



UNITED NATIONS
G-20

*Addressing the legitimacy of Afghanistan's
Taliban government*

INDEX:

Definitions of Key Concepts.....	2
Background Information.....	3
Key Stakeholders.....	5
Current Situation.....	6
Case Study.....	8
Balancing Legitimacy, Security, and Human Rights.....	9
Ethical and Legal Considerations.....	10
Suggested Bloc Positions.....	11
Western Bloc (United States, European Union):.....	11
Eastern Bloc (Russia, China):.....	12
Non-Aligned / Developing Nations:.....	12
Human Rights Advocates (NGOs, Civil Society):.....	12
Possible Moderated Caucuses.....	12
Possible Resolution Points.....	13
Bibliography and Further Reading.....	15

Definitions of Key Concepts

Government Recognition: This is the formal acknowledgment by states or international organizations that a particular government has the authority to represent a territory. Recognition allows a government to establish diplomatic relations, enter into treaties, and participate in international institutions. Recognition can be political, legal, or symbolic and often reflects both strategic interests and ethical considerations. For example, some states may recognize a government to ensure regional stability, while others may withhold recognition due to human rights concerns.

De Facto Government: A de facto government is one that exercises control over a country's institutions, military, and population in practice, even if it has not been formally recognized by other states. This type of government maintains authority through effective administration and enforcement, often without legal or international legitimacy. The Taliban in Afghanistan since 2021 serves as a contemporary example, controlling the country's institutions while lacking widespread recognition.

De Jure Government: A de jure government is legally acknowledged by other states and international organizations as the official authority of a territory. Recognition does not require actual control over the country's institutions or territory; rather, it reflects acceptance under international law. For instance, governments-in-exile may maintain de jure status even while a rival group controls the territory on the ground.

Sovereignty: Sovereignty refers to the principle that a state has exclusive authority over its internal affairs and territory without interference from external actors. It is a cornerstone of international law and underpins diplomatic recognition, territorial integrity, and the ability to make independent policy decisions. However, sovereignty is often weighed against international obligations, such as protecting human rights.

Human Rights: Human rights are fundamental entitlements and freedoms that belong to all individuals regardless of nationality, race, or religion. They include civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, such as freedom of expression, the right to education, and protection against torture. Human rights are enshrined in international instruments like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and form a critical standard when assessing government legitimacy.

Sanctions: Sanctions are economic, political, or diplomatic penalties imposed by states or international organizations to influence a government's behavior. They can include trade restrictions, asset freezes, travel bans, or suspension from international bodies. Sanctions are often used to pressure governments to comply with international norms, such as respecting human rights or adhering to peace agreements.

Legitimacy: Legitimacy is the perception that a government's authority is lawful, justified, and accepted by the population or the international community. Legitimacy can be based on legal recognition, adherence to ethical and democratic norms, or the consent of the governed. A government with widespread legitimacy is more likely to maintain stability and international cooperation.

Conditional Recognition: Conditional recognition occurs when a state or organization acknowledges a government's authority only if it fulfills specific requirements or undertakes reforms. These conditions may include commitments to human rights, democratic governance, transparency, or inclusive political participation. Conditional recognition allows the international community to engage pragmatically while promoting ethical and legal standards.

Background Information

The legitimacy of Afghanistan's Taliban government has become one of the most complex and widely debated diplomatic issues in the international system. The question grew urgent after the Taliban retook Kabul on August 15, 2021, following the withdrawal of United States and NATO forces. The internationally supported Islamic Republic collapsed almost immediately, and the Taliban assumed full control without elections or a negotiated political transition. This sudden shift repeated the situation from the period between 1996 and 2001, when the Taliban ruled Afghanistan but received recognition from only a small number of states. Once again, the international community faces the challenge of deciding whether a government that seized power through force and rejects many global norms should be considered legitimate under international law.

Since returning to power, the Taliban have taken full control of national institutions. They manage government ministries, courts, police and security forces, and provincial administrations, which makes them the clear de facto authority within the country. Despite this internal control, most states have refused to grant formal diplomatic recognition. Governments cite a range of concerns, including the Taliban's severe restrictions on women, limitations on education and work, the suppression of civil society, and the absence of political participation or inclusive governance. Reports of human rights abuses, arbitrary detentions, and the exclusion of ethnic minorities further weaken the Taliban's claims to legitimacy. Because of these actions, Afghanistan remains diplomatically isolated. Development assistance has been suspended, and billions of dollars in Afghan state assets held abroad remain inaccessible. Without these resources, the country faces significant challenges in restoring economic stability.

