

Tahleel



Issue No. 371

09 August 2021

INSULTING DEAL OF AMERICA WITH ITS ALLIES WHILE WITHDRAWING FROM AFGHANISTAN

THE US INTERESTS AND POLICIES IN AFGHANISTAN AND THE REGION AFTER
WITHDRAWAL



INSULTING DEAL OF AMERICA WITH ITS ALLIES WHILE WITHDRAWING FROM AFGHANISTAN

INTRODUCTION

The withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan is scheduled to be completed by the eleventh of September this year, after which the presence of foreign troops will officially end in Afghanistan. The complete withdrawal of foreign troops, undoubtedly, impacts the politics, security and economy of Afghanistan. The concern regarding the effects of the withdrawal of foreign troops also led to lack of attention of the government and the people of Afghanistan to the important issue of handing over the installations and facilities to the Afghan side.

The withdrawal process of foreign troops basically [started](#) in the middle of 2011 when security responsibilities were handed over to Afghan security forces in Bamyan, Laghman and some other provinces of Afghanistan, and till 2014, the security responsibilities for all parts of the country were handed over to Afghan security forces. In that time too, the foreign troops while evacuating their military bases, were destroying military installations and facilities, and then handing them over to Afghan forces. As the foreign troops were not completely withdrawing from Afghanistan at that time, the political implications of handing over security responsibilities to Afghan forces were not so profound and serious like that of the last months of its complete withdrawal. That is why, in 2013, the Afghan government [reacted](#) towards the destruction of military installations and facilities by foreign troops and through the Afghan National Security Council, the concerns of Afghan government were conveyed to authorities of the coalition forces.

After eight years, when the US and NATO member states announced complete withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan, once again the same situation repeated and the foreign troops destroyed their military bases and vehicles before handing them over to the Afghan military forces.

At the same time, a point of importance about this issue is that even if some of the sides might support destroying installations and military equipment by foreign troops, but it should be considered that these installations and equipment were vitally essential to the strength of Afghan military forces and overall for the economy of Afghanistan in the POST-PEACE stage and this issue shouldn't have been short-sighted.



This short article looks at the destruction of installations and facilities by foreign troops, the reasons for the destruction of these installations and equipment and draws a comparison between the withdrawal of former Soviet troops with US and NATO forces from Afghanistan.

DESTROYING INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES

The treatment of foreign troops towards their installations and military equipment while leaving their military bases grabbed the attention of Afghans in most cases. They take their valuable equipment out of Afghanistan and completely destroy the less-valued equipment instead of handing them over to Afghanistan and those equipment and materials that couldn't be destroyed completely are marketed to the regional demanders as iron that is worn out.

For example, the Shorabak military base (formerly Camp Bastion) which was the largest military and air base of foreign troops in southern Afghanistan for the past 20 years is now once again changed to a deserted empty field after the withdrawal of foreign troops from the base. A [documentary](#) from this military base, released in May this year, pictures that foreign troops destroying vehicles and equipment inside the base that are not worth re-transporting from Afghanistan and then sell the iron in the black market. This documentary also shows that military installations and concrete barriers are also being destroyed and even non-military vehicles and electrical wires and other tools are destroyed and damaged to a degree that it can't be reused. A commander and a number of Afghan national army soldiers visiting the base are astonished by this attitude of foreign troops. One of them surprisingly says that if they were able to carry the concrete walls, they wouldn't hesitate. The destroyers of these installations say that they don't know the reason of this but they were ordered to do so by high-ranking officials.

In the bilateral security [agreement](#) (BSA) that was signed in 2014 by America and the Afghan government, the US lightly promised that they would hand over the military bases to the Afghan government. Although the text of the agreement is prepared in a way that America has no obligation throughout all the agreement but in a way it was mentioned that they will hand over the military installations to the Afghan government. Article 8, paragraph 1, of the agreement states, "United States forces shall return to Afghanistan any agreed facility or area, or any portion thereof, including buildings, non-relocatable structures, and assemblies connected to the soil, including those constructed, altered, or improved by United States forces,



when no longer needed for United States forces' use." But contrary to this promise, in the last months, it was witnessed that most of the installations were destroyed by foreign troops.

