

# Commentary



SEPTEMBER 2021

## Pakistan's use of terror as a tool of statecraft

Akhil Ramesh

### Introduction

It has been over seven years since Canadian troops departed from Afghanistan, but the consequences of the war linger on for the 40,000 Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) members who served in Afghanistan between 2001 and 2014. The war directly cost 168 Canadian lives and over 2000 members of the CAF were wounded or injured during that time (Azzi and Foot 2021; Alexander 2021). Following the departure, the number of suicides among armed service members has risen. For example, 20 Canadian military service members committed suicide in 2019; another 16 took their own lives in the subsequent year (Canada Press 2021a, 2021b).

In August 2021, following the departure of American troops, the Afghan forces failed to put up a resistance in multiple provinces and the ones that did could not hold back the Taliban, which quickly became victorious. The hard-fought gains of Canadians and the international coalition all went to dust. And, of note, across the border from Afghanistan, in Pakistan's burgeoning metropolis Quetta, the Taliban were riding motorbikes, enjoying the weather (MahkomAfghan 2021), and waving their flag in delight (Noorzai 2021).

Canada spent an estimated \$18 billion fighting in Afghanistan and at home the death count from the war keeps increasing. The United States spent an estimated \$2.26 trillion over the course of 20 years and lost over 2300 personnel to the war in Afghanistan. And Afghanistan has lost the most during

this conflict, with an entire generation living life in terror and agony and over 250,000 lives lost (Watson Institute 2021). With that in mind, it is worthwhile pondering why the Taliban are roaming freely in Quetta, Pakistan.

Two schools of thought currently dominate the discussion about the war in Afghanistan. In progressive circles, the failures in the region are attributed to the West's alleged "imperialistic ambitions" (Jenkins 2021). On the other end of the political spectrum, the freedom-loving libertarians have blamed a cultural mismatch between the West and Afghanistan (Geller and Alam 2010). Cultural differences, lack of education, the influence of religion, and almost everything else under the sun has been cited for the failures in Afghanistan – everything, that is, except for Pakistan's role in the war. Over the course of 20 years, excluding cuts in military aid (Ali 2016), Pakistan has managed to come out of the war without being held to account for its role in the conflict.

In the post-9/11 period, Canada joined the US and the international coalition of forces to eliminate the various terror outfits in Afghanistan that were sheltered by the Taliban. Little did the coalition know that Pakistan – the partner they chose in their war on terror in Afghanistan – was sponsoring, training, and sheltering the very entities they were fighting against. Pakistan was using proxies in Afghanistan in an attempt to overthrow the democratically elected government which, in its view, was allied with its adversary, India.

Once the coalition chose such a partner, the nation-building project was doomed to failure. Pakistan was using terror as a tool of statecraft by adopting the military doctrine of strategic depth (Raghavan 2001) against India. Meanwhile, the West was trying to establish democratic institutions that could prevent the reemergence of feudal systems and radicalization practices that were part of the Taliban's system of governance. From the start of the war, this divergence in priorities limited the scope of the West's attempts at thwarting radicalization.

## Terror as a tool of statecraft

Critics of the war in Afghanistan often dismiss the last 20 years as a wasted endeavour (Hussain 2021) or a failed democracy-building exercise that did not take into account either the rationale for the coalition forces' continued presence or the reasons for its failure in sustaining peace. Realist scholars have been among the most vocal critics of the war (Wood 2019), categorizing it as a waste of resources and against the core tenets of realism, which values national interests over the global good (Wohlforth 2009).

The analysis of the intervention and the continued presence of the forces has been limited by myopic considerations such as the economic cost of the war and by the helicopter vision of the analysts in Washington and London. The purpose of the US and other Western nations spending time, money,

and energy in building democratic institutions, training Afghan forces, and providing security assistance was to prevent another 9/11-like terrorist attack in the West. This approach held that liberal democracy would put a lid on radicalization and religious fundamentalism, and prevent the state from again becoming an incubator of terror outfits, whether they be Al-Qaeda or ISIS.

Nation states such as India, the United States, and Canada have assisted in Afghanistan's development under a democratically led government. And it should be noted that the states that have contributed to Afghanistan's development did so not just out of their magnanimity or altruism (Chaudhuri and Shende 2020), but to protect their own territory from terror attacks that could originate from Afghanistan. The continued presence of the troops in Afghanistan was serving the national interests of the countries involved.

Yet most scholars studying the region have failed to acknowledge the role of other states in the conflict – in particular, Pakistan. They are not alone; the very Western governments that deployed troops to Afghanistan also showed a deficit of political will – they were unwilling to take the war across the border to Pakistan, which demonstrated that it was quite prepared to use terror as a tool of statecraft (Felbab-Brown 2018).

“ *Most scholars studying the region have failed to acknowledge the role of other states in the conflict – in particular, Pakistan.* ”

Pakistan has a long and nefarious history of providing military support to different factions within Afghanistan going as far back as the 1970s. In the 1980s, the CIA provided assistance to Pakistan to train and support the mujahideen (Human Rights Watch 2001) who were fighting against Soviet forces. Interestingly, even after the fall of the Soviet Union, Pakistani generals and military officers continued training and assisting non-state actors in Afghanistan. Humiliated by its crushing defeat in the war with India in the 1970s, Pakistan had few viable options to deal with its rival. One option was for it to use nuclear weapons, but that would have had wide-ranging consequences and caused catastrophic damage to itself in the process. The other option, tested in the Soviet era, was the use of proxies and non-state actors to terrorize its rivals.

