

# Geneva Accord 1988: Its Repercussions for Afghanistan and Pakistan

Salman Anwar<sup>1</sup>, Zakirullah<sup>2</sup>, Tayyab Irfan<sup>3</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*The Geneva Accord of 1988 marked a critical turning point in the Afghan conflict, bringing together the warring factions for negotiations that resulted in a comprehensive agreement. The accord outlined a series of provisions, including the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, the cessation of military aid to Afghan parties by external powers, the return of Afghan refugees, and a commitment to non-interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. This historic agreement signaled the end of Soviet invasion in Afghanistan and raised hopes for a more stable and peaceful future for the war-torn country. The aftermath of the Geneva Accord had significant implications for Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Soviet Union withdrew its troops from Afghanistan by February 15, 1989. Although it ended its direct military involvement in the conflict, the accord did not bring immediate peace to Afghanistan. Instead, it left a power vacuum and a deeply divided country, as various Mujahideen factions struggled for control of the Kabul government. The study aims to identify the loopholes in this historic accord which led to a superfluous civil war in Afghanistan.*

**Keywords:** Geneva, Soviet Union, United States of America, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Mujahideen, Civil war

## INTRODUCTION

The Geneva Accord of 1988 was a set of agreements reached between Afghanistan and Pakistan under the auspices of the United Nations. The accord was signed on April 14, 1988, after years of negotiations between the two countries and their respective allies. The background of the Geneva Accord of 1988 can be traced back to the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan lasted for a decade, resulting in a protracted and devastating war that killed tens of thousands of innocent people and displaced millions. In 1988, the Soviet Union decided to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan, and the United Nations stepped in to broker peace negotiations between Afghanistan and Pakistan, the two countries most affected by the war (Koops, et.al, 2015). The Geneva Accord of 1988 called for the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the establishment of a transitional government in Afghanistan, and an end to foreign interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Government Superior Science College Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.  
**Corresponding Author's Email:** salmandaudzai79@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> BS Student of Pakistan Studies, Government Superior Science College Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

<sup>3</sup> BS Student of Pakistan Studies, Government Superior Science College Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

The aftermath of the Geneva Accord of 1988 was mixed. On the one hand, the accord paved the way for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, which was a major achievement. On the other hand, the agreement failed to bring lasting peace to Afghanistan, as the country descended into a bitter civil war in the 1990s. The civil war in Afghanistan was fueled by ethnic, religious, and political divisions, and it led to the rise of the Taliban, a fundamentalist Islamist group that took control of Afghanistan in 1996 (Goodson, 2011). The Taliban's rule was marked by severe repression, including the brutal treatment of women and girls, and it was ultimately toppled by a US-led invasion in 2001.

Today, Afghanistan remains one of the world's most fragile and conflict-ridden countries, and its future remains uncertain. However, the Geneva Accord of 1988 remains an important historical milestone in the effort to bring peace and stability to Afghanistan, and it serves as a reminder of the complex challenges that continue to face the country and the region. The year 1988 was a turning point in world politics. This year marked the end of a disastrous decade that brought much bloodshed and destruction in Afghanistan and posed threats to Pakistan's security (Sarwar, 1999). The Geneva Accord has played a very significant role in changing the Geopolitical landscape of the cold war era.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Geneva Accord addressed the security threat posed by the Soviet Union to Pakistan, as the Soviet Union had repeatedly threatened Pakistan during the Soviet-Afghan war and warned that Pakistan was playing with fire by supporting the Mujahedeen. Immediately after the Geneva Accord, United States withheld all aid that had been promised to resettle refugees after the war. US sanctions under the Pressler amendment have made it difficult for Pakistan to handle the refugee burden, even though the Geneva accord stipulates that 1.5 million refugees will return to Afghanistan. Therefore the problem is to highlight the repercussions of Geneva accord for Afghanistan and Pakistan.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology adopted for this research is qualitative. Historical information on the subject matter was analyzed and described in subjective manner. As there is always a room for discussion and analysis on historical events and agreements that have far reaching impacts on regions and societies. For this purpose, data was collected from secondary sources i.e. books, reports, journals, other relevant publish documents. Interviews and focused group discussion was also conducted from the people who eye witnessed the Soviet-Afghan War 1979-89.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The Geneva Accords of 1988 was a historic agreement signed between Afghanistan and Pakistan, with the aim of ending the decade-long Soviet-Afghan War. It was signed on April 14, 1988, in Geneva, Switzerland, and was the result of years of negotiations between the warring parties, along with the United States and the Soviet Union. The agreement called for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, the return of Afghan refugees, and the

establishment of a neutral Afghan government. This literature review aims to analyze the Geneva Accords of 1988 and its aftermath through various books, research papers, journals, and articles.

