

An Analysis of Pakistan’s Role in US Dialogue with Ṭālibān

Sumayya Feroz^I

Mian Muhammad Saleem^{II}

Shehla Naeem^{III}

Abstract

The paper analysis the US talks with Ṭālibān since they attacked on Afghanistan and eliminated Al-Qā‘eda in October 2001. The piece of study highlights the role played Islamabad in patching up both Ṭālibān and American for dialogue to come up with a peaceful solution to the US War in Afghanistan. Washington always uses divers’ players for holding talks with Ṭālibān including, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Germany, UAE and the Afghan government to achieve its objective. The study found that the US never sincere in their move of dialogue with the radical forces in Afghanistan. The study also come to the conclusion that the different actors’ involved by the US has their own interests to pursue rather than achieving US interests. Additionally, Washington never gave free hand to any one of the actors to hold talks with Ṭālibān. These factors are responsible for blocking the way of peace in the graveyard of Empires.

Key Words: Talks, USA, Ṭālibān, Pakistan, Strategy, Peace, War, Afghanistan.

Introduction

The hapless people of Afghanistan have suffered relentlessly at least major power politics since King Zahir Shah has been overthrown by his own nephew Sardar Muhammad Dawood in 1970s. To buttress their strategic position and quench their thirst of geo-stratagems, major powers invaded time and again to dominate Afghan people for their own interests. The most important was the USSR invasion in 1979 that led to the collapse of soviets but heavily damaged political system and economic clout and its social fabrics. Though Afghanistan proved to be a real graveyard for the USSR but its ghost lived on and haunted Afghanistan in the time to come¹.

I Lecturar of Political Science, University of Swabi

II Associate Professor of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan

III M.Phil Scholar, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan Univ. Mardan



Following the USSR exit, Afghanistan was thrown into political turmoil under the tug of war among the Mujahedeen groups. From the ashes of these turmoil, emerged a new force on the political horizon of Afghanistan, known as the “Afghan Ṭālibān.” With their conservative interpretation of Islam, they were blamed to have banned every kind of conceivable entertainment for Afghanistan people. The Ṭālibān took several steps, which infuriated 12 Associate international community which ultimately led to its downfall post 9/11 2001 attacks. Though Ṭālibān were vanquished temporarily, they emerged recently a force to be reckoned with. In this scenario, the USA started many efforts to have peace talks with the Ṭālibān². Mulla Omar has reorganized the Ṭālibān movement in four major provinces in southern Afghanistan; Helmand, Zabul, Uruzgan and Kandahar. The reorganization process in the eastern part was carried out by Jalaluddin Haqqani and his son³. The attacks began in the Afghanistan Army from 2003⁴. Interviews followed in October 2003 with the well-known Ṭālibān, the Americans actually wanted to soften the Ṭālibān movement by donating individual troops to Tālban to donate and would be part of Afghanistan⁵.

Sources: Encyclopedia Britannica, September, 2019, retrieved from

<https://www.britannica.com/place/Afghanistan>

Dialogue in Context

The experience of Pakistan itself evinces the fact that it began peace venture with the Pakistan Ṭālibān owing to threat from security threat the former poses. These were undertaken in 2004⁶. When Afghanistan began peace talks in 2005, with the aim of avoiding a new civil war in Afghanistan following the withdrawal of the US. As the United States accelerated negotiations with the Ṭālibān leadership after Barack Obama replaced George Bush as US president in March 2009 Direct peace talks began in November, 2010, between the US and the Ṭālibān after US officials met with Ṭālibān representatives in Munich, at which point German officials and the Qatari royal family held secret talks with the Ṭālibān.

As a result, in 2011 the first two prisoner exchange talks were held in Doha and Germany, but these talks slowed down in March, 2012, as a result of the US election campaign in which the US opposed the release of prisoners. Peaceful and stable Afghanistan is a global need and especially in neighboring countries. All countries have their interests in a stable Afghanistan, and each country plays a major role in Afghanistan peace talks. There are regional strategies that keep Pakistan and India away from Afghanistan in their traditional tournaments. China with its natural resources and interests in Afghanistan has devised a clear strategic and economic policy that has led them to confront Islamic terrorism. It also used production pressure on its close ties with Pakistan, while the Russians did not want Ṭālibān to invade Afghanistan. Pakistan has played a key role in the formation of Ṭālibān factions in Afghanistan and in the fight against Afghanistan and the invasion of the Soviet Union. Pakistan conducts peace talks between Afghanistan and the Ṭālibān, and between the Ṭālibān and the USA where Pakistani government institutions, including Inter-Services Intelligence and military bases⁷.

