



The Problemology of Conflict and Peace Solution in Afghanistan

Dr. Vahid Binesh

Department of International Relations, Faculty of Political Sciences, Khatam Al-Nabieen University, Kabul,
Afghanistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i8.6137>

Abstract

Afghanistan is a country with a long experience of imposed war. During the past four decades, conflict and violence have been common, every day, and a part of the life of the people of this land, and their existence (life, property, and dignity) has been destroyed. Some consider the war as a foreign product and some as domestic. A conflict that was holy, era-making, and purposeful for a few people was absurd, unholy, and destructive for the general public. The war has brought a few people to fame, wealth, and status and has led the majority of the people to poverty and misery. At different times when war and violence have threatened the interests of warring groups, the flag of peace has been raised. Sometimes neighboring governments and sometimes the United Nations. Unfortunately, there is no end to the war in this country, nor is there a permanent peace. People are always facing this question: What is the cause of war? Is war a natural phenomenon between humans? Can war be divided into good and bad or useful and harmful? Is the result of war destruction or settlement? And about peace also: Why is peace not attainable for us? Is peace a gift? Should peace be defined against war or is it an independent social category? What does just war and honorable peace mean? What are the solutions to achieve peace? The findings of this research show that there are many causes of war in Afghanistan, and because of the peace-making process alien to the culture of this land, sustainable peace has become an unattainable ideal.

Keywords: *Conflict; War; Violence; Civil War; Peace, Sustainable Peace*

Introduction

Afghanistan is a country with a long experience of conflict and war. In the past three centuries, war, conflict, and violence have been considered common, every day and part of the life of the people of this land, and especially in the last four decades, the war has not only prevented the country from progressing and civilization about other nations and neighbors, Rather, it has led people's existence (life, wealth, and dignity) to destruction. Perhaps you cannot find a family that is not somehow caught in the tragedy of war. Some have considered the war as a foreign phenomenon and achievement, and some as a domestic outcome. A conflict that for some people was holy, era-making, and purposeful, and for others it was absurd, unholy, and destructive. War has brought some people to food, fame, glory, and status and has led some to misery and misfortune. Tens of thousands of scientists, businessmen, employees, peasants, and workers were victims and martyred, and hundreds of thousands more wandered in the land of exile. Those who are left are involved in all kinds of suffering and calamities. The torn, burned, or missing bodies of their loved ones are never far from their eyes. Either they are mentally ill, poor,

miserable, and lonely, or they are crying in a foreign country during the separation and parting of their loved ones. No one has a minimum life expectancy. Tomorrow is very dark in their eyes. The absurd and useless promises of the Bonn conference in London, Tokyo, Paris, Geneva, Brussels, and... And slogans and election campaigns of Western agents have not created hope for the people. Rather, those who promised to destroy the warmongers, Today, they sit at the negotiating table with the same warmongers and they beg for an honorable retreat. Deception, trickery, and hypocrisy have made the people of Afghanistan pessimistic about the intentions of the international community and the government of Afghan men and have placed the issue of war and peace in a thick veil of ambiguity and have faced many questions: What is war? What are the roots of war in Afghanistan? Is war a natural phenomenon between humans? Can war be divided into good and bad or useful and harmful? Is the result of war destruction or prosperity? And... and same about peace. Is peace a gift? Why do we not achieve peace? Should peace be defined against war or is it an independent social and human category? What does just war and honorable peace mean? What are the solutions to achieve peace? And... In this article, the above questions will be answered as much as possible.

Conflict

Definition of Conflict

Harry Berman: Conflict is the existence of differences and incompatibility between two or more groups, as a result of which there is a threat against each other's needs, interests, and benefits. (Berman: 1998:77).

Louis Coser: From a sociological point of view, conflict is defined as "a struggle over values, dignity, power, and scarce resources, in which the goal of each party is to neutralize, harm, or destroy its rivals." (Coser: 1956:3).

Dehqani Firouzabadi: Conflict usually refers to a situation in which a specific human group and collection, whether religious, cultural, linguistic, political, social, economic, tribal, or ethnic, due to real or apparent conflict and incompatibility, goals and values, it has a conscious conflict with a specific human group (Dehqani Firouzabadi: 13).

Haman: Conflict is a kind of interaction of people or countries with each other, which does not include their struggle with nature and their living environment. Conflict is a type of competition where the parties while struggling to obtain scarce resources, try to prevent or exclude the other by strengthening their position and improving their position. A conflict occurs when the parties have an idea and understanding of the difference between them and try to solve this difference in their favor. (Haman).

