

BETWEEN DOCTRINE AND FAILURE: THE POLITICAL DIMENSION OF NATO'S COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH IN AFGHANISTAN (2001–2021)

Laviniu BOJOR, Laurențiu GRIGORE

“Nicolae Bălcescu” Land Forces Academy, Sibiu, Romania

bojor.laviniu@armyacademy.ro, grigore.laurentiu@armyacademy.ro

Abstract: *NATO's Comprehensive Approach (CA) was designed to integrate military, political, and developmental instruments into a coherent stabilization strategy. Afghanistan (2001–2021) constituted its most extensive operational test — and in the political domain, it failed systematically. Drawing on SIGAR thematic reports as primary empirical sources, this article investigates how CA principles were applied to political governance across three operational phases. The analysis identifies three structural dysfunctions: inter-agency coordination failure, a mismatch between the transplanted governance model and local realities, and the paradoxical effects of resource allocation on political legitimacy. The central argument is that political failure was structural, not incidental — corruption functioned as a constitutive mechanism of the Afghan state rather than a symptom of its dysfunction, and external assistance progressively severed the social contract between the Kabul government and its citizens. The August 2021 collapse is interpreted as the political culmination of these failures, not a tactical defeat. The article offers an empirically grounded contribution to CA scholarship with actionable insights for NATO's future complex operations.*

Keywords: Comprehensive Approach, Political governance, Afghanistan, COIN, Civil-military coordination

1. Introduction

The collapse of the Afghan government in August 2021 provided incontestable empirical evidence of the gap between doctrinal ambitions and operational reality. For nearly two decades, the United States, NATO allies, and a broad coalition of international actors invested substantial resources in building a functional Afghan state — an effort the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) assessed as marked by fundamental failures of coherence, strategy, and institutional design.

From its earliest phase, the intervention was framed as an integrated endeavour premised on a fundamental interdependence between security, governance, and development — the logic that NATO codified as the *Comprehensive Approach (CA)*. Defined as

the coherent integration of military and civilian instruments in managing complex conflicts, CA presupposes inter-agency coordination, adaptation to local context, and the alignment of political, security, and development objectives. Endorsed at the Bucharest Summit in 2008 [1] and reaffirmed at Lisbon in 2010 [2], it represented NATO's institutional response to a core lesson: that military force alone cannot produce durable stability.

Within this framework, the political domain occupies a structurally determinant position. In the PMESII model, the Political dimension — encompassing state authority, institutional construction, and governance legitimacy — was not merely the most volatile variable, but the decisive factor conditioning the entire stabilisation architecture. In the absence of functional and

legitimate governance, military gains could not be consolidated and development investments could not generate durable effects.

This article investigates the extent to which CA principles were applied in the *political domain* of the Afghan intervention between 2001 and 2021, drawing systematically on SIGAR evaluative reports as primary sources. By anchoring the analysis in institutional data rather than normative assessments, it addresses a gap in a literature that has relied predominantly on qualitative and normative frameworks. The central research question is: *To what extent were Comprehensive Approach principles, as defined in NATO's official doctrine, implemented in the political domain of the Afghan intervention (2001–2021), according to SIGAR assessments?*

The working hypothesis holds that, although resources allocated to the political domain were substantial, the absence of sustained inter-agency coordination and the structural misalignment between the exported governance model and local Afghan realities undermined strategic coherence — generating structural vulnerabilities that SIGAR identified systematically across all three operational phases. Political failure in Afghanistan was structural, not incidental: rooted in a design incapable of translating doctrinal ambition into political reality on the ground.

2. Theoretical Framework

The Comprehensive Approach emerged as NATO's institutional response to the lessons of post-Cold War interventions. In doctrinal terms, the CA rests on three constitutive pillars: coordination of effort among international actors across military and civilian domains; adaptation of governance frameworks to local political realities; and alignment of security, political, and development objectives within a unified strategic logic [3].

