

states, to U.S. interests? I would argue that there is *no* solution, certainly no humanitarian solution, or even political solution to this problem as long as that attitude prevails.

So far, I see no great change in this regard. The United States is itself undergoing a period of great crisis, domestic crisis—I don't mean domestic politics, but in accepting the nature of a changing geopolitical world in which the United States is no longer able to fully dominate or dictate or direct the nature of all elements of international relations. This is a very painful recognition for Washington, after some 20, 30, 40, 50 [years], one might even say since the end of World War II, [of the] dominating role of the United States.

It has not all been bad, over that long period of time. But if we go back to, particularly the fall of the Soviet Union or 9/11 for that matter, then this kind of political

mentality has increasingly dominated American thinking, American policy thinking, and, indeed, has brought disaster to its own foreign policy in many places in the world: Afghanistan; people have mentioned at this excellent discussion, Syria; Yemen might be yet another consideration where very narrow-minded, narrow interpretations of the American or the international interests are prevailing, instead of a broader vision of a more humanitarian—but more than humanitarian—that's idealism—a more *stable* world, in which conflict and war are not so present, and the risks of confrontation are *far less*.

I don't think those are idealistic goals. I think those are extremely practical, national interests not only of the U.S., but of Russia, and China, and European states, and others as well, as we look into the future.

I think I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Ivan Safranchuk

Afghanistan May Be Used For Further Harm

This is an edited transcript of the opening remarks, as delivered, by Ivan Safranchuk, to the seminar, "The Humanitarian Crisis in Afghanistan: Toward a Long-Term Solution," co-sponsored by the Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC) and the Schiller Institute (SI) on February 10, 2022. Mr. Safranchuk is the Director of the Center for Eurasian Studies of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). The full video of the seminar is available [here](#).



Ivan Safranchuk
Schiller Institute

ests, but the ability to take fresh approaches. Unfortunately, we are not anywhere close to a more cooperative mindset. We are very much now in the global Great Game competition, and increasing elements of regional competitions.

In Afghanistan, right now, we do not have active competition between great powers. But we have a very unfortunate situation when Western countries, after withdrawing their

Colleagues, I'm very sorry for joining you with this delay. However, I see an opportunity in this delay, because now I have the chance to endorse my very big support for what has just been said by Graham [Fuller]. I very much sense—in his call for more common views—the times when I was a very young person. I understand Mr. Fuller was already quite a man in his most active years—I mean, the times of perestroika and the early '90s.

I remember very much how that atmosphere was different from what had been before, and what has been after that, and that is why mindset is also important. Not only some core interests and historic inter-

troops, abandoned Afghanistan. There is nothing new in this for me. I've been participating in various events, including in events of the RIAC, with various partners. Since last September-October, in several events I was participating with RIAC, I was saying actually all the same things: That after winter, most probably Afghanistan would be left on its own, because Taliban would not demonstrate enough flexibility and softness to deal with the international community, on the terms which the international community has posed, hoping that the Taliban would be far softer and moderate.

So this mismatch, where Taliban is not ready to move with a softness, and where the international community needs the Taliban to move to be able to cooperate with it, after various conditions had been posed, this

mismatch is still very big, and it is uncoverable. I was thinking it was going to happen in this way since last September. And unfortunately, I'm very unfortunate, that I'm tending to be right on this regard.

That a humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan is taking place, no question about it, but this humanitarian crisis is not of the scale that the Western community feels shame and rushes to do something for Afghanistan. Afghanistan is going to be left very much on its own. And by now, we have fully shaped the situation where there is a small group of countries which do not want the government of Afghanistan to ultimately collapse. This group includes, of course, Pakistan; also Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Turkey; and Russia, China, and Iran also lean toward this group, though with some conditions, and maybe not fully. But clearly, these three countries [audio loss].

So, there is a group of countries which is sort of positively or negatively neutral.

But I think that there is a chance that there will be a group of countries that may become interested in the collapse of the government of the Taliban, to try to make Afghanistan a regional problem, a problem for Russia, China and Pakistan, first of all; maybe also for

Iran. And then we will have a very active regional competition. I think everyone understands now that, although Afghanistan is now a regional problem—we are living in a situation when problems are going to be mostly regional, no question about it—but, I think that there will come a time, for regional countries in particular, to choose: if the crisis is facilitated by outside places, whether to take all the consequences on themselves, or to help transfer some of these consequences to other countries. I don't want to go too deep into this, but I want to remind you of the refugee crisis which was so rudely developed on the border of Belarus and Poland, in November.

The consequences of the Afghan crisis will also exist, and I'm sure that if outside players try to manipulate regional problems of Afghanistan against regional countries, there will be opportunities to unleash consequences for the regional countries in a way that they reach not only regional countries, but go beyond the region. And I think that what was going on on the border between Belarus and Poland is a good example of how it may develop. But it's only one way; I'm sure there are other ways, so that the consequences reach everyone, ... [audio loss].

Dialogue

This is an edited transcript of the dialogue that followed the presentations by Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Dr. Andrey Kortunov, and the statements by the RIAC and Schiller experts at the seminar, "The Humanitarian Crisis in Afghanistan: Toward a Long-Term Solution," co-sponsored by the Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC) and the Schiller Institute (SI) on February 10, 2022. Participating in the dialogue were Harley Schlanger (moderator), Helga Zepp-LaRouche, James Jastras, Graham Fuller, Ivan Safranchuk, and Temur Umarov. The full video of the seminar is available [here](#).

On the Humanitarian Crisis in Afghanistan

Zepp-LaRouche: We can start the discussion: Ivan, you said that you don't believe the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan is of a scale that the West feels so much ashamed, that they will do something about it. That is actually not true. The actual, real humanitarian crisis is absolutely the worst one on the planet. The figures I presented in the beginning are all official figures from the UN, from the World Food Program, from UNICEF—

so, about the objective condition, there is no question.

The fact that it's not being reported on by the mainstream media since about mid-September is the main reason—they're trying to keep the lid on the situation because once you admit what the actual situation is, there would not be just a discussion about did Biden fail by pulling out in such a sudden way, leaving all these so-called auxiliary forces behind, and all of this discussion which occurred at the end of August. But the world population would be really upset, especially in the Islamic countries, in the so-called developing countries; and that is why the media are trying to suppress the information.

The whole purpose of Operation Ibn Sina is to awaken the world public to the dimension of the humanitarian crisis, and evoke this kind of Empfindungsvermögen, which is a German word created by the greatest German poet Schiller, for which I have not found a good English translation. "Empathy" is getting close, but it's more. It's the ability to passionately love humanity and not allow genocide to occur! I think it's not so accidental, because, as I said in my initial re-