The Necessity of Conflict

Martin Lipst points out that both Alexey Dutoqueville and Marx emphasized the necessity of conflict between social and political units (Lipst 1991:71).

Ninberg believes that "conflict is one of the basic aspects of growth. An aspect that cannot be fully controlled prevented it from occurring and should not be pursued.

Definition of Violence

In the simplest definition, violence is a kind of force that puts pressure on a person from inside and outside. Most theorists emphasize the physical aspect of violence rather than its mental and hidden aspects. They have studied violence from psychological, political, social, legal, and philosophical points of view.

An important part of the studies on violence are focused on official structures and consider the law as the criterion for distinguishing violent action from non-violent action. Therefore, violence is an injury that is illegally inflicted on a person or group.

Definition of War

War is a type of violent group conflict. According to Herbert Coleman, "War is a social action that occurs in the national and international political context" (Coser: 8).

War "is a social endeavor that has passion, emotions, and collective effects" (Butol: 5:1364).

In another definition, war is "the richest source of collective inspiration, emotions, and effects" (Ibid.: 7).

Clausewitz believes that "war is merely the continuation of diplomacy with other means (violence). In his opinion, war is one of the forms of mutual communication between countries. War is the use of military force against the enemy and to achieve political goals" (Kozer: ibid.: 200).

The Conceptual Evolution of Conflict and War

Conflict and conflict studies are as old as political knowledge and together they have seen the history of science in light. Throughout the history of mankind and among different nations, war has had supporters, justifiers, and praisers, as well as opponents and blamers. The type of human attitude towards the phenomenon of war has changed and evolved over time and in social and historical contexts. As a result of the dominance and supremacy of a specific discourse at one time, some of the roots of conflict and war have been given more attention and emphasis, and on this basis, various solutions and approaches have been presented to prevent, control, and even eliminate war. (Dehqani Firouzabadi) :87).

The Greeks considered war a part of the natural system. Heraclitus considered war as a factor of progress and a criterion for measuring and dividing people. According to him, war is the root of everything. He makes gods out of some people and slaves or free men out of others (Butol: 1364:123). Plato and Aristotle considered war to be inevitable due to luxury and inequality. The thoughts of these two philosophers during the Renaissance had a significant impact on great thinkers such as Machiavelli, Rousseau, Hegel, Marx, etc. In the Middle Ages, Saint Augustine and Martin Luther believed that war was the result of human sin and considered the issue of decline to be related to it.

Some believe that the theoretical roots of war should be sought in the East and among the Indians. With the establishment of the Indian Empire in the fourth century AD, the political development of this empire gained significant momentum. Philosophical thinkers of India introduced the nature of man as selfish and criminal and considered the natural state of man prone to aggression and oppression and strong government (Nasseri: 5:1365) Although Indian sages have recommended tolerance and coexistence, militaristic politics had a special prominence in Indian political philosophy (Ibid.: 6). Among Muslims, Ibn Khaldun has studied war from a sociological perspective.

From the Renaissance period onwards, the issue of war, its causes, and agents, like many other issues, were discussed, investigated, and studied. Interest in studying conflict and war increased especially in the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, and writers from different fields addressed it until Falzgraf and Doherty wrote, "If ever the scientific community tries to present and process the general theory of conflict and War requires interdisciplinary data and information from the fields of biology, history, anthropology, social psychology, political science, economics, geography, geography, culture, communication theories, systemic, strategic, convergence, etc. (Doherty and Faltzgraf: 299: 1372).