The same story repeated in all other military bases including the large military base of Bagram. Allegedly, on daily basis, hundreds of American vehicles were being transported to Pakistan and nothing comes to sight except destruction in this base. Even it is not clear that whether these equipment and vehicles are carried to any aimed countries or to a third country like Pakistan.

Although some tools of little value, such as generators and other non-military equipment, have been handed over to the government of Afghanistan, but it is not at all worthy to be mentioned in comparison to those that are moved out of the country or destroyed. Some analysts believe that the promises of American aids are just deceptions, and that the destruction of these installations shows that the US does not want Afghans to be equipped with such tools and facilities.

A LOOK AT THE HERITAGE OF SOVIET AND AMERICA TO AFGHANISTAN

The massive destruction of installations and military and non-military equipment by foreign troops and overall the withdrawal of American and NATO forces from Afghanistan reminds every one of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan in the 1990s. At that time, the Soviet forces, unlike the US and NATO forces, handed over all their military bases with its equipment and facilities to their backed government of Afghanistan and left behind [tens of billions](#) of dollars worth of their military vehicles and equipment.

Evidence [show](#) that the Soviet forces left behind more than 2500 tanks, 500 fighter and cargo aircrafts and more than 5000 military vehicles to the government of Afghanistan. Even though, most of these equipment were destroyed during the civil war or smuggled to other countries, but if peace was restored in the country after the withdrawal of the Soviet forces, it would be a huge asset for Afghanistan.

Some studies [indicate](#) that the Soviet heritage had transformed the country's military apparatus into one of the military powers in the region. Within the Armory range, nearly 400 up to 600 T-55 tanks, about 100 T-62 tanks equipped with computer-controlled and laser-measuring devices, and hundreds of other military devices were handed over to the Afghan



government by Soviet forces. After the withdrawal of Soviet forces, Afghanistan owned hundreds of planes and helicopters. As an example, MiG-21 jets, Sukhoi bombers, Antonov aircraft, nearly 155 Mil Mi-24 fighter helicopters and tens of other military aircrafts were given to Afghanistan. Afghanistan's air force was significantly stronger, and even the Afghan air defense was equipped with advanced radar systems and equipment.

From the other side, if we look at the past two decades, the US and NATO have spent a lot of money on equipping Afghan military forces on paper, but what we witness isn't a force that can be spoken of. To the extent that the backbone of the Afghan air force is made up of about 40 Turboprop and 29 Super Tucano aircrafts which can't compete with any attacking air force. These planes, due to its low price and low expenses are suitable for poor countries like Afghanistan. A number of C-5 aircrafts that were given to Afghanistan by the US have been sold as worn-out iron. Now a limited number of aircrafts are active in the Afghan national army and a number of others are supposed to be given to Afghanistan, whose arrival is still not certain. In general, Afghanistan's current air force is incomparable to any of the remaining from the former Soviet forces in terms of capability, and is far weaker and more inefficient.

There is a great difference between the American and Soviet heritage to Afghanistan which is only mentioned here as an example but the scope of this article is too limited for its details. Overall, the soviet heritage for Afghans regarding tools, vehicles and equipment in comparison to the US and NATO, was that it changed the national army of the time to a powerful army. But, currently, with the withdrawal of the US and NATO troops, the national army, regarding the equipment and tools, is not well-equipped that it has no words to utter to the foreign threats and only can stand against the internal groups without any defense and armor.

THE REASONS BEHIND THE DESTRUCTION OF INSTALLATIONS

The point that why the US left nothing to Afghanistan while the Soviet forces equipped Afghanistan is mostly related to the political policies of the two countries. Generally, the Soviets excellently equip the countries under their support while the US and western countries have no such policy.

In 2013, coalition forces announced the destruction of the facilities due to the lack of necessary capacity to operate and protect the equipment and tools. At that time, this argument



was considered unjustifiable by the Afghan government, but even if this argument was justifiable, the question arises as to why, over the past 20 years, despite the costs and commitments to equip and train Afghan military forces even the capacity to operate the equipment is not build in Afghan forces?!

