Deconstructing Global Fault Lines

Aaron G. Sander*
Tasawar Baig, PhD

World politics is in transition, and by and large the trend is toward globalization. This pattern of global diffusion has been accelerated at both the regional and international levels. Movements across borders, reflected in trade, migration, investment, and organizations, have softened the traditional identities so long harbored within a state's boundaries, and with globalization have come general development and gains. Although we live in this era of incredible globalization, pockets remain that present barriers, if not stubbornness, to assimilation at the subregional level.

In fact, areas around the world such as Central and South Asia, South and Eastern Europe, the Middle East, the Maghreb, and Central Africa have encountered difficulties. Their problem with integrating globalization aside, these subregions' troubles and conflicts stem from deeper issues. As people, through states and empires, have sought greater influence in their surrounding territories, inevitably they have encountered indigenous obstacles, if not outside competition. Oftentimes the latter has characterized root instability along the Eurasian rim.

Great powers from both the continental and maritime worlds have encountered each other time and again along this zone, a fact that points to a systemic issue of competition that keeps these pivotal subregions in a perpetual state of instability due to designs of harnessing these gateways for their own unilateral purposes.[1] Saul Cohen describes a similar belt of territory extending from Europe through the greater Middle East and on through Asia. His view of an almost dyadic competition between land and maritime powers pits their converging areas

*A PhD candidate studying US foreign policy and security in the Graduate Program in International Studies at Old Dominion University, Aaron Sander holds a master's degree in international affairs from Washington University in St. Louis. Previously, he was a research assistant at the Kennan Institute within the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, Washington, DC. His research interests include Eurasia and its peripheral subregions.

Tasawar Baig completed his PhD in International Studies in the Graduate Program in International Studies at Old Dominion University under a Fulbright Doctoral Scholarship. He holds a full-time position as an assistant professor in the Department of International Relations, Karakoram International University, Gilgit, Pakistan. Mr. Baig holds a master's degree in international relations from the University of Karachi and a master's degree in Asian Studies with specialization in South Asia from the Center for East and Southeast Asian Studies, Lund University, Sweden. His research interests include ethnonationalism, geopolitics, fragile states, interdependence, transnationalism, and comparative politics.

of influence into a fractious belt of unstable polities—shatterbelts along the convergence zone. (Shatterbelts are "strategically oriented regions that are both deeply divided internally and caught up in the competition between Great Powers of the geostrategic realms.")[2]

Empirical results prove that the fragile states of the shatterbelts are associated with great-power intervention and that these subregions tend to have a lengthy history of geopolitical fissures and persistent instability that create formidable challenges to growth and development.[3] As Cohen describes this belt, the convergence zone is rather competitive in character, as a buffer between distinct regions. It seems that when competition reaches a stalemate, chances are that a portion of this real estate will devolve into a shatterbelt. Alternatively, given the right conditions, areas along the zone of convergence could progress to a gateway across the zone, linking substantial resources on either side. Consequently, this article explores the possibility of bringing stable development to these subregions.

With history and potential in mind, a change in course is necessary since these fragile subregions cannot maintain their present course with any expectation of successful diffusion through the international community alone. Rather than competing over this territory with force, the local actors have reached a stage where, if even through desperation, they might take matters into their own hands. This cooperation may be described as initially existing among fewer actors at the state and transnational levels but more so where the benefits of investment and development may be felt across the fault lines. In order for polities along the convergence zone to escape history, so to speak, they must endeavor to increase cooperation and development more through increased partnerships at the subregional level—to mend their common region through locally sustained interdependences. On this matter of increased interdependence with regard to shatterbelt states, David Reilly has found that an increase in trade has a mitigating effect on instability and a pacifying effect on high-risk states.[4]

Admittedly, this notion is not original. It is parallel to that of the European Community. Its project of Europe's transcendence from its conflicted history to regional integration is based on the liberal functionalism of David Mitrany: "That political unity amongst states depended upon the links at lower mostly economic levels."[5] From the minds of its planners, the European Union (EU) would have a "bottom-up" approach in order to establish a more cohesive link. From here, the European Economic Community evolved into the merchant powerhouse of today's EU. The successive harnessing of European economic power, sector by sector, simply worked. It is impressive to think upon the totality of Europe's rebound. Sunk as a continent between the two world wars, Europe as a union today boasts the highest gross domestic product as well as the highest percentages of world

trade and foreign direct investment of all global players.[6] Without a doubt, as a union, Europe's presence is noticed.

We do not argue that any other region could replicate the same degree of the EU's success. However, a precedent has been set. The lower links of functional integration create a sound footing on which to foster cooperation and communication. One should note that although increased integration is the goal, it would not need to progress to the elusive political union sought by the EU.[7] In fact, one may argue that in keeping cooperation primarily at the level of joint ventures and investments, the consortium's simple technical nature may aid its focus on efficient subregional development and stable integration within the globalized world. Indeed, such a view could potentially lead to a locally sustained gateway between regions.

With this in mind, we hope to build upon the literature of fragile states within unstable regions and show that one should place less emphasis on what outside interests and the international community can do for these trouble spots than on how they should be sustained through local interdependencies. Thus, this article addresses two case studies: the Curzon Line through Central and Eastern Europe and the Durand Line on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, both of which were forged in the competition between great powers.

Curzon's Line in the East

The Curzon Line is an effective representation of the divide long endured between Central and Eastern Europe, a milestone in recent history. One could begin with the Jireček Line across the Balkans of the previous millennia because it speaks to the duration of difference between the East and West. However, the Curzon Line of 1919, which reestablished a sovereign Poland's borders with the Soviet Union, remains the boundary between the Western influence of the EU along with the United States and that of Russia. Speaking of greater interdependence across this "line" can be discouraging in that it tends to be associated with Russian and Soviet imperial policy.[8] Therefore, any consolidation across it may then be associated with a possible neo-Russian return to Soviet times. Alternatively, Russia could see the line as a Western attempt at further encroachment toward its borders. One should note at the outset that any meaningful convergence across this divide would have to avoid these perceptions.

It is true that Russia's origins stem from the territory lying just east of the Curzon Line in present-day Belarus and Ukraine and that it maintained this presence for centuries. Russians have not been the sole proprietor of this territory, however. Central Europeans have also extended their influence into the realm as

Russian influence has waned. For four centuries, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth held territory well past Riga, Minsk, and Kiev, even into modern Russia. Not until Peter and then Catherine the Great did Ruthenian lands return to the Russians up to the Curzon Line via the Polish partitions of the late eighteenth century. Indeed, this stretch of territory from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea has been a site of competing powers since time immemorial. We seek to highlight this pattern of systemic conflict with our case studies and recommend a means of diffusion.

