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The purpose of this thesis is to examine the factors affecting the repatriation of Afghan refugees living in Pakistan, by using data collected in these refugee camps, during the Fall of 1988.

Refugees are generally defined as those people fleeing their country out of fear of persecution or physical injury from forces within their country. The flight into or out of a country, by refugees, can be seen as a special type of migration or population flow.
The initial model of population flows was developed by Ravenstein (1885). Migrations and decisions to migrate were measured along a simple linear continuum of pluses and minuses. If more pluses than minuses were present, movement (migration) occurred. This model was applied only to migration and never applied directly to refugee flight or refugee repatriation.

Ravenstein's model of migration has since been elaborated into a model of "pushes" and "pulls" (Lee 1966). Donald Bogue's work, Principles of Demography, (1969), identifies such "push" factors as decline in national resources, loss of employment, oppressive treatment of political, ethnic, and religious minorities. Catastrophes such as fire, flood and drought are also considered "push" factors.

A more complete model, and the first one applicable to refugees' flows, is the Process Model of Egon F. Kunz (1981). Kunz identifies two types of factors; a home related dimension and a host related dimension. Kunz, however, only discusses the flow from the home country to the host country and does not apply his model to repatriation.

Data for this thesis was collected through one hundred interviews, conducted in Pakistan, during the Fall of 1988. These interviews provided information regarding the background of the refugees, their previous condition in
Afghanistan and their new lives in Pakistan.

When the refugees were asked why they originally left Afghanistan, 28 percent answered simply, "Because of the Russians." Twenty-one percent replied, "Because of communism and its opposition to Islam." Twenty percent said, "Because of invasion and the war" and 24 percent answered, "Because of the fighting and the attacks." Only four percent of the refugees claimed to have left because they had either been put in jail or were threatened with being jailed.

In trying to determine certain factors that could either block or encourage repatriation, the refugees were asked a series of questions about whether they thought they would return under certain situations. The first of these questions was, "Will you return before the Russians leave Afghanistan?" An overwhelmingly 99 percent said they would not. When asked if the refugees would return if the parties or Mujahideen were fighting for power among themselves, 60 percent answered, "No" and 20 percent answered, "Yes, they would go back to try and stop the fighting." Eighteen percent insisted, "The Mujahideen and the parties would not fight among themselves as long as there was an Islamic government."

Many Afghans have been seriously injured by anti-personnel mines planted in Afghanistan. When asked if they would return before the mines were removed, 65 percent said
they would not, while 32 percent said they would go back, that it was their duty to help remove the mines.

The factors that were found to affect willingness to return under these various conditions included; number and age of dependents, time in refuge, geographic distance travelled, economic opportunities in Pakistan, minority group membership, and fear for future personal safety.

The best general description that can be made about the Afghan flight and possible repatriation, and all refugee flights, is that it is a process or cycle encompassing two countries and the interplay of factors or "pushes" and "pulls" between them.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the factors affecting the repatriation of the Afghan refugees that were living in Pakistan in 1988 by using data collected in the Afghan refugee camps in Pakistan in the fall of 1988. The analysis should be understood in the context of the conditions existing at the time the data were collected. The most important conditions included the presence of the Soviets in Afghanistan, the belief that a Soviet withdrawal would result in an immediate collapse of the Communist regime in Kabul, and the possible return of King Zahir Shah. This thesis will examine major factors that help explain why some refugees say they will return while others say they will not.

DEFINITION OF REFUGEE

Refugees are usually defined as those people fleeing their country out of fear of persecution or physical injury from forces within the country. The 1951 convention on protocol of the United Nations, adopted by the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, classifies a refugee as follows:
Any person who owing to a well founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence, is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (United Nations 1951).

MODELS OF POPULATION FLOWS

The flight into or out of a country by refugees can be seen as a special type of migration or population flow. The initial model of population flows was developed by Ravenstein (1885). Migrations and decisions to migrate were measured along a simple linear continuum of pluses and minuses. If more pluses then minuses are present, movement (migration) occurs. This model was applied only to migration and never directly to refugee flight or repatriation.

This first work of Ravenstein was based on the British census for 1881. In 1889, Ravenstein wrote a second paper, based on data from more than twenty countries. The laws put forth by Ravenstein may be summarized thusly: 1. Migration is usually only a short distance, i.e., the further the distance the less the number of migrants; 2. Migration is usually in stages, i.e., those close to a large city will migrate to it when economic opportunity warrants, and those in more rural areas will fill their places; 3.
There are streams and counter streams in migrations; 4. There are urban and rural differences in propensity to migrate, i.e., rural populations are more likely to migrate than are urban populations; 5. Short distance migrants are predominantly female, i.e., in short distance migrations females tend to outnumber men; 6. The development of technology tends to promote greater rates of migration; 7. Economic factors tend to dominate motives for migration, i.e., many factors can cause migration, but the most important is the desire for people to improve the economic situation (Ravenstein 1885, 1889). Initially Ravenstein was criticized for presenting work that would in fact seem to support the idea that migration was lawless, or that Ravenstein had formulated his laws in such a way that they could not be criticized (Lee 1966, pp. 47-48). Despite the original criticisms of Ravenstein’s laws and the subsequent criticisms that have followed in the last one hundred years, Ravenstein’s work remains the basic foundation of all work that was to follow.

The model of Ravenstein has since been modified into a model of migration based on not a "plus/minus" scheme but a "push/pull" process. This "push/pull" process was elaborated by Everett S. Lee (1966). Lee used the push-pull process in his work on the concept of intervening obstacles and their effect on migrations. Lee’s formulation showed migration to be a result of "pushes" and "pulls" or
"attractions" and "repulsions" at both the origin as well as the destination; these pushes and pulls included such factors as climate, good schools and taxes. Lee also identified the effect of intervening obstacles, such factors as geographic distance or physical obstacles. Lee went on to note that it was difficult to identify exact factors for any given person (Lee 1966).

Donald Bogue's work, Principles of Demography, (1969), identifies such "push" factors as decline in national resources, loss of employment, oppressive treatment of political, ethnic, and religious minorities, and catastrophes such as fire, flood and drought. He also expanded the list of "pull" factors to include superior opportunities for employment, preferable environment and living conditions, and dependency of persons to whom one is related.

A more complete model, and the first one applicable to refugees' flows, is the process model of Egon F. Kunz (1981). Kunz's model recognizes the importance of numerous dimensions in factors affecting refugee flows. Kunz identifies two types of factors, a home related dimension, and a host related dimension. Kunz, however, only discusses the flow from the home country to the host country and does not apply his model to repatriation.

In one of the most complete works on factors affecting refugee repatriation, Joshua Akol (1987) described a number
of specific social factors as influencing the rate of return among the Sudanese population. These included the economic situation in the home country as well as the political situation and how they affected the refugees' desire to return.

Other research has identified other aspects affecting repatriation. Jeff Crisp identified the importance of time as an intervening variable in his study of African refugees (July 1987). Sidni Lamb identified the importance of economic considerations in the return of Ethiopian refugees (1986). Richard Lawless and Liela Monihan, in their work on Moroccan refugees, showed the importance of human rights considerations and their effect on return (1987). Stephan Keller and his work on the partition of India shows how ethnic and religious conflicts can precipitate a massive migration (1975).

**THE PROCESS MODEL OF KUNZ**

The Process Model of Egon F. Kunz (1981) is useful in that Kunz breaks down factors into both a home related dimension and a host related dimension. The factors that Kunz identifies in the home related category are as follows: the identification of the refugee with other groups in the country; the attitude of the refugee in flight; and the ideological national orientation abroad of the refugee.

The identification of the refugee with other groups in
the country can be broken down into three categories. The first is "The Majority-Identified, those refugees who are firm in their conviction that their opposition to the events is shared by the majority of their compatriots." Secondly, Kunz identifies "The Events-Alienated, those who either because of events immediately preceding the refugee situation, or because of past discrimination are ambivalent or embittered towards their compatriots." Thirdly, "The Self-Alienated, those who, for varied individual reasons or philosophies have no wish to identify with the rest of the nation" (Kunz 1981, pp. 42-43).

When Kunz considers the attitude of the refugee towards flight he identifies two different attitudes. The first is the "Reactive Fate Group;" these are the refugees of wars, sudden revolutionary changes and expulsions. Secondly, are the "Purpose Groups;" the Purpose Groups are identified as usually being makers of their own situation in that they may espouse "a certain facet of belief or ideology or a form of society that is in opposition or inconsistent with the majority society" (Kunz 1981, pp. 44-45).

Next, Kunz identifies the orientation of the refugee in exile which he terms "Ideological National Orientation in Exile." The orientation includes six basic types: "Restoration Activists," those who want to restore their nation to the previous situation; "Passive Hurt," those who retire resigned to the situation; "Integration Realists,"
those realizing the reality of the situation and seek integration; "Eager Assimilationists," those who to escape guilt hyperactively seek assimilation; "Revolutionary Activists," those who turn their energies to preparing a revolution which would change the government and lifestyle in their homeland; and "Founders of Utopias," those who turn their backs on the host society and form ideologically-inspired idealist colonies (Kunz 1981, pp. 45-46).

Finally, Kunz identifies factors in the host country which impact resettlement in the host country. One host factor is cultural compatibility, including such areas as language, values, tradition, religion, politics, food and interpersonal relations. Another host factor is government policies toward immigrant populations. The two types of policies Kunz identifies are: "Augmentative," in which "the host societies are likely to look at the refugee as a sought after and valued immigrant who is expected to contribute to the nation's numerical growth and its economic capacity," (Kunz 1981, pg.48) and secondly "Self-sufficient," identified as demographically self-sufficient countries which are less likely to accept large numbers of refugees. Because they are not particularly anxious to retain and assimilate new arrivals they are less likely to press the refugee to abandon a home orientated outlook and activities (Kunz 1981, pg. 48).

Finally Kunz considers attitudes of the host society towards refugees. He identifies three attitudes: "Monastic-

FACTORS AFFECTING REFUGEE FLOWS

While Kunz's scheme is ambitious and very descriptive, it does not address the issue of repatriation in a satisfactory way. For example, it considers factors to be different between the home country and host country. Based on the previous models of migration and the factors identified by refugee writers, similar factors can be identified in both the host and home country (Bogue 1969). By considering factors in the home and host country as falling into generally similar spheres it is easier to predict flight, resettlement, and possible repatriation.

When looking at refugee flows and the factors affecting them, one finds a patterning among types of factors. The types of factors are (1) political issues (Akol 1987, Bogue 1969); (2) geographic obstacles (Lee 1966); (3) human-rights and safety concerns (Bogue 1969, Lawless and Monihan 1987); (4) social, culture, ethnic, or religious issues (Bogue 1969, Keller 1975); and (5) economic concerns or opportunities (Akol 1987, Bogue 1969, Lamb 1986). These factors must be considered in both the host country of refuge and the home country (Bogue 1969, Kunz 1981). Both must be considered when looking at refugee flows and possible refugee repatriation.
Factors in the political sphere which may provoke flight include war, invasion, civil war, and changes in government. These would all be factors causing flight (Akol 1987, Bogue 1969). Refugees fleeing these conditions would be a part of a reactive fate group (Kunz 1981). These same factors, if causing a flight, must be addressed for a return to occur.

Geographic obstacles such as rivers, mountains, oceans, and distances are all factors that affect flight as well as return. These may be identified as intervening obstacles (Lee 1966).

In the human rights sphere factors include torture, murder, illegal detention and repression of countries' citizens, whether by their own government and people or by outside forces. Refugees fleeing these conditions would also be identified as members of a reactive fate group (Kunz 1981). Again, these factors must be addressed in the home country for a full and voluntary repatriation to take place.

In the socio-cultural sphere conflicts arise among groups of people due to tribal affiliation, ethnic heritage, language or religious preference (Bogue 1969, Keller 1975).

And finally, in the economic sphere there are a number of factors. These are natural disasters, such as floods, droughts, epidemics and pestilences (Bogue 1969). And then there are those economic conditions that are man-made. Man-made economic factors may be purposeful or unintended.
Theft of government funds and inappropriate use of funds are just as devastating to a country as when its economy is run by inept and untrained people (Akol 1987).

The various factors that have been previously described have positive and negative effects. This means that events such as civil war, torture or starvation are factors that will repel a group of people whether at home or in a host country. This is a negative force or a "push" (Lee 1966). Events such as the end of a civil war, the ouster of a brutal regime, economic development or aid are all positive and have a positive value; this is a "pull" (Lee 1966) and will draw people back. Often just the removal of a negative factor, such as a civil war, is a positive charge to draw the refugees home. When a refugee flow is precipitated, there is often some strong negative "push" such as civil war, or economic deprivation, or ethnic strife.

The choice of the refugees' asylum is determined first by geographic consideration, such as being the nearest country. The nearest country would have the strongest positive "pull" in the geographic sphere. However, the host government's treatment and policies about refugees can be positive or negative (Kunz 1981). Other considerations are cultural compatibility and economic opportunity.

Most often refugees leave with some crisis precipitating the flow. For instance, economic hardship and ethnic conflict may have been tolerated for some time, but
with the outbreak of civil war the refugee decides it is finally time to leave. There usually has to be some strong "push" combined with some sort of "pull" from a host country in order to get a refugee to leave his or her home country. Most people are extremely resistant to having to leave their country. Once the refugee flow has taken place and refugees are in a host country, the decision to return is based on what factors have been addressed in the home country that caused the refugee's flight, as well as the "pulls" to remain in the host country.

For example, if there has been a civil war and an oppressive government that has driven refugees to a host country, and they are supported in that host country in a humane and dignified way, there will be little impetus to return home until the factors causing flight in the home country have been resolved. The factors that "pulled" a refugee to the host country may be strong enough to keep him or her there even though conditions in the home country improve.

In many of the repatriation flows, not only were there strong "pulls" to return home from the host country, but often there have been simultaneous "pushes" to leave a host country.

Many cases show that time becomes more important as more of it passes (Crisp, July 1987). The longer the refugees are out of their country, the greater the chance
they will be assimilated into the host country. In turn, the greater the assimilation, the less the chance they will return home. Another consideration of time is that the longer the refugees are out of their country, the greater the chance that their means of support in their home country will disappear (whether it is the fields and irrigation systems of farmers being ruined, or someone’s job disappearing, or a business being left unattended), and the greater the likelihood they will be made into economic refugees.

When considering a model of factors in refugee flows, the spheres of factors can be arranged in order of their degree of impact based on whether the factor is a crisis to react to, such as a political coup or human rights abuses, or a more long term problem such as economic problems and socio-cultural conflicts.

Time should be considered in several different ways. One way is the time it takes the various factors to occur and be resolved. At the top of the hierarchy of factors is the political sphere. Coups and civil wars can erupt in days or hours and, just as quickly, be resolved. Human rights abuses take more time to develop as a problem to which citizens react. They probably will not leave at the first sign of abuse, but as the abuse continues they are forced to flee for their own safety. These abuses take longer to address as well.
The socio-cultural conflicts take even longer to develop, often generations, and can cause very deep rooted and long term resentment and hostilities that will take decades to overcome.

Finally, economic hardships can result from war or corruption or simply be faults or flaws in the infrastructure of the home country that may have been developed over generations. A ruined economy, depleted natural resources, or severe drought or other natural disaster cannot be made up for over night. Economic problems may take the longest to resolve and are often the hardest to solve.

In addition, the more time that passes after a precipitating crisis, such as a coup, without a consensual resolution, the greater the chance that the refugee will be affected in other spheres. For instance, what starts out as a political crisis and drives refugees out of the country, if allowed to continue long enough, will result in economic hardship. Aging of the refugees and changes of family structure will also occur over time.

THE WORLDWIDE REFUGEE SITUATION

If history tells us one thing it is that repatriation is the exception instead of the rule in refugee flows. Pakistan, Israel, and the United States of America, among many nations, are all the result of extensive flows that
will never result in repatriation. The persons involved neither want it nor seek it. There are, however, many refugee flows that have resulted in repatriation.

By looking at the factors that affect refugee flows and the role these factors play in subsequent repatriation of a refugee population, it is possible to predict the outcome of current or future flows. The following sections will first focus on the literature that identifies these factors. Past and present refugee flows will be addressed to determine what these factors are.

Secondly, models of migrations will be presented and used as a foundation from which to work. The previous work of Egon F. Kunz, Everett S. Lee, and Donald Bogue will be addressed and incorporated into the description of the process. The general hypotheses derived from the literature will then be tested against the information I collected during my interviews of Afghan refugees who fled to Pakistan.

The following section on examples of refugee flows is based on work which I originally presented in 1988, in a report called "Factors Of Repatriation: The Return to Afghanistan," whose chief authors were Grant Farr and John Lorenz.
NORTH AFRICA

Algeria is a good example of a simple refugee flow that was followed shortly afterwards by repatriation of virtually the entire refugee population. The Independence War that rocked Algeria in 1960 was enough to set off a refugee flow which resulted in over 200,000 fleeing over Algerian borders into Tunisia and Morocco (Crisp, July 1987).

The two major factors which accounted for this flow were, first, the political issue of the war and, second, the issue of human rights and a fear for personal safety. The fear of war pushed the refugees out of Algeria. This would be an example of a reactive fate group, in that they fled due to a war (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). They fled to two of the nearest countries which had cultures and customs similar to Algeria. This would be considered a "host related factor of cultural compatibility" (Kunz 1981, pg. 47). The refugees who fled were only out of their country for a short time (two years), insuring that little assimilation into the host country took place. Because of the short time, time did not become a intervening variable (Crisp, July 1987). With the arrangement of the cease fire in 1962, virtually all the refugees spontaneously returned to Algeria (Crisp, July 1987).

Because little assimilation took place, because the time involved was so short, and the primary factor (a war) was resolved, repatriation took place. In other words, the
"pulls" home overcame the "pushes" that had kept people from returning, and movement occurred (Bogue 1969, Lee 1966). The Afghans, in comparison, have been assimilated to a high degree in Pakistan, and, even though the Soviets have left, and the communist government has collapsed, sporadic fighting continues, thus little repatriation has taken place.

In the case of the Western Sahara and Morocco, human rights dominated the situation. For the people of the Western Sahara the decision by Morocco to invade and actively oppress the local population in the 1980's was the driving force causing the refugees to flee to the neighboring country of Algeria. In all, a total of over 200,000 ended up fleeing Morocco into Algeria (Lawless and Monihan 1987). Morocco is maintaining its policy of oppression and kidnapping, which has so far insured that no repatriation has taken place. These refugees also would fall under the definition of being reactive fate refugees.

In the above situation, the same factors that had originally driven the refugees out, human rights issues and harsh political treatment, continue. There is no indication, at this time, that any changes will occur. In fact the recent discovery of oil deposits in the area will surely exacerbate the problem. The "pushes" that drove the refugees out continue, with no counteracting "pulls" to bring them back. Hence no repatriation has taken place.
The situation in Morocco is similar to the Afghan situation in that most of the same factors—war, opposition to communism, and harsh political and human rights situations—remain. The factors that pushed the Afghans out remain, and the refugees remain in host countries.

MIDDLE EAST

Lebanon currently has one of the most chaotic refugee situations in the world. What has taken place in Lebanon cannot even be considered a civil war in the true sense of the word; gang wars may be a truer representation. This situation is further complicated by the Israeli-Arab conflict. Because of the armed violence and continued threat to life, there are Palestinian refugees internally and Lebanese refugees externally totaling somewhere around 263,000 (Barnes 1985). The Palestinian refugees would be considered "The Majority-Identified, in which their opposition to the events are shared by the majority of their compatriots" (Kunz 1981, pg. 42). The Lebanese would probably fall into two categories, "The Majority-Identified and Events-Alienated, because of events prior to the refugee situation or past discrimination, are ambivalent or embittered in their attitude to their former compatriots" (Kunz 1981, pg. 42). Because of the continuation of the strong negative factors there has been no return as of yet. Here, like Afghanistan, threat of physical violence is a
very strong deterrent to return. These refugees would also be classified as a reactive fate group.

AFRICAN REFUGEE FLOWS

Uganda has a tragic history of suffering and terror dating back through the last two decades. While Idi Amin holds a special place in the world’s memory for flagrant human rights abuses, Oboto, upon deposing Amin, was only more discreet, but certainly no less brutal. Estimates of murdered Ugandans for the three years before Oboto’s removal in 1986, range anywhere from 500,000 to 2 million. The Ugandans would be considered a reactive fate group. For the past 20 years in Uganda, each successive leader has brutalized his tribe’s ethnic enemies. The Ugandans would be a combination of the majority-identified and the events-alienated (Kunz 1981). Even the latest revolutionary president, Mesevini, has not been able to halt this type of terror. When this is combined with the economic chaos and damaged infrastructure of the country, it is remarkable that anyone is left in Uganda. Those who have fled have gone to the Sudan, Kenya and Rwanda. Not surprisingly, the Ugandans fled to the nearest countries. It appears that Ravenstein’s first law of "migration and distance" would apply in that they fled to the nearest countries (Ravenstein 1889).

