

Six Questions We Need to Ask About Afghanistan

So, what's REALLY going on? Is the apparent Taliban "victory" masking the true narrative?

By [Kit Knightly](#)

Global Research, August 19, 2021

[OffGuardian](#) 17 August 2021

Region: [Asia](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [US NATO](#)

[War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [AFGHANISTAN](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the "Translate Website" drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg_globalresearch](#).

Afghanistan has "fallen", that's the line. The Taliban forces have taken the opportunity of US/NATO withdrawal and swept across the entire country, taking every major city within a week and with barely a shot fired.

Joe Biden is being blamed for his "lack of plan", even as Democrats try and [shift the blame to Trump](#) who first decided to pull the US out of Afghanistan [over 18 months ago](#).

Meanwhile, the press are reporting dozens of stories about the humanitarian crises, refugees fleeing the new regime, the fate of women under the Taliban, and "shocking videos" of desperate people.

That's the official story. But what's really going on?

1. DID THE TALIBAN REALLY JUST WIN?

Firstly, let's be clear, the US has not "pulled out" of Afghanistan, not in the true sense of the phrase. They still reserve the right to bomb the place. There are still private contractors in the country. And the Pentagon are already [booking their return tickets](#).

Secondly, the Taliban didn't "win", they were unopposed. More than unopposed, they were directly aided. When the US abandoned Bagram airbase they left hundreds of armored vehicles, weapons and over 5000 alleged Taliban prisoners...all of which "accidentally" [fell into the hands of the advancing Taliban forces](#).

The Afghan army, under command of US puppet **President Ashraf Ghani**, essentially folded without a shot being fired. Tens of thousands of US-trained and armed troops did nothing to stop the advance of the enemy.

There are a LOT of articles in the MSM endeavouring to explain this. [The Guardian](#). And [The Telegraph](#). [The Financial Times](#). And the non-financial [Times](#). They all give it a go.

The Washington Post's Max Boot, writing for the Council on Foreign Relations, ties himself in mental knots trying to explain how the Afghan army, with superior numbers AND firepower, "[collapsed under pressure](#)".

The Independent reports that the billions the Pentagon spent on training Afghan security forces has "[accidentally](#)" benefited the Taliban, who have now seized vehicles, missiles and aircraft.

The press clearly sees it for what it is - a hole in their story they really need to plug.

All things being equal, the simplest explanation is often the most likely. And the simplest explanation *here* is that the Afghan security forces were ordered to stand down as part of a deal with the Taliban. There are reports and rumours on social media of deals being done:

The Secret Deal b/w US, Taliban & Afghan Govt (A thread):

It is said that the trio agreed to peacefully handover [#Afganistan](#) to [#Taliban](#). Which is why the 350K Forces including 10K AirForce collapsed like dominos in the span of a week only and without a single bullet fired. 1/7 pic.twitter.com/0az3qVymhK

— The Afghan Perspective (@TAfPerspective) [August 16, 2021](#)

And, of course, the exact terms of the peace agreement, signed by Trump and Taliban last year, are not known. But it's interesting to note that this agreement actually called for a handover of [exactly 5000 Taliban prisoners](#). The same number "accidentally" left unguarded at Bagram Airbase.

One interpretation is that the withdrawal has gone exactly as planned in the deal signed by Trump. And that the melodrama and "chaos" of the pull-out was either a part of the deal, or a later addition to either cause a distraction or save some face.

2. IS THE CHAOS REAL?

The media have been generating memes to sell the "chaos" of the Taliban's advance. The go-to comparison has been the fall of Saigon, because the (completely unintentional) "[near-identical images](#)" (completely unintentionally) "[went viral](#)".

We're treated to a lot of viral video footage. Ranging from the questionable:

Does this video not ring true to anyone else? If these are all desperate refugees, where are the women & children? Why are most of them jogging nonchalantly & making no effort to get on the plane? Why are people stopping, smiling & waving to the camera? [#AfghanistanAirport](#) <https://t.co/SnBuj384FU>

— Kit Knightly (@kit_knightly) [August 16, 2021](#)

To the outright bizarre:

□ | NEW: Taliban take control of a theme park in Kabul
pic.twitter.com/pdpVIEXtGt

— News For All (@NewsForAllUK) [August 16, 2021](#)

All of this serves a purpose, aside from the distraction of emotive metaphors and [lurid headlines](#). It all aids in the construction of a narrative.

In this case, the ideas of US “mistakes” and “incompetence” and [“wishful thinking”](#) are [discussed at length](#), without ever touching on the true [mendacity at the heart of the Afghan invasion](#).

