

S. HRG. 106-868

**THE TALIBAN: ENGAGEMENT OR  
CONFRONTATION?**

---

---

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**  
ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

—————  
JULY 20, 2000  
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

00-000 CC

WASHINGTON : 2001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana

CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska

GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon

ROD GRAMS, Minnesota

SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas

CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming

JOHN ASHCROFT, Missouri

BILL FRIST, Tennessee

LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin

PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota

BARBARA BOXER, California

ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey

STEPHEN E. BIEGUN, *Staff Director*

EDWIN K. HALL, *Minority Staff Director*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Inderfurth, Hon. Karl F., Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, Department of State, Washington, DC .....	3
Prepared statement .....	8
Response to additional question from Senator Boxer .....	18
Islamic State of Afghanistan (ISA) in Washington, DC, statement submitted for the record .....	42
Karzai, Hamid, Afghan tribal leader, Glenwood, MD .....	29
Prepared statement .....	33
Shorish-Shamley, Dr. Zieba, executive director, Women's Alliance for Peace and Human Rights in Afghanistan, Washington, DC .....	37
Prepared statement .....	39
Tomsen, Hon. Peter, professor of International Studies and Programs, Univer- sity of Nebraska, Omaha, NE .....	20
Prepared statement .....	25



## THE TALIBAN: ENGAGEMENT OR CONFRONTATION?

THURSDAY, JULY 20, 2000

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Sam Brownback presiding.

Present: Senators Brownback and Boxer.

Senator BROWNBACk. The hearing will come to order. Thank you all for joining us today. Thank you, very much, Senator Boxer, for being with us as well. Secretary Inderfurth, thank you as well for returning to testify before the committee. We are glad to have you here for yet another review on Afghanistan.

I wish I could say I thought that there had been some movement in U.S. policy. In fact, though it does not appear as if there has been much. I continue to see mostly just the same, perhaps a worse situation even taking place in Afghanistan.

The Taliban are still abusing women. An American woman had been in Afghanistan for decades was just deported for being a spy. They still in Afghanistan host Osama bin Laden. Afghanistan is still permitting the operation of terrorist training camps. They are still exporting heroin. They are still promoting Islamic fundamentalism into Pakistan. Afghanistan is not just a state of concern. It is a rogue plain and simple.

Clearly, whatever policy this administration has toward Afghanistan, it is not working. The question is what will work. After Secretary Inderfurth speaks, we will have several private witnesses, one of whom is in close contact with the opposition in Afghanistan. I wonder whether we should not be doing more to help them and step up our efforts against the Taliban. I am also interested in hearing viable ideas about how to deal with the threat to the United States and our allies from all over the world.

It is a short opening statement because mostly I have questions this time around Secretary Inderfurth and for our private witnesses as well. It does not appear as if the situation is changing for the better in Afghanistan, for the people there. It does not appear as if it is improving for us on the terrorism scale. And I want to hear your thoughts of what else we can or should do or what is being contemplated to be done by the administration and also considering that from the other witnesses that we have.

The center of terrorism from around the world that we are very concerned about has shifted into Afghanistan and the regions there

around it. So it has become more and more of an interest in U.S. policy. I would hope at least we would increase our focus, provide special attention to it within the State Department and by our administration, an intensive focus of what we need to be doing in Afghanistan to deal with this terrorism threat and also what it is doing to its own people.

With that, we will have a vote in a little while. But I want to proceed as long as we can. And I would go to Senator Boxer for her opening statement at this time. Senator Boxer, thank you for joining us.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, so much for holding this important hearing on the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, a real thank you because of your leadership on this issue which could really get lost.

Last year, we joined together in support of Senate Resolution 68 which expressed the sense of the Senate that the United States not recognize any Taliban led government until the rights of women are respected. We passed this resolution last year and I again want to thank you for your amazing help on that resolution.

The Taliban is a militia group that controls between 85 to 90 percent of Afghanistan. People living under the rule are subjected to an extreme interpretation of Islam practiced nowhere else in the world. It is especially repressive on women living in Afghanistan. Under Taliban rule, women and girls in Afghanistan are denied even the most basic human rights. They cannot work outside the home or attend school or even wear shoes that make noise when they walk. Women who are in their homes are not allowed to be seen from the street. And houses with female occupants must have their windows painted over. Parents cannot take their little girls to be treated by male doctors.

Women under Taliban control are forced to wear a garment called the Burka. And I have cleared with you having one of my staffers who has agreed to show what women have to wear in Afghanistan. I think it is important to show that she cannot even see outside this. She can hardly breathe outside this. There is only a tiny opening to see and breathe through. And when we got one of these Burkas from the Feminist Majority who made it available to us, I had the women in my office—and I myself put this on and it was so claustrophobic that they could barely do it. And I want to thank my staffer for doing this.

I want to say that if women choose to wear this Burka for religious reasons, that should be their right. But the requirement that women wear a Burka is a clear violation of human rights. And the rules surrounding the requirement are frightening. Women found in public who are not wearing a Burka are beaten by Taliban militia men. If they wear a Burka and their ankles are showing, they are beaten as well.

Poor women who cannot afford a Burka are forced to stay at home preventing them from receiving medical care. I believe human rights abuses such as these, and I know we are in full agreement, are horrific and have no place in today's world. The title of today's hearing is "The Taliban: Engagement or Confrontation?"

And I have to say that I—and I believe you, Mr. Chairman—we are not convinced that a policy of normalized engagement should be in place while these gross violations of human rights exist. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, again. I really think we make a good team on this. Clearly, when we get together on something, it is a pretty broad range of colleagues, I think, will follow our leads. So I want to thank you so much again for your leadership.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you for yours on this. It has brought the resolution to the forefront that got it passed in the Senate. And that you are showing this example of suffocation of women taking place in Afghanistan by the Taliban. And, no. We should not be engaged in normalized relations with a country that is not just a country of concern. It is a rogue nation with a rogue set of policies. And I want to investigation here today what we can do to press this regime to get some sort of normalized flow on a broad set of issues.

Secretary Inderfurth, thank you again for being here and we look forward to your statement. And we will have some questions for you afterwards.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE KARL F. INDERFURTH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. INDERFURTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Boxer. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to speak with you about the topics you have chosen for today's hearing on Afghanistan, namely the Taliban engagement or confrontation.

It is, as I think my testimony will make very clear, an important, timely and difficult subject. I also look forward to hearing your views on the direction of U.S. policy. I too am disappointed that we have not been able to make more progress in dealing with the Taliban. And I hope that we can work on this together.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Boxer, the situation in Afghanistan continues to cause grave concern to the international community and great suffering to that country's own population. Recently, Afghanistan was described in Newsweek as a country in collapse. I cannot dispute that characterization. Some of this is the legacy of Afghanistan's two decades of war, first against the Soviet occupation, then against each other. And yet, a bitter irony is that today many of the country's problems are actually aggravated by its own would be rulers, the Taliban.

One recent telling example is the case of Mary MacMakin, who you referred to earlier, Mr. Chairman, a U.S. citizen who has long lived in Afghanistan and has devoted nearly four decades of humanitarian service to its people only to be detained by the Taliban and then expelled from the country this very month. We hope that Ms. MacMakin will be able to return to Afghanistan, if she so wishes, to continue her vital and important work.

Unfortunately, however, the Taliban's overall record does not inspire much confidence in this or any other regard. When they swept to power from Kandahar to Kabul in late 1996, they seemed to have considerable popular acceptance based on an understandable disgust with protracted civil war and a simple desire for personal security.

Since then, while the Taliban have extended their control to cover approximately 85 percent of Afghanistan, their popularity and legitimacy now appear to be in decline. They have failed to end the civil war. And they have failed to offer the Afghan people a better life. Instead, the Taliban continue to seek a military victory over their opponents in northern Afghanistan, but that objective continues to elude their grasp.

The Taliban's two offensives north of Kabul earlier this month led to the heaviest fighting of the year and ended quickly with heavy Taliban casualties and no change in the front lines. We believe the Taliban now have little prospect of completing their goal of gaining control over the 15 percent of the country held by the opposition. In short, Mr. Chairman, we believe the Taliban have reached their high water mark.

Let me cite a few of the latest indicators of erosion and Taliban authority and effectiveness, all occurring during the past several months.

In March, Ismail Khan, the anti-Taliban former Governor of Herat, escaped from a Kandahar prison where he had been held since 1997.

In April, the Taliban appointed Governor of Kunduz province was assassinated. More recently, we have reports of sabotage at Kabul Airport. We also hear of Taliban difficulty conscripting new recruits for this year's spring and summer offensives due to serious local resistance and low morale. There are equipment shortages for the Taliban war machine and we believe serious splits within the Taliban movement itself.

It is increasingly clear that many Afghans are giving up whatever hope they had for Taliban rule. Many would surely prefer a more inclusive, more effective, more tolerant and perhaps above all more peacefully inclined government if that option were to become available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the U.S. response? I must emphasize that, contrary to some false and damaging allegations, the United States does not now support and has never supported the Taliban. When they took over the capital of Kabul in 1996, we told them we would look at what they did, and react accordingly.

Well, what they have done, in a word, is horrendous. They have chosen to prolong their country's agonizing civil war, while oppressing its numerous ethnic and religious minorities. They have trampled on the human rights of all Afghans, especially women and girls. They have condoned and indeed profited from the deadly trade in narcotics. And they have condoned that other scourge of civilized society, namely terrorism, by providing among other things safe haven for Osama bin Laden and his network.

This is the murderer directly responsible for the loss of a dozen American and hundreds of other innocent lives in the embassy bombings 2 years ago. We believe Osama bin Laden continues to this day to plan further acts of international terrorism.

We have consistently and categorically opposed all of these Taliban policies. This is precisely the message that we have delivered directly to the Taliban in the course of our contacts with them. I personally have met with Taliban officials in Kabul, Islamabad, New York and Washington. I regret to report that they seem deter-



mined to ignore our message. If anything the Taliban have moved even further in the wrong direction. On terrorism, not only have they refused to hand over Osama bin Laden as called for by the U.N. Security Council, but they have aided and abetted other terrorists worldwide, including violent groups in Chechnya and Central Asia.

I want to make one thing very clear. The Taliban, and some of their supporters, continue to misrepresent our campaign against terrorism as an attack against Islam. Nothing could be further from the truth. We do not oppose Islam. We respect and honor Islam. We do not oppose those who practice their faith in peace. We do not oppose those who have legitimate political concerns they want redressed. But we do oppose those who commit or condone criminal acts, especially those who commit murder and inflict grievous injury against civilians in the name of any ideology, religion or cause.

On human rights, though we have publicly recognized occasional local improvements, the central authorities in Kabul have regressed: witness the fate of Mary MacMakin that I referred to earlier, or the new edict forbidding females from working even in international humanitarian activities.

On narcotics, the Taliban have allowed Afghanistan to acquire, almost overnight, the distinction of the world's largest producer of illicit opium, thereby contributing to the destruction of countless additional lives every year.

To borrow an expression from you, Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan has become a gateway country—a gateway for some of the worst evils of drugs and violence, which daily pass through it enroute to other parts of the globe.

Finally, on the prospects for Afghan peace and reconciliation, the Taliban have not wavered from their commitment to a military solution. They talk of peace, even as they launch new military actions. They agree to exchange prisoners with the Northern Alliance under Islamic auspices, and then renege. Independent political figures and political opponents of the Taliban are shot down, including just a year ago the esteemed tribal leader, Mr. Ahmed Karzai, whose son Hamad is here with us today to carry on his part of the traditional leadership and consensus-building role so sorely needed in Afghanistan today.

Mr. Chairman, my strong criticism of the Taliban should not be read to imply U.S. recognition for the opposition Northern Alliance led by Ahmed Shah Masood. The Alliance does incorporate representatives of many of Afghanistan's minority ethnic populations, and appears to come closer to meeting international standards of human rights.

Nevertheless, accurate information about conditions, including respect for human rights, in the northern areas under its control is scarce. So therefore, we call on all those who are prolonging the needless fighting in Afghanistan to shift their focus instead to bringing peace and a broad-based representative government to the people of Afghanistan.

Now, all of this raises the obvious question. What more can be done to deal with Afghanistan's ongoing tragedy and with the risks it poses to others? While we have worked hard to develop a united

front on Afghanistan with a number of key countries, multilateral diplomacy has had only a limited effect to date. The Six-Plus-Two group, which I discussed with you before, of Afghanistan's neighbors plus the United States and Russia, has been unable to agree on concerted political action. And it is now focusing on the narrower practical issue of counter narcotics cooperation.

Let me discuss our strategy, Mr. Chairman. Today we are perusing a two-prong strategy. First, firm pressure on the Taliban on the issues of greatest concern: terrorism, narcotics, and human rights. On terrorism, President Clinton took the lead last year by issuing an Executive order imposing unilateral sanctions on the Taliban designed to stop them from deriving any revenue or benefit from economic interaction with the United States.

The U.N. Security Council followed up in October, 1999 based on a U.S. sponsored resolution by unanimously adopting Resolution 1267, which puts in place mandatory sanctions against Taliban-controlled assets and international airline flights until Bin Laden is brought to justice. These sanctions I want to stress target only the regime while providing unimpeded humanitarian access for the people of Afghanistan.

In April of this year, the Security Council agreed that further action might be required. We are actively exploring those options which could include imposition of an arms embargo against the Taliban, which we have already put into effect ourselves.

We have also let the Taliban know in no uncertain terms that we will hold them responsible for any terrorist acts undertaken by Bin Laden from Afghanistan. We reserve the right to use military force in self-defense if required.

As we apply such pressure, we have also tried to engage the Taliban in a serious dialog. Some members of the Taliban have told us that they would like to improve their relations with us. They have even taken a few measures to demonstrate a willingness to work with us such as restricting Bin Laden's access to foreign media. But we have seen no indication that the Taliban are ready to take the serious actions on Bin Laden or any other issue that would be necessary for any improvement in our relations.

The second prong of our Afghan strategy is both broader and longer-term: to promote the greatest possible involvement of Afghans in the search for peace in their own country. What is needed, in our view, is a sincere negotiating process among Afghans themselves toward a broad based inclusive government which all the Afghan people, first and foremost, and then the United States and the rest of the international community can accept and which can take up the cause of rebuilding this devastated country. This will require the involvement of a wide spectrum of Afghans inside and outside the country more than just the Taliban and the Northern Alliance.

For this reason, we are encouraged by the efforts of Afghans around the world to contribute to this search for peace in group meetings, in Rome, Cyprus, Bonn, and elsewhere. Many advocate the convening of a Loya Jirga, or Grand Council, of Afghan's leaders to forge a new national accord. This could be a traditional and constructive step toward ending Afghanistan's anguish. It would offer Afghans an alternative vision of their future, authentically

both Muslim and moderate, and one that would promise peace without tyranny. Regrettably, it may be precisely the appeal of this initiative that has led the Taliban, according to new press reports this week, to instigate the arbitrary arrest of Loya Jirga proponents.

For our part, we have been meeting with such alternative Afghan representatives at a senior policy level, and have recently issued a statement of support for their legitimate objectives. In addition, we are providing modest financial support to the Rome-based effort, and diplomatic support for the Italian Government's lead on this issue. We are asking other interested countries for their support as well.