Osama's assassination has also created a crisis large Pakistani Armed Forces, policy makers and governments. Not only did Pakistan-U.S. relations break down, but it also changed the anti-terrorism coalition, the United States' counter-terrorism strategy and its counter-terrorism strategy. Prior to Osama's operation, military ties between the United States and Pakistan were strong. Obama's administration later agreed on military action and the abolition of Al-Qāeda and the Ṭālibān. But the assassination of Osama Bin Laden and Pakistan's refusal to support the war on terrorism also changed the US policy of including Pakistan in peace talks⁸.

After the election of Hamid Karzai in October 2004, he established the "Independent Peace and Reconciliation Commission" under Sibghat ullah Mujaddedi, which provides amnesty for those who voluntarily leave apartheid. But the uprising continued to increase in 2005, after which the need for talks with the Ṭālibān was called off. For that reason a German official in July 2005 met with the Ṭālibān, the CIA and the MI6 also secretly went to the Ṭālibān but all failed. And the first suicide bombings erupted on the face of Afghanistan in 2006 through the network of Dadullah (A Ṭālibān Commander). And until 2007 large sections such as Zabul, Helmand, Uruzgan and Kandahar came under the control of the Ṭālibān⁹. In 2007, with the help of Saudi Arabia, talks were held between the Afghan government and the Ṭālibān involving Qayyum (Karzai's brother) on the Afghan government side and Wakil Ahmad Mutawakkil and Mullah Abdul Salaam Zaef on the Ṭālibān side but the talks also showed disappointment. The Ṭālibān were not ready to recognize Karzai's government in any way.

In November 2008, Ṭālibān spokesman Zabiullah Mujahid told the Afghan government that they would not take part in any talks until foreign troops left Afghanistan. Presidential elections were held in the United States and Obama came to power, came up with a policy to increase troops in Afghanistan in 2009, and deployed about 30000 more troops to Afghanistan. President Obama reviewed the Afghanistan chapter in 2009, and found that there were obstacles involved in exaggerating the issue, the disloyalty of the Afghan government, the safe heavens in Pakistan and the inadequacy of Afghan forces under consideration. Many military officials and advisers rejected the wording of the talks and sought to weaken the Ṭālibān and force them to surrender. In August 2009, Hillary Clinton, the U.S. secretary of state, expressed American determination to negotiate. This determination is due to the ongoing global public perception of the US with much emphasis on military means but in reality U.S. policy remained the same¹⁰. There were differences of opinion between the U.S. administrations.

Some advocated for negotiations to be held while others felt it was not the right time for negotiations. After being re-elected in 2009, Karzai invited the Ṭālibān to peace talks and invited them to a peace conference in Afghanistan. Therefore, the start of 2010 has shown some positive signs of negotiations as a group of 15 members on Hekmatyar's side has tried to contact the Afghan government for negotiations. Not long ago in June 2010, Karzai launched the Afghan National Peace Conference as promised at a conference

in London and set up a negotiating committee with the Ṭālibān but the rebellion intensified and the Ṭālibān again rejected everything¹¹. In 2011, U.S. policy heading towards Afghanistan turned slightly and there was a space for dialogue.

