should be reconsidered. COIN demands that soldiers only fire on obvious insurgents, meaning they must be carrying a weapon or it is very apparent that the person is not simply an unarmed civilian. This can be difficult to determine at times

and it is necessary for soldiers to retain a valid sense of moral injustice without lashing out in frustration against innocent people (Perry 2009, 84).

Taliban insurgents can blend in easily with the civilian population, making it extremely difficult to separate friends from enemies. This dilemma has been a source of frustration for troops on the ground, especially for those in high threat areas. For the most part, American forces in Afghanistan have shown admirable restraint toward enemy soldiers and civilians, but the smallest slip up can initiate a lot of questions and interest about the ethics of the war (Perry 2009, 83-84). As the United States and allies evade committing atrocities, they also avoid inducing hatred from the Afghan people.

In 2001, when the United States began the war in Afghanistan, success was anticipated. Over a decade later, this is subject for debate. Some have labeled the war as “illegal, untenable and unwinnable” (Lendman 2010). On the other hand, others, including key defense planners, see that a win is still a likely outcome. Progress is gradually being made. Despite the uncertain end date and the risk of failure, the United States and allies are doing their best to keep ethics intact for a just war overall.

Probability of success is important. Although a chance of failure was not foreseen in 2001 it is now a significant ethical concern for the American public and other countries involved in the conflict. Failure would put the United States, Afghanistan, and many other countries at risk for terrorist attacks in the future. Although the war has not gone as many had hoped or expected over the years, Americans need to trust that the outcome will be positive, despite the time, money, and lives lost in Afghanistan.

A Public Broadcasting System (PBS) program about the “Morality and the

Afghanistan War” conducted an interview with John Carlson from the Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict at Arizona State University (Lawton 2009). Carlson addressed the moral legacies of war and “how the moral outcomes in many cases outweigh, in some cases outlast even, the original reasons for waging a war.” During the program he pointed out,

World War II was not waged to end the Holocaust, nor was the Civil War waged to end slavery, but those were important outcomes of those wars, so we need to keep those long-term moral legacies in mind, particularly if you’re thinking here about the liberation of the Afghan people from the oppressive regime of the Taliban (Lawson 2009).

Maybe the War in Afghanistan will not end with the kind of significant impact that World War II and the Civil War achieved, but perhaps it will be comparable. To free humans from oppression is one thing that many countries and religions can agree on. And even though there is not a definite end in sight, there are many soldiers and defense personnel devoted to doing his or her best to end this war justly.

Opinionated writers have said America has no right to be in Afghanistan ethically, morally or legally and the war is a violation of United States and international law. Polls are taken around the world to show decreases in support by populations of Western countries involved in Afghanistan and the increase in the belief that the war cannot be won, therefore making it a waste of time. Those with the negative opinions seem to focus on the years of violence when Afghans suffered under war and occupation (Lendman 2010). Death, destruction, violence, and instability were more common at the start of the war and before Counterinsurgency was introduced. Back then, the official Afghan government did not offer anything to the people and it seemed like the corruption was

irreversible. Since the United States realized the ineffectiveness of previous techniques, there has been progress in Afghanistan. Unfortunately, this is difficult for some to see, as the past lingers in the present.

Counterinsurgency was adopted to address the ethical mistakes of the past and give new meaning to what this war stands for and hopes to accomplish. The United States and its allies would like to increase troop presence in Afghanistan, have troops adopt the idea of winning the hearts and minds of the Afghan people, and then help to rebuild the country (New York Times 2010). Consequently, there are limitations to the COIN technique. It is a “manpower intensive strategy which requires broadened time horizons” and encompasses “overly restrictive rules of engagement” (New York Times 2010). Of course the winning hearts and minds strategy is not going to be easy, but ultimately it ensures ethical conduct in war and helps to improve opinions of the international community, which is critical for success.

