

VIEWS ON SECURITY IN AFGHANISTAN: Selected Quotes and Statements by U.S. and International Leaders

BACKGROUND

The United States is broadly supportive of a wide range of efforts in Afghanistan. In January, President Bush and Afghan Chairman Karzai issued a joint statement, putting the U.S. behind an effort “to build a lasting partnership for the 21st century, determined to fight terrorism, and ensure security, stability and reconstruction for Afghanistan, and foster representative and accountable government for all Afghan women and men.”

One current question is: How much basic security is needed to meet U.S. goals in Afghanistan, and how can it best be provided? While the U.S. and other countries support extension of the mandate for the 4,500-strong International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan beyond June 2002, the Bush Administration has not supported an expansion of the ISAF force size or its area of deployment beyond the vicinity of Kabul. Afghan Chairman Karzai, U.N. Special Representative Lakhdar Brahimi and a host of non-governmental organizations working in Afghanistan, however, have called for an expansion of ISAF or other efforts to provide security immediately. According to press reports in early 2002, some State Department officials appeared to favor enlargement of ISAF, while the Pentagon reportedly opposed expansion, citing potential interference between ISAF troops and the U.S.-led military campaign, additional costs, and the reluctance of ISAF contributing countries, including Turkey, to expand the deployment area.

In addition to leading the effort against Al Qaeda and the Taliban, the U.S. has pushed for training of Afghan police, military and border control forces, and the U.S. military has expressed a willingness to provide transportation, logistics and communications support to the existing ISAF force, as well as to rescue ISAF troops if needed. In Geneva in April 2002, a number of nations agreed to take the lead in training segments of the Afghan security sector. The U.S. volunteered to train the Afghan military and border security service; Germany pledged to train an Afghan police force; Great Britain agreed to lead the counter-narcotics effort; and Italy volunteered to run a rule of law program. In April, the United Nations approved the U.N. Assistance Mission to Afghanistan (UNAMA), which will oversee implementation of the Bonn process and work out of eight cities in Afghanistan.

While welcoming these developments, many non-governmental organizations face obstacles in the field and continue to press for additional security in Afghanistan until the Afghan forces are available. Members of Congress have also raised concerns about the lack of security and argued for addressing the situation. U.N. and Afghan Interim Administration officials continue to argue for an expanded force and stress the importance of security in the region.

The following quotes and statements highlight the dialogue on the future of Afghanistan, and include the views of U.S. and international leaders, on goals for and security issues in Afghanistan.

HIGHLIGHTS

U.S. Position

President George W. Bush – “The United States is committed to building a lasting partnership with Afghanistan. We will help the new Afghan government provide the security that is the foundation for peace.”¹

Vice President Richard Cheney – “We’re there to back up the ISAF international peacekeeping force. We’re there to work with the Karzai interim authority and, hopefully, a new government, once it is stood up. We are prepared to train the new Afghan national army, which they badly need.”

Asked if the United States would have to rebuild Afghanistan, the Vice President said, “Rebuild it, put it back together again, whatever phrase you want. We cannot allow Afghanistan to move to a situation where once again it’s a sanctuary for terrorists.”²

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld – “What’s the first thing in the world you need for anything else to happen, for hospitals to happen, for roads to happen, for refugees to come back, for people to be fed and humanitarian works to move on the country? You’ve got to have security.”³

“...I will say this: there is no question but that very little is possible in a country if there is not reasonable security.”⁴

“...We’re going to have to get our things together and go out and do that because without security in that country, not much else is possible. There’s not going to be a stable government. There’s not going to be humanitarian assistance. Things aren’t going to work.”⁵

“...The US military would likely wait until a national army and other Afghan security forces were capable of maintaining a reasonably stable environment so that the Taliban and al Qaeda didn’t come back in and seize control or start training terrorists again or doing what we went in to stop them from doing.”⁶

“...I think that that’s a likely outcome; that you would certainly want to have the government and its various assets – border patrols, local police, military – capable of providing a reasonably stable environment so that the Taliban and al Qaeda didn’t come back in and seize control or start training terrorists again or doing things that we went in to stop them from doing.”⁷

White House Spokesperson, Ari Fleischer – “The United States is committed to the long term of Afghanistan, including its security and safety. I think it is also fair to say that it’s not going to be an easy process, and it’s not going to happen overnight.”⁸

U.N. Position

Security Council President for April 2002, Ambassador Sergey Lavrov (Russian Federation) – “The members of the Council expressed their satisfaction with some progress achieved in the security area of Kabul, due to the activities of ISAF. They stressed the need to continue the efforts by the Afghans themselves with the assistance of the international community to improve security throughout the country, especially during the period of the Loya Jirga.”⁹

Security Council Statement, Anil Kumarsingh Gayan (Mauritius) – “We emphasize that the UN and non-governmental organizations must be allowed to operate in security and with full freedom of movement particularly in those areas most in need of humanitarian assistance.”¹⁰

U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan – “...Without security, reconstruction will not be possible and donors will not be able to disburse the money they have pledged.”¹¹

“...Urged donor states to commit funding to security, and voiced concern about the gap between the present and the future time when Afghans would have created their own security institutions.”¹²

U.N. Special Representative to Afghanistan, Lakhdar Brahimi – “The peace process depends on the resolution of the security situation. Therefore, giving money to the security sector is both vital, indispensable and urgent.”¹³

U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) Mary Robinson – “It’s absolutely vital and I kept emphasizing that the core human rights problem at the moment in Afghanistan is human security.”¹⁴

International Position

Pakistan President Musharraf – “Soldiers from the International Security Assistance Force must leave Kabul and be seen in the furthest corners of the country. There’s no other way to get the warlords to understand that from now on they must accept central power... we must reduce the influence of the minor leaders and give the Kabul government its proper stature.”¹⁵