The U.S. directly participated in the negotiations and negotiated a high-level Ṭālibān order in May 2011, Germany. The U.S. also recognizes that Pakistan is a key player in the negotiations and could play a very important role. The U.S. has nominated Frank Ruggiero (Special Representative for Pakistan and Afghanistan), Grossman and Jeff Hayes for the negotiation process. A number of times were held with the Hekmatyar Network in late 2011, when HIG demanded the complete withdrawal of the U.S. in Afghanistan. A meeting was held with Ibrahim Haqqani (Representative of the Haqqani Network) in Dubai, but this did not lead to a positive impact and the Haqqani network continued to be involved in insurgency. The U.S. is questioning the Pakistani ISI for its support for the Haqqani network by increasing its influence. In early 2012, the US position in Afghanistan was very different from that of the USSR in the 1980s, as it began looking for ways to secure its exit and on the other hand the Ṭālibān were¹². A Recapitulation from 2001 to 2019 President Donald Trump has announced the termination of protracted peace talks with the Ṭālibān. Since last August, there had been speculation and glimmer of hope that the ongoing peace talks could herald the ending of sufferings of hapless afghan people. But as the case was with the previous peace talks, this round also ended up in fiasco.

The analysis of peace talks

In retrospect, there had been many futile attempts by the USA to trash out a solution for Afghanistan persistent imbroglio. Afghanistan has been at the receiving-end of counter-terrorism and its people have been suffering from domestic conflicts and insecurity for decades¹³. The new rounds of their suffering began and worse confounded with the invasion of the country in October 2001 in the aftermath of 9/11 attacks. Within months, the USA and its international and domestic coalition toppled the government of Ṭālibān. But credible reports and situation on the ground contradict the long-held view of the USA that the Ṭālibān have been vanquished. Rather the Afghanistan Ṭālibān have been a more powerful entity to be reckoned with. The situation points towards the persistence of the clout of Ṭālibān in Afghanistan¹⁴. According to reports, still a sizeable territory in under the control of the

Ṭālibān. Ṭālibān also venture out, time and again, to attack the coalition forces.

The very recent termination of peace talks with the Ṭālibān have been justified on this ground. It is, therefore, pertinent to recapitulate the history of Afghanistan reconciliation process and to analyze as to when, where, how and why earlier peace talk were initiated and terminated and to bring forth its failure, if any.

1) Bonn conference, Germany (2001)

Bonn conference is the first step of its kind to arrive at the solution of Afghanistan perennial problems. The existing political contours of Afghanistan has been shaped by no any other conferences in such dramatic manner than the one held in Bonn in 2001. The conference came in the heel of US victory over the Ṭālibān and the collapse of their government almost 19 years back. Many nations including Germany participated in these peace talks. As per the findings of National Institute for Strategic Studies, the purpose of the conference was to help pave the way for peaceful Afghanistan and to make arrangements for the installation of a civilian government¹⁵.

In the conference, it was also decided that USA-led NATO forces are to be supported in Afghanistan for the maintenance of peace. In the conference, Afghan delegation participated, but there was no representation of any kind from the Ṭālibān. In the conference, it was also decided that an interim government under Hamid Karzai is to be set up for six months. It was a first interim government of its kind which was recognized internationally. Though interim government was installed, the Ṭālibān never recognized it and insisted relentlessly on setting up an ‘Islamic government’

Second Bonn Conference, Germany (2011)

Until 2011 no such conference, after the one held in 2001, was held in which international stakeholders could participate to discuss and find out solution for Afghanistan protracted war. According to the statement issued by the UN mission in Afghanistan, the conference was held on 10 December 2011 in Germany in which Afghanistan president Hamid Karzai also participated.

The statement spelled out the purpose of the conference as to make arrangement for handing over civilian responsibility to the Afghanistan government until 2014, the time when foreign troop's withdrawal would start¹⁶. In the conference it was also decided as to how long-term measures could be taken to ensure that international stakeholders were in constant

contact with Afghanistan for peace there. In the conference, almost 100 delegation participated. Hilary Clinton, the then USA foreign secretary, represented the USA. Besides, the then UNO secretary General, Ban Ki Moon, also participated. Pakistan was conspicuous of its boycott of the conference. The then Pakistan's cabinet had decided that Pakistan would not participate as a protest as the NATO forces had attacked the Mohammad Agency and which was preceded by the egregious violation of Pakistan's sovereignty when the USA claimed hunting down Osama Bin Laden in Abbottabad. This episode lime lighted Pakistan suspicious role in having compromised its stature by its supposed role of appeasing the world most wanted individual¹⁷.