The situation is further complicated by the deepening humanitarian crisis inside Afghanistan. The economy has deteriorated, unemployment is widespread, and the reduction in international support has pushed public services to the edge of collapse. Millions of Afghans face food shortages, poor access to medical care, and worsening living conditions. Humanitarian organizations face their own challenges, particularly due to restrictions imposed on female aid workers and limitations on independent operations. These obstacles make it difficult to provide life saving assistance. This creates a major dilemma for the international community. Applying pressure on the Taliban by withholding recognition may encourage policy changes, but it also risks worsening the suffering of ordinary civilians who have no control over government actions.

As a result, the debate on recognition has expanded beyond traditional political considerations. It now involves complex questions related to sovereignty, international responsibility, and the global commitment to human rights. Some states argue that limited and conditional engagement is necessary to stabilize the region and prevent further humanitarian decline. Others insist that any form of recognition would reward an authority that continues to violate fundamental rights and restrict basic freedoms. The issue has therefore become a test of the international community's ability to balance pragmatic diplomacy with ethical principles. The question of whether the Taliban government should be recognized remains unresolved, reflecting the tension between state interests, legal standards, and moral responsibility in an evolving global landscape.

Key Stakeholders

The Taliban: The Taliban seek to consolidate complete control over Afghanistan while achieving international legitimacy, which would unlock access to frozen foreign reserves, allow participation in international forums, and facilitate diplomatic and trade relations. Internally, the group enforces strict social policies, including restrictions on women's education and employment, limits on political participation, and suppression of dissent. Their governance relies on a combination of religious law and military enforcement, creating a system that prioritizes control over individual freedoms. The Taliban's insistence on full sovereignty often conflicts with international demands for human rights reform, placing them at the center of the debate over conditional or full recognition by the global community.

Russia: Russia has long maintained strategic and security interests in Afghanistan, particularly regarding counter-terrorism and regional influence. In July 2025, Russia became the first country to formally recognize the Taliban by accepting the credentials of their ambassador. Moscow justified this decision as a pragmatic step aimed at stabilizing the

region, ensuring counter-terrorism cooperation, and opening economic opportunities. Russia's recognition demonstrates how geopolitical priorities can outweigh human rights considerations, signaling that states may prioritize strategic stability and economic interests over adherence to international ethical standards. This move also sets a precedent that could influence other countries' decisions on recognition.

China: China maintains close economic and security engagement with Afghanistan while stopping short of formal recognition. Beijing's strategy emphasizes investment in infrastructure projects, regional security cooperation, and protecting its interests related to the Belt and Road Initiative. China's approach reflects a pragmatic balance: it engages to safeguard economic and strategic goals while avoiding full endorsement of the Taliban's governance, particularly given international scrutiny over human rights violations. China also plays a role in regional security, monitoring extremist movements that could affect its borders and Muslim-majority Xinjiang region.

Pakistan: Pakistan shares a long and porous border with Afghanistan and has historically exercised political influence within Afghan affairs. Islamabad continues to maintain diplomatic channels with the Taliban, emphasizing regional security, trade, and political influence. Pakistan's position is sensitive internationally, as it faces scrutiny for alleged past support of the Taliban. Balancing domestic security concerns with international expectations, Pakistan navigates the tension between maintaining a stable neighbor and avoiding global censure for association with a regime accused of widespread human rights violations.

Western Countries: The United States, the European Union, and allied nations emphasize human rights, governance reforms, and democratic norms as essential conditions for recognition. While these countries provide humanitarian aid to mitigate the crisis in Afghanistan, they withhold formal diplomatic recognition to pressure the Taliban on policies regarding women, minorities, free press, and civil liberties. Western governments must balance humanitarian assistance with efforts to promote accountability, often relying on conditional aid and engagement strategies that avoid legitimizing Taliban rule while addressing urgent needs.

United Nations: The United Nations remains a key actor, navigating the challenge of providing humanitarian assistance without granting political legitimacy to the Taliban. Agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UNICEF, and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) focus on delivering critical services, protecting vulnerable populations, and monitoring human rights conditions. The UN plays a dual role: coordinating aid to prevent humanitarian collapse while supporting international norms for governance, human rights, and accountability.