These declarations, however, remain at the level of normative intent rather than operational specification — generating what

may be termed a *coordination paradox*: the greater the number of actors involved, the more difficult strategic coherence becomes to achieve. This tension is compounded by the gap between CA's *whole-of-government* ambitions — requiring coordinated engagement across defence, diplomatic, development, and civilian agencies — and the siloed institutional realities that characterised the Afghan intervention in practice [4]. Within the PMESII analytical framework, the Political domain — encompassing state legitimacy, institutional capacity, civil-military relations, and governance coherence — occupies a structurally decisive position. Unlike Military or Economic variables, it is inherently constitutive: a state without legitimate governance cannot absorb assistance without diverting it into patronage networks, nor sustain security without embedding it in factional competition. The Political domain thus functions as the meta-variable upon which the coherence of the entire stabilisation architecture depends. Recent empirical work applying structural prospective analysis to PMESII confirms this hierarchy: Pătrașcu's MICMAC-based analysis of twelve PMESII sub-variables demonstrated that political stability ranks among the highest-influence variables in the entire operational system, while defence planning — the primary output variable — is maximally dependent on political and social inputs [5]; a finding reinforced by Roman's scenario-development framework, which treats PMESII domain interactions as interdependent performance indicators whose dysfunction propagates systemically across the operational environment [6].

The scholarly literature on state-building interventions has generated three converging lines of critique directly relevant to the CA's political logic. The first concerns institutional mismatch: the transplantation of Weberian statehood onto environments structured by different principles of authority produced what Barnett, Fang, and Zürcher term "*ceremonial peacebuilding*" — an outcome featuring "*an exterior surface*

that contains the symbols of a liberal-democracy and an interior that is an illiberal order", thus creating institutions with formal existence but without legitimacy or effective capacity [7]. Edwards demonstrated that this dynamic externalises illegitimacy rather than resolving it [8], while Englehart showed that centralisation under Karzai dismantled quasi-state structures in the north that had furnished more effective local governance than their replacement [9]. The second strand recasts corruption as a *constitutive mechanism* rather than a correctable pathology: Hunt [10] argued that patronage networks are the actual means by which political order is produced in weak states, a claim confirmed empirically by SIGAR's finding that the coalition's tactical tolerance of corrupt powerbrokers systematically eroded the legitimacy of the state it was building [11]. The third strand identifies the *paradox of the heavy-footprint intervention*: Suhrke [12] demonstrated that the scale of external assistance itself generated dependency and delegitimization, Mac Ginty [13] showed that liberal peace-builders were structurally compelled to rely on illiberal actors, producing a façade state, and Rangelov and Theros argued that conflict persisted not because the Afghan state was weak but because it was predatory — its institutions actively used to abuse and extort the population they nominally served [14]. Faced with this predatory governance, populations sought protection in Taliban structures, which offered both moral legitimacy against foreign occupation and pragmatic legitimacy through less corrupt administration [15].

This body of scholarship provides the conceptual foundations for the present analysis. Its primary limitation is methodological: the dominant strand of CA critique has remained normative, evaluating doctrine against ideal-type standards without systematic recourse to the institutional data generated by the intervention's own oversight architecture. Studies drawing on SIGAR assessments exist but rarely deploy them as a structured primary source for the

systematic analysis of the Political domain across the full temporal arc of the intervention, nor do they apply consistent phase-based periodisation — essential for distinguishing design failures from implementation failures. This article addresses that gap by grounding its analysis in SIGAR's longitudinal empirical record, enabling both phase-specific diagnosis and a more defensible causal account of why the political dimension of the Comprehensive Approach failed to hold.

3. Methodology

This article adopts a qualitative single-case study design, focusing on Afghanistan (2001–2021) as the primary empirical referent for examining the political dimension of NATO's Comprehensive Approach. Afghanistan represents the most extensive and prolonged test of CA principles in a complex operational environment, combining exceptional longitudinal depth — spanning initial state-building, coalition surge, and managed withdrawal — with an unparalleled volume of institutional documentation.

The research design is anchored in documentary analysis. Primary sources are drawn exclusively from SIGAR, whose independence from operational actors, grounding in hundreds of decision-maker interviews and rigorous financial audits, and capacity to transcend officially optimistic narratives make it the most pertinent available evaluator of reconstruction outcomes. Four thematic reports constitute the evidentiary core: *Corruption in Conflict* (2016) [11], *What We Need to Learn* (2021) [16], *Why the Afghan Government Collapsed* (2023) [17], and *Collapse of the ANDSF* (2022) [18]. Secondary sources — peer-reviewed literature used for conceptual anchoring rather than empirical base construction — provide the interpretive frameworks through which SIGAR findings are analytically situated.