These countries also are culturally compatible, providing further "pulls" (Bogue 1969, Lee 1981). Because
of the ongoing civil war, plus outside intervention (as in the case of Tanzanian forces aiding in the return of Oboto in 1982), coupled with an undisciplined and unrestrained army, the once extensive plantations of coffee, pineapple, and tea have been ruined. Uganda's once extensive tourist trade is completely destroyed. It is safe to say that Uganda has no economy other than at a subsistence level. The economic situation in the home country can provide a "push" to keep people from returning (Akol 1987).

Therefore, repatriation has been questionable, at best, in many cases. During 1983, refugees in the Yei River district from the Sudan returned despite continuing battles within earshot of many of the refugee camps. One 21 years old returnee explained that he would return despite threats from the military:

I will not forget the hard times in the Sudan. I have gone hungry for a long time. In the settlements I have been laboring for food, now I feel it is unbearable. So I decided to repatriate. Quite a many people had died and I fear I would die since the medical services are not quite adequate (Harrell-Bond 1986, pg. 167).

It would appear that one set of fears about threats to life and health may outweigh others. The Ugandans who have fled into the Sudan have for the most part been kept in camps with no real opportunity for work or assimilation into the local economies. This has certainly provided a "push" to leave the host country. This might be an area where Kunz's scheme would benefit from expanding his list of host related
factors to include a population policy of what I term "separatist/non-tolerant." Unfortunately the vast majority of refugees fleeing undeveloped countries flee to neighboring countries which neither can afford nor want them to be assimilated. For the Ugandans the chronic problems that they have suffered will indicate how, over time, one problem leads to another.

In Uganda what began as an oppressive and badly run government slowly translated into ethnic conflicts as first one tribe and then another gained control of the government. Each successive wave of refugees meant that crops were neglected, stores were closed, and all commerce ceased. Even those refugees who wish to return under the newest government and its promises for the future would find no effective economy and very little food.

The Ugandan crisis is especially significant in its similarities to the Afghan situation. In both cases the overthrow of a government resulted in harsh human rights violations. In both cases a long term conflict has meant extensive damage to the economic infrastructure, and in both cases the violence and damage have been so extensive people are afraid to return.

ASIAN REFUGEE FLOWS

Burma saw over 17,000 of its citizens flee to Thailand as a result of the Civil War between the government and
guerrilla forces. The majority who fled did so simply due to a well founded fear for their lives. This would undoubtedly be considered a human rights situation resulting from a political confrontation (Kumin 1987). Because of the continuing armed strife people don’t want to return. This is a strong, negative push in the political sphere and human rights sphere, which, in turn, pushes returnees away. These refugees are an example of a "Reactive Fate Group" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44).

Burma is a good example to compare Afghanistan to in that it illustrates what happens to refugees when an armed struggle between the government and guerilla forces is ongoing.

Another example is Laos, which has a refugee flow made up of those fleeing the continuing civil war and the human rights issues involved in it. The Laotians would be considered a "Reactive Fate Group" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). In addition, due to the Civil War, economic opportunities were extremely limited, causing many to flee for hope of a better economic situation. Many have fled, some even repeatedly, to Thailand in the hopes of better economic opportunities (Crisp, September 1987). This is a case where the economic situation in the home country has provided a "push" out of the home country (Akol 1987). The return to Laos was initiated by an end to hostilities, tight restrictions on economic opportunities in Thailand, as well as U.N.H.C.R.
assistance for those who return. (Naef 1987).

So for the Laotian refugees, the original reasons for fleeing (the civil war and the poor economy) had been addressed by the ending of the war and by provision of some aid from the U.N.H.C.R. The forces that had originally forced the refugees out (pushes) had been removed and positive forces (pulls), to draw the refugees back, had been put in their place. The Thai government was providing a strong push for refugees to repatriate with its limiting of economic opportunities. The Laos refugee situation is the reverse of the Afghan situation. The reasons pushing refugees out of Afghanistan have not been resolved, nor have the Afghan refugees been pushed out of Pakistan. Not surprisingly, there has been very little impetus for the Afghans to return home.

Vietnam's recent armed conflict and oppressive regime have resulted in flows into Thailand and Cambodia totaling one million (U.S. Committee for Refugees 1985). This is the result of a strong negative push to leave the country, in the area of political and human rights factors. Again these would be "Reactive Fate Refugees" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). Because of the continuation of these factors, it is not yet possible for refugees to return home. As illustrated here, if the original negative factors, continue there is every indication that repatriation will not occur. Like Afghanistan, the continued unacceptable regime has kept
refugees from returning.

CENTRAL AMERICA

El Salvador has had a history of military control over its population. The 1932 peasant uprising was violently smashed by the ruling plantation owners and the military. Government opposition and social unrest have been dealt with harshly ever since. Murder, torture, political kidnapping and assassinations have been rampant since the 1970's. By 1982, there were over 750,000 El Salvadorans out of the country and 500,000 internally displaced (Billiard, December 1987). The majority of these refugees went to Honduras where they were confined to refugee camps. For refugees from El Salvador it is obvious that they fled their country over political issues that have spawned human rights abuses. Once again, these refugees would be considered a "Reactive Fate Group" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44).

The Salvadorans would probably be considered "The Majority-Identified and The Events-Alienated" (Kunz 1981, pg. 42). This would be due to the large majority of the population being involved combined with the class conflicts evident in the situation. For the Salvadorans, the predominant forces have been a push out of the country. Repatriation has been due mainly to the decline of hostilities and a quieting of the social chaos. However, this has been coupled with the negative factor of being
imprisoned while in the Honduran refugee camps. In this unusual circumstance, there is a pull to return home in the human rights sphere, yet there is also a push from the country of refuge, the negative push of human rights infringement by restricting refugees (Billiard, December 1987). As illustrated by Richard Lawless and Liela Monihan in their work on Moroccan refugees (1987), human rights concerns can have a big impact on willingness to return; in this case it has provided a push out of the host country.

This case has been the opposite of the Afghan situation in that the Afghan political and human rights situation has not been resolved, yet the Pakistan government has treated the Afghans fairly well, giving them refuge, allowing them to come and go from their camps, and even allowing them to use Pakistan as a staging base for attacks on Afghanistan.

Guatemala is similar to El Salvador in that its current political crisis is rooted in a historic pattern of dominance by the landed elite supported by the military and U.S. business interests, particularly United Fruit Company. When Jacobo Arbenz enacted agrarian reform in 1954, it was not long before he was ousted in a C.I.A. backed coup which placed Col. Castillo Armas in power. Since 1954, military governments have altered history with fraudulent elections, to insure and provide uninterrupted repressive rule in Guatemala (Ferris 1987). As in the case of El Salvador, these refugees are "The Majority-Identified and The Events-
Alienated" (Kunz 1981, pg. 42).

Death squads and the systematic elimination of any moderate opposition created a climate of widespread fear and terror throughout the country. With the elimination of opposition leaders, guerrilla organizations became the only recognized opposition. Any indigenous populations who opposed the government or aided the guerrillas were destroyed (Ferris 1987). The refugees fleeing are a "Reactive Fate Group" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). The flow out of Guatemala has been mainly of the Indian population. Currently there are over 45,000 in Mexico. After the 1984 raids on the border refugee camps, the Mexican government moved the refugees to locations away from the borders.

As in the case of El Salvador, the armed military rule has resulted in oppressive treatment of the population and extensive human rights abuses. This is another case where the crisis is initiated by political conflicts but it is manifested as a human rights crisis. This created pushes to drive the Indians out of their country. With the continued unrest and attacks on refugee camps, there is a strong negative force keeping refugees from returning home.

Those refugees that did return were placed in "model" villages to be "re-educated." These types of acts serve to reinforce the fears of those contemplating return (Maldonado 1986). They would be the recipients of human-rights abuse. As illustrated by Lawless and Monihan (1987) and Bogue
human rights issues can have a strong effect or be a push, blocking return.

As in Afghanistan, when the original reasons for fleeing remain, refugees do not return.

Haiti has gained a sort of infamy for its particularly harsh violation of human rights. The Duvalier regime in Haiti is the western version of Idi Amin in Uganda. The government was notorious for violating human rights with the help of the military. All of these factors taking place over a long period of time reduced the Haitian economy to a shambles. The majority of its flow was into the Dominican Republic and the United States. Many fled due to the oppressive regime in Haiti. Many more, however, fled because they were economically destitute. As both Akol (1987) and Lamb (1986) have noted, the economic situation in the home country can be a tremendous force in creating a refugee flow, or in keeping them from returning.

The initial returnees came back with the fall of the Duvalier regime. There were reports that some of the initial returnees were forced out of their countries of asylum. Those that had fled for economic considerations have adopted a wait and see attitude to determine if there are economic opportunities available for them once they return. Many of the refugees who had fled for political reasons cite the poor economy as a reason to delay return (Billiard, March 1987). Haiti is another example supporting
Akol’s (1987) position on the impact that the economic situation in the host country can have. Certainly the current 1991-1992 crisis in Haiti, while precipitated by a coup and political persecution, has also been a response to the economic problems of the country.

This is a good case to compare to the Afghans’ situation, in that refugees fleeing for one reason in the interim now have other reasons not to return.

AFGHANISTAN

Afghanistan currently has five to six million refugees in Pakistan and Iran (U.S. Committee for Refugees 1985). The Afghans would be considered "The Majority-Identified" (Kunz 1981, pg. 42). The Afghan flows were precipitated by the communist coup of 1978, and the subsequent Soviet invasion and occupation to support the communist regime in Kabul (Fullerton 1983). The Afghans would be considered a "Reactive Fate Group" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44), because of heavy protest by the Afghans, a protracted guerrilla war and a Soviet "scorched earth" policy resulting in extensive damage to the economic infrastructure and agricultural capabilities. The initial forces which drove out many Afghans were political ones, naturally followed by refugees responding to human rights issues. Finally, due to time and continued damage, most of the Afghan refugees have been turned into economic refugees as well.
The Afghans fled to Pakistan and Iran where there were similar cultural backgrounds and where they have been fairly well received and cared for. This would be considered a "Host Related Factor of Cultural Compatibility" (Kunz 1981, pg. 47). For the Afghans, the issues at home, combined with the sympathy and aid in their host countries, provide very powerful forces to keep the Afghans from returning home. The Afghans in exile have maintained a strong "homeward identity view" (Kunz 1981, pg. 48). Under Kunz's scheme they would be considered to have an "Ideological National Orientation in Exile of Restoration Activists" (Kunz 1981, pg. 45).

CHARACTERISTICS OF REFUGEE FLOWS

Some assumptions that can be drawn from the previously listed flows are as follows. First, if the reasons, or most of the reasons (pushes), that drove the refugees out of their homeland continue to exist, they will not return (Bogue 1969, Lee 1966).

Secondly, if the conditions which hold refugees to the host country continue (pulls), they will not be likely to return (Bogue 1969, Lee 1966).

Thirdly, the refugees most likely to return will be those that have had the conditions driving them out of their home country removed and are then "pushed" out of their host country by refoulment (forced return) or some other factor.
which discourage their assimilation into the host society (Bogue 1969).

Fourthly, the refugees least likely to return will be those that have the conditions that "pushed" them out of their home country continue and have conditions that "pull" them to their host country continue, such as refuge, aid, and support (Bogue 1969).

The category that the Afghan refugees would fall under would be the last: the conditions driving them out have not been resolved, and they have had a good reception in Pakistan with refuge, aid and support.

Fifth, and perhaps most important, in practice repatriation is the exception rather than the rule.

The most common types of large refugee flows that have taken place in this century are made up of "Reactive Fate Groups" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). Secondly, the largest flights tend to be "The Majority-Identified" (Kunz 1981, pg. 42). Third, refugees tend to flee to countries that they are the closest to (Ravenstein 1889). Finally, refugees flee to countries that have "Cultural Compatibility" (Kunz 1981).
CHAPTER II

HYPOTHESES

Based on a combination of the works of the previously presented authors and the common characteristics identified among worldwide refugee flows, it is possible to derive a number of hypotheses. The following list of hypotheses is broken down into three areas: basic independent variables, intervening variables that have arisen during the Afghans’ refuge, and personal perception variables of the Afghans interviewed. These hypotheses will be tested with the data collected during 1988, and contrasted with recent historical and political developments.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Reason For Flight

The obstacles to repatriation will vary in relation to the original reasons for fleeing. I.e., the greater the number of factors causing flight that still exist in the home country, the less the chance of repatriation.

Age

The relationship between age and probability of repatriation is curvilinear. I.e., the very young will return with their parents. Those in their late teens,
having been out of the country their whole lives, will have less likelihood of repatriating. Those in their early twenties and upward to middle age will have a high chance of repatriating due to their strong attachments. And the very old, due to infirmity, will have a lower likelihood of repatriating.

Family Status

The concerns about safety will vary with the number of dependents. I.e., the more dependents, the greater will be the perceived concerns about personal safety and therefore greater reluctance to repatriate.

INTERVENING VARIABLES

Time

The greater the time that a refugee has been out of the home country, the less the likelihood of repatriation. I.e., the longer a refugee is in a host country, the greater the chance he or she will have of being assimilated into various spheres of that society.

Ideological Shift

Besides causing a greater assimilation over time, time will also be associated with a shift among concerns. There are several directions this shift will go. The general population will shift to more pragmatic concerns over time, while the ideological leaders will shift more towards
ideological concerns.

**Geographic**

The greater the distance or other geographic obstacles, the less the likelihood of repatriation. I.e., those who traveled the farthest will have the greatest obstacles for return.

**Economic**

Host: The greater the degree of economic assimilation in the host country, the less the likelihood of repatriation.

**Socio-Cultural**

Host: The less the socio-cultural similarity with the host society the greater the likelihood of repatriation. I.e., the refugees who are Pushtun and staying in a Pushtun part of Pakistan would have less reason to repatriate than a Tajik or Hazara staying in a Pushtun area.

**PERSONAL PERCEPTION VARIABLES**

**Economic**

Home: The greater the perceived economic opportunities at home, the greater the likelihood of repatriation. I.e., the refugees who have jobs in Pakistan, but no immediate chance of work in Afghanistan, should therefore have less of a desire to repatriate than a refugee farmer who is not working in Pakistan but can begin farming in Afghanistan as
soon as he is able to return home.

**Socio-Cultural**

Home: The greater the socio-cultural similarity with the home population, the greater the likelihood of repatriation. I.e., those refugees who were minorities in Afghanistan would be less inclined to repatriate to an area where they would be an ethnic or religious minorities.

**Personal Safety**

Home: The less the fear for personal safety from fighting or mines and comparable hazards to health, the greater the chance of repatriation.
CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND OF AFGHAN REFUGEE SITUATION

GEOGRAPHY

Geography has always had an impact on refugees; it helps determine who leaves and from what area, where they go to, and how difficult it will be for them to return and reestablish themselves. Geography is an important factor in the repatriation of the Afghan refugees. Afghanistan is a country of great geographical diversity. Afghanistan’s extensive mountain ranges, the Hindu Kush and the Pamir Knot (an extension of the Himalayas), dominate the country throughout the northeast, the east, the southeast and the center of the country. To the west and north are extensive plains and to the south and southwest are sand and stone deserts. Afghanistan is mostly semi-desert ecologically and is landlocked by its neighbors. To the north, Afghanistan is bordered by the former republics of the Soviet Union, to the west by Iran, to the south and east by Pakistan, and to the northeast it shares a tiny border with China.

Afghan refugee movement started in 1978; many Afghans fled on foot, by donkey or local transport. As a result they crossed the borders of Afghanistan into one of their
two immediate neighbors, Pakistan or Iran. (See map of the region, Figure 1.)

HISTORY

The west tends to view the Afghan situation as beginning in 1979 with the Soviet invasion, when in fact it is the final step in a historical process which has been playing itself out for centuries. The Afghans themselves view what has happened in a historical context. For most, this was one of many invasions and occupations by foreign powers. And just as the Greeks, the Persians, the Turks and the British were finally driven out, so would the Soviets and the Communists finally be overthrown. Several elder Afghan men I spoke to talked about the Third Anglo-Afghan war in 1919, as though it had happened yesterday.

Afghanistan has been invaded several times in modern history. Afghanistan's relationship with the modern world community begins with the rise of Napoleon at the end of the eighteenth century. His successes created heightened interest in Asia and India. British distrust of Russia grew following the Russian attack on Iran and subsequent treaties which supported the siege of Herat. Russia then began diplomatic maneuvering in the Afghan court of Dost Mohamad, leading to the British invading Afghanistan in 1838 in what became known as the First Anglo Afghan War (Smith 1973, pg. 47).
The British took over Qandahar and Kabul and drove Dost Mohamad to the north and then placed Shah Shuja on the throne as Amir. Shah Shuja was dependent on the British troops to keep him in power. However, tribal animosities grew until 1842 when, in an Afghan uprising, the 15,000 British were massacred at Kabul and in retreat to Jalalabad (Smith 1973, pg. 47). The next year the British returned and placed Dost Mohamad on the throne as Amir. Despite the return of Dost Mohamad, the British had caused so much destruction and resentment in Afghanistan that the Afghans themselves viewed with suspicion and hatred not only the British but all foreigners.

The Second Anglo-Afghan war, 1878-1879, was precipitated by a British policy shift to more direct intervention in the country. This caused Amir Sher Ali to turn to the Russians for help. When Sher Ali welcomed the Russian envoy but refused to accept a British mission, the British were so furious they once again invaded Afghanistan and drove Sher Ali out of power. (Smith 1973, pg. 49).

Following Sher Ali’s death in 1879, Afghanistan was then ruled by Sher Ali’s son, Yaquab Khan. The new Amir was allowed to rule but only internally. All outside relations were handled by the British. In response, five years later, in 1885, the Russians invaded and occupied Panjdeh, north of Herat. The British response was to rush to defend Herat. But instead of a war between these superpowers, a compromise
was reached and in 1887, what was later to become the permanent border between Russia and Afghanistan was established (Smith 1973, pg. 49).

Following Yaquab Khan's abdication in 1879, (Nyrop 1986, pg. 33) Abdar Rahman gained the throne and was the first ruler to transform Afghanistan into the modern state that it is today. Rahman was succeeded after his death in 1901 by his oldest son, Habibullah (Nyrop 1986, pg. 38). During his reign he was able to play Russia off against the British. During World War I he offered to attack the British for the Turks and Germans in exchange for cash and weapons, while at the same time offering to attack the Turks and Germans for the British in exchange for an end to British control. Habibullah met the classic fate of the Afghan monarch. He was assassinated in 1919 under unclear and unusual circumstances (Nyrop 1986, pg. 41).

Amanullah, Abdar Rahman's third son, seized power upon Rahman's death despite claims to the throne by his older brothers and uncle. Three months later, in May 1919, (Nyrop 1986, pp. 41), Amanullah attacked the British in what became known as the Third Anglo-Afghan War. The war only lasted one month and in the years following several agreements between the British and Afghans resulted in Afghan autonomy.

Amanullah built relations with the Soviets during his reign which soured the Afghan-British relations. Amanullah also brought about many internal reforms including:
discouraging the seclusion and veiling of women, abolishing
slavery, secular education for boys and girls, and
Afghanistan's first constitution (Nyrop 1986, pg. 45). His
reforms led to a revolt by the Shinwari and Tajik tribes,
who forced him from power.

In 1929 following a seven month rule of a Tajik,
Habibullah Khan, the next ruler was King Muhammad Nadir
Shah. His first act was to remove all the reforms of
Amanullah, his cousin. Nadir Shah did continue to modernize
Afghanistan with roads, a communication system, a banking
system, and economic planning. Nadir Shah also was
assassinated, in 1933 (Nyrop 1986, pg. 49). He was replaced
by his son, Muhammad Zahir Shah.

Muhammad Zahir Shah was the last king to rule
Afghanistan. During his reign he kept the country neutral
during World War II, wrestled with Pakistan over the control
of the North West Frontier Province, and established
relations with the United States of America. In 1950, the
Afghans established an important agreement with the Soviet
Union to get Soviet aid in petroleum exploration and
production and the shipment of goods through Soviet
territory to Afghanistan. The last had became very
important, as in the past Pakistan had embargoed goods bound
to Afghanistan during their disagreements. The most
important aspect of the agreement though was to counter
increasing American involvement in Afghanistan, which had
replaced Britain as the western super-power in the region (Nyrop 1986, pg. 56).