In Afghanistan, Pakistan adopted the doctrine of “strategic depth” in its support of factions within the Taliban (Raghavan 2001). Through Operation Tupac and a military doctrine designed to “bleed India with a thousand cuts” (Gupta 2020), it has supported militant groups such as Lashkar-e-Tayyiba, Hizb-ul-Mujahideen, al Badr, Jaish-e-Mohammad, and Harakat-ul-Mujahideen for low intensity and covert warfare in Kashmir (Chalk 2001), the Khalistan secessionist movement in Punjab, and other militant groups in India's north-east. Pakistan has funded and supported terror groups in Afghanistan to the

west and as far as Myanmar to the east with the Arakan army in the Rakhine valley (Kalita 2021).

Nevertheless, Pakistan's civilian governments are not solely in charge of these operations as they have little influence in security policy-making. The country has not had a single democratically elected prime minister serve a full term in office. Instead, it has been at the mercy of its intelligence apparatus, primarily the Inter-Services Intelligence Agency (ISI) and the military generals heading it. While Canadian and coalition forces were fighting to eliminate terror outfits in Afghanistan, these groups found refuge across the border.

Furthermore, contrary to popular opinion, Pakistan's role in sheltering, assisting, and supporting the Taliban was not a private pet project of intelligence agents, generals, and former military officers. To be sure, they helped lead these efforts. But hospitals, madrassas, and several high-profile private-sector leaders also supported the terror groups, wittingly or unwittingly. Hospitals treated injured fighters who fled across the border (Gul 2018); the madrassas provided ideological indoctrination for new recruits (Haqqani 2004); and the private sector, in particular private security contractors (Human Rights Watch 2001) and fertilizer manufacturers (Farooq 2013), provided arms and ammunition to these terrorists. It has been well established that the improvised explosive devices (IEDs) so ubiquitous in this war could not have been created without the support of Pakistan's largest fertilizer manufacturers, who provided the raw material (see Figure 1 for a breakdown of ISI's involvement across multiple domains).

**Figure 1: A breakdown of the ISI's involvement across multiple domains**



Similarly, in Kashmir, the ISI (in concert with its partners) established over 100 insurgent training camps (Chalk 2001) and executed its military doctrine against India in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir and in Gilgit-Baltistan. The most striking feature of the conflict in Kashmir is the transformation of what was originally a secular, locally-based struggle led by the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front (Chalk 2001) to one that is now largely carried out by foreign militants and rationalized in pan-Islamic religious terms. By transforming the secular struggle to a pan-Islamic cause, Pakistan was able to garner wider support from theocratic elements within its political establishment. This is evident in the recruitment practices for insurgent camps bordering India.

In Pakistan's Punjab province, there are over 50,000 madrassas. A significant number of these have been used to ideologically indoctrinate young minds, and these young men then go on to serve as pawns for the state's covert warfare in Kashmir and Afghanistan. As Husain Haqqani describes it, "the state (Pakistan) helped create a Pakistani sense of self as the citadel of Islam, which in turn enabled Islamists greater freedom of organization and movement than in other countries" (Haqqani 2004). Through these measures the ISI had converted its political ambitions into spiritual obligations. In recent years, this objective of converting otherwise secular conflicts into "Islamic" ones has taken place in the Middle East and Syria and even in Rakhine province in Myanmar.

Pakistan's ISI has used terror as a tool of statecraft under the guise of protecting Muslims, which in reality has caused widespread death and destruction in Muslim communities around the world. Pakistan's adventurism in Myanmar is a recent phenomenon. However, its destabilizing activities in Afghanistan and in India are now decades old. To many victims of Pakistan's terror campaign in Afghanistan and India, the overarching questions have centred on the relative silence of Western media outlets and on the absence of any decisive and corrective action against Pakistan as punishment for its many aggressive activities.

## Flying under the radar

The ISI and the Pakistani state have successfully flown under the Western media's proverbial radar and have come out of the war in Afghanistan relatively unscathed thanks to the tactical use of their geopolitical advantages and chequebook diplomacy.

### *Geopolitical advantages*

Over the past 20 years, Pakistan has used its geopolitical advantages to provide logistical support to Western forces (Human Rights Watch 2001), thereby establishing its preeminence in the conflict as the provider of the sole land access to Afghanistan. The West has also relied on ports and air bases in Paki-

stan for access to its operations in Afghanistan. Furthermore, the friendship cultivated between the US and Pakistan during the Cold War was rekindled through the war in Afghanistan. In other words, the US became addicted to a “better the devil you know” approach in choosing a logistics partner.