Afghanistan Interim Administration Chairman Karzai – “In asking for more international peacekeepers, we are repeating the demands of the Afghan people.”¹⁶

British Secretary of State for Defence, Geoff Hoon – “The recent Operation ANACONDA in the Paktia province, led by the United States, tackled one group of Al Qa’ida terrorists and Taliban fighters. They showed that these people are still in Afghanistan in large numbers and that they are heavily armed. Left alone, these groups would threaten all that the Afghan people and their supporters in the international community have achieved so far and would strive to retain Afghanistan as a base for training and organising terrorism. They do not recognise the Afghan Interim Authority and will work to destabilise the situation across Afghanistan.”¹⁷

United Kingdom Representative to the Security Council, Stewart Eldon – “Stewart Eldon associated himself with the statement that would shortly be made by the European Union... He welcomed the support the United Nations has given to the Afghan Loya Jirga Commission. The mandate of the ISAF should be extended, and he supported its expansion over a wider area. Careful consideration on how that could be done was essential.”¹⁸

British Ambassador to the United Nations, Sir Jeremy Greenstock – “I think the size of the force has been very carefully calculated. At one stage some of the Afghan ministers were after a smaller force, they wanted to do a lot of this work themselves. I think a good compromise has been worked out. Remember, we’re dealing with Kabul and its immediate surrounds, to the airport. We’re not talking about the wider territory. That remains the responsibility of the Afghans. If they want help for that in the future, they must ask the international community for that. But I think four to five thousand for this kind of security behind the Afghans in Kabul is about right.”¹⁹

French President, Jacques Chirac – “French President Jacques Chirac said Thursday that France does not favor deploying international troops outside the Afghan capital, Kabul, because it would cause ‘interference’ for the Afghan people... ‘We are not convinced, us French, that it is a good solution

because of the interference that it would represent for the Afghan people...’ He said, however that France supports in principle the idea of extending the stay of the 4,500 peacekeepers in Kabul.”²⁰

EXTENDED STATEMENTS

U.S. POSITION

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENTS

President Bush

“The United States is committed to building a lasting partnership with Afghanistan. We will help the new Afghan government provide the security that is the foundation for peace.” (Lawrence McQuillan, “US vows training, aid for Afghans,” *USA Today*, 29 January 2002)

Excerpts from “Joint Statement on New Partnership Between U.S. and Afghanistan” from 28 January 2002
(<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/print/20020128-8.html>)

“President Bush and Chairman Karzai commit to build a lasting partnership for the 21st century, determined to fight terrorism, and ensure security, stability and reconstruction for Afghanistan, and foster representative and accountable government for all Afghan women and men.

We stand together for a new and better future for Afghanistan -- a future free from terror, war, and want. We pledge our respect for the culture and traditions of the different peoples of Afghanistan, and for the great religion of Islam, which has been tragically distorted and misused by the Taliban.

We reaffirm our commitment to continue to work together to rout out the remnants of the Taliban and Al Qaida network. The United States and Afghanistan stand united in our determination that Afghanistan will never again become a training ground for global terror. We are equally determined that Afghanistan's tragic experience -- where terrorists were allowed to hold an entire nation hostage -- will not be repeated or replicated anywhere in the world.

The United States and Afghanistan share the belief that a secure, stable Afghanistan, at peace with its neighbors, is critical to achieving our shared goals. We agree that a lasting, permanent solution for Afghanistan's security needs must be based on strengthening Afghanistan's own capacities.

We agree that the United States will work with Afghanistan's friends in the international community to help Afghanistan stand up and train a national military and police, as well as address Afghanistan's short-term security needs, including through demining assistance.

We further agree to continue to support the mission of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to help promote security in Afghanistan. Chairman Karzai asked President Bush, on behalf of the Afghan people to consider supporting an extension and expansion of the ISAF.

Recognizing that representative and accountable national government is vital for Afghanistan to achieve stability, national reconciliation, and reconstruction, we reaffirm our shared determination to support the Bonn Agreement for a political transition process in Afghanistan over the next two years. Both sides recognize the importance of adhering strictly to the agreement's timetable.”

Vice President Dick Cheney

On U.S. role in Afghanistan:

“Vice President Richard B. Cheney, who appeared on three news talk shows yesterday, concurred with Gen. Franks’ forecast of a lengthy U.S. presence in Afghanistan. ‘We clearly will continue to have U.S. forces in Afghanistan for some considerable period of time to come. We’re there to back up the ISAF international peacekeeping force. We’re there to work with the Karzai interim authority and, hopefully, a new government, once it is stood up. We are prepared to train the new Afghan national army, which they badly need,’ Mr. Cheney said on NBC’s *Meet the Press*.

Asked if the United States would have to ‘rebuild’ Afghanistan, the vice president said: ‘Rebuild it, put it back together again, whatever phrase you want. We cannot allow Afghanistan to move to a situation where once again it’s a sanctuary for terrorists.’

Mr. Cheney noted that there is widespread perception that the ‘outside world walked away’ from Afghanistan after the Soviet Union withdrew in the late 1980s, allowing the Taliban militia to take power. ‘We can’t do that again,’ he said.” (Joyce Howard Price, “Bombers sent to Afghan air base,” *The Washington Times*, 25 March 2002)

White House Spokesperson, Ari Fleischer

“‘The United States is committed to the long term of Afghanistan, including its security and safety,’ Fleischer said. ‘I think it is also fair to say that its not going to be an easy process, and its not going to happen overnight.’” (Sally Buzbee, “Peacekeepers in fact, if not in name? US troops are doing new jobs with Afghan-US Military,” *AP Worldstream*, 25 February 2002.)