Afghan Civil Society and NGOs: Local organizations, activists, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) continue to play a critical role in Afghanistan, advocating for rights, documenting abuses, and delivering humanitarian services. These groups maintain societal structures, protect marginalized populations, and provide channels for dissent and civic participation despite facing severe threats from the Taliban regime. Civil society organizations are essential for maintaining accountability, promoting human rights, and providing a voice for communities that might otherwise be silenced under Taliban rule.

Current Situation

As of 2025, the Taliban function as a de facto government and maintain complete control over Afghanistan's political institutions, administrative structures, and security apparatus. Their authority extends across the country, with officials overseeing ministries, enforcing laws, collecting taxes, and directing public services. Despite this consolidated internal control, the Taliban continue to face significant obstacles on the international stage. Most countries have withheld formal recognition, expressing concerns about governance practices, human rights violations, and the absence of inclusive political mechanisms. This widespread reluctance to grant legitimacy has severe implications for Afghanistan's economic stability and diplomatic engagement. The government remains cut off from billions of dollars in frozen foreign assets, severely limiting its ability to maintain institutions, support public services, or stabilize the national currency. Restricted access to multilateral financial systems and international banking networks also undermines the country's capacity to conduct trade, invest in infrastructure, and respond to mounting humanitarian needs.

The Taliban's domestic policies further complicate efforts to obtain recognition. Their restrictions on female education and employment, alongside policies limiting women's mobility and public participation, have drawn condemnation from international organizations and human rights groups. These measures are accompanied by tight control over the press, including censorship, intimidation of journalists, and the closure of independent media outlets. Political dissent is suppressed through arrests, surveillance, and the dissolution of opposition networks. Such actions contribute to an environment where civil liberties are significantly reduced, raising serious concerns about the regime's willingness to adhere to international norms and legal obligations. At the same time, Afghanistan's humanitarian situation has deteriorated rapidly. More than half of the population faces food insecurity due to economic collapse, drought, and disrupted supply chains. Inflation continues to erode purchasing power, unemployment remains widespread, and essential public services struggle to operate. Social tensions have intensified as

communities grapple with poverty, diminished opportunities, and uncertainty about the future.

International responses to the crisis reveal a division in engagement strategies. Certain nations and organizations have adopted a conditional approach, offering limited cooperation or assistance tied directly to expectations of reform in governance, women's rights, and inclusivity. This strategy aims to provide humanitarian support while maintaining leverage over the Taliban, encouraging them to align their policies with international standards. Other states focus on pragmatic diplomacy, prioritizing border security, counter-terrorism cooperation, and regional stability above normative concerns. These governments engage with the Taliban out of necessity rather than ideological alignment, reasoning that instability in Afghanistan poses risks that transcend politics. The tension between these two approaches reflects the broader challenge faced by the international community, which must balance respect for sovereignty, the imperative to alleviate humanitarian suffering, and the responsibility to protect fundamental human rights. The situation illustrates the difficulty of developing a coherent global strategy in response to a government that operates effectively within its territory but remains at odds with the principles expected in modern international relations.

Case Study

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/7/3/russia-becomes-first-country-to-recognise-afghanistans-taliban-government>

In July 2025, Russia became the first country to formally recognize the Taliban government by accepting the credentials of their appointed ambassador. This move marked a significant turning point in global diplomacy surrounding Afghanistan, breaking nearly four years of widespread international reluctance to confer formal legitimacy on the Taliban. Russia's decision signaled a strategic shift in regional politics and indicated Moscow's willingness to engage with the Taliban government as the official governing authority of Afghanistan.

Russia framed its recognition as a pragmatic and security-oriented decision, emphasizing the importance of stability in Central Asia. Moscow argued that cooperation with the Taliban was necessary to manage border security, prevent the spread of extremist groups such as ISIS-K, and protect Russian allies in the region. Additionally, Russia identified potential opportunities for expanding economic ties, including trade routes, energy projects, and counter-narcotics cooperation. From the Taliban's perspective, Russian recognition provided the most substantial diplomatic victory since regaining control of Kabul in 2021. It offered

international validation, enhanced their claims of legitimacy, and enabled them to pursue further diplomatic engagement with neighboring states.

However, the decision immediately sparked international controversy and criticism. Human rights organizations and Western governments condemned Russia's move, arguing that it effectively legitimized a regime responsible for systematic violations of women's rights, suppression of political dissent, and widespread discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities. Critics stressed that recognizing the Taliban without requiring concrete reforms undermined decades of international work in Afghanistan, particularly efforts aimed at promoting women's education, protecting civil liberties, and establishing democratic institutions. They warned that such recognition could weaken global pressure on the Taliban to improve governance and uphold human rights.

