

Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan. This oil and gas should be used for local needs, while other gas, from Qatar, Iran, and other countries, should be processed into liquefied natural gas (LNG). The new infrastructure for natural gas by the year 2020, he said, would include pipelines from West Asia through Pakistan to South Asia; from the CAR through Pakistan to South Asia; from the CAR to China and Korea; from the Russian Far East to China and Japan. LNG transportation should go from West Asia to Asia; from Australia to Japan; from Australia to Pakistan and India; from West Asia to Korea and China. The pipelines from West Asia to South Asia, from Qatar to Pakistan, and from Iran to Pakistan are all at an advanced stage of feasibility. The Central Asia-Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan pipeline—the one Taliban is supposed to be making possible—has been conceptually identified, and feasibility studies have begun. “It will be required to function within the next five years,” Ahmad said.

There is no doubt that Ahmad made his proposals in good faith. Indeed, one very striking aspect of his remarks was his emphasis on the desirability of cooperation with India on a pipeline proposed by Iran. “Pakistan should have no difficulty letting pipelines go overland to India,” he said, “and India should have no concern either. There are sufficient multilateral, international guarantees, and if the flow were interrupted, both countries would suffer.” What Ahmad failed to see, is that “pipeline economics” is nothing more than raw material extraction. Building pipelines per se does not develop an economy.

The Pakistani ambassador to Turkmenistan, Tariq Osman

Hyder, spoke briefly on the pipeline as well. He said that two pipelines would be required by the end of the century, to supply Pakistan’s energy needs. “The pipeline from Turkmenistan across Afghanistan is the shortest. A quadrilateral MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] was signed in Ashgabat on May 15, 1996, between Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Pakistan,” he said. The same day, “a trilateral MOU for a parallel oil pipeline was signed between Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Commercial oil companies are ready to start the project on the ground.” Hyder proposed expanding an existing pipeline from Siberia via Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan to Turkmenistan, to utilize surplus oil reserves in these areas, to export through a port in Pakistan. He added, “I also believe that the initiation of such projects in Afghanistan will have a significant knock-on effect for peace in Afghanistan and will greatly benefit the people of Afghanistan in their quest for rehabilitating their infrastructure and economy.”

The two projects, he said, carried a price tag of \$5.5 billion together. The ambassador also said he thought that a five-dimensional corridor from CAR through Afghanistan and Pakistan should be developed—for road and rail traffic, electricity transmission, and gas and oil pipelines. “These projects will permit the beginning of the process of reconstruction of Afghanistan,” he said. He further reported that he had travelled to Afghanistan last summer with the Pakistani foreign minister, and had met with all the Afghan rival factions. “They all said, they would work together for the good of these pipeline projects. No one opposed the pipeline.” He concluded, “In the quest for peace in Afghanistan, we have to give more emphasis to the economic aspect than we have done until now,” and he suggested that an “economically strategic partnership” be constructed among the CAR, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, and Afghanistan.

In answer to a question from a German expert on Central Asia, whether such pipelines could be made safe in the midst of a war, he answered, “Even in Colombia and Algeria, where there is conflict, there are pipelines functioning.” He said, the Afghan situation was better now than under the Russian occupation, as those fighting are “only rivals.”

It is important to note that the Rand Corp.’s Dr. Khalilzad had also defined Afghanistan-Pakistan as an “alternative route” and mentioned the pipeline project of Unocal and (Saudi) Delta, companies that “need an authoritative government in Afghanistan with whom they can deal.” He lamented that “there is no overall strategy yet in Washington for Central Asia,” and thought the United States should be more active in seeking a solution to the Afghan “proxy war in the making.”

The proposition presented by the two Pakistani speakers, that an agreement among rival warlords, currently at war, can be reached for the pipeline, perhaps whereby each faction receives a cut of the take, so to speak, is not very likely, to say the least. And it became clear in the debate, that there is no consensus in the country’s elite, for continuing this support.

## Pakistani press notes Schiller Institute role

The Pakistani newspaper *The News* reported the following, in its coverage of the Islamabad conference on Central Asia: “Muriel Mirak Weissback [sic], who represented the Schiller Institute USA chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., as he wasn’t able to come to Pakistan for the workshop, in an interesting paper disclosed that a certain British organization was working since long to foment troubles and wars in the Eurasia land bridge with a view to break up nation-states to achieve long-term political and economic goals. She said the eventual objective of these British experts was to achieve Lebanonization of Central Asia. She told questioners that the Schiller Institute was founded in Germany in 1984 and now had branches all over Europe and Latin America and was being run by donations. She denied that their institute was extreme right wing.”