Since 2006, the implementation of COIN has represented an attempt to overcome mistakes from the past and make amends with the Afghan and American populations. It is important for the American citizens to support the strategy. War is constantly a balancing act, because parties abide by different ethics. The United States needs to recognize the moral implications concerning the human cost of war, both for American and Afghan lives (Lawton 2009). With this much time and effort invested to defend the world from terrorism and oppressive regimes, it is unlikely that ally forces will back down without exhausting every attempt at success.

CHAPTER 8

PAKISTAN AND THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

Pakistan is a major player in Southwest Asia and especially Afghan affairs. The border between Pakistan and Afghanistan is vital to the war and for the sustainment of worldwide terrorism threats. While Afghanistan is the primary international concern, Pakistan needs to be held accountable for its role in Afghan instability and the promotion of Islamic extremism. Unfortunately, Pakistan offers an entirely different set of challenges than Afghanistan and therefore, the policies and strategies implemented need to be specialized for each country.

While some COIN aspects may be beneficial, primarily when it comes to winning hearts and minds, this strategy cannot be executed in Pakistan like it is in Afghanistan. There is no need for the “clear, hold, build” technique, except in tribal areas and even there the United States faces many restrictions due to the alliance that exists with Pakistan. One of the most serious issues the United States has encountered involves the border. Pakistan uses the control it has to restrict actions along the border, sometimes preventing the United States from using this gateway at all as “punishment.”

In late November 2011, twenty-four Pakistani soldiers were killed due to miscommunication between the supposed allies. A joint American and Afghan patrol was hit by a mortar and small arms fire. After contacting the Pakistani army and learning it had no troops in the area, the patrol requested backup. A NATO aircraft then attacked two Pakistan army posts, resulting in twenty-four deaths. Pakistan claims the United States knew they were attacking Pakistani soldiers, because the posts were marked.

However, the United States military investigations found that the patrol acted in self-defense after being fired upon by Pakistani troops. Basically, there was poor communication by both countries, but this incident only added to the lack of trust that already existed and jeopardized Pakistan's support for winding down operations in Afghanistan.

Pakistan demanded an apology from the United States after the incident. When the demand was not met, Pakistan responded by closing the Afghan border crossings for American supplies, demanding the United States vacate an air base in Pakistan, and refusing to participate in an international conference towards a stable Afghanistan. Pakistan was also upset with Afghanistan after the incident because the aircraft responsible for killing the soldiers came from there. Pakistan protested support to the United States by pulling out of conferences aimed to improve the situation in Afghanistan. Reestablishing a positive relationship between Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the United States is vital to Taliban negotiations. Shutting down the Pakistan-Afghanistan border to insurgent traffic is a critical element of the war in Afghanistan. It is important to rebuild trust and work together with Pakistan to make progress in Afghanistan. American officials did express regret for the loss of Pakistani lives in an attempt to move forward, but this was not well received.

In July 2012, seven months after the border was closed, the United States apologized to Pakistan and the supply routes were reopened. This incident caused incredible strain on the United States' relationship with Pakistan and the seven months spent in limbo did not do much to improve feelings. In the future the United States and

allies have the ability and prerogative to give in to the smaller demands in order to focus on the more challenging battles. Small, strategic steps toward a mutually beneficial future will do wonders for the Southwest Asia region as a whole.

Throughout history, Pakistanis have relied on other countries to help achieve their goals. They look for alliances with powerful governments or those who will promote Pakistani interests. This mentality is advantageous to the United States. The increase of terrorist attacks against cities in Pakistan has turned many against jihadists operating in the country. This offers an opportunity for Pakistan to reach out to the United States for support and for the United States to promote American interests in Pakistan. President Obama addressed this development in his December 2009 address.

In the past there have been those in Pakistan who argued that the struggle against extremism is not their fight, and that Pakistan is better off doing little or seeking accommodations with those who use violence. But recently, as innocents have been killed in Karachi, to Islamabad, it has become clear that it is Pakistani people who are the most endangered and public opinions have turned (Riedel 2011, 124).