The “end” of the Afghan war is being used to re-brand its beginnings. The Taliban are propped up as villains, again, and [associated with Al Qaeda](#), as if *they* were ever anything but a Western tool in the first place.

People are talking about [“spreading democracy”](#) and [“counter-terrorism”](#) as if they were the *real* aims of the war, instead of long-discredited lies.

Marketing Afghanistan as a “defeat” for the US camouflages the truth of it – the war was a VERY profitable business venture.

And, of course, it all serves to reinforce the frail official story of 9/11, a vital keystone in the construction of our geo-political “reality”.

3. WHAT ABOUT THE HEROIN?

The press has a long history of, not just lying about Afghan heroin, but totally inverting the truth. In 2019 for example, during the farcical [“leak” of the Afghanistan Papers](#), the press lamented the US’ *“failure to curb”* the opium trade.

Afghanistan currently produces around 90% of global heroin. When the US invaded in 2001, that number was much closer to zero. The Taliban outlawed the growing of opium poppies in early 2001, and by the end of the year the business was almost extinct.

The US invaded in October 2001, and opium production has increased almost every year since then. We don’t need to go into the [CIA’s links to the drug trade](#) here, or how much money people have made from this heroin production. That’s not relevant, what we need to ask is, *what now?*

Will the newly-reinstated Taliban put an end to this trade again? Or will production continue?

According the press, the heroin will continue to flow. In fact the Taliban will increase production because the [“illegal drug trade helps fuel”](#) them.

Reuters reports that the US plan to halt heroin production “failed”, and that the opium trade is a [“boon” for the Taliban](#).

The Telegraph headlines that [“Taliban mulls flooding the West with heroin to shore up Afghan economy”](#). So we should be prepared for the illegal heroin trade to increase now the US has “withdrawn” from Afghanistan.

But the idea that heroin benefits the Taliban, and the US wants to put an end to it is a myth. Afghan heroin is, and always has been, a US/Deep State/corporate enterprise to the bone.

And, if the Taliban *do* allow the US to continue to use their land to mass-produce heroin, that is yet another piece of evidence supporting a deal between the Taliban and the West.

4. WILL THERE BE ANY POLITICAL FALLOUT?

So what are the next steps? Where is this going?

Well, in the US, President Joe Biden is experiencing some pretty heavy FLAK. Even his usually-stalwart supporters at CNN ran the headline [“Joe Biden is facing a crisis of competence”](#). Which could mean they’re in the early stages of prepping us for President Kamala Harris.

Geo-politically, the talk is of Russia and China – the only two countries to officially recognise the Taliban government – [“stepping into the void”](#). This is being played as a victory for America’s enemies (and another stick with which to beat Biden), but does that really mean anything?

The Covid “pandemic” has been an eye-opener in terms of conflict between nations. They’ve shown us that, when they really need to, they work together to the same end. They tell the same lies, sell the same stories, and want the same thing. The wall at the back of the theatre has been revealed, in that regard.

The truth is, no matter which nations notionally hold sway in Afghanistan, the profits from the war, the lithium and the heroin will all end up going to the same few pockets. Corporations rule, not countries. Nation-states are no longer the players of the Great Game, they are the pieces. Toys for corporate megaliths. Their owners can make them fight each other, or bump them together and make kissy noises. Each is equally meaningless.

5. IS THERE ANOTHER “REFUGEE CRISIS” ON THE WAY?

The Afghanistan narrative will fuel other big narratives going forward.

Firstly, there is the coming [“refugee crisis”](#).

The *“worst since world war II”*, according to Tobias Elwood MP (who can always be relied upon to promote Deep State talking points), which is weird because I’m sure that’s what they said about the [refugee crisis in 2016](#), too. Oh, [and in 2019](#).

The UK’s Defence Secretary has already announced plans to allow Afghan asylum seekers into Britain [without passports](#). Merkel is [advocating for similar steps in Germany](#), and the [US press](#) is [also on board](#).

Will these refugees be forced to stay in “quarantine hotels” at their own expense? Have they all been “double jabbed”? We don’t know. Nobody’s thinking about that, that’s from the *other* narrative. We’re talking about refugees today, Covid can wait.

Anybody opposing asylum seekers entering the country because of Covid will be branded a racist, and medical professionals will claim that *“racism is a public health issue more dangerous than covid”*, just like they did when the Covid narrative collided with the [Black](#)

[Lives Matter narrative](#) last summer.

That importing asylum seekers, undocumented, from a near-failed state could be suggested at all during an allegedly “deadly pandemic” is a sign of just how contrived both narratives are.