The Roots of Conflict

In general, there are two classical views regarding the conflict: 1- Psychological view. 2- Biological view. The theorists of decision-making and games seek the beginning of individual behavior and the roots of tensions in human nature, but sociologists, anthropologists, theorists of political science and international relations, etc., consider conflict at the level of groups, and communities. And social institutions investigate and analyze. Western philosophers and thinkers have proposed reasons for the causes of war and its inevitability, which can be seen in the doctrines of two schools of thought, idealist and realist. The idealists themselves are divided into several groups: 1- Marxists. 2- Internationalists and advocates of peace through the World Organization. 3- Proponents of general disarmament. Scholars of social sciences considered war as a social phenomenon and studied it from a sociological perspective. From this point of view, war as a social behavior occurs between individuals, groups, and social systems when two sides assume each other to be enemies and seek to harm or destroy each other. (Spriggan: 1365:77). Scholars of social and political science have presented different views about the origin of war. Some people consider war as a biological state and refer to human nature. In the analysis of human behavior, Machiavelli mentions two motivations: 1- love of innovation (which causes change and transformation). 2- Desire for freedom (which strengthens the spirit of domination to ensure individual freedom). Hobbes considers man as an animal whose behavior and movements originate under the influence of two motivations: profit-seeking (competition) and fear (lack of trust) (Hobbes: 104:1384). From Hobbes' point of view, human reason is a means to reach the desire and therefore serves his desires. For this reason, the nature of man and animal is the same. To survive, humans inevitably resort to violence like animals. Therefore, people's fear of one-sidedness causes war. The only means in a world full of chaos and conflict is force and a restless desire to gain power (Ibid: 107). Freud believes that humans are naturally aggressive creatures. He writes in the book "Civilization and its Disorders": "Humans are creatures in whose nature aggression plays a significant role" (Spriggan: 23:23, 2015). According to Freud, man is like a ravenous wolf to man (ibid.). These are pessimistic theories about human nature, which are manifested in his behavior and character. It means evil, selfishness, criminality, etc., but others consider the necessity and inevitability of war as a result of the structure of social classes. According to Marx, war is necessary and accepted for the realization of communism. He sees war as nothing but the continuation of the class struggles on a wide global level (Gali: 1372: 96). According to Marx, peace will be ensured only with the end of this struggle "gradually, when the exploitation of man by man ends, the exploitation of a nation It is also destroyed by other nations. The day when the class difference ends within a nation, the international enmity will also disappear" (Morli: 24). According to Lenin, war is the inevitable result of imperialism (Lenin: 1960:44). There are pessimistic and optimistic views among Marxists. Pessimistic Marxists consider war to be an eternal and useful phenomenon, but optimistic Marxists consider war to be terminable due to the elimination of its conditions and causes.

Some other social science thinkers do not consider human nature to be evil and do not believe in the naturalness of war. They consider war as a result of social phenomena, which may have a positive function. May, in the article "War, Peace, and Social Learning" believes that human nature is neither good nor bad. He can become capable in any direction he learns from the environment and culture (Arblaster: 1367:132). Rousseau also does not consider man to be aggressive by nature. According to his belief, man defends himself against the evil of others, but he does not seek to oppress others (Springer: Previous: 77). Eric Fromm also believes that human aggression is not his natural and internal motivation. Man does not have the motive of mere destruction; he becomes destructive only when constructive ways of satisfying the desire for excellence are closed to him. Vandalism in humans is just a secondary ability that shows itself when creative desires are not fulfilled (Forum: 24:1368). As we have seen, these scientists have a social character for war and not a human one. Montesquieu believed that if war had a human form, peace would be nothing more than a dream and would never be realized (Aron: 63:1364).

Anyway, the theorists of the realist school, inspired by Machiavelli and especially Hobbes, considered power as the principle to control violence and war and gave absolute authority to the ruler or government to establish order. The question here is whether Hobbes's theory was able to curb evil and

establish stability and order in society. Is there no violence in Hobbes's modern civil state? Why there is violence, there are different forms of violence. In the pre-modern era, or Hobbes's natural state, there was naked violence, but in the modern era, violence has assumed a sovereign and legal form and has become a system. In the definition of violence, Boman writes about the superior and subordinate relationship based on hostility. violates the law and social norms and harms others (115:1995). Žižak (2016) has conducted valuable research on violence in the modern world and introduced various types of violence. He mentions six types of violence: active violence, systemic violence, reactive violence, symbolic violence, mythological violence, and linguistic violence. (Foster: 1358:174)

Peace

Definition of Peace

Western thinkers have tried to define peace in contrast to war and call the end of war the beginning and the start of peace. As we have seen, the realists mainly consider war to be caused by sensual and instinctive desires, and to control it, the powerful power of the government is needed. International relations theories define peace versus war. So governments are the main agents of peace. In this perspective, the role of human communities and culture has been neglected. Is peace created by governments? No, peace is the power and function of a historical community or a civilization that is created to refine and make its surrounding areas livable through the expansion of culture. So peace is not one-sidedness, it is a relationship. Peace does not come from coercive power, it comes from freedom, benevolence, and collective wisdom. Peace is a return to the rule of civilization and not a temporary break from instincts. Therefore, peace cannot be understood with war, nor war with peace. Unlike those who consider war as a natural state, many thinkers do not consider peace as a natural state. Rather, they consider it a great product of human civilization and the result of cultural interactions, wise approaches, work, activity, trade, understanding, etc.

