

Trump's South Asia Strategy: Security Impacts on Afghanistan

Mohammad Wasim Arian

Assistant Professor and Director of International Relations Department, Law and Political Science Faculty, Al-beroni University, Afghanistan

Farhad Ahmad Haqbeen

Assistant Professor of International Relations Department, Law and Political Science Faculty, Al-beroni University, Afghanistan

Abstract

The paper analyses the U.S. President Donald Trump's South Asia Strategy and its security impact on Afghanistan. This strategy announced on 21 August 2017 and it is neither new nor comprehensive roadmap policy towards Pakistan, India and Afghanistan. Decimation of terrorism, end of war, peace initiatives and withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan is the center aims of this strategy. Trump's approach towards Islamabad is harsh and India is a strategic partner. Trump's based approach is new engagement and it pledges future of U.S. policy towards Afghanistan. The central question that is explored here is, what are the implications of Trump's strategy in South Asia and what have been the effects of this strategy on security of Afghanistan? For finding the answers to the above question, the study use librarian research with the descriptive-analytical method, which examines the nature and security impact of this strategy in Afghanistan. Based on the results from this study, there are several terrorist groups and complete eradication is not possible. Irresponsible withdrawal of U.S. troops is not a good option, it will lead safe haven terrorist's activities and the conditions-based approach is right. The only way for sustainable peace is political solution.

Key Words: Trump, South Asia, Security, Strategy, Impact

Date of Submission: 20-09-2020

Date of Acceptance: 04-10-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Donald Trump's strategy for Afghanistan and South Asia, elaborated on 21 August 2017 and it is neither new nor comprehensive, decimation of terrorism is the main aims of this strategy. Trump's military strategy is still the option to fight against terrorism. But, military strategy is confusion whether its counter-insurgency, counter-terrorism or both of them. Although, military force to defeats Taliban and other terrorist groups will not be successful. From Bush and Obama approaches were failed to overcome the challenges in Afghanistan.¹ The Trump administration approach to South Asia involves Afghanistan, Pakistan and India, and it has more similarities with the past administration's experiences under the administrations of George W. Bush and Barack Obama. The cornerstone of Trump's office regarding South Asia and Afghanistan are as the following: First, Taliban and Al Qaeda leaded threaten of U.S. interest and military force is appropriate to prevent Taliban and Al Qaeda extremist's activities. Trump's condemned Pakistan for terrorist's contribution in the region and he had stated message for direct involvement of Pakistan from terrorist's network. Trump's administration manifested clear message which has never elaborated by the previous U.S. administration. Pakistan has not only supported Taliban regime, even was sheltering Al-Qaeda's leadership and other terrorist groups such as Haqqani network and the Afghan Taliban to operating and targeting American, Afghan soldiers and civilian people. Osama bin Laden found refuge in Pakistan until his death in May 2011. From Obama's new Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan have been conducted to additional 30,000 troops and setting of a timetable for a "draw down" of forces in the region. In the current situation, stable Afghanistan has direct impact in the regional and global level. U.S. involved longest war in Afghanistan and its plays the key role in the American foreign policy since 11 September.² Second, conditional cooperation with Pakistan to denying a safe haven to terror organizations in the region, Third, Indian integration with the United States cultivates

¹. Mariet S. "Trump's 'new' Afghanistan and South Asia Strategy & India-US Strategic Partnership". Institute for Strategy, 2017, p. 2. See <http://www.ispsw.de>

². Jash A. "Dossier Perspectives on Trump's South Asia Policy". Indrastra, September 2017, P. 4. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-53480-3>

equilibrium to China. Since collapse of Soviet Union in the post cold war, China has replaced and it is the main actor in international politics. U.S. will never leave Afghanistan, because of China's neighborhood with Afghanistan. Trump has expressed for India's integration and it has never played dualistic policy in Afghanistan. Fourth, the Trump's speech is not nations-building in Afghanistan and it is the roadmap to search and destroys terrorism. Trump neither has he expressed in any clear terms expected steps the role of other major regional powers such as Russia, China, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. Trump strategy in Afghanistan and South Asia is uncompleted due to keep away other active player in the region.

Another issue that focused on this strategy is revising of peace initiatives. Whether, Afghanistan is a stable state and it enable to protect its people and self sufficient with limited foreign support. Peace initiatives are the main option to end the conflict and bring Taliban to the table of negotiation. U.S. efforts on Peace initiatives seems failure, complete withdrawal of foreign troops and the implementation of Sharia-based law and theocratic system of governance are non-negotiable.³ U.S. will stay in Afghanistan because of its interest. U.S. will not leave Afghanistan due to the following reasons: 1) Afghanistan's location which is neighborhood of China and nearly of Russia, two of America's strongest rivals; 2) Afghanistan's proximity to Middle East; 3) Afghanistan's neighborhood of Iran; and 4) Afghanistan's neighborhood with two emerging nuclear powers, India and Pakistan. China is capable of an economic, military and political power, threatens American interests. Even though, politically China is a communist state and U.S. is a democratic state, there are two opposite ruled ideologies with background of rivalries. Although, Afghanistan is nearly to Middle East and the U.S. presence in Afghanistan is opened the gate of Middle East. Middle East has a vital role in American foreign policy and they are rich in natural resources. Along with, expand of democratic system in the Middle East is the main principle of U.S. foreign policy. While, U.S. is in Afghanistan, Iran will come to under control and in the suitable circumstances U.S. will change the Iranian regime. India and Pakistan emerged as two nuclear powers states and U.S. will never put eyes on nuclear activates. The main concern of U.S. regarding nuclear power in the South Asia is access of terrorist groups in nuclear weapons.⁴ Trump believed one strategy for the entire region and it's founded by several main pillars. At the very top of the agenda based on his change of course is the idea that the timing of the withdrawal of U.S. troops will not be determined by a fixed date set by politicians. In addition, the US president aims at reaching a political solution and solves the conflict politically in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan a plural, multiethnic, and multilingual country has been an area of grand ambitions and competition for imperial powers both in medieval and modern history. Despite foreign interventions and repeated violence between various power structures, Afghanistan has been able to continue as a geopolitical unit. Its geographical location has always attracted the attention of regional and extra-regional powers. Afghanistan has been the playground for these powers either to retain their influence or to contain their adversary. These competitions and rivalry among various actors have negatively affected the social, political and economic development of Afghanistan. All the emerging powers states occupied Afghanistan while they were making policies out of their borders.

11th September incident brought the U.S. in Afghanistan. The presence of Al-Qaida and other terrorist groups in this country have paved the ground for the existence and changing of security and political strategies in different periods, which each have different positive and negative influences and consequences. The importance of this study is that the security issue of Afghanistan is more important than any other issue for the United States. South Asia and Afghanistan has a special place in the center of American Foreign Policy and security strategy. On the other hand, the presence of the United States for nearly two decades, complete peace and security is not assured in this country. Regarding security strategy, neither Afghanistan is independent nor can it be totally self-sufficient. The objectives that it aspires to achieve are always bigger and more than the resources that it has at its disposal at best. Each nation can hope and try to become self-reliant in the most area of its needs and interests on the ground of security. However, for securing this, it has to depend upon other nations of the worlds. The key objectives of U.S. strategy in South Asia and its impact on Afghanistan security is about the impact of interdependence of both nations which is significant in region and global sphere. Terrorism in Afghanistan which conducted by Pakistan is considered as the most important threats of U.S. national interests, and U.S. security strategies have not been successful in countering terrorism. This leads additional important of present study.

Present study mainly focuses on the genesis and relevance of Trump's Strategy in South Asia and its impact on Afghanistan Security. Based on the present paper, there will be emerging several questions and the central question that is explored here is how this strategy has conducted in South Asia and what is effect of this strategy on Afghanistan's security? Does Trump's Strategy safeguard the security threats that the U.S. face

³. Wolf O. Siegfried, "US President Donald Trump's new Afghanistan strategy in context". South Asia Democratic Forum, August 2017, p. 6. No 100.

