Chapter: 1

Introduction

Some wars happen to obtain Peace

Peace would be a form of war, and the State the means of waging it.

This ironical yet confounding statement in Olivier P. Richmond’s ‘The Transformation of Peace’ seems apt for Afghanistan. On October 7, 2001, America marched its troops in Afghanistan with the objective to destroy terrorist bases in the country and bring democracy and peace. For the first time in the history of Afghanistan, a president was elected by a popular vote in 2005, hinting towards the democratic peace. Olivier Richmond further states that without contraries there is no progression. Does this statement justify the invasion of Afghanistan in the form of Operation Enduring Freedom to eliminate terrorism threatening the order and peace of international community? Michael Walzer in his reputed treatise Just and Unjust Wars has justified war on the basis of an aggression by one state which has breached territorial and political sovereignty of another and this act constitutes a criminal act. So, was the war in Afghanistan justified? This question can only be answered by looking at the outcome of war. Is Afghanistan a peaceful and democratic State?

Richmond has argued that a hyper conservative model of peace has been established in Afghanistan. Popular elections were held in 2005 and 2009, electing Hamid Karzai as President and in 2014 elections, Ashraf Ghani was chosen as successor. Elected democratic system has been imported in Afghanistan but the institutions after 13 years of foreign intervention are still in a non functioning state. In corruption, Afghanistan ranks at 174th

---


amongst 176 countries. The Kabul Bank financial scandal involving Mahmud Karzai and others close to Hamid Karzai dented the trust and confidence of Afghanis. Violence in the country has increased manifold. Between 2005 and 2006, suicide bombings increased by more than 400 percent (from 27 to 139), the use of improvised explosive devices more than doubled (from 783 to 1,677), and armed attacks nearly tripled (from 1,558 to 4,542). Afghanistan, according to the World Drug Report 2013, is the lead producer and cultivator of opium globally. 36 million people continue to live below poverty line. 28.1% of the Afghalis above the age of 15 can read and write. Maternal mortality and literacy rate among women are bad. Life expectancy and infant mortality are the worst in the world.

So the looming question is what kind of peace is there in Afghanistan? Is it an Alexandrian peace? Or a liberal peace? Or is it a hybrid of idealist-liberal model of peace? Is Afghanistan, in any way, near to Marxist or constructive peace? These questions will also be answered in this chapter.

The purpose of this chapter is to thematically explain and apply the concept and theories of conflict and peace. It will comprise of:

a. Definition and theories of conflict and the contemporary methods of conflict resolution

b. Definition of Peace and theories of Peace Building and finally its applicability in the context of Afghanistan.

Definition of Conflict


The word conflict is derived from a Latin word confligere which means “to strike together”. John Rex defines conflict as a situation which is “oriented intentionally to carry out the actor’s will against the existence of the other party or parties”. This means that an actor has a desired goal which may or may not be the goal of an opposing party so the latter opposed it. The realization of a goal by the actor may cause harassment to the opposing party or put it in a lower position and the very thought of losing position induces opposing party to oppose the actor. Some thinkers define conflict as a state of mutual antagonism or hostility between two or more parties. Vilhelm Aubert says “The starting point must be sought in a state existing between two individuals characterized by some overt signs of antagonism. The term conflict here will be reserved for this state of tension between two actors. As a minimum, it must be demanded that at least one of the actors, in words or action, gives expression to a motive to frustrate the other or he actually frustrates him.”

Jessie Bernard defines conflict as “one which arises where there are controversial and mutually exclusive goals or values pursued by different closely placed parties”. This is a condition of incompatibility of interests or values. According to Kenneth Boulding, “Conflict exists when any potential positions of two behaviour units are mutually incompatible”. He further defines “conflict as a situation of a competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and in which party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of other”. Therefore, he defines conflict as where there is incompatibility of goals and the parties are aware of it. Deuck reasons that incompatibility may arise due to conflict of interests over power, position, authority, territory or materials or over conflict of values such as disagreement about the rules.
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Conflict is a dynamic phenomenon where one actor is acting to what the other is doing which leads to further action. And this escalates stakes in conflict. One sequence of events leads to another and it become difficult to decipher who is responsible for the action. The dynamics of conflict has removed all other possible alternatives and gives no choice but to continue reacting to violence and threat. Game theory illustrates how parties act within the confines of the game. If they follow the rules, the outcomes are predictable and if they don’t follow the rules and act on their own, then this change the dynamic of a conflict.

Johan Galtung in his book Peace by Peaceful Means has introduced a conflict triangle.\textsuperscript{15} It suggests that a conflict moves among the triangle’s three corners where corner A refers to conflict attitudes, B is conflict behaviour and C is the conflict or contradiction or incompatibility. Conflict sequence can begin from any of these corners. The conflict can be due to one’s behaviour to a situation or because of his attitude like greed, anger, impatience or frustration, fear or interpersonal tension. Or it can be a result of an incompatible or contradicting situation.

Robert Merton says that there is a latent conflict situation where the actors do not realize the urgency or immediacy of conflict. But when the actors get energy or cognizance to translate the objective interest into subjective goal, a situation is altered and conflict occurs.\textsuperscript{16}

Scholars also differ over whether conflict is cyclical or dialectical. Karl Marx endorses the dialectical view point of conflict. He says that conflict develops in phases with each phase unfolding from the previous one and resulting in a revolution and formation of a classless, non-conflictual society. “The separate individuals form a class or unit only in so far as they have to carry on a common battle against one another; otherwise they are on hostile terms with each other as competitors”. George Simmel says that “Conflict lets social boundaries between groups, socialites and nations by strengthening group consciousness and awareness of separatedness thus establishing the identity of groups, societies and nations within”. Conflict is exploited and manipulated for personal interest when some states are mired in


some grave problem and they want to divert attention of public, so they wage war with other nation. “A state of conflict pulls the members so tightly together and subjects them to such uniform impulse. This is the reason why war with the outside is sometimes the last chance for the state ridden with inner antagonisms to overcome these antagonisms”. Talcott Parsons calls conflict a “disease” which depletes huge energy and stunts growth and development. Galtung calls it as “dis-ease”.

Theories of Conflict

The overwhelming reason of conflict is the incompatibility or contradiction of interests and values. But from where does this contradiction arise? Are humans destined for conflict? Was Hobbes’s state of nature correct depiction of society? Or is it the situation which fuels a conflict? Three basic theories of conflict will be discussed. A. Inherency Theory b. Contingency Theory c. Interactionist Theory

a. Inherency Theory

…the life of man is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.

Hobbes made this observation of a man in a natural state, before the formation of government. He said that humanity has ceaseless thirst for power. And this can only be contained by Leviathan or by a strong central rule. Edmund Burke, too, acknowledged that law and custom is the only way to curtail humanity’s urge to conflict and violence.