In 1953, Daoud became Prime Minister of Afghanistan (Nyrop 1986, pp. 58). Daoud was unique in that he was the first western educated member of the royal family to wield power. He continued modernization in the social and economic areas. In a reenactment of an earlier era, Daoud attempted to play off the superpowers against each other by accepting aid from both the Soviets and the Americans.

Daoud had one great obsession during his reign and that was on the issue of Pushtunistan, the tribal area of the Pushtuns covering the North East of Afghanistan and the North West Frontier Province of Pakistan. This area had effectively been cut in half by the establishment of the Durand line in 1893 by British Indian Foreign Secretary, Sir Mortimer Durand (Dupree 1980, pp. 426-427). Pushtunistan has been a continuous sore point between Pakistan and Afghanistan: would it belong to one country or the other or remain split or perhaps become an independent nation? In 1950 Afghanistan supported an independent Pushtunistan (Nyrop 1986, pg. 55). As of 1963, Daoud and his Pakistan counterpart had became so entrenched on the Pushtunistan issue and the numerous closings of the border and blocking of trade had become so bad that King Zahir Shah asked for Daoud’s resignation because of the harm to Afghanistan’s economy (Nyrop 1986, pg. 62).
So for the first time in his reign, King Zahir Shah ruled as well as reigned. One of the most important things to happen during the king's next decade of rule was the adoption of a new constitution in 1964 (Nyrop 1986, pg. 63). The new constitution allowed for greater participation in the government by all groups.

On the first of January in 1965 the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (P.D.P.A.) was founded (Nyrop 1986, pg. 65). The P.D.P.A. was a Marxist party, although not an orthodox one but one formed of diverse leftist groups. Throughout the rest of the decade student unrest continued and criticism of the King increased in a number of areas but mainly over his refusal to approve legislation already passed by the parliament on such issues as the political parties bill which allowed opposing political parties (Nyrop 1986, pg. 67). In 1973, while the King was out of the country, Daoud, in a bloodless coup, took over the Afghan government with little resistance (Dupree 1980, pg. 753). Daoud remained in power until 1978.

In 1977 the two P.D.P.A. groups, the Khalq and the Parcham, rejoined their forces after a ten year split due to personality differences of their leaders. They had both been continually frustrated in their attempts to be in the political mainstream despite the aid of the Parcham party and Babrak Karmal in the 1973 coup when Daoud came to power (Dupree 1980, pg. 771).
In April of 1978, following the murder of Mir Akbar Khyber, who was an important member of the Parcham party, huge anti-government demonstrations began which resulted in the arrest of many P.D.P.A. members. In response, a coup lead by the P.D.P.A. and party members in the military overthrew and killed President Daoud (Dupree 1980, pg. 771). Following the coup, the P.D.P.A., with Taraki as the head, assumed leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

The party leaders began a series of reforms which, as earlier reforms had done, seriously challenged the existing power structures and traditions of the Afghans. The reforms included sweeping land reforms, doing away with mortgages, and the debts of tenant farmers to landlords, and setting up state farms. Unfortunately the land reforms brought little relief to the farmer peasants; but what it did do was alienate the village leaders, who traditionally relied on control of the land for their income and as a means of authority and control over the peasants. The other offensive reforms initiated by the P.D.P.A. were reforms over the marriage practices of the Afghans. A minimum marriage age was set and bride prices were limited. These were two issues which were of central importance in rural society. In response, armed opposition sprang up throughout the country. Conflicts continued to exist between the two parties in the P.D.P.A., and a purge of Parchamis by the
Khalqs took place. The internal situation worsened in Afghanistan as the opposition to the government and reforms spread throughout most of the country. In September, 1979, Hifizullah Amin, the Prime Minister and a Khalq party leader, arrested Taraki and threw him in jail where he was somehow killed (Dupree 1980, pg. 777). Amin assumed control of the party and the state, but he continued to be unable to thwart the increasing opposition of the mujahideen. The term Mujahideen is an Arabic word meaning those who wage a jihad. Jihad is the struggle by Muslims to enact the will of God, within oneself and among other people (Nyrop 1986, pg. 87). More specific to the Soviet invasion and subsequent war, the Afghans saw this as a jihad in that they were fighting non-believers who have invaded their country and are in opposition to Islam. The Afghans who have become communists, as in the P.D.P.A. parties, are even more abhorred by the Mujahideen, for they had abandoned Islam.

On December 24, 1979, airborne Soviet troops seized Kabul’s airport, followed shortly thereafter by mechanized ground forces which crossed the border from the north and seized Kabul (Dupree 1986, pg. 777). Amin was killed and the Soviets installed Babrak Karmal as the new president. The great game which had continued for centuries with Afghanistan walking the tightrope between the various superpowers in the region, entered a new chapter.
ETHNIC GROUPS

Afghanistan’s ethnicity is overwhelming in its diversity and vastness. Ethnicity has played an important role in influencing when refugees fled, where they fled to, and how they were received, and, depending on the future political developments, who will return.

The Pushtuns are the largest single distinct ethnic group in Afghanistan. They numbered about 6.5 million in the late 1970’s in Afghanistan (Dupree 1980, pg. 59). One important aspect of the Pushtuns is the fact that as a people and as an ethnic group they are split down the middle between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Another six million Pushtuns reside in Pakistan (Dupree 1980, pg. 59). The Pushtuns have traditionally lived in an area to the east and south and southwest of Kabul in Afghanistan and in the northwest area of Pakistan. There have at times been calls for the formation of a separate country in this area as a "Pushtunistan." Because of their ethnic identity and strong nationalist tendencies, and geographic proximity to the North West Frontier Province of Pakistan, the refugees who are Pushtuns have predominantly fled to this area.

The Tajiks number about 3.5 million people (Dupree 1980, pg. 59). Because the Tajiks are a Persian speaking people and live primarily in the northeastern provinces of Afghanistan, many Tajiks who fled sought refuge in Iran instead of Pakistan. The Tajiks who have fled into Pakistan
were from Kabul or the eastern provinces (Farr 1988, pg. 33).

The Baluch, who number about 100,000, are mainly pastoral nomads who range across the southwest borderlands of Afghanistan (Dupree 1980, pg. 59). The Baluchis have fled predominantly across the border of southwest Pakistan into Baluchistan (Farr 1988, pg. 33).

Both the Hazaras and the Aimaqs have remained fairly isolated in the central mountainous area of Afghanistan during the war and have had much less external dislocation as refugees than the other major groups (Farr 1980, pg. 33). (See map of ethnic distribution, Figure 2.)

AFGHAN SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

The social organization is to a large degree based on kinship patterns and genealogy. This reflects the strong tribalism of the area. The other type of organization and leadership is feudal. Social organization is important to note, as for some groups their social organization in Afghanistan has been repeated in exile, while others have adopted completely new patterns of social organization.

The tribal pattern is important to consider since more than two-thirds of the population base their social organization on tribal ties. This proportion is very high when compared with the rest of the Middle East. The Pushtun refugees from eastern Afghanistan are organized into tribes.
Figure 2. Ethnic distribution in Afghanistan.
The kinship system in tribal groups reflects the relative importance of family relationships above all other factors. The tribal system in Afghanistan and the patrilineal foundation on which it is based are the key to social organization. Even though kinship may not be directly linked by blood among all tribal members, each individual considers himself linked by kinship to the rest of the tribe.

The nomadic tribes are both political units and military organizations. The only reason that their autonomy exists in most cases is because they have been able to defend their autonomy. The tribes are led by a khan. The khan is selected by an open acclamation of a tribal jirgah (a council). The jirgah is composed of the heads of all the various lineages. The khan is usually the eldest son of the previous khan as well as being in the senior lineage of the tribe. The khan governs the tribe in a manner dictated by tribal custom and practice. When issues beyond the scope of the khan arise, the jirgah is called in for consultation.

The status of the tribal members is determined by the classical patrilineal model of descent and inheritance through the sons. The eldest son replaces the father as head of the household and, in theory at least, the other sons should pay respect to the eldest son as they would their father. Also, as is usually the case in nomadic tribal systems, status in the group is based on age and
seniority.

The other major socio-political organization is feudalism. This is found in the Hazaras, Tajiks, Uzbeks, and the Pushtuns in southern Afghanistan. The feudal system in Afghanistan is based on a landed aristocracy of khans who make most of the decisions.

The traditional tribal leadership has survived the transition to refugee camp life. However, the ability of the feudal khans to control their followers has waned considerably because they have lost their base of authority, their land.

Several new forms of leadership have emerged as a result of the current war and refugee situation. One new form of leader is the camp leader, or camp "malik." The camp maliks derive their power through control over the camp rations and the ability to negotiate with the local authorities and relief officials, instead of the traditional tribal or landlord basis. The other new forms of leadership are the resistance party leaders in exile in Pakistan and Iran, and the local commanders operating inside Afghanistan.

THE VILLAGE

When discussing Afghanistan the village is the next social unit to consider. The village is known as the garyah in Dari terms and as the keley in Pushto. The village in Afghanistan is usually set up in a nuclear pattern of homes
clustered around the town. The village is generally considered to be self-sufficient, with most inhabitants farming. There are few specialists in the village. The leadership is, in many cases, determined by tribal patterns. Many of the nomadic peoples spend at least part of the year in permanent settlements. Most villages are made up of an ethnic group or are very closely related by kinship.

The village chief is the malik and is picked by the villagers themselves. As in the tribal setting, the village chief is usually of senior lineage in the village and is probably the son of the previous malik. Also, as in the tribe, status in the village is first determined by which family one belongs to. The only other major consideration for status is landholding.

At the village level, flight was mainly due to opposition to communism and to the bombing and fighting (Conner 1984, pg. 177). These were issues that were collectively felt by the village. Initially the villages were untouched by the 1978 coup and later invasions, but as the resistance spread out from Kabul they became drawn into the conflict. At this level flight was a more collective decision and action than in the town or urban areas.

THE TOWN

The intermediary between the villages and the urban areas are the towns. The town is the lowest commercial
community in Afghanistan. People bring their produce from
the villages to the town by donkey or horse, or by packing
it on their backs. Once at the town it is then shipped by
truck to the cities. Towns usually occur where several
major roads or trails come together. The local civil
servants and police are usually headquartered in the town
and landlords from the surrounding countryside usually live
there.

Flight from the towns was similar to that of the
villages, but in the towns there was greater chance of being
forced to join the communist party or being arrested or
conscripted. In the towns there were both group decisions
to flee later in the conflict as well as the earlier
decisions which were more individualistic.

URBAN SOCIETY

The urban area of Kabul has long been the seat for the
urban elite which is composed of Pushtun influentialos of the
Duranni lineage, and other Pushtuns of the Mohammadzai line.
Beneath the elite are intellectuals who live mainly in Kabul
and are the focus of key positions in government and in
business.

For those from urban society, 74% cited fear of
imprisonment or arrest as a reason for leaving (Conner 1984,
pg. 177). For those in urban areas the reasons for flight
and decision to do so were primarily individual matters.
POWER STRUCTURE

The Pushtuns consider themselves to be the core community of Afghanistan. Until recently Pushtun was generally described as being the Afghan tribe, a name that was bestowed upon them by early Iranian historians. The Pushtuns believe that the country belongs to them more than anyone else. In 1747, an Afghan, who was one of the leaders of the army of the Persian shah, Nadir, took a group of Afghan warriors into Qandahar, following the shah’s murder. The Afghan, Ahmad Khan, was later elected to Khan by a tribal jirgah. Ahmad Khan was the first king of Afghanistan. He was a member of the Sandozai clan. After he became Khan he took the name of Durr-i-Durran which means, "the pearls of pearls" (Smith 1973, pp. 45-46).

The name of Durrani was later applied to his tribesmen, who are still called that to this day. At the time the young Khan came into power, he consolidated his power by establishing an agreement with the Mohammedzai clan. These two lineages continue to remain as the royal elites to this day. By comparison, the Uzbeks and the Turkomans, even though having considerable influence, have power only over their own tribes or groups.

The strength of the Pushtun tribes has insured their domination over all other tribes. They make up over half of
the population, have supplied the royal family in the past, hold most of the cabinet positions, and have wielded considerable economic power. The Pushtuns' traditional dominance in weaponry has insured their domination over the other ethnic groups of the area.

After the consolidation of the Afghan government, it took many years to bring all the other tribes into line. Until the end of the nineteenth century, there was an ongoing intertribal warfare between the Afghan lords and the Hazaras who refused to be brought under the Khans rule. The same thing was taking place with the Tajiks and the Uzbeks.

Besides the Pushtuns, religious leaders have held considerable power in Afghanistan both officially and unofficially. In the past they were informally associated with rulers and leaders and assisted them in maintaining control over the people and in interpreting the law. In 1931 King Nadir Shah founded a body of religious leaders, 'ulama. This group contained seventeen members, one top religious leader from each of the seventeen provinces. The duties of the 'ulama, was to advise the government on religious issues, control the courts and schools, and pass judgment on the practiced public and private norms and values. Their political power began to wane with the election of Daoud as prime minister in 1953 (Dupree 1980, pg. 108).

The tribal jirgah when done at a national level is
referred to as a Loya Jirgah, and is used to garner support and gain a consensus. Besides tribal leaders and other local elites, religious leaders also sit on the Loya Jirgah (Nyrop 1986, pg. 269). With the takeover of the government in 1978, by the Peoples Democratic Party of Afghanistan, a number of programs and reforms were initiated that were seen as anti-Islamic. Even though later attempts were made by the PDPA to incorporate aspects of Islam and Islamic leadership, to gain popular support, the few official mullahs, and other religious leaders who expressed support for the new regime, were horribly murdered if caught by the resistance (Nyrop 1986, pp. 270-271).

RELIGION

Almost all the Afghans are Moslems. Islam has both general beliefs that can be applied to refugees as well as specific beliefs about how to view and treat them. For the Afghan refugees, being Moslems and fleeing to Moslem countries has had a tremendous impact on how they perceive themselves, how others perceive them, and how they are treated.

For the Afghans, their views on Islam have been influenced by their customs held even before the advent of Islam. Pushtunwali is one such example. Pushtunwali is a complex code of honor which dictates behavior on and off the battlefield as well as in daily life and even issues of
One very important tenet of Islam is the requirement to offer sanctuary to the persecuted. This has played an important role in the treatment of the Afghan refugees by the Pakistanis. The Afghans were constantly offering meals and inviting me to stay with the various families in Pakistan. When asked why people were so kind, one young man replied, "God likes us to help people. I'm doing this to make God happy."

There is also a specific historical situation in Islam which defines the Afghan refugee situation in religious terms, sanctifies it and obligates the Pakistanis to offer sanctuary to their Moslem brothers (Farr 1988, pg. 41). In 622 A.D., Muhammad, the prophet of Islam, had to flee Mecca to Medina, because his preaching in Mecca had embittered the town leaders. The flight became known as the "Hejra" (Nyrop 1986, pg. 88). The Afghan refugees are called the Muhajarin, or the people of the Hejra (Farr 1988, pg. 41).
CHAPTER IV

THE AFGHAN REFUGEE SITUATION

With the communist coup and subsequent war in the late 1970's and 1980's, nearly two-thirds of the estimated 1979 population of 15.5 million have been uprooted (Nyrop 1986, pg. 85). Estimates place the number of internal refugees, those still inside Afghanistan, close to two or three million (Farr 1988, pg. 5). The majority of the displaced Afghans, however, are external refugees, those people who have left Afghanistan. According to Iranian Government figures, there are 1.9 million Afghans refugees currently living in Iran (Nyrop 1986, pg. 85). The majority though have fled to Pakistan.

There are 3.2 million refugees in Pakistan registered with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (U.N.H.C.R.). There are perhaps as many as a quarter million that are not registered with the U.N.H.C.R., bringing the total population in Pakistan up to 3.5 million (Farr 1988, pg. 5).

AFGHAN REFUGEE FLOWS

These refugees did not leave Afghanistan all at once. There were refugee flows at variable rates which were
dependent upon internal events in Afghanistan. Based on the work of Kerry Conner (1984), one can identify a number of peak refugee flows (traditionally termed vintages) out of Afghanistan. Initially there was a very high flow to Pakistan in 1978 following the coup. Following the murder of Tariki, and later Amin and the arrival of the Soviet troops, in late 1979 and into early 1980, another large flow departed. Between the end of 1980 and early 1981, Conner attributes the high flow to several possibilities: internal economic problems, military conscription by the Soviet regime, and better organization among the resistance commanders. The final large peak of refugee outflow in late 1981 and through 1982, Conner attributes to new conscription programs and expanded military offensive (Conner 1984, pp. 173-176). The rate of flow was lower in 1983 and stayed constant through 1984, although it was nowhere near the rate of the first flow (Conner 1984, pp. 173-176). After 1985 the flow considerably lessened although it never dried up. Following the battle of Jalalabad in the summer of 1989 there were an additional 70,000 refugees who came out through the Khyber Pass into the Northwest Frontier province of Pakistan. Many of the refugees have been outside their homeland well over a decade now.

AFGHAN REFUGEE ASSIMILATION

When a refugee population has been out of its country for as long as many of the Afghans have, time becomes a very
important factor in terms of being assimilated into the local economy. The longer refugees remain in a host country, the more they tend to be assimilated into the local economy. This has certainly been the case in Pakistan, even though the majority of the refugees live in camps set apart from the Pakistanis.

The Afghans have established an economic infrastructure both among the refugee population as well as the local population. To give a few examples, many of the refugees operate street vending businesses which are set up to sell food, medicine and other household supplies; others have leased store fronts to sell Afghan crafts. Afghan men work as tonga (horse cart) drivers, and others who were trained M.D.s and lawyers have practices among the local population. Practically every occupation from laborers and tailors to mechanics and teachers are evident. In other words, the refugees are doing much the same type of work as the local Pakistanis are doing. However, they aren't necessarily displacing the locals (even though that was the local perception by the Pakistanis), for much of the Afghans' work is providing goods and services to the Afghan refugees themselves.

The refugee camps look permanent. Very few people were still living in tents. There were still a number of tents evident at many of the camps, but from what can be seen and what we were told, most people use the tents now for storage
or visitors. In the last decade most refugees have built permanent housing out of mud bricks. These houses are virtually identical to what the poorer Pakistanis live in. The Afghans have been in Pakistan so long in fact that many of them have built a number of rooms onto their homes. They have built mud walls surrounding their homes, dug wells, put in gardens, built awnings and, in some cases, put television antennae on their roofs and strung electrical lines to their mud homes.

Cultural assimilation is different from economic assimilation or establishing permanent residences. Culturally, the Afghans and Pakistanis are very similar in a number of areas. Many of the residents of the Northwest Frontier Province and the Northeast section of Afghanistan are the same ethnic group, Pushtun, and speak the same language, Pushto. The ethnic identity of the Pushtun, on both sides of the border, is so strong that there have been a number of secessionist movements in the past and in the present to secede from both countries and establish a "Pushtunistan" between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Many of the Afghans are not first time arrivals in Pakistan. Many have been migrating back and forth across the border for years before the conflict as nomads, traders and herders. Some even had relatives or acquaintances in Pakistan from before the war.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, both Afghans and
Pakistanis are Muslims. Being Muslim has many important ramifications for this particular situation. Since the Afghans are Muslims and fighting "non-believers," this struggle has taken on the mantle of being a Jihad or holy war. Subsequently this means that the Pakistanis are religiously duty bound to provide food and shelter to those fighting in the Jihad or fleeing from it. There is also the standard duty of the Moslem to provide for the stranger and traveller and also the needy. In other words, the Pakistanis are doubly induced to help the Afghans.

One aspect that is in dispute in this situation is the matter of economic considerations and how they affect the refugee's decision to repatriate. Economic considerations have been the key factor and at times the only factor in other refugee repatriations. Economic concerns have caused many refugee flows initially and have had great impact in blocking returnees or encouraging them to stay in a host country. There are three major ways that economics affect a refugee population.

The first is the economic situation in the refugee's own country. A bad economy in a home country will "push" people out. Secondly, a host country with a good economy will actually "pull" refugees to it (Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754). Third, acting as a further "pull" is the international community, responding favorably to the refugees and providing quite a bit of aid to them.
Afghanistan continues to have a growing economic crisis which pushes the refugees away, pulls them into host countries, and keeps them from returning home.