Now, this brings me to a crucial aspect of implementing our two-pronged Afghan strategy I have just outlined: namely, the necessity of cooperation with other countries in the region and beyond. This is not, and cannot be, an attempt to impose some kind of outside power diktat on the proud people of Afghanistan, which history teaches us would be futile.

What we seek is not so much confrontation with the Taliban, as common cause with all the other players who wish to contain and ultimately overcome the threats that the Taliban present. Accordingly, in my written testimony, which I am submitting for the record, Mr. Chairman, I have highlighted some of those players including Russia, India and countries of Central Asia.

Now, this brings me to another country that is important in this regard, namely Pakistan, where the signals on these issues, frankly, are still mixed. Pakistan wants, as does the United States, to see peace and stability in Afghanistan—afterall, it shares the longest common border with that country. We believe the Government of Pakistan also understands that the “Talibanization”—or radicalization—of their country and of the region is something to avoid.

Perhaps the recent incident in which the Taliban forcibly shaved the heads of a visiting Pakistani soccer team as punishment for wearing shorts—while playing soccer—will remind Pakistanis of the true nature of the Taliban once again.

Moreover, Pakistan seeks to build political and economic bridges to Central Asia, and realizes that terrorism and extremism in Afghanistan and South Asia are serious obstacles to such regional cooperation and stability.

Indeed, Pakistan has made known its views that the presence of Osama bin Laden is just such an obstacle. They helped recently to facilitate a meeting between Under Secretary Thomas Pickering and Taliban officials in Islamabad on the U.S. case against Bin Laden. We also understand that Pakistan is quietly urging the Taliban to review some of their ties to terrorists.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, Pakistani officials make the point that they do not control the Taliban. We believe, however, that Pakistan does have considerable influence in Afghanistan. The goal of our continued diplomacy is to urge Pakistan to use every aspect of its influence to convince the Taliban to render Bin Laden to justice and shut down Afghanistan's terrorist networks altogether.

More broadly, we would support a Pakistani initiative to find common ground with Iran and others in working toward a peaceful solution of Afghanistan's civil war. We are pleased that just in the past few days Pakistan Foreign Minister Sattar has met with a delegation from the Rome process and expressed Pakistan's appreciation of the positive role a Loya Jirga could play.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn briefly to humanitarian issues. I know you agree that the Afghan people are bearing the brunt of the continuing conflict in Afghanistan. That is why the United States continues to lead the world in humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people, totaling around \$70 million annually in recent years, rising to a projected \$110 million in view of the extraordinary needs this year. Details are available in a fact sheet which has been attached to my testimony.<sup>1</sup>

Most of this funding, I should add, is channeled through the specialized U.N. affiliated relief and rehabilitation agencies or through American and international NGO's. I should also mention that we take special care in this context to ensure that our aid reaches those most in need, including women.

We must also take into account extraordinary circumstances such as the current disastrous drought in adjusting our levels and types of aid. Our extra \$4 million so far this year in well-targeted and I might add well-publicized, drought relief has been very well received and should generate, we hope, lasting good will—as the photographs I have brought along of Ambassador Milam on the docks of Karachi so vividly suggest.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Boxer, let me conclude by saying that, from both the human and political standpoints, the situation in Afghanistan remains extremely difficult, but not without some hope that conditions may be changing.

As I said earlier, we believe the Taliban has reached its high water mark. This is a regime which by its behavior at home and abroad has isolated itself from almost the entire world, and increasingly from its own people. There is a real sense in which Afghans and the concerned international community want many of the same things: An Afghan Government that is representative, that respects human rights, that rejects rather than embraces narcotic traffickers and terrorists.

I believe our strategy of pressure on the Taliban, support for alternative Afghan voices and concrete cooperation with other countries on these issues can move us closer to that common objective. As we approach it, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Afghanistan can once again become a gateway nation of a different kind—a gateway for people, commerce and cultural exchange between different parts of Asia and the world and the positive sense that we would all desire to see. Thank you, very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Inderfurth follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. KARL F. INDERFURTH

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to speak with you about the topic you have chosen for today's hearing on Afghanistan—"The Taliban: Engagement or Confrontation?" It is, as my testimony will make clear, an important, timely, and difficult subject.

<sup>1</sup> See page 13.

## AFGHAN UPDATE: SIGNS OF CHANGE?

The situation in Afghanistan continues to cause grave concern to the international community, and great suffering to that country's own population. Recently Afghanistan was described in Newsweek as "A Country in Collapse." I cannot dispute that characterization. Some of this is the legacy of the Afghans' two decades of war—first against the Soviet occupation, and then against each other. And yet a bitter irony is that today many of the country's problems are actually aggravated by its own would-be rulers, the Taliban. One recent telling example is the case of Mary MacMakin, a U.S. citizen who has long lived in Afghanistan and has devoted over four decades of humanitarian service to its people—only to be detained by the Taliban and then expelled from the country this very month. We hope that Ms. MacMakin will be able to return to Afghanistan, if she so wishes, to continue her important work.

Unfortunately, however, the Taliban's overall record does not inspire much confidence in this, or any other, regard. When they swept to power from Kandahar to Kabul in late 1996, they seemed to have considerable popular acceptance, based on an understandable disgust with protracted civil war and a simple desire for personal security. Since then, while the Taliban have extended their control to cover approximately 85 percent of Afghanistan, their popularity and legitimacy now appear to be in decline. They have failed to end the civil war, and they have failed to offer the Afghan people a better life. Instead, the Taliban continue to seek a military victory over their opponents in northern Afghanistan, but that objective continues to elude their grasp. The Taliban's two offensives north of Kabul earlier this month led to the heaviest fighting of the year and ended quickly with heavy Taliban casualties and no change in the frontlines. We believe the Taliban now have little prospect of completing their goal of gaining control over the 15 percent of the country held by the opposition. In short, Mr. Chairman, we believe the Taliban have reached their high-water mark.

Let me cite a few of the latest indicators of erosion in Taliban authority and effectiveness, all occurring during the past several months. In March, Ismail Khan, the anti-Taliban former governor of Herat, escaped with two senior aides from a Kandahar prison where he had been held since 1997. In April, the Taliban-appointed governor of Kunduz province was assassinated. More recently, we have reports of sabotage at Kabul airport. We also hear of Taliban difficulty conscripting new recruits for this year's spring and summer offensives, due to serious local resistance and low morale. There are equipment shortages for the Taliban war machine and serious splits within the Taliban movement itself. It is increasingly clear that many Afghans are giving up whatever hope they had for Taliban rule. Many would surely prefer a more inclusive, more effective, more tolerant and perhaps above all more peacefully inclined government, if that option were to become available.

## BACKGROUND OF U.S. POLICY

What has been the U.S. response? I must emphasize that, contrary to some false and damaging allegations, the U.S. does not now support and has never supported the Taliban. When they took over the capital of Kabul in 1996, we told them we would look at what they did, and react accordingly. Well, what they have done, in a word, is horrendous. They have chosen to prolong their country's agonizing civil war, while oppressing its numerous ethnic and religious minorities. They have trampled on the human rights of all Afghans, especially women and girls. They have condoned and indeed profited from the deadly trade in narcotics. And they have condoned that other scourge of civilized society, namely terrorism, by providing among other things safe haven for Usama Bin Laden and his network. This is the murderer directly responsible for the loss of a dozen American and hundreds of other innocent lives in the East Africa embassy bombings two years ago. We believe Bin Laden continues to this day to plan further acts of international terrorism.

We have consistently and categorically opposed all of these Taliban policies. This is precisely the message that we have delivered directly to the Taliban in the course of all our contacts with them. I personally have met with Taliban officials in Kabul, Islamabad, New York and Washington. I regret to report today that they seem determined to ignore our message. If anything, the Taliban have moved even further in the wrong direction. On terrorism, not only have they refused to hand over Bin Laden as called for by the U.N. Security Council, but they have aided and abetted other terrorists worldwide, including violent groups in Chechnya and Central Asia.

I want to make one thing very clear. The Taliban, and some of their supporters, continue to misrepresent our campaign against terrorism as an attack against Islam. Nothing could be further from the truth. We do not oppose Islam. We respect

Islam. We do not oppose those who practice their faith in peace. We do not oppose those who have legitimate political concerns they want redressed. But we do oppose those who commit or condone criminal acts, especially those who commit murder and inflict grievous injury against civilians, in the name of any ideology, religion, or cause.

On human rights, though we have publicly recognized occasional local improvements, the central authorities in Kabul have regressed: witness the fate of Mary MacMakin that I referred to earlier, or the new edict forbidding females from working even in international humanitarian activities. On narcotics, the Taliban have allowed Afghanistan to acquire, almost overnight, the distinction of the world's largest producer of illicit opium, thereby contributing to the destruction of countless additional lives every year. To borrow an expression from you, Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan has become a gateway country—a gateway for some of the worst evils of drugs and violence, which daily pass through it enroute to other parts of the globe.

Finally, on the prospects for Afghan peace and reconciliation, the Taliban have not wavered from their commitment to a military solution. They talk of peace, even as they launch new military actions. They agree to exchange prisoners with the Northern Alliance under Islamic auspices, and then renege. Independent political figures and political opponents of the Taliban are shot down, including just a year ago the esteemed tribal elder Mr. Ahmed Karzai, whose son Hamad is here with us today to carry on his part of the traditional leadership and consensus-building role so sorely needed in Afghanistan today.

Mr. Chairman, my strong criticism of the Taliban should not be read to imply U.S. recognition for the opposition Northern Alliance led by Ahmed Shah Masood. The Alliance incorporates representatives of many of Afghanistan's minority ethnic populations, and appears to come closer to meeting international standards of human rights. Nevertheless, accurate information about conditions, including respect for human rights, in the northern areas under its control is scarce. We call on all those who are prolonging the needless fighting in Afghanistan to shift their focus instead to bringing peace and a broad-based representative government to the people of Afghanistan.

All of this raises the obvious question: What more can be done to deal with Afghanistan's ongoing tragedy, and with the risks it poses to others? While we have worked hard to develop a united front on Afghanistan with a number of key countries, multilateral diplomacy has had only a limited effect to date. The Six-Plus-Two group of Afghanistan's neighbors plus the United States and Russia has been unable to agree on concerted political action, and is now focusing on the narrower practical issue of counter-narcotics cooperation.

The U.N. Secretary General's previous representative on Afghanistan, Lakhdar Brahimi, resigned last year with little to show for his lengthy and tireless efforts, thanks largely to Taliban intransigence and the lack of commitment from external parties to use their influence with the warring factions to bring them to the negotiating table. His successor as of the beginning of this year, Francesc Vendrell, is making an admirable effort to address this acute tangle of problems, but wisely acknowledges the limitations of his mission's mandate and capabilities in light of Afghan realities. We are and will stay in close touch with him, and with others concerned about Afghanistan. We are planning a new series of meetings with Ambassador Vendrell and others at the U.N. this coming fall. At the same time, we need to consider what U.S. strategy is most appropriate in this situation.

#### U.S. STRATEGY TODAY: A TWO-PRONGED APPROACH

Mr. Chairman, the strategy that we are pursuing today is two-pronged: First, firm pressure on the Taliban on the issues of greatest concern: terrorism, narcotics, and human rights. On terrorism, President Clinton took the lead last year by issuing Executive Order 13129, imposing unilateral sanctions on the Taliban designed to stop them from deriving any revenue or benefit from economic interaction with the United States. The U.N. Security Council followed up in October 1999 by unanimously adopting Resolution 1267, which puts in place mandatory sanctions against Taliban-controlled assets and international airline flights until Bin Laden is brought to justice. These sanctions, I want to stress, target only the regime, while providing unimpeded humanitarian access for all the people of Afghanistan. In April of this year, the Security Council agreed that further action might be required. We are actively exploring those options, which could include imposition of an arms embargo against the Taliban. We have also let them know, in no uncertain terms, that we will hold them responsible for any terrorist acts undertaken by Bin Laden from Afghanistan. We reserve the right to use military force in self-defense if required.

As we apply such pressure, we have also tried to engage the Taliban in a serious dialogue. Some members of the Taliban have told us they would like to improve their relations with us. They have even taken a few measures to demonstrate a willingness to work with us, such as restricting Bin Laden's access to foreign media. But we have seen no indication that the Taliban are ready to take the serious actions—on Bin Laden or on other issues—that would be necessary for any real improvement in our relations.

The second prong of our Afghan strategy is both broader and longer-term: to promote the greatest possible involvement of Afghans in the search for peace in their own country. What is needed, in our view, is a sincere negotiating process among Afghans themselves toward a broad-based, inclusive government which all the Afghan people, first and foremost, and then the U.S. and the rest of the international community, can accept, and which can take up the cause of rebuilding the country. This will require the involvement of a wide spectrum of Afghans inside and outside the country—more than just the Taliban and the Northern Alliance.

For this reason, we are encouraged by the efforts of Afghans around the world to contribute to this search for peace, in groups meeting in Rome, Cyprus, Bonn, and elsewhere. Many advocate the convening of a *Loya Jirga*, or Grand Council, of Afghan leaders to forge a new national concord. This could be a traditional and constructive step toward ending Afghanistan's anguish. It would offer Afghans an alternative vision of their future, authentically both Muslim and moderate, and one that would promise peace without tyranny. Regrettably, it may be precisely the appeal of this initiative that has led the Taliban, according to new press reports this week, to instigate the arbitrary arrest of *Loya Jirga* proponents.

or our part, we have been meeting with such alternative Afghan representatives at a senior policy level, and have recently issued a statement of support for their legitimate objectives. In addition, we are providing modest financial support to the Rome-based effort, and diplomatic support for the Italian government's lead on this issue. We are asking other interested countries for their support as well.

Let me make one thing clear. Critics of those who are seeking to convene a *Loya Jirga* claim that its supporters want to reestablish a monarchy in Afghanistan, and return former king Zahir Shah to power. Zahir Shah has offered his prestige as elder statesman to this process in an attempt to restore peace to his shattered homeland, but we see no evidence that he or his colleagues seek to revive the monarchy. Rather, *Loya Jirga* is a leadership forum where all speak their minds freely and come to a political consensus. It is the traditional process Afghans have used for centuries to achieve resolution to crises in their land.

Mr. Chairman, it is time Afghans were allowed to restore equilibrium in their political affairs and tranquillity within their borders, without adverse outside interference. A traditional, sovereign Afghanistan at peace with its neighbors would be the best guarantee for stability in South and Central Asia as a whole.

#### INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

This now brings me to a crucial aspect of implementing the two-pronged Afghan strategy I have just outlined: the necessity of cooperation with other countries in the region and beyond. This is not, and cannot be, an attempt to impose some kind of outside power diktat on the proud people of Afghanistan, which history teaches would be futile. What we seek is not so much confrontation with the Taliban, as common cause with all the other players who wish to contain and ultimately overcome the threats that the Taliban present. Accordingly, I would like to take just a few moments to highlight some of these players.

First, with regard to Russia, President Clinton and Russian President Putin recently agreed to form a bilateral working group on Afghanistan. This group should serve to improve diplomatic cooperation with Russia on this problem. It will also complement our ongoing counter-terrorism efforts. The first meeting of this working group will take place in the near future and will focus on joint means to counter the threat emanating from Afghanistan. This subject also figured prominently in the very detailed and useful discussions on South Asia that I conducted in Moscow in May.