One of the influential forces in inherency school is Sigmund Freud and his school of psychoanalysis. He talks about life and death instincts. The life instinct has a desire for pleasure. The libido refers to the life energy within humans, though it was viewed by Freud in terms of sexual energy. Opposed to life instinct is death instinct or ‘thanatos’. Freud believed
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that ‘thanatos’ ‘turn into destructive instinct when it is directed outwards on to objects’. The death instinct, however, can be transformed within the person to serve the purposes of life.²⁰

Konrad Lorenz in his book On Aggression says that aggression serves a purpose of survival. It is also instrumental in ‘balanced distribution of animals of the same species over the available environment, selection of the strongest by rival fights, and defence of the young.” ²¹ Rapoport holds that “aggressive behaviour does confer a survival advantage on the species in which it is genetically embedded”.²²

The inherency school theorists blame aggressive human nature as the cause of conflict. Their main purpose is of self preservation and to protect them and their family from threat, so being aggressive is important for their survival. Lorenz further argues,

I return to the theme of the survival value of the rival fight, with the statement that this only leads to useful selection where it breeds fighters fitted for combat with extra-specific enemies as well as for intra-specific duels. The most important function of rival fighting is the selection of an aggressive family defender, and this presupposes a further function of intra-specific: a brood defence.²³

Protection of territory also ignites individual. Robert Ardrey examines the role of territory in the onset of aggression. He said that “the concept of territory as a genetically determined form of behaviour in many species is today accepted beyond question in the biological sciences. But so recently have our observations been made and our conditions formed that we have yet to explore the implications of territory in our estimate of man”,²⁴ The drive to defend territory leads humans to increase their resources, multiply their activities and place them in mortal danger.

On the other hand, aggression is not always negative. De Waal gives a positive aspect of aggression, that is, of creating a sense of group. He suggests that it is not aggression against some outside group but rather it is aggression within the group. Cohesion is created for


²³Ibid P: 39.

example by the practice of hazing, where young military cadets in military academies undergo rituals, such as cleaning toilets with toothbrushes or standing guard in the nude. These lead to aggression against their own group. But for De Waal, peace comes through accepting that some are unequal in their status and they ought to accept it. To use De Waal’s phrase it is “unification through subordination”. It implies that equality is not the only criterion of attaining peace.  

Keith Webb has given common characteristics of inherency theories

a. Fundamental disposition of individuals is towards power and dominance, violence is only an extreme but normal expression of this tendency
b. There are alternative channels for seeking power in which violence is one of it
c. The major problem is explaining why violence odes does not occur more often
d. The choice of violence is a question of tactical consideration
e. Tactical choices are influenced by cost-benefit calculations
f. Cultural factors play a relatively minor role and it will both inhibit and promote use of violence.
g. Factors such as coercive balance of forces and facilitating conditions are of major importance.

Therefore, inherency school theorists do not paint a very grim picture of humanity. An individual is greedy and brutish as he wants to expand and enhance his power and assets. But at the same time he exhibits violent nature to protect himself, his beings and his environment.

b. Rational choice theory

Following the lines of inherent theory is the rational choice theory. Actors have their own rationality, form their own judgments, make decisions, pursue strategies, and thus initiate chain of events that lead to war. And similarly actors need to make judgments to end wars and reach agreements. The notion that wars arise from rational calculation is not new. But to terminate conflict and attain peace should also require rational calculations. Zartman, Paul Pillar, Roger Fisher and William Ury have done pioneering work in this. Zartman says that if
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the conflict continues without any party winning such stalemate is painful and Zartman calls this a ‘hurting stalemate’. He converts this ‘hurtful stalemate’ into an ‘enticing opportunity’ and considers it as a ripe moment for resolution.26 And this resolution can be in the form of ceasefire where the opposing parties can seriously give peace a chance or it can be used by opponents to muster their strength for a stronger attack of the other party. Outsiders also influence the calculations rather than dynamics or needs.

c. Contingent theories

Opposite to inherency theory is contingent theories which postulate that aggression depends on external factors and is not inherent in individuals. Individuals are basically pacific and they become aggressive only in demanding situations. Webb explains that “Conflict may occur through scarcity of a competition for resources, or through mal distribution of resources of ample resources. But it may not be a necessary condition of human societies that these conditions pertain”.27

The earliest presentation of contingent theorists is found in writings of Rousseau. His famous phrase “Man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains” justifies the contingent theories. In his book Discourse on Inequality (1755) he describes natural man as a ‘noble savage’, living life of idyllic blissfulness and primitive simplicity. He states that men in the state of nature are equal, self sufficient and contented. But with the rise of civilisation, private property came into existence and inequalities surfaced.

Karl Marx theory of class conflict is based upon contingency argument. He argued that workers are alienated from themselves, their work, their family and their environment due to the capitalistic structure of society. And a society can become classless, conflict less and egalitarian if the society is restructured on the basis of communism. John Maynard Keynes brought attention to the flaws of European economic organisation following the end of World War 1 and into the Great Depression. Keynes encountered main social problems of
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unemployment, disease and hunger and humans act in ways to prevent them. So it becomes the duty of government to use its powers to influence the economy by stimulating investment through a variety of means. He said that even if government has to break roads and rebuild it in order to provide work to citizens, then the government must do it. Albert Bandura has argued three main primary sources of human aggression. One source which moulds and defines our behaviour is familial setting- violent families produce violent offsprings. Second source is found in subcultures. Bandura explains that “the highest rates of aggressive behaviour are found in environments where aggressive models abound and where aggressiveness is regarded as a highly valued attribute.” She asks “why anyone residing in such an environment should adopt a markedly different style of life?” A final category of social learning comes from symbolic sources. She says that major source of transmission for violence comes from television. Television transmits pictures of violence, impressions of violence and even the symbolic culture of violence.

Contingency theories argue that aggression is a manifestation of frustration. But it is also not that all frustration culminates in aggression. Deprivation theorists refer to frustration-aggression hypothesis. Denial of access to needs leads to aggressive behaviour. Lewis A. Coser argued that conflicts as well as violent actions originate from not being accepted in society, a matter of dignity, political access and power. He writes that ‘only where there exists open channels of political communication through which all groups can articulate their demands, are the chances high that the political exercise of violence can be successfully minimised.’ Edward Azar in his work on ‘protracted social conflict’ explained the lack of security, identity, recognition, and participation as the reason for conflict. Ted R. Gurr says ‘relative deprivation’ as a systematic way for conflicts to become violent. Lake and Rothchild has argued that when states lose strength and they lack the resources necessary to


provide security, groups will prepare for and invest in violence, a situation that often leads to violent conflict. Therefore, frustration leads to aggression. And if there is no frustration, then there will be no aggression and therefore, no conflict. Burton suggests problem solving mechanism to resolve the crisis.

d. Interactionist Theories

Behaviour is driven either by nature or nurture. But interactionist school reject both these and call it Galton’s error after Francis Galton took the phrase ‘nature versus nurture’ from Shakespeare’s Tempest. Wrangham and Peterson have rejected this reductionist debate and instead held both genetics and environment responsible for the human behaviour. John Burton has argued that needs satisfaction is essential for the society. And these needs are either driven by biology or environment. He explains that “from the perspective of conflict studies, the important observation is that these needs will be pursued by all means available. In ontological terms, the individual is conditioned by biology or primordial influence to pursue them. Needs, however, do not exist in the biological world alone, but rather in a social milieu. Needs satisfaction behaviour is expressed socially and so the social setting influences the degree to which they may be satisfied.”