Thematic analysis is applied in a deductively oriented manner, guided by CA principles and the PMESII political dimension. Coding

is organized around three analytical categories derived from the working hypothesis: (1) inter-agency coordination; (2) governance model alignment with local realities; and (3) effects of resource allocation on political legitimacy. These are further disaggregated into the sub-dimensions of formal versus real institutional capacity and corruption as structural governance mechanism.

The analysis is structured across three operational phases: Phase I (2001–2005), initial state-building under the Bonn architecture; Phase II (2006–2014), ISAF surge and institutional expansion; Phase III (2015–2021), Resolute Support, Doha negotiations, and state collapse. This periodization follows structural discontinuities documented in SIGAR's own longitudinal reporting [17].

Key limitations include SIGAR's American institutional perspective — justified as a valid coalition proxy given U.S. dominance in reconstruction funding and command authority — the interpretive rather than causal character of the qualitative design, third-party archiving of SIGAR reports post-September 2025, and the absence of systematic subnational analysis.

4. Results

The thematic analysis of SIGAR documentation across the three operational phases reveals three structural patterns consistent with the article's central hypothesis: the persistent failure of inter-agency coordination, the systematic misalignment between exported governance models and Afghan political realities, and the paradoxical effect of resource allocation on political legitimacy.

4.1 Phase I (2001–2005): State-Building Without Foundations

The Bonn Agreement established the formal architecture of a new Afghan state, but American strategic priorities — focused on counterterrorism rather than governance — subordinated civilian reconstruction to military imperatives from the outset. Freeman documents that human security was

treated as an outcome of military stabilization rather than an autonomous objective, precluding genuine integration of civilian and military instruments [19]. The military's direct reliance on warlords to fill security vacuums compounded this incoherence: Dearing demonstrates that the United States subcontracted security governance to actors structurally incompatible with legitimate state construction, while simultaneously re-arming militia networks outside central government control [20].

The highly centralized presidential system imposed at Bonn actively disrupted quasi-state arrangements that had provided relative stability under regional governance. Englehart demonstrated that forced centralization generated immediate alienation in areas where warlord governance had functioned effectively [9], while Mukhopadhyay documents how stabilization in provinces such as Balkh derived not from formal institutional capacity, but from "*disguised warlordism*"—militia commanders governing through informal patronage networks under official titles [21].

By 2005, the Afghan state presented the outward form of a functioning democracy while its political substance was determined by patronage and captured institutions — a façade state whose foundations SIGAR's *Corruption in Conflict* (2016) identifies as constitutively corrupt from the moment of construction [11].

4.2 Phase II (2006–2014): Surge, Institutional Mimicry, and Predatory Consolidation

The ISAF surge multiplied actors and resources without resolving structural fragmentation — producing a coordination overload in which parallel initiatives exceeded any capacity for strategic alignment. Systematic loss of institutional memory through rapid personnel rotation — the "*annual lobotomy*" documented by SIGAR — produced effectively twenty one-year wars rather than a coherent long-term strategy [16]. The contradiction reached its

starkest expression in the Host Nation Trucking contracting arrangements, through which American military procurement directly financed militia commanders who paid protection fees to Taliban networks, meaning reconstruction resources simultaneously funded the insurgency the mission sought to defeat [16].

Provincial Reconstruction Teams — designed as the operational vehicle for CA at the subnational level — frequently bypassed Afghan authorities, becoming parallel governance structures that substituted for state capacity rather than developing it [16]. At every level of governance, institutional mimicry prevailed: Billaud [22] documents Afghan ministries reproducing the formal architecture of modern bureaucracy while actual resource allocation followed patronage networks invisible to external monitors); Beyer [23] and Monsutti [24] show formal councils captured by existing powerbrokers and NGO proliferation rendering the state invisible at the local level. The result, as Wilde and Mielke synthesize, was not state-building but "*state-making dominated by patronage networks*" [25]. The Kabul Bank scandal marked the belated recognition of corruption as a strategic threat — but by then the system had consolidated into a predatory state in which, as Rangelov and Theros document, "*abuse of power became endemic and emerged as a major driver of persistent conflict*" [14]. Suhrke demonstrates that external assistance had created a rentier state structurally incapable of domestic accountability [12], while Terpstra documents how Taliban shadow governance acquired pragmatic legitimacy precisely because the formal state had forfeited it [15].