With India, we have this year institutionalized very productive consultations on counter-terrorism, naturally with a special focus on Afghanistan and related South Asian issues. We share India's concern about the spillover from Afghanistan to other areas, including Kashmir, where violence is increasingly associated with foreign elements. We appreciate India's earlier closing down of Ariana flights to Amritsar and its strong cooperation in implementing the U.N. sanctions against the Taliban, in international counternarcotics and other law enforcement efforts.

Moving to Central Asia, the U.S. and the countries of that region took a significant step last month when we hosted a Central Asia counter-terrorism conference here in Washington. Representatives from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan all agreed with us to enhance cooperation in denying sanctuary or support to terrorists. This issue, and the broader issues of Afghanistan's overall fate, will remain high on the agenda in all of our high-level contacts with the Central Asian states. These countries have started working better with each other, with Russia through OTS channels, and with China in the "Shanghai Five" group to confront the common threats from Taliban-ruled Afghanistan.

This brings me to Pakistan, where the signals on these issues, frankly, are still mixed. Pakistan wants, as does the U.S., to see peace and stability in Afghanistan—after all, it shares the longest common border with that country. We believe the government of Pakistan also understands that the "Talibanization"—or radicalization—of their country and of the region is something to avoid. Perhaps the recent incident in which the Taliban forcibly shaved the heads of a visiting Pakistani soccer team as punishment for wearing shorts—while playing soccer—will remind Pakistanis of the true nature of the Taliban yet again. Moreover, Pakistan seeks to build political and economic bridges to Central Asia, and realizes that terrorism and extremism in Afghanistan and South Asia are serious obstacles to such regional cooperation and stability. Indeed, Pakistan has made known its view that the presence of Usama Bin Laden is just such an obstacle. They helped facilitate a recent meeting between Under Secretary Pickering and Taliban officials in Islamabad on the U.S. case against Bin Laden. We also understand that Pakistan is quietly urging the Taliban to review some of their ties to terrorists.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, Pakistani officials make the point that they do not control the Taliban. We believe, however, that Pakistan does have considerable influence in Afghanistan. The goal of our continued diplomacy is to urge Pakistan to use every aspect of its influence to convince the Taliban to render Usama Bin Laden to justice and shut down Afghanistan's terrorist networks altogether. More broadly, we would support a Pakistani initiative to find common ground with Iran and others in working together on a peaceful solution of Afghanistan's civil war. We are pleased that just in the past few days Pakistan Foreign Minister Sattar has met with a delegation from the Rome Process and expressed Pakistan's appreciation of the positive role *Loya Junga* could play.

#### HUMANITARIAN ISSUES

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn briefly to humanitarian issues. The human crisis in Afghanistan is eloquently summarized in the latest report by U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan. Allow me to cite a few lines here:

The situation of the Afghan people remains deplorable. Four years after the takeover of Kabul by the Taliban, visitors compare the city to a bombed-out city a few years after the end of the Second World War, except that no reconstruction is in sight and its people have little hope for improvement. There is a growing process of pauperization throughout Afghanistan, exacerbated by the most severe drought in 30 years. Afghanistan remains in a state of acute crisis—its resources depleted, its intelligentsia in exile, its people disfranchised, its traditional political structures shattered and its human development indices among the lowest in the world.

I know you agree, Mr. Chairman, that the Afghan people do not deserve to suffer in this way. That is why the U.S. continues to lead the world in humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people, totaling around \$70 million annually in recent years, rising to a projected \$110 million in view of the extraordinary needs this year. Details are available in the attached fact sheet. Most of this funding is channeled through the specialized U.N.-affiliated relief and rehabilitation agencies, or through American and international NGO's. Their integrity, expertise and on-the-ground experience makes them the most effective conduits for such programs, which we hope will continue with your support. It is a sound investment, not only in averting humanitarian tragedy, but in preserving our friendship with the people of Afghanistan, while we and they await a better future.

We take special care, in this context, to ensure that our aid reaches those who need it most, including women. Since FY 1998, for example, we have provided assistance to programs in various regions of Afghanistan that involve women in local decisions and also provide them with job opportunities. These programs not only help local communities, but also integrate women into them as productive members, in a way both consistent with Islam and human rights standards, thereby fostering a more tolerant grass-roots culture in Afghanistan. We must also take into account extraordinary circumstances, such as the current disastrous drought, in adjusting



our levels and types of aid. Our extra \$4 million so far this year in well-targeted and well-publicized drought relief has been very well received and should generate lasting goodwill—as the photographs I brought along of Ambassador Milam on the docks of Karachi so vividly suggest.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that, from both the human and the political standpoints, the situation in Afghanistan remains extremely difficult, but not without some hope that conditions may be changing. As I said earlier, we believe the Taliban regime has reached its high-water mark. This is a regime which, by its behavior at home and abroad, has isolated itself from almost the entire world, and increasingly from its own people. There is a real sense in which Afghans and the concerned international community want many of the same things: An Afghan government that is representative, that respects human rights, that rejects rather than embraces narcotic traffickers and terrorists. I believe our strategy of pressure on the Taliban, support for alternative Afghan voices, and concrete cooperation with other countries on these issues can move us closer to that common objective. As we approach it, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Afghanistan can once again become a gateway nation of a different kind—a gateway for people, commerce, and cultural exchange between different parts of Asia and the world, in the positive sense that we would all desire to see.

---

#### U.S. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO THE AFGHAN PEOPLE

[Updated fact sheet: 7/19/00]

The U.S. has long been involved in humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people. This assistance still continues. The U.S. is the largest single donor of humanitarian aid to the Afghan people. So far this year, U.S. assistance to Afghans, both inside and outside Afghanistan, totals about \$80 million.

U.S. assistance is intended to provide humanitarian assistance in general and to ensure that the Afghan people do not suffer from the sanctions imposed on the Taliban. It is also intended to relieve the suffering resulting from the severe drought in Afghanistan.

Because of the Taliban's continuing refusal to hand over indicted terrorist Usama bin Laden to a country where he can be brought to justice, the United Nations imposed sanctions on the Taliban on November 14, 1999, in accordance with UNSC resolution 1267. The aim of the United Nations sanctions is to persuade the Taliban to meet their responsibility to hand over bin Laden, without adding to the hardships already facing the citizens of Afghanistan. There has been considerable concern in the United States and around the world over the plight of the Afghan people, who have suffered the ravages of twenty years of warfare, and who are now suffering from the worst drought in 20 years.

The sanctions are specific: they target only the aircraft, bank accounts and other financial assets of the Taliban. They do not impede the flow of humanitarian aid, including food and medicine, nor do they prohibit private cross-border trade with Afghanistan. The sanctions specifically allow for exemptions from flights related to religious duty and humanitarian emergencies. The United Nations resolution was carefully written not to impede the Afghan people in their struggle to build a safe, peaceful future for themselves and their families.

Of every two dollars of global assistance to Afghans, half is food aid; and of every ten dollars' worth of food aid to Afghans, nine dollars is a United States contribution. In 1999, the United States contributed over \$70 million in assistance of all sorts to the Afghan people. So far, in FY 2000, USG humanitarian assistance to Afghans totals approximately \$80 million. Projected contributions during this fiscal year are expected to bring the total to approximately \$110 million. Below is a partial summary of U.S. contributions to humanitarian assistance for the Afghan people from October 1, 1999 through July 15, 2000. (Projected figures are in italics.)

In FY 2000, \$8 million has been given to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). This contribution supports UNHCR's protection, care and maintenance activities for Afghan refugees in Pakistan, and Iran, and supports UNHCR protection, repatriation, and re-integration activities for Afghan refugees who return to Afghanistan. *(In addition, at least \$3 million more will be contributed to the UNHCR during the course of this fiscal year, for a projected total of \$11-12 million.)*

*Approximately \$8 million will be provided during the current fiscal year to various NGOs providing housing, health care, and education for Afghan refugees. (Final fig-*

ures and breakdowns should be available in August. This figure is up from the \$5.4 million that was contributed last year.)

Approximately \$8.6 million will be given to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) during the current fiscal year. This contribution to the ICRC's Asia and Pacific Appeal supports ICRC's programs for victims of conflict throughout South Asia, mainly in Afghanistan.

The Food for Peace Program (FFP) has contributed approximately \$8.5 million of wheat to the World Food Program's Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRRO) for Afghans inside Afghanistan, so far this year. (Additional contributions of commodities, to the Aga Khan Foundation for northern Afghanistan, totaling approximately 6,870 metric tons, and valued at \$5 million, are in the pipeline.)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) recently committed 60,000 metric tons of wheat, valued at approximately \$24 million, to WFP's emergency feeding operation for victims of drought in Afghanistan. This commitment is in addition to 75,000 metric tons of wheat, valued at \$33 million, committed by USDA in February to the World Food Program's (WFP's) Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) for vulnerable populations and households, and returning refugees and displaced persons in Afghanistan. This tonnage (75,000 metric tons) is currently being shipped to WFP/Afghanistan, Afghanistan.

More than \$4 million in emergency relief assistance through the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) has been given to various NGOs in support of emergency assistance for Afghans inside Afghanistan. The OFDA is responding to the current drought by focusing on the following sectors: provision of potable water, preventative health, support to livelihoods through livestock and agriculture projects, and transport of relief workers and commodities through the UN's air service. (Additional projected contributions of up to \$4 million for drought response.)

The USG also has contributed \$3 million to de-mining efforts in FY 2000, and \$500,000 to the U.N. for the FY 2000 Afghanistan Emergency Trust Fund.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you, Secretary Inderfurth. From the clock, it is 7 minutes and we can bounce back and forth as long as it goes or until a vote time that we would have.

I appreciate the statement. Recently, Russia has made a number of statements regarding Afghanistan. I would be curious as to your thoughts about those statements that Russia has made in any communication that we have had with Russia on dealing with Afghanistan.

Mr. Inderfurth. Mr. Chairman, the Russians are very concerned about Afghanistan. I note in my written testimony that President Clinton and President Putin have recently agreed to establish a joint working group on Afghanistan to address these concerns. We have worked very closely with the Russians in New York at the United Nations on the first U.N. Security Council resolution which I referred to in my testimony and we are looking at the other measures called for by the Security Council to see if we should move forward with a second resolution.

They are concerned about Afghanistan for a number of reasons, including the support the Taliban has provided to terrorist training that has spilled over into the Caucasus, into Chechnya and Dagistan. They are very concerned that the Taliban have recognized Chechyan sovereignty. They are very concerned about Bin Laden's operations. And they do see this as a contributing factor to the ongoing crisis in Chechnya.

We agree with them that Afghanistan is the gateway in many respects, not only affecting the situation in Chechnya, but also in Kashmir and in other parts of the region. So we are working with them to see what can be done.

I believe that Russia is a key player here. I was there myself in May for consultations with Russian officials on Afghanistan and more broadly South Asia. At that time, there was a question of

Russian intentions—I think their spokesman had referred to the possibility of air strikes against the Taliban in terms of terrorists making their way from Afghanistan to Chechnya.

The Russians made it clear that this was not something that they were actively considering, but it is a matter of grave concern to them. I urged that any actions that they take be designed and would be ensured to weaken, not strengthen the Taliban. I think they took that point.

Senator BROWNBACk. Looking at the Northern Alliance which controls some, I guess, 15 percent of the land mass of Afghanistan, what is the administration's view toward providing support to the Northern Alliance? Food aid I presume is probably taking place to some degree now. But other development type of assistance or support to the Northern Alliance.

Mr. INDERFURTH. Well, I think the types of assistance that you have suggested are ones that the United States could and should support, including humanitarian assistance and food aid. I think where we draw the line is offering the Northern Alliance military assistance. I think that that would be a mistake in terms of our becoming actively involved militarily once again in Afghanistan.

As my statement makes clear, our principle focus of opposition is on the Taliban and its behavior and the actions that they have taken across the range of issues, human rights, terrorism, narcotics and the rest. But we do not want to imply that as a result of that opposition that we are endorsing the Northern Alliance.

We believe that what must take place is not a government of only two parties, the Taliban and the Northern Alliance, but of all parties. That would include ethnic Tajics, Uzbeks, Hazara, all of the various factions and ethnic groups that make up Afghanistan. So we do want to make sure that our humanitarian assistance makes its way to all Afghans throughout the country, including in that part of Afghanistan, the Panshir Valley, that the Northern Alliance controls.

We are concerned, quite frankly, that the Northern Alliance itself has been split with internal rivalry throughout its history with General Dostrum, with Commander Masood and others. That has been part of the problem, that there has not been a unified opposition to the Taliban that the Northern Alliance has been, as I said, split.

That is why we are actively supporting those Afghan groups outside the country that are trying to bring about some national consensus that would move toward a broad based government. And I think that you will hear more about that in testimony after I have concluded.

Senator BROWNBACk. Once the outside groups that you have been working with to try to build a uniform position, a united position in Afghanistan, once they are coming and pulling together, are there plans to help them move more aggressively forward in Afghanistan to reestablish a more civil type of government?

Mr. INDERFURTH. Well, we are providing some support now, \$100,000 to the so-called Rome process, to help them facilitate their effort to both convene and get their message to other governments. Hopefully, they will have an opportunity to deliver that message directly to the Taliban itself and to the Northern Alliance.

How they can move beyond that, as you said, aggressively, is a very good question. Because we are under no illusion that Afghans meeting outside the country can dislodge the Taliban from the control of 85 percent of the country.

We are hopeful, indeed we are encouraged by what I said at the beginning of my testimony, that there are signs that the Taliban has reached its high water mark and that there are signs that it may be receding. Part of this, quite frankly, is the active opposition that Commander Masood has been able to mount in that remaining 15 percent of the country. That is important.

But in terms of Afghans coming together for a Loya Jirga, the key part of that will be a recognition by the Taliban that they cannot attain their goal of control of Afghanistan through military power. That they must come to a conclusion that they need to negotiate a broad based settlement. At that point, I think we can do even more to provide assistance to these Afghan groups to aggressively move in that direction.

Senator BROWNBACK. Good. Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I appreciate that you are trying very hard to make progress in this part of the world. But I have to say I am a little disappointed in the testimony when I see that you mentioned women and girls very rarely in these seven page of testimony. You mention them on page two. You say, "They trampled on the human rights of all Afghans, especially women and girls." And then you mention women and girls on page seven. You say, "We take special care in this context to ensure our aid reaches the people who need it most including women."

Now, I have to say, unless I am missing something, that when a regime clamps down on the majority of its population like it clamps down on women and girls, and we see from the Burka that the intent is to essentially make these people invisible, give them no recognition as human beings, I have to believe that our country should be very outspoken on this. Because I think it helps us to rally public opinion against the Taliban, even more than all the things you talk about.

So I am a little distressed. I want to go back to when we asked Secretary Albright about this. She said, and I quote, "There are those who suggest that all this is cultural"—meaning the treatment of women and girls—"and there is nothing we can do about it." And she goes onto say, "I say it is criminal and we have a responsibility to stop it."

Now, that is the Secretary of State. So Mr. Secretary, what specific steps have the administration taken to improve the lives of women and girls in Afghanistan? And how would you rate the effectiveness of these steps?

Mr. INDERFURTH. Well, I would hope that I could allay your concerns and dismay that not more time and attention was paid to this testimony to the tragic situation of women and girls in Afghanistan.

I too have a Burka which I have in my office and which I obtained when I was in Kabul several years ago. And I bring it out frequently to demonstrate what that represents.