Qatar Dialogue

The opening of Qatar office enlivened the hope that the Ṭālibān, onward, would stretch out olive branch and turn to negotiating table. The USA had, also then, insinuated kick-starting the peace talks. The then US president, Barack Obama, had said in the conference in the Berlin that he saw no dialogue with the Afghan Ṭālibān in foreseeable future unless the withdrawal of foreign troops were discussed¹⁸. On other hand, the opening of political office by afgghan Ṭālibān sent a wave of despondency in Afghanistan. That was the reason Hamid Karzai gave up dialogue of the USA troops presence in Afghanistan with the USA¹⁹.

Moscow Conference (2019)

After the lapse of many years, Afghanistan political elites and the representative of the Afghan Ṭālibān thronged Moscow, the capital of Russia, for peace talks in February 2019. These talks emphasized on ending the 18 years longest war in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of foreign troop from Afghanistan. Hamid Karzai, who earlier had participated in Bonn conference, also participated (Khan, 2017). But the incumbent government in Afghanistan was unhappy with what was happening in Moscow. According to reports, Ashraf Ghani is reported to have said that he was happy with any peace venture aimed at ending the sufferings of Afghanistan people but in such talks the legitimate Afghanistan government is not to be kept in oblivion. He emphasized any peace talks under the Afghanistan government (Khalid H. U., 2018). That was the reason that many political and strategic thinkers had predicted the futility of those talks²⁰.

New Round of Talks

Earlier in September 2018, the USA appointed Mr. Zalmi Khalid Zad as the special representative of USA to Afghanistan. With his appointment, he initiated frantic forays with the American and afghan Ṭālibān representative to bring them to negotiating table with the spirit of a new start so that any reconciliation pact could be implemented (Khalid H. U., 2018). These frantic diplomatic efforts ultimately culminated into the afghan Ṭālibān agreeing to peace talks with the USA²¹.

Earlier round of the talks occurred in the start of 2019. the ninth round of these talks was underway since 22 august 2019, which very recently president trump aborted on the grounds of Ṭālibān recent attacks of American forces. The dialogues were terminated when these were at the cusp of being finalized and both sides were mulling over making the agreement public. But despite the termination of peace talks, both sides still can turn around. USA foreign secretary, Mike Pompeo, while talking to different TV channels highlighted his optimism of jump-starting the peace talks in no-distant-future. He said that the USA needed a special commitment from the Afghan Ṭālibān. On other hand, the afghan Ṭālibān also has exhibited their optimism of starting the peace talks. In all these dialogue which were underway for Afghanistan reconciliation had the support of Pakistan. The support, Pakistan extended, was meant to ensure regional tranquility and stability in Afghanistan.

Many stakeholders have recognized Pakistan critical support. Very recently, the president of USA, Donald Trump said in unequivocal terms that Pakistan was instrumental in bringing the afghan Ṭālibān to negotiating table. It, therefore could be said without a speck of doubt that Pakistan made the peace talks a radical realty. Challenges to Afghanistan peace process what happens next in Afghanistan, will depend, considerably on the negotiation process, currently underway, to help resolve the Afghanistan's crises. The hapless Afghanistan's people have suffered incessantly due to internecine civil war and at the hands of foreign players, who invaded Afghanistan time and again. The latest rounds of talks are silver lining for the Afghanistan and the people of Afghanistan. But before these peace process could be effected, there lies various challenges, which are stumbling blocks in the way of successful, durable and lasting peace in Afghanistan.

The first challenge emanates from the people of Afghanistan themselves. The people of Afghanistan never united after the 1980's particularly. The perusal of past history shows that whenever the people of

Afghanistan got united they defied the empires and superpowers. The issues, as exist in Afghanistan, are due to lack of unity. This lack of unity was fully exploited by the outside countries to get foothold in Afghanistan. In 2014, the unity government was brokered by the USA. People expected the unity government to deliver, but after the conclusion of its term, Afghanistan is no better than it was a decade earlier. According to media reports and credible evidences, still a major portion of Afghanistan territory is controlled by the Ṭālibān. The drugs trade in Afghanistan is thriving with full throttle, which is the major source of income for the Ṭālibān.