4.3 Phase III (2015–2021): Managed Decline and Structural Collapse

Aid conditionality — the primary lever of international political influence during Resolute Support — proved consistently ineffective: Afghan political actors who understood that withdrawal was politically determined had no rational incentive to implement reforms threatening their own

patronage networks [11]. The Doha Agreement (2020), negotiated with the Afghan government systematically excluded, represented the definitive abandonment of CA principles — signalling explicitly to security forces and the broader population that the regime had been abandoned by its principal patron and precipitating the disintegration of institutional loyalty that preceded the August 2021 collapse [17].

The façade state had become a structural feature rather than a transitional condition. Mehran documents the complete neopatrimonial capture of formal institutions, with "*cultures of entitlement*" making meritocratic reform structurally impossible [26], while Malejacq demonstrates that powerbrokers successfully shape-shifted, transforming the formal state apparatus into merely an extractive resource to fund their own parallel, quasi-state patronage structures [27].

As withdrawal became imminent, predatory elites accelerated the extraction of remaining state resources — an anticipatory capital flight that hollowed the institutional architecture before its formal collapse. SIGAR's *What We Need to Learn* (2021) is unambiguous: twenty years of reconstruction had produced capacity that existed only in relation to external inputs, not as an independent political achievement [16].

4.4 Cross-Phase Synthesis

Three mutually reinforcing structural patterns define the political failure of CA in Afghanistan. Inter-agency coordination collapsed through irreconcilable strategic priorities — military imperatives subordinated civilian objectives, annual personnel rotation destroyed institutional memory, and reconstruction contracting directly financed insurgent networks. Governance model alignment failed because informal and customary arrangements were dismantled in favour of formal Western templates, producing a façade state that performed democratic rituals while

patronage and capture determined political reality. Resource allocation without strategic coherence produced the inverse of its intended effect: the Host Nation Trucking arrangements, the Kabul Bank scandal, and anticipatory capital flight before collapse are not exceptional episodes but symptomatic illustrations of a systemic logic in which the instruments of reconstruction became instruments of institutional corrosion. SIGAR's documentation across twenty years provides consistent empirical support for this structural interpretation, corroborated at every phase by the academic literature on state-building, warlordism, and the political economy of intervention.

5. Discussion

The findings presented across the three operational phases converge on a conclusion that extends beyond Afghanistan: the political failure of NATO's Comprehensive Approach was not a failure of execution but a failure of design. SIGAR's longitudinal assessments do not document a mission that tried and fell short; they document a mission that generated systemic dysfunctions in direct proportion to the resources it deployed [16]. Afghanistan is not a "failed case" of the CA — it is a revelatory one, exposing the framework's intrinsic structural limits.

The most consequential pattern is the inversion of the CA's intended causal logic. Massive resource inflows, delivered without strategic coherence or accountability mechanisms, constituted corruption as a structural feature of the state rather than a deviation from it [11]. The result was a rentier state whose accountability ran entirely toward foreign donors rather than Afghan citizens [12][28]. As official evaluations concluded, a central government that was completely "*beholden only to international donors*" effectively severed the social contract that political legitimacy requires, rendering it fundamentally illegitimate in the eyes of the population [17]. The anticipatory capital flight of Afghan elites before the 2021 collapse was the terminal expression of this dynamic:

rational actors extracting value from a structure they had always understood as transient.

A second structural tension concerns the gap between the Comprehensive Approach (CA) as NATO doctrine and its operational reality as an American-dominated practice. While the Bucharest and Lisbon Summit Declarations affirmed a coherent, alliance-wide approach, the operational reality was characterized by severe coordination overload—exacerbated by dozens of "*national caveats*" that fragmented the multinational mission [16].

Consequently, civilian instruments were progressively subordinated to counterinsurgency (COIN) requirements. As official evaluations noted, civilian agencies like USAID were routinely "bulldozed" by the military, which elevated tactical combat objectives over long-term development goals [16]. This dynamic fundamentally altered the civil-military balance, transforming humanitarianism and diplomacy into mere instruments of military victory [28], and leaving European civilian efforts marginalized as a strategic "sideshow" to US military dominance [29]. The initial Bonn decision to impose a hyper-centralised presidential system on a country defined by deep ethnic fragmentation constituted a structural design error that no subsequent resource increase could correct [17]. The Doha Agreement of 2020 crystallises this trajectory. By excluding the Afghan government from negotiations, the US formally abandoned the political dimension of CA at the moment its coherence mattered most. The ANDSF collapse in August 2021 was not a tactical defeat but a political failure: security forces found no rational basis to defend a state order whose legitimacy had long been exhausted [18]. Taliban legitimacy — rooted in predictability and accessible local justice — emerged not despite the intervention, but because of it [15].