Halford Mackinder wrote about this systemic pattern as early as a decade prior to the Great War, warning that Central Eastern Europe (CEE) would be the pivot upon which a power could stake its claim to the remainder of Eurasia. Whoever controls this beltway, he believed, would have carte blanche access throughout Europe and into the vastness of Eurasia.[9] His theoretical warning, by and large, has been heeded—that is to say, successful opposition has made domination of this thruway, with enough capacity to launch past it, impossible. Yet, the attempts to do so or to maintain the bulwarks have left the region a perpetual "crush zone."[10] Stuck between competing powers on either side, this zone is characterized by James Fairgrieve as one "with sufficient individuality to withstand absorptions, but unable or unwilling to unite with others to form any larger whole, they remain in the unsatisfactory position of buffer states, precariously independent politically, and more surely dependent economically."[11] To compare, whereas Mackinder warned of the subregion's absorption leading to cross-continental domination, Fairgrieve believed in its stubborn unlikelihood. As has been the case, policy has called for maintaining the subregion as a divided buffer.

Both the East and West chose to split the region, leaving the fringe as a buffer of the bipolar world—from the rebirth of Poland following the First World War to the bitter tension laid across it and neighboring states following the Second World War. As such, it remained within its traditional fragile state, seemingly forever stuck in history. The result is a belt across Europe, its own subregion, which has developed separately with regard to its cultural, economic, and political character. As Friedrich Ratzel writes, the region is "not a border between two states but between two worlds."[12] It would continue to be felt as much after the Second World War as all the while west of this buffer, "free" Europe was undertaking a substantial experiment—interdependence. Times have changed, indeed, since Europe is not the same—not entirely.

"Partnership" with the East?

Europe today, as a region and in comparison to others in the world, is unique. While conflict percolates and occurs elsewhere, Europe has been able to shed the

baggage of interstate rivalry. Instead, the states of the EU have endeavored to work toward mutual development. With the divide above in mind, only with the autonomy gained in the 1990s could the European community, born in the west, extend the prospects of partnership with its immediate east. Yet, as much as the EU has grown, it still suffers from an internal divide between Old and New Europe.[13] This constitutes another fissure on the mend within the EU, along the Oder-Neisse, with its own multilevel divide between Western and Central European states.[14]

Accordingly, while Western European Union (WEU) states in Old Europe seem to have progressed from nations' "state of nature," CEE states in New Europe are in transition.[15] For them, conflicts within the EU represent not a "return of history" but a reminder that it has not yet left.[16] After all, the WEU states have been the engine of the EU's growth; as such, its center of gravity leans westward.[17] For example, it is the "tendency among some of the key actors, specifically France and Germany, to present their particular interests as European interests in general, without first discussing them with the other EU members and without trying to determine the common European interest on the basis of this discussion."[18] Consequently, membership in the EU is a process of vertical Europeanization rather than the "partnered" union implied by the rhetoric.[19]

This has resulted in expectations less satisfied by grouped members.[20] As this case study attempts to argue, the "lower links" of David Mitrany and others worked wonders in *the aggregate* but did not perform well for all across the board—least of all the newest members in the east and those to which the EU attempts to reach out further east. European integration has taken a different path since its founding. Expansion for and into CEE states, as well as prospects for states across the Curzon Line, has been politically driven from the top down, and its related policies have apparently lost touch with the "partnership" with those it has reached out to in the east.[21] Eastern European (EE) states, for example, are hardly treated as equals, and their prospective costs of membership are high. Regarding costs, it appears that EU aid has been quite high—not in quantity invested but apparent waste. Support tools for Eastern Partnership countries across the Curzon have no common themes; that is, monies are spent on a multitude of programs that have little value-added development when combined.[22] Further, their prospects for achieving a robust economy following accession would be highly doubtful if CEE member states are any indication.

Most recently, the EU's Eurozone project has faced increasing pressure from the global recession and has given cause regarding whether its membership is worth the expense. Hungary has argued on grounds of national sovereignty that it will not join the Eurozone in tightening fiscal policy.[23] By itself, Hungary is

significant enough to create ripples within the EU's Eurozone although the situation could potentially snowball if other members along the eastern periphery join the resistance to center-led austerity measures. However, austerity is not the underlying force that drives a wedge between the EU center and its periphery.

As George Friedman sums up, "The structure of the EU itself is faulty" insofar as a band of developing states along the EU periphery should have a positive balance of investment and trade within the EU.[24] However, this is not the case. The original estimation of benefits was overstated when presented with a free-trade zone dominated by a center-led, export-dependent economy.[25] Moreover, it seems that this was the intended structure designed within the union's expansion. CE(E) wage and industrial advantage presented more of a threat than possible opportunity to actors within the WEU. Wade Jacoby writes that "management efforts allowed [WEU] . . . actors to exploit investment opportunities in CE(E) but without exposing [WEU] . . . economies to large increases in migration or trade pressure in sectors where CE(E) had comparative advantage."[26] This, then, shifted inherent potential growth to one based on foreign direct investment so that WEU firms are securely emplaced in CEE and essentially control much of their leading export industries.[27] The result has been low growth in locally owned export-manufacturing capabilities, particularly high-tech industries.[28]

Because EE states would also likely face this vertical Europeanization in CEE, along with its lopsided trade flow, CEE and EE states share some commonalities with regard to economic and social development. States along the Curzon Line need only be willing to engage in focused partnerships that satisfy their mutual interests, along with representative leadership. The obvious candidate for this role is not a single state but the Visegrad Group, composed of Poland, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, and Hungary. Together with others along the line, a "zone of small nations" may converge in order to establish beneficial terms of economic and developmental interdependence heretofore unrealized within the EU.[29]

Intermarium Potential

Partnership across this (former) divide could come to resemble more of a concert of interests within Europe. The notion that subregional cooperation can be more efficient, "lead[ing] to less fragmentation . . . [and] . . . encouraging pooling and sharing of capabilities," is supported by the union's principle of "subsidiarity."[30] Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union states that "in light of the possibilities available at national, regional or local level . . . the Union does not take action (except in the areas that fall within its exclusive competence)."[31] At the risk of being repetitive, Europe itself has yet been able to completely and competently

address the breadth of its economic stability and the desired inclusive development in both Central and Eastern Europe.

The clear delineation between that which is retained at the level of nation-state versus the region, as understood within subsidiarity (that authority should be decentralized to the smallest entity capable of addressing the matter effectively), thus leaves room to interpret a relationship of progression toward these ends, where subregional cooperation may provide a stepping-stone. In other words, *the functional argument for acceptance of a regional entity above the nation-state has rested on its ability to facilitate a service better than an individual state could provide alone*. Otherwise, the member states would elect to resolve matters themselves. Establishing joint developmental programs that benefit CEE and EE states first, followed by others to the West and East, can further bridge this fissure. This integrative approach, yielding more functional cooperation within their economies while avoiding politics, would greatly benefit the prospects of establishing greater autonomous growth across the Curzon Line (as much as is permitted).

Recommendations for Local Diffusion

As has been established, EU tools for integrating the Central European states as well as those in Eastern Europe are ineffective because they have not addressed the issues of development important either for them or for the proper mending of this fissure along the Curzon Line.[32] CEE and EE states are interested in capitalizing on their own comparative advantage, and the task for the Visegrad partnership is to cultivate their shared capabilities. Economically, support for small and medium-sized enterprise development would be a step in the right direction, focused on common desired themes at the local level.[33] Both the concentration on linking local firms and focused efforts in key industries could be sufficient in beginning to bridge the divide.