⁴. Ab. Mahdi, Shikhbani, "The Short and Long-term goals of the United States in its Military Invasion of Afghanistan". Scientific Journal, Summer, 2010, Vol. 3, P. 3.

in Afghanistan? In order, this strategy has several pillars and the very top of the agenda is withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan on one hand, and focus is to bring the conflict to an end on terms acceptable to the Afghan people and its regional and international partners. To find the appropriate answer, it would be essential to create hypothesis. There is direct relationship between Trump's strategy in South Asia and security of Afghanistan. Withdrawal of U.S. troops, military strategy to eradicate of terrorist groups are not appropriate options and political approach is hopeful among than other variable for sustainable peace in Afghanistan. Regarding this research paper, descriptive-analytical method will engage and data have been collected from the original sources and different books, articles, research papers, magazines and journals U.S. strategy's periodical reports and other published and unpublished literature on Trump's Strategy in South Asia and Afghanistan. Relevant written text and videos on internet have remained useful on understanding the research topic. The present study is archival in nature. Textual and contextual approach has been adopted for seeking an answer to the research objectives in writing. Secondary sources have been also used for the purpose of the present research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In general, the U.S. strategy in South Asia has been examined by different writers, several books and articles are published for Afghanistan's security place in U.S. foreign policy post-2001 by various scholars. But, there is not particular implication that shows the U.S. strategy in South Asia and its impacts on security of Afghanistan. This has led a cycle of instability and crisis at the domestic level and it's considered immediate consequences in the regional and global level. Hence, security in Afghanistan makes the world safer. Although, the articulated studies on Trump's strategy in South Asian Policy have not critically examined Afghanistan's security. However, there are several books and academic journals which focused on George W. Bush and Barak Obama's security strategy in Afghanistan. Regarding the discussion the objectives of the present study, it is essential to concentrate on different resources and relevant literatures as the following:

Akshay Ranade has been written an article which is named "*Trump's Afghanistan Strategy and Emerging Alignments in the Region: Implications for India*". It is published in Ore Issue Brief No. 209, November 2017. The author of this paper focused a descriptive-analytical method to engage the dynamic factors of the South Asia. The centered aims of this article are the Trump's Afghanistan Strategy: Continuities and Departure. Pakistan as a main factor, China pursuits it is objectives in Afghanistan, Russia's double policy, the Iran Factor and India's implications.

Another research paper "*Trump's New Afghanistan Strategy: Implications for India*" is written by Luciane Noronha that published in Brazilian Naval War College on August 2017. The relevant topic for present study is U.S. involvement in long war of Afghanistan, India has partnership with United States and Pakistan is as a target of the new counterterrorism strategy of the U.S. for South Asia.

Further, Valentina Taddeo has done a relevant research named "*U.S. Response to Terrorism: A Strategic Analysis of the Afghanistan Campaign*" which is published on journal of Strategic Security, Number 2, Volume 3, Summer 2010. This article pointed out to comparative study of Trump's strategy and previous U.S. strategies.

There is another article named "*U.S. President Donald Trump's new Afghanistan strategy in context*", published in August 2017, and has been written by Dr. Siegfried O. Wolf. The relevant issues regarding this study are the following: Revising of U.S. and Afghan policy to initiate a new peace process and failure of strategies regarding changes of U.S. troops.

Trump's new strategy for Afghanistan and South Asia: A recipe for disaster (2017) is written by Institute of Strategic Studies. The key aims of this research is that it has relevance to present study, the security threats that the U.S. face in Afghanistan, and the border region, are immense, the new strategy will be an integration of all instruments of American power such as diplomatic, economic, and military and U.S. develop strategic partnership with India.

U.S. congressional research service has provided report under the heading of "*Afghanistan: Background and U.S. Policy*". This report announced on July 2010. The center aims of this report have been written regarding Afghanistan Security as a dynamics factor for Unites States policy, military engagement on regional and global contest.

There is another article, "*Consequences of a Precipitous U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan*" which has been written by James Dobbins, Jason H. Campbell, Sean Mann and Laurel E. Miller January (2019). This article deals with the different contents such as: first, impact of U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan on the region. The next part of this article deals with Afghanistan descends into a wider civil war. The last part of this article focused on role and activities of Al Qaeda and Islamic State (IS) against American homeland.

Ashley J. Tellis and J. Eggers in their work, "*U.S. Policy in Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains*" (2017), this article discussed the current interests and objectives of Unites States in Afghanistan.

Similarly, Richard L. Armitage and Samuel R. Berger have written “*U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan*”. This article has concentrated on strategic objectives of United States in South Asia and Afghanistan.

Clear, Build, Hold, transfer: Can Obama's Afghan Strategy Work? is another article that has been written by C. Christine Fair. In this article, she pointed out the evaluation of the viability of U.S. strategy in Afghanistan.

In order, David Rank articulated his article under the title of “*Leveraging U.S.-China Cooperation to Build a Regional Consensus on Afghanistan*” (2018). In this article Trump's Administration Policy in South Asia and Afghanistan has been studied.

Furthermore, “*Asia and the Trump Administration: Challenges, Opportunities, and a Road Ahead*” (2017), has written by James J. Przystup and Phillip C. Saunders. In this article several issues have conducted regarding present study such as, Asia-Pacific security challenges and sustaining U.S. presence in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan's security situation anno 2016: an overview, by Dr Mona Kanwal Sheikh is another work that has discussed the overview of the main security challenges of Afghanistan today, an impact on the situation on the ground is the increase in violent incidents, development relates to progress in the peace initiatives. Despite of the reviewed literatures, there are several other scholars who they have articulated their articles. *Factors Affecting the Adoption of Trump's Strategy in Afghanistan* is written by Nowzar Shafiai (2016). In this article author has concentrated on what factors and conditions compelled President Donald Trump's to formulate this strategy. Regarding the scope of this article, it is relevant to objectives of present study.

III. STRATEGY BASED ON U.S. ATTITUDE

This strategy is appropriate for the region as well as Afghanistan based American attitudes. This strategy has conducted all available instruments of United States power to counter terrorism and enemies will be defeated. This is a suitable outline to secure U.S. interest in Afghanistan. This strategy places America first and emphasizes protection of the homeland, borders and citizens. This strategy recognizes that America is not alone and engages a huge number of partners to combat fundamental Islamic terrorism, Iran and Pakistan-sponsored terrorism, and other forms of violent extremism.⁵

However, Contours of Trump's new Afghan strategy has declared on President Trump announced its Afghanistan/South Asia Policy on August 21, 2017. The main contours of Trump's new Afghan strategy include: 1) Granting the U.S. forces more autonomy to deal with ground situation in Afghanistan; 2) Sending out a message to the Taliban that the U.S. is not to withdraw in haste; 3) Urging the Afghan government to show “determination and progress”, and share “military, political and economic burden”; 4) Emphasizing counter terrorism rather than nation building; 5) Putting pressure on Pakistan to eliminate terrorist sanctuaries along its border; and 6) Inviting India to active involve in the realm of economic and development assistance for Afghanistan.⁶

In order, there is some restriction for U.S. forces to operating and searching of the terrorist groups, this limitation had imposed while Hamed Karzi was the president and still it is applicable. The restriction has been imposed due to Afghan customs which are opposite of their values. Given the United States longtime war in Afghanistan needs more autonomy to deal with ground situation in Afghanistan. This autonomy has been requested for independent action of U.S. forces to control the fundamentalist groups. This strategy had given a clear message for Taliban and Al Qaida, which U.S. forces have not withdrawn speedy. Whether United States forces leave Afghanistan, Taliban, IS and other terrorist groups will have been trying to safe haven and sheltering in this country. Moreover, warlord and ethnic groups will collapse the Afghan government, based on the result civil war is going to be lead again and U.S. forces will come back to this country. Although Afghan government is responsible to show its progress of democratic institution and U.S. supported different anti-corruption institutions to observing the rule of law. Counter-terrorism is the fundamental cornerstone of Trump's strategy in the region. Based on Trump's strategy in South Asia, economic and political pressure on Pakistan is the good option which Pakistan have not been supporting and sheltering Taliban and Al Qaida leaders.