According to Jamil, peace is a movement or dynamism that creates balance in the collective relations of humans, so that all members of a community can live harmoniously together (Jamil: 2016:4). Galtung defines peace as a relationship, and believes that this relationship is multi-sided (Galtung: 1967:71). What kind of relationship can there be between the parties? Galtung introduces three types of relationships.

- 1- Negative and disharmony relationship: something that is good for one party and bad for the other party. So this is the relationship of war. According to Hobbes, war is a situation in which there may be no conflict.
- 2- The relationship of indifference or lack of interest: in which one person does not pay attention or interest in the situation of another person. So no harmony is conceivable.
- 3- Positive and harmonious relationship: in which everything good or bad for one is also for the other. It is in a negative relationship that the parties become actors and there is a possibility of violence. (Ibid.) According to Galtung, if violence is not intentional, it is called indirect violence. Like behavior out of habit. Indirect violence is caused by unjust structures that lead to harm and loss, such as humiliation and inequality, which turn into direct violence. Based on this division, Galtung reaches two types of peace. Positive peace and negative peace. Negative peace means the absence of violence. such as a ceasefire or separation of the conflicting parties from each other. It means that the relationship is impartial. But positive peace means to be present, to accompany in harmony and with intention. Augustine did not consider peace to be only the absence of hostility but believed that peace is the presence of tranquility. According to Augustine, the prerequisite for peace is freedom and justice. Peace is the result of the individual's reconciliation with himself, and in the collective case, it is the result of the collective action of humans. Peace is a process that arises from within. Buddha believed that peace should be found within. While discipline is unifying, peace is pluralizing. Discipline is a process that comes from the outside, but peace comes from the inside. It must be admitted that compared to war, today's idea of peace is insufficient and needs to be reconsidered.

Peacemaking

International relations thinkers consider peace as a social construct. In the discussion of peacemaking, it is discussed how to help a country involved in a civil war so that while overcoming the challenges ahead, it does not face conflict and internal conflict again (Cheganizadeh: 2014: 44). Peacemaking is one of the important topics of international institutions, especially the United Nations, and it includes measures that aim to prevent the reoccurrence of internal armed war, its management, and the continuation of sustainable peace after the end of the conflict. There are at least three views on Hepar's theory of international relations. Realist school, liberal view, and Hungarian theorist. One of the schools that defends the issue of peacebuilding is the "Conflict Change" school. This school pays attention to the creation of long-term infrastructures for peace-building through supporting reconciliation capacities within and re-establishing broken relationships, focusing on reconciliation within the society, and strengthening the peace-making capacities of the society (Galtung: 1976: 282). The theorists of the conflict transformation school believe that the intervention of external actors should be focused on supporting internal actors and establishing coordination between peace-building efforts. In this regard, it is necessary to be sensitive to the local culture and have a long-term time frame. This approach emphasizes the establishment of popular institutions of peace by individuals and the middle classes of society and strengthening them to support reconciliation. It is assumed that strengthening and empowering the middle class has an important effect on peacebuilding (ibid.).

The school of conflict modification originates from the theories of John Galtung. In 1976, in his articles, he considered three approaches to peace: peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and peacemaking as different from each other. According to Galtung, the mechanism that creates peace must eliminate the roots and causes of war and provide solutions to avoid it in situations where war may occur (Galtung: ibid). Therefore, peacebuilding is the concept of trying to create lasting peace by addressing the root causes of violent conflicts and creating local capacities to manage conflict resolution. The process of sustainable peacebuilding should be based on the identification of specific cultural contexts and areas of conflict and the concept of active participation in civil society.

By presenting the concept of sustainable peacebuilding, Paul Lederger believes that the concept of peace is beyond physical reconstruction and includes a set of processes, approaches, and steps necessary to transform conflict into sustainable peace relations. On this basis, peace is socially constructed. In this interpretation, peacebuilding does not only have a hardware aspect such as the reconstruction of political, security, and economic institutions, but also a collaborative social process that restores discrete relationships between people. Therefore, the process of sustainable peacebuilding should be based on the identification of specific cultural platforms and areas of conflict and the active participation of civil society (ibid.). Has there been such a view in peacemaking efforts for Afghanistan?