Therefore, interactionist school believes that individuals are often pacific but violence as such is not aberrant. Violent behaviour in moulded by cultural learning tempered by inherent impulses. And conflict is one of the many responses to unmet needs.

Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

Conflict is a universal and inevitable aspect of social life. Therefore, conflict “must be channelled within a set of agreed norms that foster discussion of difference, proscribe violence as a means of settling disputes, and establish rules for the limited kinds of violence


that are condoned”. Contemporary peace literature has conflict resolution mechanisms to resolve the crisis. Jacob Bercovitch and Richard Jackson defines “Conflict Resolution as a range of formal or informal activities undertaken by parties to a conflict, or outsiders, designed to limit and reduce the level of conflict and to achieve some understanding on the key issues in conflict, a political agreement, or a jointly acceptable decision on future interactions and distribution of resources. It does not mean suppressing, eliminating or controlling conflicts. Nor is it about avoiding a conflict and it is certainly not about using superior force to conquer an adversary. Conflict Resolution is about accepting a conflict, recognising that there are ways out of it and engaging in some tacit or explicit coordination without which none of these goals can be achieved”. Theorists of conflict resolution argue that conflicts can be dysfunctional so conflicts need to be dealt in such a way as to experience more values and benefits and to decrease the costs associated with conflict. But the traditional conflict resolution mechanisms fail to address the new wars inflicting the international society. Intra state wars have outnumbered inter-state wars. Wars are now fought on the basis of identity, mal-distribution of resources or discrimination against a specific group. Also, the traditional methods of conflict resolution deals at the top political level and the concerns of the marginalised or the genuinely affected people are sidelined. The representatives come to a compromise but the real problem remains unaddressed. So, this part has new methods to resolve the conflict and help in building peace.

Traditional mechanisms

a. International negotiation

Negotiation is the most frequently employed of all methods of international conflict resolution, not only “because it is always the first to be tried and successful but also because states may believe its advantages to be so great as to rule out the use of other methods, even in situations where the chances of negotiated settlement are slight”. Negotiation is designed
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to regulate conflict, limit or prevent escalation of its attitudinal or behavioural components, and when possible, reach a political agreement that may set the stage for better interactions in the future.\textsuperscript{39} Factors which influence negotiation are – a. personal factors which include needs, attitudes, expectations and other enduring dispositions that an individual bring with them, b. role factors refer to a set of influences from a negotiator’s reference group or from expectations attached to her/his position. c. situational factors which refer to social and physical conditions under which the process takes place. d. substance related interests where the parties may have conflicting interests, shared interests or complementary interests. e. process related interests include enhancing relationships, preserving reputations, demonstrating competence, remaining consistent, minimising transaction costs and gaining access to new resources.

b. \textbf{Mediation and International Conflict Resolution}

When negotiations fail and parties refuse to communicate, states seek assistance or mediation by third party. It takes place in situation of: a. long drawn out conflict b. parties has reached an impasse c. parties are ready to cooperate to break the stalemate d. neither side is prepared to countenance further costs or escalation.\textsuperscript{40} Oran Young defines mediation as “any action taken by actor that is not direct party to the crisis, that is designed to reduce or remove one or more problems of the bargaining relationship, and therefore to facilitate the termination of the crisis itself”.\textsuperscript{41}

c. \textbf{Arbitration, Adjudication and International Law}

International law based methods of conflict resolution are a binding form of third party intervention. Disputing states submit their claims to an impartial judicial body that makes a ruling on the basis of established international legal principles. Through adjudication, or judicial settlement, disputes are referred to an established court or standing tribunal, such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) or the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR).


Alternately, a dispute might be submitted to arbitration. This requires the parties themselves to set up the machinery to handle the dispute—the judges, procedures, and jurisdiction of the tribunal—as well as determine the scope or terms of the award.\footnote{Bercovitch, J., & Jackson, R. (2009). \textit{Conflict Resolution in the Twenty First Century: Principles, Methods and Approaches}. USA: University of Michigan Press. P: 47.} International law–based methods are, by and large, an efficient and rational means of dealing with a narrowly defined set of international disputes, namely, those that require a legal ruling, as opposed to a political settlement.\footnote{Ibid} They are also surprisingly effective; the vast majority of awards and judgments are adhered to.\footnote{Merrills, J. (1998). \textit{International Dispute Settlement}. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.} It has important function of maintaining peace and order in society. It creates situation for cooperation and adjustment. In negative sense, it assists in preventing growth of interests leading to strife. The actors have to abide by the rules and interests of international community and more or less suppress their articulation of interests.

d. International Organizations

International organizations are premised on the principles of functionalism.\footnote{Functionalism theory argues that international organizations are primary means by which interdependence in social, political, economic and environment can be managed. According to Deutsch, the theory is based on a hope that more and more common tasks will be delegated to such specific functional organizations and that these organizations will become supranational in time.\footnote{Deutsch, M. (1978). \textit{The Analysis of International Relations}. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.}} According to Deutsch, world nations will gradually become integrated into a single community within which war will be impossible.\footnote{Deutsch, M. (1978). \textit{The Analysis of International Relations}. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.} United Nations primary purpose is defined in Article 1 of UN Charter

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

UN is not a unitary but it is an amalgam of actors, processes and interests which lacks real autonomy. In this context, conflict resolution takes place ‘through UN’ rather than ‘by
The advantage of this multilateral context is that the disputing states have a platform to discuss and explore opportunities through closed and open forums. But the disadvantage is that actors place higher expectations on the organization in comparison to the resources at their call which is a common predicament of UN. Also the states comprising of UN are not autonomous and they are guided by a hegemon state and also by their own national interests. A disputing state may also face unwanted exposure or attention and pressure to conform to international standards and collective opinions.

UN has innovated UN Peacekeeping mission. It is defined as “an operation involving military personnel, but without enforcement powers, under-taken by the United Nations to help maintain or restore international peace and security in areas of conflict”. Based on the principles of impartiality, the consent of the parties, and the non-use of force except in self-defence, peacekeeping can play a useful role in containing and defusing conflict, thereby providing breathing space for diplomatic negotiation or mediation.

e. Peace keeping

It has been an established method of conflict resolution since 1956. The peace keeping operations are dispatched after a cease fire has been reached and with the agreement of both states. Their role is to prevent re-eruption of armed conflict and oversee implementation of political agreement. It is aimed at controlling violent manifestation of conflict but not resolving conflicts. If the peace keeping operations fail, then it is not due to the delivery of operations but it is because of failure of diplomacy.

Peacekeeping is defined as “the prevention, containment, moderation, and termination of hostilities between or within states, through the medium of a peaceful third-party intervention, organized and directed internationally, using multinational forces of soldiers,
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police, and civilians to restore and maintain peace”\textsuperscript{51} Their 3 key tasks is of a. observation b. separation of forces between the conflicting parties c. ensuring law and order and taking over temporary administration.