Further, India and Afghanistan have a strong relationship based on historical and cultural links. The relationship is not limited to the governments in New Delhi and Kabul, but has its foundations in the historical contacts and exchanges between the people. In recent past, India-Afghanistan relations have been further strengthened by the Strategic Partnership Agreement, which was signed between the two countries in October 2011. The Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA) between the two sides, inter alia, provides for assistance to help rebuild Afghanistan's infrastructure and institutions, education and technical assistance to re-build indigenous Afghan capacity in different areas, encouraging investment in Afghanistan's natural resources, providing duty free access to the Indian market for Afghanistan's exports support for an Afghan-led, Afghan-

⁵. The White House Washington, Dc. “*National Strategy for Counterterrorism of the United States of America*”, October 2018.

⁶. M. Munir & M. Shafi, “*Trump's New Afghan Strategy: Policy Options for Pakistan*”. *Journal of Contemporary Studies*, Vol. VI No. 2, January, 2017. P. 40. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336304203>

owned, broad-based and inclusive process of peace and reconciliation, and advocating the need for a sustained and long-term commitment to Afghanistan by the international community. India is a strategic partner with U.S. and it had played good role in Afghanistan.

Peace and stability in Afghanistan is relevant with the dynamics factors which are played from actors of the regional countries. Afghanistan became the play ground of regional and global powers, this complexity of dynamics factors have negative effect on socio-economic and political situation of Afghanistan. Based on Trump's approach, included several states in the region.⁷

1. **Pakistan Dual Policy:** Since 1947, Pakistan played dual policy towards Afghanistan and based on Trump's strategy in Afghanistan is new approach towards Pakistan. The open punish was announced regarding the dual game of Pakistan towards Afghanistan while Trump was elaborating this strategy in the entire region. However, Trumps has emphasized on conditional support to Pakistan till taking strong and credible action to not have been training, supporting and sheltering Taliban, Al Qaida and Haqqani network branch. Trump has at least taken a step forward, namely by making some U.S. aid to Pakistan conditional on ending support for the Taliban.⁸ Trump's speech was unlike earlier presidents such as George W. Bush and Barak Obama, who have been disappointed with Pakistan's continuous support, conduct, sheltered and trained terrorist's groups. Trump's message to Pakistan is to given a strong and credible action to not have close ties with terrorist groups.⁹

2. **China's Attempt:** China has strategic interests in Afghanistan, from one side threatens from U.S. presence in Afghanistan and other side it has domestic concerns with Islamic fundamentalism on Afghanistan neighborhood. Trump in his speech was silent about China. This might be the lack of U.S. interests to China's role in the region as well as Afghanistan. Moreover, pressure on Pakistan to have given credible measurement to not safe haven terrorist groups leads this country close to China and Russia. Whether, this measurement seems important to check and control over treatment of China in the entire region.

3. **Russia's Direct Support Taliban:** Russia is also playing dual game towards Afghanistan. In the historical context, Soviet Union invaded in Afghanistan in 1979 and Afghanistan became a victim of cold war which has emerged between U.S. and Soviet Union. United States had been indirect supported Mujahedin to defeat Soviet Union with direct involves of Pakistan. In the current context, Moscow's continuing outreach to Taliban, and has close ties with Pakistan. This factor compounded the complexity of current situation. Russia's interests in Afghanistan is as the following: first, Central Asia is still considered domain of Russia's influence and Russia will be safe haven to stop it from Islamic State and other extremist groups in the region. Second, to check and control of U.S. hegemony in the region. United States and Soviet Union were two greatest powers in the entire period of cold war (1945-1991) and rivalry was the main principle of their foreign policy. Russia's approach towards Afghanistan is support Taliban and Taliban is the most important groups to attain its interest. while U.S. leaded this strategy to prevent Russia's influence in the region.

4. **The Iran Involvement:** Moreover, Iran trends to support Taliban against U.S. forces also complicate the stability of Afghanistan. Iran expressed its concerns to IS presence in Afghanistan. U.S. presence in Afghanistan enhanced the Iran concerned to targets Iran nuclear facilities and military intervention from Afghanistan's territorial. United States of America has committed Iran to direct engagement with Taliban and use of these groups against U.S. forces. The important issue is that, whether, U.S. has given any credible action towards Iran and it has direct impact on social-economic and political dimension of Afghanistan. Along with the dynamics factors of region, India's foreign policy in the region will have to consider to non-interfere in domestic of the regional countries.

5. **India's Implication:** Trump has put India at the very heart of a new South Asia strategy. According Indi, Trump has emphasized on terrorism which Pakistan's direct involvement in terrorist activities in the region. India's emphasize is to confronting issue of safe havens of cross-border support by terrorists. India is as a major player in South Asia, India's priority in Afghanistan is to support the Afghan government established after 2001. However, the political and security challenges after the announcement of U.S. military withdrawal from Afghanistan have significantly impacted India. Afghanistan is facing a challenge on security level. On the security level, although the counter-insurgency measures taken by both international forces led by the U.S. and Afghan forces have lost for more than two decade. India's policy toward Afghanistan also has been hotly debated given the vulnerabilities of both Afghan government and its military forces. Some believe that India should make more efforts to help Afghan military forces and the government to prevent the expansion of the Taliban; India's rivalries with Pakistan on Kashmir Issue direct effect security of Afghanistan. Some Pakistani even believed that tension between India and Pakistan based on Kashmir is relevant on Afghanistan. India's

⁷. Ranade Akshay, "Trump's Afghanistan Strategy and Emerging Alignments in the Region: Implications for India". Observer Research Foundation, 11 (2019), November, 2017, p 2-6. www.orfonline.org

⁸. Hehn C. A. C. M. "Donald Trump's New Strategy for Afghanistan". Konrad Adenauer Stiftuna, November 2017, P. 2. www.kas.de/usa

⁹. Maini T. Singh, "Trump's Straight Talk: India's Reaction". Indrastra Global. Vol. 3, Issue No: 09, 2017, p.11. <http://www.indrastra.com/2017/09/Trump-s-Straight-Talk-India-s-Reaction-003-09-2017-0015.html> | ISSN 2381-3652

interests in Afghanistan are as the following: preventing Afghanistan from becoming a shelter to organize anti-India activities; and ensuring stability in Afghanistan to assure itself of a gateway to Central Asia.¹⁰

Trump's approach has pointed out several elements to India and subcontinent. Stability in Afghanistan is the first part; India plays a vital role in stability and peace process in Afghanistan. But tension between India and Pakistan lead negative impact on security of Afghanistan, Pakistan as very much part of the problem in Afghanistan. However, the success or failure of Trump's strategy on Afghanistan is depending on what happens in Pakistan. Indeed, Pakistan is at the very top of Trump's strategy in the region. Second part, Trump called India to taking credible steps to overcome the conflict in Afghanistan; and the last part of Trump's new strategy for Afghanistan is the most important elements among others. Trump emphasized on India as a strategic partner to concentrate China. United States trends in the region to create a new strategic balancing with China. Therefore, India is the measurable power to natural balance with China, one of the most important reasons that U.S. presence in Afghanistan to control the regional power, any strategy for balancing China must involve India.¹¹

IV. THE HISTORY OF U.S. ENGAGEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN

United States has a long history with Afghanistan and for the first time U.S. Ambassador created in the 1934 while Zher Sha was the king. But through all the U.S. engagement, relations turn ups and downs. Afghanistan became the victim of cold war which emerged by the two rival super powers, United States and Soviet Union. Soviet Union invaded to Afghanistan in 1979, the U.S. approach to not confront physically with Soviet Union and indirect engaged by supporting the Mujahideen, using Pakistani security forces as the delivery mechanism, as the British and Russian Empires had done in the previous century.¹²

Over the past almost two decade of direct U.S. engagement in Afghanistan, U.S. tried to conduct different strategies under the administrations of President George W. Bush, President Barack Obama, and now President Trump. Afghanistan's political and security situation compels United States to contribute with regional and global actors to bring peace and stability in the region. However, each of them has had a set of goals and no one of them had succeeded to secure stability.¹³ The 11th September incident brought the U.S. and its Western allies to Afghanistan. The presence of al-Qaida and other terrorist groups in the country have paved the ground for the existence and changing of security and political strategies in different periods, which each have different positive and negative influences and consequences.