Deconstructing the Curzon Line in the construction of partnerships could come to resemble clusters of interrelated firms.[34] The latter could then later spill over into other industries and onto other levels of cooperation.[35] In this manner, greater energies put into the high-tech sector would capitalize on the joint competitive advantage that these states share within the subregion.[36] Other technical areas, such as transport, logistics, and tourism, have already been identified as achieving success in cross-border integration with EE states more easily than, say, the energy sector.[37] Even though this is most certainly the case, were the situation to become ripe for such a venture, local cross-border initiatives in energy also show much promise. For example, both Poland and Lithuania continue cooperating on shale gas exploration.[38] Expanding this cooperation to Ukraine would greatly enhance economic development as well as energy diversification.[39] How-

ever, any discussion on energy will inevitably, and unavoidably, involve the interests of other neighbors (e.g., Russia, as a major provider of energy resources, and Europe, as a major consumer). Here, one must remember that both East and West have the opportunity to use this "burgeoning" bridge across Curzon symmetrically rather than asymmetrically—an issue with which the rest of Europe would eventually need to come to terms.[40]

Durand's Line for the West

The Durand Line (originally the Indo-Afghan border) is a long and porous border between Afghanistan and Pakistan—the product of great-game rivalry between imperial Britain and Russia. Unsurprisingly, great-power rivalries over strategic interests have resulted in the creation of frontiers and boundaries for old and new societies. According to Lord George Nathaniel Curzon, "When the interests or ambitions of one state come into sharp and irreconcilable collision with those of another," the ideal choice is to resolve it on the frontiers.[41] Therefore, "frontiers are indeed the razor's edge on which hang suspended the modern issues of war and peace, of life and death to nations."[42] Throughout history, great-power struggles over a clash of interests vindicate their engagements in surgical partitions and the geopolitical mapping of the world. Imperial expansions and the strategic management of geostrategic regions are some reasons for this geopolitical remapping. In the past, regions that include Central Asia, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Eastern Europe have remained the pivotal part of great-power confrontations "on the chessboard of Imperial diplomacy."[43]

In a highly globalized world, the geopolitics of the Middle East, South Asia, and its extension to Central Asia seems to be replacing the old notion of great-game rivalry between great powers with a new great-game phenomenon yet to be played at multiple levels. Geopolitics explains the "relation of international political power to the geographical setting."[44] Hence, historically beyond the Durand Line, "Afghanistan was not a frontier, or barrier for a frontier, but actually the centre of great empires" to engage for dominance and secure their vital interest.[45] In retrospect, as a center of great empires (powers), Afghanistan and its neighboring region faced a wide range of domestic instability and endless violent feuds within and beyond their frontiers. The reasons for a violent past run deeper than the tribal issues, Pashtun and non-Pashtun autonomy of diverse ethnic groups, and dynasty problems within the region. Rather, imperial designs have deliberately made and maintained a buffer zone.

A Historical Glimpse of the Durand Line—Past, Present, and Future

Afghanistan has remained a center of great empires that includes the sway of Alexander the Great, Persian dynasties, Afghan dynasties themselves, Mongols (later, Mughals), British, Russians, and the influence of the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War. Lately, one has seen the influence of neighboring states added to great-power involvement in Afghanistan. The historical strategic buffer of Afghanistan and "the Afghan trap" also prove to be the quagmire or "graveyard of empires," resulting from imperial overstretch toward its center.[46] Lord Curzon, later the governor-general of India, expressed the geostrategic importance of the region: "Turkestan, Afghanistan, Transcaspia, Persia—to many these names breathe only a sense of utter remoteness or a memory of strange vicissitudes and of moribund romance. To me I confess, they are the pieces of a chessboard upon which is being played out a game for the dominion of the world."[47] He would shortly be very much involved in this game.

The Durand Line agreement was a "razor's edge" frontier formed between Afghanistan and then British India in November 1893.[48] The sharp-edged frontier did prevent major confrontations between powers, but it badly affected the region's political development and split the tribal clans across the border.[49] Earlier, when British India noticed Russian mobility in Central Asia and northern Afghanistan, British forces attempted to transform Afghanistan into a neutral and friendly buffer state. But the attempt failed as a result of the first Anglo-Afghan war in 1839–42. The Afghans' guerilla warfare tactics led to the massacre of thousands of British troops during an agreed-upon retreat of the latter. Russian annexation of Central Asia's khanates of Kokand and Bukhara, however, prompted another military adventure between British and Russians into Afghanistan.[50]

Between 1873 and 1887, British and Russian imperial diplomacy reached some border agreements over Afghanistan, Persia, and Central Asian states. In the meantime, Amir Abdur Rahman Khan, claimant for the throne, succeeded as a new Afghan amir after the second Anglo-Afghan war (1878–80) with the help of British support.[51] With the new appointment, he dispelled a British attempt to create Herat and Kandahar as new states, which could further impede Russians from reaching the British frontiers.[52] In addition, British negotiations with Afghanistan regarding border and security measures concluded with the drawing of an international border that suited the imperial powers at the expense of the local populations.[53] The negotiations carried out between Amir Abdur Rahman Khan, the king of Afghanistan, and Sir Henry Mortimer Durand, leader of the British mission, concluded the much-disputed Durand agreement. The primary objective of Durand was to divide the Pashtuns into two geographical units, making it

easier to control the regime in Afghanistan and bridle any Pashtun resistance or aggression. More significantly, this action would create a shield to defend against any Russian aggression.[54] In fact, a recent history of Afghanistan indicates that the Afghan amir signed the Durand Line agreement under imperial pressure. Nevertheless, the amir astutely consolidated his powers and built the first Afghan army, which helped the king regain his authority over weak links of his dominion.[55]

In fact, later amirs and kings of Afghanistan either endorsed the agreement or sustained the status quo. For instance, Amir Habibullah Khan agreed to respect the arrangements between his father, Amir Abdur Rahman, and the British government during the Treaty of the Mole in 1905. Although the third Anglo-Afghan war of 1919 was a setback to relations between Afghanistan and the British government, it gave a tactical victory to the latter since the new Treaty of Rawalpindi of 1919 reaffirmed the Durand Line as the political boundary between them.[56] Besides, before the third Anglo-Afghan war, Afghanistan had become an independent buffer state with the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907. Apparently, this convention bridled the intensity of the great-power struggle, the great game, played at the cost of South and Central Asia.[57]

In 1947 the decolonization process changed the original shape of the Indo-Afghan border as a result of the birth of India and Pakistan. Speaking in the United Nations General Assembly when Pakistan sought membership as a new sovereign state, Afghan diplomat Hosyan Aziz noted that "we cannot recognize the North West Frontier [now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa] as part of Pakistan so long as people of the North West Frontier have not been given an opportunity free from any kind of influence, I repeat, free from any kind of influence to determine for themselves whether they wish to be independent or to become part of Pakistan."[58] Later, when the issue of Durand's legality was referred to the British House of Commons, it also "officially reconfirmed their original position of 1893 on the Durand Line as the legal border between Afghanistan and Pakistan."[59] It would not continue without protest, though.