WHITE HOUSE PRESS BRIEFING, 28 JANUARY 2002:

“Q. All right. On Afghanistan, you mentioned a moment ago, as you frequently do, this is a different kind of war. I’m wondering if it requires a different kind of assessment of peacekeeping. Many of the independent analysts who have looked at what Afghanistan needs most -- the word that most often comes to their lips is ‘security’ -- internal security -- dealing with the warlords; pacifying, even disarming them.

You made it clear this morning the United States is not going to participate in a long-term international security force. I’m wondering if you can tell us why, since so many who look at Afghanistan’s internal problems say that’s what is most necessary, and if the U.S. stepped up, then the world would know that security force is real, robust and long-term.

MR. FLEISCHER: At the heart of your question is participation in the security of Afghanistan. And the answer to that is, yes, the United States will participate in helping secure the future of Afghanistan, and it’s doing that through a series of ways: first, foremost is through our military presence in Afghanistan to fight a war. The security of Afghanistan will best be obtained as a result of the United States having eliminated the al Qaeda and the Taliban and their ability to create insecurity in Afghanistan.

Secondly -- and this is something the president will address directly, with Chairman Karzai at his side -- the president will announce today a series of steps the United States is -- the United States government will take to help secure the future of Afghanistan through financial means, through diplomatic means, through political means. The United States has been the largest donator of food to the people of Afghanistan. We continue in that role.

Q. Ari, can I come back to the Afghan peacekeeping? If every nation said that "our forces are for winning wars only, not for peacekeeping," there would be no peacekeeping forces. What exempts us?

MR. FLEISCHER: If every nation used their military forces the way the United States did, there would be no wars.

Q. (Off mike.)

Q. Is that going to happen any time soon?

MR. FLEISCHER: That's the point. The United States uses its military for the purpose of fighting and winning wars, which has historically resulted in more peace around the world. It's historically resulted in nations that used to be enemies becoming friends -- France and Germany, for example. And that is as a result of the fact that when our nation commits its military to war, it does so for high moral purposes, backed up by military might. And the world's always been a better place for it.

Having said that, that is the contribution that this president believes should be made by our military -- to fight and win a war -- and he is pleased to work with the international community on a peacekeeping mission that would focus on other nations' activities around peacekeeping.

That should not be a surprise to anybody. That's exactly what the president committed to during the campaign, and that's what he intends to do.

Q. I guess that's the nature of my question, is he has really spoken of this in blanket terms, that this is what we use our military for, this is what we don't use our military for. And you're saying that because -- our willingness to use our military to fight wars exempts us from peacekeeping; is that right?

MR. FLEISCHER: Well, we're not exempt from peacekeeping. The United States has a series of commitments around the world to peacekeeping that the president is honoring. The president would like, over time, to be able to draw those down so the core mission of our military can remain focused on a combat-ready force.

But the president made clear -- and it shouldn't surprise anybody that he does what he said he'd do in the campaign -- that he does not intend to pursue new peacekeeping efforts with our military all around the world. We're pursuing combat in Afghanistan, and as a result, Afghanistan now has an environment in which security may be able to take hold.

Q. So it's not blanket? You could be using them elsewhere, depending upon how we choose --

MR. FLEISCHER: No, I think you understand the president's philosophy very clearly."

PENTAGON STATEMENTS

Secretary Rumsfeld

On establishing security in Afghanistan:

"I want to comment briefly on the importance of restoring peace and stability in Afghanistan. Our goals, which the coalition forces of course share, are to sustain an environment that will allow us to continue our work while we hunt down the Al Qaeda and Taliban that still remain in Afghanistan or in the neighboring countries; to assist the interim government in establishing reasonable order in that country; to ensure that the conditions exist which will allow humanitarian assistance to reach the needy and so that refugees can return from outside the country or the internally displaced persons from inside the country to their homes.

"Clearly there is no blueprint for what we are doing. For example, Afghanistan is a country some ten times the size, and five or six times the population of Bosnia. It has been at war with itself or with others for close to two decades. Also, foreign forces in another country are, as we all know, an anomaly. And Bosnia of course is an example of how their presence can allow circumstances to grow and develop around them in an anomalous

way. The -- when it comes time to try to withdraw foreign forces from a country, one finds that much of the country's daily life has come to depend on them, and that there's a fear that withdrawal could conceivably create an instability, or at least an uncertainty.

I think it's helpful to remember that those who developed the concept for peacekeepers in Bosnia assured everyone that those forces would complete their mission by the end of that year and be home by Christmas. We are now heading into our seventh year of U.S. and international involvement in Bosnia.

Many aspects of what we are doing in Afghanistan are really quite different from what we faced before. There are a number of ideas being discussed as to how best to help develop conditions for peace and stability in that country. Some are urging that a large number of additional international peacekeepers be brought in to patrol potential trouble spots across the country. One drawback to that proposal is that there really aren't -- the people making the suggestions are not offering troops; nor are they offering money. And the people who have stepped forward to help, like the Turkish government, have indicated that they do not want to see it expanded, and indicated in addition that they would be grateful if the United States and others -- and we certainly will help them -- see if we can't find some funds to help support and sustain the effort that they have indicated that they are willing to lead, as the U.K. steps aside from that leadership role. So a lot of people seem to have ideas, but there are very few volunteers. I don't know quite why that is.

Others are recommending that it would be best to spend the time and money and effort trying to build up an Afghan national army. Still others are recommending that we do both at once -- that somebody do both at once, I should say. There are still others who are suggesting that it would be best if the Afghan people and their leaders decide what approach they believe would be best to bring about security in their country, either the interim government or the follow-on government.