Today, the U.S. goals and objectives in Afghanistan is counter-terrorism and it's the fundamental goal of United States to fight against terrorism which is sheltered and leaded from Afghanistan. United States has implemented various strategies from President Bush, Barak Obama and now new strategy from Trump offices. Military strategy was the main option to eradicate terrorism. No one of them had succeeded to decrease the tension and terrorist activities became enhanced day by day. Therefore, use of force is not a suitable to end the war and president Trump has been changed the option to end the conflict. This option is political solution. President Trump has appointed a special envoy, Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, who has begun engaging in direct diplomacy with the Taliban. According U.S. approach regarding Afghanistan, the only way for sustainable peace is negotiation with Taliban. What interesting is that, Taliban well come on the table for negotiation and will have given request to changes the form of government and neither accepts almost achievement of two decade of Afghanistan. Whether, Taliban engaged to peace initiatives, there are more than 22 terrorist groups which have never come to under Taliban leaderships. They will fight and organized extremist activities.

Terrorism has based on U.S. administration office since 11th September; from Bush strategic objectives is disintegration of terrorist's network which are being unable to attack on U.S. and other aliens from Afghanistan. Strengthen of Afghan soldiers to fight against terrorism. When U.S direct attacked in Afghanistan, Taliban has been lost and relative peace came to exist. But within the nearly two decade Taliban became strong and U.S. might not find the final way to end the war. From Barak Obama's approaches regarding Afghanistan: 1) Preventing Al Qaida from safe haven in the region; 2) Preventing Taliban to overthrow the Afghan Government; and 3) Strengthen the capacity of Afghan security forces to over taken the future responsibility. The strategy had the three core elements to achieve the relevant objectives: 1) A military

¹⁰. Maini T. Singh, "Trump's Straight Talk: India's Reaction", Indrastra Global, Vol. 3, Issue No: 09, 2017, p.13. <http://www.indrastra.com/2017/09/Trump-s-Straight-Talk-India-s-Reaction-003-09-2017-0015.html> | ISSN 2381-3652.

¹¹. Mohan, C. Raja. "America's reset of Afghan Strategy: Potential Realignment of South Asian Geopolitics". Institute of South Asian Studies. National University of Singapore. No. 456, p. 2. August, 2017. Available at: www.isas.nus.edu.sg or <http://southasiandiaspora.org>

¹². Dormandy, Xenia and Keating, Michael, "The United States and Afghanistan: A Diminishing Transactional Relationship".

¹³. Magsamen, Kelly, Fuchs, Michael, "The Case for a New U.S. Relationship with Afghanistan", Foreign Policy and Security, July, 2019. <https://www.americanprogress.org>

effort to maintain peace and end conflict; 2) A civilian surge that reinforces positive action; and 3) An effective partnership with Pakistan.¹⁴

Each U.S. approaches have made its priority to eliminate the threat of terrorism and prohibit Afghanistan from fundamentalist activities. Based on security of Afghanistan, Pakistan has been training, financial supporting and systematic organizing insurgency to attack with different methods, such as bombing and suicide attack in Afghanistan. Pakistan appeared as the main supporter of cross-border terrorist activities and it's the main principle of its foreign policy. Another problem has been raised due to lack of capacity from Afghan government to secure its own territory. There is no guarantee that terrorists may not safe haven in Afghanistan. U.S. troops stay in Afghanistan to taking effectively action respect of counter-insurgency in the current situation. However, Afghanistan has depended on U.S. financial support for military soldiers, even military equipments. Donald Trump has expressed to end the longest war in Afghanistan while he was talking in inaugurated as a president of United States. The earlier presidents of Unites States were optimistic regarding conflict of Afghanistan and claimed who have maintain their interests and extra terrorist attacks. During the presidential campaign, Donald Trump was calling invasion of U.S in Afghanistan is "terrible mistake". That meant invading in Afghanistan was a mistaken engagement of U.S. foreign policy. This was complete waste of lives and money. Trump has not differentiated among IS, fundamentalist, Muslims and radical extremists groups, this can leads the war and conducts critically circumstances, Trump also has given some restriction for the seven Muslims countries which is not allowed to entering in the Unites States.¹⁵

Furthermore, unlike Obama, Trump encouraged India's involvement into Afghanistan's matter. But besides this all, the core goal of both the Presidents was same that was to clear the land of Afghanistan from the evil entities like the Taliban and make it a peaceful place so that there would remain no threat to America's security. Both the Presidents wanted to compel the insurgents to leave the field of battle, end the war and settle the matter by negotiations with Kabul, for which Obama had to face failure during U.S. 2010 and 2011 troop surge. For Pakistan, Trump had different views as compared to Obama. Over the course of time, Trump had been more coercive towards Pakistan and compelled Pakistan to crack down all the militant groups and network that have been attacking on the American troops in Afghanistan including the Taliban and Haqqani network. He threatened Pakistan to impose sanctions other than freezing aid.¹⁶

Trump's South Asia strategy characterized by a substantial continuity with the Obama strategy: confirmation of military strategy to fight against terrorism; training of Afghan security forces and peace initiatives are similar with former president Barak Obama. Along with, there were some important changes. The most relevant issue regarding South Asia was rearrangement of U.S. relations with Pakistan and Pakistan has directly committed for safe haven to agents of chaos, violence, and terror. Trump strongly condemned Pakistan to played dual policy in the region. Trump stated about Afghanistan, "neither we want to end the war and nor we do it", because it can kill one billion people and it is possible to remove Afghanistan's map from world map.¹⁷ Millions of people in the world has became furious while they were listening Trump's speech. Trump may Saied: military strategy is not good option to deal with Taliban due to highest loses.

V. U.S. INTERESTS IN AFGHANISTAN

It is the most important and changeable question to identifies the U.S. goals and objectives in Afghanistan. The United State's interests in Afghanistan have shifted as dynamic factors for revising various strategies since 2001. But neither the former U.S. presidents strategies were successful nor the current. Over the two decade, there is ambiguity of its goals and objectives. It is a questionable, what does Washington want from Afghanistan and does it important to be presence in Afghanistan or Afghanistan is important as a dynamic factor and for how long?¹⁸ First, United States trends to create balance with Russia and China as a major rivalry powers which is the fundamental range of Washington national security interests. U.S. appearances shake North Korea to refrains from nuclear power. However, Iran is the next factor which Washington has imposed some embargo to change the regime, acquiring nuclear facilities and refrains to engagement with terrorism. Targeting the Islamic State and other fundamentalists groups in Middle East is another factor of U.S. appearances in Afghanistan. Along with, active involvement of Taliban, Al-Qaida, and Islamic State in Afghanistan threats national security of United States, Washington is here to complete elimination of terrorism and might not repeat terrorist attack towards of U.S. borders and citizens. Second, war led increase regional instability; Washington

¹⁴ Report Progress toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, April 2010, p. 11.

¹⁵ Mohammad Rasouli, "The U.S. Approach to Peacebuilding in Afghanistan, a Comparative Analysis of George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump Administration Policies in Afghanistan". City University of New York (CUNY), February 2020, p. 31. https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3547

¹⁶ Muhammad, Owais, "U.S. President Trump Policies towards South Asia with Particular Reference to Afghanistan, India and Pakistan". Journal of Indian Studies Vol. 5, No. 2, July – December, 2019, p. 247.

¹⁷ Diego Abenante, "Trump's New Strategy, the Af-Pak Conundrum, and the Crisis of the National Unity Government". University of Trieste, 2017, pp. 371-372. diego.abenante@dispes.units.