The case also illustrates a broader geopolitical strategy. Russia's recognition aligns with its desire to expand influence in Asia amid growing tensions with Western nations. By engaging directly with the Taliban, Russia positions itself as a key regional power broker. This move may also be interpreted as a challenge to Western foreign policy, especially since the United States and European Union maintain that recognition must remain conditional on measurable improvements in human rights and inclusive governance. The divergence highlights a global split between states prioritizing security and strategic interests versus those emphasizing ethical governance and international norms.

Furthermore, the case highlights how recognition decisions can set new international precedents. Russia's unilateral action may encourage other Eastern or non-aligned countries, such as China, Iran, Pakistan, or Central Asian states, to reconsider their own diplomatic stance toward the Taliban. In doing so, it raises concerns that authoritarian governments may feel empowered to pursue legitimacy through strategic alliances rather than compliance with human rights obligations or democratic principles. This dynamic risks weakening international standards that govern recognition, potentially enabling future regimes that seize power by force to gain legitimacy through geopolitical partnerships instead of legal and ethical criteria.

Ultimately, this case study serves as a critical example of the tensions at the heart of debates over the Taliban's legitimacy. It demonstrates how security, strategic influence, human rights, and ethical foreign policy intersect, and often conflict, in shaping international responses to contested governments. Russia's recognition of the Taliban not only reshapes regional diplomacy but also challenges the international community to reconsider how legitimacy is defined and what responsibilities states have when confronting governments with poor human rights records.

Balancing Legitimacy, Security, and Human Rights

Recognition of the Taliban involves balancing several major considerations that shape the choices of the international community. Each factor carries significant consequences for regional stability, global norms, and the wellbeing of the Afghan population. Together they form a complex diplomatic landscape in which governments must weigh practical security needs against commitments to human rights and humanitarian principles.

Security concerns represent one of the strongest arguments in favor of engagement. Supporters of recognition argue that cooperation with the Taliban could strengthen efforts to prevent terrorism, limit the spread of extremist movements, and stabilize borders in a region already vulnerable to conflict and insecurity. Without diplomatic channels, coordination on issues such as intelligence sharing, counter narcotics efforts, and border management becomes extremely difficult. This reduced cooperation may allow rival militant groups to expand their influence in areas where governance is weak or contested. Fragmented relations may also contribute to increased cross border violence, regional rivalries, and the growth of transnational criminal networks. For these reasons, many security oriented analysts believe that some level of engagement is necessary to prevent Afghanistan from becoming a source of broader regional instability.

Human rights form the core of the argument against recognition. Critics warn that granting formal legitimacy to the Taliban without strict conditions would signal acceptance of their policies, which continue to restrict fundamental freedoms. These include prohibitions on secondary and higher education for girls, limitations on women's employment, suppression of independent media, and the absence of inclusive political representation. Many observers fear that recognition could weaken international leverage and remove incentives for reform, making it more difficult to advocate for the protection of vulnerable groups. The international community has repeatedly stated that the treatment of women and girls will be a key measure of the Taliban's willingness to comply with global norms. Recognition therefore risks sending a message that such standards can be ignored without consequences.

Humanitarian aid presents another major challenge. Afghanistan remains one of the most food insecure countries in the world, and millions of civilians depend on international assistance for survival. Donors must find ways to deliver aid directly to communities without empowering Taliban authorities politically or financially. Humanitarian organizations often encounter restrictions on movement, limitations on female staff, and interference in the distribution of supplies. These obstacles complicate the mission of reaching those most in need, especially women and children. Governments must therefore design strategies that protect civilian wellbeing while avoiding the appearance of endorsement. This requires a delicate balance between principled action and urgent humanitarian necessity.

The ethical debate ties all these issues together. Governments face a difficult question. Should they prioritize immediate stability and the potential to save lives through

engagement, or should they uphold moral and legal principles by refusing to recognize a government that continues to violate basic human rights? Supporters of engagement argue that diplomatic contact does not necessarily imply approval, and that dialogue may help moderate the Taliban over time. Opponents counter that normalization may legitimize repression and set a dangerous precedent for other authoritarian movements. This divide highlights the tension between practical policy considerations and long standing commitments to international values. The international community must therefore navigate a landscape in which every choice carries both benefits and risks, and in which the fate of millions of Afghans depends on the outcome.