\textbf{Contemporary methods of Conflict Resolution}

Jacob Bercovitch and Richard Jackson said that the ‘New World Order’ which in the shadow of post Cold War, was one of conflict, aggressive nationalism, chaos and instability.\textsuperscript{52} The nature of conflicts has also changed. Since 1989, conflicts have occurred not between states but within states. Of the 94 conflicts since 1989, only two were of the traditional interstate kind, all were civil conflicts and state formation conflicts.\textsuperscript{53} Ethnic, communal, religious or secessionist conflicts have shaped the new international environment. They are destructive and intractable in nature. The prevailing conflict resolution has been framed to react to the conflict but not to act prior so as to prevent the formation and escalation of conflict. Preventive diplomacy is a different approach as it emphasises on prevention rather than cure. It identifies a place where a conflict is likely to take place, create mechanisms to warn the international community and also to build pressure so that actors do not go for war. Michael Lund defines preventive diplomacy to the phase of conflict where serious violence has not taken place and he calls this stage as ‘unstable peace'.\textsuperscript{54} I. William Zartman defines conflict prevention as “providing diplomatic assistance in conflict situations as a strategy to prevent renewed outbreak of conflicts that are protracted in nature”.\textsuperscript{55} But De Jong Oudraat says that diplomatic measures are not considered very effective.\textsuperscript{56} Louis Kriesberg has proposed broad

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid P: 76.
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measures which will not only prevent violence but also address the underlying causes of conflict.\textsuperscript{57} He talks about the need to distinguish proactive policies that reduce causes from the preventive policies that address immediate source of conflict.\textsuperscript{58} Jacob Bercovitch and Richard Jackson include conflict prevention as addressing structural constraints of poverty, social, political and economic inequality and corrupt governance. This transforms a conflict. But this generally leads to the accusations of violation of sovereignty of the conflicting states although at the same time it upholds the rights of individuals. The international community gives primacy to individual rights in the form of R2P: Responsibility to Protect.

To realize this, firstly, early warning signs need to be observed and the gap between the warning signs-response needs to be bridged. Secondly, diplomacy ranging from negotiation to mediation, to coercive diplomacy to fact finding mission can be taken up.

c. Humanitarian intervention

A special form of peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention involves range of civilian and military actors and processes. It is an extension of preventive diplomacy and attempts to stop large scale human right abuses or prevent outbreak and escalation of conflict. Whitman defines humanitarian intervention as “employing military means for humanitarian ends under UN sanction”.\textsuperscript{59} Pugh explains it as “the external use of force to stop genocide or widespread human rights abuse”.\textsuperscript{60} UN conceives humanitarian intervention as complex peace operations that combine peacemaking (using diplomatic methods to bring conflicts to a halt, such as mediation), peacekeeping (military operations designed to oversee cease-fires or the implementation of peace agreements), and peace building (a range of activities designed to address the roots of conflict and create the conditions for a consolidated and stable


peace).\textsuperscript{61} Jacob Bercovitch and Richard Jackson add humanitarian operations sometimes also include peace-enforcement, so-called muscular peacekeeping, which involves using offensive military force to achieve humanitarian or political goals.\textsuperscript{62} Humanitarian interventions, according to Bercovitch and Jackson can be an effective way for freezing the conflict, limiting its contagious spread, and deterring the renewal of its hostilities. It can stabilise the fragile cease fire and allows for peace making to take place. The presence of intervention forces also insulates the interference from regional forces. Humanitarian intervention has “proven to be remarkably resilient as a circuit breaker in a spiralling cycle of violence. If a military solution proves illusory but peaceful settlement remains elusive, then peacekeeping forces are needed, wanted, and a useful instrument of conflict management”.\textsuperscript{63} It is a great method to create positive peace and in enforcing and establishing international human standards. But it carries its own limitations. It does get into a controversy of interfering in the internal affairs of the country and breaching its sovereignty. Also, it is also accused of exacerbating conflict rather than mitigating it. It causes the proliferation of war economies where warlords and militia are employed as security guards and the money they receive is used to buy weapons and muster for further conflict. They also do not engage with locals in delivering of aid which limits the development and capacity of national and local institutions. They are also accused of legitimating the rule of warlords and local militia after the intervention which goes against their aim of providing a fair and just system of working. Conceptually, humanitarian intervention is accepted as a promoter of neo liberal economic and political agenda. And operationally, it faces the problem of limited number of peacekeeping forces and lack of coordination amongst various actors and states.

d. Regional Task Sharing


This conflict resolution mechanism is also synonymous with devolution or decentralisation of responsibilities. It is also referred as “security regionalism”\(^{64}\), subcontracting, subsidiarity, the peace pyramid or supervised devolution of international conflict resolution mechanism. It refers to the regional organizations or groupings of state assume primary responsibility for preventive diplomacy, mediation, peace keeping, peace-enforcement and peace building with their geographical area.\(^{65}\) The UN is at the apex of this system providing authorisation, legitimacy, monitoring and advice and wherever necessary diplomatic and material support. Bennett categorise regional organizations into three forms- multi purpose organizations, alliance type organizations, and functional organizations.\(^{66}\) Multi Purpose regional organizations are established by treaties and provide a broad framework of issues within which they can operate. For Example, EU, OAS, ASEAN. Alliance organizations are either collective self defence arrangements designed to confront a specific external threat or collective security arrangements for maintaining order among members. For example: NATO, ANZUS, ARF. Functional organizations are for narrow economic, social or political goals and have limited regard for security. For example: OPEC, ECOWAS, OECD, APEC. Regional task sharing contributes to democratisation and participation of international community. Moreover, regional countries can provide the long term will power to the afflicted country and they also share local knowledge, resources, experience and contact with state leaders which facilitate their task. This also reduces the burden of already overburdened UN. They mitigate anarchy through the creation of international norms, facilitate the construction of security communities, provide a forum and venue for multilateral diplomacy, act as a communications link, reduce uncertainty, mobilize resources for peace processes, and have a range of institutional machinery for conflict resolution. The strategies available to them include norm-setting and regime creation, assurance, community building, deterrence, non-intervention, isolation, fact-finding, mediation, judicial settlement, peacekeeping, peace-


enforcement, and internationalization. But the regional organizations face the constraint of resources and autonomy. Also there are many organizations existing in a region which overlap and it becomes confusing which organization can deal best with the crisis.