The assassination of various prominent personalities in recent past exhibit, how the Ṭālibān have become potentially dangerous and vociferous force to be reckoned with. Similarly, there are diverse approaches to resolve the Afghanistan crises. These peace process are separately led by the USA and Russia. The USA is involved in protracted efforts to ensure safe exit from Afghanistan. The USA has appointed Zalmi Khalilzad, as special representative to go ahead with the Afghanistan peace process. During the course of negotiations, he has visited various countries including Pakistan. The USA also wants Pakistan to play a major role in peace process. The letter, written by Donald Trump, to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan, is the recognition of Pakistan's central role in the region and Afghanistan particularly. The USA, after invading Afghanistan also strived to equip the Afghanistan Army with training to fright the insurgency, but after the lapse of years Afghanistan is still evincible. Therefore, for the USA, peace is the only viable option (Behuria, 2019). The peace process, initiated by the Russia, is in collision course with that of the USA. The current diverse approaches towards Afghanistan crisis points towards the deep hostility still exist in both countries. The Russia, last month in November, convened a conference aimed to thrash out the solution of Afghanistan crisis, in which the USA was not invited.

More than anything else, the USA and Russia must recognize the centrality of Afghanistan issue and help it solve with unified approach, taking the best interests of Afghanistan. But, the outcome of Afghanistan peace process does not depends only on the role of the USA and Russia. Other regional countries like Pakistan, India, Iran and China must play its role to help resolve the issue in amicable manner. All regional countries have stakes in Afghanistan. Pakistan being a next door neighbor of Afghanistan and sharing a long border with it must play its sincere role in the Afghanistan crisis.

Whatever happens in Afghanistan, cannot go unnoticed in Pakistan. Pakistan also hosts millions of refugees since decades.

The FATA and the people of tribal areas along the porous border are divided along the Durand line. Therefore, for the best interest of Afghanistan, Pakistan must recognize the centrality of the solution of Afghanistan. In past, both countries engaged in blame- game and mud-slinging, but the recent peace overtures between two countries are positive development, which will go a long to help pacify trust deficit exist on both sides. India, along with Pakistan, also can play a complementary role in Afghanistan peace process. In recent statement in Shah Mahmood Qureshi, offered India to help Pakistan resolve the Afghanistan crisis. India must recognize the sufferings of the Afghan's people and should not use Afghanistan as linchpin to further sinister move against Pakistan or any other regional countries. India should engage in positive economic development in Afghanistan, but it should not be at the cost of alienating Afghanistan's people viz-a-viz Pakistan. If India and Pakistan play its due complementary role, then Afghanistan bad days are going to end soon. Similarly, Iran and China must play a positive role in Afghanistan's peace process. China is a rising economic giant and must include Afghanistan in its integrative process to help Afghanistan develop economically. But whatever happens in the end, whatsoever direction the peace process takes, and whatever outcome it might have, all depend on the sincere role of all the stakeholders.

The peace process must be based on as ‘Afghan-own and Afghan-led.’ Any peace process devoid of these sentiments will backfire. It must, also, aimed at ending the long sufferings of the Afghan's people. The peace process must be carried out in impartial manner, without expecting any strategic gains in Afghanistan from the peace deal. The specter of strategic gains or losses have played havoc with people of Afghanistan. It is a propitious time to ensure the ending of the suffering of Afghanistan. The peace must prevail as the path of peace and negotiations is the worth reliable way to the political, social and economic development of Afghanistan.

Pakistan Role in Talks

In the aftermath of litany of allegations emanating from different sources, Pakistan took some decisive step to patch up the difference between Afghan factions. Pakistan is driven by its own security concerns as India is using the western border as the second lynchpin of instability in Pakistan. Pakistan Security Center has always made an impact in Afghanistan because of

the Indian threat, and as a result Pakistan's main goal is to curb Indian influence in Afghanistan, and to protect Indian support from representative conflicts within Pakistan (Shah, 2015) .1 Pakistan also considers Afghanistan as a place where they gain victory against India in the Pakistan-Indian war. The Pakistani leadership for their national security is looking for support in helping to build a political settlement between the Ṭālibān and the Afghan government, assuming that Pakistan has close ties to the Ṭālibān, so Pakistan's role will help in negotiations with the Ṭālibān.