For almost the first 30 years of Pakistan's independence, Afghanistan strongly backed Pashtunistan or Pashtun autonomy.[60] Afghanistan believed it had a due right to support the Pashtun cause, "a remnant of Western colonialism."[61] Especially under King Zahir Shah's reign, his prime minister, Sardar Muhammad Daoud Khan (the king's first cousin), gave great momentum to the Pashtunistan movement during 1953–63.[62] In 1960 and 1961, the infiltration of thousands of Afghan soldiers into Pakistan's tribal areas called Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) further proved the assertiveness of Afghanistan on the Pashtun issue.[63] However, the pro-Pakistan tribal Pashtuns and local forces repelled these

infiltrations each time.[64] Pakistan quickly noticed that the FATA's tribal people could be a better shield against any irredentist move.

When Daoud became president of Afghanistan in 1973 after deposing King Zahir Shah, he facilitated the occasional meeting of anti-Pakistani Pashtun leaders and the naming of "Pashtunistan Square" in Kabul.[65] Further, the new regime under Daoud provided sanctuary to Baloch tribesmen from Marri and Mengal who were leading insurgencies in Balochistan, an area spanning western Pakistan and Afghanistan as well as eastern portions of Iran. Pakistan had just lost its eastern-wing (Bangladesh) after war in 1971 against India and a domestic uprising. Therefore, for obvious reasons, "Islamabad was hyper-sensitive to (any further) territorial encroachments."[66] In retaliation, Pakistan's first intervention in Afghanistan started in 1973 by "terrorist bombing in Kabul and Jalalabad."[67] Moreover, Z. A. Bhutto's government started to provide shelter and support to Afghan dissidents of Ghilzai Pashtuns, many of whom became key leading figures during the mujahedin action against the Soviet Union.[68] These were crucial years for Pakistan as it began to consolidate its power, establish its institutions, and determine a political direction toward its nation-building process.

Both Afghanistan and Pakistan utilized India's centric policy to assert influence and counterbalance each other. Afghanistan quickly aligned with India, Pakistan's archrival in South Asia. Both India and Pakistan have fought four wars, coupled with frequent border clashes. Pakistan's first conflict with India in 1948 over Kashmir brought Afghanistan and India closer together while Pakistan quickly aligned with China to balance India, reflecting the old strategic policy of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." Cautious in the first years of its independence, Pakistan concentrated on its eastern border. Afghanistan criticized Pakistan's claim for plebiscite over the Kashmir issue, asserting that Pakistan denied any plebiscite for Pashtuns in the early days.[69]

Except for the Taliban, most of Afghanistan's regimes were supported by India, even the Soviet-backed Afghan government. Accordingly, on a diplomatic front inside the United Nations, India provided a cover to Kabul to raise its voice for self-determination of the Pashtun as a counterbalance to Pakistan's push for its Kashmir cause.[70] Later, India gradually softened its diplomatic stance although Pakistan would still allege that India persistently supported irredentists in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan provinces. Remarks by Atal Bihari Vajpayee, then the Indian minister for external affairs, however, clarify his country's softening: "The existing Durand Line between Pakistan and Afghanistan should be respected by the new Afghan Government. If there was any difference on the subject it should be settled through negotiations."[71]

The last decade of the Cold War repeated the legacy of foreign interventions in Afghanistan when the "geostrategic and geopolitical domains were breached by external major powers or their surrogates."[72] Once again the Durand Line played a key role in determining the final outcome of Soviet intervention. Thinking that the British exit from the subcontinent had created a vacuum, the Soviet Union sought to fill it and maintain its historic frontier influence in the region. Over the years, the Soviets aligned with Afghan regimes and supported the Pashtunistan issue as well. Their involvement did not bear fruit, and in the end the Afghan-Soviet war became a farewell for them.

During the entire decade of Afghan-Soviet war from December 1979 to February 1989, billions of dollars and weapons funneled across the Durand Line region to counter the communist regime and Soviet forces. Apart from bringing thousands of foreign religious fighters into this region, the conflict saw training camps and religious schools (madrassas) established, the Durand Line was piled with arms and ammunition, and an estimate indicated that Afghanistan became the fifth-largest arms importer during 1986–90.[73] Unfortunately, no effort was made to deweaponize the border zone at the end of the war.

Pakistan benefited directly from the conflict both economically and strategically. Economically, its annual foreign aid during 1976–79 was around $900 million, which rose to an average of $2 billion a year.[74] Strategically, Pakistan gained in two aspects. First, the irredentist problem involving the Pashtuns diffused as a consequence of their transformation into a new religious and pro-Pakistani identity. The Pashtun nationalist movement of the 1950s and 1960s gradually died during the Afghan-Soviet war.[75] It is important to note that the construction of religious identity was not possible without the support of Saudi Arabia and other Muslim states, who joined the Afghan war against the Soviets. In addition, the Iranian revolution of 1979 had already jostled Saudi Arabia and neighboring countries with the fear of similar movements in their states. Therefore, this transforming of a new religious identity also checked any possible spillover of Iranian revolutionary influence into Afghanistan. That later became visible through a sharp divide between Pashtun and non-Pashtun areas during the Afghan civil war and sectarian clashes in Pakistan.[76]

Second, given the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan, the latter believed that Afghanistan balanced India's nuclear power by offering strategic depth, which has become a mirage in recent years.[77] According to Zbigniew Brzezinski, after the Cold War Pakistan's "primary interest is to gain geostrategic depth through political influence in Afghanistan—and to deny to Iran the exercise of such influence in Afghanistan and Tajikistan—and to benefit eventually from any pipeline construction linking Central Asia with the Arabian Sea."[78] To

attain the primary interest, Pakistan hoped to install a friendly government in Kabul through supporting groups whose identity was based more on Islamic ideology than Pashtun nationalism. Indeed, it momentarily subdued irredentist demand for Pashtunistan.[79] However, Pakistan would not realize until the traumatic events of 9/11 that its Cold War policies were the makings of another monster. Following the terrorist attacks, President Hamid Karzai's government replaced the Taliban regime, and Pakistan and Afghanistan embarked on another episode of distrust and blame games. On the one hand, President Karzai supports the issue of Pashtuns in Pakistan as part of traditional politics, reiterating in June 2008 that Afghanistan has the right and duty to "defend itself and defend their brothers, sisters and sons on the other side [in Pakistan]."[80] On the other hand, he faces domestic pressure from his non-Pashtun alliance, who suffered bitterly during civil war and the Taliban regime.

Mending the Fault Line: Challenges and Opportunities

Developing interdependence would ease many problems between Afghanistan and Pakistan. When the British left, both India and Pakistan inherited the entire railroad infrastructure. Afghanistan and Pakistan, immediate neighbors, should develop a mutual understanding to expand railroad networks deep into Afghanistan to improve transportation. Both countries would gain immensely from this one project. Besides, Pakistan also could have offered assistance in nonpolitical areas like health, education, sports, and telecommunications. The two countries have a common interest in mining, trade corridors, gas pipelines, and even security, but political differences and deadlocks have hampered positive initiatives such as the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India gas pipeline (also known as the peace pipeline). Furthermore, each country is rich in minerals, and proper training of the workforce as well as technological partnering can harness such resources for economic gain. To date, though, there have been few efforts to reduce mistrust.