The Afghans insist that they don’t care about economics or money, just about being in their country. Officially the government welcomes and aids the refugees, although it is also common to be told by officials that they will be glad when the refugees go home. The impacts the refugees are having on Pakistan include Afghans competing with Pakistanis in the local economy, crowding in the cities and surrounding areas, and competing over resources such as water, land and firewood. Also there are increasing tensions among the various ethnic groups and between Pakistanis and Afghans. The Pakistanis, in growing numbers, insist that the Afghans are only in Pakistan to sell drugs and weapons. Crime that takes place in Peshawar is usually automatically blamed on the Afghans by the Pakistanis, whether it’s burglaries or political murders. The Pakistanis are also resentful of all the aid received by the Afghans. In some cases the Afghans were better off than the local people, and yet it was the Afghans who received aid. These negative views go both ways; it is common to hear Afghans speak in disparaging terms of the Pakistanis. One scene witnessed in public in Peshawar was an Afghan man admonishing a Pakistani woman for having a misbehaving child, and the Afghan turning and announcing, “These Pakistanis don’t know how to raise their
children." Despite the close ethnic and religious backgrounds of these two groups, there has always existed a certain underlying tension. The Pakistanis view the Afghans as arrogant, illiterate, mountain nomads. The Afghans view the Pakistanis as stupid, docile farmers who live in the valleys. Many of the international agencies and workers espouse a view somewhere between these.

Finally, and not least, are human rights and human safety concerns. Many observers assumed that the refugees would be automatically returned once the Soviets withdrew. However, the war continues, first without the Russians, now without the communists.

Even though there are unique characteristics to the Afghan refugee situation, not the least the sheer numbers of people involved, there are clear indicators from other refugee flows and subsequent repatriations, of how certain factors affect the refugees' flight, assimilation, and possible repatriation.

AFGHANS IN THE PROCESS MODEL

The Afghan refugee crisis is rather unique in that all four spheres or types of factors mentioned--political, human rights, economic and socio-cultural--came into play in driving the refugees out of their home country. First in the political sphere we have the coup of 1978, and the subsequent placement of a communist government in Kabul.
This is followed shortly by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. In the next stage, opposition to the government and Soviet forces means more battles and more governmental retaliation. The army is forcibly conscripting youth to serve against the Mujahideen. Refugees flee to avoid personal injury to themselves or their children. Many flee to avoid Soviet retaliation. The young men flee forced conscription, to avoid fighting their own countrymen.

As the new government continued in power, other changes took place on the social and cultural level. The government instituted land reforms, passed laws against the customary bride fees, and even began schooling of girls. All of these changes were culturally quite abhorrent to traditional Moslems.

Finally, with the extensive war, combined with the Soviet's "scorched earth" policy, all agriculture came grinding to a halt. Many of the irrigation ditches and tunnels were blown up or filled with silt. Roads were destroyed, and many economic areas, such as markets, were deserted.

When the Afghans fled, they went to a country that was politically supportive of the cause of the Afghans in opposing the Soviets and communist government in Kabul. The Pakistanis also directly supported the Afghans in their struggle by providing weapons and training, and allowing the transit of weapons from other countries.
In the human rights sphere, the Pakistanis provided aid, food, protection, and shelter and opposed attempts by the Afghan army to come into Pakistan after the rebels. At the same time, Pakistan also exhibited strong positive "pulls" in the socio-cultural sphere. For example, many of the Pakistanis and Afghans have similar ethnic backgrounds. In the N.W.F.P., all are Pushtun. In many cases they speak common or similar languages. Many of the refugees have been coming and going across the border for years as traders and nomads.

And the most important factor of all, they are all Moslems. The Islamic creed demands that sanctuary be given to those in need. Additionally they are both fighting what they perceive as a common enemy to the Islamic way of life, communism.

And finally, the Pakistanis have provided for the Afghans economically, both directly with aid, food, shelter, and medicine, as well as indirectly by allowing some penetration into the Pakistan economy. There have been some workshops set up for rug weaving and ethnic art work, as well the Afghan trucking industry which has sprung up to supply transport for poor Pakistanis. All these factors still exist, holding the Afghans in Pakistan.

So what needs to be considered is this: would reasonable persons (refugees) decide to leave a country of long standing refuge, where the government sides with them
politically, sees that they are protected and safe, supports them and allows them to make a living, where the local people are similar in manner and custom and religion, and return to a country in a civil war, to face personal danger, ethnic strife, and economic destitution? Is this a reasonable exchange? Or will forced repatriation be necessary?

In the Afghan refugees' situation, all the positive factors drawing the Afghans to Pakistan are intact. All the negative factors pushing the Afghans out of their country are constantly changing. However, the final outcome still is unknown. With the Soviet troop withdrawal and removal of the Kabul government, civil war may still embroil the country as various groups vie for power in the new government. If a civil war takes place among the various factions, the civilian population will be enmeshed in it due to the very nature of the Afghans' guerrilla tactics. The Afghans have always been heavily dependent on local population support. Any civil war in Afghanistan will certainly involve a substantial portion of the population. Not only will the civilians be in the middle of a civil war; they will probably be targeted as logistical support by the opposing factions.

The groups that are currently vying for power have a number of platforms, some calling for Islamic fundamentalist reform, others a return of the former king, and of course
the Russians hope for a pro-Moscow government in Kabul. There is no doubt that, whatever faction or coalition of factions gains power, some group will be opposed to it for political, religious, or ethnic reasons. There is every reason to believe that the civil war will break out along ethnic or religious lines.

Finally we must consider that the country is devastated economically. Huge amounts in aid and extensive local efforts will be required to rebuild the country. If the government is under siege or there is no government infrastructure, there will not be a functioning economy as well. If large parts of the population are fleeing a civil war there will certainly be no rebuilding taking place. With a fleeing population there will be no redevelopment of agriculture, even direct aid distribution to the returnees will be difficult. What can be done then? Should all aid and support be cut off from the Afghans in Pakistan, forcing them home? While appearing as a solution it can only be a temporary one at best. As we know from other forced repatriations, they are painful at best, deadly at the worst.

The most important factor to deal with in Afghanistan is its political crisis, followed by the economic crisis. Afghanistan needs a stable government and an economic base to build from, before one can reasonably expect the refugees to return home.
CHAPTER V

METHODS

Data for this thesis were collected through one hundred interviews conducted in Pakistan during the Fall of 1988. The interviews provided data regarding the background of the refugees, their previous condition in Afghanistan and their life in Pakistan. Besides the direct responses to the questions (such as yes or no, or other answers that have been categorized in the following data sections) all answers and comments made during the interviews were taken down word for word as they were given in English by the respondent or as they were translated by my guides. Some of the open ended responses were quite lengthy and very rich in detail. As an illustration, when asked why they left, a common answer was, "Because of the Russians", the respondents would then go on and give several pages of in-depth explanation about why they left because of the Russians. While those data do not lend themselves well to statistical analysis, they give a great deal of insight into the motivations, feelings and perceptions of the Afghan respondents. These open-ended responses will be used when applicable to try to understand the refugees’ perspective in a fuller social context, and where possible identify the difference between
the "expected" answer and how the respondents really felt. Besides the interview data, field notes were made following each batch of interviews and of any situation or observation relating to the Afghan refugee situation. Also, notes were kept of interviews and conversations with refugee aid workers, Pakistani officials, U.N.H.C.R. workers, and anthropologists and journalists who were in Peshawar and Quetta at the time. This information will be used, when applicable, to try to more fully understand the Afghan refugee situation and the responses of the refugee respondents. Data were collected in both Baluchistan and the North West Frontier Province so as to get a more representative sample of Afghans, although the Afghan refugees in Pakistan are primarily from the border provinces.

The population that was studied was a small segment of the 3.5 million Afghans currently in refuge in Pakistan. Due to the great mobility of the Afghan refugee population in Pakistan and the fact that so many refugees are not registered with the various refugee agencies, or are double registered in different camps, or are registered in camps and then have gone back across the border to continue fighting in the Jihad (as well as my own monetary, time and political restraints), it was not feasible or possible to choose a random sample. Instead, I used Afghans as guides and requested them to take me to many different refugee
camps in the areas around Peshawar and Quetta, in order to get as wide a range of subjects as possible. Overall, sixteen different camps were visited. The respondents were selected on the basis of availability; some knew the guides, most did not. If the guide knew someone in the camp, we would go to his hut and ask him to send sons or friends off to collect those willing to be interviewed. People were also stopped in the streets and asked to be interviewed. We did this if the guide did not know anyone in the camp. Never in my presence did anyone refuse to be interviewed; most were very willing.

To work with as wide a range of subjects as possible, if one person from a specific family was interviewed, we would not interview others from that same family. Also, if we interviewed several people from one village in Afghanistan, we then moved on, trying to talk with people from many different areas. If we interviewed several older men, we would ask for some young men and vice versa. The same procedures were followed for the educated or uneducated and professions, such as farmer versus teacher or resistance leader versus follower. Once the respondent was selected, the guide and I would explain the nature of the research project and who I was. The respondents were not paid for their time.

Of the three different Afghan guides with whom I worked, the first I met in Portland, the second was arranged
by the Belgium S.O.S. Center (a refugee aid group) in
Peshawar, and the third guide was arranged through the Save
the Children Federation (a refugee aid group) in Quetta.
The guides were paid for their time and chosen on the basis
of their fluency in English (all were very fluent) and their
knowledge of the surrounding camps. I spent several hours
with each of the guides before the interviews explaining the
project and the nature of each question. I stressed the
importance of asking the questions of each respondent in the
same way, without leading any of the subjects. The few
times I was not able to work with the guides, I went to
various sections of Peshawar and Quetta that had Afghan
shops and merchants and requested to interview them. I
deliberately turned down an offer from the Peshawar minister
of refugees for his office to provide me with a guide, as
well as turning down offers from two resistance leaders, one
in Peshawar and one in Quetta, to provide me with guides. I
did this because I had been warned that they would only take
me to those whom they wanted me to interview.

Approximately half the refugees spoke little or no
English, and the guides acted as translators. Those that
did speak English I interviewed directly. Of the refugees
that spoke no English, I was able to verify the yes and no
responses to questions, where they were from and how many
children they had and other short answers, as I had studied
Pushtun and spoke it a little. During the interviews, the
questions were asked off a typed interview sheet, and all refugees were asked the same questions in the same order and same manner, except for the first ten respondents which I used as a sample survey. These first ten respondents suggested an additional twelve questions, which were asked of all the following subjects.

During the interviews, responses were recorded in writing in English, by myself, as they were given, either directly or through the translation of my guides.

Despite the problems of conducting this survey in difficult conditions, such as language barriers, it is believed that the research represents reliable data given the situation.

PROBLEMS IN THE METHODOLOGY

Qualifiers

1. I attempted to conduct the interviews anonymously, but most of the Afghans kept insisting on telling me their names. So I took all of their names in order to remain consistent. However, I have been careful not to use any of the names in the reporting of the data, nor have I ever listed the names with any of the data being analyzed.

2. The question of age is an interesting one for the Afghans. You are either a young man, a middle aged man, or an old man. Some people honestly admitted that they did not know their exact chronological age. I was told later by
Sar-Baz that, in general, Afghans do not keep track of their birthdays. Based on the conversations with the respondents about two-thirds knew when they were born. If people were not sure I asked them to make the best guess they could.

3. Enquiring about ethnic group or tribe resulted in mainly a Pushtun response, but there were also some Tajiks and an occasional Dari speaker. Some responses though were simply, "I’m Afghan" (which generally means Pushtun).

4. The marital status question was interesting in that people would give me shocked looks if they had children themselves, and answer, "Why of course I’m married". In general, if the men were old enough to be married they were.

5. Questions about the number of children in each family and their ages evoked differing responses. Children are the Afghans’ great pride and joy. They love to show them off, especially their sons, as in the case of the little boy who was presented to me to sing the song about "death to the Russians." Other men were interviewed while holding little squirming two or three year old daughters in their arms, yet they wouldn’t admit to having girl children. They would say "Yes I have two children... oh, and one daughter." Also, many of them weren’t sure about the ages of their children and would reply "Oh... he is two or maybe three." I made it a point to ask people how many sons and daughters they had. As far as children’s ages, I asked parents to give me a specific age or their best guess.
6. Answers to the questions about home town revealed that many people lived in rural communities and would give the name of the nearest big town and the province they lived in. In the analysis of the data, province was used to determine geographic location (except for those who said they were from Kabul).

7. The years of education question revealed that many people were literate who had never been to school. Many were self taught, or had gone to the mosques where they had been helped by imans or other learned men who would go to the mosque to help those who wanted to learn. I was told that this was customary in Afghanistan as a way for people to learn. The three levels of education seen among the respondents were: formally educated at a school; informally educated, at a mosque; and illiterates with no education.

8. When asked the reasons for leaving Afghanistan, some responded "because of the communists," others "because of the Soviets;" some gave the reason as the war, others say all of these. The answers given were difficult to analyze since some were so short yet were meant as a global response, others were so lengthy and had so much detail that they fit into all of the categories.

9. The respondents were asked, "When did you leave?" Most answers were straight forward, although a couple of people stated they had never left their country, that they were just "visiting" in Pakistan before returning home.
Others said they left then went back several times. When people said they left and reestablished their home and family in Pakistan was the answer I used for when they fled.

10. People were asked where they lived in Pakistan. Some lived in camps, others lived in camps that were really spontaneous settlements. Others, especially the well off, do not stay in the camps, but are merely registered in the camps and in fact live in town or in the nearest city.

11. People were asked, "Do you work here in Pakistan?" Many had regular jobs such as drivers or merchants. Others had apprentice positions such as tailors or masons through the local VOLAGS, such as the Belgium center. Others said no they had no job except living or that their job was the jihad and helping the Mujahideen.

12. Respondents were asked, "What was your job in Afghanistan?" This seemed rather straightforward, once they understood that it was their occupation before the war that I was interested in. What surprised me is the huge number of young men who had been students in their early teens or younger, and only Mujahideen since. It raised the same concerns for myself that others have noted: that this is a whole generation of young men who know nothing except fighting in a war.

13. The respondents were asked, "Is your family here?" This was fairly straightforward. For the majority of men, it was a foregone conclusion. Because if they had come out
of Afghanistan due to heavy fighting, it was almost a sure bet that they had brought out their families long before. Of course some of their families had been killed and a few still had relatives inside. Then there is the question of what is family. For the Afghans, it is considered in its extended form. For some, family includes cousins, aunts, uncles, siblings, and in-laws, besides the regular accompaniment of what we would consider families of fathers, mothers and direct children.

14. "Will you return before the Soviet's withdrawal?"

This and subsequent questions which I see as being "repatriation" questions seemed to be the most difficult in that the Afghans see these in a very mono-ideological way. What I mean by this is that when I would ask this and other repatriation questions, I would get a comprehensive response which usually included most of the following ideological components: "I'll return when the communist repression ends, the puppet government falls, there is Islamic rule, and we can live in peace." It was difficult to separate out the various issues. I would ask, "Well, what about just the withdrawal of Soviet forces?", and I would receive the whole response once again. Basically, though, most responded that, "Yes, the withdrawal of Soviet forces was the most important issue of all." If the respondents would not give me a direct answer I would repeat the specific question until I would get an answer specific to it.
15. The respondents were asked, "Will you return to Afghanistan if the Mujahideen and the other parties are fighting for power?" Besides the problem noted above, this question was interesting in that many people refused to admit that this could happen. On the one hand, I think a lot of people had been told by their leaders that this would not happen; and, on the other hand, I think they might have been a little miffed about the way the western press treated the issue - which was that as soon as the Soviets left, a huge civil war would break out among all the groups trying to gain control of the country. However, these people had all been fighting together and cooperating. I think many actually believed that after being in the jihad together that they had a bond that superseded any previous rivalries or jealousies.

16. One of the biggest limitations in this research project revolves around the relation between what respondents say they will do, and what they are actually likely to do in the future. One of the intentions of this project was to be able to predict refugee flows and possible repatriation based on the responses given by the Afghan subjects who were interviewed. Because the data were collected at a time now over three years before any large scale repatriation was even possible, time has become an intervening variable impacting beliefs and possible future actions. As Herbert Blumer noted in his work in 1948,
"Public opinion must obviously be recognized as having its setting in a society and as being a function of that society in operation. The formation of public opinion occurs through the interaction of groups" (Blumer 1948, pp. 543-544). The point Blumer was making was that opinion is not just the sum of individual beliefs. As he notes, "Public opinion does not occur through an interaction of disparate individuals who share equally in the process." (Ibid, pg. 544) More specific to the Afghan situation and this research is the relation between intention and behavior. As Fishbein and Azjen noted in their work, Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research (1975), the best way to predict a people’s behavior is to ask them if they are going to perform that behavior. Fishbein and Azjen believed that there was a high correlation between intention to perform a particular behavior and a person’s actually performing that behavior. However, they go on to qualify this by noting, "The longer the time interval between measurement of intention and observation of behavior, the greater the probability that the individual may obtain new information or that certain events will occur which will change his intention...The greater the number of intervening steps, the lower the intention behavior correlation will be" (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975, pp. 369-370). All three of these authors' work has important implications for this research. The Afghans are
ideologically oriented, and very much collectively so. While they had pragmatic objections to the Soviets and communists they were also wrapped in an ideological/emotional blanket. Their stated intentions bordered on attitudes and opinions, in sense that their responses were probably closer to Blumer’s opinions than to Fishbein and Ajzen’s intentions. Despite my efforts, it was very difficult to interview people in private. Often their relatives and neighbors wanted to be present. Even when I would have the observers leave, they would hang around outside and peer in the doors or windows, putting latent pressure on the respondent to give the correct collective answer. Approximately half the interviews were done with others present. As noted previously the Afghans are to a large degree tribal and they rely on tribal leadership. According to current contacts I have in Pakistan, even with recent developments, the leaders are discouraging wide scale return currently.

As far as behavioral intentions at the time of the interviews (1988), the respondents did not appear to really know what would be happening in the future. When they were asked to give specific times of when an event might occur (such as repatriation), they would say "Only Allah knows." It was assumed that the Kabul government would collapse with the withdrawal of the Soviets in the Spring of 1989. Many refugees felt there would not be fighting among the parties
once the communists were removed. When the refugees were asked when they would return only six percent gave an actual time, the rest said either, "When Allah wishes," or they gave a list of preconditions. What this illustrates is that, despite what they said, the relation between their intentions and possible repatriation behavior is a very complex one. This relation is certainly heavily impacted by the time interval and intervening steps, as noted by Fishbein and Ajzen, as well as the issue Blumer raised of the relationship between individual opinion and collective belief.

17. Another important consideration is that the number of cases as well as the type of sample do not allow for a multivariate statistical analysis. In the following data presentation and analysis, I do not attempt to control for intervening variables or do multivariate analysis. I will examine the relations between pairs of variables in the form of cross tabulations. I must also acknowledge that not enough questions were asked about the actual decision-making process by which the refugees left Afghanistan or the process by which they will decide to repatriate. Even though the respondents were asked as individuals, they certainly will rely to a great extent on their leadership in the decision making process. One must also recognize that the decision to return and when to return will not be left solely to the Afghans but will be impacted, if not
manipulated, by foreign governments, relief agencies, and Pakistan.

These qualifiers do not mean that the view and intentions of the refugees based on their answers in 1988 will be unimportant. However, I do not intend to present these findings as the sole predictor of repatriation behavior that may take place in the future. Instead, I present these data as part of what will be a very complex process and in all probability will take years to resolve. Based on past refugee flows and repatriation, the Afghan situation will probably never be completely resolved. I believe that the orientations and answers given by the refugees I interviewed will be part of this complex process, and I present the data and conclusions in that context.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS

The questions and findings are broken down into three major areas. The first is basic demographics. The second is intervening variables, such as how much aid have you received from Pakistan (these are headed with IN). Third are issues directly affecting repatriation (these are headed with RP). Since there were 100 subjects, in all of the basic findings presented below the percent is the same as actual number of respondents. For example, 50 percent is equal to an N of 50.

Of the 100 subjects interviewed, the ages ranged from 15 to 70 years, with a mean of 35.85 and a mode of 30.

Of the respondents, 50 percent were 31 years old or less. This is a characteristic grouping of agriculturalists living in a non-industrialized society. (See Table I.)

The respondents were primarily Pushtun speakers, totaling 83 percent. Tajik speakers made up 13 percent of the group, and four percent were other. (See Table II.)

Of the refugees interviewed, 76 percent were married, 20 percent were single, and four percent widowed. (See Table III.) Virtually all people of marrying age were either married or widowed. My refugee assistant claimed that
### TABLE I

**AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 yrs.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 yrs.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 yrs.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II

**ETHNIC GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pushutun</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajik</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkoman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III

**MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Afghans never divorced because no one would want to marry someone who has been divorced. Nor would they let their sister or daughter marry a man who has divorced.

The respondents with children were 74 percent of the group and they were all married. In fact most of the refugees were surprised to be asked if they had children. The typical response was, "Why of course I have children; I'm married."

At the same time unmarried subjects expressed surprise at being asked if they had children. Of the respondents, 26 percent had no children. Of those with children, 55 percent of the total sample had three or more children and 19 percent had seven or more. (See Table IV.)