Saikal & Maley (1989) in their book "*The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan*" argue that Geneva Accord was a major event in the Soviet-Afghan War. This book carefully examines everything related to these accords. It goes deep into how the negotiations happened and what came after the agreements were made. The main argument of the authors is that the Geneva Accords had a big problem right from the start. They didn't really deal with the deep-seated political and social issues that had been causing the war in Afghanistan for a long time. So, even though these accords managed to make the Soviet troops leave Afghanistan, they didn't solve the main problems causing the conflict. As a result, they didn't bring lasting peace to Afghanistan. This book is a valuable resource not just for understanding what happened during the Geneva Accords but also for seeing how they fit into the bigger picture of the Afghan conflict and its ongoing challenges.

Grau (1996) in his book "*The Bear Went over the Mountain: Soviet Combat Tactics in Afghanistan*" elaborates Geneva Accords from a military perspective. It dives into the military side of the conflict in Afghanistan and offers a detailed analysis of how the Soviet Union conducted its military operations during the war. Grau's key argument is that the Soviet Union didn't achieve its goals in Afghanistan, and one of the reasons for this was the way they used their military. He suggests that the tactics and strategies employed by the Soviet forces had limitations, and these limitations played a role in their ultimate failure. In simpler terms, the book focuses on how the Soviets fought the war in Afghanistan and why their military approach didn't lead to success. It's a valuable resource for understanding the military aspect of the Afghan conflict during the time of the Geneva Accords.

Coll (2004) in his book "*Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*" goes beyond just the Geneva Accords. It covers a broader period, shedding light on the secret history of the CIA's involvement in Afghanistan, from the Soviet invasion up to the eve of the September 11, 2001, attacks. While it explores a wider timeline, the book provides essential context for understanding the Geneva Accords and what followed. Coll's main argument is that the United States got involved in Afghanistan primarily because of the Cold War rivalry between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. He emphasizes that the Geneva Accords, even though they happened, didn't do much to fix the deeper issues that had caused the Afghan conflict.

Jalal (2021) in his article titled "*Peeking into Afghan's History: A Study from 1988 to 2010*" offers insights into the significance of the Geneva Accords of 1988. He argues that, these accords represented a significant achievement for the Soviet Union. They allowed the Soviets to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan without experiencing a clear military defeat, which was important for their image and goals. Additionally, the accords set the stage for Mikhail Gorbachev's policies of perestroika (economic restructuring) and glasnost (political openness), marking a turning point in Soviet history.

Garthoff (1994) in his book titled "*The Great Transition: American-Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War*" narrates a contrasting viewpoint regarding the Geneva Accords. Cohen regards these accords as a notable achievement for the United States. He argues that the agreement provided a valuable and dignified way for the United States to exit the Afghan conflict, avoiding the perception of defeat. In his view, this exit strategy helped restore American credibility in the broader region, which had been eroded by the protracted involvement in the Afghan conflict. Additionally, Cohen suggests that the Geneva Accord also brought benefits to Pakistan. He contends that Pakistan was successful in safeguarding its interests in Afghanistan through the agreement, and it facilitated the establishment of a government in Kabul that was sympathetic to Pakistan's objectives.

Khan (2007) in his article "*Understanding Pakistan's Pro-Taliban Afghan Policy*" The Geneva Accords and the Future of Afghanistan," published in *Asian Affairs*, voiced strong reservations about the accords. He argue that the Geneva Accord failed to involve the Afghan people in the peace process, sidelining their voices and needs. He pointed out that the agreement did not effectively address the root causes of the conflict in Afghanistan, which included complex political and social issues. Khan's viewpoint was that the Geneva Accord appeared to be a victory primarily for the superpowers involved and their proxies in the region, rather than a solution that would genuinely bring peace to Afghanistan. Essentially, Khan's criticism emphasized that the accords did not adequately consider the Afghan people's concerns and aspirations, and therefore, they did not lead to the lasting peace that many had hoped for in Afghanistan. This perspective highlights the importance of including local voices and addressing underlying issues in peace processes to achieve true and enduring stability.

