

By [The CATO Institute](#) , Individual Liberty, Free Markets, Peace - 3 Hours Ago



[Comments\(0\)](#) | [\(0\)](#)



## Related Articles

- [White House Says Obama Not Pulling Out of Afghanistan](#)
- [Defense Secretary Gates to Go Along with Obama's Decisions](#)
- [Obama Must Show Leadership, Pull Out of Afghanistan](#)
- [Condoleezza Rice's Flawed Thinking on Afghanistan & Terrorism](#)

by *Malou Innocent*

Maleeha Lodhi, Pakistan's former ambassador to Washington, and Anatol Lieven, a professor at King's College London, [discuss](#) in the *Financial Times* how we can exit the Afghan quagmire:

*The west should therefore pursue a political solution, open negotiations with the Taliban and offer a timetable for a phased withdrawal in return for a ceasefire. This should begin with the [military](#) pulling out of specific areas in return for Taliban guarantees not to attack western bases and Afghan authorities in those areas. If the Taliban refuses such terms, then military pressure should continue. The point should not be to eliminate the Taliban – which is impossible – but to persuade it to agree to a deal.*

Lodhi and Lieven's argument echoes one that [David Axe, Jason Reich, and I made yesterday on ForeignPolicy.com](#).

*... regime [change](#), and [democracy](#), are not necessary for counterterrorism. Propping up President Hamid Karzai's Western-style [government](#) in Kabul does not make operations against al Qaeda any easier or more successful. If anything, it distracts from the conceptually simpler task of finding and killing terrorists. Without U.S. and NATO protection, Karzai's regime would, sooner or later, probably fall to the Taliban. But U.S. observers should not equate that eventuality with "losing" the war. The war is against terrorists, not Islamist governments. The United States should be prepared to make peace, and amends, with a resurgent Taliban — and to encourage the group to excise its more extreme elements.*

I admit talking to the Taliban sounds weird and scary. But my contention is that there is no shortage of Pashtun militants willing to fight against what they perceive to be a foreign occupation of their region. Certainly the Taliban does not enjoy support among the majority of Pashtuns—as Lodhi and Lieven point out—but neither did the IRA in Northern Ireland or the FLN in Algeria. The point is not exclusively about popularity (although that's a critical component, along with local legitimacy), but the fact that these indigenous groups are willing to fight the United States and NATO indefinitely. Indeed, it is the western military presence that is [driving](#) support for the Taliban both in Afghanistan and in Pakistan.

Moreover, the notion that we must protect Pakistan from the Taliban is ludicrous. Pakistan's intelligence service helped create the Taliban and they continue to protect the Afghan Taliban to keep India at bay. From this point of view, deploying more troops would be irrelevant to the fight against al Qaeda and counterproductive in our attempts to pacify the region. For more on what we should do, check [this](#) out.

This content is inappropriate



Please select the category that most closely reflects your concern about this content, so that we can review it and determine whether it violates [Civility 101](#) or isn't appropriate for some other reason.

Abusing this feature is also a violation of [Civility 101](#).

Explanation:

**Submit**

Regarding Article

**OPINION:Should the U.S. Negotiate With the Taliban?**

**Thank You for your Comment**

We review all comments before they're posted. For more on our comment policy, please see our [FAQ](#).

- Be the first to [comment](#).

## Related Debates



• [Has Guantanamo Prison Made America Safer?](#)



• [Did the U.S. Torture Prisoners in Guantanamo?](#)