Ethical and Legal Considerations

Ethical and legal considerations play a central role in determining whether the international community should recognize the Taliban government. International law traditionally upholds the principle of state sovereignty, which grants governing authorities the power to exercise control within their borders. At the same time, international law also stresses the importance of adhering to human rights obligations that protect individuals and communities from oppressive governance. These two principles often come into conflict in situations like Afghanistan, where a group exercises effective control over a territory but implements policies that violate global human rights standards. Recognition therefore becomes more than a simple diplomatic act. It involves evaluating the nature of the governing authority, the legitimacy of its rule, and its willingness to align with international expectations. In the case of the Taliban, their control over Afghanistan is clear, yet their compliance with human rights norms remains deeply contested, creating a difficult legal and ethical dilemma for states considering formal recognition.

Conditional recognition has emerged as a widely discussed approach in this context. This framework does not immediately grant full diplomatic legitimacy to the Taliban. Instead, it links recognition to concrete and measurable reforms in areas such as governance, human rights, education, and the inclusion of women and minorities in public life. By setting clear expectations and tying diplomatic privileges to progress, conditional recognition aims to provide meaningful leverage without abandoning moral or legal principles. It offers a structured pathway for engagement that can encourage positive behavior while avoiding the impression that the international community accepts the Taliban's current policies. Some governments and international organizations view this approach as a way to influence the Taliban constructively while still protecting the rights and wellbeing of the Afghan population. Others argue that any form of recognition, even conditional, risks legitimizing a regime that has not demonstrated respect for fundamental freedoms. This ongoing debate

reflects the complexity of balancing ethical responsibility with political practicality in one of the most challenging diplomatic issues of the twenty-first century.

Suggested Bloc Positions

Western Bloc (United States, European Union):

The Western Bloc prioritizes human rights, democratic governance, and adherence to international norms when considering engagement with the Taliban government. These countries emphasize conditional engagement, linking any diplomatic interaction or economic assistance to measurable reforms in areas such as women's education, political participation, freedom of expression, and minority rights. While providing humanitarian aid to mitigate the severe crisis in Afghanistan, Western nations carefully avoid conferring formal recognition to prevent legitimizing the Taliban regime. Their strategy balances moral and ethical responsibilities with pragmatic concerns for regional stability and counter-terrorism. The Western Bloc often advocates for multilateral coordination and transparency in aid distribution to ensure that assistance directly benefits Afghan civilians rather than bolstering the government's political control.

Eastern Bloc (Russia, China):

Countries in the Eastern Bloc approach the recognition of the Taliban with a more pragmatic lens, prioritizing strategic, economic, and security interests. Russia's formal recognition in 2025 highlights how states may use diplomatic engagement to secure counter-terrorism cooperation, regional stability, and trade opportunities. China similarly engages with Afghanistan through infrastructure investments and economic partnerships, focusing on long-term stability and protection of its borders while avoiding full endorsement of the Taliban's human rights record. These nations view recognition as a tool for geopolitical influence rather than a moral endorsement, reflecting a prioritization of realpolitik considerations. Engagement may include technical cooperation, regional security dialogue, and selective economic initiatives designed to maintain influence without attracting excessive international criticism.

Non-Aligned / Developing Nations:

Non-aligned or developing countries often adopt a middle-ground approach, balancing humanitarian concerns with political neutrality. These nations prioritize delivering aid, supporting dialogue between the Taliban and international actors, and encouraging multilateral oversight of governance and human rights without offering formal recognition. By focusing on practical solutions, such as ensuring access to food, healthcare, and education, non-aligned countries attempt to protect civilians while avoiding entanglement in the Taliban's legitimacy debate. This bloc may also advocate for international frameworks to

monitor government accountability, promoting ethical engagement while respecting Afghanistan's sovereignty.

Human Rights Advocates (NGOs, Civil Society):

Human rights organizations and civil society actors focus on conditional engagement tied to strict accountability mechanisms. Their primary concerns include protecting women, ethnic and religious minorities, journalists, and other vulnerable groups, ensuring that international recognition is not granted without meaningful reforms. NGOs monitor and report human rights violations, provide legal and humanitarian assistance, and advocate for international standards that link recognition and aid to compliance with human rights obligations. Civil society actors often serve as both watchdogs and partners for international bodies, helping ensure that interventions prioritize the rights and safety of the Afghan population over political expediency.