The Socioeconomic Way Out: Most Likely to Mend

The functional ways of integration primarily rely on socioeconomic dimensions to facilitate bottom-up solutions, which would help viable integration. Mending the fault line economically is more favorable and in the interest of both countries. Trade between Afghanistan and Pakistan has increased dramatically from $170 million in 2000–2001 to $2,508.7 million in 2010–11, including illicit trade along the porous border. Under the arrangement of transit and trade, more than $2 billion worth of goods are smuggled into Pakistan. Such activity affects the domestic production and import of goods in Pakistan. Despite Afghanistan's great demand

for food, officially only 600,000 tons of wheat are exported to that country while more than 500,000 tons are smuggled in. For the most part, militants in the border region benefit from this illicit trade.[81]

Traditionally, many Afghan and Pakistani traders blame Kabul-Islamabad's seasonal relationship as the main hurdle to smooth flows of goods into and out of Afghanistan. In October 2008, a formal (revised) agreement of the Afghanistan-Pakistan Transit Trade Agreement (APTTA) was signed in Kabul that would allow Afghanistan's trucks to carry goods to the Indo-Pakistan Wagah border and permit the use of Pakistani seaports for Afghan transit and trade. In return, Pakistani trucks would transit Afghan soil to reach Central Asian republics. For security reasons, Pakistan did not agree at this stage to allow Indian goods to go through the Wagah border to Afghanistan, but its recent decision to grant most-favored-nation status to India will potentially facilitate the border as a gateway for Central and South Asian trade. The two countries have also established the Afghanistan-Pakistan Transit Trade Coordination Authority to supervise implementation of the APTTA, effective June 2011. Further, Pakistan provided $300 million for various projects in the post-9/11 reconstruction phase. The Torkham-Jalalabad dual highway, for example, is one of the megaprojects completed by Pakistan.[82] Afghanistan and Pakistan are also looking into potential transit and trade routes through tribal areas (the shortest feasible routes in the future) that will develop those regions, curb illicit trade and militancy across tribal zones, and help revive the "silk routes" toward Central and East Asian markets. Working more on the economic side can produce good results for the two societies. Unfortunately, the border clashes of May 2013 between Afghan and Pakistani forces over construction of a border gate could complicate such endeavors.

Another core advocacy involves investing in education, particularly for women. The low literacy ratio of tribal areas is a dangerous sign and an impediment to transborder development of the two countries.[83] Investing in education is significant because it provides a base for producing human and social capital as a means of sustaining tangible peace and socioeconomic growth. On this scale, it can build "the foundation for good citizenship, respect for self and others."[84] Education also helps establish a viable knowledge base for society, which supports the true essence of pluralistic norms, self-actualization, and the harnessing of talent to gain greater benefits. In 2009 Pakistan's Higher Education Commission announced 1,000 scholarships for Afghan students in various universities of Pakistan. In addition, in 2011 a 15-member delegation of Afghan professors visited the commission for the purpose of building linkages for research and training between the leading major universities in both countries. The countries will reap the positive and multilayer effects of these ventures in the years to come.

This study strongly recommends that both Afghanistan and Pakistan facilitate initiatives in the realm of economic growth, specifically through transit and trade agreements, and that these economic commitments should continue, regardless of politics and diplomatic rows. The same policy of facilitation and commitment needs to remain persistent in the fields of higher education and training of human capital. Educational programs should also be designed along the motives of cultural-exchange initiatives to promote better understanding between new generations of both sides. Furthermore, provisions of more avenues in sports activities would develop bonds across the border. In recent months, for example, the frequent visits of the Afghan Cricket Team have been a great initiative. In support, the Pakistan Hockey Federation signed a memorandum of understanding with the Afghanistan Hockey Federation that affirms Pakistan's commitment to provide professional support to develop field hockey in Afghanistan and promises to involve Afghanistan's team in Pakistani domestic competitions. Expanding areas of cooperation and scope in other popular sports of both countries will be significant and favorable for both societies.

Each country also needs to expand areas of cooperation to support the local cottage industry, which needs to be revived so that domestic women can become bread earners for their families. Moreover, women in these societies have always faced sociocultural limitations. Therefore, provisions of training schemes for women, microfinancing for domestic projects, and marketing of their products will generate a healthy outcome. During the last 30 years of conflict, women had to stay behind walls or flee as refugees with their families, resulting in the decay of local business. Reviving the local cottage industry will give life to inherited art, generate economic benefits, and stabilize networks across the border and beyond for marketing purposes.

Perhaps communications is the core phenomenon that has accelerated integration processes around the world. Like David Mitrany and Ernst B. Haas, who talked about functional ways of integration, Karl Deutsch also emphasized the increase in levels of communication—that such expansion will produce a higher level of integration and eventually will increase social mobility, followed by political development.[85] Following the same patterns, communities across the Durand Line frontier can initiate joint media networking that specifically establishes a "tribal broadcast network." The latter will offer an enabling environment to create spheres of socialization at least on a digital scale, reviving music and poetry as a force to bring societies closer together. Hence, people-to-people contact can bring a drastic change in perceptions of society and further thaw relations between Kabul and Islamabad.

The Political Way Out: Less Likely to Mend

Most regions across the world have entered the twenty-first century with broader-scale integration and partnerships with major economies, but South Asia carries a burden of history and geography. Consequently, it would seem to make the least effort to learn from other successful examples of integration. Before Afghanistan can achieve sustainable, long-term economic activity, it must become self-reliant and free of any "necessary" foreign or external interference.[86] Similarly, the Pakistani establishment understands the limitations of using religious ideology to subjugate ethnic identities. Again, the 1971 war had already nullified the religious dimension in favor of ethnonationalism, and Pakistan's compromising policies on the Kashmir issue show some flexibility in traditional policy.[87]

On political grounds, there are only two ways to move past the Durand Line: (1) Afghanistan's formal acceptance of the Durand Line as the legal border with Pakistan, and (2) Pakistan's incorporation of the FATA region into its political and legal structure with complete abolishment of the British Frontier Crimes Regulation policy.[88] Doing so would stop both sides' interference in each other's domestic affairs. However, it is quite an impossible option to realize at this stage of history. In retrospect, informal interaction and coordination have occurred among various interest groups, tribesmen, traders, and nomads travelling across the border. Most recently, networks have been established between madrassa (religious) schools. After 9/11, Pakistan initiated a madrassa reform project to redesign religious schools' curricula, bringing them more in line with those of the national schools by introducing math, science, computer literacy, and additional subjects to their students. Although reforms have been slow, with greater effort and participation, a nontraditional, established network of madrassas across the Durand border can become a terrific transforming factor for the two countries. Madrassas can serve as platforms for technical education as well.

