



An Analysis of Pakistan's Role in US Dialogue with Taliban



Page: 87 – 96

Vol. V, No. I (Summer 2020)

Ijaz Khalid *

Hina Malik †

Aneela Akbar ‡

Abstract

The paper analysis the US talks with the Taliban since they attacked Afghanistan and eliminated Al-Qaeda in October 2001. The piece of study highlights the role-played Islamabad in patching up both Taliban 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 the Taliban 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 have their own interests to pursue rather than achieving US interests. Additionally, Washington never gave a free hand to any one of the actors to hold talks with the Taliban. These factors are responsible for blocking the way of peace in the graveyard of Empires.

Key Words: Talks, USA, Taliban, 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 the 1970s. To buttress their strategic position and quench their thirst for geo-stratagems, major powers invaded time and again to dominate the Afghan people for their own interests. The most important was the USSR invasion in 1979 that led to the collapse of the soviets but heavily damaged the political system and economic clout, and its social fabrics (Rubin, 2013). Though Afghanistan proved to be a real graveyard for the USSR, its ghost lived on and haunted Afghanistan in the time to come (Ahmad, 2002).

Following the USSR exit, Afghanistan was thrown into political turmoil under the tug of war among the Mujahedeen groups. From the ashes of this turmoil emerged a new force on the political horizon of Afghanistan, known as the "Afghan Taliban." With their conservative interpretation of Islam, they were blamed for having banned every kind of conceivable entertainment for Afghanistan people. The Taliban took several steps, which infuriated 12 Associate international community, which ultimately led to its downfall post 9/11 2001 attacks. Though Taliban 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 Taliban (BAGAI, 2014). Mullah Omar has reorganized the Taliban 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 son (Haqqani Network) (Barfield, 2004). The attacks began in the Afghanistan Army in 2003 (Barnett R. Rubin , Andrea Armstrong, 2003). Interviews followed in October 2003 with the well-known Taliban; the Americans actually wanted to soften the Taliban

* Demonstrator, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan.
Email: ijazawkum@gmail.com

† Demonstrator, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan.

‡ Demonstrator, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan.

movement by donating individual troops to the Taliban to donate and would be part of Afghanistan_(MAHAPATRA, 1997).



Sources: Encyclopaedia Britannica, September 2019, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Afghanistan>

Dialogue in Context

The experience of Pakistan itself evinces the fact that it began a peace venture with the Pakistan Taliban owing to the threat from security threat the former poses. These were undertaken in 2004 (Paris, 2013). 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 Taliban 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 Taliban after US officials met with Taliban representatives in Munich, at which point German officials and the Qatari royal family held secret talks with the Taliban.

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. A 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 the Taliban to invade Afghanistan. Pakistan has played a key role in the formation of Taliban factions in Afghanistan and in the fight against Afghanistan and the invasion of the Soviet Union. Pakistan conducts peace talks between Afghanistan and the Taliban, and between the Taliban and the USA where Pakistani government institutions, including Inter-Services Intelligence and military bases (Jones, 2008).

Osama's assassination has also created a crisis for large Pakistani Armed Forces, policymakers 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-Qaeda and the Taliban. 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 talks (Galád, 2012).

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 Taliban was called off. For that reason, a German official in July 2005 met with the Taliban, the CIA and the MI6 also secretly went to the Taliban but all failed. And the first suicide bombings erupted on the face of Afghanistan in 2006 through the network of Dadullah (A Taliban Commander). And until 2007, large sections such as Zabul, Helmand, Uruzgan and Kandahar came under the control of the Taliban (Cheema 1988). In 2007, with the help of Saudi Arabia, talks were held between the Afghan government and the Taliban involving Qayyum (Karzai's brother) on the Afghan government side and Wakil Ahmad Mutawakkil and Mullah Abdul Salaam Zaeef on the Taliban side, but the talks also showed disappointment. The Taliban were not ready to recognize Karzai's government in any way.

In November 2008, Taliban 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 Taliban and force them to surrender. In August 2009, Hillary Clinton, the US 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, US policy remained the same (Alex Thier and Scott Worden, 2017). There were differences of opinion between the US 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 Taliban 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 Taliban, but the rebellion intensified, and the Taliban again rejected everything (Akhtar, 2008). In 2011, US policy heading towards Afghanistan turned slightly, and there was a space for dialogue.

The US directly participated in the negotiations and negotiated a high-level Taliban order in May 2011, Germany. The US also recognizes that Pakistan is a key player in the negotiations and could play a very important role. The US 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 US 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 the insurgency. The US 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 Taliban were (Ayaz Wazir, et al., 2015). A Recapitulation from 2001 to 2019 President Donald Trump has announced the termination of protracted peace talks with the Taliban. 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 a 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 decades (Jarvenpaa, 2011). The new rounds of their suffering began and, worse, confounded with the invasion of the

country in October 2001 in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. Within months, the USA and its international and domestic coalition toppled the government of the Taliban. But credible reports and situation on the ground contradict the long-held view of the USA that the Taliban have been vanquished. Rather the Afghanistan Taliban have been a more powerful entity to be reckoned with. The situation points towards the persistence of the clout of the Taliban in Afghanistan (Neumann, 2014). According to reports, still a sizeable territory under the control of the Taliban. Taliban also venture out, time and again, to attack the coalition forces.