Perhaps one of the most important factors that the US and NATO member states do not want to hand over their equipment and facilities to the Afghans is the fact that the US has learned a lesson from the realities of Afghan society and the destruction of the Soviet equipment that they have left to Afghanistan and they are concerned that the equipment, at a time, may fall to the hands of their enemies. The US also has a bitter experience of South Vietnam and the ruling government there that after direct US support in a short period of time, Vietnam was defeated and its military equipment fell to the hands of the number one enemy of the US. If we consider the current political situation of Afghanistan, it is clear that the current government of Afghanistan is also facing many challenges and problems and uncertain future awaits Afghans; the national interests are sacrificed for the personal interests of some powerbrokers and rulers and the current situation in Afghanistan has increased the possibility of repeating experiences of the past.

Overall, the policy of America with its allies is completely different from that of the Soviets. The contemporary history of the US witnesses that America has never been faithful to its allies and international partners and mostly it didn't stay faithful to its commitments. That is why when the former president of Afghanistan in 2013 didn't accept signing the security agreement, he said that he didn't trust America. He [said](#), "Whenever America decides to go, if we give them thousands of agreements, they will leave. After the years of Jihad and victory of Jihad, when the Soviets left Afghanistan, they, at once, left Afghanistan all alone and closed their embassies." He continues, "Whenever there is no interest for them, they will never value us."

CONCLUSION

Destroying installations and facilities by foreign troops basically shows lack of their commitment towards Afghanistan. The presence of US-led foreign troops over the past 20 years has failed to bring security and peace to the country. During these years, Afghanistan not only did not escape the interventions of neighboring countries but also it got involved in



dangerous regional and trans-regional games. It is scheduled that, within a month, all the US and NATO troops will withdraw from Afghanistan and the government of America promised that they will keep supporting Afghan security forces but the destruction of these installations and facilities simply shows that this country has no commitment to the future of Afghanistan and there will come a day that they will completely leave behind Afghanistan and will become only an observer of the challenges and house-by-house civil wars.

The end

Center for Strategic and Regional Studies (CSRS)



THE US INTERESTS AND POLICIES IN AFGHANISTAN AND THE REGION AFTER WITHDRAWAL



Introduction

Twenty years ago, the interests of the US demanded invading Afghanistan, ending the Taliban's rule and bringing in a new government. The reason for invading Afghanistan was 9/11 attacks. The Americans claimed that Al-Qaeda was responsible for it and should be punished. After twenty years, the US ends its presence reasoning that Osama bin Laden is no more alive and the Taliban promised that they will end their relationships with Al-Qaeda and similar groups and they will not allow anyone to use Afghanistan's soil against any country particularly the US.

With the end of the US military presence, the question that arises is what will be the US interests and how they will achieve it in the region and Afghanistan. The rise of this question assures that even after the end of the US military presence, the US will pursue its interests in the region and Afghanistan. But, what will be these interests, where its boundaries will start and where will it end, and ultimately, through which policies and tactics the US will observe its interests, are debatable issues that will be, to its possible degree, addressed in this article.

HOW TO IDENTIFY THE US INTERESTS IN THE REGION AND AFGHANISTAN?

However, a large number of American political analysts believe that the US is responsible for human rights, women's rights, civil liberties, and ultimately for democracy as its leader in the world, and therefore, they add up ensuring human rights, women's rights and establishing democratic regimes to the list of the US interests.¹ The reason behind the dominance of this belief on Americans' public mind is the role of media, research centers, and is the result of the propaganda of the politicians through tools of social communication which should be created for legalizing any sort of US war. However, current and historical facts reveal that the above mentioned issues aren't part of the list of the US interests. In southern America, Middle East, Africa and in other parts of the world, destroying governments and bringing in humanitarian catastrophes, supporting dictator regimes, supporting military coups against legitimate elected governments or staying silent regarding them are the things that are in opposition to the human rights and principals of democracy which make up a great part of the history of the US military, intelligence and political efforts.

The fact that the history of the US foreign policy witnesses that after the military presence in Afghanistan, the US will redefine its interests and set new boundaries must not be overlooked when trying to identify American interests in the region and in Afghanistan. On the way towards ensuring these interests, the type of the coming regime, the state of human rights, human catastrophe, immigration of millions of Afghans and even house-by-house civil war wouldn't be its negative or positive factors.