Al-Qaeda attacks against Muslims have produced strong backlash at times, but this shift in Pakistani opinion is far from complete. It is still difficult for the United States to gain public support, despite the increase in negative thoughts about local extremism. The relationship needs to slowly be rebuilt and the United States must be able to play an invaluable role in Pakistani interests. One way to do this is for the United States to use the backlash, created by al-Qaeda and other extremist organizations operating in Pakistan, in a productive way to deter further support of these terrorist networks. The international community cannot miss a single opportunity to win the hearts and minds of the Pakistani people.

In August 2012, Pakistan informed United States military officials of plans to launch combat operations in tribal areas along the Afghan border that serve as a safe haven for the Taliban and al-Qaeda militants. However, the main target of these operations will be the Pakistani Taliban, Pakistan's own homegrown insurgency. While Pakistan does not aim to deal with the Afghan insurgency that exists in the area, this is still a good sign for Pakistan's future involvement in Afghanistan. In the past, Pakistan has refused to do anything about the groups using Pakistani territory as an area to regroup and plan attacks on coalition forces across the border. This decision came at a significant time when insider attacks in Afghanistan were increasing.

In 2012, there were numerous "green on blue" attacks in Afghanistan, as the transition process between coalition forces and the Afghan National Army accelerated for the withdrawal, now planned for 2014. This increase may also be a reflection of Taliban instability as they try new tactics to make a statement since old ones have lost effectiveness. President Karzai was apologetic for these attacks and ordered investigations into them by Afghan authorities. This is a positive sign that rule of law and Afghan institutions are gaining ground. A stronger government in Afghanistan would also mean a weaker Taliban.

Insider attacks against coalition military trainers may also be a sign of the Taliban's weakness. An enemy that is backed into a corner is going to fight its way out. Luckily, Pakistan is prepared to get involved in the conflict. This decision came at a time when relations between the United States and Pakistan were improving, primarily due to the July 2012 apology for the November 2011 border incident. Perhaps if the

relationship continues to grow stronger, Pakistan will be more inclined to expand its target to other insurgent groups operating along the border. Consequently, Pakistanis deny the possibility, but this first step could mean great strides for the war in Afghanistan and for future relations with Pakistan.

CONCLUSION

Most defense planners and policy makers will defend the claim that Afghanistan is headed for success. Issues still exist, but lessons learned in Iraq can provide framework for operations and strategies in Afghanistan. COIN is fundamentally a strategy that requires a lot of manpower and money, in addition to flexibility, initiative, tolerance, and the ability to be pragmatic (Hashim 2006). While operations have come ethical conduct has come a long way in both countries, the public is running out of patience and more time is still needed in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Time will ensure a smoother transition in Afghanistan from international to Afghan control and it will afford Pakistan a better chance to break away from current policies and reestablish an alliance with the United States (Isby 2012, 370).

The first challenge is to address the situation in Pakistan. A simple solution would meet Pakistani needs and support the alliance they want in order to improve the situation in Afghanistan. However, this is not the answer. Giving in to Pakistan would do more harm than good. Pakistan runs the risk of becoming a major threat to American interests. Ignoring the situations there could accelerate movement toward authoritarianism, radical Islam, regional separatism, renewed war with India, or state failure (Cohen 2004, 306). It is essential for Pakistan to become a democratic state with good neighbor relations. To do this, the United States must understand the short and long term challenges in Pakistan.

The safe haven issue is important, but there are more topics of concern to combat in order to prevent the country from becoming a rogue state. A rogue Pakistan would be

very volatile with weapons of mass destruction, support for terrorism, and hostility towards neighbors and allies. The climate in Pakistan must be a long-term concern that goes beyond the war in Afghanistan. Pakistan's potential failure must be prevented. Combating al-Qaeda and nuclear issues are important short-term concerns, but dealing with them now will help mitigate the long-term worry that Pakistan may develop into a dangerous state.