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

Bonn Conference, Germany (2001)

Bonn conference is the first step of its kind to arrive at the solution to Afghanistan perennial problems. The existing political contours of Afghanistan has been shaped by no other conferences in such a dramatic manner than the one held in Bonn in 2001. The conference came on the heel of US victory over the Taliban and the collapse of their government almost 19 years back. Many nations, including Germany, participated in these peace talks. As per the findings of the 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 government. (Castillo, 2010).

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, the Afghan delegation participated, but there was no representation of any kind from the Taliban. In the conference, it was also decided that an interim government under Hamid Karzai is to be set up for six months. It was the first interim government of its kind, which was recognized internationally. Though the interim government was installed, the Taliban never recognized it and insisted relentlessly on setting up an “Islamic government” (Fields, 2011). 2)

Second Bonn Conference, Germany (2011)

Until 2011 no such conference, after the one held in 2001, was held in which international stakeholders could participate in discussing and finding out a 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 spelt 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 start. (Ayaz Wazir, et al., 2015). 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 delegations 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 individual. (Akhtar, 2008).

Qatar Dialogue

The opening of the Qatar office enlivened the hope that the Taliban, onward, would stretch out an olive branch and turn to negotiate the table. The USA had, also then, insinuated kick-starting the peace talks. The then US president, Barack Obama, had said in the conference in Berlin that

he saw no dialogue with the Afghan Taliban in the foreseeable future unless the withdrawal of foreign troops was discussed (Castillo, 2010). On the other hand, the opening of political office by the Afghan Taliban sent a wave of despondency in Afghanistan. That was the reason Hamid Karzai gave up a dialogue of the USA troops presence in Afghanistan with the USA (Cheema 1988).

Moscow Conference (2019)

After the lapse of many years, Afghanistan political elites and the representative of the Afghan Taliban thronged Moscow, the capital of Russia, for peace talks in February 2019. These talks emphasized ending the 18 years longest war in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of foreign troop from Afghanistan. Hamid Karzai, who earlier had participated in the 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 talks (Castillo, 2010). 4)

New Round of Talks

Earlier in September 2018, the USA appointed Mr Zalmi Khalid Zad as the special representative of the USA to Afghanistan. With his appointment, he initiated frantic forays with the American and afghan Taliban 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 in the Afghan Taliban agreeing to peace talks with the USA (Alex Thier and Scott Worden, 2017).

Earlier round of the talks occurred at 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 the Taliban recent attacks on 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 (Khalid C. D., 2017). 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 Taliban (Kaura, 2017). On the other hand, the Afghan Taliban also has exhibited their optimism of starting the peace talks. In all these dialogues that were underway for Afghanistan, reconciliation had the support of Pakistan. The support Pakistan extended was meant to ensure regional tranquillity and stability in Afghanistan.

Many stakeholders have recognized Pakistan critical support. Very recently, the president of the USA, Donald Trump, said in unequivocal terms that Pakistan was instrumental in bringing the Afghan Taliban to negotiating table. It, therefore, could be said without a speck of doubt that Pakistan made the peace talks a radical reality (Kaura, 2017). Challenges to Afghanistan peace process what happens next in Afghanistan will depend considerably on the negotiation process currently underway to help resolve Afghanistan's crises. Hapless Afghanistan's people have suffered incessantly due to the internecine civil war and at the hands of foreign players, who invaded Afghanistan time and again. The latest rounds of talks are a silver lining for Afghanistan and the people of Afghanistan. But before these peace process could be affected, there lie various challenges, which are stumbling blocks in the way of successful, durable and lasting peace in Afghanistan (Ayman, 2013).

The first challenge emanates from the people of Afghanistan themselves. The people of Afghanistan never united after the 1980s 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 a lack of unity (Khalid H. U., 2018). This lack of unity was

fully exploited by the outside countries to get a 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 Taliban. The drugs trade in Afghanistan is thriving at full throttle, which is the major source of income for the Taliban.

The assassination of various prominent personalities in the recent past exhibit how the Taliban have become a potentially dangerous and vociferous force to be reckoned with. Similarly, there are diverse approaches to resolve the Afghanistan crises. These peace processes are separately led by the USA and Russia. The USA is involved in protracted efforts to ensure a safe exit from Afghanistan. The USA has appointed Zalmi Khalilzad as a 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 the 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 Russia, is on a collision course with that of the USA. The current diverse approaches towards the Afghanistan crisis points towards the deep hostility still exist in both countries. Russia, last month in November, convened a conference aimed to thrash out the solution of the Afghanistan crisis, to which the USA was not invited.