¹⁸ Richard L. Armitage, Samuel R. Berger and Daniel S. Markey, "U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan", p. 29. www.cfr.org

has a specific interest in the region, particularly between nuclear-armed Pakistan and India. In order, U.S. has a set of limited objectives: prevent the Taliban from overthrowing the Afghan government, pursue political reconciliation with those parts of the Taliban willing to negotiate, and target terrorist and insurgent groups that threaten the United States.¹⁹

In order Pakistan is safe haven terrorists training, sheltering and providing military equipment. So, complete decimation of radicalism and extremism constituted the core objective U.S. military forces in Afghanistan post 11th September. President Trump inherited a U.S. policy toward Afghanistan which has experienced from the earlier presidents. Trump's policy is not nation building and it's based on counterterrorism and he has focused on building Afghan security forces while maintaining stability against transnational threats.²⁰

Peace and security in Afghanistan has directed relevant with peace in South Asia and global security. Washington South Asia strategy has been formulated on regional and global security concerns and interests. The United States involvement in South Asia has historical background of cold war. Pakistan has gotten U.S. partnership since 1954 to refrains Soviet Union influence and it implemented U.S. project to defeat communism. Cold war has managed deterrence to not physically confront the two super powers U.S. and Soviet Union. They had invaded to the third world such as Afghanistan and Vietnam. U.S. foreign policy is determined to win the cold war and Soviet Union was the factor of determination over the post Second World War till end of cold war (1945-1991). U.S. mainly focused after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. Non-alignment was the main principle of Pakistan's foreign policy during the cold war, but it has been closing ties with United States irrespective of Non-alignment principles.

Nuclearisation of South Asian countries relevance to two countries India and Pakistan, two nations stated in the history of partition, 1947, suspicion, fear and insecurity, Pakistan involvement in encouraging terrorism in Kashmir and India focus on the Principles of mutual respect and non interfere in its foreign policy with special reference with the neighbors dealt as a big brother. Among all the seven nations in South Asia India is politically parliamentary representative form of government, socially secular and economically stable than others. The main features of this region is political differentiations, demographically 1/5 the world population live in region which India has a largest number of population in the region. India's nuclear policy is, nuclear deterrence, no first use and no use against non-nuclear states, but the common concerns regarding South Asia's nuclear power is enabling terrorists efforts to obtain or use weapons of mass destruction, whether by facilitating, financing, or providing expertise or safe haven for such efforts. Whether, Pakistan has organizing extremist's activities and there is no guarantee to obtain or using terrorists groups.

Since India and Pakistan successfully test the nuclear weapons in 1998, the tension on Kashmir threatens the security of regional states and U.S. approaches to putting them under the inspection of International Atomic Energy Commission.²¹ Terrorism caused Washington to rearrange partnership in the region after suicide attacks in World Trade Center. Pakistan was incorporated as a Non-NATO ally, and the South Asia strategy was constituted in order to prevent an "aggressive" rising China. China is controlling when U.S. concentrated to India as a partner. The U.S. imposes economically, politically pressure on Pakistan to countering terrorism in order and to safe havens Afghanistan.²²

Nowzar shafiaee has listed varieties of U.S. interest and objectives regarding Afghanistan in his article "*An Examination Causes of Trump's Strategy towards Afghanistan*", (2016): 1) Prevent Afghanistan to not haven paradise for terrorist groups and would not threats U.S. interest (core interest); 2) Prevent collapse of Afghan government (important interest); 3) Control over Iran, Pakistan, Russia and China activities and operationalization in Afghanistan (permanent interest); 4) Prevent nuclear confrontation of India and Pakistan as nuclear power states(vital interest); 5) Keep away terrorists groups to access nuclear instruments(vital interest); and 6) Increase regional and international U.S. prestige (important interest).²³

Furthermore, U.S. goals eliminate Al-Qaida leadership, terminate the rule of the Taliban and their leadership and end the use of Afghanistan as a sanctuary for terrorism. For these aims U.S. has taken several measurements which are still unsuccessful. Beside the aims and objectives of U.S. interest in Afghanistan, there are several U.S. strategic goals as the following: 1) never again a safe haven for terrorists and is a reliable,

¹⁹. Jones G. Seth, "*Managing the Long War US Policy towards Afghanistan and Region*". Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif. June, 2017, Retrieved, www.rand.org/pubs/testimonies/CT472.html

²⁰. Ashley J. Tellis, Jeff Eggers, "*U.S. Policy in Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains*". Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May, 2017. P. 8.

²¹. Xiaoping, Yang, "*Managing Leadership in the Indo-Pacific, the United States' South Asia Strategy Revisited*" China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, Vol. 3, No. 4, P. 465. www.worldscientific.com

²². Xiaoping, Yang, "*Managing Leadership in the Indo-Pacific, the United States' South Asia Strategy Revisited*" China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, Vol. 3, No. 4, P. 466. www.worldscientific.com

²³. Nowza, shafiaee, "*An Examination Causes of Trump's Strategy towards Afghanistan*". International Relations Journal, first period, Vol 24. Summer, 2016. P. 111.

stable ally in the War on Terror; 2) moderate and democratic, with a thriving private sector economy; 3) capable of governing its territory and borders; and 4) respectful of the rights of all its citizens.²⁴

Pakistani intelligence services has direct contact with Afghan Taliban, Haqqani network branch and Al-Qaida to constitutes suicide attacks on cross-borders, Central Asia and South Asia which is beyond of U.S. interests in Afghanistan. An unstable Afghanistan risks also destabilizing South Asia and other countries. Whether, terrorism is a global threat, proceedings might be global. This leads U.S. and other collation to taking priority strategy to decimate terrorism and safe havens world.²⁵

VI. TRUMP'S OPTIONS IN AFGHANISTAN: LEAVE, INCREASE, STAND PAT, OR CUT BACK

After twenty years of U.S. direct engagement in Afghanistan, obviously no good option exists to end the causes of never-ending war. But to pull out our troops, America's credibility is going to be crushing. Withdrawal is not a good option and it would humiliate and decrease U.S. character. Whether, U.S. leaves Afghanistan, there might be two reasons: first, Washington has fault versus Taliban, and second, Trump has promised to return the forces from Afghanistan before the next presidential elections. Conditional based approach is good option, because whether, Taliban and other relevant extremists groups are not threat for United State's national security interests, it is a good option to leave Afghanistan. However, leave of Washington will have negative impacts on domestic society of Afghanistan. The first cause is the tribal competition on basis of ethnicity which is leading Taliban's fights against other ethnic groups. The second cause is Pakistan's support of the Taliban. Since 1947 Pakistan tried to haven influence on Afghanistan and post 9/11 terrorism became the main instrument for Pakistan to achieve the targets.

Post 9/11 terrorism became the common instrument of Pakistan to achieve its targets. Pakistan foreign policy will not change towards Afghanistan. For the Pakistani ruling elite, duplicity is synonymous with diplomacy. Pakistan has controlling the supply factors to Afghanistan soil and because U.S. does not want to risk a fissure that results in nuclear weapons falling into terrorist hands. Opium is another reason in south of Afghanistan, the half of the country side household growth, producing many time instead of any other crop. The annual trade of opium and poppy was \$1 to \$4 billion, relying on calculation of multiplier effect. This leads the war situation complexity. The fate in 2020 is depending upon decision of Trump's administration and foreign policy.²⁶

On December 19, 2018, President Donald Trump stated to reduce by half the U.S. troops presence and ends mission in Afghanistan. While decision has been taking that he ordered a complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from Syria, The following consequences will be engage: 1) Whether, U.S. leave Afghanistan, other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces also leave; 2) Reduce the external security assistances; 3) Kabul government will not efforts from its military expenditure and would face with the lack of legitimacy; 4) Regional militias and local workloads will have security responsibility; 5) Terrorists groups, including Al Qaeda and the Islamic State, gain additional scope to organize, recruit, and initiate terrorist attacks against U.S. regional and homeland targets; 6) It would leads wider civil war; 7) Civilian victims and refuges will increase; 8) Taliban and other extremists groups will control over territory and lose interest on negotiation process; and 9) Regional states will interfere in Afghanistan.²⁷

President Trump Saied: There were not special strategy and policy engagement of United State in South Asia and Afghanistan. What they do if there is no idea why they are doing it. President Trump's question "Why are we still there?" is unanswerable. With such a perspective, military strategy will not be a good option to overcome the war in Afghanistan. Afghanistan has no values on ground of economic resources, but it is the region for political game to internal political power. Such as Pakistan's government in to 40 years back, however, the disengagement in Asia, especially in Afghanistan would be harmful to United State and their political partners at foreign countries. Over time, and due to depending for leading to organic priority for the Status quo, the government is seemed to appearance manner of action with lacking some self-confidence of either a prospective political settlement or the option to quickly return to counterterrorism operations in Afghanistan should circumstances demand it.²⁸

It is not cleared that staying duration of United State force in Afghanistan when they will leave Afghanistan with which political station and system. Although the leaving issue debated many times at inside and outside of U.S under Trump's and Barak Obama's Administration and most of Afghan expert do not agree

²⁴. *Report on Progress toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan*.