Sources: know where consulting, September 2019, retrieved from. For the purpose of stabilizing Afghanistan post 2014, Pakistan and Afghanistan took important steps to date in 2012.

They also called for the third annual conference in Pakistan-Afghanistan-Iran in Islamabad, where they began a free entry into Afghanistan-led peace intervention. This action was taken by Hamid Karzai in response to American and Ṭālibān negotiations in 2010. Hamid Karzai said apart from Saudi Arabia and Turkey to host competing negotiations Americans could not negotiate. Pakistan and Afghanistan held talks in Turkey in 2012, in which they discussed the framework prepared by the Afghan High Peace Council “Peace Process Roadmap to 2015” in which Pakistan was given a key role in the peace process. The 1Peace talks with the Ṭālibān have largely failed due to the deception of American decision-makers and policy makers of the Afghan Government. Peace talks with the Ṭālibān will not succeed without resolving demarcation with Pakistan and the official adoption of the Durand

Line. Peace talks have also failed miserably because of internal racial tensions. It was thought that the current peace talks were not a comprehensive process and did not address the grievances of the entire Afghan community.

The Ṭālibān were also unwilling to participate in peace talks which is an important factor in failure. Political, economic, military and communications reliance on Pakistan over the weekend its US position for independent response to US policies in Afghanistan. Pakistan had no choice but to support the US in its war with Afghanistan. Like all third world leaders, the Pakistani leadership was also very active in supporting US policies in neighboring Pakistan which also made a significant contribution to Operation Enduring Freedom. Its breadth and power to US officials. In the reconstruction of Afghanistan, Pakistan has embraced all the steps and actors that make Afghanistan a peaceful and sustainable state²². Pakistan cherished Afghanistan reconstructions due to own concerns. Though Pakistan cannot play as an important role like other regional countries but still it significant actor. Pakistan also is accused by the USA as opposing Afghanistan reconstruction which hold no water. Pakistan opposes drone attacks due to a number of factors.

One thing is clear that political leadership is more opposed to military leadership; they consider drone attacks within Pakistan to be tantamount to violating the sovereignty of the independent state. Osama's performance has raised many questions in Pakistan and in the international community. It raised the question of Pakistan's role as a troubled state and exposed the American and Western guilt for making a double whammy in the war. The USA also accuse of Pakistan having led to the duplicitous or double dealing in the war which is viewed by most as its intelligence failure.

Conclusions

Global history is full of wars, conflicts and crises but at the same time the history of International relations has also witnesses the agreements, alliances, treaties and cooperation among states before and post any conflict. Talks and dialogues are the cooperative aspect of international politics that resolves the issues through peaceful, means. The US being a super power has a huge experience of wars and conflicts since 1940 to the last stage of the Cold War in 1980s but as a result they come up with dialogue to the enemy party to settle the dispute. Post-Cold War the US has dominated global politics politically, economically, militarily and technologically emerged the sole super power by defeating the USSR. The American came to Afghanistan to punish

Al-Qaeda backed Ṭālibān as holding responsible for the 9/11 2001, attacks on US.

The US presence has a lot of questions for the regional powers surrounding Afghanistan and feel surprise and state of paradox. The US has a clear strategy to enter to the graveyard of empires post attack, introduction of drone's technology in and out from Afghanistan. By understanding their strategy, there are a lot of uncertainty about their objectives in Afghanistan. Like other conflicts and wars, the US war on Terror in Afghanistan has also compelled the American to come up with a peaceful resolution to the Afghan problem. Washington initiated talk with Ṭālibān in December 2001 but no one is sure about their objectives of dialogue as to what extent it was part of the strategy or they were sincere. Since 2001, till date the uses dialogues with Ṭālibān as strategy because they were not ready to full withdrawal from Afghanistan. The Obama and Trump administration in their election campaign promised the American public of full and peaceful evacuation from Afghanistan but none of them come up with completion of their promise.