Barfield & Nojumi (2010) in their article "*Bringing more effective governance to Afghanistan: 10 Pathways to stability*" presents a viewpoint critical of the Geneva Accords. They argue that the Geneva Accord represented a missed opportunity for the international community to tackle the root causes of the conflict in Afghanistan. They contends that the agreement fell short in addressing crucial issues, including human rights abuses, the involvement of Islamic militants in the conflict, and the urgent need for national reconciliation within Afghanistan. From their perspective, the international community had the chance to address these pressing concerns and help pave the way for a more stable and democratic government in Afghanistan. However, the Geneva Accords did not sufficiently tackle these issues, leading her to describe it as a "Pyrrhic victory." This term suggests that the perceived success of the accords may have come at a significant cost or without addressing the fundamental problems in Afghanistan.

Savranskaya & Blanton (2020) explained in their book "*Gorbachev and Reagan: The Last Super Power Summits. Conversations that ended the cold war*" that the accords missed a critical point. They believe that they didn't address the core problem of how power would be shared among Afghanistan's different ethnic groups. This omission, according to them, left Afghanistan susceptible to future conflicts because it didn't resolve the issue of who gets to make important decisions in the country. Similarly, anthropologist Thomas Barfield explained in their argument that pointed out another problem with the accords. He argued that they put too much emphasis on having a strong central government in Afghanistan. This approach didn't consider the country's

intricate mix of ethnic groups and languages. Barfield believed that this oversight set the stage for more conflict because it didn't recognize and respect the diversity within Afghanistan.

Ahsan (2002) explained in his article "*Re-emergence of Afghanistan after Bonn Conference*" highlights the pivotal role played by the Geneva Accords in shaping how the international community approached the task of rebuilding Afghanistan after the conflict. He argues that the accords had a profound influence on the international community's strategy. The accords placed significant emphasis on the concept of national sovereignty, which means that Afghanistan should have the right to govern itself without external interference. Additionally, the accords stressed the importance of involving all Afghan factions in the political process, promoting inclusivity. He suggests that these principles from the Geneva Accords greatly impacted the international community's decision-making process.

Bazai (2008) in his Thesis "*An Assessment of the Pak-Afghan Relations Geneva Accords on Afghanistan: Pakistan's Perspective*" sheds light on why this instability persisted. Bazai contends that the Geneva Accords fell short in addressing the fundamental reasons behind the conflict in Afghanistan. Specifically, he points to the country's weak and corrupt government institutions as a critical issue. He suggests that the accords focused heavily on the idea of national reconciliation, which means bringing different Afghan factions together, often at the expense of implementing necessary political reforms. This emphasis, contributed to Afghanistan's continued instability. In simpler terms, the study argues that the Geneva Accords didn't adequately address the deep-seated problems in Afghanistan, particularly the issues with its government institutions.

Goodson (2011) in his book "*Afghanistan's Endless war: State Failure, Regional Politics and the rise of Taliban*" argue that the Geneva Accords are identified as a critical juncture in the Soviet-Afghan War. His analysis underscores that these accords carried immense significance because they represented the very first instance where the Soviet Union decided to withdraw its troops from a foreign nation without achieving a clear military victory. This departure from the traditional pattern of seeking military triumph before withdrawal was groundbreaking. He goes on to argue that the Geneva Accords had broader implications beyond just the war in Afghanistan. He asserts that these agreements created a new space for political and diplomatic initiatives to emerge. This shift in approach eventually played a role in the collapse of the Soviet Union itself.

Sarwar (1999) explained in his research thesis, titled "*The Geneva Accords on Afghanistan: Pakistan's Perspective*" that looks at how a big international agreement called the Geneva Accords in 1988 affected Pakistan, especially during the Afghan conflict. Pakistan was helping Afghan fighters (Mujahedeen) during that time, and lots of Afghan people came to Pakistan as refugees. The research is about how this agreement changed things for Pakistan. It talks about how it affected Pakistan's safety, the problems caused by having so many Afghan refugees, and how it changed the politics and relationships in that part of the world. The study also looks at what happened in the long run, how it affected Pakistan's safety and the way it deals with other countries. It also checks how Pakistan helped make peace in Afghanistan. This research helps us understand how Pakistan saw this important moment in world politics and how it played a role in the Afghan conflict.