Peacemaking Efforts in Afghanistan

During the four decades of war and insecurity in the country, many efforts have been made inside and outside of Afghanistan (neighboring countries, regional countries, and the international community). In this regard, we can refer to the peace that the Marxist government of Babrak Karmal and Najibullah made under the name of national reconciliation, the peace that the Mujahideen groups fought among themselves, the efforts of the United Nations to end the war in Afghanistan during the occupation of this country by the Red Army of the former Soviet Union, the Bonn Conference To create a government after the Taliban, and the efforts of the US government at the moment through its special representative Mr. Khalilzad.

The Role of the United Nations in peacebuilding for Afghanistan

There are different stories about why the Russians occupied Afghanistan and how they allowed their forces to withdraw. At least three views have been mentioned about the reason for the occupation of Afghanistan.

American international relations theorist George Kenan believes that Moscow understood the danger of fundamentalism (Harrison: 1988:72). Raymond Gartoff cites Moscow's concern about American intervention in Iran as the main reason for the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (ibid.). According to Harrison, Moscow saw Hafizullah Amin as an opportunistic nationalist who might make deals with China and America. For these reasons, Brezhnev and his ideologue Suslov were in favor of the occupation and Andreevov was against it (ibid). Brezhnev's reason was that Karmal could return the trust that Amin destroyed. Therefore, Babarak entered Afghanistan on Russian tanks along with more than a hundred thousand armed soldiers (ibid.). The Soviet Red Army was present in Afghanistan in support of its puppet government for ten years and committed terrible crimes. The people of Afghanistan did not let them rest for a moment, they started an uprising and resisted the aggressors. The international community also took a stand against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and condemned it. The brave resistance of the Afghan people made Russia fall to the ground. Outside of Afghanistan, the international community's efforts to put pressure on the Russians were increasing day by day, to the point where opposition voices against the war were raised in the discussions of the political bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Andropov glorified the futility of the war in Afghanistan and the killing of Russian children by the Afghan Mujahideen. After the death of Brezhnev, the role of extremists in the leadership of the Soviet Union diminished, so the United Nations entered the field to end the occupation of Afghanistan. After taking office as Secretary General of the United Nations in 1982, Parsedkoyar appointed Córdovez as his representative for the peace of Afghanistan. Córdovez operationalized the role of the United Nations as an active mediator. Therefore, he established contacts with the governments of Afghanistan, Pakistan, America, and the Soviet Union. His first task was to develop a framework that could break the deadlock (ibid.). There were different and conflicting perceptions of the war, the presence of the Soviet Union, and the intervention and support of the United States for the leaders involved in the war in Afghanistan, and this issue made the way of negotiation and reconciliation difficult and difficult. The politics of America, Pakistan, the Soviet Union, and Afghanistan were initially dominated by extremists who each sought to exploit the occupation of Afghanistan for their benefit. America and Pakistan wanted to ground the Soviet forces in Afghanistan. The Russians and the government of Kabul claimed that they had prevented the aggressive and imperialist policies of America. The United States made the signing of the agreement conditional on the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, and the Soviets, in return for the withdrawal of their forces, made it conditional on the cessation of American arms aid to the Mujahideen. Islamabad, which knew that the cut-off of aid would be detrimental to itself, kept away from the negotiations and gave various excuses. The government of Kabul considered the withdrawal of the Soviet forces as the end of the rule of the Communist Party and the fall of the Marxist government of Kabul and did not agree to negotiations. The Russians wanted direct negotiations between Pakistan and the Kabul government, but Pakistan considered direct negotiations with Kabul as a sign of recognition of this regime and avoided it. The lack of agreement on the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan and the simultaneous cessation of American and Western aid to the Mujahideen were also major obstacles in the Geneva negotiations. The task of the UN representative was really difficult to create understanding between the very conflicting points of view. Cordoves first convinced the conflicting parties to accept indirect negotiation as a step toward reconciliation. After the death of Andropov, after facing a political and military deadlock, Gorbachev sought a dignified way out to prevent the growing losses of this deadlock. Therefore, he mentioned Afghanistan as a festering wound for the Soviet Union and made a serious decision by setting the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet forces in June 1985. Gorbachev's decision forced America to soften. In the first meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan in 1985, America pledged as a guarantor of the agreement. Moscow was also able to speed up the negotiations by abandoning Babrak Carmel and bringing in Dr. Najib. In this way, the negotiations of the United Nations strengthened the factions of traders in both the US and the Soviet Union, who wanted relations with each other.