These findings suggest the need to recalibrate the CA from a prescriptive model based on ideal integration toward an

adaptive one that prioritises local legitimacy over formal institutional compliance. The remaining PMESII domains will test whether the dysfunctions identified here were specific to the political dimension or symptomatic of a deeper incoherence in the CA framework itself.

6. Conclusions

The question driving this study — *to what extent were Comprehensive Approach principles, as defined in NATO's official doctrine, implemented in the political domain of the Afghan intervention between 2001 and 2021* — admits a clear answer: CA principles were formally invoked but structurally undermined across all three operational phases. Applied on paper through elaborate plans and substantial resources, they were systematically subverted in practice by the absence of effective inter-agency coordination and the consistent prioritization of short-term security imperatives over political legitimacy.

The central hypothesis is confirmed, with one important nuance. The failure was not simply a deficit of coordination; it was the product of a systematic inversion of CA logic. In Phase I, the Bonn Agreement imposed a hyper-centralized system on a fragmented polity while military imperatives drove co-optation of warlord networks that directly contradicted state-building objectives [11]. In Phase II, institutional expansion occurred simultaneously with the deepening of corruption as a constitutive mechanism of the state [16]. In Phase III, structural vulnerabilities accumulated rather than corrected — the Doha Agreement formalized strategic abandonment of the Afghan government and precipitated the institutional collapse of August 2021 [17].

Throughout, developmental objectives were subordinated to military requirements, and more resources applied through a misaligned governance model accelerated delegitimization rather than reversing it.

This study contributes two findings to existing scholarship. Theoretically, it establishes the PMESII political domain as a structural variable — not contextual backdrop — upon which the durability of all other intervention dimensions depends, and confirms that institutional mismatch and the coordination paradox are features of the doctrine's design, not its implementation. Empirically, it offers a systematically source-anchored assessment grounded in SIGAR audit data, addressing a gap in a literature that remains predominantly normative. For NATO planning, the evidence calls for recalibrating CA from a prescriptive integration model to an adaptive one that prioritizes local political legitimacy over formal institutional compliance — since sustainability is incompatible with political illegitimacy.

The principal limitation of this research is the American-centric perspective embedded in SIGAR documentation, which may not fully capture informal governance mechanisms or non-US coalition dynamics. Future articles in this PMESII series will examine the Military, Economic, Social, Informational, and Infrastructure dimensions of the same intervention — tracing how the political misalignment documented here conditioned failure across the full architecture of the Comprehensive Approach.

Acknowledgements

The author declares no external funding or assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- [1] NATO. Bucharest Summit Declaration [Internet]. NATO; 2008. <https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/official-texts-and-resources/official-texts/2008/04/03/bucharest-summit-declaration>. Accessed January 15, 2026.