I will say this: there is no question but that very little is possible in a country if there is not reasonable security. And therefore it is regrettable that the donors conference that met came up with some money, but they came up with money for things other than security. And there's not a nickel in the donors conference funds that is available to provide for the development, training, sustainment of an Afghan national army. Nor is there money there for the International Security Assistance Force.

So the United States is addressing the question of raising some of our own money, and then helping to raise some money from other countries, so that whatever is decided can in fact be accomplished. And we have been busy doing that.

Meanwhile, while this is going on, this discussion, I should say that the United States is currently working with the interim Afghan government to train at least the beginning of an Afghan national army and border patrol. And, in addition, the existing International Security Assistance Force is already helping to train some Afghan troops." (Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers, *Defense Department Operational Update Briefing* 28 March 2002)

On funding security in Afghanistan:

"...We're going to have to get our things together and go out and do that because without security in that country, not much else is possible, There's not going to be a stable government. There's not going to be humanitarian assistance. Things aren't going to work. The borders are going to remain open without border patrols. The police work won't be done because there won't be policemen. The national government will not have a national Afghan army and, therefore, not be able to provide any stability from the center—from the capital of that country. We've got to get about the task and do that."

"What's the first thing in the world you need for anything else to happen, for hospitals to happen, for roads to happen, for refugees to come back, for people to be fed and humanitarian workers to move on the country?"

You've got to have security." (Secretary Rumsfeld and General Myers, *Defense Department Operational Update*, 28 March 2002)

"You know, it will not be the United States or even the International Security Assistance Force or coalition forces that will ultimately create an environment in that country that one could characterize as secure; it will be the Afghan people and the Afghan government and the cooperation among those various elements in the country who are going to, in the last analysis, provide for their own security.

"We, needless to say, do not want to leave abruptly in a way that could inject an instability in the situation, which is why we're working with the interim government to see if we can be helpful in getting their army going and up to speed. There are four or five different models. What the interim government will finally settle on or what its successor government will, remains to be seen. But we have always said we think we'll be there a number of months, and certainly our hope is that there will be a sufficient police force, a sufficient border patrol, and a sufficient Afghan national army that while we're facing down the remaining al Qaeda and Taliban, that the government forces will be sufficient to create an environment that permits humanitarian assistance and internally displaced people to come back and go to their homes, or refugees to come in from other countries and come back to their homes, but it is not knowable how long that will take." (Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers, *Defense Department Operational Update Briefing* 25 March 2002)

On warlords undermining a national Afghan army:

"But we do know this: We know that Afghans are well armed. And we know there's a lot of soldiers. And do we know they know how to fight? And one would think that at some point, we may be fortunate enough that they'll decide that it's in their interest to have a national army and military and border and police circumstance, rather than simply various provinces having their own military forces. I mean, what will ultimately happen in that regard, it's hard to know. I think the important thing is that it appears that the—all the representatives in the interim government favor a national army. To the extent that they end up being sufficiently influential in the country, then it's likely there will be a national army, as opposed to all of the multiple armies that we see in different sectors of the country." (Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers, *Defense Department Operational Update Briefing* 25 March 2002)

On expansion of the international peacekeeping force:

"Rumsfeld said that while some US partners have unsuccessfully urged Washington to provide peacekeepers to the British-led International Security Assistance Force – a 5,000-member force that is limited to the capital city Kabul—few of those nations have offered to increase their own role in stabilizing the country.

He noted that Turkey, which is scheduled to take command of the peacekeeping force from the British, has opposed extending the mission of the force to provincial areas of the country where regional conflicts have erupted.

'We've got wonderful cooperation from folks all across the globe...in terms of the coalition forces,' he said in reference to allied support to the military campaign. 'Now what we need is some more cooperation from folks around the world on the security environment in the country, and I'm hopeful that will occur.'" (Bryan Bender, "Fighting Terror/Coalition Questions Funds and Forces; Pentagon Chiefs Say Allies Could Do More," *The Boston Globe*, 29 March 2002)

"'One of the problems with that concept is that there is no one who's volunteering to do it...which suggests to me that that is not going to happen,' he said. (Jonathan S. Landay, "No peacekeepers likely outside Kabul; Rumsfeld: Lack of Money, Troops Suggests No Expansion," *The San Jose Mercury News*, 16 March 2002)

On U.S. support of ISAF once Turkey takes command:

"Well we haven't resolved that. We're in the process now of working with the Turkish government and the Brits and some others to try to help raise money for the International Security Assistance Force. We did have a

negotiated memorandum with the Brits whereby we would provide some logistics as we were able to, some intelligence as we were able to. And in addition, that with respect to the element in Kabul, in the event that there was a dust-up of some kind, that we would—and we had people in the area, that we would provide a quick reaction capability. I would guess that we'll enter into some sort of an arrangement with Turkey also.” (Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers, *Defense Department Operational Update Briefing* 25 March 2002)

On U.S. participation in peacekeeping in Afghanistan in interim before establishment of Afghan national army:

“Q: In the interim, before the national army in Afghanistan takes hold, are you unalterably opposed to having a limited number of American peacekeepers to prevent lawlessness from sweeping through the land and perhaps snatching defeat out of victory?”

Rumsfeld: I'm not unalterably opposed to most things. I like to learn through discussion, and I find my—when I get smarter about things and learn more about them, sometimes my thinking evolves. Furthermore, it's not a matter for me to decide. It's for the president of the United States to decide. Third, I would say that we tend to do war fighting more than peacekeeping, and as a result, we have encouraged other countries who have an interest in peacekeeping to participate in the International Security Assistance Force to the extent they want to, and they have. We have not put, quote, “peacekeepers” into the ISAF, as a country, although we're helping them, obviously, in the ways I just indicated.