²⁵. Vanda Felbab-Brown, "President Trump's Afghanistan Policy: Hopes and Pitfalls". Foreign Policy at Brookings, September 2017, P. 11.

²⁶. Bing, Wes, "US Strategy in Afghanistan". Strategika, Conflict of the Past as Lessons for the Future. Featured Commentary, issue 48, February, 2018. P. 6-7.

²⁷. James, Dobbins, Jason H. Campbell, Sean Mann, Laurel E. Miller. "Consequences of a Precipitous U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan". Rand Corporation, January, 2019, p. 2. Available at: visit www.rand.org/t/PE326

²⁸. Ashley, J. Tellis, Jeff, Eggers, "U.S. Policy in Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains". May 2017. P. 14.

with full withdrawal of U.S force from Afghanistan, they said it will have bad consequences on future of Kabul's government. It could be judged that an early U.S. military departure unrelated to a negotiated peace settlement. In an August 21, 2017, President Trump announced a new strategy for Afghanistan, the core principle of which was "a shift from a time-based approach to one based on condition. U.S. objectives to eradicate terrorism in Afghanistan and the stopping terror attack from Afghanistan against America. So, military option is not proper to reach in peace and defeat terrorist groups in Afghanistan. Therefore, need to replace their political strategies. The main option for Afghanistan is Taliban talks with U.S.²⁹

Due to United State government brought change in direction to its strategy to deal, need to specified some important and vital actions such as: 1) Convince Taliban to accept the two decades achievement in Afghanistan; 2) United State should push to Kabul for commence intra-Afghan peace talks to reach to peace and political reconciliation with Taliban, it requires to come together all categories of community and ethnic groups including women to encompasses the regional, national, and provincial level; 3) Trump's Administration would not come with a political decision about Pakistan to target terrorist leadership. While they will come together for peace negotiation; 4) all endeavor to seek political reconciliation in Afghanistan need to asking a wide spread national consensus for success. Washington would consider the role and interests of the regional states; and 5) Afghan government leads strategy to define women rights, achievements, regional and international states.³⁰

Agreement for Bringing Peace to Afghanistan between the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan which is not recognized by the United States as a state and is known as the Taliban and the United States of America was signed on February 2020. The agreement has four parts:

1. Commitment and fulfillment action that will banned the application of soil in Afghanistan through some specified group and elders against security of United State and its allies, despite of signing the peace agreement (Taliban will not allow any of its members, other individuals or groups, including al-Qaida, to use the soil of Afghanistan to threaten the security of the United States and its allies). This cant guaranteed that other terrorists groups engage activities against U.S. interest.³¹

2. Guarantees, enforcement mechanisms, and announcement of a timeline for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan. Whether, the United States leave Afghanistan, all military forces of the United States, its allies, and Coalition partners, including all non-diplomatic civilian personnel, private security contractors, trainers, advisors, and supporting services personnel within fourteen (14) months following announcement of this agreement will leave.³²

3. After the commitment of United State for fulfill withdrawal of NATO force and withdrawal timetable in front of international community witness. Afghanistan's soil will not use against of U.S. interests and security and their allies, the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan which is not recognized by the United States as a state and is known as the Taliban will start intra-Afghan negotiations with Afghan sides.

4. A long time ceasefire will be a big issue in the intra-Afghan peace talk's agenda, the delegates of Afghanistan's government. And people will discuss on date and mechanism of long time ceasefire. This will announce for competition and settlement on political path of Afghanistan.

The United State goal had decided in July 2018 to come directly on table with Taliban for peace negotiation and they ignored the presence of Afghanistan delegations. This taken a time after the new strategy announcement by U.S. for South Asia, the United State government revert the long term standing place that peace talks to be intra-Afghan peace talks, Afghan-led and Afghan owned, the direct negotiation of United State and Taliban was in Doha in July 2018. Trump's Administration has optioned Mr. Zalmay Khalilzad as a special representative for Afghanistan reconciliation, that he made effort to convinced Taliban for peace negotiation. Based on peace initiatives it has not only decrease violence and even it increase the violence in different aspect of country.

The United State goals is policy in Afghanistan is to banned terrorist to use Afghanistan's soil as a secured place and on their force through any terrorist group and the main attainment of Trump's Administration has been involved in peace negation with Taliban. Prisoners exchange and stopping the violent conflict is also the standpoint of negotiation.³³ The core problem which it is in both main Afghan parties to any deal, the

²⁹ . James, Dobbins, Jason H. Campbell, Sean Mann, Laurel E. Miller, "Consequences of a Precipitous U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan". Rand Corporation, January, 2019. Available at: visit www.rand.org/t/PE326

³⁰ Ashley, J. Tellis, Jeff, Eggers, "U.S. Policy in Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains", May 2017. pp. 17-20.

³¹ . CNN, <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/02/29/politics/us-taliban-deal-signing/index.html>, 10 July, 2020.

³² . Sarah, Dadouch, S. George and D. Lamothe, "U.S. signs peace deal with Taliban agreeing to full withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan". Feb, 2020. Availableat:https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/afghanistan-us-taliban-peace-deal-signing/2020/02/29/b952fb04-5a67-11ea-8efd-0f904bdd8057_story.html

³³ . Mohammad, Rasouli, "The U.S. Approach to Peacebuilding in Afghanistan: Comparative Analysis of George W. Bush, Barak Obama, and Donald Trump Administration Policies in Afghanistan". City University of New York, February, 2020, P. 52.

government and the Taliban, would expect to come out ahead in the overall distribution and balance of power in any agreement.³⁴

Moreover, U.S. condition-based approach would be useful in terms of confidence and capacity building of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) for a long term. The new strategy is focusing more on war fighting with little emphasis on political and economic reforms. Here the important issue is that, the ANSF can't remain dependent on foreign troops. The United States' puts some conditional on Pakistan and Afghanistan as the following: 1) Washington pressured Pakistan to stop sponsored terrorism; 2) conditional adding or withdrawing of U.S. troops from Afghanistan; and (3) huge cuts of financial assistance from Pakistan. Pakistan may not bring changes its foreign policy and constituted negative images around the world. Washington imposed conditional aid strategy on Pakistan to isolate it in the region. But, Trump's decision has brought Pakistan closer to China and Russia.³⁵ Trump was elaborating about new policy toward Islamabad to change the dual policy in Afghanistan and prevent restoring of Taliban. But, neither Pakistan changed its policy nor Trump was silent unlike the former presidents of United States. U.S. withdrawal has discussed and conditional adding of forces is also questionable due to the result which is not change the nature of war. Since 11th September, U.S. added a large number of troops, still war is continuing and Attacks on Afghan soldiers, foreign forces and civilians which most of them are carried out by the Taliban and Haqqani network continue on a regular basis. Huge cuts of financial assistance are another condition which Trump mention it while elaborating the Afghanistan and South Asia strategy. As a result, it opened the gate toward of China and Russia for foreign aids of Pakistan. U.S. and NATO forces commitment to Afghan security forces was another part of strategy which is included train, advice and assists to efforts counterterrorism operation.