The basic question is whether the Soviet Union would have left Afghanistan without the intervention of the United Nations. The answer seems to be yes. Yes sir. On the one hand, the courageous resistance of the Muslim people had made the Russians desperate, on the other hand, the Soviet Union

had problems in regional and international relations in addition to economic and military losses and internal pressures.

Gorbachev wanted better diplomatic relations with China, Iran, Western Europe, America, etc. A Soviet diplomat said in Washington in 1988, "We and America have our problems and we will no longer allow Najibullah and Golbedin to determine our relations" (Harrison: *ibid.*: 76). Another question is to what extent the efforts of the United Nations could lead Afghanistan to peace and stability and give peace to this country?

Bonn Conference and Peacemaking of the World Community

The Bonn Conference was held on November 21, 2001, in the city of Petersburg near Bonn, the capital of Germany. Four groups from Afghanistan including 1- Northern Alliance 2- Zahir Shah's supporters 3- Cyprus group 4- Peshawar group and also 19 countries were present as observers in the Ben meeting. (Dobbins: 2008:77). After the Bonn conference, other meetings were held to follow up its results: Tokyo 2002, Berlin 2004, London 2006, Rome 2007, Paris 2008, Moscow 2009, The Hague 2009, London 2010, Bonn 2011, London 2014.

Solutions and Achievements of the Agreement of Bonn

In the Bonn Agreement, based on the liberal peacemaking of Western countries, they tried to include issues such as human rights, women's rights, etc. in the compromise. The agreement considered the Loya Jirga as an institution of internal governance and presented it as a liberal institution. The creation of an independent human rights commission, the deployment of United Nations security forces for the security of Kabul city, and state building were the first steps of these solutions. Therefore, the formation of the interim government was implemented in December 2001 and Hamed Karzai took over the interim administration. An emergency Loya Jirga was convened in June 2002, and on January 4, 2004, the Loya Jirga formed and approved the Constitution. In the 2004 elections, Hamed Karzai was elected as the president. Karzai won again in the 2009 elections and ruled until 2014.

In the security sector, the formation of a 35,000-strong national army, the disarmament of opposition militias, the implementation of the peace plan, and the return of fighters to the community were among the provisions of the agreement. On December 20, 2001, the United Nations Security Council approved a resolution for the presence of ISAF to maintain the security of Kabul and its surrounding areas. With the implementation of the SSR program, according to the UNDP report from 2011 to 2014, 5,912 ex-combatants returned to civilian life and 7,333 weapons were collected (UNDP: 2015). :3). In the DDR project, from 2003 to 2006, 6323 fighters were disarmed. And 58,000 weapons were collected. The important issue of progress in the field and reform of the security sector, disarmament, and return of fighters to civil society was included in the Bonn Agreement under the pressure of America and was implemented with haste. In 2002, the group decided to divide the reform of the security sectors among the countries, German police, the American army, Italy's justice system, England's fight against drugs, and Japan's disarmament "DDR" including disarmament of soldiers, collection of heavy weapons, took charge of demining. America claims to have paid 13 billion dollars for the SSR project in 2009 and 2010, and Japan spent 150 million dollars for the implementation of the DDR project at the same time.

In the economic dimension, according to the World Bank report, the growth of Afghanistan's GDP from 2003 to 2012 was 9% on average. The poverty line, which was 40% in 2008, reached 35% in 2010.

Challenges of the Agreement of Bonn

Despite the mentioned political, economic, and security achievements, peace was not established and is facing challenges. What is the challenge for peace? The heterogeneity and lack of necessary coordination between the statesmen and the existence of different racial, ethnic, and linguistic populations

have challenged efficient governance. Before the Bonn meeting, Afghanistan was facing poverty, corruption, civil war, and the lack of an efficient government, but these problems were not paid attention to in Bonn. The Bonn Agreement was concluded to rebuild Afghanistan through a functioning central government. This government could not reduce the role of local leaders. This agreement was presented based on Weber's model, which included a free market economy, liberal democracy, respect for human rights, etc. These are not compatible with Afghanistan's infrastructure and are alien to the realities of Afghanistan's society. Therefore, it raised serious challenges.