It is extremely difficult to cultivate change in another country, especially in fundamental structural institutions. Ideally, the United States should implement an easy, low-cost strategy to achieve permanent and positive change in Pakistan. It is important to remember that Pakistanis will continue to pursue their own interests, but it may still be possible to gradually shape the future to meet American interests as well. Over the years, Pakistan has resisted American involvement and priorities concerning the nuclear program, the Kashmir conflict, the tolerance of domestic extremists, and the support offered to al-Qaeda and Taliban members. Thus far, the United States has been unable to persuade Pakistanis that these policies are a threat to their own country, not just to the United States. It is vital to develop a policy for the future that will gain support from Pakistan. American methods will continue to fail if the rocky relationship remains as it is now.

Democratization is a key requirement for a stable future in Pakistan. Democracy, along with civil service and judiciary administrative functions, has been eroded over time by the rampant corruption and politicization that has existed under the military and civilian governments (Cohen 2004, 316). The United States must help rebuild these in an

effort to achieve administrative reform in Pakistan. This idea was rejected by President Musharrat in 2003, but it is important to continue to press hard on this topic and help Pakistanis understand that democratization is in the country's best interest. Developing Pakistan as a democracy is the best way for the United States to hinder the rise of radical Islam, safeguard the limited civil liberties that currently exist, and preempt separatist movements (Cohen 2004, 317). If possible, a condition of aid to Pakistan will include a requirement for mainstream political parties, like the Pakistan Muslim League, to function freely in the country. This caveat can protect American interests without openly demanding too much from Pakistan.

While democratization is a long-term goal for Pakistan, there are some short-term objectives that will create a more stable country for democracy if they can be met. The United States must seize short-term opportunities in order to secure long-term assistance efforts. For example, Pakistan's demand for an apology regarding the border incident in November 2011 was a small battle that went on longer than necessary. Is it fair for the United States to be coerced into apologizing for a miscommunication caused by both sides? No, but a small concession like this outweighs the positive impact it could have on future relations. Current trends must be turned around in Pakistan and Afghanistan to ensure a future that is brighter than the past.

A peaceful future for Afghanistan is dependent upon competent government ministries and other Afghan successes that benefit the population. Afghans will have to draw on strengths that have aided them in past conflicts to be a serene nation that does not require a large scale foreign military presence once again (Isby 2010, 370). These

strengths are the faith, determination, and commitment of the Afghan people. Ahmad Shah Massoud describes the Afghan national vision as follows:

Afghan Islam, a willingness to embrace democracy down to its roots in the Afghan jirga and Islamic requirements for majlis-e-shura, and the commitment to better the quality of life could, together, offer a future more appealing than any the insurgents could envision. It is here the battle for hearts and minds can be won (Coll 2004).

Insurgencies may never fully be contained and corruption will likely exist in the government for years to come, but the country can find the stability it once had; the stability that the Afghan people are content with. For this to happen, the Taliban must be removed from Afghanistan. United States Lieutenant Colonel Vamvakias said “half the battle is the population. Once they all start turning on the Taliban, the Taliban has no leg to stand on, and I do think we’ll get there.”

2012 was a violent, but pivotal year for the war in Afghanistan. Both Afghanistan and Pakistan experienced change from new policies and in response to significant events. There is still a lot to accomplish and that will take time. People cannot expect the conflict to be resolved soon. However, 2012 could demonstrate a turning point for the global war on terror. The international community is prepared to withdraw from Afghanistan in 2014. This end date may be achievable if Pakistan steps up to help combat extremist networks in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas and the Afghan government continues to take ownership of its own security and stability. The United States must help Pakistan reach a stable, democratic, and peaceful future, where national security is not defined by the military (Isby 2010, 381). This achievement will be the game changer for terrorism, nuclear security and the well-being of Afghanistan.