There are many reasons that can be counted to claim that the US administration has no intention to take dialogue seriously with Ṭālibān. Firstly, it was too immature in December, 2001 to start talks as the picture in Afghanistan peace was not clear. Secondly, Washington always adopted the strategy of differentiating good and bad Ṭālibān. Thirdly, the US has never provided full authority to any of the actor who were talking on behalf of the US. Fourthly, American always uses divers' actor to talk with Ṭālibān and changed their players for acting the card of dialogue. Lastly, all the different factors including, Pakistan Saudi Arabia, Germany, NATO, UAE, Qatar and the Afghan Government has their own interests to pursue rather to pursue the US objectives. In international relations one can change the friend or enemy but one can't change the neighbor and Pakistan has the same case when the US came to Afghanistan and posed threat to its existence also.

After US attack on Iraq in March 2003, most of the Ṭālibān and terrorist got an opportunity to cross the Pak-Afghan border and started a new phase of War on terror in Pakistan that heavily damaged Pakistan politically, militarily, socially, economically and psychologically. Islamabad always play its due role to deter and contain war to Afghanistan but the US has their own calculation to follow. Obama administration blamed Pakistan for its double game to openly supporting US and secretly providing weapons to Ṭālibān but during Trump administration it was clear that Ṭālibān is purely indigenous

organization and belongs to Afghanistan. The current PTI government in Pakistan under Khan Leadership has fully supported the US and tried to bring Ṭālibān to table with US but since 2001 till date every time it was the US administration to block the talks with Ṭālibān.

References

- 1 Ahmad, Qazi Shakil. 2002. "Reconstruction of Afghanistan: Problems and Prospects." Pakistan Institute of International Affairs 31-54
- 2 Bagai, Mithila. 2014. "Challenges In Afghanistan." The Journal of International Issues 108-123
- 3 Barfield, Thomas J. 2004. "Problems in Establishing Legitimacy in Afghanistan." Iranian Studies 263-293.
- 4 Barnett R. Rubin , Andrea Armstrong. 2003. "Regional Issues in the Reconstruction of Afghanistan." World Policy Journal 31-40
- 5 Mahapatra, Chintamani. 1997. "The Afghan Turmoil: Problems and Prospects." India International Centre Quarterly 131-143.
- 6 Paris, Roland. 2013. "Review: Afghanistan: What Went Wrong?" American Political Science Association 538-548.
- 7 Jones, Seth G. 2008. "The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad." The MIT Press 7-40.
- 8 Galád, Adriana Zobrist. 2012. "The Challenges and Role of Structures in the Reconstruction of Afghanistan." Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes 5-36.
- 9 Cheema, Pervaiz Iqbal. 1988. "Impact of the Afghan War on Pakistan." Pakistan Institute of International Affairs 23-45.
- 10 Alex Thier and Scott Worden. 2017. "Political Stability in Afghanistan: A 2020 Vision and Roadmap." US Institute of Peace
- 11 Akhtar, Nasreen. 2008. " Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the Ṭālibān." International Journal on World Peace 49-73
- 12 Ayaz Wazir, et al. 2015. "Symposium: Developments in Afghanistan: Implications for Pakistan and the Region." Policy Perspectives 109–125.
- 13 Jarvenpaa, Minna. 2011. "Making Peace in Afghanistan: The Missing Political Strategy." US Institute of Peace.
- 14 Neumann, Ronald E. 2014. "Bringing the Ṭālibān to the Table: Developing a Framework for Peace in a Country That Has Only Known War." Georgetown Journal of International Affairs 67-74.
- 15 Castillo, Graciana del. 2010. "Peace Through Reconstruction: An Effective Strategy for Afghanistan." The Brown Journal of World Affairs 195-211.

- 16 Symposium: Developments in Afghanistan: Implications for Pakistan and the Region." Policy Perspectives 109–125.
- 17 Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the Ṭālibān, ppg49-73
- 18 Ibid
- 19 Impact of the Afghan War On Pakistan, ppg 23-45.
- 20 Peace Through Reconstruction: An Effective Strategy for Afghanistan, ppg 198-211
- 21 Political Stability in Afghanistan: A 2020 Vision and Roadmap." US Institute of Peace
- 22 Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the Ṭālibān, ppg49-73