e. **Non official Diplomacy**

There are two kinds of intervening actors for conflict resolution – Track 1 which constitutes officials, diplomats, and governmental actors. And Track 2 has informal, non official and private actors. The latter category has started gaining significance as it leads to democratisation of global governance where non governmental actors- individuals, associations, organizations, religious groups, multi national companies, social movements play an active role. Non official diplomacy is defined as activities of private, non governmental actors seeking to prevent, resolve or reduce violent conflicts. It is also explained as “encompassing the many kinds of non official interaction between members of adversary groups or nations which aim to develop strategies, influence public opinion, and organise human and material resources in ways that might help resolve conflicts”\(^68\). The advantage of nonofficial diplomacy is that they act with speed and respond pragmatically; secondly, they strengthen the resiliency of societies. They also help in early warning and conflict prevention, peace making and mediation, and reconciliation and peace building, provision of relief during humanitarian crisis and strengthening of civil society.\(^69\)

f. **Reconciliation and Justice**

They are seen in the form of truth commissions and human rights trials for the purpose of national reconciliation of the moral and political order following war or conflicts. Their aim is to deal with the excesses of past and build a peaceful future. It evolved owing to internationalisation of justice and due to the formation of participatory form of governance in


newly independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. According to John Paul Lederach, reconciliation is a process and the place where truth, mercy, justice and peace come together. Bercovitch and Jackson says that Truth and reconciliation commissions— the institutionalized expression of the theory of reconciliation— are designed to facilitate the truth-telling part of this process, in the hope that it will engender forgiveness, a measure of catharsis, the forsaking of vengeance, the humanization of both victims and perpetrators, and the chance to articulate the vision of a common future. It is important to deconstruct enemy images and recognise the humanity of Other. This will aid in breaking down the hostility between groups and facilitate social integration and national healing. Secondly, trials will help in establishing rule of law. And prosecutions will break the culture of impunity and disrespect for human rights. It will send the perception that at least justice is being meted out. But it is not without its flaws. It will be difficult to evaluate a truth commission as what may be correct in one situation may not be correct in another. Presence of international community, third parties, state actors may guide the judgment of trials. And justice is a contested concept. So what constitutes justice is highly debatable. Moreover, the trials take place when conflict has already been resolved. So this resuscitates the horrible past memories which makes integration difficult.

g. Peace Building

Peacemaking and peace-keeping operations, to be truly successful, must come to include comprehensive efforts to identify and support structures which will tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well being among people.70

Introduced by Boutros Boutros Ghali in 1992 in his An Agenda for Peace, peace building encompasses complete transformation of political, social and economic structures. It is defined as “action to identify and support structures which tend to strengthen and solidify peace to avoid a relapse into conflict”.71 International Peace Academy defines it as an “attempt to reduce the sources of present and ongoing antagonisms and build capacities for conflict resolution in divided societies- often in the face of open hostilities and raw trauma”. Canadian Peace building Coordination Committee introduced the notion of “human security”.
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Brahimi report defines it as “hybrid of political and development activities targeted at the sources of conflict”. Neela Tschirgi defines peace building as “non military interventions by external actors to help war torn societies not only to avoid a relapse into conflict but more importantly to establish conditions of sustainable peace”.\textsuperscript{72} It is seen as measures to be taken after military peace keeping. Michael Pugh defines peacebuilding in the context of development based approaches to dealing with emergencies, suggesting that it “can be defined as a policy of external international help for developing countries designed to support indigenous social, cultural, and economic development and self-reliance, by aiding recovery from war, and reducing or eliminating resort to future violence”.\textsuperscript{73} Pugh’s definition seems to put development and peace building on the same level. But there’s a difference between the two. Peace building aims to reconstitute political and social order and re-establish social norms of non violent conflict resolution. And also peace building aims at reconciliation and healing the old wounds of the victimized community. It is considered that peace building is defined in the context of liberal peace theory. It is in general agreement that the security and order have to be achieved for social reconstruction to take place otherwise it becomes difficult to resume work amidst violence. Second, support from external actors facilitates the process. Third, peace building is a multi dimensional process which focuses on social, political, economic, security and legal aspects. And lastly, it requires cooperation and involvement of locals to make it successful.

Peace keeping and peace making were existent in conflict resolution but these did not address the underlying causes. In 1960s, peace researcher Johan Galtung distinguished between peace keeping, peacemaking and peace building. He explained peacekeeping as a way of reducing the overt violent behaviour of conflict through the interposition of military forces; peacemaking as one that reconciles the political differences of elites through diplomatic means such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and conciliation; and peace building, which entailed “the practical implementation of peaceful social change through socioeconomic


reconstruction and development”. 74 Galtung also introduced the notion of “structural violence” – which refers to the injury and harm physical and psychological-that results from exploitative and unjust social, economic and political systems and structures. 75 And this kind of violence is a result of hierarchical ordering society which results in oppression of marginalized communities. Peace research has also introduced two concepts of peace-negative and positive peace. Negative peace deals with the absence of war whereas positive peace deals with bringing justice, equality, democracy and welfare of people. Lederach criticizes Galtung and introduces the concept of ‘sustainable peace’ which can be realized not only by focusing on resolution but restoration and rebuilding of relationships. The notion of peace building needs to include changing mutually negative conflict attitudes at the grass root level 76 and promotion of conditions that create cooperative relationships. 77

Tasks of Peace Building

Peace building, according to Oliver Ramsbotham, constitutes of negative and positive tasks. Negative task is to prevent recurrence of violent conflict and positive task is to aid national recovery and expedite removal of underlying causes. 78 Krishna Kumar sees peace building as a. restoration of essential government services, basic social services, and minimum level of physical infrastructure b. structural reforms of political, social and economic and c. institution building which entails rehabilitating of social and political institutions. Nicole Ball says peace building constitutes of two primary phases: transition phase where security and law need to be restored and consolidation phase where social justice needs to be prevalent. 79


Bercovitch and Jackson acknowledge that most authors agree that peace building aims at: a. security rehabilitation b. political rehabilitation c. economic rehabilitation d. social rehabilitation. On one hand, where peace building focuses on holistic development, on the other it encounters many challenges. It is a long term process which requires great will power and coordination among nations to sustain it. Krishna Kumar finds a conceptual problem in peace building. Deeper causes of conflict are not analysed and the strategies of peace building to address those conflicts are not well thought out.

**Forms of Peace**

a. **Realist Peace**

b. **Liberal Peace**

c. **Marxist Peace**

d. **Post Structuralist contributions to Peace**

In the introductory chapter, it becomes important to study different forms of peace as it renders a platform to the researchers to analyse what kind of peace has been imported in Afghanistan and what kind of peace is required and the peace building strategies to be employed?

**Realist Peace**

For every state, war is incessant and lifelong against every other state...For what most men call ‘peace’, this is really only a name- in truth, all states by their very nature are always engaged in an informal war against all other states.\(^8^0\)

Peace, according to realist, is a zero sum game. They believe that society is anarchical where all men are engaged in war for their survival. They argue that peace in realism is an absence of open violence but not an absence of threat. They reject universal ethic of peace and accepts a limited understanding of peace contained within state boundaries and projected by powerful actors according to their own interests. For them, insecurity is a problem.

Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan* said that life of a man is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.\(^8^1\) There is a prevalence of insecurity. And to save himself from prevailing insecurity,


\(^{8^1}\)There is a prevalence of insecurity. And to save himself from prevailing insecurity,
man breaks contract. Hobbes recommends the formation of a commonwealth which will create a sense of fear of punishment in the minds of those who breaches contract. Hobbes says that law of nature suggests that humans seek peace and therefore, the commonwealth will look over the sustenance of peace in society. In this commonwealth, men do not possess the right to disagree with the policy. The only place where they can lay a claim to their right is when there is a danger to their life. At this time, the commonwealth can be replaced by another. But such kind of peace is a limited peace which is focussed on survival and resting on one’s state or an alliance of state’s hegemony which is similar to imperialism. Peace, here is limited by requirement of a constant state of domestic preparation of war.