At the moment, the core issue for both Afghanistan and Pakistan concerns dealing with terrorism and ensuring the security of the general population. In order to solve the problem, reference is made in connection to strategic policies of two countries and terrorist safe havens in tribal areas. In the past, governments on both sides of Durand encouraged arming local militias (the Arbakees in Afghanistan and the Lashkars in Pakistan) with the consent and consultation of tribal alliances through the jirga (the tribal grand assembly) to protect the community against terrorists and to coordinate between militias and regular state forces to launch selected operations against their hideouts. The lack of trust between Kabul and Islamabad inhibits the expansion of any level of coordination between jirgas to discuss the matter.

In the future, solutions to many of these problems will still lie in providing a higher level of interdependency among tribal networks through resetting the lost traditional tribal balance and then creating spheres of socialization; thus, the process can help establish norms and regulations. First, tribes across the Durand Line hardly accept it as a boundary since it has never been a barrier to mobility even though they respect the existence of the two countries. It is natural that when a border is quite porous and no strict state laws are implemented, provision of an easy-passage corridor for mobility is always practical. Second, across the line, family kinship offers another way of staying connected. Third, most skilled laborers, traders, and even visitors without proper travel documents have crossed the Durand border for generations.[89] The bond across the line is so strong that Pakistani society has "always felt the repercussions of the tumultuous events in Afghanistan."[90] Similarly, significant events on the Pakistani side have ripple effects across the border. The two countries need to officiate these informal networks and convert challenges into opportunities.

As a matter of fact, economic and strategic interests converge for regional and extraregional states at the Durand Line and its surrounding region. The area has an immense but latent amount of potential to drive regional and global economic growth, acting as an energy corridor to regional powers like India and China as well as providing trade corridors between East and West—a "New Silk Road" revival.[91]

Conclusion

These two case studies help show that subregions across Eurasia's fault lines can become stabler and better integrated within their own regions as well as better partners in the world of globalization. The means to do so lies in constructing locally clustered social and economic interdependencies. Clustered, interrelated industries, for example, would finance economic growth and act as a positive incentive for its continuation. Cross-border social programs would provide a supportive foundation, and as the subregions become sounder or merely serve as a way of underwriting long-term legitimacy, local stakeholders would necessarily allow for outside participation.

Indeed, as mentioned earlier, major powers might be hesitant or even apprehensive at the outset of fault-line deconstruction; however, it is very important that both great powers and local stakeholder states not repeat the mistakes of history. The replacement of space so long dependent or subjected with that which is stabler and more independent presents a learning curve that history would suggest is quite long. But as increasing subregional cooperation begins to yield ben-

efits, it stands to reason that in short order, influential states would become more willing to take part in limited and balanced partnerships across the diminishing divide.

A central goal would call for meeting local mending or deconstruction with consultancy instead of intervention. That is, major powers would need to reduce direct interference but maintain a role of consultation, with technical and financial assistance, in return for a moderate part of the profit and sustainment of global peace. Aid would have to be limited so that decision making and ownership remain at the subregional (local) level and the available balance so that no major regional actor is excluded from equal opportunity. The success of this breadth can create a favorable "win set" for all participants toward international diffusion.

In this manner, one can view the Curzon and Durand Lines as amenable to their own mending. Locally controlled investment and development in key areas may eventually serve as a desirable gateway of commerce and activity between greater regions. The resources—and will—have been forever present. Competition must be set aside to allow the space that mending needs to take shape.

Notes

1. Halford J. Mackinder, "The Geographical Pivot of History," *Geographical Journal* 23, no. 4 (April 1904): 421–37.

2. Saul Bernard Cohen, *Geopolitics: The Geography of International Relations*, 2nd ed. (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009), 33–44.

3. Paul R. Hensel and Paul F. Diehl, "Testing Empirical Propositions about Shatterbelts, 1945–1976" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association–Midwest, East Lansing, MI, 20–21 November 1992); and Monty G. Marshall and Benjamin R. Cole, *Global Report 2009: Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility* (Fairfax, VA: Center for Systemic Peace, Center for Global Policy, George Mason University, December 2009), http://www.systemicpeace.org/vlibrary/GlobalReport2009.pdf. This includes the potential for long-term adherence to democratic norms. See William Easterly, Shanker Satyanath and Daniel Berger, *Superpower Interventions and Consequences for Democracy: An Empirical Inquiry* (Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, May 2008), http://repository.essex.ac.uk/6040/1/ColdWarNBER.pdf; and Jack A. Goldstone et al., "A Global Forecasting Model of Political Instability" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 4 September 2005).

4. David Reilly, "Shatterbelts and Conflict Behaviour: The Effect of Globalisation on 'High Risk' States," *Geopolitics* 5, no. 3 (Winter 2000): 48–77.

5. Quoted in David Armstrong, Lorna Lloyd, and John Redmond, *From Versailles to Maastricht: International Organization in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 140.

6. *CIA World Factbook*, 2011, accessed 15 October 2011, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html. Gross domestic product was measured in purchasing power parity; percentages of world trade measured the sum of exports and imports as a percentage of world trade; foreign direct investment was measured in "stock of direct foreign investment—at home."

7. Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe* (London: Stevens, 1958), chap. 1; and Alex Stone Sweet and Wayne Sandholtz, "European Integration and Supranational Governance," *Journal of European Public Policy* 4, issue 3 (September 1997): 297–317.

8. Janusz Bugajski, *Expanding Eurasia: Russia's European Ambitions* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2008).

9. Mackinder, "Geographical Pivot of History," 436. Later, in 1919, Mackinder more clearly outlined his famous dictum of Eastern Europe's pivotal location in his book *Democratic Ideals and Reality* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1942), 106.

10. John O'Loughlin, "Ordering the 'Crush Zone': Geopolitical Games in Post–Cold War Eastern Europe," in *Geopolitics at the End of the Twentieth Century: The Changing World Political Map*, ed. Nurit Kliot and David Newman (Portland: Frank Cass, 2000), 47.

11. James Fairgrieve, *Geography and World Power* (London: University of London Press, 1927), 330.

12. John O'Loughlin, "Geopolitical Visions of Central Europe," in *Europe between Political Geography and Geopolitics*, ed. Marco Antonsich, Vladimir Kolossov, and M. Paola Pagnini (Rome: Societa Geografica Italiana, 2001), 5, http://www.colorado.edu/ibs/pec/johno/pub/trieste.pdf.

13. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld distinguished between those in Europe that did not support US actions in Iraq (Old) and those that did (New). See "Outrage at 'Old Europe' Remarks," *BBC News*, 23 January 2003, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2687403.stm. For the most part, this divide was also referred to geographically as the Old West and the New East, and we see an increasing push for the New Europe in CEE to become more independent. See, for example, Celestine Bohlen, "Rumsfeld's 'New Europe' Must Drop U.S. Crutch," *Bloomberg*, 12 October 2009, http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aiPybKs.aeWQ.

14. This internal EU divide, however, is not as severe as that represented between Eastern Europe and the Western-driven EU.

15. David A. Lake, "Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics," *International Security* 32, no. 1 (Summer 2007): 47–79.

16. Robert Kagan, *The Return of History and the End of Dreams* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008); and Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992).