As a result, in what can only be described as a rent-seeking mechanism, US tax dollars ended up paying for missiles that were never launched. As Steve Coll put it in his interview with *The Atlantic*,

The deal was stunningly lucrative for Islamabad. Each year, the Pentagon transferred hundreds of millions of dollars in cash to Pakistan, ostensibly to reimburse its military for counterterrorism operations. In fact, Coalition Support Funds were a kind of legal bribery to Pakistan’s generals. The Pentagon would receive bills for air-defense expenses, even though al-Qaeda had no air force. One Special Forces colonel, Barry Shapiro, recalls invoices from Pakistan’s navy listing per diem pay for sailors on duty fighting the Global War on Terrorism. Shapiro tried to question some of the expenses: Was there any proof that the Pakistani army had indeed shot off the missiles it was asking to be reimbursed for? But he was told by his superiors to be quiet and pay up. (Mazzetti 2018)

The question remains whether this practice was borne out of a lack of a feasible alternative to Pakistan or if there existed a quid pro quo arrangement between certain US and Pakistani intelligence officials dating back to the Cold War. Regardless, Pakistan’s sponsorship of terror groups persisted, and meanwhile, Pakistan had positioned itself as an indispensable partner for the West. The US supported Pakistan in its quest to restructure its debt through the IMF and provided financial aid to help it address domestic issues.

Nevertheless, the same aid was used as a stick when the US government ran out of carrots to offer (Ali 2016). And that has been the only measure that successive US administrations have taken to hold Pakistan to account. American Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump have all withheld aid (the stick), including the Trump administration, which cut off US\$300 million in military aid in 2018. However, such measures did little to curtail Pakistan’s actions, and indeed only seemed to push Islamabad further into China’s orbit by making the state heavily reliant on China’s aid to sustain its economy.

### *Chequebook diplomacy*

Pakistan has used information campaigns to shape the narrative surrounding conflicts in South Asia. In 2019, for example, the *New York Times* featured a one-page ad calling out India for its alleged brutality in Kashmir (ANI 2019). The ad was sponsored by an organization called the International Humanitarian Foundation (IHF) (Westrop and Lee 2021). The advertisement was followed by billboards in Times Square that also drew attention to India’s treatment of people in Kashmir.

Further investigation revealed that the IHF was a “shell NGO” – one that was created by the US office of the Pakistani prime minister’s political party in Houston, Texas, and was registered only a couple of months prior to the protests it had organized against the Indian prime minister’s visit to the city. These protests revealed a disturbing trend: they converted the Kashmiri conflict to a pan-Islamic cause by including Islamic societies and associations (Kumar 2019), including a variety of Western-based Islamic organizations.

Weeks prior to these events, the US Department of Justice notified the US federal government that IHF had engaged the DC-based lobbyist Fenton Communications (Kumar 2019) as a declared foreign agent of Pakistan under a US\$50,000 contract for 11 days of work. Subsequently, through the contract, the Pakistani prime minister landed an interview on the MSNBC’s flagship *Morning Joe* news program (Westrop and Lee 2021).

According to the files obtained from the US Department of Justice, Pakistan has hired several lobbying firms in the past, such as Brown Lloyd James (also used by China) and Holland & Knight to act on its behalf in Washington, DC (US Department of Justice 2020). These firms have likely helped Pakistan successfully navigate the Washington landscape by placing op-eds in the *Washington Post* and securing interviews on CNN and MSNBC. Several media appearances have been favourable to Pakistan, however, with some – such as Foreign Minister Qureshi’s anti-Semitic comment on CNN (Golodryga and Lyons 2021) – only serving to bring out the country’s true colours.

Not all of Pakistan’s influence operations have involved straightforward lobbying. A few of its agents have even been convicted under the *Foreign Agents Registration Act* (South Asia Press 2021). For example, the ISI funded Syed Ghulam Nabi Fai, a US citizen, and used his links to Capitol Hill to manipulate the Kashmir narrative in Pakistan’s favour. Fai was the head of the Kashmiri American Council and in 2011 the FBI arrested him for secretly lobbying for Pakistan and receiving over \$400,000 in funding from the ISI (South Asia Press 2021).

Despite Pakistan’s questionable behaviour in Washington, the capitol has long been averse to reevaluating US policy toward the country. This is partly because several think tanks and nonprofits have helped maintain the status quo. For example, Christine Fair, an expert on South Asia, sounded the alarm in 2019 on the appointment of Moeed Yusuf to a US taxpayer-funded think tank (Fair 2019). Yusuf, a Pakistani citizen, later became the national security advisor to the prime minister of Pakistan. In other words, a US institution tasked with promoting conflict resolution was housing the future national security advisor of Pakistan and offering policy recommendations on Pakistan, that he had no doubt helped craft, to the US Congress. Multiple other think tanks have also given Pakistan the benefit of the doubt and many have made a concerted effort to exclude voices critical of Pakistan.

Washington is filled with such open secrets, mysteries, and unsavory prac-

tices. And states like Pakistan have been able to successfully leverage them to shape the discourse and gain credibility in the West. Through the effective manipulation of many of Washington's trusted elites, Pakistan has effectively blinded the progressives, the security apparatus, and the media to its use of terror. In short, Washington's policy on Pakistan can be represented by the three famous monkeys: "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil."