Morganthau, too, talked about limited peace. He believed in balance of power to contain the struggle. He equated interest with power.

Hegel has offered another critique of peace. He has said that war maintained the ethical health of nation and ‘prevents a corruption of nations which a perpetual violence would produce’. Kant also saw that perpetual peace might be subject to hegemony.

Peace, in realism, would be underpinned by a dominant or hegemonic state. Neo-realism focussed on the present situation, upon balancing multiple State’s interests and pre-empting future violence by constructing a militarised capacity that would make violence between states too costly for one state to believe that there could be a clear winner.

**Liberal Peace**

Defining contemporary thinking about Peace, Richmond in Globalisation and Challenges to Peace mentions that there are four main strands of thought in the liberal peace framework- victor’s peace, institutional peace, constitutional peace and civil peace. Victor’s peace rests on realist principles that military victory, hegemony and domination are all that matters. In its
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extreme form, it can be perceived as Carthaginian peace and the only way of containing Hobbessian nature of anarchy. Institutional Peace is premised on idealist, liberal-internationalist and liberal-institutionalist attempts to carve states within normative and legal foundations in which states multilaterally agree on what standard and behaviour to maintain. This can be traced to the Treaty of Westphalia and founding of UN and beyond. Constitutionalist Peace rests on liberal Kantian argument that free trade, democracy, markets are vital for sustenance of peace. They believe that individuals are ends not means. Civil Peace is premised on the preservation of human rights, social justice, citizen advocacy, mobilisation of individuals. But these strands of peace are both contradictory and complementary. Victor’s Peace emphasises on territorial sovereignty. Institutional Peace has become an amalgam of discordant voices and it becomes difficult to bring different actors and institutions on a consensus. In multilateral governance, State’s primary aim is to guard their sovereignty. The Constitutional Peace becomes problematic for those who do not want to share their power and do not want the constitutional set up to limit their activities. Richmond says that emergence of Liberal Peace reflects Augustinian thinking on the ‘tranquility of order’, the contradictions of Hobbesian in containing the State of nature and the project outlined by Quincy Wright that peace is represented by a community in which law and order prevail both internally and externally. War is made in the minds of men so ‘it is in the minds of men the defences of peace must be constructed’. Wright’s statement underlines that for attaining peace merely defences is created from the excesses of state of nature or anarchy or hegemony implicit in its victor’s peace component. The liberal peace, therefore, rests on Platonic ideal form and Kantian moral imperative. It also silences any other alternative to peace and considers Western liberal peace as the sole method of attaining peace. It is considered that achieving constitutions and institutions should be prioritised than basic security as without law and order it becomes difficult to work at the ground level. Martin Ceadal says that liberal peace depends on intervention and balance of consent, conditionality


and coercion. The liberal peace is created through ‘peace building consensus’ where like minded liberal states co-exist in a western oriented international society and states characterised by democracy, human rights, free markets, development, vibrant civil society and multilateralism. Fukuyama is against the interventionary peace because the top down process focuses on building state and this destroys the institutional and local capacity. The shape of peace depends on funders, executors and the key states involved in ‘peace building consensus’. Moreover, the locals get suspicious of the activities of the outsiders. Richmond has devised a new model of peace christened as ‘peace as governance’. ‘Peace as governance’ in state building focuses on the institutions of state as the basis for constructing liberal peace. For NGOs and agencies, it focuses on governance of society. The balance of power, hegemony, institutionalism and constitutionalism and civil society converge in this version of peace in an era of governmentality, which is super-territorial, and multi-layered. It incorporates official and private actors from the local to the global, institutionalized in the alphabet soup of agencies, organizations, and institutions. But, in its top-down guise it is also a form of the victor’s peace, relying on dominant states, in the context of the states-system.\(^9\)

**Further graduations of Liberal Peace**

The first is the conservative peace of liberal model which involves top down approaches, hegemony, domination and coercion to peace building and development. US unilateral state building efforts have been accused of pursuing conservative peace. Richmond in his book Transformation of Peace has also remarked that militarisation of peace in Afghanistan represents a hyper conservative model. Another is the orthodox model in the liberal framework in which local ownership and culture are involved. It is dominated by consensual negotiation and is multi lateral but still it is state centric. It is represented by international organizations and institutions and international NGOs. It is a bottom-up approach led by civil society, grassroots and also top down approach which is led by states, donors and officials. Third, is the emancipatory model which emphasises strongly on local ownership and is highly critical of coercion and state led efforts. This is a bottom-up approach and centres more on social justice and welfare. It is shaped by private actors and social movements. This is almost akin to Richmond’s peace as governance model. These models contradict and complement

each other. During emergency, conservative model is at work. But once sustainability becomes important, emancipatory approach largely prevails. But Richmond has nullified the transition from conservative to orthodox to emancipatory model. He says that experience has shown that where force is used in a hyper-conservative initial approach, transition to orthodox category has not occurred. He gives example of Bosnia and Kosovo, the state is weak or minimally present, and the social and economic spheres are unsustainable despite the length of time the internationals have been involved. But where entry of international actors is dependent on a consensual peace agreement it rapidly moves from conservative to orthodox sphere.

Richmond, therefore, mentions that import of democracy, human rights, neo-liberal development and civil peace has led to the formation of weak state and institutions and unemployment and underdevelopment has severely marred the civil society. This also arouses suspicion of the intentions of international actors, of local politicians, and also of confidence in the institutions. Rasmussen has defined this peace as “negative epistemology of peace”.

Hardt and Negri say that conservative and orthodox form of liberal peace appears to be “imperial sovereignty”. There is also a danger of liberal peace ending as virtual peace. Post Gramscian notion explains liberal peace as a form of multiple hegemonies and a single dominant discourse promoted by powerful states. It is accused of upholding actor’s interests and objectives.

**Marxist Peace**

The bourgeoisie…(i.e. capitalism) creates a world after its own image.

This approach deals with structures that are exploited by rich and powerful to deny freedom to individual through hegemonic domination based upon unequal distribution of material
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resources or via race or class. Marx has argued that inequality can be removed by either reform or through revolutionary action against hegemony. Underlying this debate is a concern for emancipation of disadvantaged. According to Marx, structuralism indicates that change occurs through materialist dialectic - the Hegelian principle that thesis will become anti thesis and that human nature is fluid and it responds to environment, societal dynamics and historical experience. This shows the contradiction in the society in the form of class struggle. He has historically explained the class contradictions in different phases namely ancient phase where equality was prevalent and society was classless. But as the production emerged, two classes emerged- one that possessed tools and the other that had no tools. Therefore, as the society moved into feudal society, two classes emerged- landlords and the slaves. But the contradictions emerged as the deprived and marginalised wanted a better society and given the changes in the environment, feudal society paved way for capitalist society where two classes existed- bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Bourgeoisie exploited labour class by extracting surplus value and giving the minimum salary which was sufficient to feed them and their family. But the proletariat felt alienated from themselves, their product, their family and their environment and therefore waged a revolution to bring down the capitalist structure. And when the societal structure will be re-modified to adjust the proletariat class and inequality will be eliminated, then a class less society will be formed and peace will prevail in communist society. Marx from this historical materialism believed that materialism is the basis of social and political life.

Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin’s structuralism was based on the dynamics produced by private ownership of property and pursuit of profit and material interests. Capitalism survives on the logic of surplus value which is inherently unfair and unjust and is of benefit to elites and causes exploitation of masses thus producing class system. The economic base will support political and social institutions called the superstructure. Marx and Engels believed that there would be real emancipation in society only when there would be no exploitation of labour. He argued that for mutual interests to emerge, which was a pre-requisite of the form

of peace implied by Marxism, capitalist property must be abolished in order to remove the exploitation that occurred between ‘nations’ leading to social justice.

Lenin stated that ‘imperialism is the highest form of capitalism’. And imperialism has made peace impossible.

Marxist version of peace affirmed that if historical materialism can be reconfigured to the benefit of masses so that they control the means of production and escapes class conflict determined by private property, then a class less peace without structural violence and with justice can emerge. Capitalist system is an obstacle to social justice and equity and would not rest merely on treaties between states or on elites which controlled material and political resources. Reforms or through revolution will aid in bringing emancipation, social justice, language, identity and end to hegemony.

**Post-Structuralism Peace: Beyond Emancipation**

Modernist discourse is open in principle to a variety of interpretations of the sovereign man that it puts at its centre and whose voice it speaks. The liberal’s ‘possessive individual man’, the Marxist ‘labouring man’, the romantic ecologist’s ‘man in harmony with nature’, the Christian Humanist’s ‘man in brotherhood with man’...

Richard Ashley’s statement exhibits how modernist discourse is internally contested. The following words of R.B.J Walker, too, complement this.

The bankruptcy of established intellectual traditions, the untidy proliferation of research strategies, an unseemly dependence on the interests of specific states and cultures, and the hubris of empirical social science.

The above quotation talks about the contestation in modern discourse. It questions and challenges the sovereignty rendered to dominant discourse which marginalises the ‘other’. This sidelines the peripheral groups, discourse, gender, sections and environment which otherwise would have enriched the diversity and heterogeneity. Post structuralism arose due to tensions within modernity.

Heidegger in his ‘Contributions to Philosophy’ criticises the Enlightenment project although he acknowledges the progress made from the period where religion, superstitions, fear of

---

change used to rule the roost. Enlightenment paved the way for scientific knowledge, rationality, belief in progress and the capacity to solve any problem through scientific and logical methods. But the modern era too came to be plagued by the vices of industrialisation, pollution, environmental degradation, genocide, dehumanisation, inequality which displaced humanisation. In this, liberal discourse reigned marginalising all other unknown and unpopular thinking, norms and institutions. This caused dehumanisation. Foucault wrote that ‘illegitimate knowledge’ is presented in contrast to ‘true knowledge’ and this censor alternative knowledge and at the same time making claims that the dominant knowledge is pre-existing and eternal. Michael Foucault established the link between power and knowledge and showed that oppressive and hegemonic actors have upheld the rules and norms of liberal and Western value systems.

Genealogical approach helps in uncovering the discourses which allows for complexity and breadth of a concept, issue or dynamic and also to reveal the way in which social, political, and knowledge hierarchy are built and maintained. This means no knowledge can take priority over another and reality lies only in discourse. Post Structuralism calls for interrogating orthodoxies, meta-narratives and claims of universal truth.

Lyotard in his work ‘The Differend’ identified the dilemmas existing in institutions and frameworks although they would have been built of just and fair norms. Lyotard believe that injustice is still produced in these institutions that would marginalise some participants. Lyotard further states that communities create their own truths and meanings. Feyeraband favors theoretical pluralism to counter claims of representation, monotonous certainties and eternal truths of positivism.

---


John Vasquez says that modernity is arbitrary, truth is actually a choice, reality is a social construction, conceptual frameworks produce self-fulfilling prophecies and identity and identification are forms of power open to abuse.\(^{101}\)

Post structuralism calls for deconstruction of text. Deconstruction allows text to be ‘read’, opening up the debates of meaning, knowing and problems caused by logo centrism and binary oppositions that emerge from liberal and positivist epistemologies.\(^{102}\) Such binaries are culturally and historically defined who give fixed meaning to norms and institutions. Post structuralism argue that knowledge is discursively produced and reproduced and that discourses of power and truth merely represent hegemony and interests rather than being interest free and universal theories. Richard Ashley appreciates that post structuralism open up the question of how deeper, representative, reflexive, inclusive, flexible and self sustaining peace may be achieved.\(^{103}\)

Sylvester argues that dominant discourse excludes the ‘Other’. And the hegemonic order is built on the key binaries of – inside/outside, self/other, universal/particular and civilised/barbarian.

Post-Structuralism also critiques the development context. Orthodox approaches in development studies make use of western knowledge and technology and bring development in developing world ignoring and bypassing the indigenous know-how. Agamben writes that bare life comes about because of the western political habit of exclusion that simultaneously claims to be inclusive.\(^{104}\)

Post-Structuralism gives rise to an understanding of peace which is pluralist and free of violence. This offers emancipation incorporating politics of resistance, solidarity and indigenous movements. Peace, in Post Structuralism, is reconceptualised not necessarily as an


\(^{103}\) Ibid P: 138.

objective but as a method and process and never a final end state.\textsuperscript{105} There is a need to move beyond institutional and liberal politics, power, sovereignty and representation and to be engaged and involved with emotive, aesthetic, linguistic and cultural representations. This ontology of peace is multi centred, anti hegemonic, indicative of agency and requires interrogation of power, resistance and marginalisation. This peace accepts resistance to an accepted norms and institutions and privilege the ‘unknowable other’. Post structuralism accepts difference, hybridity, rejects sovereignty (cutting off the king’s head) and resort to power or coercion to incorporate inclusion.

Map 1: Political Map of Afghanistan

So, what kind of peace is required in Afghanistan?

Before the ascension of Taliban, the war in Afghanistan has deteriorated the human condition in the world to its lowest. But after its arrival on the political stage in 1994, it gained international notoriety for its conservative policies which further exacerbated the condition of people. Although initially Afghans did not resent Taliban as it reduced corruption and relatively brought down instability post Soviet invasion and subsequent civil war. But the Taliban rule further deteriorated the human condition. Women’s condition was at its worst. Feminist groups in America vehemently spoke against Taliban and the inability of America to act against it. Although America has dirtied its hands by involving itself in Afghanistan to wage war against communism and to overthrow occupation of Soviet Union, in the process it planted seeds and watered the Mujahedeen. But without knowing, that they will one day become a Frankenstein monster and bring down the supremacy of America. On 11 September 2001, the twin towers of United States came crashing down under the attack of Al-Qaeda led by Osama Bin Laden. Shocked and stunned, United States launched ‘Operation Enduring Freedom’ to restore international order and salvage the world from the virus of terrorism.