Considering the above explanation, the situation in Afghanistan after the end of the military presence of the US has got complex. The peace talks are stopped, military movements are highly active that hundreds of humans are killed on daily basis and no one can anticipate what the future holds. Looking at this unknown situation, the US government is still unable to come up with a roadmap of its interests and next steps.² In such a situation, the only way through which the US interests could be understood is the principle of benefiting and harming from the incidents, changes

¹ Annie Pforzheimer "Protecting Wider U.S. Interests after a Troop Withdrawal". *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, 16 June 2021, www.csis.org/analysis/protecting-wider-us-interests-after-troop-withdrawal

² Mitchell, Ellen. "Biden Struggles to Detail Post-Withdrawal Afghanistan Plans." *TheHill*, The Hill, 19 June 2021, thehill.com/policy/defense/559229-biden-struggles-to-detail-post-withdrawal-afghanistan-plans?rl=1.



and alterations. Meaning that it should be looked for that which Afghanistan is benefiting America and which Afghanistan is benefiting the countries of the region. As a result of this calculation, the US interests can be somehow analyzed.

The benefiting and harming sides of the coming situation of Afghanistan can be categorized in two categories; one side is the regional countries as a whole while the other side is America.

THE STANDS OF THE REGIONAL COUNTRIES

Overall, the countries in the region see their interests in a stable Afghanistan, so that the geography is no more a concern for their security and with the help of the geography of Afghanistan the region alters to an economic bloc. Pakistan, particularly, shares this interest.

Pakistan is the most active regional country in Afghanistan's issue. The historical takeaway of Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies is to place the enmity or partnership with the Afghan government at the forefront of their national security issues. Rivalry with India, Durand Line and the Pashtun and Baloch nations dwelling to the east of Durand Line are all considered as major security problems for Pakistan.

Considering its situation, Pakistan doesn't want to be stuck in a geography where a strong enemy like India lives and to the other side rise another powerful enemy Afghanistan. That is why, from 1970s, it is deeply involved in Afghanistan's issues.³

Now that America's military presence is ending in Afghanistan, observing the situation, the scale of balance seems to be heavier on Pakistan's side. Pakistan tries to ensure its interests in the coming governing system of Afghanistan. Another fact beside this positive situation for Pakistan is that Pakistan's economic situation is not good and it can get better when there is political stability and economic development in the region. Pakistan needs to get connected to the markets of central Asian countries through Afghanistan, to sell its products and benefit from the sources of energy of that place. Also, China has multi-billion-dollar project of China- Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) with Pakistan and wants to connect it through Afghanistan with central

³ "Pakistan: Shoring Up Afghanistan's Peace Process." Crisis Group, 30 June 2021, www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/pakistan/b169-pakistan-shoring-afghanistans-peace-process.



Asia. Beside this, Pakistan knows that an unstable Afghanistan is more than anyone dangerous for Pakistan, insecurities in on-border areas and possible bulk of millions of immigrants are small examples for that.⁴

Economic needs, its economic partnership with China and the issues of national security encourage Pakistan to work for stability in Afghanistan and the region and try not to lose its influence in Afghanistan at this new stage. But Pakistan wouldn't let the Taliban to seize power by force. If the Taliban try to seize power by force, they will lose the legitimacy they have gained through diplomatic efforts over the past three years or so. Also, a government installed by force will not be recognized and acceptable to the international community and the regional countries. This is something that is in conflict with Pakistan's interests. Pakistan wants the Taliban to participate in a legitimate coalition government to gain international and regional acceptance.⁵

China pursues two main goals in Afghanistan. The first one is economic, that is, to connect Pakistan's seaports and the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) with central Asian countries via land routes of a stable Afghanistan; The second one is security, that is, Afghanistan should not be a safe haven for those groups that could be used against China's security, specifically with insecurity in Xinjiang, the Chinese projects will face barriers and delays. Beside this, insecure Afghanistan will become a major producer and exporter of narcotics which China fears.⁶

Russia also doesn't want to face security problems in its southern borders. That is why it has vast military presence in Central Asia; and including regional countries, it has brought in a regional security coordination.⁷ Russia and countries of Central Asia see ISIS as a major threat to themselves and this fear is grater due to the presence of the nationals of Central Asia in ISIS's ranks. An insecure Afghanistan is counted as a suitable geography for the growth of ISIS and this will lead Russia and other countries of Central Asia to challenges which will have huge costs economically and will lead to human catastrophes. Currently, Russia's strategy is to be on the side of no one in Afghanistan. Russia can cooperate with any kind of regime in Afghanistan but on