In questioning further about their children, 50 percent of the sample had children who were five years old or less and 67 percent had children who were 14 years or less. (See Table V.) While the large numbers of children are a characteristic of non-industrialized societies, I was also informed by a number of Afghans that Allah and Islam wanted them to have lots of children. I was even admonished for being married and not having children yet. I was scolded, "If you Americans weren't so greedy for your cars and television sets, you could then afford to have lots of children."

The respondents were primarily men, 96 percent. Only four women were interviewed due to the cultural restrictions
TABLE IV

NUMBER OF CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven +</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE V

AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Five</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the interactions between men and women. I felt that even though the number of women interviewed were limited that they might offer some possible insights on potential differences. The women that were interviewed showed no consistent differences in their responses from those of the men.

Eight percent of the interviewees claimed to be party leaders or tribal leaders and six percent were visibly wounded or crippled due to involvement in the war.

When asked where their homes were, 11 different provinces were listed by the respondents. The largest group by far, 45 percent, were from the Ningrahar province. The next largest group, 22 percent, were from Kabul. (See map on Origin of Refugee Respondents, and see Table VI.)

When asked about their educational background, there was a wide disparity in levels of education. Thirty eight percent of the subjects had no formal education (See Table VII.)

For the Afghans, there are two types of educations that are utilized. The first is the standard education of schools, textbooks and hired teachers teaching a standard educational curriculum. The second type of education is going to the local mosque and being taught to read the Koran by the local Mullah. I was informed that if someone wanted to learn to read and write he or she would go to the mosque and ask for help, and either the Mullah or some other
Figure 4. Origin of refugee respondents by percent.
### TABLE VI

**PROVINCE FROM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jowzjan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningrahar</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qandahar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruzgan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunduz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paktia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapisa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VII

**YEARS OF EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 +</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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learned man would teach those wanting it. Sometimes they were taught to read just the Koran, but sometimes they would practice reading other things as well.

When the refugees were asked why they originally left Afghanistan, 28 percent answered simply, "Because of the Russians." Twenty-one percent said, "Because of communism and its opposition to Islam." Twenty percent said, "Because of invasion and the war." And 24 percent said, "Because of fighting and the attacks." Of the subjects, four percent claimed to have left because they had either been put in jail or were threatened with being jailed. (See Table VIII.)

Another way to consider these statistics is that almost half, 49 percent, left for what seemed to be a combination of safety concerns and ideological reasons. While I had hoped to have clear answers distinguishing safety versus ideological reasons, what became obvious after conducting the interviews (and based on my observations and field notes) was that for some the Russians were synonymous with fears about safety, as they were identified as the source of the bombing and fighting, while others were ideologically opposed to the Russians due to communism's opposition to Islam. In future research of this type, questions concerning a foreign occupying force should be broken down into sub-categories of fear for personal safety and ideological opposition. Forty-four percent would appear to be obvious safety concerns of invasion, war, fighting, and
attacks. Unlike other refugee populations around the world, not a single refugee subject mentioned fleeing his or her home country for economic considerations. In sharp contrast, based on my field notes and interviews and conversations with Pakistanis, the Pakistanis' general belief is that in fact the Afghans are there for economic reasons.

The subjects who were interviewed had left their homes in Afghanistan anywhere from one year up to ten years before these interviews took place. Thirty percent of the subjects had been refugees for nine to ten years and 74 percent had been refugees for five years or more. The fact that such a large population of people have been refugees for so long causes concern since it appears that the longer refugees remain out of their home country, the less is their likelihood return. (See Table IX.)

Seventy-five percent of the 100 refugees interviewed were scattered among the 16 refugee camps within Pakistan; the remaining 25 percent resided in Jamrud tribal area (also in Pakistan), or in the cities of Peshawar or Quetta or in the town of Hyadabad.

When asked what their jobs were in Pakistan, 22 percent said they had none. Eight percent listed themselves as leaders, 12 percent were teachers and 48 percent claimed their job as the Jihad; the remainder fell into other categories with less than three respondents each.
TABLE VIII
REASONS FOR LEAVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Given</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion/War</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting/Attacks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism/Islam Opposition</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail/Threatened</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IX
WHEN DID YOU LEAVE HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 yrs.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 yrs.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 yrs.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked what their occupations were in Afghanistan, 23 percent reported being farmers, 24 percent were students, 10 percent were teachers, seven percent were merchants, five percent were clerks, five percent claimed to be leaders, and 22 percent were scattered among several occupations.

One important consideration affecting repatriation is whether or not a refugee leaves his family behind or takes them into refuge as well. Of the people interviewed, 95 percent had their families with them in Pakistan, only one percent had part of his family in Pakistan and only four percent did not have their families with them.

When asked which party the subject belonged to, 20 percent, the largest group, were members of the Hezb-I-Islami party run by Moli Halis. Seventeen percent were members of the party run by Gulbiden Hekmatyer. Another 17 percent were members of the Mohaz-A-Mili, and 14 percent belonged to the Jamiat Islami. The remainder were distributed among the three other major parties and the five minor splinter parties. Contrary to the perception that party membership is an important part of Afghan life, the Afghans interviewed seemed not to have a great deal of concern with regard to which party they belonged. Many explained that they had simply joined the party that was in charge of which ever camp they had settled into or which their relatives belonged to.

When asked which party should govern in the new Afghan
government, 34 percent said, "Any Islamic party as long as it is Islamic." Twenty-five percent said "Any party," nine percent said, "All of them should govern," and eight percent said "None are able to." Only eight percent of the refugees stated that, "The party they belonged to should run the new government in Afghanistan." I think these answers are significant to note in that they illustrate the difference between the western press and leaders' perceptions of party importance and what the refugees were willing to say.

IN) When the refugees were asked how important religious freedom was to them, on a scale of the most important factor to not a very important factor, 22 percent said it was the most important, 58 percent said it was very important, 13 percent said it was important, and three percent said not as important as other factors.

For the Afghans the term "religious freedom" meant freedom to practice Islam, not freedom to practice any religion.

IN) When asked what help they have received from Pakistan, 41 percent answered, "They gave us shelter." "Shelter, aid, and food were given," claimed 18 percent, and 10 percent replied, "They gave us wheat or food." Often, after the initial answer, the Afghans would add that in fact the Pakistanis stole much of the international aid and relief supplies for their own use. I believe that this illustrates some of the underlying tensions and distrust
that existed between the Afghans and their Pakistani hosts.

When asked if they expected more help from the Pakistanis after they returned home, 28 percent said, "Yes," 21 percent did not know, 14 percent said, "Maybe," 13 percent said, "Hopefully," and seven percent answered, "No." The rest answered in other categories.

The refugees were asked if they thought the Pakistanis would ever force them to leave. Fifty-two percent answered, "No." Only six percent answered, "Yes." Eleven percent said, "It depends on the future government." Nine percent said, "Maybe," and the rest did not answer or did not know.

Another aspect the refugees were questioned on was their perception of what would be needed when they returned. The largest category, 42 percent, gave a long list of necessities including money, tents, food, tractors, building materials, and agricultural materials. The next largest group, 32 percent, answered, "We need everything." Ten percent of the subjects listed immediate needs such as housewares, utensils, food and clothing. And finally, nine percent said, "We need cash."

Essentially, 74 percent indicated that they recognize that they will need almost everything when they return.

The refugees were asked what they planned on taking back with them when they return. Forty percent said, "Everything I have." A surprising 27 percent said, "We have nothing to take." This I can verify. The people I
visited and especially those with whom I stayed had nothing but their string beds, a few clothes and some cooking pots and cooking utensils. Seventeen percent said they would take "Clothes, baggages and beds."

RP) When asked how the refugees would rebuild their war destroyed homes, 30 percent answered, "International aid." Twenty one percent said, "Cash," 19 percent said, "Work and aid." Twelve percent answered with, "Hard work," and eleven percent were hopeful of the United Nations. The refugees were then asked what work they would do when they went home. Twenty-four percent said they would be farmers, 16 percent said they would work for the government or the army, 11 percent said they would be students, and five percent claimed they were too old to work. Twenty-five percent listed other occupations.

RP) With the concerns over possible violence, the refugees were asked if there would be a problem with bandits or fighting with all the heavily armed Afghans. Thirty percent thought there would be such a problem. Twenty-three percent said, "No problems," while thirty three percent claimed, "If there is an Islamic government, there will be no fighting."

RP) Tribal ties are an important consideration for the Afghans. When asked if their whole tribe would return as a group, eighty percent said, "Yes." Fourteen percent said, "No, we would go individually."
When asked who would make the decision when it was time to go back, 48 percent said, "The leader of the tribe." Fourteen percent claimed they would decide individually, and fourteen percent said, "The parties would decide."

RP) When the refugees were asked how they would return to Afghanistan, 19 percent said they had walked to Pakistan and they would walk back to Afghanistan. Thirty-five percent said they would go by truck or bus, if they got help, and by foot if not. Eighteen percent said that they would return by bus or truck. Twenty-two percent said that they would return in any way, that how was not important. This is not a naive answer as it first might appear. Conversations with several journalists and aid workers who had been inside Afghanistan with the Mujahideen, verified that most transportation was by foot. At times hundreds of miles were covered on foot depending on where groups were heading.

RP) In trying to determine which refugees would remain in Pakistan, the subjects were asked if they thought the rich Afghans would stay in Pakistan? Sixty-six percent said, "No." Thirteen percent said, "Maybe," and nine percent said, "Yes." At the same time, the subjects were asked if they thought the students in the universities in Pakistan would finish their education before they returned. Fifty one percent said, "No, they would not finish their education. They would return as soon as possible." Twenty
seven percent said, "Yes, the students would stay and finish their educations," or that, "They should stay for the good of Afghanistan." And eleven percent said, "Maybe," or "It depends on the students."

The refugees were then asked if they knew anyone personally who would stay in Pakistan? Eighty-two percent said, "No," and six percent said, "Yes."

One respondent took me aside after a series of interviews with other refugees and explained in private that in fact many refugees would not return home, due to tribal rivalries or feuds, or because they had established their business in Pakistan, but that it was not safe to acknowledge this fact because everyone was expected to return to their homeland.

Finally, the subjects were asked if someone stays, will their family stay with them? Fifty-two percent said, "Yes," while 22 percent said, "No." Sixteen percent said "Maybe," or "It depends on them."

RP) In trying to determine certain factors that could either block or encourage repatriation, the refugees were asked a series of questions about whether they thought they would return under certain situations. The first of these questions was, "Will you return before the Russians leave Afghanistan?" An overwhelmingly ninety-nine percent said they would not. Only one of the subjects said he would return before the Russians left but this was only so he
could continue to fight the Russians.

When asked if the refugees would return if the parties or Mujahideen were fighting for power among themselves, sixty percent said, "No" and twenty percent said, "Yes, they would go back to try and stop the fighting." Eighteen percent insisted that the Mujahideen and parties would not fight among themselves as long as there was an Islamic government. Many Afghans have been seriously injured by anti-personnel mines planted in Afghanistan. When asked if they would return before the mines were removed, 65 percent said they would not, while 32 percent said they would go back, that it was their duty to help remove the mines. Three percent said, "Maybe," or that they would prefer that they were removed.

RP) When considering the make up of the future government of Afghanistan, the refugees were queried on whether or not they would return if there was not an Islamic government. Ninety-five percent said that they would not return if there was not an Islamic government. This question, when asked, seemed to invoke surprise among the subjects. Many would look at me as though I were a somewhat "backward child" and patiently explain to me in such terms as, "The whole reason that we are fighting the war is because we do not have an Islamic government."

Only one person out of the 100 subjects said that he would return if there was not an Islamic government.
RP) The refugees were also asked if they would return if King Zahir Shah returned from exile and governed Afghanistan. Forty-four percent of the refugees claimed they would not. Many even said they would fight against him if he did return; it was his fault that the communists had gained control in Afghanistan in the first place. However, 36 percent said they would return, that they supported the King; and 12 percent claimed that they would return as long as the King had an Islamic government.

RP) With the complete destruction of the economic infrastructure in Afghanistan, it was considered important to ask if the refugees would return if there were no jobs in Afghanistan. Ninety-six percent said, "Yes" they would and went on to explain to me that they were not fighting the war or living as refugees because of a concern over jobs, that the moment the war was over and there was an Islamic government, they would immediately return home. It became apparent, after interviews and conversations with refugee aid workers in Peshawar and Quetta, that the vast majority of farms, fields, houses and irrigation systems along border areas and areas of intense fighting within Afghanistan had been completely devastated by the Soviets in pursuing their "scorched earth policy." Despite what the Afghans said in interviews, the vast majority have become economic refugees on top of fleeing for fear of safety or out of ideological concerns. What remains to be seen is how the refugees deal
with their economic losses. The conversations and open ended answers indicated that many of the refugees knew their farms, fields and houses had been destroyed; in some cases they were temporarily returning to Afghanistan and rebuilding or replanting and then returning to Pakistan.

The refugees were also asked if they would return if there were no schools for their children. Eighty percent said "Yes" that they would return whether or not there were schools; and 18 percent insisted that, "If there was an Islamic government there would be schools." Only two people said that they would not return under those conditions.

RP) An important concern for the refugees is the make up of the future government, an issue which I believe is not sufficiently recognized by the international communities. When asked if they would return if there was a coalition government with the communists and the Mujahideen, 80 percent said, "No." Only 10 percent said "Yes," and this was only if the Mujahideen held the majority of the power in the government.

RP) Since the refugees are so group oriented, they were asked if their families had the same opinions they were expressing. Seventy percent said, "Yes," and only one person said, "No." The remainder qualified their answers.

RP) I felt it necessary to ask if there were any other important issues that I had not asked about. Fifty percent said, "No," while 16 percent said the refugees needed more
help and aid. Eleven percent expressed concerns about human rights and safety. Ten percent listed concerns about the political situation.

RP) The refugees were asked when they thought all the refugees would go home. Only four percent actually gave a time, ranging from two months to a year. The rest would only list preconditions which had to be met before the refugees would leave. Twenty seven percent said, "When Allah wishes," or "Allah knows better." Thirty one percent said, "When there is an Islamic government and when the Russians leave." Six percent said, "When there is peace and the Russians leave."

What these answers illustrate is that the refugees don’t know or even have a set time themselves, which is a very frustrating situation if you are a refugee. More important is the fact that there are, according to the refugees interviewed, a number of preconditions which must be met before they will return. The most important of these was the withdrawal of the Russians. This is obviously not the only condition as evidenced by the continuing refusal of the refugees to repatriate. This listing of preconditions is tied directly to what Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) had noted that the more the preconditions the lower the possibility of the intended behavior actually occurring.
CHAPTER VII

CROSS TABULATION/RELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES

When looking at the relationships among variables it should be noted that cross tabulations were done only in those areas identified in the hypotheses as dependent and independent variables. The independent variables were: reason for flight, age of respondent, family status, time in host country, ideological orientation, geographic distance or obstacles to return home, economic and socio-cultural assimilation in the host country, and then a set of personal perceptions of the refugees, including their perception of economic opportunities at home, the degree of socio-cultural similarity with the groups in the area they would be repatriating to, and finally their fear for personal safety when they do return. The dependent variables are the specific questions formatted as, "Would you return under these conditions?" The conditions include: Will you return to Afghanistan before the Soviet’s withdrawal? Will you return if the Mujahideen and the Parties are fighting for power? Will you return before the removal of the mines? Would you return if King Zahir Shah ran the government? Will you return if there are no jobs in Afghanistan? Will you return if there are no schools in Afghanistan? and Would
you return if there was a coalition government with the communists?

The literature suggests that if the original reason for flight continues, it will block willingness to repatriate. This would be a minus, or a push blocking return according to Bogue (1969) and Lee (1966). When the reasons for flight were cross tabulated against a willingness to return before the Soviets left, of those who fled due to the Russians, 100 percent (N=28) said they would not return before the Russians withdrew. It should be noted that overall 99 percent (N=99) of all respondents said they would not return before the Soviets left, whether they left due to fear for personal safety or out of opposition to communism. I believe that what this illustrates is that opposition to the Soviets was both ideological as well as relating to fear for personal safety, in that the Soviets were seen as both the cause of the threat to safety and as the promoters of communism.

When the reasons for flight were cross tabbed against a willingness to repatriate if the Mujahideen and parties were fighting for power (which would be a minus or a push to keep refugees from returning), it was found that 89.3 percent (N=25) of those who said they had fled because of the Russians would not return if the parties were fighting for power, compared to 55 percent (N=11) of those who cited the Russians, war and invasion as their reason for leaving,
compared to 50 percent (N=12) of those who cited fighting, aggression and attacks and 42 percent (N=9) of those who cited communism and its opposition to Islam as their reason for leaving. In other words those most willing to return if the parties were fighting for power, were those who fled due to communism and its opposition to Islam (ideological concerns). This in my view supports the notion that those who fled for fear of personal safety were less willing to return if there is still a risk to their safety. (See Table X.)

When asked about their concern over mines (which would be a minus or a push blocking return), 75 percent (N=21) of those who left because of the Russians said they would not return if the mines were still in place, compared to 65 percent (N=13) of those who left due to the Russians, war and invasion, compared to 62.5 percent (N=15) of those who cited fighting, aggression and attacks, and 61.9 percent (N=13) of those who cited communism and its opposition to Islam. It is interesting to note that higher proportions of respondents say they will not return if the mines are still in place than if the parties were fighting for power. It would seem that those groups who cited fear for personal safety as a reason to flee are more concerned about the mines as a safety issue than the parties fighting for power. This is probably due to the fact that many people had already been killed or wounded by the mines, whereas the
TABLE X
WILL YOU RETURN IF THE PARTIES ARE FIGHTING CROSS TABULATED WITH THE REASONS FOR LEAVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did you leave</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Islam Gov. now</th>
<th>Don't</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians and War</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invasion or invaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting, Aggression or Attacks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism and its Opposition to Islam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in Jail, or threatened</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
issue of the parties fighting for power after the Soviet withdrawal was something hypothetical that might take place in the future. This finding might also be impacted by the belief that there would be no fighting among the parties. Eighteen percent of all the respondents (N=18) refused to answer this question "Yes" or "No" but would insist that there would be no fighting if there was an Islamic government. One observation recorded in my field notes was of the six young men who were brought to me to be interviewed, each of them had lost a foot or leg or both feet so recently that blood was still seeping through the bandages on their stumps. Many mine victims were simply killed on the spot or died shortly after their injury. The mines were a very real danger and were recognized as such. (See TABLE XI.)

When asked if they would return if there was not an Islamic government (which would be a minus or a push blocking return), only one person said "Yes"; this person had left because of communism and its opposition to Islam. One person said "Maybe" under these conditions; this person had fled because of the Russians. One person said he would prefer that there was an Islamic government; this person had fled due to Russians, war and invasion. One person didn’t know, and one didn’t answer. The other 95 respondents said they would not return if there were not an Islamic government. I think this illustrates that, even though many
### TABLE XI

**WILL YOU RETURN IF THE MINES ARE IN PLACE CROSS TABULATED WITH THE REASONS FOR LEAVING AFGHANISTAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did you leave</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Would Prefer</th>
<th>Don't now</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians and War</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion or Invaders</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting, Aggression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Attacks</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism and its Opposition to Islam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in Jail, or threatened</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the Afghans have very serious safety concerns, ideological considerations can be just as important or more important than safety issues. However, it is important to note that, despite what the Afghans I interviewed said, many aid workers believe that the Afghans would probably return under a broadly based coalition government. In an interview with the Afghan Refugee Commissionerate (a Pakistani), he insisted that, despite what the Afghans claimed about being unwilling to accept a non-Islamic government or a coalition government, as long as there was stability and an end to the fighting most Afghans would probably return home.

When considering the issue of the Shah, overall 44 percent (N=44) said they would not return if King Zahir Shah returned to run the government. These were fairly evenly distributed among the reasons for flight. The return of the Shah is an issue that for some people would be a positive pull to return or a plus, but for others would be a minus or a push blocking return. While recording the open ended responses, it was common for people to explain that they would return under Zahir Shah because he was their King and had the best hope of taking charge of the new government. Those who opposed the return of Zahir Shah would often add the comment that they opposed him because he had allowed the communists to take over and therefore the Afghan war was his fault. The issue of the return of Zahir Shah is similar to that of non-Islamic government. Even though many
respondents indicate that they would not return under the Shah, the Afghan Commissionerate and refugee aid workers in Peshawar and Quetta insisted in interviews and conversations that in fact the refugees would probably return even if they opposed Zahir Shah. One estimate quoted to me by members of the S.O.S. Belgium group (an aid agency) was that, if Zahir Shah returned, as many as 90 percent of all refugees would return, even those who opposed him.