## Fending off the hyenas all by itself

In the popular Disney film, *The Lion King*, when the father lion Mufasa has departed, the cub Simba is left to fend for himself. The US and other allied nations have played the role of Mufasa raising Simba (i.e., Afghanistan), by building its democratic institutions and security apparatus, and training its defence forces. Raised by Mufasa, Simba was well equipped to deal with the challenges he faced in the wild. However, Simba had to grow to become a lion to pose a formidable challenge to the clan of hyenas hounding him. Similarly, while Afghanistan's institutions have given the nation a solid framework on which to build, it has faced an uphill battle trying to sustain peace in the face of multiple adversarial forces in the region that are working together for their own vested interests.

With the recent fall of Afghanistan's democratically elected government, its civil society is vulnerable and exposed to Pakistan's proxies. Unfortunately, these proxies are likely composed of both state and non-state actors. Afghanistan's neighbours have been vying for a bigger role in the peace and reconciliation process and, as an extension, in the country. In particular, Turkey, Iran, and China have had roles to play in one form or another in the negotiations with the Taliban (Jones 2021) and have sought to fill the void left by Western nations (Mazhari 2021).

A good case in point is Turkey. As the Taliban rushed to form the new government in Kabul, Turkey was among the first to accept the reality of the situation and initiated discussions with the theocratic regime. Turkey even offered to provide a coordinated response to the refugee crisis by working with Pakistan. It is also telling that in early 2021 Turkey had proposed that it would secure the Kabul airport – though this early proposal now appears moot, given the speed of the Taliban's takeover of Kabul. Yet the fact Erdogan's Turkey even stepped up to offer security indicates a shift in regional power dynamics. Turkey has also supported Pakistan regionally in its dispute with India over Kashmir. For instance, Turkey supported Pakistan's effort to internationalize the dispute and raised the issue at the UN general assembly in 2019 (Raj 2020).

Interestingly, Turkey and Pakistan have found a willing partner in each other as both seek to advance their own international ambitions – specifically, to take on the self-anointed leadership role as the protectorate of the world's

billion-plus Muslims. Erdogan has also time and again expressed his desires to revive the glory of the Ottoman empire (Mikhail 2020). He has indicated these grand ambitions through speeches at the United Nations, and in provocative speeches in response to violent attacks on Muslims in the Western world. By framing conflicts and experiences of Muslims in the Western world as a cultural and religious conflict between West and Islam, Turkey under Erdogan has sought to take on the leadership mantle of the Islamic world. Earlier in 2019, Erdogan, Imran Khan, and former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad announced plans to create a television network to “counter Islamophobia” and that would allegedly “set the record straight” on Islam (Kugelman 2021).

Similarly, Iran has had a longstanding water dispute with Afghanistan (Sadat and Sayed 2020) and it was strongly apprehensive about dealing with the previous Afghan government, which it viewed as being under Western influence. As such, one can be rightly suspicious of any role it intends to play in the conflict. The Taliban had repeatedly called the Ghani administration a “puppet government” before finally overthrowing it in mid-August 2021. It is unfortunate that the Iranian regime and the Taliban have more in common than the former Afghan government and its Iranian counterpart.

“*Afghanistan's neighbours have been vying for a bigger role in the peace and reconciliation process and, as an extension, in the country.*”

Finally, China’s presence in the region through its trillion-dollar connectivity project, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), overshadows Pakistan’s proxies and other regional actors. Pakistan is one of the largest recipients of aid through China’s BRI (Kong 2019). The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) is estimated to be worth around US\$60 billion, making the project a significant contribution to the Pakistani economy. China has also committed to investing over US\$400 billion in Iran over the course of 25 years in exchange for steady supply of oil (Fassihi and Myers 2021). Clearly, a missing piece in this puzzle has been Afghanistan. Both China and Pakistan have voiced their support for connecting the BRI running through Iran to Pakistan via Afghanistan (Tribune 2021). In the event that China and Pakistan’s plans solidify, the entire region will fall under China’s orbit and, as an extension, under its “all weather friend,” Pakistan, and its proxies, including the Taliban.

China protects Pakistan from international action for its terror financing and in turn, Pakistan turns a blind eye to China’s treatment of the Uyghurs (Westfall 2021). With China’s support, Pakistan will have free rein to use terror as a tool of statecraft in Afghanistan and India. It would have China to protect it

from international scrutiny and action, much as it has done in the past. The agreement China signed with Iran grants it permission to deploy troops to Iran to protect vital assets that are part of the BRI. In Pakistan, China has used both private security personnel and its own troops to secure infrastructure projects and the safety of its workers. Considering how China has used private security contractors and its national army in the past, it is plausible that the region will witness the increased presence of Chinese troops.

At the onset of the civil war in Afghanistan in the 1990s, truckers and traders at the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan supported the Taliban onslaught for economic reasons (Human Rights Watch 2001). Decades later, the Iran-Pakistan-China axis will again support non-state actors in Afghanistan for their own economic gain. And with Turkey's support, any intervention by a Western power will be labelled as an imperialist, "Islamophobic" endeavour.

## Policy recommendations

In July 2021, the daughter of Najibullah Alikhil, Afghanistan's ambassador to Pakistan, was kidnapped by unidentified men in Islamabad and tortured before being released (Saifi and Popalzai 2021). In response, the Afghan ambassador and other diplomats were called back to Kabul, which led to a further deterioration of relations between the two states. In the week following this horrific incident, Washington continued its disconnected policy-making by introducing a new Quad for Central Asia (Pakistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and the United States) to increase economic activity and linkages between the four (US State Department 2021).