If you want to take “peacekeepers” and make it not a capital P, which means a certain thing, but a small p, our very presences in Bagram, in Kabul, in Kandahar, in the eastern provinces, our Special Forces' presence with most of the military factions in that country embedded in their activities, obviously contributes to, if not peace, at least a more stable and secure situation.

Q: Will they stay there till the new national army takes hold?

Rumsfeld: Oh, goodness, I don't know. It—I suppose it depends partly on what's going on in the world, what other things happen. But I would say that we have an interest as a country in seeing that Afghanistan's successful, and that's why we gave something like \$137 million in food aid before September 11th ever happened, to the starving people in Afghanistan. Its why we're continuing to do humanitarian things there, and it's why we're trying to help them root out these terrorists that still exist there. I can't look around four corners, and every time you take a look at Afghanistan, you see four, five, or six corners, so—” (Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers, *Defense Department Operational Update Briefing*, 25 March 2002)

Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Douglas Feith

On the role of the U.S. and the international peacekeepers:

“‘We are not involving ourselves in internecine politics,’ insists Douglas Feith, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, ‘including politics backed by guns.’... Feith maintains that ‘there's no great inclination’ to expand ISAF's mandate, and in comments to airmen at Nevada's Nellis Air Force base last week, Rumsfeld reiterated his preference for building and Afghan army (‘which is where my brain is’) over increasing the size of ISAF.” (Michael Elliott, “The Battle over Peacekeeping; As the fighting in Afghanistan drags on, American troops risk being dragged into a messy civil war,” *Time*, 4 March 2002)

Chair Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers

On whether U.S. troops would intervene to quell conflicts in Afghanistan:

“Air Force Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in an interview this week that U.S. Army Special Forces soldiers had already taken action in more than 10 incidents to ‘keep peace within the family.’ It remains unclear whether U.S. troops would be inserted into any major inter-Afghan battles that risked sizable American casualties. Yet U.S. officials concede that mediating conflicts between rival warlords or groups is now one of the many roles the troops have taken on to help ensure security as Afghanistan seeks to end decades of war.” (Paul Richter, “U.S. Troops Sliding Into Mission to Keep Peace,” *The Los Angeles Times*, 28 March 2002)

“In regards to training an Afghan national army, from the start, one of our missions has been to ensure Afghanistan is not a safe haven for terrorists, especially organizations like the al Qaeda. This assistance that we’re going to provide will train the Afghan national army, is directly part of that mission.” (Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers, Defense Department Operational Update Briefing, 25 March 2002)

“Training the Afghan army will serve as a positive step to help ensure that there is a better chance for peace and security in Afghanistan and that the country is not used as a terrorist haven in the future,’ Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said yesterday.” (Tom Bowman, “U.S. sets to train Afghan army; Green Berets to lead instruction of initial force of 2,400 troops; A goal of peace and security; Recruit training to start this spring; allies to share costs,” *The Baltimore Sun*, 26 March 2002)

General Tommy R. Franks

“We should expect to be doing this for a long, long time in the future,’ Gen. Tommy Franks, commander in chief of the U.S. Central Command, said of the global war on terrorism on NBC’s *Meet the Press*. He added: ‘We should expect that operations in Afghanistan are not going to be over anytime soon. We should expect that those operations are going to continue to involve serious risks to our young people who are serving on the ground over there.’ Gen. Franks said military efforts in Afghanistan will not be completed until the ‘al Qaeda network inside Afghanistan is destroyed.’ Elements now complicating those efforts, he said, include the return of warlords to their power bases and ‘external influences,’ meaning countries he did not identify that have interests in Afghanistan.” (Joyce Howard Price, “Bombers sent to Afghan air base,” *The Washington Times*, 25 March 2002)

“The commander of U.S. forces in Afghanistan yesterday endorsed creation of an Afghan national army to deal with the country’s ‘murky and troublesome’ security situation and said U.S. commanders oppose expansion of the international peacekeeping force. ‘We’re sure that the right thing to do is to have an Afghan national army,’ said Gen. Tommy R. Franks, who heads the Central Command. ‘I don’t think any of us are prepared to say that [the peacekeeping force] should be expanded right now.’

Franks’s remarks came one day after Zalmay Khalilzad, Washington’s special envoy to Afghanistan, told reporters in Kabul that the United States is planning to step up its security role, possibly by seeking expansion of the 4,500-member multinational peacekeeping force, which is currently led by Britain. Briefing reporters from Central Command headquarters in Tampa, Franks’s preference for assisting in the development of Afghan forces over expanding the role of peacekeepers echoed the position of Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld and other senior Pentagon officials.

In that stance, they have differed with State Department officials, who have indicated that they believe it will probably be necessary to expand the peacekeeping force and broaden its area of operations from Kabul, the Afghan capital, to other parts of the country while an Afghan military force is trained. Franks made it clear that he and his subordinates commanding about 4,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan ‘want to do something that will gain us this stability out in the outlying regions.’

But their primary focus is on helping the Afghans develop a force of their own, Franks said, noting that Army Maj. Gen. Charles C. Campbell, the U.S. Central Command’s chief of staff, had just returned from a mission to Kabul to assess the needs of an Afghan force. ‘What we want to do is get ourselves set up with an Afghan

national army that is able to serve the country of Afghanistan through time with border security . . . police functions and the like,' Franks said. He added that such a force should probably include troops from multiple ethnic groups and tribes that now control various regions of the country.