REFERENCE LIST

- ABC News*, International Edition. 2001. The Abu Sayyaf-Al Qaeda Connection-Abu Sayyaf Terrorist Group Alleged to Have Links to Al Qaeda. December 20. <http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=79205&page=1&page=1>. (Accessed 2010).
- Abuza, Zachary. 2003. Funding Terrorism in Southeast Asia: The Financial Network of Al Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah. *The National Bureau of Asian Research*. December. <http://www.nbr.org/publications/issue.aspx?id=15>. (Accessed 2010).
- Al-Zarqawi, Fu'ad Husayn. 2005. The Second Generation of al-Qa'ida, Part Fourteen. *Al Quds al-Arabi*. July 13.
- Balder, Lolita C. and Robert Burns. 2012. Panetta: Pakistan Military Plans to Open New Front. *Yahoo.com*. August 13. <http://news.yahoo.com/panetta-pakistan-military-plans-open-front-211622732.html>. (Accessed 2012).
- Barry, James A. 2006. Managing Covert Political Action: Guide posts from Just War Theory. In *Ethics of Spying: A reader for the intelligence professional – Volume 1*, ed. Jan Goldman, 250. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Bergen, Peter. 2011. *The Longest War: The Enduring Conflict between America and Al-Qaeda*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Boyle, Joseph. 1997. Just and Unjust Wars: Casuistry and the Boundaries of the Moral World. *Ethics and International Affairs – Volume 11*, ed. Joel H. Rosenthal, 83-98. Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs.
- Clark, Emily. 2006. Abu Sayyaf History. *United States Pacific Command*. September 21. <http://www.pacom.mil/piupdates/abusayyafhist.shtml>. (Accessed 2010).
- Clifton, Eli. 2010. Poll: Pakistanis Dislike US, Taliban, and al-Qaeda. *Antiwar.com Original*. July 31. <http://original.antiwar.com/eli-clifton/2010/07/30/poll-pakistanis-dislike-us-taliban-and-al-qaeda/>. (Accessed 2011).
- CNN.com. 2001. Witness: Bin Laden planned attack on U.S. embassy in Saudi Arabia. February 13. http://articles.cnn.com/2001-02-13/justice/Embassy.bombings.trial_1_mohamed-odeh-jamal-ahmed-al-fadl-al-fadl?_s=PM:LAW. (Accessed 2011).

- CNN.com. 2009. Obama Afghanistan Strategy: More troops in quickly, drawdown 2011. December 1. <http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/12/01/obama.afghanistan/index.html>. (Accessed 2011).
- Cohen, Stephen P. 2004. *The Idea of Pakistan*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Coll, Steve. 2004. *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 11, 2001*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- Dale, Catherine. 2011. War in Afghanistan: Strategy, Operations, and Issues for Congress. *CRS Report for Congress*. March 9.
- Doble, Anna. 2010. War files leak: timing threatens US-Pakistan relations. *Channel 4 News*. July 26. <http://www.channel4.com/news/war-files-leak-timing-threatens-us-pakistan-relations>. (Accessed 2011).
- Ehrenfeld, Rachel. 2009. Winning the War in Afghanistan. *Front Page Mag*, October 1.
- Eikmeier, Dale C. 2007. Qutbism: An Ideology of Islamic-Fascism. *Parameters* (Spring).
- Elegant, Simon. 2008. The Return of Abu Sayyaf. *Time Asia Magazine*. August 30.
- English Islam Times*. 2010. Resistance against Talibanization in the FATA & KPK. December 27.
- Agence France-Presse*. 2007. Topic: Left-wing group brands planned Abu Sayyaf film as propaganda. February 18. <http://www.timawa.net/forum/index.php?topic=6969.0>. (Accessed 2010).
- Gehriger, Urs. 2008. Counterinsurgency in Iraq and Afghanistan: An Interview with John Nagl. *World Politics Review*. September 18. <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/2672/counterinsurgency-in-iraq-and-afghanistan-an-interview-with-john-nagl>. (Accessed 2011).
- Gul, Imtiaz. 2010. *The Most Dangerous Place: Pakistan's Lawless Frontier*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Gutman, Roy. 2008. *How We Missed the Story: Osama Bin Laden, the Taliban and the Hijacking of Afghanistan*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Hashim, Ahmed S. 2006. *Insurgency and Counter-Insurgency in Iraq*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Hastings, Michael. 2010. The Runaway General. *Rolling Stone*, June 22.
- Heinze, Eric A. 2009. *Waging Humanitarian War: the Ethics, law, and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Herman, Michael. 2010. Ethics and Intelligence after September 2001. In *Ethics of Spying: A reader for the intelligence professional – Volume 2*, ed. Jan Goldman, 104-117. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Hulnick, Arthur S. and Daniel W. Mattausch. 2006. Ethics and Morality in U.S. Secret Intelligence. In *Ethics of Spying: A reader for the intelligence professional Volume 1*, ed. Jan Goldman, 42-44. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Iqbal, Anwar. 2010. Al Qaeda will try to provoke new India-Pakistan war: Gates. *Dawn.com*. January 20. Pakistan: DAWN Media Group. <http://archives.dawn.com/archives/42862>. (Accessed 2012).
- Isby, David. 2010. *Afghanistan Graveyard of Empires: A New History of the Borderland*. New York, NY: Pegasus Books.
- Jalalza, Musa Khan. 2003. *Taliban and the Post-Taliban Afghanistan: Terrorism, al Qaeda and the Qila-e-Jangi massacre*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications.
- Johnson, Donald. 2012. India-Pakistan Relations: A 50-Year History. *Asia Society*. March 4. <http://asiasociety.org/countries/conflicts/india-pakistan-relations-50-yearhistory?page=0,0>. (Accessed 2011).
- Jones, Owen Bennett. 2002. *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Khan, Aarish Ullah. 2005. *The Terrorist Threat and the Policy Response in Pakistan*. Stockholm: Stockholm international Peace Research Institute.
- Khan, Kashif Saeed and Munir Ahmed Syed. 2008. *Conflict Transformation and Development in Pakistan's North Western Territories*. Pakistan Security Research Unit, Department of Peace Studies. UK: University of Bradford.
- Kinzer, Stephen. 2008. The Reality of the War in Afghanistan. *The Boston Globe*. October 15. http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2008/10/15/the_reality_of_war_in_afghanistan/. (Accessed 2011).