This testimony was designed to talk about what pressures and influence we can bring to bear on the Taliban. I have testified at greater length on the situation of women and girls. I have appeared on a panel discussion in New York on the Council on Foreign Relations devoted entirely to that subject. And I would be glad to provide you with that testimony.

Senator BOXER. Good.

Mr. Inderfurth. And most importantly, I think that this administration has made clear in very public statements by President Clinton, by Secretary Albright and by the First Lady the abhorrence we have for the Taliban's treatment of women and girls in Afghanistan.

So I hope that taking that into account, your concerns about the lack of statements in my testimony will be put into perspective.

Senator BOXER. If I could just say, I totally appreciate that and believe that. But I think since the purpose of the hearing is to discuss how we can bring pressure to bear, I just want to make a statement to you that I believe that everytime you talk about the subject, do not isolate it to a particular hearing on the treatment of women and say, well, I said that.

Mr. Inderfurth. I understand.

Senator BOXER. In other words, I am suggesting to you that when the world knows more, and sometimes it takes repetition. Senator Brownback and I know this. Whether it is our campaigns or what we believe in, you have got to keep on reiterating these issues. And I do not think that we should separate out the treatment of women and girls to another type of a hearing. I think we should weave it into everything we do. Because I think that is so shocking to people. And even though we think everyone knows it because we think about it all the time—the three of us—it is not really widely known as you think.

I wanted to ask you, because I do not have that much time, it is my understanding that Pakistan and Saudi Arabia have given support to the Taliban. To what extent have these two countries provided assistance to the Taliban? And to what extent has the United States taken steps to urge Pakistan and Saudi Arabia to withdraw their support?

Mr. Inderfurth. Well, with respect to Saudi Arabia, they have withdrawn a great deal of their support from the Taliban. And we have urged them to do so. My written testimony and my oral testimony here discussed what we have been doing with Pakistan.

As I said, their record is mixed with respect to what steps they are taking to deal with Afghanistan and with the Taliban. In all of our discussions with both countries, the issue of women and girls has been raised. And I mentioned my own personal contacts with the Taliban in these four different locations. And in each of those instances, their treatment of women and girls has been raised.

So, I very much take your point. We will not separate out this subject for separate testimony. It has been a part of every testimony that I have given on the subject. And I will make sure that it continues to be.

In terms of specific programs, because you asked about this, in addition to speaking out in every international forum possible about this subject, we have also provided several million dollars in

assistance for health and education, programs for Afghan women and girl refugees. We are continuing to fund such programs, emphasizing health and education projects for Afghan women and girls. Our budget cycle is being reviewed now and I will be glad to provide you additional information and would very much like to have your suggestions of additional projects and programs that we should be looking at.

We have also launched a U.S. resettlement program for Afghan women at risk and their families. We expect to admit about 1,500 individuals in this fiscal year. And I think that is a substantial program and that has been a substantial increase over the past.

Senator BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit some followup questions regarding—

Senator BROWNBACK. I think we have a couple more minutes here before we have to go over and vote. And if you want to go ahead with a couple of those, that is fine.

Senator BOXER. I really just have one more series of questions but I will just make it one. I am concerned about the refugee applications of Afghan women and their families. They are processed under P-1 category. And this status requires a specific referral from UNHCR and extensive evidence from each individual refugee demonstrating the targeting for immediate danger.

And it is my understanding that this P-1 process is not sensitive to the special needs of Afghan women and often causes long delays. Would the administration consider creating a P-2 category for Afghan women and girls that would reduce the need of each individual to present specific evidence that they have been persecuted since we all know that women and girls are persecuted per se.

Mr. Inderfurth. Let me get to you with an answer on that. It sounds very reasonable to me, but let me consult at the Department and get back to you.

[The following response was subsequently received.]

RESPONSE OF HON. KARL F. Inderfurth TO SENATOR BOXER

*Question.* Would the Administration consider a P-2 status for Afghan women?

*Answer.* We share Senator Boxer's abiding concern for the plight of Afghan women and have taken significant steps to increase the number of women at risk who are resettled in the United States.

Our goal in resettling vulnerable Afghans, particularly Afghan women and girls, is to afford maximum protection for the safety and welfare of the individuals and to expedite processing of those in need of rapid resettlement because of danger to their lives and their families.

Given the limitations on our resources, we believe that it is essential to focus on the most urgent cases and to involve other countries in this effort. Accordingly, continued reliance on UNHCR to identify urgent protection cases in the country of asylum is the fairest and most effective approach. As a multilateral effort, UNHCR involvement includes both the United States and other countries and is consistent with other aspects of our overall assistance to Afghan refugees.

We are also taking steps to increase the resources of the UNHCR to ensure priority resettlement for the most urgent cases.

In 1999, the Department of State and the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service established a resettlement processing office in Islamabad. This office was established with a specific mission to expand and expedite the processing of Afghan women identified by UNHCR as Women-At-Risk.

The U.S.-supported program is providing a significant resettlement opportunities within resource constraints for vulnerable Afghan women refugees. We are seeing results.

In FY 1999, 367 Afghans, most identified as women at risk and their family members, were resettled in the U.S. Several hundred additional cases of Afghan women

and their families, involving more than 1,500 individuals are being processed for admission to the U.S. in FY 2000.

The P-2 category is an effective mechanism for processing refugees for resettlement, because individuals in a P-2 category are eligible to directly apply to the U.S. admissions program. However, a category as broad as women at risk, involving potentially tens or even hundreds of thousands of applicants will only result in a significant slowing of refugee processing. This is because the U.S. Government does not have the resources to process direct applications from an applicant pool so large, nor deal with the security problems inherent in managing such a large number. With a direct application process, there is a good chance that many of those most compelling cases would not get processed because of the diversion of resources and personnel to process those who are not genuine candidates for resettlement.

In Pakistan, when rumors of a special program for Afghan women circulated, the UNHCR offices were so overwhelmed by potential applicants that operations came to a virtual halt and UNHCR had to restrict access to their offices for days.

Processing women at risk for U.S. resettlement is a priority for the USG. We have made it clear numerous times to our partners in refugee processing that we have a very great interest in these cases. We will continue to focus our efforts on the plight of Women-at-Risk.

Senator BOXER. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you, Senator Boxer. And thanks for raising those important issues. Women's rights, lack thereof, within Afghanistan. I think it is something that just shocks all of our consciousness when you see that taking place on such a broad scale with an entire nation. And it is not just cultural. It is criminal. We should stand up to that at every chance we possibly get.

Secretary Inderfurth, thank you very much. We want to keep working with you on this. I sense from some of your comments that your policy is searching what it is that we can do. This is a country that we have limited contacts and dealings with. It is therefore then limited and difficult for us as to how do we press it? And we should not recognize the Taliban regime. But we do need to get pressure to bear on them to deal with some of these very big issues, women's rights, terrorism, exported drugs that are effecting the entire world.

And I will look forward to making some suggestions to you. I think the next panel of witnesses have some specific items that they want to put forward as well. So I hope that your staff or somebody could also provide some of those items and suggestions to you too.

Thank you for joining us. We will be in recess. It will probably take us about 15 minutes to get over to the floor, vote and back. And then we will proceed with the second panel at that time.

[Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.]

Senator BROWNBACK. We will reconvene the hearing. We have the second panel that we will have testify. My apologies to everybody for the recess, but we had votes on the floor. The panelists are the Honorable Peter Tomsen. He is a professor of International Studies and Programs, University of Nebraska, Omaha, an expert on Afghanistan. We are delighted to have the Honorable Mr. Tomsen here.

We have Mr. Hamid Karzai, Afghan Tribal Leader. And also I think representing the overall Rome group here as well. And Dr. Zieba Shorish-Shamley, executive director, Women's Alliance for Peace and Human Rights in Afghanistan who has been here before and I am delighted to have you back.

I look forward to hearing your testimony. I think Senator Boxer may be joining us in a little bit as well. And specifically, your suggestions as to what has occurred to U.S. policy in Afghanistan. More importantly, what should we be doing now to alter that policy? That would be the thing that would be of most interest to myself and I think other members as well. Mr. Tomsen, the floor is yours.

**STATEMENT OF PETER TOMSEN, PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, OMAHA, NE**

Mr. TOMSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and your subcommittee for the invitation to testify today. The influence of Afghanistan on critical U.S. interest in the Central-South Asian region and globally has for far too long been underestimated. The current American policy toward Afghanistan and the Taliban has not and cannot advance these interests. I congratulate you for organizing today's hearing to explore a more effective American approach to breaking the bloody stalemate in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, among the countless Afghan parables is one that states: "As long as the root touches the water, there is hope." Afghans still hope for peace despite their predicament. No nation since perhaps the Germans during the devastating 30 years war have suffered proportionately and continuously such death and destruction over decades.

The extremist network created during the 9-year Afghan-Soviet war has subjected Afghanistan to another form of tyranny every bit as pernicious as the bloody string of Soviet supported Communist rulers during the 1980's.

The Pakistani military's Interservices Intelligence Directorate (ISI), Pakistani radical Muslim parties, Saudi and other Arab extremists, including Osama bin Laden, and Afghanistan's own Islamist elements—Hekmatyar, Rabbani, Sayyaf, and the Taliban are examples—have exploited the country as a springboard for exporting terrorism, suppressing women, drug smuggling and Muslim extremism throughout Eurasia from Xinjiang to Chechnya, Kashmir to Karachi.

Terrorist operations, massive drug production and the ebb and flow of fighting in Afghanistan is now accompanied by destructive drought which is drying wells, denying moisture to crops, and forcing the premature slaughter of livestock. There are reports of large-scale locust attacks. Criminal activity and banditry in urban and rural areas is on the rise as the Taliban grip weakens in Afghanistan. Colombia-style murderous narco terrorist syndicates with international tentacles are emerging. Afghans, desperate for peace, ask if their nightmare will ever end.

As the Afghan proverb tells, there is hope. Modern history records examples of how proud, small nations, particularly those with their own history, culture and religion resist subjugation. Afghans see their history as a united nation going back to the mid-18th century. As practiced, the Afghan national identity is a unique, holistic blend of Islam, tribal codes of conduct, and Afghan nationalism. It spreads north and south, east and west. Afghanistan's moderate Islam rejects the Taliban-style radical Deobandi,



Wahabbi and Ikhwani influences imported from Pakistan, the Persian Gulf, and the Middle East as turmoil enveloped the country.

There are reasons for hope.

The Taliban is in decline. It will probably be driven from Kabul by the end of this year.

Unlike in the Balkans, no Afghan ethnic group inside Afghanistan has separatist aspirations. The Pashtuns do not want to join Pakistan, Tajiks likewise prefer their Afghan moorings to union with Tajikistan; Afghanistan's Shia population has shown no inclination to seek association with Iran.

It is also potentially helpful, Mr. Chairman, that each of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council has an interest in seeing a legitimate regime in Kabul, accepted by most Afghans, as chosen by Afghans, in an Afghan deliberative process not imposed from the outside; a regime which focuses on Afghanistan's massive internal economic and social problems; one prepared to work with Afghanistan's neighbors and the international community to break the utilization of Afghan soil by terrorists, to phaseout opium production, restore gender and human rights, and reap the substantial economic gains from the revival of ancient trade and transport corridors transiting Afghanistan. The Taliban fail in all of these categories.

A stable Afghanistan offering a crossroads for regional and global commerce along a sweeping north-south and east-west axis would prove an economic boon to each of Afghanistan's neighbors in the region, as well as to Afghanistan itself.

Islamabad would benefit the most. Pakistan cannot transit Afghanistan to market its products in Central Asia, the Caspian Basin and China while instability persists in Afghanistan.

Pakistan has legitimate interests in Afghanistan. They do not, however, extend to selecting those who rule in Kabul. Islamabad's sponsorship of the Taliban will only further advance the economic and social decay underway in Pakistan itself. Pakistan's continuing support for the Taliban will also deepen its political isolation in the region and in the international community.

Neither Pakistani nor Iranian attempts to mediate the Afghan dispute can succeed. The period since the Soviet pullout is littered with the carcasses of Islamabad peace initiatives for Afghanistan. These include the Afghan interim government in 1988, the 1992 Islamabad Accord, and then the Taliban in the mid-1990's. Pakistan has consistently sought to put Afghan Muslim extremists in Kabul, much like the Soviets attempted to place their own asset, the Afghan Communists, in Kabul. Afghans are now thoroughly suspicious of any outside mediation, most notably initiatives from Islamabad and Tehran. This cynicism extends as well to Moscow and Riyadh.

Many Afghans also worry that Russian leaders may emulate the Soviet era tendency to reach for military and intelligence levers in dealing with the complex Afghan issue. In 1979, the Soviet Politburo took that path, disregarding the advice of many in Soviet foreign policy and think tank positions who were knowledgeable about Afghanistan.

Today, powerful elements of the Russian military and intelligence establishment may play a spoiler role by arguing against an

internationally assisted Afghanistan settlement process, favoring instead a climate of confrontation along the Amu Darya to buttress Moscow as a “protector” of the Central Asian states against the Muslim extremist threat from Afghanistan.

Russian stoking of conflict in Moldova and the Caucasus has had a similar objective of drawing the former Soviet republics back under Russia’s control. Conversely, Moscow’s cooperation in an internationally assisted Afghanistan settlement could be an important precedent for further Russian cooperation with the West to resolve other conflicts smoldering across Eurasia.

Mr. Chairman, Afghans have become disillusioned with Washington’s disengagement from Afghanistan, as the United States outsources its policy to Pakistan. This disengagement was illustrated again when the State Department recently repeated U.S. support for both Pakistani and Iranian settlement initiatives on Afghanistan. These initiatives have no chance of succeeding. They will be rejected by Afghans as further destructive Iranian and Pakistani attempts to champion their favored extremist elements in Afghan internal affairs. Ongoing Iranian and Pakistani strategic competition in Afghanistan also dooms these outside interventions to failure.

But United States policy toward Afghanistan and the region will be critical to the success of an Afghan peace process. The principal problem, Mr. Chairman, is that there is not, and has not been, an American policy toward Afghanistan since the 1992 collapse of the Communist regime in Kabul.

It was only after the 1998 Osama bin Laden-instigated bombings of U.S. Embassies in Africa that U.S. policy on Afghanistan began to stir. The resultant, single-minded “get Osama bin Laden” approach, however, has missed the point. Seizing one terrorist, however odious, does not address the broad and important U.S. interests at stake in Afghanistan.

A comprehensive American policy is required in order to stem international terrorism; reverse soaring narcotics production; remove the increasingly dangerous internationally Islamic network using Afghanistan as an operational bases; and to lay the basis in a positive way for revival of Eurasian trade routes through Afghanistan; while helping Afghanistans to rebuild its nation after over two decades of Soviet and Islamic generated death and destruction.

Whether it is in this administration or the next one, an effective American policy on Afghanistan will need to fit into a broader regional policy framework: helping Pakistan out of its present mess; defusing Indo-Pakistani tensions; pursuing rapprochement with Iran; strengthening the democratic and economic transition process in Russia and Central Asia; combating the threat to regional and global stability posed by Afghanistan-sourced drugs and terrorism; unleashing the regional economic benefits that peace in Afghanistan would bring to South Asia, Iran, Russia, China, and the new Central Asia republics; and an area for fruitful U.S. cooperation with Japan and China.

What specifically should the United States do?