- [2] NATO. Lisbon Summit Declaration [Internet]. 2010. <https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/official-texts-and-resources/official-texts/2010/11/20/lisbon-summit-declaration>. Accessed January 14, 2026.
- [3] NATO. A “comprehensive approach” to crises [Internet]. NATO; 2024. <https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/partnerships-and-cooperation/a-comprehensive-approach-to-crises>. Accessed January 14, 2026.
- [4] Constantinescu M. Dezvoltarea rezilienței strategice a mobilității militare printr-o abordare cuprinzătoare, la nivelul întregului guvern. *Gândirea Militară Românească*. 2025;(3):532.
- [5] Pătrașcu P. PMESII Structural Analysis for Enhanced Military Operations Planning. *OaS*. 2025;25(2):133.
- [6] Roman D. Scenario Development in Planning Military Actions to Prevent a Crisis Situation. *RMT*. 2023;2023(1):108–127.
- [7] Barnett M, Fang S, Zürcher C. The Peacebuilder’s Contract: How External State-building Reinforces Weak Statehood. *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations*. Routledge; 2009.
- [8] Edwards LM. State-building in Afghanistan: a case showing the limits? *Int rev Red Cross*. 2010;92(880):967–991.
- [9] Englehart NA. A Tale of Two Afghanistans: Comparative Governance and Insurgency in the North and South. *Asian Survey*. 2010;50(4):735–758.
- [10] Hunt SL. The Origins, Organization, and Perhaps Demise of Armed Resistance to the State. *Int Stud Rev*. 2013;15(4):594–599.
- [11] SIGAR. Corruption in Conflict: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan [Internet]. Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; 2016. Report No.: SIGAR 16-58-LL. <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/sigar/sigar-16-58-ll.pdf>. Accessed January 18, 2026.
- [12] Suhrke A. Statebuilding in Afghanistan: a contradictory engagement. *Central Asian Survey*. 2013;32(3):271–286.
- [13] Mac Ginty R. Warlords and the liberal peace: state-building in Afghanistan. *Conflict, Security & Development*. 2010;10(4):577–598.
- [14] Rangelov I, Theros M. Abuse of power and conflict persistence in Afghanistan. *Conflict, Security & Development*. 2012;12(3):227–248.
- [15] Terpstra N. Rebel governance, rebel legitimacy, and external intervention: assessing three phases of Taliban rule in Afghanistan. *Small Wars & Insurgencies*. 2020;31(6):1143–1173.
- [16] SIGAR. What We Need to Learn: Lessons from Twenty Years of Afghanistan Reconstruction [Internet]. Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; 2021. Report No.: SIGAR 21-46-LL. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo159506/pdf/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo159506.pdf>. Accessed January 19, 2026.
- [17] SIGAR. Why the Afghan Government Collapsed [Internet]. Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; 2022. Report No.: SIGAR 23-05-IP. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo220710/pdf/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo220710.pdf>. Accessed January 19, 2026.
- [18] SIGAR. Collapse of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: An Assessment of the Factors That Led to Its Demise [Internet]. 2022. Report No.: SIGAR 22-22-IP. <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/sigar/sigar-22-22-ip.pdf>. Accessed January 19, 2026.

- [19] Freeman C. Introduction: Security, Governance and Statebuilding in Afghanistan. *International Peacekeeping*. 2007;14(1):1–7.
- [20] Dearing MP. Turning gangsters into allies: the American way of war in Northern Afghanistan. *Small Wars & Insurgencies*. 2019;30(1):101–139.
- [21] Mukhopadhyay D. Disguised warlordism and combatant hood in Balkh: the persistence of informal power in the formal Afghan state. *Conflict, Security & Development*. 2009;9(4):535–564.
- [22] Billaud J. The Making of Modern Afghanistan: Reconstruction, Transnational Governance and Gender Politics in the New Islamic Republic. *Anthropology of the Middle East* [Internet]. 2012;7(1). Accessed January 15, 2026.
- [23] Beyer J. Informal order and the state in Afghanistan. *Central Asian Survey*. 2018;37(3):486–488.
- [24] Monsutti A. Fuzzy Sovereignty: Rural Reconstruction in Afghanistan, between Democracy Promotion and Power Games. *Comp Stud Soc Hist*. 2012;54(3):563–591.
- [25] Wilde A, Mielke K. Order, stability, and change in Afghanistan: from top-down to bottom-up state-making. *Central Asian Survey*. 2013;32(3):353–370.
- [26] Mehran W. Neopatrimonialism in Afghanistan: Former Warlords, New Democratic Bureaucrats? *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*. 2018;13(2):91–105.
- [27] Malejacq R. Warlords, Intervention, and State Consolidation: A Typology of Political Orders in Weak and Failed States. *Security Studies*. 2016;25(1):85–110.
- [28] Ozdemir E. Deteriorating Proximity between Liberal Peacebuilding and Counterinsurgency: Warlordism and Corruption in Afghanistan. *Interventions*. 2019;21(2):188–218.
- [29] Hassan O. Afghanistan: Lessons learnt from 20 years of supporting democracy, development and security [Internet]. European Parliament, Policy Department for External Relations; 2023. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2023/702579/EXPO_STU\(2023\)702579_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2023/702579/EXPO_STU(2023)702579_EN.pdf). Accessed January 25, 2026.