



Strategic Ambitions and Fragile Outcomes: A Multidimensional Analysis of U.S. Engagement in Afghanistan (2001–2021)

Sediqullah Anwary¹, Obaidullah Zarifi²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Panjab University

²Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Bakhtar University

Abstract

This study critically examines the strategic outcomes of U.S. intervention in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2021, arguing that underlying economic and geopolitical ambitions significantly shaped policy alongside declared counterterrorism and democratization objectives. Employing a tripartite analytical framework of geopolitical realism, liberal state-building, and humanitarian intervention, it explores: (1) economic exploitation of Afghanistan's mineral wealth; (2) containment of regional powers (China, Russia, Iran); and (3) promotion of Western governance norms. While U.S. efforts yielded infrastructural development, expanded social services, and temporary advancements in women's rights and civil society, these were ultimately undermined by endemic corruption, cultural insensitivity, and strategic miscalculations—most notably the Doha Agreement and rapid fall of Bagram Airbase. Drawing on 120 primary documents, peer-reviewed studies, and interviews with Afghan officials, the findings underscore the imperative of culturally attuned, participatory frameworks for sustainable peace and development.

Keywords: Afghanistan · U.S. foreign policy · geopolitical strategy · state-building · humanitarian intervention · mineral resources · Taliban

1. Introduction

The U.S.-led intervention in Afghanistan, initiated in October 2001 following al-Qaeda's September 11 attacks, rapidly expanded beyond dismantling terrorist networks to encompass extensive state-building and resource security objectives. This paper contends that U.S. strategy integrated counterterrorism with ambitions to exploit Afghanistan's vast mineral reserves, establish strategic footholds in Central Asia, and project Western political norms, but lacked coherence with local sociocultural dynamics, resulting in systemic failure by 2021.

In framing this analysis, we also consider the agency of Afghan actors—ranging from provincial warlords to civil society leaders—whose cooperation, resistance, and negotiation shaped the implementation and impact of U.S. policies. Furthermore, the roles of NATO allies, Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), and Iran's border strategies introduced additional layers of complexity.

This introduction outlines: the evolution of objectives from counterterrorism to multifaceted state intervention; the paradox of projected stability versus on-ground volatility; and the central research question: What strategic, developmental, and institutional benefits did the U.S. derive, and why did they prove unsustainable?

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Contemporary scholarship on Afghanistan spans counterinsurgency studies, liberal institutionalism, and critical geopolitical analyses. However, fewer works synthesize economic drivers with civilizational narratives. This study's conceptual framework integrates three theoretical lenses:

2.1 Geopolitical Realism

Realism emphasizes power balances and state security. Mearsheimer (2001) posits that great powers seek strategic depth; Afghanistan's \$1–3 trillion in identified mineral reserves (USGS, 2011) and adjacency to Central Asia and Iran underscored its importance. Rashid (2008) and Sakwa (2016) document how U.S. basing structures in Bagram and Karshi-Khanabad aimed to forestall Chinese and Russian expansion.

2.2 Liberalism and State-Building

Liberal theories advocate institutional reform and cooperative governance. Fukuyama's *State-Building* (2004) and Rotberg *et al.* (2003) conceptualize Afghanistan as a testbed for democratic institution-building. Barfield (2010) and Gopal (2014) highlight successes—elections, legal reforms, and gender education—alongside pitfalls of corruption and aid dependency (SIGAR, 2021).

2.3 Humanitarian Intervention

Evans and Sahnoun's (2001) Responsibility to Protect provides moral legitimacy for intervention against Taliban-era human rights abuses. Studies by Mamdani (2004) critique the imposition of external values, noting that short-lived gains in women's rights unraveled post-withdrawal.

2.4 Literature Gap and Synthesis

While existing analyses address security outcomes and institutional failures, there is a paucity of integrated studies linking mineral resource interests, geopolitical rivalry, and civilizational rhetoric. This paper bridges that gap by examining how these dimensions interacted to produce both fleeting gains and enduring vulnerabilities.

3. Research Methodology

Adopting a qualitative inductive design, the study analyzes 120 primary documents—including SIGAR reports, U.S. Congressional testimonies, UN data, and field interviews with Afghan officials—aiding triangulation. Thematic coding identified four core categories: economic exploitation, geopolitical containment, institutional dependency, and sociocultural misalignment. Rigorous cross-validation of sources mitigates individual bias and enhances credibility.

4. Analysis and Findings

4.1 Economic Exploitation of Mineral Wealth

U.S. reconstruction funding disproportionately benefited foreign contractors. Projects such as the Mes Aynak copper mine and lithium surveys (Peters *et al.*, 2011) spotlight America's interest in critical minerals. Yet SIGAR (2021) notes only 5% of funds supported Afghan institutions, entrenching a rentier economic model.