When asked if they would return under a coalition government, 95 percent (N=95) of the respondents said they would not return if there was a coalition government between the Mujahideen and the communists. The one respondent who said he would return under a coalition government had fled because of communism and its opposition to Islam. One respondent who fled because of the Russians said maybe he would return, and one respondent said he would prefer an Islamic government before he returned. There was also one "No," answer and one "Don’t know." Due to the limited number of responses in these other categories, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the Afghans I spoke to appeared to feel very strongly about having an Islamic government. Again, what the Afghans claim and what I was told in interviews and conversations with Pakistani, Afghan and western aid workers were at times contradictory. Two UNHCR workers in Peshawar insisted that, except for the leaders, the political situation did not matter to the
common people, that as long as there was stability and the Russians left it did not really matter who ran the future government.

All of the reasons for flight that were given by the refugees would fall under Kunz's definition of a "Reactive Fate Group," in that they were reacting to a situation (Kunz 1981, pg. 44).

If there is a flight of pro-communist supporters out of Afghanistan with the fall of the communist regime, under Kunz's scheme they would be a "Self-Fulfilling Purpose Group" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). They would be considered this in that they were the makers of their own situation.

The first hypothesis would be supported in that the issues most closely related to the reasons for flight (such as Soviet presence, a communist government, the possibility of the parties fighting and the existence of mines) that still existed were identified by the majority of refugees as conditions under which they would not return. I believe this illustrates that Bogue's and Lee's original contention about migration would be supported: that the decision to migrate is to a certain extent based on the sum of "pluses" and "minuses" (Lee 1966, pp. 50-52) or "pushes" and "pulls" (Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754).

Normally it is difficult if not impossible to really test the relationship between intention and actual behavior (unless one follows the subjects over time). I think though
that, based on what has happened since 1988, and what the refugees interviewed for this project said, we can assume a correlation between intention and actual behavior. Despite the withdrawal of Soviet forces in February, 1989, twenty-three months later the UNHCR estimated that five percent or less of the refugees had repatriated (based on conversations with UNHCR personnel). What this means is that the first hypothesis would be supported by observable behavior; that is, the more factors causing flight that still remain, the less the likelihood of repatriation. I believe that even more important is the fact that a number of factors have arisen since the original causes of flight, and they also can and have blocked return. The issue of the parties fighting or the Shah returning, the removal of the mines, and economic devastation are just a few examples.

The following cross tabulations using age as an independent variable are tests of the hypothesis which states, "The relationship between age and probability of repatriation is curvilinear." Age was chosen due to Lee's identification of it as a way to identify stages in a life cycle (Lee 1966, pp. 51-52). When age is used as an independent variable in determining willingness to repatriate, there is little or no variation for some dependent variables. As stated previously, only one person said he would return before the withdrawal of the Soviets; this person was in the 55-64 year old range. All other
respondents said they would not return before the Soviets withdrew. The responses have so little variation that it is not possible to support or reject the hypothesis in this case.

When age was used as the independent variable in determining whether or not people would return home if the parties were fighting for power, the highest percentage of those who said that they would not return home were the youngest group interviewed. For the 15-24 year olds 76.2 percent (N=16) said they would not return under these conditions. This compares to the 25-34 year old category in which 59.4 percent (N=19) said they would not return under these conditions. Between ages 35 and 44, 70 percent (N=14) said they would not return. Between ages 45 and 54, 42.9 percent (N=six) said they would not return if the parties were fighting. Fifty percent (N=four) in the 55-64 year old group said they would not return under these conditions; and the 65-70 year old group had 20 percent (N=one) who said he would not. (See Table XII.) While on the surface there appears to be a curvilinear relationship, some of the cells are so small (one or two cases), that one cannot say a clear relationship exists. One general relationship that does come out is that up to age 44 those who say they will not return if the parties are fighting outnumber those who would by six to one. After the age of 45, those who say they will return and those who say they will not return are almost
### TABLE XII

**WILL YOU RETURN IF THE PARTIES ARE FIGHTING**

**CROSS TABULATED WITH**

**AGE OF RESPONDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Column Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Column Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evenly divided. While there does not appear to be a curvilinear relationship, there appears to be a roughly increasing willingness to return if the parties are fighting as one gets older. Perhaps the older respondents did not believe the parties would fight, or maybe they did not believe it would involve them if they did. Another consideration is that the younger respondents (between 15-24) have in some cases spent more than half of their lives in refuge in Pakistan; perhaps they are not as attached to Afghanistan as those who have lived in their homeland most of their lives. These findings would not support the hypothesis about a curvilinear relationship between age and willingness to repatriate.

When age was cross tabulated with the question of whether the refugees would return before the mines were removed, 61.9 percent (N=13) of the 15-24 age group said they would not return before the mines were removed, while 65.6 percent (N=21) of the 25-34 age group said they would not return. This compares to 75 percent (N=15) of the 35-44 age group who said they would not return, 57.1 percent (N=eight) of the 45-54 group, 37.5 percent (N=three) of the 55-64 age group, and 100 percent (N=five) of the 65-70 year old group. (See Table XIII.)

I believe that this pattern is due to the fact that the youngest group has no children and are still very ideologically orientated, while the lower middle and middle
### TABLE XIII

**WILL YOU RETURN BEFORE THE REMOVAL OF THE MINES**

**CROSS TABULATED WITH**

**AGE OF RESPONDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Would Prefer</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 32 65 1 2 100
Total 32.0 65.0 1.0 2.0 100.0
age groups have many dependents. The upper middle age group's children are grown adults, while the very elderly are frail and dependent on their children who have young children of their own. Even though this would suggest a curvilinear relationship, some of the differences between cells are only one case. The general conclusion that can be drawn is that the least willing to return are those between 65-70 followed by those between 35-44. This would reject the hypothesis.

Everett S. Lee has suggested that besides being related to stages in a life cycle, age may also be related to dependence in that whereas children are bound to their parents, when they become older, they might leave the parents, and become married and soon have children of their own (Lee 1966, pp. 51-52). In other words perhaps the important relationship may be that of one to his or her dependents.

When age is cross tabbed by willingness to return under a non-Islamic government, between 90.5 percent and 100 percent of all age groups said they would not return if there was a non-Islamic government. These findings do not support the hypothesis. The one conclusion that can be drawn is that most Afghans say that they oppose a non-Islamic government. Based on the open ended responses collected during the interviews, it was evident that most of the Afghans equate a non-Islamic government with a communist
government. It should be noted here, as mentioned previously, that what the Afghan respondents I interviewed said and what many experts believe they will do are quite different.

In regard to the relationship between age and willingness to return if the Shah ran the government, the distribution of "Yes," "No," "Maybe," and "Yes if he has an Islamic government," appeared to be randomly distributed, with no clear pattern. There is a lot of diversity on the approval of the Shah. These findings do not support the hypothesis on a curvilinear relationship between age and willingness to return.

When considering age and willingness to return if there are no jobs, the issue of no jobs at home was one that Sidni Lamb identified in his study of Ethiopian returnees, who fled immediately after return due to economic hardship (Lamb 1986, pg. 9). The only person who said he would not return if there were no jobs was between 55-64. Two people from the 25-34 category said, "Maybe," as well as one person between 45-54. The other 96 percent (N=96) said they would return if there were no jobs. On this issue there appears to be a great deal of unanimity among the various age groups. Certainly for the 23 percent (N=23) of the respondents who had been farmers it was a non sequitur; all they have to do to have jobs is to return home to their farms and start farming again. For those who had been
farmers a common open ended response was, "Sure I will go back if there are no jobs; I am a farmer and will return to my fields; that is my job." Even though the Afghans do not appear to be concerned about the lack of available jobs, it is clear from conversations and interviews conducted in Pakistan with aid workers that Afghanistan has been economically devastated; I therefore would question whether or not returning refugees might return to host countries once this becomes evident to them as well. This has happened to other refugee populations that have returned home willingly but are unable to stay due to lack of economic opportunities. Such was the case among Ethiopian, Ugandan and Laotian refugees. As Jeff Crisp noted in an article on Laotian refugees, some fled repeatedly, were forced to return, and then would flee again immediately again due to economic hardships (Crisp, September 1987, pp. 27-28). As a matter of fact many authors have identified the importance of the economic situation at home (Akol 1987, pp. 156, Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754).

On the issue of age and willingness to return if there are no schools, only two people said they would not return if there were no schools, one was between 35-44 and the other between 45-54. The 18 percent (N=18) who said, "If there is an Islamic government there will be school," were very evenly distributed among all the age categories. The same is true for the 80 percent (N=80) who said they would
return if there were no schools: they were evenly distributed among all age groups. Although the common answer was that they would return even without schools, it was often mentioned to me after interviews or in private conversations that students in school in Pakistan would probably stay and finish before returning home to Afghanistan. One highly educated Afghan (he had a graduate degree from Oxford) insisted in a private conversation that he would encourage students to finish their educations before returning to Afghanistan because educated and technically skilled people were desperately needed after the long and devastating war.

The issue of returning under a coalition government was very similar to returning if there were no schools: overall 80 percent (N=80) said they would not return under a coalition government, and the distribution was fairly evenly divided among the different age categories. The degree to which the Afghans opposed the concept of a coalition government is not a surprising one. They deeply opposed the communists on ideological grounds as well as for pragmatic safety reasons. Compromise is not one of the Afghans' great strengths. They have carried out blood feuds over decades. They strongly opposed communist involvement in a future government. As noted in the beginning on the methods section, no one believed in 1988 that the communist government would last, so agreeing to a coalition was not
necessary. As Akol (1987, pg. 156), Bogue (1969, pg. 753) and Kunz (1981, pp. 42-62) pointed out, the political situation in the home country can create a push to drive people out or prevent return.

Based on these findings the hypothesis stating that there would be a curvilinear relationship in regard to age and willingness to repatriate would be rejected, although Lee's original contention about age and stage of life cycle does seem to have an impact in some areas (Lee 1966, pp. 51-52).

The next hypothesis to be tested has to do with family status and states, "The concerns about safety will vary with the number of dependents." This hypothesis attempts to test whether concerns about safety and reluctance to repatriate increase with a greater number of dependents. The issue of dependency has been identified by numerous authors, most notably Bogue (1969, pg. 754) and Kunz (1981, pp. 42-46).

To measure the dimension of "family status" marital status and number of children were utilized. Age of youngest child was also collected to see if those with younger children were more concerned about safety. When considering marital status and the effect on willingness to return before the Soviets withdrew, the only person who said he would return was a widower. The three other widowers said they would not return. This would not support or reject the hypothesis because it is so limited.
When considering marital status cross tabbed with willingness to return if the parties were fighting, it was found that 70 percent (N=14) of the single respondents said, they would not return. Of the married respondents, 57.9 percent (N=44) indicated they would not return and 50 percent (N=2) of the widowed said they would not return. A large proportion of the married men, 22 percent (N=17), felt there would be no fighting once there was an Islamic government. There were only four widowers in the entire sample, so any conclusions about their unwillingness to return is not very reliable. Since so many married men believed there would be no fighting, they had the smallest group who actually said, "Yes" they would return. Of those who were married, only 18 percent (N=14) said they would return if the parties were fighting, compared to 25 percent (N=five) of the single men and 25 percent (N=one) of the widowers. However, since the number of widowed respondents was so small, the only reliable comparison is between those who are married and those who are single. Those who are single are more willing to return, which would support the hypothesis on number of dependents affecting willingness to return. (See Table XIV.)

When considering concerns about mines, 60 percent (N=12) of the single respondents said they would not return before the mines were removed compared to 65.8 percent (N=50) of the married and 75 percent (N=three) of the
### Table XIV

**Will you return if the parties are fighting**

Cross tabulated with marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Would prefer</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widowed</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Column**     | 20  | 60 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 100 |
| **Total**      | 20.0| 60.0| 1.0 | 18.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
widowed respondents. The single are slightly more willing to return than those who are married, which would support the hypothesis about willingness to return and number of dependents. (See Table XV.)

For the safety issues of the withdrawal of the Russians, the parties fighting for power and the removal of the mines, the findings would support the hypothesis that those with dependents are less willing to return than those without dependents.

To further test the hypothesis on willingness to return and the relationship to number of dependents, the number of children and age of youngest child are compared to willingness to return.

The one person who was willing to return under the Russians had six children. This is too limited to draw any conclusions.

When checking how dependents affected willingness to repatriate if the parties were fighting amongst themselves for power, 69 percent (N=18) of the people without children said they would not return under this circumstance, 66.7 percent (N=six) of those with one child said they would not return, 70 percent (N=seven) of those with two children said they would not. This compares to 33.3 percent (N=two) of those with three children, 72.7 percent (N=eight) of those with four children, 80 percent (N=eight) of those with five children, 55.6 percent (N=five) of those with six children,
### TABLE XV

WILL YOU RETURN BEFORE THE REMOVAL OF THE MINES
CROSS TABULATED WITH
MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Would Prefer</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
<th>Column Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and 31.6 percent (N=six) of those with seven or more children who said they would not return if the parties were fighting for power. While it appears that as the number of children increases, concerns about parties fighting increases up to five children where it starts to decrease, it should be noted that those with six or more children had 22 percent (N=two) of their group which believed that there will be no fighting under an Islamic government as did those who had seven or more children which had 26.3 percent (N=five) of their group that did not believe there would be any fighting. These findings would not support the hypothesis in regards to number of dependents affecting willingness to return. I think that the real relationship being illustrated here is a function of the respondents' age. Those who were in their teens and early twenties up to those who were in their late forties and early fifties were the least willing to return under these conditions. Those who were 55 and older were increasingly more willing to return under these conditions. One possibility is that the older Afghans have older children and do not view the safety issues the same way as those with primarily younger children do.

When the same people were asked if they would return before the mines were removed from the country, 61.5 percent (N=16) of those without children said they would not return before the mines were removed; this group was also the
youngest of all respondents. Of those with one child, 33.3 percent (N=three) said they would not return before the removal of the mines. This compares to 70 percent (N=seven) of those with two children, 83.3 percent (N=five) of those with three children, 72.7 percent (N=eight) of those with four children, 80 percent (N=eight) of those with five children, 55.6 percent (N=five) of those with six children, and 68.4 percent (N=13) of those with seven or more children, who said they would not return.

The variation here does not appear to follow any general pattern in relationship to the increasing number of dependents. This would not support the hypothesis about number of dependents affecting willingness to return.

When using number of dependents, and the effect on willingness to return if there is not an Islamic government, the one person who said he would return if there was not an Islamic government had six children. This is so limited that it cannot be used to test this hypothesis.

To see if number of dependents affected willingness to return in areas other than safety issues, some other relationships were tested.

The effect of number of children on willingness to return under the Shah had a lot of variation among the responses. Of those with no children 53.8 percent (N=14) did not want to return under the Shah. Those with one child had 77.8 percent (N=7) of their group who said they would
not return under the Shah; but then the next group, those with two children, had only 30 percent (N=three) saying they would not return under the Shah. This compares to those with three children in which 66.7 percent (N=four) said they would not return, those with four children in which 27.3 percent (N=three) said they would not, those with five children where 40 percent (N=four) said they would not, those with six children where 22.2 percent (N=two) who said they would not, and those with seven or more children where 36.8 percent (N=seven) said they would not return under the Shah. There does not appear to be any relationship between number of dependents and willingness to return under the Shah. The return of the Shah does not appear to be considered a safety issue but an ideological one. There is a great deal of diversity on this answer.

When looking at the effect the number of dependents has on willingness to return if there are no jobs in Afghanistan, the only respondent who said he would not return if there were no jobs, had seven or more children. Three respondents said maybe they would return if there were no jobs; they had, respectively, two children, four children and six children. This is one topic in which there is so much unanimity that it is difficult to discern any pattern.

The effect of number of children on willingness to return if there is no schools is an interesting one. There were two respondents who said they would not return if there
were no schools, one had no children and the other had six
children. Out of all the respondents, 80 percent (N=80)
said they would return if there were no schools. The other
category had 18 percent (N=18) who said that if there was an
Islamic government there would be schools. These
respondents were fairly evenly distributed among all
categories of number of dependents. The one category which
stood out were those with seven or more children. From this
group, 42 percent (N=eight) said that if there was an
Islamic government there would be schools.

When looking at the effect of number of children on
willingness to return if there is a coalition government,
those who said they would not return under a coalition
government were fairly evenly distributed among the various
categories of numbers of children. Overall 80 percent
(N=80) said they would not return under these conditions,
and among the various categories it ran from a high of 100
percent (N=six) of those with three children to a low of
45.5 percent (N=five) among those with four children.

When considering safety and willingness to return based
on number of dependents, since the one person who would
return under the Russians had a child, and there was no
clear relationship for number of children and returning if
the parties are fighting or before the removal of the mines,
this hypothesis would not be supported based on the answers
given by the respondents I interviewed. I feel though that
this is an area that would benefit from further research.

One drawback to the previous hypothesis test was that people would say yes they had children even if the children were in their twenties. For the Afghans a person in his/her late teens is a young adult, so they are probably not seen in the same way as young children. To further test this hypothesis, age of youngest child was used to see if the issue of dependency and its relationship to willingness to migrate might be correlated as Bogue had described in his work (1969).

When looking at the age of the youngest child and how this affects willingness to return under the Russians, a respondent with the youngest child between 15-18 was the only person who said he would return before the Russians left. This is too limited to draw any conclusions.

When using the child’s age as the independent variable influencing the willingness to return if the parties were fighting, it was found that 62 percent (N=31) of those whose youngest children were five years old or less were not willing to return if the parties were fighting for power, compared to 54.5 percent (N=six) of those with a youngest child of 6-10 and 33.3 percent (N=two) of those with a youngest child of 11-14. (See Table XVI.) Therefore as the youngest child’s age increases so does the willingness to return if the parties are fighting for power. Of the respondents who had their youngest child between 15-18 and
TABLE XVI

WILL YOU RETURN IF THE PARTIES ARE FIGHTING
CROSS TABULATED WITH AGE
OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
<th>Column Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
those whose youngest child was between 19-22, 50 percent said they would not return if the parties were fighting for power; however, there were only one or two respondents in each of the respective cells, so it is very inconclusive for those with children above the age of 15. Even though this finding is inconclusive due to the limited number of cases of youngest child above the age of 11, I believe that it is worth noting in that it indicates the possibility that this hypothesis may be correct.

As the youngest child’s age increases, so does the parent’s willingness increase slightly to repatriate if there are still mines in Afghanistan. Sixty-eight percent (N=34) of those with children five or less said they would not return under these conditions; 63.6 percent (N=seven) of those with children six to 10 said, "No," and 66.7 percent (N=4) of those with children 11-14 said, "No." Those with children 15-18 said, "No," 50 percent (N=one) of the time. Due to the limited number of cases it is impossible to draw any reliable conclusions for those with children between 11-18. (See Table XVII.)

These findings are very limited, but I believe they indicate that the hypothesis about family status and willingness to repatriate may be supported with further research. This would support Bogue’s identification of this as a factor affecting migration (1969).

Issues other than safety were checked to see if they
TABLE XVII

WILL YOU RETURN BEFORE THE REMOVAL OF THE MINES
CROSS TABULATED WITH AGE
OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Age</th>
<th>Row Percent</th>
<th>Column Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Would Prefer</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were impacted as well. There is very little variation in willingness to return under a coalition government when cross tabbed with age of youngest child. The one respondent who said he would return had a child less than five; there was also one respondent with a child between six and 10 who said maybe he would return under a coalition government.

An interesting trend is noticed in the relationship between the youngest child's age and willingness to return if the Shah returned to run the government in Afghanistan. Forty six percent (N=23) of those with children five or less said they would not return under these conditions. Thirty-six percent (N=four) of those with youngest children between six to 10 said, "No," and only 16.7 percent (N=one) of those with youngest children between 11-14 said, "No." A more reliable indicator (due to larger number of respondents) is those who said, "Yes they would return if the Shah returned to run the government." Of those with youngest children five or less 34 percent (N=17) said yes they would return. Of those with youngest children between six to 10, 45.5 percent (N=five) said they would return and of those with youngest children between 11-14, 66.7 percent (N=four) said they would return. Between 15-18 there was only one respondent, too small to be reliable. (See Table XVIII.)

As the age of youngest child increases the willingness to return under the Shah does too.

When considering youngest child's age and the
TABLE XVIII
WILL YOU RETURN IF THE SHAH RETURNS
CROSS TABULATED WITH AGE
OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Age</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>5 or less</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>15-18</th>
<th>19-22</th>
<th>23+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, if there is an Islamic Fight</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>Him</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Row Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Percent

Total 100.0
willingness to return if there are no jobs, there is very little variation. The one respondent who said he would return if there were no jobs had a youngest child between 15-18. Two people who had youngest children less than five said maybe they would return if there were no jobs. Also, one person with a youngest child between 6-10 said maybe they would return. The other 96 percent (N=96) said they would return if there were no jobs.