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Babb, Carla, et al. "China's Plans in Afghanistan Following US Troop Withdrawal." *Voice of America*, 18 June 2021, www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/chinas-plans-afghanistan-following-us-troop-withdrawal

⁷ Lewis, Dustin. "Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO)." *HLS PILAC*, HLS PILAC, 30 Mar. 2015, pilac.law.harvard.edu/multi-regional-efforts//collective-security-treaty-organization-csto.



condition that it shouldn't pose a threat to Russia's interests. Also, Central Asian countries and Russia fear Afghanistan's narcotics problem like China and don't want their markets to become major demanders of narcotics.⁸

Military presence of America in Afghanistan has been proven benefitting for both China and Russia. During America's presence, for twenty years, China and Russia weren't concerned about their borders. In the past twenty years, Russia has rigorously avoided direct interference in Afghanistan and didn't want to be part of a puzzle that its solution is unknown. Also, Russian facilities and resources in the region are not to a degree that can handle a great war. Russia does not have such a control on its southern borders and Central Asian countries to prevent large-scale immigration, drug trafficking and the movement of insurgents. That is why, Russia hasn't opposed the US presence in Afghanistan in the same way like in other parts of the world, especially in the Middle East.⁹ China's stand has been similar to that of Russia over the past twenty years, the US has established relative stability through its spending and efforts, and China didn't want to be directly involved in Afghanistan's issue.¹⁰

Iran has similar economic problems like Pakistan. As a result of years of economic blockade, Iran's economy is in a dire condition. In Middle East, Iran is busy in many countries. Also, Iran, specifically, eastern Iran is located on the dry part of the world which is considered as a major problem for Iran's national security. In such a situation, Iran tries not to waste resources and time on Afghanistan's issue like that of the Middle East. At the same time, Iran does not want to have no part in the future of Afghanistan. Iran needs a stable and partner Afghanistan. Afghanistan is a good market for Iranian commercial products and oil. Besides, Iran has 25-year economic agreement with China and wants to broaden its economic relations with China and Pakistan. Economic activities of Iran, China and Pakistan in the region face challenges without a stable Afghanistan.¹¹

⁸ TRENIN, DMITRI, et al. *A Russian strategy for Afghanistan after the coalition troop withdrawal*. CARNEGIE MOSCOW CENTER, May 2014, carnegieendowment.org/files/CMC_Article_Afganistan_Eng14.pdf.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Babb, Carla, et al. "China's Plans in Afghanistan Following US Troop Withdrawal." *Voice of America*, 18 June 2021, www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/chinas-plans-afghanistan-following-us-troop-withdrawal

¹¹ SETH J. FRANTZMAN "After US Afghanistan Withdrawal, Will Pakistan, Iran and Turkey Take Over." *The Jerusalem Post* | *JPost.com*, www.jpost.com/international/after-us-afghanistan-withdrawal-will-pakistan-iran-and-turkey-take-over-672090



In short, stability in Afghanistan is beneficial for the regional countries. A stable Afghanistan is a necessary step for the economic development of the region. But an insecure Afghanistan could pave the way for the growth of militant groups, insurgents and paramilitaries in the region, which will have far-reaching effects on the region as a whole, especially Pakistan, China, Russia, Central Asia and Iran. In such a situation, the regional countries will try to work for the stability of Afghanistan, and for them, without Pakistan which sees the Taliban as its chance, it wouldn't matter which group or which side stabilizes Afghanistan.

AMERICAN INTERESTS AND POLICY

After twenty years, America believes that Al-Qaeda has been weakened up to a point of absence and the Taliban promised that they would let no one and no group to be a challenge to American interests. The president of America, Joe Biden, and other high-ranking officials believe that there is no need for military presence and activity in Afghanistan. It is so because the old threat is no more there. But ending military presence doesn't mean that the importance of American interests is lost in the region and Afghanistan.

After twenty years, the region and the world is changed. China, as a major economic power, wants to grab hands over the globe, extend a new economic network with developing and impoverished countries from Asia to Africa, and challenge the American hegemony around the world. Also, Russia is ready to make allies and blocs in the region. Even if they don't trust one another in Central Asia, China and Russia can trust each other against America. Russians has also challenged American hegemony in the last ten years in the Middle East. India is the only regional country that can walk together with America but other regional countries are either America's strategic competitors or seek the heavy side of the scale of balance for their own benefits.