- Koontz, Theodore J. 1997. Noncombatant Immunity in Michael Walzer's *Just and Unjust Wars*. *Ethics and International Affairs – Volume 11*, ed. Joel H. Rosenthal, 55-82. Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs.
- Lawton, Kim. 2009. Morality of the Afghanistan War. *Public Broadcasting Station*. December 4.
- Lendman, Stephen. 2010. War in Afghanistan: Illegal, Untenable and Unwinnable. *The Baltimore Chronicle*. July 2. <http://baltimorechronicle.com/2010/070210Lendman.html>. (Accessed 2011).
- Metz, Steven. 2007. Learning from Iraq: Counterinsurgency in American Strategy. *Strategic Studies Institute* (January).
- Montero, David. 2008. *Pakistan: State of Emergency*. FRONTLINE and Christian Science Monitor joint project.
- Moran, Daniel. 2002. *Wars of National Liberation*. London, UK: Cassell.
- Nance, Malcolm W. 2010. *An End to Al Qaeda: Destroying Bin Laden's Jihad and Restoring American's Honor*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- New America Foundation. 2010. The Al-Qaeda-Taliban relationship After 2001: Report. *Human Security Report Project: Afghanistan Conflict Monitor*. April 30. <http://www.afghanconflictmonitor.org/2010/04/the-alqaedataliban-relationship-after-2001-report.html>. (Accessed 2011).
- New York Times, At War, Notes From the Front Lines*. 2010. Rolling Stone Article's True Focus: Counterinsurgency. June 23.
- Nojumi, Neamatollah. 2002. *The Rise of the Taliban in Afghanistan: Mass Mobilization, Civil War, and the Future of the Region*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Office of the Secretary of Defense. Public Affairs Research and Analysis. *House Armed Services Committee Hearing: Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Michele Flournoy & General David Petraeus*. End of Day Report, March 16, 2011.
- Orend, Brian. 2006. *The Morality of War*. Canada: Broadview Press.
- PBS. 1998. Al Qaeda's Second Fatwa. *PBS NewsHour, Military*. February 23. http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/military/jan-june98/fatwa_1998.html. (Accessed 2010).