17. In fact, the WEU has been the economic engine throughout Europe through modern history.

18. Zdenek Kriz, "Comparison of Czech and European Security Strategies," in *"Easternization" of Europe's Security Policy*, ed. Tomas Valasek and Olga Gyarfasova (Bratislava: Institute for Public Affairs, 2004), 39. Admittedly, he is writing on the topic of European security; nevertheless, it is an example of the general opinion between Old and New Europe.

19. Ekaterina Turkina and Evgeny Postnikov, "Cross-Border Inter-firm Networks in the European Union's Eastern Neighborhood: Integration via Organizational Learning," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50, no. 4 (July 2012): 632–52; and Elena A. Korosteleva, "Change or Continuity: Is the Eastern Partnership an Adequate Tool for the European Neighborhood?," *International Relations* 25, no. 2 (22 June 2011): 243–62.

20. Hanns Maull, "A Small Power?," *Survival* 53, no. 2 (March 2011): 177–87.

21. Korosteleva, "Change or Continuity," 243–62.

22. Piotr Kazmierkiewicz, *ENPI's Performance in Eastern Partnership States: Lessons from the Current Perspective for the New Budget* (Warsaw: Institute of Public Affairs and the Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2013).

23. "Hungary: National Sovereignty an Issue with New Eurozone Agreement—PM," Strategic Forecasting, 9 December 2011.

24. "Agenda: With George Friedman on the Visegrad Group," Strategic Forecasting, 20 May 2011, http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/20110520-agenda-george-friedman-visegrad-group-1.

25. George Friedman, "Europe, the International System and a Generational Shift," Strategic Forecasting, 8 November 2011, http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20111107-europe-international-system-and-generational-shift.

26. Wade Jacoby, "Managing Globalization by Managing Central and Eastern Europe: The EU's Backyard as Threat and Opportunity," *Journal of European Public Policy* 17, no. 3 (April 2010): 425.

27. Jan Drahokoupil, "The Rise of the Comprador Service Sector: The Politics of State Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe," *Polish Sociological Review* 2, issue 162 (2008): 175–89.

28. Peter Havlik et al., *The European Rim Countries—Challenges and Opportunities for EU Competitiveness*, Policy Notes and Reports, no. 9 (Vienna: Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, October 2012), 9–10, 34.

29. Milan Hodza, "The Future of Central Europe," *International Affairs* 14, no. 4 (July–August 1935): 514–30; and Tadayuki Hayashi and Hiroshi Fukuda, *Regions in Central and Eastern Europe, Past and Present* (Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 2007).

30. Pierre Hougardy, "Permanent Structured Cooperation," in *The Lisbon Treaty and ESDP: Transformation and Integration*, ed. Sven Biscop and Franco Algieri (Gent, Belgium: Academia Press, 2008), 12.

31. "Subsidiarity," Summaries of EU Legislation, accessed 1 May 2014, http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/glossary/subsidiarity_en.htm.

32. Korosteleva, "Change or Continuity," 243–62.

33. Kazmierkiewicz, *ENPI's Performance in Eastern Partnership States*, 11–13. See also Kinga Dudzinska and Elzbieta Kaca, "The Eastern Partnership under the Lithuanian Presidency: Time for the EU to Keep an Eye on Eastern Europe," *Polish Institute of International Affairs Bulletin* 93, no. 426 (28 September 2012), https://www.pism.pl/files/?id_plik=11580.

34. M. E. Porter, *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (New York: Free Press, 1990).

35. Ernst B. Haas, "International Integration: The European and the Universal Process," *International Organization* 15, no. 3 (1961): 366–92.

36. Drahokoupil, "Rise of the Comprador Service Sector," 177.

37. Turkina and Postnikov, "Cross-Border Inter-firm Networks," 638–39.

38. "When Polish and Lithuanian Interests Align," *Lithuania Tribune*, 15 February 2013, http://www.lithuaniatribune.com/29619/when-polish-and-lithuanian-interests-align-201329619/.

39. Przemek Skwirczynski, "As the EU Falters a New 'Empire' Could Rise in Eastern Europe," *Commentator*, 7 September 2012, http://www.thecommentator.com/article/1624/as_the_eu_falters_a_new_empire_could_rise_in_eastern_europe/page/2.

40. Havlik et al., "European Rim Countries," 22. Not the least of which have to come from Europe's acceptance of Russian participation. Further, the WEU would need to embrace openness rather than protectionism with regard to any shift in comparative advantage for the subregion.

41. Lord George Nathaniel Curzon, *Frontiers* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1908), 5.

42. Ibid., 7.

43. Lord George Nathaniel Curzon, *Russia in Central Asia in 1889 and the Anglo-Russian Question* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889), 326.

44. Saul Bernard Cohen, *Geography and Politics in a Divided World* (New York: Random House, 1963), 24.

45. A. G. Constable, "Afghanistan: The Present Seat of War, and the Relations of That Country to England and Russia," *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 11 (1879): 51.

46. William Maley, "Afghanistan and Its Region," in *The Future of Afghanistan*, ed. J Alexander Thier (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2009), 83, http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/resources/foa.pdf. See also Derek Gregory, *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 35; and Nathaniel Fick, "Defining Victory: Assessing Military Efforts and Measuring Outcomes in Afghanistan," in *American Interests in South Asia: Building a Grand Strategy in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India*, ed. Nicholas Burns and Jonathon Price (Washington, DC: Aspen Institute, 2011), 60.

47. Hon. George N. Curzon, *Persia and the Persian Question*, vol. 1 (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892), 3–4.

48. S. Fida Yunas, ed., *The Durand Line Border Agreement, 1893* (Peshawar: Area Study Center, University of Peshawar, 2003), 34–36 (draft of the Durand Line Agreement).

49. Some 15 major tribes are cited in Dr. Azmat Hayat Khan's work, which includes both Pashtun and non-Pashtun tribes residing along the Durand Line—namely, (1) Wakhi, (2) Nuristan or Kaferistan or Kalash, (3) Mushawani, (4) Salarzai, (5) Mamund, (6) Mohmands, (7) Shinwaris, (8) Afridi, (9) Mangals, (10) Wazir, (11) Sulaiman Khel, (12) Kakars, (13) Achakzai, (14) Barech, and (15) Baluch and Brahuis. See more in Khan, *The Durand Line: Its Geo-Strategic Importance* (Peshawar: Area Study Center, University of Peshawar and the Hanns Seidel Foundation, 2000), 38–41.

50. Alexander Cooley, *Great Games, Local Rules: The New Great Power Contest in Central Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 3. Throughout history, great powers tried to create a neutral or friendly buffer zone, but the facts proved that any military escalation of either side resulted in a "breakdown of cooperation" between powers. See more in Barnett R. Rubin, *The Search for Peace in Afghanistan: From Buffer State to Failed State* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 142–45.

51. Afghan amir Abdur Rahman is also known as the "Iron Amir." According to Ahmed Rashid, he used British subsidies to establish the first standing army and bureaucracy. Employing brutal methods that were closely copied by the Taliban (against the Northern Alliance), he suppressed 40 revolts by the Uzbeks, Hazaras, and Tajiks, thus ending their autonomy and bringing them under the control of Kabul. He changed the demographic ratio by placing Pashtun famers and settlers in non-Pashtun areas to weaken the opposition. See more in Rashid, *Descent into Chaos: The US and the Failure of Nation Building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia* (New York: Penguin, 2008), 8.