Pakistan is an active player for peace initiatives to convince Taliban to find solution of never-ending war. Even, Al-Qaida's leadership refuge in Pakistan and it continues to sabotage efforts at peace in Afghanistan. Pakistan appearances the main responder of Taliban and Al-Qaida's leadership to constitutes unprecedented attacks against Afghanistan's army from one side. On the other hands, Pakistan fights against insurgents and terrorists in the border regions.³⁶ The war in Afghanistan has caused many factors and dimensions which included domestic factors, regional factors and international factors. Ethnicity and political crisis is the main cause of domestic level, ethnic groups fight against each other, and even they have gotten influence in Afghan's security institutions. Whether, sustainable peace is applicable while domestic crisis ends. In order, Trump's speech was not sought nation building which is based on ethnicity, racial, linguistic and tribal. The solution is to unity and integrity of Afghan people and leaders. This can pave the way for domestic intervention of regional countries. In the regional level, U.S. presence in Afghanistan changes the circumstances for China, Iran and other regional states to not be silent and seek their interests. A solution is that, constitutes regional assembly and convince regional power which unstable Afghanistan will have negative impact to regional states. Among other states in South Asia, Pakistan emerged as dangerous state in the region which is leading the top level of interference in Afghanistan. Nowadays, Pakistan efforts to bring the Taliban on negotiation in Doha due to fear of Washington, It means, Pakistan leaders believed, whether, peace talks is a great opportunity to end the conflict in Afghanistan and it loses the opportunity, Washington will revenge from Pakistan which Islamabad pay the unprecedented price. A solution aimed at pressuring Taliban would accordingly require Pakistan to use all its levers of influence, persuasive and coercive, to compel Taliban to either negotiate with Kabul.³⁷

So far, challenges from Afghan side remains towards U.S. One challenge with U.S. policy in Afghanistan is that, there is no convincing theory of victory. There is no guarantee that the United States secures Afghanistan and engages democratic system in the future. Even though, unaccountable withdrawal theory is not applicable, it leads unsecure Afghanistan and strength terrorism. More importantly, subsequent rise of the Islamic State have made Afghan politicians even more risks with respect of haste withdraw back. Withdrawal and change the level of troops is also negotiable whether, win the war in Afghanistan. Indeed, future of U.S courses in Afghanistan is another main challenge, within the complexity of situation U.S. will never find appropriate solution.³⁸ But, more troops will help to protect and to prevent the defeat of the Afghan government and prevent the victory of Taliban and other terrorists groups.³⁹

³⁴ Michael O. Hanlon, "Afghanistan After Mattis: A Revised Strategy To Focus On Counterterrorism And The Afghan Security Forces". *Foreign Policy*, January 2019, P. 5.

³⁵ Xiaoping, Yang, "Managing Leadership in the Indo-Pacific, the United States". *South Asia Strategy Revisited*, China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, Vol. 3, No. 4. P. 471. Available at www.worldscientific.com

³⁶ Xiaoping, Yang, "Managing Leadership in the Indo-Pacific, the United States". *South Asia Strategy Revisited*, China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, Vol. 3, No. 4. P. 472. Available at www.worldscientific.com

³⁷ Ashley, J. Tellis, Jeff, Eggers, "U.S. Policy in Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains". May 2017. P. 12.

³⁸ Diego, Abenante, "Trump's "New Strategy", The Af-Pak Conundrum, and the Crisis of the National Unity Government". University of Trieste, 2017, diego.abenante@dispes.units

³⁹ Wolf, O. Siegfried, "US President Donald Trump's new Afghanistan strategy in context". *South Asia Democratic Forum*, Sadaf Comment, August, 2017, P. 3.

Many experts believe that Trump's strategy on Afghanistan has many faults. Firstly, by using the same tools as have already been used by the U.S. in the past would not give different results. Secondly, the strategy is devoid of any regional diplomatic effort. Thirdly, Trump's undue pressure on Pakistan and enhancement of the role to India in Afghanistan is a sure recipe to complicate the issue. In this critical situation, the most important policy option for Pakistan is to improve relations with its neighbors, especially according priority to its relations with Afghanistan. Pakistan might lead the key role in Afghan stability. Particularly, the last three decades of instability in Afghanistan also have had consequences for Pakistan, ranging from issues of cross-border militancy, illicit drug trafficking, arms smuggling and Afghan refugees in Pakistan. The two sides have frequently been blaming each other for terrorist safe havens, cross-border infiltration and the movement of militants.⁴⁰ Trump's strategy in Afghanistan seems fault like former presidents, there is not any theory of victory of Washington in longest war. The Trump administration's announced approach to Afghanistan is not a strategy for victory. Staying on military strategy is still deficient and is misleading of Washington Administrative office.⁴¹

In order to overcome the challenges from Afghanistan, there are several possible recommendations: 1) Regional options, India and Pakistan's conflict should be resolving to constitute a neutral Afghanistan; 2) Unilateral options, Washington's complete disengagement is unfair in current context and make the situation full of risk; 3) Only political settlement has been left to end the war; 4) To be successful, Washington will need to empower the U.S. ambassador in Kabul to oversee the administration's entire strategy in Afghanistan; persuade the Afghan government to begin a serious national dialogue on political reconciliation; 5) and particularly, recommend to Afghan government to have written a comprehensive strategy to determine regional state's interests, Taliban's desires, the global actors involving Interests such as Russia and U.S. and guarantee the civil and political rights of Afghan citizens.

VII. CONCLUSION

United States has been examined several security strategy in the region and in particular in Afghanistan since 11th September 2001. These approaches have been led from President George Bush in 2003, Barak Obama 2012 and President Trump in 2017. The presence of Al-Qaida and other terrorist groups in South Asia and Afghanistan have paved the ground for the existence and changing of security and political strategies in different periods, which each have different positive and negative influences and consequences. But, neither of these strategies has been successful nor comprehensive to maintain peace and stability in the region and Afghanistan. Unlike the earlier U.S. approaches, Trump's approach has bright pressure and put some condition on Pakistan dual policy. Trump's approach included India and a strategic partner and it has active role in security situation of Afghanistan, Pakistan is direct engaging to support of Taliban. Al-Qaida and Haqqani network branch and Afghanistan is the main safe havens of terrorists groups. Trump believed, U.S. engagement in Afghanistan is terrible mistake which has been done by previous presidents. It is just waste of life and money. Afghanistan is vulnerable country and each policy of regional and international actors have direct impacts in security situation of this country. India has close ties with Afghanistan and it has no interfered in this country, Trump strongly criticized Pakistan for giving safe haven to agents of chaos, violence, and terror which had imposed condition based approach. Pakistan's foreign policy is characterized to sheltering, training, and financial supporting terrorists groups and it has vital role in peace process of Afghanistan.

Based on the result, Trump's strategy in Afghanistan is failure and there is no good approach to end the war in Afghanistan. In the current condition U.S. forces withdrawal from Afghanistan leads threatens of its interests. Collapse of Afghan government is also considerable while U.S. forces leave Afghanistan; Afghan government is unable to efforts from its expenditure and military equipments. Taliban, Al-Qaida, Haqqani network branch and other fundamentalists groups are still strong in Afghanistan. This option might lead U.S. regret. The enemies that drew the United States back into Afghanistan in 2001 and back into Iraq in 2014 are still present in Afghanistan in 2020. As mentioned, there is no military solution to end the conflict in Afghanistan, since 11th September 2001, military option was the priority of U.S. strategy to maintain peace and end the war, but still it seems fault. However, Taliban became stronger and occupied more territorial with complexity operating. The only way to overcome the security challenges of Afghanistan is political solution. U.S. has led peace initiatives to solve the dispute in Afghanistan. So, Trump appointed a senior and very experienced American envoy Zalmay Khalilzad to talks with Taliban. After 11th steps, U.S. and Taliban have signed bringing peace agreement, the Taliban negotiation agenda seems clear. The first is with the U.S. over the withdrawal and, if that is agreed, the second is with the Afghan political groups other than the Afghan government over the future of governance in Afghanistan. Time table based approach to complete withdrawal of U.S. forces; and ceasefire was the other elements of agreement. But, no one of them implemented even the

⁴⁰ M. Munir, & M. Shafi, "Trump's New Afghan Strategy: Policy Options for Pakistan". *Journal of Contemporary Studies*, Vol. VI No. 2, January, 2017. P.43. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336304203>

⁴¹ Vanda Felbab-Brown, "President Trump's Afghanistan Policy: Hopes and Pitfalls". *Foreign Policy at Brookings*, September 2017.

current situation is worse. Taliban's approaches regarding peace talks are complicated, state based Sharia law is the red line of Taliban which is against the Afghanistan and U.S. administrations. Peace comes while all the Taliban engaged to talks.