When asked if they would return if there were no schools, only two people said they would not return, one with no children and one who had a youngest child who was five or less. Many with children, believed that if there was an Islamic government, that there would be schools. Of those with children five or less, 22 percent (N=11) said there would be schools if there was an Islamic government. Of those with youngest children between six to 10, 36.4 percent (N=four) said there would be schools if there was an Islamic government.

There appears to be little effect of children’s age on the willingness to repatriate if there is a coalition government. Of those with youngest children five or less, 74 percent (N=37) said they would not return if there was a coalition government. Of those with youngest children between 6-10, 90.9 percent (N=10) said they would not return. For those with youngest children between 11-14, 83.3 percent (N=five) said they would not return. Those
with youngest children between 15-18 were 100 percent (N=two) opposed to returning under a coalition. The same is true for those with the youngest child between 19-22 and over the age of 23, in that they were very opposed to returning (75 percent to 100 percent) but there were only three or one cases in each cell.

The next hypothesis to be tested states, "The greater the time that a refugee spends out of the home country the less the likelihood of repatriation." The refugees in this study were asked when they fled and this was then compared to their willingness to repatriate under certain conditions.

The effect of when a respondent fled on their willingness to return before the Soviets left is not possible to determine since only one respondent said he would return before the Soviets withdrew. That person had been in exile for 3-4 years.

When looking at the effect time in refuge has on a willingness to repatriate, there appears to be little relationship to the matter of whether the parties are fighting for power. Overall 60 percent (N=60) said they would not return if the parties were fighting. Comparing the different categories of those who had been out of Afghanistan for various times and said they would not return ranged from a high of 75 percent to a low of 43 percent with no discernible pattern. The same situation exists for when someone left and if they are willing to return before the
mines are removed. Those who said they would not return before the mines were removed based on when they left, varies from 57 percent to 75 percent, with no discernible pattern. The one person who was willing to return if there was not an Islamic government had left Afghanistan between nine to 10 years before. Willingness to return under the Shah and the length of time as a refugee shows an interesting relationship. Of those who had been refugees only one year or less 75 percent (N=three) said they would not return if the Shah came back, compared to 67 percent (N=four) of those in refuge for one to two years, 69 percent (N=11) of those who had left three to four years before, 38 percent (N=eight) of those who had left five to six years before, 39 percent (N=11) of those who had left seven to eight years before, and only 30 percent (N=nine) of those who had left nine to 10 years before. The longer people had been out of the country the more willing they were to return under the Shah. (See Table XVIII.)

The effect of the length of time that someone had been out of the country on willingness to return if there are no jobs available is not possible to discern because only one person said he would not return if there were no jobs. This person had left the country five to six years before. Two people who had been out of the country seven to eight years said, "Maybe" they would return and one person who had been out of the country nine to 10 years said he maybe would
TABLE XVIV

WILL YOU RETURN IF THE SHAH RETURNS
CROSS TABULATED WITH WHEN
RESPONDENT FLED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Did You Flee</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Percent:
- 1 year: 25.0%
- 1-2 years: 4.0%
- 3-4 years: 16.0%
- 5-6 years: 21.0%
- 7-8 years: 23.0%
- 9-10 years: 30.0%

Row Percent:
- Yes: 25.0%
- No: 75.0%
- Maybe: 4.0%
return if there were no jobs. When this group was asked if they would return if there were no schools, only two people said, "No." One, had left Afghanistan three to four years before; the other had left five to six years before. The other category were those who answered, "If there is an Islamic government, there will be schools." Those who answered in this category were fairly evenly distributed between all of the various categories of time out of the country. This same group when asked about the willingness to repatriate under a coalition government roughly showed increasing willingness to do so the longer they had been out of the country: 100 percent (N=four) of those who had fled that year said they would not return under a coalition government, compared to 83.3 percent (N=five) of those who had fled one to two years before, 93.8 percent (N=15) of those who had fled three to four years before, 76.2 percent (N=16) of those who had fled five to six years before, 87 percent (N=20) of those who fled seven to eight years before and 67.7 percent (N=20) of those who had fled nine to 10 years before saying they would not return under a coalition government. (See Table XX.) This was an interesting finding in that it appears to reject the hypothesis that people would be less likely to repatriate the longer they were out of the country. This would support the position of Crisp in regards to the importance of time, but in the opposite way from that which he described (1987). However, it could
### TABLE XX

**WILL YOU RETURN UNDER A COALITION GOVERNMENT CROSS TABULATED WITH WHEN RESPONDENT FLED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Did You Flee</th>
<th>I Will If Others No Don't Answer Know Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>4 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>100.0 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>1 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>2 (21.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 years</td>
<td>2 (23.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 years</td>
<td>7 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>10 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
- Total percentages for each row and column are shown.
- The table includes cross-tabulations with the number of years a respondent fled.
- The categories include Yes, No, Maybe, Do, Other, Answer, and Know.
- The table shows the distribution of responses across different time periods.

**Sample Calculations:**
- For 1-2 years, the total is 6 (16.7% of 36.0)
- For 3-4 years, the total is 16 (16.0% of 100.0)
indicate also that people are less and less concerned about the conditions at home because they have less and less intention to return and hence are willing to say they would return no matter what. Another possibility is that the longer the Afghans were in refuge the more desperate they were to return home under any condition. This is possibly related to the "Ideological National Orientation Abroad" as identified by Kunz (1981, pp. 44-46). Those who maintain a homeward orientation and do not become eager assimilationists may in fact find time to be an intervening variable which works as a "push" to return home instead of roadblock to return. The longer the "homeward oriented view" (Kunz 1981, pg. 44) refugee remains in refuge the more frustrated and determined the refugee becomes to eventually repatriate.

Tied to the issue of time is the hypothesis that the general population over time will become more pragmatic in their concerns, while the leadership will become more ideological in their concerns (Crisp 1987, Kunz 1981). As has been noted earlier only one person was willing to return before Soviet withdrawal; he had been out of the country three to four years. In regards to whether the parties were fighting for power or the mines had not been removed there did not appear to be any relationship to how long the general population had been out of the country.

If there was not an Islamic government the two people
who said, "Yes" or "Maybe" they would return, had been out of the country for nine to 10 years, which is interesting but so limited in numbers that all one can suggest is that it warrants further investigation.

With regards to the hypothesis that pragmatic concerns would increase over time in refuge, people seem to be more willing to accept the Shah and a coalition government the longer they had been in refuge. The issues of returning with no schools or no jobs or a non-Islamic government indicate that people might be more pragmatic over time but if they are it is a very slight increase and needs further research. There doesn’t appear to be any increase over fear of parties fighting or of mines over time. For this hypothesis, one can not accept or reject it at this point. Further studies are needed to see if people do become more pragmatic.

When comparing those in positions of leadership (tribal leaders and commanders), all but one of the eight leaders had been out of the country for eight to ten years. One leader had been out of Afghanistan for four years. Unfortunately the sample of leaders was not large enough to detect any significant variation over time. Statistically the categorized answers of the leaders were not significantly different from those of the everyday people. However, when referring to field notes made following the interviews of five commanders and leaders over a several day
period, I had noted that in the open ended responses and conversations the leaders were very dogmatic and very insistent about the importance of Islam and the removal of the Russians. They also were the most insistent that there would never be fighting between the parties and that a coalition government would never be formed. While some answers of the general people seem to indicate a pragmatic shift over time, not enough data were collected to determine a shift among the leaders. However, the leaders certainly seemed to be more ideological, based on observations and conversations. While this might indicate the possibility of a relationship, further research is needed.

Geographic obstacles have been noted as a feature that can block flight or repatriation. Lee noted the importance of geographic obstacles in his work in 1966 as an intervening variable. The next hypothesis to be tested states, "The greater the distance or other geographic obstacles, the less the likelihood of repatriation." In the case of the Afghans, distance is such an obstacle. For ease of analysis and comparison the provinces that the Afghans fled from will be broken down into those that are on the border with Pakistan or adjacent to provinces on the border and those that are not. Those that are on the border or very close to it and which respondents to this survey fled from are: Kabul, Ningraham, Qandahar, Helmand, Laghman, Logar, and Paktia. Those provinces that respondents came
from that are not on the border or close to it are Jowzjan, Uruzgan, Kunduz and Kapisa.

When looking at those who would be willing to return before the Soviets left, the one person who said, "Yes" was from Kabul, which is both adjacent to a border province and has a major road leading to it.

When looking at the issue of who would return if the parties are fighting, the one respondent from Jowzjan, the one respondent from Uruzgan, one of the three respondents from Kunduz, and the one respondent from Kapisa all said they would not return under these conditions. Of respondents from the non border areas between 33.3 percent and 100 percent said they would not return under these conditions (three-fourths of the non border provinces had 100 percent of their respondents who would not return). The respondents from the areas close to the border said they would not return at a low of 44.4 percent ($N=4$) from Logar and a high from Kabul of 63.6 percent ($N=14$) of the time. Because there were only one, two or three respondents from the outlying provinces, it is not possible to draw a firm conclusion about geographic distance determining willingness to repatriate. However, it can certainly be taken as a good possibility that geographic distance affects willingness to repatriate, and it needs to be recognized that this issue warrants further research.

When looking at where people fled from and how that
affects their willingness to repatriate if there are still mines, the respondent from Jowzjan, the respondent from Uruzgan, two of the three respondents from Kunduz, and the one respondent from Kapisa all said they would not return if there were still mines. In other words between 66.7 percent and 100 percent of those from the outlying provinces said they would not return. Between 33.3 percent and 100 percent of respondents from border areas said they would not return. The same situation applies here in that the numbers away from the border areas are very small, but it indicates there might be a relationship, and further research should be conducted.

While 95 percent (N=95) said they would not return if there was not an Islamic government, all respondents from the provinces not close to the border said they would not return if there was not an Islamic government.

There didn't appear to be any pattern at all in regards to where people were from and whether or not they would return if the Shah returned to run the government.

Willingness to return if there were not jobs in Afghanistan didn't seem to be impacted by where people were from. Except for people from Ningrahahar (a border province) all other respondents said they would return if there were no jobs. Of those from Ningrahahar, one said, "No" he would not return and three said, "Maybe" they would return if there were no jobs.
When considering how area fled from affected willingness to return if there were no schools, interestingly all of the respondents from provinces away from the border said that even if there were no schools they would return. The only respondents who said they would not return were from border provinces, but only two respondents said this. The other answer that those from border provinces gave was that, if there is an Islamic government there will be schools. Twenty percent overall answered this way.

When considering how the distance one fled from affects their willingness to return if there is a coalition government, of those who fled from the four non border provinces, 83.3 percent (N=five) said they would not return if there was a coalition government. This is about the same as the response of those from border areas, of whom 85.2 percent (N=75) said they would not return.

Another geographic consideration is whether people fled from a rural area or from Kabul (the one urban area). The respondents from Kabul, as compared to other areas, showed no noticeable difference between Kabul and the rural provinces. While the findings are extremely limited due to the majority being from the border provinces, I believe the responses do indicate the possibility that the hypothesis about the greater the geographic obstacles the less the likelihood of repatriation could be supported with further
research. This would support Lee's (1966) view of importance of intervening obstacles.

Another hypothesis to consider is: the greater the degree of economic assimilation in the host country the less the likelihood of repatriation (if they have jobs in the host country they will be less likely to repatriate). As has been noted, many authors have identified the importance of economics as an important factor in affecting migration (Akol 1987, pg. 156, Lamb 1986, pg. 9). Donald Bogue (1969) has further identified economic opportunities in the host country as an important pull into the host country for migrants. As has been mentioned previously, only one person said he would return before the Soviets withdrew; this person had a job.

Of those who had jobs, 76.1 percent (N=48) said that they would not return if the parties were fighting for power; this compares to 54.5 percent (N=12) of those not having jobs saying they would not return. Whether or not one has a job does seem to affect willingness to return if the parties were fighting for power. This would support the hypothesis.

When considering the effect of someone having a job on willingness to return if there are still mines, 63.6 percent (N=14) of those without jobs said they would not return compared to 67.1 percent (N=51) of those with jobs. Because of the number of cases this is a small difference but it
could indicate a relationship here. This would support the hypothesis.

Whether or not someone had a job did not seem to impact their willingness to return if there was not an Islamic government. All of those without jobs (100 percent, N=22) said that they would not return if there was not an Islamic government. The one person who said he would return if there was not an Islamic government had a job. This would not support the hypothesis, but is so limited it is insignificant.

Those without jobs were more willing to return if the Shah returned to power than those with jobs. Of those with no job in Pakistan 40.9 percent (N=9) said they would not return if the Shah returned to power, compared to 57.4 percent (N=35) of those with jobs. This would support the hypothesis.

When asked if they would return if there were no jobs in Afghanistan the only person who said, "No," did not have a job in Pakistan. Ninety-six percent (N=96) said they would return, and three people with jobs said, "Maybe" they would return. This would not support the hypothesis.

Whether or not people had jobs in Pakistan did not seem to affect their willingness to return if there were no schools, only two people said they would not return if there were no schools and they did have jobs; and 18 percent (N=18) said if there was an Islamic government there would
be schools. This was fairly evenly distributed among those with and without jobs. All the other respondents said they would return if there were no schools. This would not support the hypothesis.

Whether or not one had a job in Pakistan only slightly affected willingness to return under a coalition government. Eighty-two percent (N=18) of those without jobs said they would not return under a coalition government. This compared to 89.8 percent (N=62) of those with jobs saying they would not return. While there is a slight difference, it is accounted for by only two cases, so is not significant. This would not support or disprove the hypothesis.

The hypothesis that the greater the degree of economic assimilation, the less the likelihood of repatriation, would be supported for the issues of whether the parties were fighting, mines were present, or the Shah returned to run the government which would support Bogue's (1969) identification of this as an important "pull." This hypothesis would not be supported for the issues of returning if there are no jobs or no schools, and it is not supported for the issues of the withdrawal of the Soviets and a non Islamic government or a coalition government. It should be noted that these non supporting matters have a high degree of unanimity among the respondents and probably were ideological responses. Therefore these responses might
not be significant in not supporting this hypothesis.

Next we will consider the hypothesis that the less the socio-cultural similarity with the host society the greater the likelihood of repatriation. There were respondents from six categories of ethnic groups. However, only two had more than one respondent in a particular ethnic group, these two being the two largest groups in Afghanistan and the majority of those in refuge in Pakistan. The two groups were the Pushtuns and the Tajiks. The Pushtun category had 83 respondents while the Tajik had 13. Both the Pushtuns and the Tajiks fled to and settled in Pushtun areas. These two groups will be compared to determine willingness to return from a similar ethnic group area and a non-similar ethnic group area.

The only person who was willing to return under the Soviets was a Pushtun. While 22.9 percent (N=19) of the Pushtuns were willing to return if the parties were fighting for power, none of the Tajiks were. This would not support the hypothesis.

If mines were still present, 61.4 percent (N=51) of the Pushtuns said they would not return. However 84.6 percent (N=11) of the Tajiks said they would not return. This would not support the hypothesis.

The one respondent who said he would return under a non-Islamic government was Pushtun, while all Tajiks said they would not return under these conditions. Like the
issue of the Soviets, this is too limited to draw any conclusions.

The Pushtuns and the Tajiks were both about equally opposed to the Shah. Whereas 45.8 percent (N=38) of the Pushtuns said they would not return under the Shah, 46.2 percent (N=6) of the Tajiks said they would not return. When asked if they would return if there were no jobs, the only person who said, "Yes," was a Tajik, three Pushtuns said, "Maybe," and everyone else said, "Yes they would return if there were no jobs."

When asked if they would return if there were no schools the only people who answered, "No," were two Pushtuns. Fifteen Pushtuns also said that if there were an Islamic government there would be schools, as did three Tajiks.

When asked if they were willing to return under a coalition government, 79.5 percent (N=66) of the Pushtuns said, "No," 84.6 percent (N=11) of the Tajiks said, "No," one said, "Maybe," one said he would accept it if others did.

This hypothesis would be not be supported. Except for returning if there were no schools or under the Shah, the Pushtuns are more willing to return than the Tajiks. It is possible that what is really being measured here is respondents' geographic proximity to the area they are from or that since Afghanistan has been traditionally dominated
by the Pushtuns politically they are more willing to return to a country in which they are dominant.

The hypothesis covering the personal perception variable of economic opportunity says that someone who has greater economic opportunity at home but no work in Pakistan would be more willing to repatriate. However, only one respondent said that he not would return if there were no jobs. This person did not have a job in Pakistan and was a farmer in Afghanistan. The other 21 respondents who did not have jobs in Pakistan said they would return if there were not jobs in Afghanistan. Of those with jobs all but three said they would return if there were no jobs; three people with jobs said, "Maybe," they would return if there were no jobs. This is an area that certainly needs more research but at this point one would have to say that this hypothesis is not supported. As had been noted earlier, even though the refugees may honestly plan on returning, due to the extensive devastation (based on UNHCR workers' surveys in Afghanistan) there is a possibility that there may be return refugees after the initial repatriation, as observed by Jeff Crisp (September 1987) in his study of Laotian refugees.

Considering the personal perception variable of being a minority in Afghanistan, this was an area that Kunz had identified as being an "events alienated" refugee, which is when due to past discrimination a refugee is embittered
towards their former compatriots (Kunz 1981, pp. 42-43).

The hypothesis to be tested states, "The greater the socio-cultural similarity with the home population the greater the likelihood of repatriation."

The same data used to test cultural compatibility with the Pakistanis will be used to test this hypothesis.

The only category that had more than one respondent was the Tajiks who, while being a large group, are a minority compared to the Pushtuns in size and power.

The one person who was willing to return under the Russians was a Pushtun.

If the parties were fighting for power 22.9 percent (N=19) of the Pushtuns were willing to return but none of the Tajiks were.

If the mines still existed, 61.4 percent (N=51) of the Pushtuns said they would not return, and 84.6 percent (N=11) of the Tajiks said they would not return.

The one person who was willing to return if there was not an Islamic government was a Pushtun.

If the Shah returned Pushtuns and Tajiks were fairly equal in the percent who said they would not return.

Tajiks had the one person who said he would not return if there were no jobs.

The one real break in the pattern is if there are no schools, the two people who said they would not return, were Pushtuns.
If there was a coalition government, eleven percent of the Pushtuns said, "Yes, they would return," but no Tajiks said, "Yes."

In comparing Pushtun and Tajik, the hypothesis stating, "The greater the socio-cultural similarity with the home population the less the likelihood of repatriation," is supported by the data. This would support the identification by Kunz of the importance of self-identification by the refugee (1981, pp. 42-43).

While no specific author has identified education as a variable that impacts refugee migrations, there are such general issues raised by authors such as Everett S. Lee (1966, pg. 56) in which he stated, "Migration is selective," and "positive selection is made for migrants of high quality."

Education was chosen as one such indication of "high quality" When the education of the respondents was cross tabbed with a willingness to return if the parties were fighting for power, it was found that 68.4 percent (N=26) of those with no education were not willing to return under these conditions, compared to 100 percent (N=three) of those with three-five years, 75 percent (N=six) of those with six-eight years education, 53.1 percent of those with nine-12 years and only 42.1 percent of those with 13-15 years or more. The most willing to return if the parties were fighting are those with the most education. When
considering the question of mines, 78.9 percent (N=30) of those without education said they would not return before the removal of the mines, compared to 66.7 percent (N=two) of those with three-five years of education, 75 percent (N=six) of those with six-eight years, 59.4 percent (N=19) of those with nine-12 years, and 42.1 percent (N=eight) of those with 13-15 years and more. Again the most willing to return are those with the most education. A rough relationship appears to be that as education increases so does willingness to return. It is possible that as the level of education increases the respondents either see more opportunities for themselves or see more possible outcomes to a situation.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

When drawing conclusions from the interview data, one generality that can be drawn is that the Afghans as a group either tend to have almost complete unanimity on an issue or they have very diverse beliefs.

The hypothesis that states, "The obstacles to repatriation will vary in relation to the original reasons for flight," would be supported. This would support the concepts behind Bogue's (1969) and Lee's (1966) work, of migration being the sum of "pluses" and "minuses" or "pulls" and "pushes." Just as continuation of the original factors causing flight, the issues that arise in the intervening years of refuge can also block repatriation. For the Afghans this includes the parties fighting for power, the Shah returning, and the mines. All of these can act as minuses or pushes to keep the Afghans from desiring to repatriate. Simultaneously, the Afghans have established communities, social and cultural ties and been economically assimilated in Pakistan. All of these acts as pulls or pluses to remain in Pakistan. This is an area that is considerably underrated by the various governments and agencies involved. While it is undeniably crucial to remove
or reduce the original causes of flight, the factors that have arisen since can be just as important in blocking repatriation.