It’s not said much – but corporations *love* refugees. Just like illegal immigrants, undocumented refugees can be used as cheap labour, with none of the legal protections of full citizens. They can then be blamed for deteriorating living standards, unemployment and wage stagnation. They act as a heat-sink for public anger.

Further, “refugees” with no passports are a great way to get your trained mercenaries, agitators, saboteurs, and/or special forces across national borders without leaving a trail.

The resulting army of undocumented men of fighting age can then serve as a pool of potential “terrorists” who can be “radicalised” at a moments notice and deployed to spread panic at home or abroad.

Which leads us neatly onto...

6. WILL WE SEE A MAJOR TERRORIST ATTACK?

It’s only been a few days since the “fall” of Kabul, but already the “renewed terrorism threat” is making waves in the press.

The Sun, in its usual understated style, [headlines](#):

RED ALERT Britain faces ‘direct threat of terrorism’ from Taliban’s Afghan takeover in new wave of terror against West

A rather more sedate report in [from AP says](#): “Concerns over US terror threats rising as Taliban hold grows.”

The New York Times goes almost fully schizophrenic, reporting “A decade ago, a U.S. withdrawal from Iraq opened the door for the Islamic State. Will the withdrawal from Afghanistan do the same for the Taliban?” and warning of [other terror attacks](#) in the future...

...without ever acknowledging that the US **never “withdrew” from Iraq at all**. Or that they armed, and trained, ISIS.

Bloomberg [warns](#) that “The Taliban are already inspiring terror beyond Afghanistan”. The Times is worried about the [“terrorist elite”](#) the Taliban freed from Bagram prison.

Project Syndicate [reports](#) that “The world should not ignore the risk that Afghanistan under the Taliban could become a breeding ground for international terrorism.”

Politicians from [France](#), the US and UK been eager to talk it up, too:

Immediate priority for UK govt: secure safe passage for British citizens & Afghans who have supported us.

But the long term threat is that terrorists will use Afghanistan as a base to attack the UK.

PM must set out a strategy for strengthening our counter-terrorism capability.
pic.twitter.com/tOMEkyy80M

— Stephen Kinnock (@SKinnock) [August 17, 2021](#)

The former head of NATO has said the West needs to [“bolster its terror defences”](#), whilst the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has said [“terror groups will re-constitute in Afghanistan faster than expected”](#) and the UN is calling for [“unity against the global terrorist threat”](#).

There’s a common theme to some of these dire warnings, too. Tobias Elwood MP (him again), [told the Independent](#):

I would not be surprised if we see another attack on the scale of 9/11, almost to bookend what happened 20 years ago,

Whilst Ivor Roberts, another senior Tory, used the [exact same phrase in the Metro](#), as does [this article in The Sun](#).

All of that in just the last two days.

Does this mean we will see a major terrorist attack?

Maybe, maybe not. We are past due for one, certainly. Major international terrorism, much like the flu, [took some time off during the “pandemic.”](#) But, in many ways, the threat is just as effective as the attack itself.

The Covid fear fog is thinning, people are starting to wake up a little, and the people running things need everyone to be afraid.

Conclusion

To sum up the official narrative on US withdrawal from Afghanistan in bullet points:

- Trump signed a deal with the Taliban, over a year ago, to withdraw from the country and hand over 5000 prisoners.
- Despite having over a year to plan, the US “withdrawal” was chaotic and messy.
- The US accidentally left behind weapons, helicopters, ammunition and armoured vehicles, which the Taliban took.
- The US accidentally left behind 5000 prisoners, whom the Taliban freed.
- Without US support, the Afghan army, which outnumbers and outguns the Taliban, folded without firing a shot and the Taliban took control of the entire country in less than week.
- Despite shutting down the heroin trade prior to the US invasion, the Taliban now intend to keep it going, and even increase production.

Do you believe this story? Is it at all believable?

Ignore the sound and fury from the media. The press are like a street magician, if you want to understand what they’re up to you have to look past the hand he’s waving in your face, and look at the one behind his back.

It seems fairly obvious, to me anyway, that US gave weapons and vehicles to the Taliban in exchange for a promise to keep the heroin production going (and maybe access to mineral mines, no word on that yet).

Meanwhile, the “fall out” of the totally manufactured “chaos” is being used to fan the flames of fear-porn. Promoting division over asylum seekers and spreading panic about terrorism.

In short, the Afghanistan story, as related by the mainstream press, is a twisted illogical ball of confusion, intended to provide fuel for future narratives of control.

...which is pretty much true of everything in the news, these days.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Featured image is from OffGuardian

The original source of this article is [OffGuardian](#)
Copyright © [Kit Knightly](#), [OffGuardian](#), 2021

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kit Knightly](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca