

creation of the Taliban regime.) **Therefore, any action in Afghanistan must be considered against the backdrop of at least three possible regional implications/dangers:**

1. escalation of the nuclear threat (especially if the situation in Pakistan destabilises due to the Western-led action in Afghanistan),
2. further consolidation of Islamic fundamentalism, and
3. consistent/systematised recourse to terrorism (reasons for these dangerous developments may include: a backlash to the military campaign against the Taliban regime; the spread of Madrasas as alternative centres of learning in the absence of secular schools; a continuation of policies pursued by the current or a future government of Pakistan to train terrorists to fight in Kashmir).

The efforts aimed at stabilising the regime in Pakistan were broadly encouraged by the participants.

3. Failed States and Governance: Lessons Learned

The potential and limitations of an international role in Afghanistan depend first and foremost on Coalition foreign policy: How far are the Coalition partners prepared to go? Do they seek to overthrow the Taliban regime? Do they intend to install the Northern Alliance or the King, or some other combination of forces? What alternative government is possible and what do the Afghan people want? What role will the UN play in the reconstruction efforts, if any? How will Afghanistan and other countries in the region and elsewhere respond? Thinking about these questions is important, since the answers affect the role for outsider actors.

There are basically **two types of UN operations:**

1. Implementation of a peace agreement after a war: in this case parties agree on power-sharing arrangements (i.e., Bosnia, Haiti). This type of operation has always been based on two key concepts: consent (the peace agreement would invite UN troops to play a role) and impartiality (the UN is not supposed to choose sides, merely point out violations). For such an operation to be possible in Afghanistan, the various factions would have to come to an agreement. Even then, the UN could be drawn into a prolonged political struggle. The UN could potentially monitor elections. However, experiences from Angola, Cambodia, and Guatemala show that in failed states, elections do not necessarily lead to peace nor democracy.
2. International governance without an agreement: in this situation, the international community decides to support the winning side (i.e., Kosovo, East Timor).

Beyond these two types, operations can be also characterised on the basis of the depth of involvement (from assisting governance, to delegating functions, to direct administration) and the range of tasks/functions (including administrative, mediating, or guarantor functions).