Possible Moderated Caucuses

Moderated caucuses during the debate on the legitimacy of Afghanistan's Taliban government can focus on several key questions that allow delegates to explore ethical, legal, and practical considerations. One important discussion point is what specific conditions the Taliban should meet in order to gain international recognition. Delegates can debate benchmarks related to human rights protections, governance reforms, the inclusion of women and minority groups, and adherence to international norms. This conversation encourages participants to think critically about how recognition can be tied to concrete actions rather than simply territorial control.

Another key area for discussion is how international aid can be delivered to the Afghan population without politically legitimizing the Taliban regime. Delegates may explore strategies to ensure that humanitarian assistance reaches civilians directly while avoiding empowerment of the governing authorities. This topic emphasizes the balance between moral responsibility to support vulnerable populations and the risk of inadvertently validating a government with a poor human rights record.

A related caucus could focus on whether the United Nations should implement independent monitoring mechanisms for human rights and governance in Afghanistan. Such mechanisms could help ensure accountability, provide transparent reporting on the Taliban's actions, and guide international policy decisions. Delegates can debate the feasibility, scope, and potential challenges of monitoring initiatives, including cooperation from the Taliban and the safety of observers.

International engagement strategies also raise questions about balancing counter-terrorism priorities with human rights concerns. Delegates can discuss how states and organizations

can maintain regional security while avoiding actions that contribute to repression or civilian harm. This discussion highlights the tension between pragmatic diplomacy and ethical responsibility in a volatile geopolitical context.

Another relevant topic is whether global standards should exist for recognizing governments that seize power through force. Such standards could provide clarity and consistency for the international community, ensuring that recognition is not arbitrarily granted and that human rights and democratic principles are taken into account.

Finally, delegates can explore how recognition strategies might be designed to support civilians while minimizing the risk of legitimizing violations. This discussion involves examining conditional recognition, sanctions, aid delivery mechanisms, and diplomatic engagement as tools to protect human rights without strengthening oppressive regimes. These caucuses collectively provide a framework for nuanced, solution-oriented debate on one of the most pressing issues in international relations today.

Possible Resolution Points

Establish an international monitoring framework to oversee governance and human rights compliance in Afghanistan. This framework would track the Taliban's adherence to international norms and report transparently on progress or violations. It could involve UN bodies, independent observers, and regional partners to ensure accountability and credibility.

Deliver conditional humanitarian aid tied to reforms in women's rights, education, and civil liberties. Aid programs should be designed to reach civilians directly, bypassing Taliban control where possible. This ensures essential support for the population while promoting positive changes in governance and social policies.

Facilitate regional dialogue to coordinate security and counter-terrorism efforts. Countries in South and Central Asia can work together to prevent the spread of extremist groups and stabilize borders. Cooperative security initiatives can reduce the risk of insurgency while maintaining international oversight.

Create accountability mechanisms for human rights violations, including documentation, reporting, and potential sanctions. These mechanisms can apply pressure on the Taliban to respect basic rights and provide recourse for affected populations. They can also serve as a deterrent against further abuses.

Implement gradual, conditional recognition of the Taliban government. Legitimacy should be linked to measurable improvements in governance, human rights, and inclusion. This

approach allows the international community to engage pragmatically while avoiding full endorsement of oppressive practices.

Bibliography and Further Reading

Al Jazeera. (2025, July 3). *Russia becomes first country to recognise Afghanistan's Taliban government.*

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/7/3/russia-becomes-first-country-to-recognise-afghanistans-taliban-government>

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2024). *Human rights in Afghanistan.*

<https://www.ohchr.org/en/regions/asia-pacific/afghanistan>

BBC News. (2021). *Taliban government: International recognition and global response.*

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-58187485>

Human Rights Watch. (2024). *Afghanistan: Country report on rights under Taliban rule.*

<https://www.hrw.org/asia/afghanistan>

Council on Foreign Relations. (2024). *The Taliban in Afghanistan.*

<https://www.cfr.org/backgroundunder/afghanistan-taliban>

United Nations Security Council. (2024). *Security Council documents on Afghanistan.*

<https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/afghanistan>

Amnesty International. (2024). *Afghanistan: Women's rights under Taliban rule.*

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/location/asia-and-the-pacific/south-asia/afghanistan/report-afghanistan/>

The Diplomat. (2022). *The international legitimacy of the Taliban.*

<https://thediplomat.com/2022/03/the-international-legitimacy-of-the-taliban/>