The second hypothesis states, "The relationship between age and probability of repatriation is curvilinear." This hypothesis would not be supported. There are a few general relationships evident, but they are not curvilinear. For the relationship between the parties fighting and age there is a rough relationship indicating that as people got older they were more and more willing to return if the parties were fighting for power. As far as the issue of the mines goes the least willing to return if there still are mines are the oldest. These simple relationships I believe would support the identification by Lee (1966) of age as being an important factor. As far as willingness to accept a non-Islamic government, one general conclusion that can be drawn is that the most willing to accept non-Islamic government are the youngest, those between 15-24. In regard to acceptance of the Shah, there is no clear relationship between age and willingness to accept his return. There also does not appear to be any relationship between age and willingness to return if there are no schools or no jobs.

The third hypothesis states that, "The concerns about safety will vary with number of dependents." This hypothesis considered marital status, number of children, and age of youngest child. Safety in the context of flight
and repatriation would be a minus or push blocking return if an area was not safe. If the parties were still fighting, those most opposed to returning were those who were single, next were those who were married and finally those who were widowed. This would not support this hypothesis. Those who were least willing to repatriate if the mines were not removed were the widowers followed by those who were married, and the most willing to return were those who were single. Several things to be considered here, are that on the one hand, the number of widowers is small (four total), so they might not be reliable; on the other hand, they might have concerns about other dependents which would make them not want to return. Comparing just single and married, this hypothesis would be supported. For the issue of marital status, this hypothesis is supported under one condition but not another. This is an area that would certainly benefit from further research.

The issue of safety and number of children does not show any clear relationship for number of children and concern about returning under the Russians, while the parties are fighting or if there are still mines present. For this measure the hypothesis would not be supported.

When looking at the age of the youngest dependent and willingness to return if there is fighting among the parties, there is increasing willingness to return as the age of the youngest child increases. There is also a rough
increase in willingness to return if there are mines as the age of the youngest child increases. This would support the hypothesis that concerns about safety will vary with number of dependents, which would support the identification by Bogue (1969, pg. 754) of the importance of dependents.

The next hypothesis had to do with the effect of time on willingness to repatriate. This hypothesis states, "The greater the time that a refugee has been out of the home country the less likelihood of repatriation." For the issue of returning under the Russians no conclusion can be drawn. When returning if the parties are fighting for power, no relationship appears to exist, the same can be said about returning if there are mines or a non-Islamic government. It is not possible to tell if time in refuge has any affect on willingness to return if there are no jobs or no schools since all but a few people said they would return. These findings would not support this hypothesis. When considering the willingness to accept the Shah there is a strong relationship. The answers of the respondents indicate that the longer they were in refuge the more willing they are to accept the Shah. When considering a coalition government there was a rough trend for people to be more willing to return under a coalition government the longer they had been out of Afghanistan. These relationships would not support the hypothesis. I believe in fact that they indicate some other relationship.
Tied to the issue of time is the hypothesis that states that, "Over time, the general population will become more concerned about pragmatic issues, while the ideological leaders will shift towards more ideological concerns." There does not appear to be any relationship if the parties are fighting, if there are mines or there is not an Islamic government. This would not support the hypothesis. If the Shah returns, people are more willing to return the longer they have been out of the country, which supports the hypothesis for the general population. Respondents' willingness to return under a coalition government roughly increased, which supports this hypothesis. The few limited respondents who voiced concern about jobs had all been in refuge 5-10 years; the two people who expressed concern about schools had fled 3-6 years before. While not enough data were collected about leaders to draw any conclusions, based on observations and conversations, leaders were more concerned with ideological issues than were the everyday people. While these findings are very tentative, they indicate that with further research these relationships would support this hypothesis.

The next hypothesis has to do with the greater the geographic distance the less the likelihood of repatriation. The one person willing to return if the Russians were still present was from Kabul (a province close to the border). If the parties were fighting, those from provinces far from the
border were less willing to return. They were also less willing to return if there were mines present, if there was a non-Islamic government, if there were not schools and if there was a coalition government. Thus the data would support this hypothesis. There was no relationship in regard to where someone was from and willingness to return under the Shah or if there were no jobs. For this hypothesis, there was such a small number of respondents from provinces not close to the border that it is not possible to draw a reliable conclusion. However it indicates that there is a possibility that there is a relationship which warrants further research. I believe that in general this does support Lee's (1966) identification of the importance of intervening variables.

Hypothesis number seven says, "The greater the degree of economic assimilation the less the likelihood of repatriation." There did appear to be slight relationship between having a job in Pakistan and the willingness to return if the parties were fighting, there were mines, or the Shah returned. This would support this hypothesis. The one person who said he would return under the Russians had no job in Pakistan, and the two people who said they would not return if there was no school had jobs in Pakistan. These findings are so limited they cannot be relied on to draw a general conclusion. This hypothesis is supported in some areas but not others. This is an important finding
since so much emphasis has been placed on the Afghans being economic refugees. A very common theme in Pakistan is that the Afghans are there merely for jobs, this finding would certainly dispute that the Afghans are in Pakistan only for jobs.

The next hypothesis states, "The less the degree of socio-cultural similarity with a host society the greater the chance of repatriation." To test this Tajiks and Pushtuns were compared, both being in refuge in a Pushtun area of Pakistan. The one person willing to return under the Soviets was a Pushtun, the Pushtuns were more willing to return if there was fighting between the parties, there were mines, there was a non-Islamic government, or a coalition government. The two people who said they would not return if there were no schools were Pushtun. There was no relationship in regards to returning under the Shah, or if there were no jobs. Overall this hypothesis would not be supported by the data.

The next set of hypotheses have to do with personal perceptions about Afghanistan. The first personal perception variable states that the greater the socio-cultural similarity with the home population the greater the likelihood of repatriation. Again using the Pushtuns and the Tajiks as a test of this, the Pushtuns are more willing to return if the parties are fighting, there are mines, there are no jobs and there is a coalition government, there
is a limited relationship for the Pushtuns returning under the Russians and under a non-Islamic government. There was no relationship in regards to the Shah, or returning if there is no schools. This hypothesis would be supported. This would support Kunz's (1981) identification of the importance of the refugees' identification with his or her compatriots.

The second personal perception hypothesis states that, "The greater the economic opportunities at home, the greater the likelihood of repatriation." The overwhelming insistence of all but four respondents that they would return home if there were no jobs in Afghanistan, would not support this hypothesis.

The final hypothesis has to do with personal safety and states that, "The less the fear about safety the greater the chance for repatriation." Based on the finding that the majority of the people would not return if the Russians were still present, the parties were fighting for power, or there were mines present, this hypothesis would be supported as well. This would support both Bogue's (1969) and Kunz's (1981) identification of war or threat to safety as an important factor in causing flight.

When education was used as an independent variable, increased levels of education were roughly associated with an increasing willingness to return if the parties were fighting for power or the mines had not been removed.
If one were to construct a composite of a person that would be least likely to return based on the data collected during this thesis, it would be someone who still had the reasons that drove him out of Afghanistan in the first place, either very young or very old, married, have infant children, have fled Afghanistan fairly recently, be part of the general population (not a leader), be from a non border province, not be economically assimilated in Pakistan, be a minority (not a Pushtun), not have the personal safety issues resolved and, have some (three to five years) education.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS ON THE AFGHAN REFUGEES

1. The Afghan refugees are made up of political and human rights refugees, who have become economic refugees in the interim.

2. There probably will be two flows or vintages returning. Those who are political and human rights refugees, and those who have become economic refugees.

3. Economic refugees will be much slower in returning. In the recent case of Haitian refugees, the political refugees returned immediately while most of the economic refugees waited to see what would happen next.

4. If economic problems are not dealt with, economic refugees may return to their host country, as in the case of Laotian refugees who fled into Thailand for economic reasons.
Forcible repatriation will cause many to flee right back. The Afghans have expressed their belief that since the U.S. and others helped extensively during the war they will provide extensive aid to rebuild once people return.

5. If civil war breaks out in Afghanistan, there is every reason to believe that refugees will not return or that returnees will turn around and leave again in new flows. Many refugee flows in Africa are the direct result of civil war. Uganda is an excellent example of this. Civil wars have caused severe refugee problems in Burma, Laos, Lebanon, and Nicaragua as well.

6. If extensive aid continues, as has been suggested, for the Afghans living in Pakistan, and if the Afghans are not forcibly dragged to the border by the Pakistanis, and if civil war breaks out and the Afghans are told not to return by rebel leaders, few, if any appreciable number, will return.

7. Repatriation can be forced through lack of aid. Such was the case for Ugandans forced out of the Sudan and back into Uganda; many returned even though fearing they might be killed. Refugees can be forcibly returned as the Laotians were forced from Thailand. Both of these refugee situations saw many fleeing their home country again. This scenario has been mentioned by Pakistan, other countries, and NGO’s for forcing repatriation.

8. One important issue for the Afghans is, naturally, their cultural heritage. The Afghans are extremely proud of
their heritage and desire very strongly to return to their homeland. At the same time, many of these people have been nomadic or semi-nomadic and have crossed the Pakistani/Afghan border numerous times in the past and will continue to do so in the future. So while returning may be very important, it may not necessarily have to take place right away.

9. A very important consideration is that, despite emphasis on what individuals will do and how they will decide to return, the leaders will have a big impact on the decision to return. Of the respondents, 48 percent have said the leader of the tribe will decide when they will return home.

10. Another very important aspect of the Afghans' return is that they have no set timetable for when they would return. Only four respondents actually gave a time of possible return; all others said something like, "When the Russians leave, and the mines are gone and there is an Islamic government."

11. Many of the Afghans have been refugees now for ten years or longer. Because of the time involved, a high proportion have been assimilated into the Pakistan and Iranian economy and therefore will not return.

12. To have repatriation occur, three different events will have to take place. First, there will have to be a political change in Afghanistan, such as the establishment of an Islamic government. Secondly, civil wars must end and safety issues such as the removal of mines must be dealt with (based on data from 1988). And finally, economic aid must be
available to returnees for support and rebuilding.

13. Even though it is a very simple finding, I believe that the percent of respondents who say they will not return under certain conditions is a reliable indicator of what the population of refugees at large may feel. According to the respondents, 99 percent said they would not return before the withdrawal of the Russians. According to UNHCR workers and NGO workers I spoke to in 1988, less than one percent of the refugees had returned before the Soviet withdrawal. The next most important issue was whether refugees would return if there was not an Islamic government, 95 percent said, "No" they would not. According to conversations with UNHCR workers and NGO workers, who had returned from Pakistan and Afghanistan in 1991, it was estimated that five percent or less of the refugees had repatriated so far. There are five other issues about which varying amounts of people say they will not return under certain circumstances. Rated from most important to least important: 80 percent said they would not return if there was a coalition government; 65 percent said they would not return if the mines had not been removed; sixty percent indicated they would not return if the parties were fighting for power; if the Shah returns 44 percent said they will not return; if there are no schools two percent said they will not return; if there are no jobs one percent said they will not return. Because the number of respondents who said they would not return before the withdrawal of the Russians
and if there was not an Islamic government has closely matched what has happened in the interim, I believe it indicates that these other issues which are minuses or pushes blocking repatriation may have a similar importance for the general population of Afghan refugees.

PREDICTING RETURN

There are several different ways in which the process of who will repatriate can be predicted. One such way is to use a Bogue type scheme and measure the "pushes" and "pulls" and from their sum predict under what conditions people will return (Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754).

To make predictions of possible outcomes of possible repatriation, one needs to weigh the pushes or minuses against the pluses or pulls to repatriate. As has been stated previously, pulls or pushes can come from home country as well as host country. Currently in Pakistan, the refugees enjoy political refuge, they are physically safe, they receive aid from international agencies, the majority are ethnically similar to their hosts, both hosts and refugees are Moslem (which is important to the Afghans), and some refugees are able to find employment in the local economy. Overall in Pakistan, all factors operating are positive pulls to keep the refugees from returning home. The economic situation in Pakistan is best described as neutral; some refugees find work, others do not. Obviously at this point in time the
pulls or pluses in Pakistan combined with the minuses or pushes in Afghanistan are enough to keep 95 percent of the refugees from returning. Currently this system is almost at a standstill. One option would be to turn the pluses or positive factors in Pakistan into negative ones: humanitarian aid could be cut off, all refugee work could be stopped, and the refugees could be forcibly rounded up at gunpoint and driven to the border and forced across. Forced return, or refoulment, has been denounced by the UNHCR as both being in violation of a refugees’ rights as well as being a non-viable alternative since it is usually not a durable solution, but one that results in subsequent refugee flight. Recognizing this, one can rate the importance of the factors holding the Afghans in Pakistan, but for solutions one must change the factors acting as pushes or minuses in Afghanistan which block return.

Based on responses given by the refugees interviewed, one can estimate percentages of returnees. The ranges listed are derived from the factor which will cause the highest rates of non-return and the next highest factor below it, then each successive factor below that. The situation that currently exists is a negative scenario where between 80 percent and 65 percent will not return. The high rate of non-return will occur if a coalition government or what is perceived as a coalition government is formed, the mines are not removed, and other negative factors remain in place. If there is not a
coalition government, but the mines are in place and the parties are fighting between 65 percent and 60 percent will not return. If the mines have been removed, but the parties are fighting and the Shah returns, between 60 percent and 44 percent will not return. If the parties are not fighting but the Shah returns and there are no schools, between 44 percent and two percent will not return. If the Shah does not return, but there are no schools and no jobs between two and one percent will not return. Even if all negative factors which currently block return are removed, due to the large amount of time passing while the Afghans have been in refuge and the accompanying economic and cultural assimilation, it is very possible that between ten and 15 percent will never repatriate.

While in Peshawar I met with Llyod Deacon, a UNHCR officer. Based on his knowledge of the situation he said the refugees would return in three stages. First would be the farmers living in the refugee camps. They would go to areas controlled by the Mujahideen and that had been cleared of mines. Secondly, the small time merchants and city dwellers who had been living in the city would go. Last to go will be the big merchants or successful businessmen who have a lot of cash. The last group may wait as long as two or three years until they are guaranteed security. Deacon also said that current programs in Afghanistan (in 1988) were geared towards getting farmers to return first; once the farmers are in place
hopefully it would draw other refugees back (based on field notes of conversation with Lloyd Deacon, November 1988).

Writers such as William Wood, believe that return will be based, first, on the determination of the tribal leaders and Mujahideen leaders of when it is safe to go back. Secondly, the border provinces will receive the first returnees, who will be men who return several months or weeks before their families, to repair homes and fields. This will then be followed thirdly by a slower, more organized migration (Wood 1989).

Finally it should be noted that I have just received a letter, dated May 4, 1992, (following the collapse of the communist regime in Kabul) from one of the Afghans who worked as my assistant and he says, "My family will leave as soon as the peace gets stability in the country, however those who used to live in the cities have already started moving, because their houses are intact" (personal letter from Afghan refugee).

THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE AFGHAN REFUGEES

Based on the work of the authors cited in this thesis, to summarize the Afghan refugee situation one would best start with the work of Bogue or Lee. The Afghans were pushed out of their country by "minuses" (Lee 1966, pg. 50) or "pushes" (Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754). The Afghans are a "Reactive Fate Group" in that they are refugees of war or revolutionary
changes (Kunz 1981, pg. 44). The Afghan refugees would also be considered "The Majority Identified" in that they believe that their opposition to the situation is shared by the majority of their compatriots (Kunz 1981, pp. 42-43). The Afghans were pushed out by "home related factors" (Lee 1966, pg. 50, Kunz 1981, pp. 42-46). Other than the war, the other home related factors include: the political situation in the home country (Akol 1987, pg. 156) and ethnic and religious conflict (Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754). In the interim the Afghans have become economic refugees as well. The Afghans overcame the "intervening obstacle" of geography (Lee 1966, pg. 50). The Afghans have been "pulled" to the host country of Pakistan by host related factors (Lee 1966, pg. 50, Kunz 1981, pp. 46-49). The "pulls" include "preferable environment and living conditions and dependency of persons to whom one is related" (Bogue 1969, pg. 754). If one considers Kunz's "host related factors," the Afghans and Pakistanis share the same language (in the Northwest Frontier Province), they both have similar values, both Afghans and Pakistanis have similar traditions, share the same religion (Islam), the Pakistanis have an Islamic government, the Afghans want one, they eat similar types of food and have similar interpersonal relations (Kunz 1981, pg. 47). In fact Pakistan as a host country is culturally compatible (generally) in all the areas that Kunz identified.
MODEL OF FLOW

The best general description that can be made about the Afghan flight and possible repatriation, and all refugee flights, is that it is a process or cycle encompassing two countries and the interplay of factors or "pushes" and "pulls" between them (Bogue 1969, pp. 753-754).

A good analogy to use here is that the process is similar to the cycle a motor goes through. Refugees are pushed out of their country and pulled to a host country. The Afghans were pushed out initially or in the interim by all four spheres: political, human rights, economic and socio-cultural. They have overcome the geographic obstacles and were pulled to Pakistan by the socio-cultural sphere, the human rights sphere and the political sphere. The economic sphere would be considered neutral. Since their arrival, time has become an intervening obstacle. To repatriate, the pulls home must overcome the pulls to remain in a host country (Bogue 1969), in this case Pakistan. While the political situation or sphere has improved in Afghanistan it is still far from ideal. The same can be said about the socio-cultural and human rights sphere. Finally, the economic sphere continues to be very negative or to push refugees away. Like a gasoline engine this process or cycle can run very badly or inefficiently, with pulls barely overcoming pushes, or it can run very efficiently with pulls for movement very strong and the pushes blocking movement, non-existent or weak. A system running
with high efficiency (lots of pluses and low or no minuses) would have high levels of returnees. A system running with low efficiency (lots of minuses and few pluses) would have low or no rates of returnees. To apply the analogy to the Afghans, one would have to say that at this point, the motor (or cycle) is running at low efficiency, because the pushes blocking return and the pulls from the host country are still stronger than the pulls to return home, to Afghanistan. (See Figure 5., Refugee Flight and Repatriation Flow Model.)

FURTHER RESEARCH THAT IS NEEDED

In general all of the topics covered in this research project would benefit from further research covering a greater sample. Over time a number of the issues and scenarios described within the work will come to pass, so continued longitudinal research would be beneficial as well to see if the amounts of returnees match the responses of the sample.

Specific areas that seemed to be important, but had few respondents, or not enough data collected about them and hence have questionable reliability, were the issues of why people left, ethnic differences, gender differences, differences in those from different geographic locations, and effect of dependents on willingness to repatriate. All of these areas would benefit from a larger sample and more in-depth research.
Figure 5. Refugee flight and repatriation flow model.
One area that would have been beneficial to pursue would have been to study the group decision making processes and how they differ among various tribal groups and other forms of leadership, both among the Afghans as well as refugees around the world.

Another area that would have been fascinating to pursue would have been a longitudinal study of what specific respondents said they would do and what they in fact later did do. This would allow a correlation between intention and actual behavior to be measured.

Most important of all would be to conduct more research on other refugee populations to determine what is unique and specific to the Afghans and what are universal factors and issues affecting all refugees.
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APPENDIX

Questionnaire used in interviewing Afghan refugee subjects;

1. Age
2. Ethnic Group /Tribe
3. Marital Status
4. Number of Children and ages
5. Home town and village or province
6. How many years of education have you had?
7. What are your reasons for leaving Afghanistan?
8. When did you leave Afghanistan?
9. Do you live in a refugee camp? if not where?
10. Do you work here in Pakistan?
11. What was your job in Afghanistan?
12. Is your family here with you?
13. Will you return to Afghanistan before the Soviet withdrawal?
14. Will you return if the Mujahideen and the parties are fighting for power?
15. Will you return before the removal of the mines.
16. Will you return if there is not an Islamic government.
17. Which party do you belong to?
18. Which party should run the government?
19. Would you return if King Zahir Shah ran the government?
20. Will you return if there are no jobs in Afghanistan?
21. Will you return if there are no schools?

22. How important is religious freedom for you to return?

23. How will you return to Afghanistan?

24. Do you think the rich Afghan will return to Afghanistan?

25. Do you think the student in the university will stay here to finish their studies?

26. Do you know anyone who will stay here?

27. If someone stayed in Pakistan what would their family do.

28. When the refugees go back what will they need to survive?

29. How have the Pakistanis helped the refugees?

29a What help have other countries given.

30. Will the Pakistanis continue to help when the refugees return home?

31. With all of the Afghans heavily armed will there be a problem with violence when everyone goes home.

32. When will you and the other refugees return?

33. Would you return if there was a coalition government with the communists?

34. What will people do about roof poles and building material when they return home?

35. Are there any other important issues I have not asked about?

36. What will you take back with you?

37. What will your tribe do will they all go back together?

38. Who will decide when it is time for your tribe to go back?
39. What job will you do when you return?

40. Will Pakistan ever force the refugees to leave?

41. Does your family feel the same way about these issues?