Lack of communication between the formal and informal system of governance: Non-acceptance of the informal system of governance in countries emerging from civil war by the intervening countries is one of the obstacles to the progress of peace-building efforts.

Contrary to the Weberian model of the state, the "hybrid" political combination order works in countries emerging from civil war.

Venman finds the combined order very useful. This type of order has problems of (sovereignty and authority) which are often not recognized and create conflicts in the country. This order may not be the same as the views of Westerners about politics, economy, and society, but it is useful and can be used as a political opportunity (Venman: 2008:27).

Although in Afghanistan, this task was assumed by the independent directorate of tribal affairs, the lack of constructive communication between government and social institutions and focusing only on the government, which often leads to external legitimacy, did not solve this problem. In this case, personal, ethnic, and family relationships are based on bureaucratic rules and are stronger. OECD or the Organization for Economic Co-operation advises Afghanistan's donors to pay attention to the issue of legitimacy instead of paying attention to the development of capacities and to try to gain a definite and empirical understanding of local sources of legitimacy.

Lack of Inclusive Participation in the Peace Process:

In the Ben agreement, the northern forces were viewed as an anti-terrorism group, and a special position was given to them in the government. However, the Pashtuns and the Taliban were marginalized.

The most important obstacles in the implementation of the DDR and SSR program were security problems. While this plan is for post-conflict and post-conflict countries, America used it as a shield in the face of immediate security threats. Deep divisions in the government, especially in the security sector, are one of the main reasons that have caused problems not only for disarmament but also for judicial reforms. The lack of human capacities and government institutions is another disorder. There was no single leadership in the SSR program and there was no necessary coordination with domestic government institutions. The tribal support of fighters and militias caused the failure of the DDR project. The issue of national reconciliation was mentioned in this agreement, but America and its allies did not want this issue to be implemented through the implementation of justice in the transitional period. According to Dobbins, the Karzai government could not do such a thing. Therefore, he turned to state building. Militants' access to illegal income is a major obstacle during the civil war. Both the Taliban and local warlords benefit from the shortcomings of the Bonn Treaty. The Taliban, who banned the drug trade during their rule, continued to export drugs in large volume after the fall, and the local warlords who were supported by the United States took advantage of this issue. The imposition of taxes by some militias facilitated the export of drugs. Some groups made the granting of loans to farmers dependent on opium cultivation. Warlords imposed taxes on all kinds of trade items. The value of opium in 2005 was up to 70% of Afghanistan's GDP. Foreign aid constituted 92% of the country's budget in 2005.

The role of America and the West in implementing the provisions of this agreement and limiting the actions of Afghan delegations is evident. America was interested in security goals and directed the

agreement in the other direction. The content of the Bonn agreement clarifies the foreign interference in Afghanistan after 2001.

Negotiations in Doha, Qatar, and Peacemaking by the US Government:

After the events of September 11, the United States of America subjected the Taliban to heavy airstrikes for not handing over 50 suspects and the main designer of the incident, bin Laden, overthrew the Taliban regime and prepared the ground for the new government with the Bonn Conference. Then they brought the forces of the international coalition to Afghanistan for the complete suppression of the Taliban and the establishment of a new government and pledged to the people of America and Afghanistan by signing a strategic agreement that they would not leave Afghanistan until the destruction of the terrorist groups. Now that the Taliban have revived more than in the past and are either directly occupying more than half of the country or are considered a serious threat, the United States has sent its representative Khalilzad to them in Doha, Qatar for reconciliation.

The main discussion in the negotiations is based on the Taliban's request: The withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan, making the Taliban share in power, is an amendment to the Afghan constitution. (B.B.C. Farsi: March 2017).

The Afghanistan Reconciliation Leadership Council defined the red lines of the Afghan government in Qatar negotiations as follows: Inter-Afghan negotiations, maintaining the system of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, holding elections, and maintaining the constitution (Supreme Peace Council: 2018). In addition, the Afghan government has declared women's rights, democracy, and economic system as non-negotiable. The first Taliban meeting with Zalmi Khalilzad was held on October 12, 2018, in Doha, Qatar, and subsequent meetings were held in Russia, Uzbekistan, and Norway, and a total of 9 rounds of negotiations have been held so far. The key figures in the negotiations are Zalmi Khalilzad the special envoy of the US government and Sher Mohammad Abbas Stanekzai, the former head of the Taliban's political office in Qatar. The Taliban delegation consists mainly of the leaders, commanders, and officials of the former Taliban emirates, and the American delegation consists of officials of the US State Department, the International Cooperation Agency (USAID), and some members of the US Embassy in Kabul (BBC 2018). Neither the Taliban nor Khalilzad have leaked anything from the main content of the talks. Both sides claim that progress has been made and a peace agreement will be signed soon. The Taliban have so far refused to negotiate with the Afghan government and consider the government illegal and illegitimate. They want a transitional government. At the Moscow meeting, which was attended by more than 40 Afghan political figures in addition to the Taliban, Abbas Stanekzai announced that the Afghan constitution was invalid. He mentioned the reason as follows: "Western countries have imposed this law on the people of Afghanistan. A new constitution must be drafted with Islamic standards and Afghan values after the complete withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan. (BBC Farsi 1398-1-21). Why America has agreed to negotiate and reconcile with the Taliban evokes questions in the mind. But apparently, Trump's campaign for the next American election is one of the reasons. Will this US peacemaking lead Afghanistan to stability and peace?

Conclusion

Although peacemaking is a positive step to achieve peace in troubled societies and can lead war-torn societies towards positive changes and give peace to the people to some extent, it cannot keep the foundations of peace and stability strong. Peace is indeed a construction, but this construction requires cultural and social preconditions. As mentioned above, peace is a culture and a relationship. A culture in which mistrust, hostility, enmity, ignorance, and autocracy give way to trust, benevolence, rationality, and tact and pave the way for coexistence and understanding. In peace, the priority of the interests of the sacrificed and victimized people is raised, but in peacemaking, the main goal of the interests of the intervening power is the pawn of the belligerent.

References

- Arblaster, Anthony (1367 AH), *The Rise and Fall of Imperialism*, translated by Abbas Mokhbar, Tehran, Central Publishing.
- Aron, Rimón (1366), *Memoirs*, translated by Masoud Mohammadi, Tehran, Office of Political and International Studies.
- Butol, Gasten (1380 AH), *Sociology of War*, translated by Hoshang Farhikhta, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- Butool, Gasten (1364 AH), *A Study in Militancy*, translated by Hoshang Lahoti, Tehran, Information Publications.
- Chegani, Ghulam Ali and Mohammad Reza Sahrai (1394 AH), *Peacemaking in Afghanistan*, *Strategic Policy Research Quarterly*, No. 44.
- Dehqani Firouzabadi (1382 AH), *Evolution of conflict and cooperation theories in international relations*, *Law and Politics Research Quarterly*, No. 8.
- Deuteri, Jamiz and Robert Faltz (1383), *Conflicting Theories in International Relations*, translated by Vahid Zagheri and Alireza Tayeb, Tehran, Qoms Publishing House.
- Dobbins, Janes (2008), *After the Taliban, Nation Building in Afghanistan*.
- Foster, Michael (1383 AH), *Gods of Political Thought*, translated by Javad Sheikhul Islami, Tehran, Amir Kabir.
- Harrison, Selik (1988), *The United Nations and Afghanistan's Peace Negotiations* translated by Alireza Tayeb, *Journal of Political Economic Information*, No. 26.
- Hekmatyar Gol Badin, *Peace in Afghanistan*, interview with BBC Farsi, 2-12-2017.
- Hobbs, Thomas (1384 AH), *Leviathan*, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran, Nashrani.
- Jamil Javed (2016) *T Defining Peace*.
- Lewis Coser (1965) *The Functions of Social Conflict*, New York, the Free Press.
- Lipset, Sznour Martin (1996) *Consensus and Conflict, Essays in Political Sociology*, Transaction Publishers.
- Mousavi-Niya, Seyyed Reza and Tahai (1397 AH), *Seyed Javad, Classical Approach and Criticism of Modern Theory of Peace*, *Government Research Quarterly, Law and Political Science Faculty Journal*, No. 13.
- Nasari, Mohammad (1356), *History of Political Opinions*, Tehran (Bita).
- Peace talks with the Taliban*, BBC Farsi, 01-21-1398.
- Spriggan, Thomas (1365), *Understanding Political Theories*, Translation of Rajaei's Culture, Knowledge Publications.
- Washington DC: Potomac Book.
- Žižak, Slavi (1388), *violence, five looks under the eyes*, translated by Alireza Pak Nihad, Tehran, Nashrani.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).