

Biden Betrays Another Campaign Pledge—Admits that U.S. Will Continue to Bomb Afghanistan

After 20 Years, America’s “Longest War” Is Not Really Ending

By [Nick Mottern](#)

Global Research, July 07, 2021

[CovertAction Magazine](#) 6 July 2021

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

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [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](#).

*On July 2nd, fleeing questions from reporters about U.S. plans in Afghanistan, **President Joe Biden** sought refuge behind the July 4th Independence Day holiday. Yet he obliquely acknowledged that the U.S. will use some level of “over-the-horizon” air attacks to prevent the Taliban from taking power, attacks that will include drones and manned aircraft, possibly even B-52s.*

Here is a portion of President Biden’s remarkable exchange with the press, which occurred at the close of his [comments](#) on the June 2021 jobs report:

Q: Are you worried that the Afghan government might fall? I mean, we are hearing about how the Taliban is taking more and more districts.

THE PRESIDENT: Look, we were in that war for 20 years. Twenty years. And I think — I met with the Afghan government here in the White House, in the Oval. I think they have the capacity to be able to sustain the government. There are going to have to be, down the road, more negotiations, I suspect. But I am — I am concerned that they deal with the internal issues that they have to be able to generate the kind of support they need nationwide to maintain the government.

Q: A follow on that thought on Afghanistan —

THE PRESIDENT: I want to talk about happy things, man.

Q: If there is evidence that Kabul is threatened, which some of the intelligence reports have suggested it could be in six months or thereabout, do you think you’ve got the capability to help provide any kind of air support, military support to them to keep the capital safe, even if the U.S. troops are obviously fully out by that time?

THE PRESIDENT: We have worked out an over-the-horizon capacity that we can be value added, but the Afghans are going to have to be able to do it themselves with the Air Force

they have, which we're helping them maintain.

Q: Sir, on Afghanistan —

THE PRESIDENT: I'm not going to answer any more quick question on Afghanistan.

Q: Are you concerned —

THE PRESIDENT: Look, it's Fourth of July.

When the President refers to “over-the-horizon capacity that we can be value added,” he is referring to a plan, that [appears](#) might cost \$10 billion, to fly drones and manned attack aircraft from bases as far away as Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait to assist the current Afghan central government in defending itself against the Taliban.

His statement is the first acknowledgment that the “over-the-horizon” air operations, that [reportedly](#) may rely very heavily on drone assassination and drone targeting for manned aircraft, will be directed at the Taliban.

In congressional [testimony](#) in June, Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin said that “over-the-horizon” operations would focus on “elements that can possibly conduct attacks against our homeland,” suggesting Al Qaeda and ISIS as targets but not foreclosing attacks against the Taliban.

The President's remarks about “over the horizon” as “value added” flowing into “but the Afghans are going to have to be able to do it themselves with the Air Force they have,” is reminiscent of former President Richard Nixon's attempt to argue that the puppet government of Vietnam was developing the power to defend itself, attempting to cover U.S. tracks out of the horribly disastrous U.S. colonization project in Vietnam.

“Our air strikes have been essential in protecting our own remaining forces and in assisting the South Vietnamese in their efforts to protect their homes and their country from a Communist takeover,” Nixon said in a 1972 [speech](#) to the nation.



Biden's strategy for Afghanistan looks like Nixon's Vietnamization policy for Vietnam which subcontracted and outsourced the war. [Source: [history.com](https://www.history.com)]

The apparent U.S. decision to continue to assist the Afghan central government from the air comes in company with a *New York Times* [report](#) saying that President Biden has placed “temporary limits on counterterrorism drone strikes and commando raids outside conventional battlefield zones like Afghanistan and Syria, and it has begun a broad review of whether to tighten Trump-era rules for such operations, according to officials.”

A similar [report](#) in *Foreign Affairs* says that there has been an apparent reduction in U.S. drone attacks, and details elements of a “bigger rethink” process that the Biden administration is said to be going through to limit civilian deaths and reevaluate how the U.S. should respond to “the overseas terrorist threat.” A goal of the administration, the report says, is to end the U.S. “forever” wars.

It must also be said, however, that these reports indicate that President Biden fully intends to continue the U.S. drone assassination/pre-emptive killing policy of Bush, Obama and Trump, possibly with more care for civilian casualties but in defiance of international principles of war, as [outlined](#) on BanKillerDrones.org, that would rule out the use of weaponized drones and military drone surveillance altogether whether inside or outside a recognized combat zone.

It appears that the reformist talk from Biden officials, much of it unattributed and therefore having no accountability, is intended to divert and placate those of us citizens who are repulsed by continuing drone atrocities, such as those leading 113 peace, justice and humanitarian organizations which signed a [letter](#) demanding “an end to the unlawful program of lethal strikes outside any recognized battlefield, including through the use of drones.”



Anti-drone activists and the peace movement are being rebuffed by yet another administration.

[Source: [rt.com](https://www.rt.com)]

Apart from the view, noted above, that drone attacks and surveillance are illegal anywhere, we have to question the U.S. having turned the entire world into a potential “recognized battlefield.”

Even though U.S. ground forces have largely left Afghanistan, it is clear that the Biden administration considers Afghanistan a legitimate battlefield for U.S. air forces.

In President Biden's "value-added" remark, one can see a clear message: Regardless of talk of a more humanitarian policy of drone killing and ending "forever" wars, the president has decided that prolonged civil war in Afghanistan is in the interest of the U.S.

Possibly this is because continued turmoil in Afghanistan will be unsettling and preoccupying to her neighbors, Iran, Pakistan, Russia and China. Possibly it is because a civil war will make it easier for corporations and banks to exploit Afghanistan's mineral, fossil fuel and opium wealth.

Certainly, continued U.S. air assaults in Afghanistan will generate money for U.S. military contractors.

With continuing U.S. air and commando attacks, Afghanistan can turn into a Libya, a [divided](#), stalemated, suffering, bleeding country, where Turkey, Russia and China test their weapons and seek advantage.

Indeed, the U.S. is negotiating with Turkey, over the objection of the Taliban, to maintain "security" at the Kabul International Airport.

Undoubtedly, the Turkish political/military/ corporate elite, who have their own expansionary ambitions, will use its drones, among them the semi-autonomous Kargu 2, to try to hold the airport and surrounding territory.

The Black Alliance for Peace released a [statement](#) on June 25 opposing "any effort to prolong the U.S. war on the Afghan people, including efforts to keep the United States engaged in any form in Afghanistan."

The statement expressed concern for "the continued operation of U.S. special forces and mercenaries (or contractors) in Afghanistan, as well as U.S.-pledged support for Turkish military defense of Kabul International Airport, a site that has continued to be a major U.S. military stronghold to support its imperial presence."

President Biden would do well to heed this statement, along with a [petition](#) to him, circulated by [BanKillerDrones.org](#), urging no further U.S. air attacks against the Afghan people.

Now that Independence Day has passed, perhaps the President will be more willing to answer questions about the real goals of "over the horizon."

*

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.

Nick Mottern Co-coordinates [BanKillerDrones.com](#) and is Coordinator of [Knowdrones.com](#). Nick can be reached at nickmottern@gmail.com.

Featured image: U.S. jets bombing Afghanistan. These attacks will not end despite the formal U.S.

withdrawal by September 11th. [Source: wired.com]

The original source of this article is [CovertAction Magazine](#)
Copyright © [Nick Mottern](#), [CovertAction Magazine](#), 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Nick Mottern](#)

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