A U.S. diplomatic push on Afghanistan should best work indirectly through the U.N. Security Council, which has the legitimate mandate under the U.N. charter to prevent threats to peace and

security. The United States could be the sparkplug for U.N. Security Council action to convene a major international conference to focus exclusively on Afghanistan. The main goals of the conference should include a formal treaty which would recognize Afghanistan's neutrality and sovereignty, and independence, such as was done for Austria in the 1955 Austrian State Treaty, signed by the Soviet Union and the West. The conference and its attendant documents could further:

Bind outside governments and entities not to provide the Afghanistan belligerents with weapons or other war-making potential, including aviation fuel.

Make clear that governments or entities which persist in supplying the Afghan belligerents with war-making potential would be sanctioned.

Register pledges of support for Afghanistan's reconstruction. The U.N. would coordinate the international assistance effort.

Designate the U.N. Secretary General special envoy as the only outside mediator for the Afghan settlement process.

Prohibit separate, direct mediation or lobbying by foreign governments or regional organizations with the separate Afghan factions. Instead foreign governments would provide their insights directly to the United Nations mediation initiative.

Provide incentives to discourage Pakistan from shifting its support to yet another mix of Afghan extremists in Kabul as the Taliban disintegrates.

On international coordination, active support for a Security Council initiative on Afghanistan by Afghanistan's neighbors, especially Pakistan, will be essential to its success. Positive incentives for Pakistan's cooperation will be important to counter internal Pakistani opposition from Muslim extremist elements in Pakistani military and political circles. Incentives for a constructive Pakistani approach would include Pakistan's access to Eurasian markets and trade routes through a peaceful Afghanistan. The international conference, which would include Pakistan, could also offer Pakistan a share of the international assistance which would accompany an Afghan settlement.

Pakistan's reasonable strategic concern about the revival of the two front security challenge it experienced for most of its post-independence period must also be addressed. Islamabad's sponsorship of a radical Islamic government in Kabul has geo-political origins with offensive and defensive qualities. It is offensive in creating "Islamic depth" against India; defensive in preventing New Delhi and Moscow from once more making Afghanistan the upper lip of a strategic vice against Pakistan.

An international conference on Afghanistan could therefore include a declaration patterned on the 1975 Helsinki Accords in Europe which would formally recognize the sanctity of Afghanistan's pre-Soviet invasion frontiers, including the Afghanistan-Pakistan border area. The conference might urge that the legitimate regime in Kabul emerging from a settlement process work with Pakistan to include a bilateral border agreement, thus setting aside the century old Afghan-Pakistani controversy on the 1893 Durand line. The conference could propose that U.N. or International Court of

Justice mediation be made available to assist Pakistan-Afghanistan bilateral border negotiations.

An international conference could be the vehicle to commit India, Russia, Iran, as well as Pakistan to a broader, authoritative international undertaking to restrain themselves from manipulating Afghanistan to serve their separate strategic goals in Central Asia. An international understanding respecting Afghanistan's neutrality, sovereignty and frontiers could be a form of collective security for all, bolstering Afghanistan's stability at the center of the Eurasian land mass.

No single major power would achieve one hundred percent of its goals, as the West and the Soviet Union accepted when they removed their occupation forces from Austria in 1955. All would benefit from the abandoning of the zero-sum geo-political competition by outside powers in Afghanistan that has led to the current destructive stalemate in which none of Afghanistan's competing neighbors can succeed in maintaining its favored Afghan in Kabul.

All will continue to suffer from the stalemate of, death, drugs, destruction, and chaos on their borders. A forceful American and United Nations Security Council Initiative from outside the region could break the impasse. As the noted Pakistani specialist on Afghanistan, respected journalist, Ahmed Rashid, has written in *Foreign Affairs*, "Until the United States demonstrates that it has the determination to mobilize an international effort for ending outside interference, Afghanistan's chaos will only spread."

An international conference projecting international support for Afghanistan's neutrality and sovereignty would give impetus to the internal Afghan settlement process which has already begun to generate progress as the Taliban fades. The Taliban's decline is assisting this welcome trend. Tangible as well as intangible elements are steadily eroding the Taliban's base of support, including in the southern Pashtun belt.

Senator BROWNBACK. Mr. Tomsen, if we could summarize maybe the rest of that because I want to make sure we get to these other witnesses and have a chance for some questioning on it. I appreciate your in-depth thoughts on it. And we will make sure to have all of that in the record. But I want to make sure we have some time too for other witnesses.

Mr. TOMSEN. OK. In sum, Mr. Chairman, my own judgment is that it is useless to expect good results from negotiations with the rigid, orthodox, anti-Western Taliban. They are self-destructing. We should follow this prong of an international conference to work with the outer circle of powers and then support the peace initiatives internally.

If I may just present here a section on what can Congress do and then terminate my testimony.

Congress can do a lot. We cannot expect an effective foreign policy on Afghanistan before this administration ends. Whatever party wins in November, it will take at least a year for the next administration to establish the essential analytical framework and policy approach needed to satisfy U.S. interest in Afghanistan and the region.

In the mid-1980's, Congress seized the initiative and legislated a more invigorated American approach on Afghanistan. You are real-

ly the only hope for policy change on Afghanistan at this time as we proceed from one administration to the next.

My suggestion is two-fold. As you did in 1988, also a Presidential election year, adopt legislation re-establishing the position of an American Special Envoy on Afghanistan with the rank of Ambassador. A high level Special Envoy specifically dealing with Afghanistan would reverse the image of American disengagement from Afghanistan. It would compensate for the lack of an American Ambassador in Kabul. The envoy would coordinate a fresh American approach on Afghanistan, working interagency, with the Congress, Afghans and foreign governments.

The second suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is to adopt legislation re-establishing a direct United States AID humanitarian assistance program for Afghanistan. The level could begin at \$10 million or even less. It would be managed from USAID offices in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, as well as from Peshawar, Pakistan to ensure that American aid goes to non-Taliban areas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Tomsen follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. PETER TOMSEN

UNTYING THE AFGHAN KNOT

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and your subcommittee for the invitation to testify before you today. The influence of Afghanistan on critical United States interests in the Central-South Asian region and globally has for too long been underestimated. The current American policy toward Afghanistan and the Taliban has not and cannot advance these interests. I congratulate you for organizing today's hearing to explore a more effective American approach to breaking the bloody stalemate in Afghanistan.

During my thirty-three years in the American Foreign Service, preceded by two years as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Nepal, I served as a United States Ambassador to a country—Armenia—and as an American Ambassador and Presidential Special Envoy to a cause—the quest for peace and freedom in Afghanistan. Now retired, I retain a deep interest in that cause.

Mr. Chairman, among the countless Afghan parables is one that states: "As long as the root touches the water, there is hope." Afghans still hope for peace, despite their predicament. No nation since perhaps the Germans during the devastating Thirty Years War have suffered proportionally and continuously such death and destruction over decades. The Soviet invasion and occupation killed two million Afghans, ripped apart the delicate socio-political fabric and traditional base of Afghanistan, shattered the economic structure, sewed over ten million mines, drove five million Afghans into Pakistan and Iran, destroyed much of the centuries-old underground irrigation system and created the Muslim extremist foothold in Afghanistan which has fueled the second round of warfare in Afghanistan continuing today.

The extremist network created during the nine year Afghan-Soviet war has subjected Afghanistan to another form of tyranny every bit as pernicious as the bloody string of Soviet-supported communist rulers during the 1980's. The Pakistani military's Interservices Intelligence Directorate (ISI), Pakistani radical Muslim parties, Saudi and other Arab extremists, including Osama bin Ladin, and Afghanistan's own Islamist elements (Hekmatyar, Rabbani, Sayyaf, and the Taliban) have exploited the country as a springboard for exporting terrorism, drugs and Muslim extremism through Eurasia, from Xinjiang to Chechnya, Kashmir to Karachi.

Tribal leaders in Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province earlier this year warned the Pakistani Tehrik-e-Taliban ("Taliban Movement") against forcing Talibanization in their tribal areas. Sunni fanatics recently assassinated fourteen more Shia in Karachi. Uzbek customs officials seized a shipment of radioactive material in May. Press reports indicate the shipment was destined for Taliban-held areas in Afghanistan where it would be converted into powerful radiation bombs for use by international terrorists based in Afghanistan.

Terrorist operations, massive drug production and the ebb and flow of fighting in Afghanistan is now accompanied by destructive drought which is drying wells, denying moisture to crops and forcing the premature slaughter of livestock. There are

reports of large-scale locust attacks. Criminal activity and banditry in urban and rural areas is on the rise as the Taliban grip weakens in Afghanistan. Colombia-style murderous, narco-terrorist syndicates with international tentacles are emerging. Afghans, desperate for peace, ask if their nightmare will ever end.

As the Afghan proverb tells, however, there is hope. Modern history records examples of how proud, small nations, particularly those with their own history, culture and religion, resist subjugation. Afghans see their history as a united nation going back to the mid-eighteenth century. As practiced, the Afghan national identity is a unique, holistic blend of Islam, tribal codes of conduct, and Afghan nationalism, north and south, east and west. Afghanistan's moderate Islam rejects the Taliban-style radical Deobandi, Wahabbi, and Ikhwani influences imported from Pakistan, the Persian Gulf, and the Middle East as turmoil enveloped the country.

There are other reasons for hope.

The Taliban is in decline. It will probably be driven from Kabul by the end of the year.

Unlike in the Balkans, no Afghan ethnic group inside Afghanistan has separatist aspirations. Pashtuns do not want to join Pakistan; Tajiks likewise prefer their Afghan moorings to union with Tajikistan; Afghanistan's Shia population has shown no inclination to seek association with Iran.

It is also potentially helpful that each of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council has an interest in seeing a legitimate regime in Kabul, accepted by most Afghans as chosen by Afghans, in an Afghan deliberative process not imposed from the outside; a regime which focuses on Afghanistan's massive internal economic problems; one prepared to work with Afghanistan's neighbors and the international community to break the utilization of Afghan soil by terrorists, to phase out opium production, and reap the substantial economic gains from the revival of ancient trade and transport corridors transiting Afghanistan. The Taliban fail in all of these categories.

A stable Afghanistan offering a crossroads for regional and global commerce along a sweeping north-south and east-west axis would prove an economic boon to each of Afghanistan's neighbors in the region, as well as to Afghanistan itself.

Islamabad would benefit the most. Pakistan cannot transit Afghanistan to market its products in Central Asia, the Caspian Basin and China while instability persists in Afghanistan.

Pakistan has legitimate interests in Afghanistan. They do not, however, extend to selecting those who rule in Kabul. Islamabad's sponsorship of the Taliban will only further advance the economic and social decay underway in Pakistan itself. Pakistan's continuing support for the Taliban will also deepen its political isolation in the region and in the international community.

#### AFGHAN VIEWS OF OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE

Neither Pakistani nor Iranian attempts to mediate the Afghan dispute can succeed. The period since the Soviet pullout is littered with the carcasses of Islamabad initiated "peace" initiatives for Afghanistan. These include the Afghan Interim Government in 1988, the 1992 Islamabad Accord, and then the Taliban in the mid-1990's. Pakistan has consistently sought to put Afghan Muslim extremists in Kabul, much like the Soviets attempted to place their own asset, the Afghan communists, in Kabul. Afghans are now thoroughly suspicious of any outside mediation, most notably initiatives from Islamabad and Tehran. Their cynicism extends as well to Moscow and Riyadh.

Many Afghans also worry that Russian leaders may emulate the Soviet era tendency to reach for military and intelligence levers in dealing with the complex Afghan issue. In 1979, the Soviet Politburo took that path, disregarding the advice of many in Soviet foreign policy and think tank positions who were knowledgeable about Afghanistan. Today, powerful elements in the Russian military and intelligence establishment may play a spoiler role by arguing against an internationally assisted Afghanistan settlement process, favoring instead a climate of confrontation along the Amu Darya to buttress Moscow as a "protector" of the Central Asian states against the Muslim extremist threat from Afghanistan. Russian stoking of conflict in Moldova and the Caucasus has had a similar objective of drawing the former Soviet republics back under Russia's control. Conversely, Moscow's cooperation in an internationally assisted Afghanistan settlement could be an important precedent for further Russian-Western collaboration to resolve other conflicts smoldering across Eurasia.

Afghans have become disillusioned with Washington's disengagement from Afghanistan, as the United States sources out its policy to others. This disengagement was illustrated again when the State Department repeated U.S. support for Paki-

stani and Iranian settlement initiatives for Afghanistan. These initiatives have no chance of succeeding. They will be rejected by Afghans as further destructive Iranian and Pakistani attempts to champion their favored extremist elements in Afghan internal affairs. Ongoing Iranian and Pakistani strategic competition in Afghanistan also dooms these outside interventions to failure.

#### FORMULATING AN EFFECTIVE AMERICAN POLICY

United States policy toward Afghanistan and the region will be critical to the success of an Afghan peace process. The principal problem is that there is not, and has not been, an American policy toward Afghanistan since the 1992 collapse of the communist regime in Kabul. It was only after the 1998 Osama bin Ladin-instigated bombings of U.S. embassies in Africa that U.S. policy on Afghanistan began to stir. The resultant, single-minded "get bin Ladin" approach, however, has missed the point. Seizing one terrorist, however odious, does not address the broad and important U.S. interests at stake in Afghanistan. A comprehensive American policy is required in order to: stem international terrorism; reverse soaring Afghan narcotics production; remove the increasingly dangerous international Islamist network using Afghanistan as an operational base; lay the basis for revival of Eurasian trade routes through Afghanistan; and help Afghans rebuild their nation after over two decades of Soviet and Islamist generated death and destruction.

The Clinton administration over the past seven years has squandered the opportunity to end the Afghan conflict. Washington's vapid approach has assumed that there is no cost to American disengagement. But there are costs. They are already high. They will only increase should American inaction continue.

President Clinton, during his April South Asia visit, reflected the lack of an effective United States policy on Afghanistan. He mentioned Afghanistan in public but once, and that was in the form of another "get bin Ladin" reference during his meeting with Pakistan Chief Executive Musharraf. President Clinton's trip could have been used to propose a major initiative on Afghanistan, laying out a broad U.S. policy responding to the multiple U.S. interests in Afghanistan.

Whether it is in this Administration or the next one, an effective American policy on Afghanistan will need to fit into a broader regional policy framework: helping Pakistan out of its present mess; defusing Indo-Pakistani tensions; pursuing rapprochement with Iran; strengthening the democratic and economic transition process in Russia and Central Asia; combating the threat to regional and global stability posed by Afghanistan-sourced drugs and terrorism; unleashing the regional economic benefits that peace in Afghanistan would bring to South Asia, Iran, Russia, China, and the new Central Asian Republics; and creating an area for fruitful U.S. cooperation with Japan and China.

A U.S. diplomatic push on Afghanistan should best work indirectly through the U.N. Security Council, which has the legitimate mandate under the U.N. Charter to prevent threats to peace and security. The U.S. could be the sparkplug for U.N. Security Council action to convene a major international conference to focus exclusively on Afghanistan. The main goals of the conference should include a formal treaty formally recognizing Afghanistan's neutrality and sovereignty, such as was done for Austria in the 1955 Austrian State Treaty. The conference and its attendant documents could further:

- Bind outside governments and entities not to provide the Afghan belligerents with weapons or other war-making material, including aviation fuel.
- Make clear that governments or entities which persist in supplying the Afghan belligerents with war-making potential would be sanctioned.
- Register pledges of support for Afghanistan's reconstruction. The U.N. would coordinate the international assistance effort.
- Designate the U.N. Secretary General's Special Envoy on Afghanistan as the only outside mediator for the Afghan settlement processes.
- Prohibit separate, direct mediation or lobbying by foreign governments or regional organizations with the Afghan factions. Instead, foreign governments would provide their insights directly to the United Nations mediation initiative.
- Provide incentives to discourage Pakistan from shifting its support to yet another mix of Afghan extremists in Kabul as the Taliban disintegrate.

#### INTERNATIONAL COORDINATION

Active support for a Security Council initiative on Afghanistan by Afghanistan's neighbors, especially Pakistan, will be essential to its success. Positive incentives for Pakistan's cooperation will be important to counter internal Pakistani opposition from Muslim extremist elements in Pakistani military and political circles. Incen-

tives for a constructive Pakistani approach would include Pakistan's desperately needed access to Eurasian markets and trade routes through a peaceful Afghanistan. The international conference could also offer Pakistan a share of the international assistance which would accompany an Afghanistan settlement.

Pakistan's reasonable strategic concern about the revival of the two front security challenge it experienced for most of its post-independence period must also be addressed. Islamabad's sponsorship of a radical Islamic government in Kabul has geopolitical origins with offensive and defensive qualities—offensive in creating "Islamic depth" against India; defensive in preventing New Delhi and Moscow from once more making Afghanistan the upper lip of a strategic vise on Pakistan.

An international conference on Afghanistan could include a declaration patterned on the 1975 Helsinki Accords formally recognizing the sanctity of Afghanistan's pre-Soviet invasion frontiers, including the Afghanistan-Pakistan border area. The conference might urge that the legitimate regime in Kabul emerging from a settlement process work with Pakistan to include a bilateral border agreement, thus setting aside the century-old controversy over the 1893 Durand Line. The conference could propose that U.N. or International Court of Justice mediation be made available to assist Pakistan-Afghanistan bilateral border negotiations.

An international conference could be the vehicle to commit India, Russia, Iran, as well as Pakistan to a broader, authoritative international undertaking to restrain themselves from manipulating Afghanistan to serve their separate strategic goals in Central Asia. An international understanding respecting Afghanistan's neutrality, sovereignty and frontiers would be a form of collective security bolstering Afghan stability at the center of the Eurasian land mass. No single major power would achieve one hundred percent of its goals, as the West and Soviet Union accepted when they removed their occupation forces from Austria in 1955. All would benefit from the abandoning of the zero-sum geo-political competition by outside powers in Afghanistan, that has led to the current destructive stalemate in which none of Afghanistan's competing neighbors can succeed in maintaining its favored Afghan in Kabul. All will continue to suffer from the stalemate of death, destruction, and chaos on their borders. A forceful American and United Nations Security Council Initiative from outside the region could break the impasse. As the noted Pakistani specialist on Afghanistan, respected journalist Ahmed Rashid has written, "Until the United States demonstrates that it has the determination to mobilize an international effort for ending outside interference, Afghanistan's chaos will only spread."

#### GOOD TIMING FOR DOMESTIC AFGHAN AGREEMENT

An international conference projecting international support for Afghanistan's neutrality and sovereignty would give impetus to the internal Afghan settlement process which has begun to generate momentum. The Taliban's decline is assisting this welcome trend. Intangible as well as tangible elements are steadily eroding the Taliban's base of support, including in the southern Pashtun belt. A successful international conference could indirectly assist Afghans to fill the vacuum left by the Taliban's demise, discourage Pakistan from sponsoring yet another radical Muslim option to replace the Taliban, provide "cover" to Pakistan's leaders to end Islamabad's failed course in Afghanistan and regain its image as a constructive partner in the international community.

The most likely immediate scenario following the breakup of the Taliban would be the re-emergence of local military commanders, tribal and clan leaders in previous Taliban areas. Some combination, perhaps including former Taliban elements, would then take over Kabul. A critical issue at this point would be whether those controlling Kabul will be ready to support a genuine Afghan political settlement process.

The Northern Alliance (or United Front) leader Ahmed Shah Masood's actions would be important while Taliban control in the southern Pashtun belt continues to weaken. By pushing toward Kabul, he would re-unite Pashtun opposition against himself. More months if not years of warfare would follow. Masood would again find himself constantly beleaguered, faced with enemies from the east, south, and west seeking to dislodge him from the capital. He could instead announce his support for a peace process, representing all Afghan groups, while eschewing unilateral military advantage. In addition to Masood, other major commanders in Afghanistan, Pashtun and non-Pashtuns, would need to join in backing the political process, restraining themselves militarily.

The great majority of Afghans have concluded that a peace process must include the convening of a large gathering of Afghans, which fairly represents Afghanistan's major groups and regions. Such meetings—termed Loya Jirgas or "Grand Assemblies" in Afghan history—have chosen leaders and set a direction for the country



before in Afghan history. The Loya Jirga movement revolving around Ex-monarch Zahir Shah is one—but not the only—possible catalyst to this end. The new group in Kabul replacing the Taliban could turn out to be a supporter of a representative Loya Jirga if it opts for a settlement process and resists the temptation to become the next transitory ruler in Kabul.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, my judgement is that it is useless to expect good results from negotiations with the rigid, orthodox, anti-western Taliban. The Taliban are active partners in the international extremist network threatening the region and beyond. We should proceed in a way that accelerates the Taliban's deteriorating position in Afghanistan. Our policy should discreetly assist the intra-Afghan dialogue to create a legitimate non-Taliban regime in Afghanistan, missing since the early 1970's. That regime, I believe, could lead Afghanistan back to playing a respectable role in the international community, as it did before the Soviet invasion. Diplomatically, the United States should help put together an international arrangement which will assist the return to peace in Afghanistan and ensure stability in central Eurasia for the upcoming decades.

Afghans will benefit the most from the resulting chance for peace. So will all of Afghanistan's neighbors and the broader Central-South Asian region generally.

#### WHAT CAN CONGRESS DO?

A lot. We cannot expect an effective foreign policy on Afghanistan before this Administration ends. Whichever party wins in November, it will take at least a year for the next administration to establish the essential analytical framework and policy approach needed to satisfy U.S. interests in Afghanistan and the region. In the mid-1980's Congress seized the initiative and legislated a more invigorated American approach on Afghanistan. You are really the only hope for policy change as we proceed from one administration to the next.

My suggestion is that you consider legislation realizing the following objectives:

- As you did in 1988, a presidential election year, adopt legislation re-establishing the position of an American Special Envoy on Afghanistan with the rank of Ambassador. A high level Special Envoy specifically dealing with Afghanistan would reverse the image of American disengagement from Afghanistan. It will compensate for the lack of an American ambassador in Kabul. The envoy would coordinate a fresh American approach on Afghanistan, working inter-agency, with the Congress, Afghans and foreign governments.
- Adopt legislation re-establishing a direct United States humanitarian assistance program for Afghanistan. The level could begin at ten million dollars or even less. It should be managed from USAID offices in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, as well as from Peshawar, Pakistan to ensure that American aid goes to non-Taliban areas.

Mr. Chairman, these two steps would project to Afghans, as well as to outside powers involved in Afghanistan, that the United States is finally giving a higher priority to Afghanistan through an effective policy. As in the mid-1980's, you will face resistance from the bureaucracy in passing legislation on these two issues. As we go from this administration to the next one, however, congressional action is really the only alternative for shifting our policy to a course that will generate tangible results for American interests in Afghanistan and the region.

Senator BROWBACK. Thank you for that thoughtful comment and set of items that Congress could do as well. Mr. Karzai, thank you, very much for being with us.

#### **STATEMENT OF MR. HAMID KARZAI, AFGHAN TRIBAL LEADER, GLENWOOD, MD**

Mr. KARZAI. Thank you, very much, sir. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to appear before you. My testimony will take the following format:

A brief observation about the traditional politics of Afghanistan. Observations about what brought Afghanistan to this point.

The prospects for peace.

Traditional body politics of Afghanistan. Historically the evolution and stability of the Afghan nation and its independence have rested upon the sanctity of the three dominant pillars of the Af-

ghan national identity. These three pillars are: Islam, national unity, and traditional tribal social structure.

Islam in Afghanistan has always been faith-based, above politics and the daily conflicts and burdens of life. A tolerant and moderate of Islamic way of life provides a comprehensive faith-based moral quote and guidance for the Afghan society as well as for the individual. Religious and spiritual leaders have never in the past entertained the desire to control government, but enjoyed privilege to influence government policies.

National unity. Coexistence of all Afghan groups in the framework of national unity have always been a prerequisite and in the forefront of achieving and protecting the Afghan independence. The maintenance and enhancement of the Afghan national unity was neither the work of politics nor government, but has been rather the work of Afghan people and individuals to cooperate and thus peacefully coexist as one nation.

Traditional social structure. The traditional and tribal value structure perhaps is the best guide as to how the Afghan society and individual have resisted radicalism and totalitarianism of both right and left since the Communist coup of 1978. The tribal value structure enumerated below can also provide the best comparison between the moderate temperament of the Afghan society and communism and extremism that have been imposed on us since 1978. I am not going to detail what they are.

It is the presence, cooperation and coexistence of these three pillars in our history that shaped the Afghan nation and its identity.

For me the mother of all evils in Afghanistan was the Communist coup of 1978 and the subsequent Soviet invasion of our country. But allow me to tell you what else happened to bring Afghanistan to this point.

Mr. Chairman, I joined the Afghan resistance against the Soviet invasion in 1983. I was 25 then. And ever since, like many of my compatriots, I am still struggling for the Afghan right to self-determination to bring durable peace and stability to our country. For 22 years, war and destruction has uprooted the Afghan society, socially, politically, economically, and emotionally.

Our economy is in ruins. Our people are pushed into destitution and despair. Our land is turned into a training camp for terrorists, gun runners, drug dealers and criminals. Our agriculture is destroyed because of land mines. Worst of all, Afghans are still dying in a foreign imposed war.

Who is responsible for all of this? Afghans? Mr. Chairman, no. The outsiders? Yes.

Before the Soviet invasion of 1979, Afghanistan was among the most peaceful countries in the world. Probably one of the most peaceful countries in the world. The economy was growing. The social and economic infrastructure was improving. And cooperation with the traditional leadership, a fairly well-educated class was increasingly participating in local and national politics, in the developmental processes and in building the civil society sector.

We had freedom of the press and freedom of association with an independent judiciary. The national and provincial authorities did not intervene in local affairs. Local leaders and civil society were

allowed to settle issues and adjudicate disputes in accordance with our traditional and social values.

Afghanistan, Mr. Chairman, was not a rich or developed country. However, its people lived in peace and with dignity as Afghans and as members of the international community.

Disruption began when the former Soviet Union tried to superimpose communism on our society by trying to weaken our traditional social fabric and institutions. The Soviets and their Communist allies, undertook a violent and revolutionary approach to turn the Afghan society and the Afghan world outlook upside down. They embarked on eliminating the traditional leadership and the educated. They tampered with our faith.

Unfortunately, after the Soviet pullout from Afghanistan, the neighboring countries that were the most supportive of our Jihad qualitatively adopted the same radical approach and social experimentation to further uproot and destabilize the Afghan society.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, of the countries that supported our Jihad, Iran and Pakistan share borders with us. They received millions of refugees for which we remain very grateful. We are especially grateful to the people of Pakistan who treated our refugees with warmth and hospitality.

But it was always these two countries that interfered the most in our internal affairs during the years of Jihad and most importantly after the Soviet withdrawal. Both chose to implement and support extremism in Afghanistan. Iran did it to promote its ideological and revolutionary interests. Pakistan interfered to gain strategic depth.

Thus, after the Soviet withdrawal continuing until today, Pakistan's intervention in Afghanistan remains the most intensive and systematic. This has been done by persistent massive support extremism to undermine the role of the educated experienced bureaucrats, the patriotic, and traditional leadership of Afghanistan.

Systematic efforts are still going on to undermine our national unity and the traditional social-political foundation of the country. The presence of terrorist training camps and the use of our soil by militant groups are the result of this ongoing interference and the consequences of neglect by the West and in particular by the United States.

The Taliban emerged when Afghans were desperately looking for a savior. Their emergence was supported by the majority of the Afghan people hoping that the Taliban equipped with good and honest credentials during the years of Jihad would mobilize all Afghans to end the bloodshed and would bring the much-needed peace and stability.

I was among the first to actively support the Taliban movement. I personally knew and worked with the majority of the leadership during the entire period of Jihad. They were neither radical nor against Afghan values and culture. They entertained no ambition to hold onto political power nor to remain involved in politics.

Thus, my knowledge of and experience with the Afghan Taliban makes it very clear to me that the presence of militancy and terrorism in Afghanistan are not the product of Afghans, but rather the product of non-Afghans who have come to our country in disguise to appear as Afghans and as Taliban.

While the majority of these non-Afghan militant elements come from Pakistan, a substantial number are also from other countries. Some of them are ideological zealots. Some are mercenaries and some belong to other institutions. The majority is sponsored by government agencies and extremist organizations like Sepah-ie-Sahaba of Pakistan, Harakat-ul-mujahedeen, et cetera.

Our people do not and did not invite these extremist militant forces to our country. Though they may have some Taliban collaborators. Just like the Soviets were not invited by our people to invade us in the name of invitation by their Communist collaborators.

But there is not much that the people of Afghanistan can do to remove foreign military presence and the training camps without a proper and strong international action to help Afghans regain self-determination and sovereignty over the Afghan territory and to take its rightful place alongside other nations of the international community.

The United States bombed terrorist bases in Afghanistan in 1998. The Government of Russia recently threatened to bomb these bases. Bombings or the threat of bombing will not remove terrorist's bases from Afghanistan. Such actions will only add to the problems and prolong the suffering of our people and worst of all solidify the presence of terrorist groups.

I believe that Afghanistan under the prevailing circumstances is dangerous to itself, dangerous to the stability of the region and dangerous to the accepted international norms and behavior. On the other hand, peace and stability in the context of a sovereign Afghanistan—I underline sovereign Afghanistan, Mr. Chairman, here repeatedly so as to make a point.

On the other hand, peace and stability in the context of a sovereign Afghanistan is beneficial to economic and political stability of the whole region, most of all to Pakistan, Iran and our other neighbors. It is here that all Afghans sincerely believe that the international community, but particularly the United States and Western Europe, have the capability to intervene and put pressure on our neighbors, especially on Pakistan. The United States and its allies on a larger scale did precisely that in Kuwait.

Stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan can only be achieved in the historical national decisionmaking process of Loya Jirga which is the Grand Council of the Afghan people. Loya Jirga is the meeting of representative, effective and prominent Afghans at any given time.

Senator BROWNBACK. We will put your whole statement in the record. So if there are places that you could—summarize in particular what we should be doing now or the administration.

Mr. KARZAI. Exactly. I am coming to that. The Afghans expect precisely the following. That foreign interference and foreign incursions on the soil of Afghanistan must stop. And that the United States can act effectively to do this. That the people of Afghanistan believe that the United States neglected Afghanistan after the Soviet withdrawal. That it is only with the help of a strong and powerful country like the United States and other major powers that such interference can cease in Afghanistan.

That only then can an intra-Afghan government take place. Without interference in Afghan, the Afghans will not be able to get together and form a government of their own.

In this regard and with regard to the support for the forces of Loya Jirga, the Congress of the United States of America which is a body of the people of America, can take the most effective action to support a body again which is a representative body of the people of Afghanistan, Loya Jirga.

Finally, I would like to use this august forum of the representatives of the people of the United States to assure our neighbors that the people of Afghanistan are their friends and wish to have the best mutually beneficial relations with all the neighboring countries and the region. That any government that emerges from the will of the Afghan people will not be a threat to the legitimate interests of Pakistan or any other country for that matter. The world should expect nothing more or nothing less from a free and stable Afghanistan.

I call upon the international community and particularly upon the Government of the United States to look at Afghanistan from the perspective of Afghanistan, and not that of its neighbors which has been happening so far. And that the time to watch is over and the responsibility to act is long overdue. Further delay will dramatically increase the political and economic cost of the resolution of the conflict in Afghanistan and the region.

With regard to specifics, the United States can encourage the U.N. Security Council to adopt effective measures, to have a cease-fire in Afghanistan and to bring about an arms embargo.

The United States can take strong action to support Loya Jirga the way I elaborated further and to work with the United Nations to adopt Loya Jirga as the best means toward the resolution of the Afghan problem.

And last and most important of all, Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan is suffering a famine caused by years of drought. The people of Afghanistan at this time need the greatest international assistance, especially in food. We would be very grateful if the Congress of the United States would do something strong and effective to alleviate the suffering of our people. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Karzai follows:]

#### PREPARED STATEMENT OF HAMID KARZAI

Mr. Chairman, Senator Brownback, Ranking Member, Senator Wellstone and honorable members of the committee.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you. My testimony before you will take the following format:

- A brief observation about the traditional body politics of Afghanistan
- My observation about what brought Afghanistan to this point
- The prospects for solution

#### TRADITIONAL BODY POLITICS OF AFGHANISTAN

Historically the evolution and stability of the Afghan nation and its independence have rested upon the sanctity of the three dominant pillars of the Afghan national identity. These three pillars are:

##### *Islam*

Islam.—Islam in Afghanistan has always been faith based, above politics, the daily conflicts and burdens of life. A tolerant and moderate Islamic way of life pro-

vides a comprehensive faith based moral code and guidance for the Afghan society as well as for the Afghan individual. Religious and spiritual leaders never in the past entertained the desire to control government, but enjoyed privilege to influence government policies.

*Ethnic groups within the framework of national unity*

National Unity.—Ethnic groups in the framework of national unity have always been a prerequisite and in the forefront of achieving and protecting the Afghan independence. The maintenance and enhancement of the Afghan national unity was neither the work of politics nor government, but has been rather the work of Afghan people and individuals to cooperate and thus peacefully coexist as one nation.

*Traditional and tribal social structure*

Traditional and Tribal Social Structure.—The traditional and tribal value structure perhaps is the best guide as to how the Afghan society and individual have resisted radicalism and totalitarianism of both right and left since the Communist coup of 1978. The tribal value structure enumerated below can also provide the best comparison between the moderate temperament of the Afghan society and communism, and extremism that have been imposed on us since 1978.

1. A tolerant and moderate Islamic faith versus Communism and extremism.
2. Ownership and Private property with Islamic and Tribal sanctity based on full potential and prerogative to open commerce and free enterprise economics versus communal property and controlled economy.
3. Individualism versus totalitarianism.
4. Patriotism versus ideological politics without borders.
5. Social and political decision making and conflict resolution by consensus building and mediation (Jirgas) versus violence and domination.

It is the subtle working presence, cooperation and co-existence of these three pillars in our history that shape the Afghan nation and its identity.

The Afghan national politics must harmonize with the above three dominant pillars of the Afghan National Identity or it is intolerably discordant with the Afghan nation. That is what we have been having in Afghanistan for the last twenty plus years.

*What brought us to this point?* For me the mother of all evils in Afghanistan was the Communist coup of 1978 and the subsequent Soviet invasion of our country. But allow me to tell you what else happened to bring Afghanistan to this point:

I joined the Afghan resistance against the Soviet invasion in 1983. I was 25 years old then and ever since like many of my compatriots I am still struggling for the Afghan right to self-determination, to bring durable peace and stability to our country. For 22 years, war and destruction has uprooted the Afghan society, socially, politically, economically, and emotionally. Our economy is in ruin and our people are pushed into destitute and despair. Our land is turned into a training camp for terrorists, gunrunners, drug dealers and criminals. Our agriculture is destroyed because of land mines. Worst of all, Afghans are still dying in a foreign imposed war.

Who is responsible for all of this? Afghans? No. The outsiders? Yes.

Before the Communist coup of 1978 and the subsequent Soviet invasion in 1979, Afghanistan was among the most peaceful countries in the world. The economy was growing; the social and economic infrastructure was improving. In cooperation with the traditional leadership, a fairly well educated class was increasingly participating in local and national politics, in the developmental processes and in building the civil society sector. During the period of constitutional monarchy until 1973 political power between national and local politics was allocated in the framework of parliamentary form of government. We had freedom of the press and freedom of association with an independent judiciary. The national and provincial authorities did not intervene in local affairs. Local leaders and civil society were allowed to settle issues and adjudicate disputes in accordance with our traditional and social values. Afghanistan was not a rich or developed country, however its people lived in peace and with dignity as Afghans and as member of the international community.

Disruption began when the former Soviet Union tried to superimpose communism on our society by trying to weaken our traditional social fabric and institutions. They, the Soviets and Communist allies, undertook a violent and revolutionary approach to turn the Afghan society and the Afghan world outlook upside down. They embarked on eliminating the traditional leadership and the educated. They tampered with our faith.

They violated the virtue of individualism to replace it with totalitarianism. They attacked our patriotism to replace it with ideological internationalism. They attacked our social-political processes of decision-making and conflict resolution

through consensus and mediation by imposing of a zero-sum method of waging violence and dominance.

Unfortunately after the Soviet pullout from Afghanistan the neighboring countries that were most supportive of our Jihad qualitatively adopted the same radical approach and social experimentation to further uproot and destabilize the Afghan society.

As you know Mr. Chairman, of the countries that supported our Jihad, Iran and Pakistan share borders with us. They received millions of refugees for which we remain very grateful. We are especially grateful to the people of Pakistan who treated our refugees with warmth and hospitality.

But it was always these two countries that interfered the most in our internal affairs during the years of Jihad and most importantly after the Soviet withdrawal. Both chose to implant and support extremism in Afghanistan. Iran did it to promote its ideological and revolutionary interests. Pakistan interfered to gain strategic depth and was keen to install a puppet government in Afghanistan. Thus after the Soviet withdrawal continuing until today, Pakistan's intervention in Afghanistan remains the most intensive and systematic. This has been done by persistent massive support to extremism to undermine the role of the educated, experienced bureaucrats, the patriotic, and traditional leadership of Afghanistan. Systematic efforts are still going on to undermine our national unity and the traditional social-political foundation of the country. The presence of terrorist training camps and the use of our soil by militant groups are the result of this ongoing interference and the consequences of neglect by the West and in particular by the United States.

The Taliban emerged when Afghans were desperately looking for a savior. Their emergence was supported by the majority of the Afghan people hoping that the Taliban equipped with good and honest credentials during the Jihad would mobilize all Afghans to end the bloodshed and would bring the much needed peace and stability.

I was among the first to actively support the Taliban movement. I personally knew and worked with the majority of their leadership during the entire period of Jihad. They were neither radical nor against Afghan values and culture. They entertained no ambition to hold onto political power or to remain involved in politics. Thus my knowledge of and experience with the Afghan Taliban makes it very clear to me that the presence of militancy and terrorism in Afghanistan are not the products of Afghans, but rather the products of non-Afghans who have come to our country in disguise to appear as Afghans and as Taliban. While the majority of these non-Afghans militant elements come from Pakistan, a substantial numbers are also from other countries. Some of them are ideological zealots, some are mercenaries and some belong to other institutions. The majority is sponsored by government agencies and extremist organization like Sepah-ie-Sahaba of Pakistan, Harakat-ul-mujahedeen, et cetera. Our people do not and did not invite these extremist militant forces to our country. Though they may have some Taliban collaborators, just like the Soviets were not invited by Afghans but invaded us in the name of invitation by their Communist collaborators.

But there is not much that the people of Afghanistan can do to remove foreign military presence and the training camps without a proper and strong international action to help Afghans regain self-determination and sovereignty over the Afghan territory.

The United States bombed terrorist bases in Afghanistan in 1998. The government of Russia recently threatened to bomb these bases.

Bombings or the threat of bombing will not remove terrorist's bases from Afghanistan. Such actions will only add to problems and prolong the suffering of our people and solidify the presence of terrorist groups.

I believe that Afghanistan under the prevailing circumstances is dangerous to itself, dangerous to the stability of the region and dangerous to the accepted international norms and behavior. On the other hand, peace and stability in the context of a sovereign Afghanistan is beneficial to economic and political stability of the whole region, most of all to Pakistan, Iran and our other neighbors. It is here that all Afghans sincerely believe that the international community but particularly the United States and Western Europe have the capability to intervene and put pressure on our neighbors, especially on Pakistan. The United States and its allies on a larger scale did precisely that in Kuwait, the United States and its allies did precisely that in Bosnia and Kosovo and it is doing precisely that now in the Middle East.

As we look at the history, the dynamism and composition of the Afghan nation, the collective psyche of our people and their love for independence, one is forced to see that Afghanistan can never stabilize under foreign domination. That it is a li-

ability to all when it is pushed into violence and despair and is an asset to all when it is free and stable.

Stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan can only be achieved in the historical national decisionmaking process of Loya Jirga (Grand National Council). Loya Jirga is the meeting of representative, effective and prominent Afghans at any given time. In this regard, efforts increased in May of 1997 when some tribal elders and prominent Afghans sat together in Islamabad. To mobilize Afghans this process quickly emerged into an Intra-Afghan dialogue process that convened a series of representative Afghan gatherings in Istanbul and Bonn in 1998. In every step these gatherings were deliberated by an absolute majority that H.M. Mohammed Zaher the former Afghan king was the most trusted senior Afghan national elder and the legitimate center of the Afghan national politics to facilitate the convening of the Afghan Loya Jirga. Since the summer of 1999, the Loya Jirga process has moved on to put together a series of Afghan meetings and diplomatic initiative under the auspices of the former Afghan Monarch residing in Rome. I would like to submit to the committee that since the Soviet pull out from Afghanistan there has been the inescapable reality awaiting us that peace and stability in Afghanistan can only be achieved in the logical order and decorum of the following realizations and practical steps:

1. War, international terrorism and extremism have taken such a grave regional and international dimension that compromises our tenets of Islam, national unity, territorial integrity and national sovereignty.

2. Afghans themselves can only deliberate peace under the prevailing circumstances in Afghanistan.

3. Foreign interference and foreign incursions on the Afghan soil must stop. The integrity and sanctity of the Afghan borders must be observed in accordance with International laws. The perpetrators whether governments or organizations at the disposal of government must be put under tight international scrutiny with binding repercussions both economic and political. Here the burden of enforcement is on the shoulders of the United Nations, the United States, European Union and other major powers of the international community.

4. War must cease immediately. The United Nations Security Council must impose an arms embargo.

5. The Afghan National Unity must be upheld and enhanced. The incentive is what Madison said during the American struggle for independence "We either hang together or we will be hanged separately."

6. Afghans must exercise their right of self-determination.

7. Self-determination must be deliberated by all Afghans and legitimized within the process of the Afghan Loya Jirga. That Loya Jirga worthy of the noble cause of Afghan self-determination to achieve durable peace and stability must proceed with principles of inclusiveness, transparency, national unity, consultation and national representation. The burden of all this is of course on Afghans whether living inside Afghanistan or abroad. In this critical moment of history, peace and stability in our country demands from all of us that we must act as Afghans and only as Afghans.

Finally, I would like to use this august forum of the representatives of the people of the United States to assure our neighbors that the people of Afghanistan are their friends and wish to have the best mutually beneficial relations with all the neighboring countries and the region. That any government that emerges from the will of the Afghan people will not be a threat to the legitimate interest of Pakistan or any other country for that matter. The world should expect nothing more or nothing less from a free and stable Afghanistan.

I call upon the international community and particularly upon the government of the United States to look at Afghanistan from the perspective of Afghanistan, not that of its neighbors, and that the time to watch is over and the responsibility to act is long overdue. Further delay will dramatically increase the political and economic cost of the resolution of the conflict in Afghanistan and the region.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you. Is there a particular region of the country where there is famine, or is it over the entire nation?

Mr. KARZAI. Well, rain has not been there in the southern and western parts of the country. But because of years of war, the entire Afghan nation is in despair and destitute and angry.



Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell a personal story here. There is somebody who is a lawyer who is a Pashtun law. Ten years ago, he had a house. He had education for his children and he had plenty to eat. Five years ago, he came to me for help for house rent. Two years ago or 3 years ago, he came to me seeking help for the education of his children. And last year, he was there seeking help only to feed his family. That is how bad Afghanistan is. And this is the condition of a highly educated Afghan, a man who fought heroically against the Soviets. Now he is in such destitute. The rest of the Afghan society is an example that we can take from an educated man.

Senator BROWBACK. Dr. Shamley, thank you, very much for joining us as well. If you would like to summarize your statement so that we can get to questions, and we will take the full statement into the record, but we do want to hear your points that you have.

**STATEMENT OF DR. ZIEBA SHORISH-SHAMLEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S ALLIANCE FOR PEACE AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFGHANISTAN, WASHINGTON, DC**

Dr. SHORISH-SHAMLEY. Thank you Mr. Chairman for organizing this important hearing and for giving me the opportunity to speak to you about the Afghan crisis and possible solutions to the crisis.

However, I am going to skip the area of the cruelty and human rights violations by Taliban because I think it has been covered well.

All I want to say is that the Taliban edicts are neither part of the Afghan culture nor the religion of Islam. In Islam, God grants human rights and they are part of Muslims faith. Anyone who considers himself, herself, a Muslim must accept, recognize those rights. Islamic rights cannot be changed and are applicable to all human beings.

Islam has granted rights for security of life and property and protects honor and dignity of human beings. Islam protects the human rights to security and privacy.

Under the Islamic principles, no one can be imprisoned unless his/her guilt has been proven in an open court. To arrest and imprison individuals on the basis of suspicion without due process is not permissible in Islam.

Islam has given human beings the right to protest against government tyranny. Islam protects individuals from being arrested or imprisoned for the crimes of others. Islam grants human beings the rights of freedom, of thought, of expression, of association and of formation of organization on the condition that these rights be used for propagation of truth, virtue and justice.

Islam also protects the human freedom of conscious of convictions and of related sentiments. Islam ensures that the human religions sentiments are respected and nothing will be done that may encroach upon these rights. Islam recognizes the rights of humans to the basic necessities of life.

Islam grants humans equality before law and does not hold the rulers above the law. Islam grants humans the right to participate in the affairs of their estate. Islam has granted all humans, male and female, the right to education and work. Islam has laid down

some universal fundamental rights for humanity as a whole. That ought to be respected and observed by all human beings.

Therefore, the Taliban brand of Islam is not based on the teaching of Islam.

I have a few recommendations, but I will highlight the five important things as to what the United States can do.

The human rights of women and girls in Afghanistan must remain a priority for the United Nations and United States. Efforts must be focused on rights of women and girls to have full access to health, education, work and other social and political aspects of their society.