Can it, then, be concluded that “some wars happen to obtain peace”?

First, let us theoretically trace the source of conflict in Afghanistan. The conflict in Afghanistan is a combination of inherency and contingency theory or we can say that it is an interaction of both the factors. The conflict cannot be simply reduced to inherency or contingency and this has been pretty evident in terms of Afghanistan. In Chapter 2, we will see that tracing conflict in Afghanistan historically has been due to avarice of political rulers which Ahmed Rashid has termed it as “polygamic rivalries”. The ensuing problems led to weakening of institutions, poor generation of revenues causing financial deficit and therefore, shameful dependency on neighbours and superpowers. Second, the intervention of foreign countries to gain influence in the country of ‘land of routes’(Refer Map 1: Political Map of Afghanistan) and make it a proxy state has caused phenomenal damage to Afghanistan. Therefore, an interaction of inherency and contingency factors made it a crisis laden country.


107 For more details, Refer Chapter: 2.
Second, I will be talking about the peace efforts adopted by international community to resolve conflict.

For the fourth time, Afghanistan was to be occupied by an invading power and this time by a country whose legitimacy and aid has always been sought, the United States of America. Richmond has said that emphasis on different aspects of liberal peace depends on the actors that intervene or coordinate. The US tends to focus on the victor’s peace as well as constitutional peace, though it must be noted that on all terms apart from per capita, the US is the biggest contributor to different aspects of liberal peace—victor’s, constitutional, institutional and civil peace. Therefore, US focussed on the victor’s peace i.e. to gain victory over Taliban who refused to hand over Osama Bin Laden, the architect of September 11, 2001 attacks, to America. In Johan Galtung’s words, negative peace was achieved. Taliban ran for shelter to Pakistan. International conference on Afghanistan was organised in Bonn, Germany on 5 December, 2001 to set the course for future of Afghanistan. Provisional government under Hamid Karzai was formed and emergency *Loya Jirgah* was held in 2002 to decide on the constitution. In 2005, presidential elections were held where Hamid Karzai, became the first popularly elected leader in the history of Afghanistan. America did exactly what was expected. Waged war, brought peace, imported democracy and elections and focussed on institutions. Richmond has rightly put Afghanistan under hyper conservative model of liberal peace. But the civil aspect has largely been ignored and left for civil society to take over. The civil society, too has encountered myriad problems to bring an emancipatory model of liberal peace namely, peace as governance. (Problems of civil society will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3). Foreign NGO staffers pocket predominant share of international aid. They try to impose their own Western model of development complacent of the local needs and knowledge of an area. They also defy the expertise of traditional civil society terming them as conservative, narrow minded and impediments to peace and order. The half hearted bottom up approach of civil peace has not been able to produce much effect. Further, United States’s narrow aim of catching and prosecuting the mastermind of September 11, Osama Bin Laden in 2012 near the military headquarters in Abbottabad and finally packing its bag in 2014 from Afghanistan validates Richmond’s hyper conservative model.

---

model applied in Afghanistan.

Richmond also cites Kosovo and Siberia to explain that the transition from conservative and orthodox model to emancipatory model has, generally, never occurred. But to understand the kind of peace required in Afghanistan we need to first evaluate the genesis of problem in the country. Chapter 2 elaborately discusses the Genesis and Dimensions of Conflict in Afghanistan. Conflict in Afghanistan is predominantly political. Historically, the Afghanis has watched helplessly and suffered deeply under polygamic rivalries at the higher political echelon. The build up and capacity of institutions have also taken toll under the family fights. Non-functioning of institutions has also affected the economy and created a finance deficit. This caused dependency on foreign countries who were all ready to spread their tentacles and gain foot hold in the geo-strategically significant country of land of routes. The political *harakiri* has enervated the state of the country making it vulnerable to frequent crisis and fall outs. Therefore, it was imperative to focus on strengthening of institutions which could put the country back on the rails. Afghanistan is usually denoted as one living in traditional culture and political system. And Afghanistan is a country where fearless Pathans have selflessly fought to secure their dignity and honor in the milieu of any danger. The westerners are also blamed for imposing their western model of political system which is completely alien to the traditional eastern society. Even if these assumptions are taken correct, Afghanistan can very rightly live under their own kind of autonomous political system. But the ills plaguing the political state needs to be weeded out. Equality and justice are universal values and these can only be upheld with the support of strong institutions. Afghanistan has also suffered due to the rapidity with which modernising reforms were implemented\(^\text{109}\). The ideas of republicanism and democracy did seem alien to Afghans but for them to accept it grass root work need to be done. And emancipatory model fits here then. Modernisation does not solely means industrialisation and commercialisation but it is also associated with ideas of fairness, equality, justice, human rights and most importantly not confined to any country or group. Civil society in Afghanistan has contributed in peace building efforts. But much remains to be achieved. There is a large gap between rural and urban Afghans. 36 million

\(^{109}\)For more details, Refer Chapter: 2.
people continue to live below poverty line. Education has also been severely impacted. Violence has prevented 5 million children from attending school in year 2010. The teacher-student ratio is also pathetic. Since the Taliban regime toppled, the number of students increased but the quality of teachers remained qualified at high school education and did not receive post secondary education. Afghanistan is the lead producer of opium crop. Corruption is rampant. Kabul scandal involving the close aides of Hamid Karzai shook the confidence and trust of Afghans in the institutions of State.

Confining only to liberal peace will speak about the poverty of peace theory. Liberal peace needs to be enmeshed with emancipatory peace that works on bottom up approach.

**Conclusion**

Conflict has been defined in terms of incompatibility of goals. And conflict in Afghanistan is over the incompatibility amongst political rulers over taking reins of political power. Johan Galtung talked about the conflict triangle to find the genesis of conflict. Afghanistan’s problem can be understood from this triangle. The attitude of rulers is characterised by greed, power hungry and of impatience. This is concomitant with their reactionary behaviour. And the location of Afghanistan which holds geo strategic importance adds to the problem in Afghanistan. Therefore, the conflict triangle aptly describes the conflict in Afghanistan. US has adopted liberal method to bring in the country. And within liberal peace, most of the emphasis has been laid on victor’s peace. And this is evident by the fact that America has announced its departure of NATO troops from Afghanistan after the killing of Osama Bin Laden. The aim with which America intervened to wage war against terrorism seems to have accomplished for her after the killing of the architect of September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on World Trade Centre. But such a narrow aim and its accomplishment will only cause ruin for the Afghans. There is a need to move beyond the orthodoxy of liberal peace and encompass the grass root participation along with marginalised. Focus should also shift


towards justice, distribution, equality, participation and representation. A hybrid of liberal-emancipatory model will aid in peace building efforts. Otherwise, the suicide attacks have already risen in Afghanistan which shows the resurgence of Taliban. Waging war to impose the alien political structure of democracy and elections will not help the people much. Otherwise America will be accused of its realistic peace philosophy. And to sum up in the words of Tacitus,

They make it a desert and call it peace.

For more details, Refer Chapter: 2.