As noted earlier, Washington's policy-making can be summarized using the Japanese three monkey pictorial maxim – it sees no evil by Pakistan, hears no evil of Pakistan, and speaks no evil about Pakistan. Unfortunately, it is evident from the Biden administration's decisions that Washington has not changed course and continues to support and rely on its Cold War ally in the region.

Ottawa should deviate from Washington and chart its own independent foreign policy for South Asia and find like-minded countries in the West and in South Asia to execute the following recommendations as a multilateral undertaking. While sentiment against deploying troops is growing, Ottawa has other means that it can employ to address the challenges that Afghanistan faces. Too many Afghan and Canadian lives have been lost to abandon the nation to the pack of hyenas. To confront today's gruesome reality, Ottawa should use its foreign, security, and even education and immigration policies to engage the world against Pakistan's use of terror. Specifically, Canada along with the support of likeminded Western nations should:

1. *List Pakistan as a state sponsor of terrorism and add it to the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) blacklist.*

Pakistan has been on the FATF's grey list and has repeatedly failed to deliver on the demands of the international organization to address money laundering mechanisms within its economy. Pakistan's financing of terror will be partially thwarted if it is black-listed. If major Western powers coordinate their efforts, they can bring pressure on the US to impose hard-hitting economic sanctions on Pakistan.

## *2. Impose targeted economic sanctions on Pakistani generals, businessmen, and security contractors involved in "strategic depth."*

Pakistan's relative success using proxies can be attributed to its ability to bring multiple stakeholders in the process under its wing – fertilizer manufactures, truckers, traders, and former military officials. If the past 20 years has taught the Western coalition anything, it should be that going after the Taliban without going after those supporting Pakistan is a fool's errand. Ottawa should advocate for economic sanctions on military generals, private sector leaders funding these proxies in Pakistan and abroad, and security contractors providing arms and supplies to the Taliban.

## *3. Support the Afghan diaspora and democratic activists in the West speaking out against Pakistan's sponsorship of terror*

In the weeks prior to the fall of Kabul in August 2021, it was the Afghans and the Afghan diaspora that got the hashtag #SanctionPakistan trending on social media. They've been vocal about Pakistan's role in the destabilization of their country. Given the Pakistani intelligence agency's ability to mute any criticism of its actions by spending dollars in Washington and London, Ottawa should support the Afghan community by actively engaging the diaspora and the democratic activists seeking support to counter the tyrannical Taliban regime in Afghanistan.

There have been two successes resulting from the war in Afghanistan: Al-Qa-eda has been eliminated from the country (as of August 2021), and a generation of Afghans have been raised under a democratically elected government to cherish liberty, freedom, and equality, and to oppose the Talibanization of their homeland. Short of providing a soap box, Canada should help the diaspora shape the narrative and form policy on Afghanistan.

## *4. Adopt the French model over the American one to address Islamo-Leftism*

Faced with protests, knife attacks, and an unprecedented increase in radicalization in economically weaker sections of French society, President Macron has enacted reforms and established a review commission to look into radicalization in university departments and in the mosques that receive foreign funding (Onishi and Méheut 2021). His administration has focused its efforts on reviewing research coming out of universities that is challenging the very

core of French values through *l'islamo-gauchisme* or Islamo-leftism (Beardsley 2021). In contrast, North America has been particularly lax at analyzing the role of the strange bedfellows – progressives and radical Islamists – in incubating radicalization.

Ottawa should review foreign funding of mosques, which will prevent terrorist states like Pakistan from receiving support from well-intentioned Canadians seeking to support the oppressed. Canadian civil society should rightly identify the oppressor and the oppressed. The victims of Pakistan's proxy wars, which include Afghans (in particular Afghanistan's women and children), but also Kashmiris, Pashtuns, and Baluchis are the oppressed and not the perpetrators of the said war. Identifying the oppressors and the oppressed will also have an impact on our immigration policy. It is vital that the distinction between the oppressors and oppressed be made clear, which will subsequently prevent a dystopian future from becoming a reality – a future where a park or library named after a Canadian leader is taken down over protests and replaced with a Pakistani military dictator or prime minister.

Canada has consistently supported those who suffer at the hands of theocratic elements, such as Asia Bibi (Sherwood 2019), a Catholic woman who was sentenced to death over charges of blasphemy. Ottawa welcomed her with open arms, saving her life and giving her a new home. Ottawa should continue this policy of providing asylum and support to the victims of radical Islam practiced by Pakistan's orthodox and political establishment.

## Conclusion

Through its influence peddling and chequebook diplomacy Pakistan has managed to shape the narrative in favour of its proxy war in Afghanistan, which humiliates ordinary Pakistanis who deserve to live with the dignity of a democratic government exercising civilian control over its military. Unfortunately, when it comes to the ISI's aggression, the forces fighting Pakistan's proxies have remained divided, overwhelmed and intransigent. In order to support the Afghans and the other victims of Pakistan's proxy war, including the Pakistani people, Ottawa should incubate and provide a platform for the courageous souls speaking out against Pakistan's use of terror, as it is vital that the distinction between the oppressors and oppressed be made clear, as this will help provide support to those in need and direct punitive measures toward the perpetrators.