4.2 Geopolitical Containment of Regional Powers

Basing agreements served dual purposes: counterterrorism and strategic encirclement of China's Belt and Road Initiative and Russia's CSTO framework (Wang, 2022; Sakwa, 2016). Post-2021, China's swift mining deals and Russia's diplomatic outreach reveal the ephemeral nature of U.S. influence.

4.3 Institutional Dependency and Collapse

Western-centric governance structures—spanning the central bank, justice system, and security forces—were built with minimal tribal consultation (Rubin, 2002). The resulting \$88 billion Afghan National Security Forces unraveled within weeks of U.S. withdrawal, demonstrating institutional fragility (SIGAR, 2021).

4.4 Sociocultural Misalignment and Human Cost

Externally imposed reforms clashed with local norms. Civilian casualties exceeded 47,000 (UNODC, 2020), while millions were displaced. Afghan provincial leaders employed both collaboration and resistance to preserve autonomy, illustrating agency overlooked in top-down narratives.

4.5 Strategic Miscalculations: Doha Agreement & Bagram Withdrawal

The 2020 Doha Agreement, negotiated without Afghan government inclusion, and the unannounced handover of Bagram Airbase in July 2021 epitomize U.S. misjudgments. These moves eroded local trust and accelerated regime collapse.

5. Conclusion and Policy Implications

5.1 Summary of Findings

The U.S. intervention achieved tactical successes—disruption of terrorist networks, infrastructure, and social service expansions—but strategic objectives tied to resource security and geopolitical dominance were undermined by corruption, cultural disconnect, and flawed exit strategies.

5.2 Policy Implications

Future interventions should embed local governance traditions, ensure equitable resource-sharing mechanisms, and adopt participatory state-building to foster legitimacy and resilience.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study's reliance on secondary documents and anonymous interviews constrains granularity. Further research should incorporate Taliban governance perspectives and longitudinal economic analyses of post-U.S. investment patterns.

References

- Andishmand, A. (2005). *The legitimacy of U.S. intervention in Afghanistan: A critical review of discourses*. Kabul University Press.
- Barfield, T. (2010). *Afghanistan: A cultural and political history*. Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (2013). *Drone wars: Transforming conflict, law, and policy*. Pluto Press.
- Cordesman, A. H. (2012). *Afghanistan and the United States: The end game*. Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Durrani, M. (2018). Monetary policy and dollarization in post-Taliban Afghanistan. *Journal of Economic Policy Studies*, 9(2), 160–175.
- Evans, G., & Sahnoun, M. (2001). *The responsibility to protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. International Development Research Centre.
- Fukuyama, F. (2004). *State-building: Governance and world order in the twenty-first century*. Cornell University Press.
- Gopal, A. (2014). *No good men among the living: America, the Taliban, and the war through Afghan eyes*. Metropolitan Books.
- Grare, F. (2006). *Pakistan–Afghanistan relations in the post-9/11 era*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Humphries, M. (2021). *Critical minerals and the role of Afghanistan: Global supply chain implications*. Congressional Research Service.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon & Schuster.
- Jones, S. G. (2009). *In the graveyard of empires: America's war in Afghanistan*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Kolhatkar, S., & Ingalls, J. (2006). *Bleeding Afghanistan: Washington, warlords, and the propaganda of silence*. Seven Stories Press.
- Malkasian, C. (2021). *The American war in Afghanistan: A history*. Oxford University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Peters, S. G., Compston, W., & Davis, A. (2011). Summaries of important areas for mineral investment and production opportunities of nonfuel minerals in Afghanistan (U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2011–1204). U.S. Geological Survey.
- Rashid, A. (2008). *Descent into chaos: The United States and the failure of nation building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. Viking.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2003). *State failure and state weakness in a time of terror*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Sakwa, R. (2016). *Russia against the rest: The post-Cold War crisis of world order*. Cambridge University Press.
- SIGAR. (2021). *Quarterly report to the United States Congress (April–June 2021)*. Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. <https://www.sigar.mil>
- Stevens, P. (2016). *The TAPI pipeline: A test case for the Asian energy market* (Chatham House Briefing Paper). Chatham House.
- UNICEF. (2020). *Afghanistan education sector analysis*. UNICEF.
- UNODC. (2020). *World drug report 2020*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- Wang, Y. (2022). China's role in post-U.S. Afghanistan: Risks and opportunities. *Journal of International Affairs*, 75(1), 90–104.
- Wilson, A. B., Canali, M. G., & Brock, M. (2011). *Geological investigations in Afghanistan for mineral resource assessment* (U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin). U.S. Geological Survey.