



PIPS

## The US President's New Strategy to Deal with Global Terrorism and Case of Pakistani Tribal Region

Muhammad Amir Rana

### Pak-US Engagement Rules in War on Terror

- After 9/11, Pakistan occupied central place in United States' foreign policy. Given the country's proximity to Afghanistan, the US sought Pakistan's support in its global war against Terrorism.
- Pakistan deployed its 120,000 troops first time in the history on its western borders to capture and kill the terrorists.
- Provided logistic (air, sea and land) and intelligence facilities to the US to supply critical fuel, vehicles and aircrafts to support coalition troops in Afghanistan, and to target the terrorists. In return Pakistan got more than US\$ 10 billion aid mainly for military purposes.

(continued)

## Pak-US Engagement Rules .....

- A tripartite military forum was formed in 2002 to enhance the cooperation between allies to defeat the terrorists.

### Role of Pakistan

- Pakistan arrested 1,250 Al-Qaeda suspects and killed more than 200, launched 12 major military operations against Taliban in its territory and killed more than 3,000 and arrested more than 2,000 including Afghan Taliban.
- Pakistan suffered from 1,750 troops' casualties, which is two times higher than total casualties suffered by coalition forces of 41 countries in Afghanistan.
- 650 terrorist attacks including 113 suicide attacks which killed about 5,000 people including civilians, paramilitary and police personnel.

## Failure of the Strategy

- The US strategy was based on 'War' as primary response to what they understood new global dangers, and lacked a large conceptual framework. The strategy revolved around 'pre-emptive strike' and 'the US internal security centric' approaches.
- It ignored or did not prioritize the domestic/ regional implications and effects, due to which:
  1. Taliban reorganized their movement and strengthened their alliance with Al-Qaeda. They succeeded to establish 'operational zone' across the border between Afghanistan & Pakistan.
  2. Governance, security and development challenges in Afghanistan became more complex. Drug trafficking emerged as new challenge.

(Continued)

## Failure of the Strategy

3. The mushroom growth of Taliban groups in Pakistan emerged as a bigger security threat and Talibanization phenomenon gripped not only the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) but also adjacent settled districts.
4. Mistrust between the coalition partners prevailed and increased.
5. The US-Pak diplomatic ties became more coercive (demonstrative denial) and newly elected democratic set up in Pakistan found itself in an inherited crisis.

## Finding the Solution: Evolution of Approaches

### Collective Response

- The approach was floated by Pakistan based on understanding of each other's political and social systems, cultures and values, and strategic interests.
- The approach was derived from the Iraq Study Group (ISG) report based on the regional initiative concept also conceived as “new diplomatic offensive” to engage all local, regional and international stakeholders, who have interest in Iraq.
- Now this approach is also being suggested for Afghanistan to build genuine consensus on the goal of achieving Afghan stability by addressing the legitimate sources of Pakistan's insecurity, along with India, China, Russia, and Iran would be brought into the negotiations to provide the necessary assurances.

(Continued)

## Evolution of Approaches...

### Two +Six Formula

- The 2+6 group was set up in 1997 and had been effective until 2001. It drafted proposals on settling the political crisis in Afghanistan under UN auspices and held a meeting of the warring sides in Tashkent in July 1999, which adopted the declaration on the guidelines for settling the conflict.
- Uzbek President Islam Karimov had put forward the approach again while adding NATO to the 2+6 group on peace and stability in Afghanistan, held between the countries bordering on it - Iran, China, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, plus the United States and Russia, as guarantors.
- A trilateral commission comprising Afghanistan, Pakistan and ISAF representatives is already in function for this purpose. Why were not set up similar commissions with other members of the 2+6 group?

(Continued)

## Evolution of Approaches...

### Grand Bargain

- The notion of a "grand bargain" was first used in connection with Iran in which it was advocated that Washington should provide security guarantees to Iran, normalize bilateral ties, and develop a cooperative approach to regional security - including Iraq and Afghanistan.
- The notion has recently been raised in connection with Afghanistan and Pakistan. The newly appointed CENTCOM chief **Gen. David Petraeus** is the buyer of this idea, who developed the new U.S. **counterinsurgency doctrine**, which served him well in Iraq and now, reports suggest, he is blending this approach with his own doctrine. (Continued)

## Evolution of Approaches...

- These approaches stress upon the need to take regional initiative to resolve the terrorism issue.
- When French President Nicolas Sarzoky suggested to differentiate between global terrorists and local insurgents groups, or when we see Saudi efforts to detach Taliban from Al-Qaeda, these approaches are moving in the same direction i.e. regional initiative.
- Newly elected American President, Barack Obama, was also referring to more extended regional approach to address the issue when he stated that resolution of Kashmir issue is vital to enhance Pakistan capabilities to fight terrorists.

## The Local Approach

- To make the regional approaches more comprehensive, there is need to evolve local approaches in line with the major regional strategy.
- Pakistan and Afghanistan can develop national strategies according to the ground realities. The response should come to:
  1. Ideological Levels
  2. Education, Media & Cultural Front
  3. Legislation Front
  4. National Consensus
- Terrorist combat strategies should be formed according to the local political circumstances and must regard the cultural & religious values.
- There is need to prioritize the threat levels:
  1. Area to area
  2. Tribe to tribe

(Continued)

## The Local Approach....

3. Group to group
4. Leader to leader
  - Grand bargain approach could be localized.
  - There is need to make 'local Jirga' more effective.
  - At regional level 2+6 group can be re-activated and expanded with consent of the all regional and international stakeholders.
  - All leading stakeholders should protect each other's strategic interests.

**Thank You**