# About the author



**Akhil Ramesh** is a researcher and scholar, currently serving as a Nonresident Fellow with the Pacific Forum, Hawaii, USA. Previously, he worked on track 1.5/2 diplomacy initiatives for think tanks and on Asia focused consulting projects for risk consulting firms in New York City and Washington D.C. Over the course of the last seven years, he has worked across three continents and successfully undertaken several research projects involving the study of South Asia and the Indo-Pacific region,

ranging from a comprehensive mapping project of China's Belt and Road Initiative, to analyzing the relationship between international security and geoeconomics. His writing on international security issues involving China, India, Pakistan and the United States can be found in global publications such as the *Diplomat*, *The National Interest*, *Asia Times*, *Hindustan Times*, *The Quint*, *Jerusalem Post*, *South China Morning Post* and the *Hill*. He can be reached on Twitter (@akhil\_oldsoul) and you can find his bi-weekly column in the *Hill* every other Monday morning.

# References

Alexander, Chris. 2021. *Ending Pakistan's Proxy War in Afghanistan*. Macdonald-Laurier Institute. Available at [https://macdonaldlaurier.ca/files/pdf/20210212\\_Pakistan\\_Proxy\\_War\\_Alexander\\_PAPER\\_FWeb.pdf](https://macdonaldlaurier.ca/files/pdf/20210212_Pakistan_Proxy_War_Alexander_PAPER_FWeb.pdf).

Ali, Idrees. 2016. "U.S. Aid to Pakistan Shrinks amid Mounting Frustration over Militants." *Reuters* (September 6). Available at <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-pakistan-aid-idUSKCN1110AQ>.

ANI. 2019. "New York Times Carries Factually Incorrect Full-Page Ad Towing Pak's Line on Kashmir." *ANI News* (September 27). Available at: <https://www.aninews.in/news/national/general-news/new-york-times-carries-factually-incorrect-full-page-ad-towing-paks-line-on-kashmir20190927230823/>.

Azzi, Stephen, and Richard Foot. 2021. "Canada and the War in Afghanistan." *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (February 5). Available at <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/international-campaign-against-terrorism-in-afghanistan>.

Beardsley, Eleanor. 2021. "French Education Minister's 'Islam-Leftism' Probe Meets Academic Backlash." *NPR* (February 21). Available at <https://www.npr.org/2021/02/21/970001632/french-education-ministers-islamo-leftism-probe-meets-academic-backlash>.

Canadian Press. 2021a. "Canadian Armed Forces Reports 16 Military Suicides in 2020." *CTV News* (June 8). Available at <https://www.ctvnews.ca/politics/canadian-armed-forces-reports-16-military-suicides-in-2020-1.5461341>.

Canadian Press. 2021b. "16 Canadian Armed Forces Members Died by Suicide in 2020, Military Says." *Global News* (June 8). Available at <https://globalnews.ca/news/7931300/canadian-armed-forces-suicides-2020/>.

Chalk, Peter. 2001. *Pakistan's Role in the Kashmir Insurgency*. Rand Corporation (September 1). Available at <https://www.rand.org/blog/2001/09/pakistans-role-in-the-kashmir-insurgency.html>.

Chaudhuri, Rudra, and Shreyas Shende. 2020. *Dealing With the Taliban: India's Strategy in Afghanistan after U.S. Withdrawal*. Carnegie India. Available at [https://carnegieendowment.org/files/Chaudhuri\\_Shende\\_-\\_Afghanistan.pdf](https://carnegieendowment.org/files/Chaudhuri_Shende_-_Afghanistan.pdf).

Duncan, Conrad. 2020. "Muslims Have a Right to 'Kill Millions of French People' over Past Actions, Former Malaysian PM Suggests." *The Independent* (October 29). Available at <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/eu>

rope/muslims-france-malaysian-pm-mahathir-mohamad-macron-charlie-hebdo-b1424838.html.

Fair, C. Christine. 2019. "Was US Institute of Peace Harboring a Pakistani Asset? The Case of Moeed Yusuf." *The Print* (October 3). Available at <https://theprint.in/opinion/was-us-institute-of-peace-harboring-a-pakistani-asset-the-case-of-moeed-yusuf/300386/>.

Farooq, Umar. 2013. "Pakistani Fertilizer Grows Both Taliban Bombs and Afghan Crops." *Christian Science Monitor* (May 9). Available at <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-South-Central/2013/0509/Pakistani-fertilizer-grows-both-Taliban-bombs-and-Afghan-crops>.

Fassihi, Farnaz, and Steven Lee Myers. 2021. "China, With \$400 Billion Iran Deal, Could Deepen Influence in Mideast." *New York Times* (March 27). Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/27/world/middleeast/china-iran-deal.html>.

Felbab-Brown, Vanda. 2018. "Why Pakistan Supports Terrorist Groups, and Why the US Finds It So Hard to Induce Change." Order from Chaos blog (January 5). Brookings Institution. Available at <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/01/05/why-pakistan-supports-terrorist-groups-and-why-the-us-finds-it-so-hard-to-induce-change/>.

Geller, Armando, and Shah Jamal Alam. 2010. "A Socio-Political and -Cultural Model of the War in Afghanistan." *International Studies Review* 12, 1 (March): 8-30.