- Perry, David L. 2009. *Partly Cloudy: Ethics in War, Espionage, Covert Action, and Interrogation*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Petraeus, General David H. 2010. COMISAF's Counterinsurgency Guidance. *International Security Assistance Force/United States Forces-Afghanistan*. DoD training material.
- Qutb, Sayyid. 2003. *Milestones*. Chicago, IL: Kazi Publications.
- Rashid, Ahmed. 2008. *Descent into Chaos: the United States and the Failure of Nation Building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Renno, Erika Michelle. 2010. *Swatting at Flies: Pakistan's Use of Counterinsurgency*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University
- Riedel, Bruce. 2011. *Deadly Embrace: Pakistan, America, and the Future of Global Jihad*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Robinson, Linda. 2010. *How Afghanistan Ends: A Political-Military Path to Peace*. Small Wars Journal. DoD training journal.
- Rodin, David. 2007. The Problem with Prevention. In *Preemption: Military Action and Moral Justification*, ed. Henry Shue and David Rodin, 155. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Salam, Reihan. 2009. The Taliban-Al Qaeda Connection. *The Daily Beast*. October 16. New York, NY: Newsweek/The Daily Beast Company, LLC.
- Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter. 2007. Preventive War, What is it Good For. In *Preemption: Military Action and Moral Justification*, ed. Henry Shue and David Rodin, 202-219. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Temple-Raston, Dina. 2007. Independent Cell Allegedly Hatched Fort Dix Plan. *NPR*. May 9. <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=10090608>. (Accessed 2010).
- The Epoch Times*. 2010. Homegrown Terrorism Reflects the Changing Tactics of Al Qaeda. March 17. New York, NY: The Epoch Times. <http://www.theepochtimes.com/n2/united-states/homegrown-terrorism-reflects-the-changing-tactics-of-al-qaeda-31520.html>. (Accessed 2010).

- Thistlethwaite, Rev. Dr. Susan Brooks. 2009. How to make the Afghanistan War a “Just War.” *American Progress*. November 19. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/11/just_war.html. (Accessed 2011).
- Thompson, Leroy. 2002. *The Counterinsurgency Manual*. London, UK: Greenhill Books.
- Trinquier, Roger. 2006. *Modern Warfare: A French View of Counterinsurgency*. Westport: Praeger Security International.
- Uniacke, Suzanne. 2007. On Getting One’s retaliation in First. In *Preemption: Military Action and Moral Justification*, ed. Henry Shue and David Rodin, 76. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- United States Government Accountability Office. 2009. *Securing, Stabilizing, and Developing Pakistan’s Border Area with Afghanistan*. Washington, DC: U.S. Govt. Accountability Office.
- United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. 2009. *Confronting al Qaeda: understanding the threat in Afghanistan and beyond*. 111th Cong., 1st sess. Washington, DC: U.S. G.P.O.
- Von Kuch, Lynn. 2010. Culture as a Tool of War: US Military Approaches to Occupation in Iraq. Information paper from Rochelle Davis’ presentation, the Middle East Institute. July 27.
- Warren, Marcus. 2001. Former bin Laden mentor warns the West. *The Telegraph*. December 3. Kent, UK: The Telegraph Media Group. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/1364206/Former-bin-Laden-mentor-warns-the-West.html>. (Accessed 2010).
- WikiLeaks. Afghan War Diary, 2004-2010. http://wikileaks.org/wiki/Afghan_War_Diary,_2004-2010. (Accessed July 30, 2010).
- Woodward, Bob. 2010. *Obama’s Wars*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Wright, Lawrence. 2006. *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Wright, Andrew. 2007. Basic Counter-Insurgency. *MilitaryHistoryOnline.com: A webzine of community-submitted articles*, February 17. <http://www.Militaryhistoryonline.com/general/articles/counterinsurgency.aspx>. (Accessed 2011).