More than anything else, the USA and Russia must recognize the centrality of the Afghanistan issue and help it solve it with a unified approach, taking the best interests of Afghanistan. But, the outcome of the Afghanistan peace process does not depend only on the role of the USA and Russia. Other regional countries like Pakistan, India, Iran and China must play their role to help resolve the issue in an amicable manner (Behuria, 2019). 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 for 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 the past, both countries engaged in blame-game and mud-slinging, but the recent peace overtures between the two countries are a positive development, which will go a long to help pacify the trust deficit that exists on both sides (Behuria, 2019). India, along with Pakistan, also can play a complementary role in the Afghanistan peace process. In a 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 the 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 their 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 (Khan, 2017). 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 "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 an impartial manner without expecting any strategic gains in Afghanistan from the peace deal. The spectre of strategic gains or losses has played havoc with the 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 (Behuria, 2019).

Pakistan Role in Talks

In the aftermath of a 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 Taliban and the Afghan government, assuming that Pakistan has close ties to the Taliban, so Pakistan's role will help in negotiations with the Taliban. (Ashley J. Tellis, 2009).



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 Taliban negotiations in 2010 (Khalid M. S., 2016).¹ 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 (Ashley J. Tellis, 2009). The Peace talks with the Taliban have largely failed due to the deception of American decision-makers and policymakers of the Afghan government. Peace talks with the Taliban 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 Taliban were also unwilling to participate in peace talks which is an important factor in failure (Ayman, 2013). 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 (Hassan MI, 2017). 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 state (Akhtar, 2008). Pakistan cherished Afghanistan reconstructions due to its own concerns. However, Pakistan cannot play an important role like other regional countries but still a significant actor. Pakistan also is accused by the USA as opposing Afghanistan reconstruction, which holds 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 (Behuria, 2019). 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 Pakistan has led to duplicitous or double-dealing in the war, which is viewed by most as its intelligence failure.

Conclusion

Global history is full of wars, conflicts and crises, but at the same time, the history of International relations has also witnessed 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 is a superpower, has a huge experience of wars and conflicts from 1940 to the last stage of the Cold War in the 1980s, but as a result, they come up with dialogue with the enemy party to settle the dispute. Post-Cold War, the US has dominated global politics politically, economically, militarily and technologically emerged the sole superpower by defeating the USSR. The American came to Afghanistan to punish Al-Qaeda backed Taliban is holding responsible for the 9/11 2001 attacks on the US.

The US presence has a lot of questions for the regional powers surrounding Afghanistan and feels surprised and a state of paradox. The US has a clear strategy to enter the graveyard of empires post-attack, the introduction of drone's technology in and outs from Afghanistan. By understanding their strategy, there is 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 talks with the Taliban 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, to date, they use dialogues with the Taliban as a 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 the 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 the Taliban. 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 Taliban. Thirdly, the US has never provided full authority to any of the actors who were talking on behalf of the US. Fourthly, American always uses divers' actor to talk with the Taliban 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, have their own interests to pursue rather than 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 a threat to its existence also.

After the US attack on Iraq in March 2003, most of the Taliban and terrorist got an opportunity to cross the Pak-Afghan border and started a new phase of the war on terror in Pakistan that heavily damaged Pakistan politically, militarily, socially economically and psychologically. Islamabad always plays 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 the US and secretly providing weapons to the Taliban, but during the Trump administration, it was clear that the Taliban is a 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 the Taliban to the table with the US, but since 2001 till date, every time it was the US administration to block the talks with the Taliban.

References

- Alex T. & Scott W. (2017). "Political Stability in Afghanistan: A 2020 Vision and Roadmap." US Institute of Peace.
- BAGAI, M. (2014). "Challenges in Afghanistan." *The Journal of International Issues* 108-123.
- Barfield, T. J. (2004). "Problems in Establishing Legitimacy in Afghanistan." *Iranian Studies* 263-293.
- Barnett R., & Armstrong, A. (2003). "Regional Issues in the Reconstruction of Afghanistan." *World Policy Journal* 31-40.
- Castillo, G. d. (2010). "Peace Through Reconstruction: An Effective Strategy for Afghanistan." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 195-211.
- Galád, A. Z. (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.
- Iqbal, C. P. (1988). "IMPACT OF THE AFGHAN WAR ON PAKISTAN." *Pakistan Institute of International Affairs* 23-45.
- Jarvenpaa, M. (2011). "Making Peace in Afghanistan: The Missing Political Strategy." *US Institute of Peace*.
- Jones, S. G. (2008). "The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad." *The MIT Press* 7-40.
- Mahapatra, C. (1997). "The Afghan Turmoil: Problems and Prospects." *India International Centre Quarterly* 131-143.
- Nasreen, A. (2008). "Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the Taliban." *International Journal on World Peace* 49-73.
- Neumann, R. E. (2014). "Bringing the Taliban to the Table: Developing a Framework for Peace in a Country That Has Only Known War." *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 67-74.
- Paris, R. (2013). "Review: Afghanistan: What Went Wrong?" *American Political Science Association* 538-548.
- Shakil, A. Q. (2002). "Reconstruction of Afghanistan: Problems and Prospects." *Pakistan Institute of International Affairs* 31-54.
- Wazir, A. et al. (2015). "Symposium: Developments in Afghanistan: Implications for Pakistan and the Region." *Policy Perspectives* 109-125.