Golodryga, Bianna, and Emmet Lyons. 2021. "Pakistan's Top Diplomat Makes Anti-Semitic Remark during CNN Interview about Gaza Conflict." *CNN* (May 22). Available at <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/21/world/pakistan-diplomat-gaza-interview-intl/index.html>.

Gul, Ayaz. 2018. "Ghani Accuses Pakistan of Treating Wounded Taliban Fighters." *VOA News* (August 17). Available at <https://www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/ghani-accuses-pakistan-treating-wounded-taliban-fighters>.

Gupta, Anil. 2020. "Let Pakistan Bleed Not India." *Indian Defence Review* (May 6). Available at <http://www.indiandefencereview.com/news/let-pakistan-bleed-not-india/>

Haqqani, Husain. 2004. "Madrassas: Knowledge or the 'Shade of Swords.'" Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (April 21). Available at <https://carnegieendowment.org/2004/04/21/madrassas-knowledge-or-shade-of-swords-pub-1509>.

Human Rights Watch [HRW]. 2001. "Pakistan's Support of the Taliban." In *Afghanistan: Crisis of Impunity. The Role of Pakistan, Russia, and Iran in Fueling the Civil War* 13, 3(C). HRW. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/afghan2/Afghan0701.pdf>.

Hussain, Murtaza. 2021. "The U.S. Could Have Left Afghanistan Years Ago, Sparing Many Lives." *The Intercept* (April 16). Available at <https://theintercept.com/2021/04/16/afghanistan-withdrawal-forever-war-biden/>

Jenkins, Simon. 2021. "What Did 20 Years of Western Intervention in Afghanistan Achieve? Ruination." *The Guardian* (April 16). Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/apr/16/20-years-western-intervention-afghanistan-terror>.

Jones, Dorian. 2021. "Erdogan Pushes for Turkish Role in Afghanistan after US Leaves." *VOA News* (July 21). Available at <https://www.voanews.com/middle-east/erdogan-pushes-turkish-role-afghanistan-after-us-leaves>.

Kalita, Jayanta. 2021. "Rohingya Terrorist Group Linked to Pakistan and Militant Islamic Organizations." *Irrawaddy* (July 15). Available at <https://www.irrawaddy.com/opinion/rohingya-terrorist-group-linked-to-pakistan-and-militant-islamic-organizations.html>.

Kong, Veasna. 2019. *The Belt and Road Initiative – Six Years On. Moody's Analytics* (June). Available at <https://www.moodyanalytics.com/-/media/article/2019/belt-and-road-initiative.pdf>.

Kugelman, Michael. 2021. "Imran Khan's Silence on Uighurs Undercuts His Defense of Muslims Worldwide." *Foreign Policy* (January 29). Available at <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/01/29/imran-khan-uighurs-muslims-china/>.

Kumar, Ankit (2019). "Behind Imran Khan's UN Campaign, Shell NGO, PR Firm and an Advertising Blitzkrieg." *India Today* (September 30). Available at <https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/imran-khan-un-campaign-shell-ngo-pr-firm-advertising-blitzkrieg-1604919-2019-09-30>.

MahkomAfghan (@MahkomAfghan). 2021. "If this footage makes you think that this is a city in Afghanistan, than you are wrong. Its provincial capital of Quetta where Taliban are enjoying the rainy weather." (July 14, 6:24 am). [Twitter Post]. Available at <https://twitter.com/HaiPashteen/status/1415301197083336707?s=20>.

Mazhari, Mohamad. 2021. "China Plans to Form Alliance with Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey to Undermine U.S. Hegemony: Professor." *Tebrantimes* (July 6). Available at <https://www.tehrantimes.com/news/462804/China-plans-to-form-alliance-with-Iran-Pakistan-and-Turkey>.

Mazzetti, Mark. 2018. “The Devastating Paradox of Pakistan.” *The Atlantic* (March). Available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/03/the-pakistan-trap/550895/>.

Mikhail, Alan. 2020. “Why Recep Tayyip Erdogan’s Love Affair with the Ottoman Empire Should Worry the World.” *Time* (September 3). Available at <https://time.com/5885650/erdogans-ottoman-worry-world/>.

Noorzai, Roshan. 2021. “Taliban Active in Pakistan as Dead and Wounded Militants Arrive from Afghanistan.” *VOA News* (July 13). Available at <https://www.voanews.com/extremism-watch/taliban-active-pakistan-dead-and-wounded-militants-arrive-afghanistan>.

Onishi, Norimitsu, and Constant Méheut. 2021. “Heating Up Culture Wars, France to Scour Universities for Ideas That ‘Corrupt Society.’” *New York Times* (February 21). Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/18/world/europe/france-universities-culture-wars.html>.

Raghavan, V.R. 2001. “Strategic Depth in Afghanistan.” *The Hindu* (November 7). Available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20111017211658/http://www.hindu.com/2001/11/07/stories/05072523.htm>.

Raj, Yashwant. 2020. “India slams Turkish President Erdogan’s Kashmir Remarks at UNGA.” *Hindustan Times* (September 23). Available at <https://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/india-slams-turkish-president-erdogan-s-kashmir-remarks-at-unga/story-ann6FVUwGjTW7Ez37afnvI.html>.