Geopolitics and security implications of regional countries such as Pakistan are important for success and failure of Trump's strategy in Afghanistan. Furthermore, suspicion and mistrust between Afghanistan and Pakistan have obstructed the peace efforts. Under the U.S. South Asia Policy, India has been played a larger role in Afghanistan and its U.S strategic partner. Although, Withdrawal is not a good option and it humiliates and decrease U.S. place in the world. This option would threats U.S. interests in Afghanistan and at least till the next American president, they should stay in Afghanistan. The deadlock is to be staying for the next several years. Although, there are several main causes of never ending war which is not simply uproot them. Whether, U.S. is here or not. Irresponsible leave of U.S. troops is not a good option because the Afghan's army based on fragmentation and ethnic with political patronage lines; they will fight against each other. Ethnic infighting, beyond the Taliban, breaks out on Afghan politician's led crisis to change the statues to Taliban and they occupy each part of Afghanistan. Based on the result, Trump's strategy is not successful in order to ends the war in Afghanistan. Since 2001, use of military forces to overcome the war in Afghanistan is also fault.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abenante, Diego, Trump's New Strategy, the Af-Pak Conundrum, and the Crisis of the National Unity Government. University of Trieste, (2017), diego.abenante@dispes.units.
- [2]. Akshay, Ranade, Trump's Afghanistan Strategy and Emerging Alignments in the Region: Implications for India. Observer Research Foundation. 11 (209), (2017), available at: www.orfonline.org
- [3]. Armitage, L. Richard, Berger, R. Samuel, Marke, S. y Daniel, U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan.. www.cfr.org
- [4]. Ashley, J. Tellis, B. Gopalaswamy, Review of President Trump's South Asia Strategy: The Way Ahead, One Year in. Atlantic Council South Asia Center, (2018), See at: <http://www.Atlanticcouncil.org>.
- [5]. BBC, <https://www.bbc.com/persian/51677036>, 15 June, (2020).
- [6]. Clayton, Thomas, Afghanistan: Background and U.S. Policy. Congressional Research Service, July (2019), see at <https://crsreports.congress.gov>.
- [7]. CNN, <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/02/29/politics/us-taliban-deal-signing/index.html>, 10 July, (2020).
- [8]. Dadouch, S. Sarah, Lamothe, D. George , U.S. signs peace deal with Taliban agreeing to full withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan. Feb, 2020. available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/afghanistan-us-taliban-peace-deal-signing/2020/02/29/b952fb04-5a67-11ea-8efd-0f904bdd8057_story.html
- [9]. Dobbins, James, Campbell, H. Jason, Mann Sean, Miller, Laurel, E. Consequences of a Precipitous U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan. Rand Corporation, January, (2019), see at: visit www.rand.org/t/PE326
- [10]. Donnell, Thomas, Afghanistan: no Choice but to Remain. Strategika, Conflict of the Past as Lessons for the Future, Featured Commentary, Issue 48, February, (2018).
- [11]. Felbab, B. Vanda, President Trump's Afghanistan Policy: Hopes and Pitfalls. Foreign Policy at Brookings, September, (2017).
- [12]. Hanlon, O. Michael, Afghanistan after Mattis: A Revised Strategy to Focus On Counterterrorism and The Afghan Security Forces. Foreign Policy, January, (2019).
- [13]. Hehn, C. A. C. M, Donald Trump's New Strategy for Afghanistan. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. November, (2017). www.kas.de/usa
- [14]. Jash, A, Dossier Perspectives on Trump's South Asia Policy. IndraStra, 1(1). September, (2017), available at: <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-53480-3>
- [15]. Kelly, Magsamen, Michael, Fuchs, the Case for a New U.S. Relationship with Afghanistan. *Foreign Policy and Security*, (2019).
- [16]. Mariet, S, Trump's 'new' Afghanistan and South Asia Strategy & India-US Strategic Partnership. Institute for Strategy, (2017), available at: <http://www.ispsw.de>
- [17]. ¹. Shikhbani, A. Mahdi, "The Short and Long-term goals of the United States in its Military Invasion of Afghanistan", Scientific Journal, Summer, 2010, Vol. 3, P. 3.
- [18]. Monish, Tourangbam, Strategy in Afghanistan: Old Wine in Trump's Bottle. IndraStra Global. Vol. 3, Issue No: 09, (2017), available <http://www.indrastra.com/2017/09/US-Strategy-in-Afghanistan-Old-Wine-Trump-s-Bottle-003-09-2017-0016.html> | ISSN 2381-3652
- [19]. Munir, M. Shafi M, Trump's New Afghan Strategy: Policy Options for Pakistan. Journal of Contemporary Studies, Vol. VI No. 2, January, (2017). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336304203>
- [20]. Owais, Muhammad, U.S. President Trump Policies towards South Asia with Particular Reference to Afghanistan, India and Pakistan. Journal of Indian Studies Vol. 5, No. 2, July – December, (2019).

- [21]. Rasouli, Mohammad, The U.S. Approach to Peace building in Afghanistan, a Comparative Analysis of George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump Administration Policies in Afghanistan. The City University of New York (CUNY), February (2020), https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/354731.
- [22]. Raja, C. Mohan, America's reset of Afghan Strategy: Potential Realignment of South Asian Geopolitics: Institute of South Asian Studies. National University of Singapore. No. 456, August, (2017), available at: www.isas.nus.edu.sg or <http://southasiandiaspora.org>
- [23]. Raja, C. Mohan, Trump and South Asia: Breaking New Ground. The Asia Foundation, (2018).
- [24]. Report Progress toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, April, (2010).
- [25]. Shafiaee, Nowzar, Examination Causes of Trump's Strategy towards Afghanistan. International Relations Journal, first period, Vol 24. Summer, (2016).
- [26]. Singh, K. Hemant, Trump's Afghanistan Strategy: Implications for India. DPG Policy Brief, Vol. II, (5), August, (2017).
- [27]. Singh, T. Maini, Trump's Straight Talk: India's Reaction. IndraStra Global. Vol. 3, Issue No: 09, (2017), available at: <http://www.indrastra.com/2017/09/Trump-s-Straight-Talk-India-s-Reaction-003-09-2017-0015.html> | ISSN 2381-3652
- [28]. Sriparna, Pathak, Trump's South Asia Policy: Implications for China. IndraStra Global Vol. 3, Issue No: 09, available at: <http://www.indrastra.com/2017/09/Trump-s-South-Asia-Policy-Implications-for-China-003-09-2017-0014.html> | ISSN 2381-3652
- [29]. Siegfried, O. Wolf, US President Donald Trump's new Afghanistan strategy in context. Sadf Comment. South Asia Democratic Forum. No 100, August, (2017).
- [30]. Seth, G. Jones, Managing the Long War US Policy towards Afghanistan and Region. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif. June, 2020. Retrieved, www.rand.org/pubs/testimonies/CT472.html
- [31]. Tellis, J. Ashley, Eggers, Jeff, U.S. Policy in Afghanistan Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May, (2017).
- [32]. The White House Washington, Dc. National Strategy for Counterterrorism of the United States of America, October, 2018.
- [33]. Wes, Bing, US Strategy in Afghanistan. Strategika, Conflict of the Past as Lessons for the Future. Featured Commentary, issue 48, February, (2018).
- [34]. Xenia, Dormandy, Michael, Keating, the United States and Afghanistan: A Diminishing Transactional Relationship.
- [35]. Yang, Xiaoping, Managing Leadership in the Indo-Pacific, the United States' South Asia Strategy. Revisited. China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, Vol. 3, No. 4. See at: www.worldscientific.com

Mohammad Wasim Arian. "Trump's South Asia Strategy: Security Impacts on Afghanistan." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(10), 2020, pp. 32-45.