But much remains to be decided. 'The precision of exactly how that will be accomplished is what I think we're all thinking about,' Franks said. 'What we will do is we'll take the results of this work done by General Campbell and his team, and then we'll carry recommendations to the secretary of defense, who will then carry recommendations to our president.'" (Vernon Loeb, "Franks Supports an Afghan Army," *The Washington Post*, 26 February 2002)

"What we are prepared to say is that we want to do something that will increase security,' beyond Kabul, Franks said. He called the security situation 'murky and troublesome.'" (Sally Buzbee, "Peacekeepers in fact, if not in name? US troops are doing new jobs with Afghan-US Military," *AP Worldstream*, 25 February 2002.)

Maj. Gen. Charles C. Campbell, chief of staff for US Central Command

Post fact-finding mission to Afghanistan, regarding winning over warlords to national army:

"My sense from a number of conversations is that the notion of a national army is one that resonates with all of the parties including the regional leaders of armed factions," he said. "At least right now, there is a window of opportunity where you have warlords—for lack of a better term—prepared to make available soldiers to participate in establishing a national army." (Thom Shanker, "A nation challenged: The Military; U.S. to Send Special Forces to Train Army for Kabul," *The New York Times*, 26 March 2002.)

STATE DEPARTMENT STATEMENTS

Secretary Powell

"President Bush has made it clear that the United States will not abandon the people of Afghanistan,' Secretary Powell said, adding that it was up to the world to help Afghans 'make a future worthy of their highest hopes.' He added: 'Let us build on the richness of Afghanistan's past. Let us build a new history that will protect and ennoble us all.'"²¹ (Todd Purdum and Howard French, "U.S. Makes Pledge for \$300 million in Aid for Afghans," *The New York Times*, 21 January 2002)

On ISAF:

"Many of our key allies and partners are contributing to the International Security Assistance Force in Kabul to help ensure a secure environment for Mr. Karzai to build a new Afghanistan. We are reviewing whether or not more forces might be needed for this force and we will continue to look closely at the security needs as we move forward. We want to do everything possible to prevent the rise of any alternative power to the Interim Authority, until a permanent government can be established and begin to take care of that challenge on its own." (Secretary Powell, Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 5 February 2002)

"Under British leadership, the International Security Assistance Force is off to a good start. But much more needs to be done. We need a national army created in Afghanistan. We need a national police force. And we are hard at work with Chairman Karzai and his associates to make this happen. And we have to make sure that a Loya Jirga takes place soon, and that we transition this interim authority into a permanent authority, and then the Afghan people have a chance to participate in full and free elections within two years time." (Secretary Powell, Testimony before the House International Relations Committee, 6 February 2002)

U.S. Deputy Ambassador James Cunningham

"U.S. Deputy Ambassador James Cunningham told the council the United States would support extending the mandate of the force for another six months through December when it comes up for renewal, but opposes

any geographical expansion of the International Security Assistance Force, or ISAF. 'Given the present security situation and the range and variety of assistance already available or under way, we do not see a need to expand ISAF's activities beyond Kabul and its immediate environs,' Cunningham said." ("U.S., France oppose extending international security force beyond Kabul," *The Guelph Mercury (Canada)*, 27 March 2002)

Director of Policy Planning, Richard Haass

"Richard Haas, the department's head of policy planning, has said that a peacekeeping force throughout the whole of Afghanistan would have to be about 25,000 strong, compared with the 4,700 in the country now." (Michael Elliott, "The Battle over Peacekeeping: As the fighting in Afghanistan drags on, American troops risk being dragged into a messy civil war," *Time*, 4 March 2002)

U.S. Special Envoy to Afghanistan, Zalmay Khalilzad

"'Afghanistan and the interim authority here face a number of obstacles, a number of challenges,' Khalilzad told reporters after meeting with interim Prime Minister Hamid Karzai. 'We need to come up with an answer relatively soon. ... It's a complicated situation. We want Afghanistan not to return to warlordism.' Khalilzad, who offered few specifics about the US involvement, said the goal is a self-reliant Afghanistan that maintains its own security." (Nancy San Martin, "U.S. may expand peacekeeping role to stave off Afghan civil war," *Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service*, 25 February 2002)

"'I believe the warlords do not want to go back to war—but if the Afghans want to go back to war, there is not an international force big enough to stop them,' Khalilzad said. 'Our concern is that because of the lack of trust and security, warlords might do things that lead to war, so we're looking at various options to limit the prospect of war among various armies.'"

However, Khalilzad said, the Bush administration wants to make sure that the major thrust is to encourage the creation of a national army. 'We do not want Afghanistan to be a kind of security welfare state,' he said." (Esther Schrader, "Avowals Aside U.S.' Afghan Role Has Become that of Peacekeeper," *The Los Angeles Times*, 25 February 2002)

State Department Spokesman Richard Boucher

On whether U.S. troops would intervene to quell conflicts in Afghanistan:

"'We'll continue to use our Special Forces and civil affairs teams with local commanders on the ground to try to deal with contentious issues and to discharge conflict among them,' State Department spokesman Richard Boucher said Wednesday." (Paul Richter, "U.S. Troops Sliding Into Mission to Keep Peace," *The Los Angeles Times*, 28 March 2002)

CONGRESS

Senator Joseph Biden

"'Security is the basic issue in Afghanistan,' Biden, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in a Washington speech. "Whatever it takes, we should do it. History will judge us harshly if we allow the hope of a liberated Afghanistan to evaporate because we failed to stay the course.'" (Peter Selvin, "Biden Says U.S. Role Needed In Afghan Peacekeeping Force," *The Washington Post*, 5 February 2002)

"Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.) said U.S. troops should be part of the force, and it should have a broad mandate that includes the right to shoot to kill anyone who threatens order and stability. 'I'm not talking about peacekeepers; I'm talking about [troops who] can come in here and shoot to kill,' said Biden, who is visiting Kabul as part of a trip to Central Asia. 'Absent from that, I don't see any shot for this country. They have no

army. They have no police force. They have no way to keep control.” (Margaret Coker, “Global Military Force Needed to Keep Afghan Peace,” *The Atlanta Journal & Constitution*, 13 January 2002)

Senator Robert Torricelli

“Without some nation-building, the cycle of poverty to terrorism will be repeated. I suspect President Bush now regrets those comments from the last campaign (that the US should not be in the business of nation building). You can’t just separate out some nation building from our war on terrorism. They are part of the same campaign.” (“U.S. Senators Warn Taliban Could Return to Afghanistan,” *The New York Times*, 1 April 2002)

“I was very reluctant before visiting Afghanistan, and now I feel there’s no choice but to expand,’ Sen. Robert G. Torricelli told The Associated Press. Torricelli, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also said he expects U.S. military forces to remain in this country for several years because it will take a long time to build a national Afghan army.” (“Visit Changes Senator’s Mind,” *Associated Press*, 1 April 2002)

Representative Frank Wolf

“Security also remains a major concern. I was told there are no ‘low risk’ areas and crime, including robbery and murder, is on the rise in Kabul since the fall of the Taliban. Chairman Karzai repeatedly stressed that he was committed to improving security. Kabul is operating under a curfew. Security also is critical to the successful delivery of humanitarian assistance. The Afghan government will need help building an army loyal to the central government and a police corps to help maintain order. An effective stabilization force will most likely need to be deployed for a period of time to ensure security across Afghanistan.” (“We Can’t Abandon Scarred, Fragile Afghanistan Again,” *The Washington Post*, 14 February 2002)

Representative Joseph Pitts

“Security is the primary need, mentioned in every meeting and site visit we had. Unless there is security, no amount of effort will ensure that the new government leaders can implement the very necessary changes in the country.” (“Afghanistan Trip Report,” U.S. House of Representatives, *Congressional Record*, 6 February 2002)

INTERNATIONAL VIEWS

UNITED NATIONS

Secretary General Kofi Annan

“Speaking immediately before Brahimi, Annan stressed that ‘without security, reconstruction will not be possible and donors will not be able to disburse the money they have pledged.’” (“Top U.N. Official Backs Demand for Larger International Force in Afghanistan,” *Agence France Presse*, 6 February 2002)

“Annan said that security was the ‘number one preoccupation’ of everyone he met during his visit last month to Kabul.” (“Brahimi: Expand, Extend Afghan Force,” *United Press International*, 6 February 2002)

U.N. Envoy Lakhdar Brahimi

“There were ‘increasingly vocal demands’ from ordinary Afghans, members of the interim government, and even from warlords, for the International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF) to expand from the capital, Kabul, to the rest of the country, Brahimi said.” (“Top U.N. Official Backs Demand for Larger International Force in Afghanistan,” *Agence France Presse*, 6 February 2002)

“What we have been saying all along is that in the case of Afghanistan this (security forces) is an essential part, indeed to first indispensable part of any reconstruction programme.” (“U.N. Envoy Appeals for Funds for Afghan Security Forces,” *Agence France Presse*, 2 April 2002)

Deputy to U.N. Special Envoy Brahimi, Francesc Vendrell

“The call was made by Deputy UN Representative for Afghanistan Francesc Vendrell at a press briefing at the Inter-continental Hotel in Kabul. ‘The main thing is that there is a feeling of uncertainty in many parts of Afghanistan. The situation is fragile,’ Vendrell told reporters when speaking about the situation in the country. Vendrell indicated that at least 30,000 troops, much more than the current number of ISAF, are needed to keep security in Afghanistan. . . Warning that a civil war may break out again if the international community fails to help the country, he argued that there are about 40,000 troops in Kosovo to keep peace and the figure of 30,000 soldiers for the whole of Afghanistan ‘was not such a big figure.’ ‘We need to establish a civil society in Afghanistan, we need to establish a society based on the rule of law... otherwise the country will revert to the situation in the early 1990s,’ he said.” (“More Security Troops Needed for Afghanistan: U.N. Official,” *Xinhua News*, 25 January 2002)

U.N. Human Rights Commissioner, Mary Robinson

“It’s absolutely vital and I kept emphasizing that the core human rights problem at the moment in Afghanistan is human security. There must be a taking of the guns out of circulation,’ Robinson told reporters here.” (“U.N. Rights Commissioner Urges More Foreign Troops in Afghanistan,” *Agence France Presse*, 12 March 2002)

UN Human Rights Representative for Afghanistan, Kamal Hossain

On addressing the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights after presenting his Afghanistan Report:

“‘The first priority is security,’ Kamal Hossain said. ‘Never will so much have been at stake on a modest request for 10,000 to 20,000 people. . . .It would be a failure to respond to a very legitimate need.’ Afghan authorities are trying to build a new national army and police force with the help of the international community. But meanwhile, Afghans are living in a ‘vacuum’ as authorities are finding it difficult to keep the peace between rival warlords and control crime, Hossain said.” (“U.N. Afghan Forces to Be Extended,” *AP Online*, 28 March 2002)

AFGHAN INTERIM ADMINISTRATION

Chairman Hamid Karzai

“‘In asking for more international peacekeepers, we are repeating the demands of the Afghan people,’ Karzai said Wednesday in Berlin, where he met with German Chancellor Gerhard Schroder.” (Jonathan S. Landay, “No peacekeepers likely outside Kabul; Rumsfeld: Lack of Money, Troops Suggests No Expansion,” *The San Jose Mercury News*, 16 March 2002)

ALLIED COUNTRIES

Pakistan

On the “Situation in Afghanistan”

“Security remains the most pressing issue at this point in time. It is the very prerequisite for the implementation of the Bonn Agreement, and imperative for a stable political and economic future of Afghanistan. The present lack of security has been a major hindrance to stability in the past and continues to threaten peace today. The Afghan people have suffered far too long at the hands of ambitious warlords. The international community must, therefore, ensure that the old rivalries and hatreds, which once wreaked havoc across Afghanistan, are not given a chance to obstruct the establishment of a stable political dispensation in Afghanistan.