Sadat, Said Hashmat, and Nasrat Sayed. 2020. “Afghanistan and Iran: From Water Treaty to Water Dispute.” *The Interpreter* (October 14). Available at <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/afghanistan-and-iran-water-treaty-water-dispute>.

Saifi, Sophia, and Ehsan Popalzai. 2021. “Afghanistan Withdraws Diplomats from Pakistan Following Alleged Kidnapping of Ambassador’s Daughter.” *CNN* (July 19). Available at <https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/19/asia/afghanistan-pakistan-ambassadors-daughter-intl-hnk/index.html>.

Sherwood, Harriet. 2019. “Asia Bibi Begins New Life in Canada – But Her Ordeal May Not Be Over.” *The Guardian* (May 8). Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/may/08/asia-bibi-begins-new-life-in-canada-but-her-ordeal-may-not-be-over>.

South Asia Press. 2021. “How to Buy U.S. Democracy? (The Pakistani Way!)” *South Asia Press* (July 21). Available at <https://southasiapress.org/2021/07/21/how-to-buy-u-s-democracy-the-pakistani-way/>.

Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs. 2021. *Cost of War*. Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Brown University.

Tribune. 2021. “New CPEC Road Network to Improve Access to Iran: Asim Bajwa.” *Tribune* (May 23). Available at <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2301194/new-cpec-road-network-to-improve-access-to-iran-asim-bajwa>.

US Department of Justice. 2020. *Foreign Agents Registration Act*. US Department of Justice. Available at <https://efile.fara.gov/docs/5875-Exhibit-AB-20200831-55.pdf>.

US State Department. 2021. “Announcing the U.S. – Afghanistan – Uzbekistan – Pakistan Quad Regional Support for Afghanistan-Peace Process and Post Settlement.” Press Release (July 16). Government of the United States. Available at <https://www.state.gov/announcing-the-u-s-afghanistan-uzbekistan-pakistan-quad-regional-support-for-afghanistan-peace-process-and-post-settlement/>.

Westfall, Sammy. 2021. “Pakistan’s Prime Minister Embraces China’s Policy toward Uyghurs in Remarks on Communist Party Centenary.” *Washington Post* (July 2). Available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2021/07/02/pakistan-prime-minister-backs-china-on-uyghurs/>.

Westrop, Sam, and Martha Lee. 2021. “Kashmir Faces Deep Threat as Pakistan Offers Tacit Support to Houston Network to Spread Islamic Fanaticism, Separatism in Valle.” *FirstPost* (June 4). Available at <https://www.firstpost.com/india/kashmir-faces-deep-threat-as-pakistan-offers-tacit-support-to-houston-network-to-spread-islamic-fanaticism-separatism-in-valley-9684321.html>.

Wohlforth, William C. 2009. “Realism.” In Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press.

Wood, Ruairidh. 2019. “Promoting Democracy or Pursuing Hegemony? An Analysis of U.S. Involvement in the Middle East.” *Journal of Global Faultlines* 6, 2 (December 2019-February 2020): 166-185. Available for download at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13169/jglobfaul.6.2.0166>.

constructive

important

forward-thinking

insightful

high-quality

active

# Ideas change the world

## WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING ABOUT MLI

### The Right Honourable Paul Martin

I want to congratulate the **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** for 10 years of excellent service to Canada. The Institute's commitment to public policy innovation has put them on the cutting edge of many of the country's most pressing policy debates. The Institute works in a persistent and constructive way to present new and insightful ideas about how to best achieve Canada's potential and to produce a better and more just country. Canada is better for the forward-thinking, research-based perspectives that the **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** brings to our most critical issues.

### The Honourable Jody Wilson-Raybould

The **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** has been active in the field of Indigenous public policy, building a fine tradition of working with Indigenous organizations, promoting Indigenous thinkers and encouraging innovative, Indigenous-led solutions to the challenges of 21<sup>st</sup> century Canada. I congratulate **MLI** on its 10 productive and constructive years and look forward to continuing to learn more about the Institute's fine work in the field.

### The Honourable Irwin Cotler

May I congratulate **MLI** for a decade of exemplary leadership on national and international issues. Through high-quality research and analysis, **MLI** has made a significant contribution to Canadian public discourse and policy development. With the global resurgence of authoritarianism and illiberal populism, such work is as timely as it is important. I wish you continued success in the years to come.

### The Honourable Pierre Poilievre

The **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** has produced countless works of scholarship that solve today's problems with the wisdom of our political ancestors. If we listen to the **Institute's** advice, we can fulfill Laurier's dream of a country where freedom is its nationality.

## M A C D O N A L D - L A U R I E R I N S T I T U T E



323 Chapel Street, Suite 300,  
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7Z2  
613-482-8327 • [info@macdonaldlaurier.ca](mailto:info@macdonaldlaurier.ca)



@MLInstitute



[facebook.com/MacdonaldLaurierInstitute](https://facebook.com/MacdonaldLaurierInstitute)



[youtube.com/MLInstitute](https://youtube.com/MLInstitute)



[linkedin.com/company/macdonald-laurier-institute](https://linkedin.com/company/macdonald-laurier-institute)