In such an environment, America is forced to reorganize its priorities in the list of interests and alter its policies. The end of military presence in Afghanistan is the first step in reorganizing the priorities in the list of interests and altering policies.

Currently, it seems that America follows some specific goals in the region and sees its interests in achieving these goals. The first of these goals is that Afghanistan's soil shouldn't be used in any case against America and this goal is achieved. The second one is that insecure



Afghanistan shouldn't pose danger to Pakistan which as a result will lead to falling the nuclear weapons of Pakistan to the hands of insurgents. Or the Afghan problem gets that wider that it leads to nuclear war between India and Pakistan. America closely observes the conflict of Pakistan and India in the region and doesn't want to leave its only ally, India, to dangers. America has always made its concerns clear about the nuclear program of Pakistan and currently, reducing tensions between India and Pakistan is an essential part of America's strategy about South Asia.¹² The third goal is that Afghanistan should have a government that is not under the influence of regional competitors of America. A government that is independent and doesn't look at America as a strategic enemy even if the Taliban has a major and important part in it is acceptable for America.¹³

The interests of the regional countries and America's goals are not in conflict but are even closer. The regional countries see a stable Afghanistan beneficial for them and due to the regional rivalries none can have complete control or hegemony on the future government of Afghanistan. In such a situation, America is not forced, and doesn't consider it as its responsibility, to spend 40 billion dollars annually on stabilizing Afghanistan all alone by itself or to lose its troops. America now believes that a stable Afghanistan more than anyone is beneficial for regional countries and they should greatly than anyone take their part in the process of peace and stability in Afghanistan. This belief of America is more evident in the interview of America's Secretary of State, Antony Blinken, with CNN.¹⁴

CONCLUSION

To conclude, after twenty years of military and political efforts, the US has failed to bring political stability and security to Afghanistan. Countries in the region are skeptical of the US plans; that is why, they maintain relations with the Taliban as well as with the Afghan government. The situation in the region is changing and American competitors are calmly making plans for their

¹² JIM GARAMONE. "President Unveils New Afghanistan, South Asia Strategy." U.S. Department of Defense, www.defense.gov/Explore/News/Article/Article/1284964/president-unveils-new-afghanistan-south-asia-strategy/

¹³ Felbab-Brown, Vanda. "US Policy toward Afghanistan: Consider the Trade-Offs, Including with Other Policy Areas." *Brookings*, Brookings, 14 Jan. 2021, www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2021/01/12/us-policy-toward-afghanistan-consider-the-trade-offs-including-with-other-policy-areas/

¹⁴ Gaouette, Nicole, and Jennifer Hansler. "Blinken Says US Withdrawal from Afghanistan Will Concentrate the Minds of 'Free Riders' in the Region." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 30 Apr. 2021, www.cnn.com/2021/04/27/politics/blinken-tapper-the-lead/index.html



regional and international goals. Looking at all these, the US does not want to bear all the costs of Afghanistan's stability and security alone, and use its intelligence and military resources to an unknown time in a fruitless war. That is why, the US is putting an end to its military presence and wants to hand over responsibility of Afghanistan's security and stability to regional countries. At this stage, the role of the US will be to support the peace process to the best of its ability, to prevent an immediate collapse of the Afghan government through assistance, and to put the necessary pressure on them when necessary to agree to peace talks.

If the war in Afghanistan stops, it is in America's interest, and if the war continues, it will be on harm of the countries in the region which are America's strategic competitors. If the situation in Afghanistan worsens, the Americans will be able to control their regional interests and goals, to some extent, from the countries of the region and, when necessary, they will intervene militarily. Given the circumstances, there are little reasons for the possibility that the US wants Afghanistan's intentional instability and war against its regional competitors, particularly China and Russia. If the regional countries see their interests in the stability of Afghanistan, they can easily prevent the spread of war together. America will not be willing to compete against all in such a situation.

The end

The Centre for Strategic and Regional Studies (CSRS) is an independent, non-profit, and non-governmental research organization established in July 2009 in Kabul. CSRS is committed to promoting policy-oriented research through conducting authentic and unbiased research concerning Afghanistan and the region.