End the monopoly of participation of the warring factions and their foreign supporters in the U.N. peace initiative. Diversify contacts within the Afghan populace, particularly with Afghan women refugees living in Pakistan, and formally include the Afghan Civil Society and non-violent political and social centers to become equal participants with the warring factions and their foreign backers in the United Nations peace initiative.

The Afghan women must be involved in the peace process and must have the right to be effective participants in the internal and external affairs of their country and society. Having women at the table must be a condition of peace talks. A democratic, representative government should be established in which all members of the Afghan society regardless of gender, age, ethnicity and religious affiliation can be equally represented.

Encourage non-governmental organizations to work in Afghanistan to address women's security, access to health, education and other basic needs. The U.S. should provide funds for the Afghan NGO's for training of the Afghan refugee women in the areas such as their empowerment, capacity-building, individual skill building, advocacy and development. The United States should appoint a Special Envoy to bring to an end the human rights violations in Afghanistan.

The United States and United Nations should negotiate for the local populations to have the right to govern themselves. They should support the idea of self-determination and a democratic system of governance for the people of Afghanistan. The United States and United Nations should negotiate for an agreement from the warring factions for the redrawing of the administrative unit in the government. Representation of the administrative unit should enhance the cohesion of the different ethnic groups of different territories and provinces within Afghanistan.

Inject moral and human rights measures to judge the sincerity of the warring factions and their foreign backers in the U.N. peace initiative. The United States and United Nations should identify and recognize the democratic elements inside Afghanistan who support human rights in general and women's rights in particular. These elements should be supported and encouraged by the United States and the United Nations, that includes in the peace talks.

The Security Council members such as United States need to adopt enforcement measures against the Taliban for opting for military resolution to end the conflict and for the gross violation of human rights. The warring factions and their foreign backers must

be held accountable for the war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide and violations of human rights.

The United States and United Nations must force all warring factions to agree to cease-fire. The foreign countries involved in supporting the action of war must be made to be committed to support urgent humanitarian assistance and funds for refugee repatriation and reconstruction efforts through international and non-governmental organizations.

The United States and United Nations must urge the Taliban and other warring factions to release imprisoned Afghan women and men leaders. The U.S. and the U.N. and the international community should demand that the Taliban and other warring factions must make prisons accessible to international human rights organizations.

The U.N. should investigate atrocity cases inside Afghanistan and in the refugee camps in Pakistan. There should be a U.N. tribunal to bring to justice those who have violated the rights and have committed war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and other forms of violence against the Afghan women, children and men. The U.N. should empower an international tribunal to identify and bring to justice Communist-era Afghan and former Soviet war criminals, and those responsible for other crimes after the Communist era.

In addition, the warring factions and their foreign supporters must be put on the notice that war can never produce dividends in the negotiation stages of bringing peace or when peace comes to Afghanistan. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Shorish-Shamley follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ZIEBA SHORISH-SHAMLEY, PH. D.

Honorable members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you about the Afghan crises and possible solutions to the crises.

Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan that once was the land of heroic peoples and hospitality has become the land of terror and torture. There are proxy wars, war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and cultural genocide. There is persecution and prosecution of people based on gender, religious belief, political affiliation, ethnicity language and others. There is trafficking of women and girls. There are forced prostitution and forced marriages. There are illegal arms and drug trafficking and terrorist training. There is child labor and boys as young as ten years old are forced to fight in armed conflict.

Under the Taliban's misogynist rule the Afghan women have become voiceless, invisible, nonbeings with no rights to an independent existence. They are stripped of all basic human rights that are fundamental to human existence.

The imprisonment of the Afghan women and girls, and prohibition of women from work, education and equal access to health care, have led to starvation, malnutrition, psychological disorder and other related diseases and intentional death among women and girls. Thousands of women and their children have died and continue to die as a direct result of this brutal system of Gender Apartheid imposed by the Taliban.

In September 1999 the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women accused the Taliban of systematic discrimination against women. The Special Rapporteur argued that the Taliban exercise official discrimination in all areas affecting women rights, including health, education, employment, movement and physical security. The U.N. Special Rapporteur points out that while discrimination against women exists throughout the world, in Afghanistan it is official policy.

The Taliban's edicts that deprive millions of Afghan women, men and children of their basic human rights are immoral and inhumane. The edicts are neither part of the Afghan culture nor the religion of Islam. In Islam God grants human rights and they are part of the Muslims faith. Anyone who considers himself/herself a

Muslim must accept, recognize, and enforce these rights. The Islamic rights cannot be changed, and are applicable to all the human beings (Qur'an Sura 5 Verse 44).

Islam has granted rights for security of life and property and protects the honor and dignity of human beings (Sura 49 Verse 11-12). Islam protects the human rights to security and privacy (Sura 49 Verse 12 and Sura 24 Verse 27). Under Islamic principles, no one can be imprisoned unless his/her guilt has been proven in an open court. To arrest and imprison individuals on the basis of suspicion without due process is not permissible in Islam. Islam has given human beings the right to protest against government's tyranny (Sura 4 Verse 148). Islam protects individuals from being arrested or imprisoned for the crimes of others (Sura 35 Verse 18).

Islam grants human the rights for freedom of thought, of expression, of associations and of formation of organizations, on the condition that these rights be used for the propagation of truth, virtue and justice and not for evil purposes. Islam also protects the human's freedom of conscience, of convictions and of religious sentiments (Qur'an Sura 2 Verse 256). Islam ensures that the humans religious sentiments are respected and nothing will be done that may encroach upon these rights. Islam recognizes the rights of human to the basic necessities of life (Sura 51, Verse 19). Islam grants humans equality before law and does not hold the rulers above the law. Islam also grants humans the right to participate in the affairs of their State (Sura 42, Verse 38).

Islam has granted all human male and female the right to education and work (Sura 35 Verse 28 and Sura 4 Verse 32). Islam has laid down some universal fundamental rights for humanity as a whole that are to be respected and observed by all human beings (Surah 5 Verse 8).

The Taliban's brand of Islam is *not* based on the teaching of Islam. Islam, which is a religion of peace, compassion and justice, is represented to the world as a religion of violence, cruelty and injustice. The Muslim scholars in the world have condemned the Taliban's "brand of Islam."

The Taliban's strategy is to systematically depopulate Afghanistan through gender apartheid, ethnic genocide, and cultural genocide. They have massacred thousands of ethnic groups and religious minorities; and thousands of others are either missing or they are imprisoned. Hundreds of thousands other ethnic people are internally and externally displaced. The Taliban have destroyed and continue to destroy Afghan cultural heritage.

Most Afghans believe that after the former Soviets withdrawal from Afghanistan, the United Nations and the international community predominately, but not exclusively, limited their peace initiatives to negotiation between the warring factions and their foreign supporters. This strategy has led the United Nations and the international community to be unusually silent about the war crimes and human rights violations in Afghanistan. This strategy has enticed the warring factions and their foreign supporters to use war to attain more leverage in the negotiation. Therefore, the unarmed and non-combatant, ninety-five percent of the Afghan people, including the Afghan women are trapped in a vicious and perpetual cycle of war.

It is important to note that the reign of war-genocide, human indignity, indiscriminate attacks and bombardment on civilians, forced embargo to starve groups (all in violation of international conventions and international laws) are related to foreign interference, particularly that of Pakistan. But the United Nations and the International community have not held the interfering nations and the warring factions accountable for these crimes. This strategy of peace initiative in Afghanistan has shamefully failed.

Within the peace initiative set by the United Nations, the situation of women and girls in Afghanistan not only must be realized and abuses remedied, but Afghan women need to be incorporated in the peace process from the onset. Restoration of Afghan women's rights must be implemented and insured. Afghan women need to be given an equal opportunity to participate in the civic and social sectors of their country; this involves their participation in the Grand Assembly (Loya Jirga), Parliament and in the future broad-based governance body of Afghanistan. *Peace without restoration of women's rights can never be true peace.*

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS FOR A POSSIBLE VIABLE PEACE SOLUTION TO THE AFGHAN CRISIS

The following recommendations are the result of interviews held with various Afghan scholars, experts, journalists, women's rights advocates and others.

(1) The Beijing Platform for Action by the United Nations emphasizes the human rights of women. These human rights include women's full and equal enjoyment of their rights in access to education, health, work and elimination of all forms of dis-

crimination against women. Therefore, the human rights of women and girls in Afghanistan must remain a priority for the United States, the United Nations and the international community. Efforts must be focused on the rights of women and girls to have full access to health, education and work and other social and political aspects of their society.

(2) End the monopoly of participation of the warring factions and their foreign supporters in the United Nations peace initiative. Diversify contacts within the Afghan populace, particularly with Afghan women refugees living in Pakistan, and formally include the Afghan Civil Society and nonviolent political and social centers to become equal participants with the warring factions and their foreign backers in the United Nations peace initiative.

(3) The Afghan women must be involved in the peace process and must have the right to be effective participants in the internal and external affairs of their country and society. Having women at the table must be a condition of peace talks. A democratic, representative government should be established, in which all members of the Afghan society, regardless of gender, age, ethnicity and religious affiliation can be equally represented.

(4) The United States and the United Nations should encourage non-governmental organizations to work in Afghanistan and to address women's security, access to health education and other basic needs. The United States should provide funds for the Afghan NGOs for training of the Afghan refugee women in the areas such as empowerment, capacity-building, individual skill building, advocacy and development. The United States should appoint a special envoy to bring an end to the human rights violations and end the suffering of the women, men and children in Afghanistan.

(5) The United States and the United Nations should negotiate for the local population to have the right to govern themselves. The United States and the United Nations should support the idea of self-determination and a democratic system of governance for the Afghan people. The United States and the United Nations should negotiate for an agreement from the warring factions for the redrawing of the administrative unit in the government. Representation of the administrative unit should enhance the cohesion of the different ethnic groups of different territories and provinces within Afghanistan.

(6) Inject moral and human rights measures to judge the sincerity of the warring factions and their foreign backers in the United Nations Peace initiative. The United States and the United Nations should identify and recognize the democratic elements inside Afghanistan who support human rights in general and women's rights in particular. These elements should be supported and encouraged by the United States and the Nations and included in peace talks.

(7) The Security Council members, such as the United States need to adopt enforcement measures against the Taliban for opting for a military solution to end the conflict and for the gross violation of human rights. The warring factions and their foreign backers must be held accountable for war crimes and crimes against humanity at the present and must be brought to trial when peace returns. The United States and the United Nations must force all warring factions to agree to a cease-fire.

(8) The Foreign countries involved in supporting the factional war must be made to be committed to support urgent humanitarian assistance and funds for refugee repatriation and reconstruction efforts through international and non-governmental organizations.

(9) The United States and the United Nations must urge the Taliban and other warring factions to release imprisoned Afghan women and men leaders. The United States, the United Nations and the international community should demand that the Taliban and other warring factions must make prisons accessible to international human rights organizations.

(10) The United Nations should investigate atrocity cases inside Afghanistan and in the refugee camps in Pakistan. There should be a United Nations tribunal to bring to justice those who have violated the rights and have committed war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and other forms of violence against the Afghan women, children, and men. The U.N. should empower an international tribunal to identify and bring to justice Communist-era Afghan and former Soviet war criminals, and those responsible for other crimes after the Communist era. In addition, the warring factions and their foreign backers must be put on the notice that war can never produce dividends in the negotiation stages of bringing peace or when peace comes to Afghanistan.

Senator BROWNBACK. I am late on another meeting that I was supposed to attend. One thought I want to put out in front of you. I hope we can disengage some other countries from the region for the conflict. And I think several of you have noted the problem has been over many years. It is just too many people stirring the pot. I think we are probably going to have to go further than that to help to encourage in the stabilization of Afghanistan over a period of time. I think it is going to be important on how this develops going forward. Now, particularly as we are looking toward a new administration, of their engagement of solving this issue.

We did a wrong policy move when the Soviet Union was trying to take over Afghanistan. The United States was very supportive of the Afghan freedom fighters. That was the right thing to do. Immediately after the Soviets fall out, we are saying, well, OK. This is all over. And we go home and then left things there to follow a very difficult course that has happened over a period of a number of years.

That I think was a luxury we could enjoy for a period of time because from our perspective it was not a clear and present danger, an issue for the United States. Now with the center of terrorism locating in Afghanistan and the surrounding region with the production of heroin within the region with the spread of the radicalism much of which has been in some cases directed toward the United States, we do not any longer have that luxury.

I think these are good suggestions that you have put forward. I am hopeful that we can continue to work in keeping this issue present so that we can in the next Congress, this Congress as well, it is going to be a little difficult with this Congress doing much, but with the next administration and pressing this issue toward the American people that this is something we are going to need to address and need to resolve. And the hearing itself is an attempt to try to raise the visibility on this issue so we can press it on forward.

Thank you, very much for your thoughtfulness, for your thoughtful comments. I appreciate those. The record will remain open for the requisite number of days so that if you have other things that you would like to submit to it, we would be happy to receive that. We do have testimony submitted from the Office of the Islamic State of Afghanistan in Washington, DC. It will be included in the record as well. The hearing is adjourned.

[The statement referred to follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE ISLAMIC STATE OF AFGHANISTAN (ISA)  
IN WASHINGTON, DC

PROPOSAL

Two issues regarding U.S. policy toward Afghanistan should be addressed. The first of these involves drought relief for Afghanistan and the second concerns reopening the Afghan Embassy here in Washington.

Regarding the drought, ISA applauds the U.S. decision to send much-needed aid to people of Afghanistan during this period of acute crisis. However, ISA is concerned that if all of the intended aid flows through Pakistan, very little of that assistance—if any—will reach the equally-devastated areas controlled by the ISA. Therefore, we would strongly recommend that the U.S. ensure that half of its aid be directed through Central Asia, particularly Tajikistan. While we realize that the U.S. does not have an embassy in Dushanbe, the World Food Program and other non-governmental organizations do operate out of there and already have the infra-

structure in place for delivery of assistance to the Areas controlled by the Islamic State of Afghanistan.

We would also recommend that the U.S. should make its aid to both sides contingent on their observance of a cease-fire. Summer is traditionally the season of heaviest fighting in Afghanistan, and already the Taliban have launched several unsuccessful attacks on the Islamic State positions. The United States should not become involved in providing for the humanitarian needs of the population while the leadership of the Taliban is allowed to devote all of its resources to a war which only increases the suffering of the people.

We believe the U.S. should increase pressure on the Taliban since they continue to flout U.S. policy goals, particularly those regarding the expulsion of Usama bin Ladin, reducing opium production, negotiating toward a broad-based government, and adhering to internationally-accepted norms of human rights. A good method to apply this pressure would be to allow the Afghan Embassy to re-open under the Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan. This government contains representatives of all of Afghanistan's ethnic groups and has proven its viability by withstanding repeated Taliban attacks—offensives supported by large numbers of non-Afghans in the Taliban's ranks—to the point where the ISA now controls approximately one quarter of Afghan territory. It is the only alternative to the Taliban which currently exists inside Afghanistan.

Furthermore, the ISA is the government recognized by all other foreign countries with the exception of Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. It is also the government that holds Afghanistan's seat in the United Nations. Re-opening the Afghan Embassy with ISA representation would send a powerful message to the Taliban and their supporters that the United States is serious regarding its concerns with the Taliban's behavior in Afghanistan. It also has the advantage of costing the United States very little—if anything—to implement.

[Whereupon, at 12:09 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.]