52. Satinder Kumar Lambah, *The Durand Line*, Policy Paper Series (New Delhi: Aspen Institute India, 2011), 7–8.

53. Devin T. Hagerty and Herbert G. Hagerty, "The Reconstitution and Reconstruction of Afghanistan," in *South Asia in World Politics*, ed. Devin T. Hagerty (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), 115.

54. Ijaz Khan, *Pashtuns in the Crossfire: Pashtun Politics in the Shadow of "War against Terrorism,"* Brief no. 19 (Bradford: Pakistan Security Research Unit, 5 September 2007), 4, https://www.dur.ac.uk/resources/psru/briefings/archive/Brief19finalised3.pdf.

55. In response to the Durand agreement, the Afghan amir notes in his own diary that "I had made a kingdom of Afghanistan, which before had been divided into so many independent States ruled over by separate chiefs; and how I had extended my dominions, which, at the time of my accession, were no more than the city of Kabul and Jallalabad, together with a few other places.... At the time when I was occupied in breaking down the feudal system of Afghanistan and moulding the country into a strong consolidated Kingdom, I was not unaware nor neglectful of the necessity of defining my boundaries with the neighbouring countries. I well knew that it was necessary to mark out the boundary lines between my dominions and those of my neighbours, for the safety and protection of my Kingdom, and for purpose of putting a check on their advances and getting rid of misunderstandings and disputes." Abd al-Rahmān Khān, *The Life of Abdur Rahman, Amir of Afghanistan*, vol. 2, ed. Mir Munshi and Sultan Mahomed Khan (London: John Murray, 1900), 145–46.

56. Yunas, *Durand Line Border Agreement*, 1893, 4–6.

57. Ellsworth Huntington, "The Anglo-Russian Agreement as to Tibet, Afghanistan, and Persia," *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 39, no. 11 (1907): 655–58; and Khan, *Durand Line*, xiii.

58. Cited in Khan, *Durand Line*, 187. See also Victoria Schofield, *Afghan Frontier: Feuding and Fighting in Central Asia* (London: Tauris Parke Paperbacks, 2003), 245.

59. Brad L. Brasseur, *Recognizing the Durand Line: A Way Forward for Afghanistan and Pakistan?* (New York: EastWest Institute, 2011), 7, http://www.ewi.info/sites/default/files/ideas-files/durandline.pdf.

60. Stanley Wolpert, *Roots of Confrontation in South Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 107.

61. Khan, *Durand Line*, 190.

62. Riaz Mohammad Khan, *Afghanistan and Pakistan: Conflict, Extremism, and Resistence to Modernity* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2011), 165.

63. FATA is Pakistan's Pashtun-majority area. It is 27,220 square kilometers (km) in size and shares a 600 km border with Afghanistan. With a predominantly Pashtun population of 3.17 million, according to the 1998 census, it has seven administrative agencies: (1) Bajaur, (2) Khyber, (3) Kurram, (4) Mohmand, (5) Orakzai, (6) South Waziristan, and (7) North Waziristan. See International Crisis Group, *Pakistan's Tribal Areas: Appeasing the Militants*, Asia Report no. 125 (Brussels: International Crisis Group, 11 December 2006), http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/south-asia/pakistan/125-pakistans-tribal-areas-appeasing-the-militants.aspx

64. Julian Schofield, "Diversionary Wars: Pashtun Unrest and the Sources of the Pakistan-Afghan Confrontation," *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 17, no. 1 (2011): 42.

65. Khan, *Afghanistan and Pakistan*, 165.
66. Schofield, "Diversionary Wars," 43.
67. Ibid.
68. Khan, *Afghanistan and Pakistan*, 165.
69. Khan, *Durand Line*, 190.
70. Rasul Bakhsh Rais, *Recovering the Frontier State: War, Ethnicity, and State in Afghanistan* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008), 200; and Schofield, "Diversionary Wars," 42.
71. Lambah, *Durand Line*, 24.
72. Saul B. Cohen, "Asymmetrical States and Global Geopolitical Equilibrium," *SAIS Review* 4, no. 2 (Summer–Fall 1984): 196.
73. Barnett R. Rubin, "Afghanistan in 1993: Abandoned but Surviving," *Asian Survey* 34, no. 2 (February 1994): 185.
74. Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Islamic Leviathan: Islam and the Making of State Power* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2001), 133.
75. Peter R. Lavoy, "Pakistan's Foreign Relations," in *South Asia in World Politics*, ed. Devin T. Hagerty (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), 66.
76. Rubin, "Afghanistan in 1993," 187.
77. Eqbal Ahmed, "A Mirage Mis-Named Strategic Depth," *Al-Ahram Weekly*, no. 392 (27 August–2 September 1998).
78. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostragic Imperatives* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), 139.
79. Kulwant Kaur, *Pak-Afghanistan Relations* (New Delhi: Deep & Deep, 1985), 8–77; Yunas Samad, *A Nation in Turmoil: Nationalism and Ethnicity in Pakistan, 1937–1958* (London: Sage Publications, 1995), 114; and Maya Chadda, "International Dimension of Ethnic Conflict," in Hagerty, *South Asia in World Politics*, 195.
80. Carlotta Gall, "Karzai Threatens to Send Soldiers into Pakistan," *New York Times*, 16 June 2008, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/16/world/asia/16afghan.html?_r=0.
81. Khan, *Afghanistan and Pakistan*, 172–73.
82. Ibid., 174.
83. Ahmed Rashid, *Pakistan on the Brink: The Future of America, Pakistan, and Afghanistan* (New York: Viking, 2012), 39.
84. Mohamed C. Kamanda, "The Role of Higher Education in Developing and Sustaining Peace in Sierra Leone," in *When War Ends: Building Peace in Divided Communities*, ed. David J. Francis (Burlington and Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012), 157.
85. David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966); Ernst B. Haas, *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964); and Karl W. Deutsch, *Political Community at the International Level: Problems of Definition and Measurement* (Garden City, NY: Archon Books, 1970 [c. 1954]).
86. Barnett R. Rubin, *The Fragmentation of Afghanistan: State Formation and Collapse in the International System*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), 47.
87. Schofield, "Diversionary Wars," 46.
88. Marvin G. Weinbaum and Haseeb Humayoon, "The Intertwined Destinies of Afghanistan and Pakistan," in Thier, *Future of Afghanistan*, 95.
89. Tom Rogers, "Two Dimensions of a National Crisis: Population Growth and Refugees in Pakistan," *Modern Asian Studies* 26, no. 4 (1992): 753.
90. Imran Khan, *Pakistan: A Personal History* (London: Batnam Press, 2011), 72.
91. Jeffrey Mankoff, *The United States and Central Asia after 2014*, Report of the CSIS Russia and Eurasia Program (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, January 2013), 19–24, http://csis.org/files/publication/130122_Mankoff_USCentralAsia_Web.pdf.