Without security there can be no peace in Afghanistan, no unity, no stability, no humanitarian relief, no reconstruction or recovery. The Bonn Agreement stipulated the establishment of a “United Nations mandated force” for the maintenance of security for Kabul as well as other areas of the country. While we support the deployment of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Kabul, we feel that its size and scope must

now be expanded and extended to all over the country, especially its major urban centers. ISAF, in the absence, of a proper Afghan security force, is the only option we have at the moment and restricting it only to Kabul will in effect defeat the very purpose for which it was established.” (Statement by Ambassador Shamshad Ahmad, Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations, 26 March 2002)

On whether U.S. troops would intervene to quell conflicts in Afghanistan:

“Officials of allied countries and private Western groups in Afghanistan say they believe that, like it or not, the U.S. troops have become the security force of last resort. ‘In effect, they will be the peacekeepers,’ said a senior Western diplomat who spoke on condition of anonymity. “Why not admit it?” (Paul Richter, “U.S. Troops Sliding Into Mission to Keep Peace,” *The Los Angeles Times*, 28 March 2002)

EU Special Commissioner for Afghanistan, Klaus-Peter Klaiber

“In his opinion, the mission of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) must ‘be extended geographically.’ It is not enough to restrict it to Kabul only. Security forces would have to move into other cities as well. The numerous warlords could not be kept in check without a greater presence of the just under 5,000 soldiers who are now there. And unless the ISAF remains, ‘the development of the country will not succeed.’” (“EU Afghan commissioner calls for expansion of ISAF mandate, criticizes Karzai” *BBC Worldwide Monitoring* 10 March 2002)

German Chancellor, Gerhard Schroeder

“German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder said Thursday that Germany opposed expanding international peacekeeping in Afghanistan beyond Kabul, but would consider prolonging the mandate of the security force there. Speaking at a joint press conference after meeting in Berlin with Afghan interim leader Hamid Karzai, Schroeder said it was ‘clear that we are skeptical about extending the territory of the mandate’ for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Schroeder said Germany had ‘limitations’ due to its military forces being spread thin by peacekeeping in other crisis spots.” (“Schroeder against expanding peacekeeping force beyond Kabul,” *Agence France Presse*, 14 March 2002)

-
- ¹ Lawrence McQuillan, "US vows training, aid for Afghans," *USA Today*, 29 January 2002
- ² Joyce Howard Price, "Bombers sent to Afghan air base," *Washington Times*, 25 March 2002
- ³ Secretary Rumsfeld and General Myers, Defense Department News Briefing, 25 March 2002
- ⁴ Secretary Rumsfeld and General Myers, Defense Department Operational Update Briefing, 28 March 2002
- ⁵ Ibid
- ⁶ Jim Mannion "US military may stay in Afghanistan until national army takes over: Rumsfeld," *Agence France Presse*, 8 April 2002
- ⁷ Secretary Rumsfeld and General Myers, Defense Department News Briefing, 8 April 2002.
- ⁸ Sally Buzbee, "Peacekeepers, in fact, if not in name? US troops are doing new jobs with Afghan-US military," *AP Worldstream*, 25 February 2002
- ⁹ "Security Council stresses need to improve security in Afghanistan," *UN News Centre*, 5 April 2002
- ¹⁰ "Welcoming Karzai, Security Council vows support for Afghanistan's recovery," *UN News Centre*, 30 January, 2002
- ¹¹ "Top U.N. official backs demand for larger international force in Afghanistan," *Agence France Presse*, 6 February 2002
- ¹² "Security Council stresses need to improve security in Afghanistan," *UN News Centre*, 5 April 2002
- ¹³ "More Afghan peacekeepers needed: U.N." *Business Recorder*, 3 April 2002
- ¹⁴ "U.N. Rights Commissioner urges more foreign troops in Afghanistan," *Agence France Presse*, 12 March 2002
- ¹⁵ "ISAF should deploy throughout Afghanistan: Musharraf," *Agence France Presse*, 8 April 2002
- ¹⁶ Jonathan Landay, "No peacekeepers likely outside Kabul; Rumsfeld: Lack of money, troops suggests no expansion," *San Jose Mercury News*, 16 March 2002
- ¹⁷ Statement by the Secretary of State for Defense, Geoff Hoon, to the House of Commons, Westminster, 18 March 2002.
- ¹⁸ "Security Council expresses overwhelming support for proposed UN assistance mission in Afghanistan: Proposals to extend mandate, theatre of operations of international security force met with more cautious approval – Part 2 of 3," *M2 Presswire*, 27 March 2002
- ¹⁹ Ray Suarez Interview with Sir Jeremy Greenstock, "Prospects for Peacekeeping," *The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, 9 January 2002
- ²⁰ Kim Housego, "French president opposes deploying peacekeepers outside of Kabul," *AP Worldstream*, 28 February 2002
- ²¹ Todd Purdum and Howard French "U.S. Makes Pledge for \$300 Million in Aid to Afghans," *The New York Times*, 21 January 2002