Shahi (2008) in his article “*The Geneva Accords*” argue that contrasts with the positive aspects often associated with the Geneva Accords. He states that these accords didn't effectively deal with the fundamental reasons behind the conflict in Afghanistan. Instead, he suggests that they placed a strong emphasis on national reconciliation, which is about bringing different Afghan groups together, often at the expense of addressing the country's deep-rooted social, economic, and political problems. According to Shahi, this emphasis on reconciliation over broader reforms contributed to Afghanistan's ongoing instability.

Maley & Jamal (2022) in their article “*Diplomacy of Disaster: The Afghanistan Peace Process and the Taliban Occupation of Kabul*” shifts the spotlight onto the aftermath of the Geneva Accords and the role played by the international community in shaping Afghanistan's future. Their argument centers on the notion that the Geneva Accords presented a missed opportunity to tackle Afghanistan's underlying issues and establish a stable, democratic government in the country. They contend that the international community, in particular, failed to remain actively involved in Afghanistan after the accords were signed. They suggest that this lack of continued engagement allowed powerful warlords to seize control of various regions within Afghanistan. These warlords, in turn, paved the way for the rise of the Taliban, a radical group that eventually gained control over significant parts of the country.

Koops et.al (2015) in their book “*The Oxford handbook of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*” echoes concerns about the Geneva Accords, particularly regarding their impact on human rights in Afghanistan. Gossman argues that these accords did not do enough to promote and protect human rights in the country. She points out that the emphasis placed on national reconciliation and the inclusion of all factions in the political process had unintended consequences. According to Gossman, this approach allowed individuals with questionable human rights records, including warlords and those involved in abuses, to maintain their positions of power in post-conflict Afghanistan. Gossman further argues that the international community's failure to hold these individuals accountable for their actions contributed to Afghanistan's continued instability.

Stobdan (2008) in his article “*The Afghan Conflict and Regional Security*” focus shifts to the regional implications of the Geneva Accords in the context of the Afghan conflict. He emphasizes the vital role played by these accords in shaping the dynamics among neighboring countries. He points out that the Geneva Accords created an opportunity for enhanced regional cooperation, particularly between Afghanistan and Pakistan, as well as with other neighboring nations. He further argues that this cooperation played a crucial part in bringing the conflict to an end. The research suggests that the Geneva Accords' emphasis on principles like national sovereignty and territorial integrity helped stabilize the broader region.

Begum (2017) in her book “*The Impact of the Afghan Soviet War on Pakistan*” argue that the Geneva accord was signed and the soviet withdrawal was completed in 1989. Soon after the signing of this accord, the main characters of the decade of the 1980s in Pakistan, who actually supported the US and mujahedeen during the war, became the victim of a plane crash. The elimination of General Zia-ul-Haq, General Akhtar Abdul Rahman the chief architects of

Pakistan's afghan policy and the departure of soviet troops from Afghanistan pushed Pakistan's internal regional and global politics toward another direction.

### **GENEVA ACCORD OF 1988 AND ITS AFTERMATH**

After years of negotiations during Soviet-Afghan war, finally the peace agreement was signed in Geneva on April 14, 1988 by the then foreign ministers of Afghanistan and Pakistan (Shahi, 2008). While the US secretary of state and foreign minister of USSR signed it as guarantors. The main points of this historic agreement were as follows;

1. Soviet Union should evacuate its forces from Afghanistan.
2. Pakistan and Afghanistan should not interfere in each other internal affairs.
3. Afghan Refugees would return to their homeland.
4. USA and USSR should guarantee the enforcement of this accord.
5. United Nation Organization would monitor the implementation process of this accord.

#### **Skepticism and Concerns**

**Lack of Mujahedeen Involvement:** The Mujahedeen's absence in the negotiations preceding the Geneva Accords stands as a pivotal point of contention. Their exclusion from the negotiation table, where the primary actors were the superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, along with the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan, resonated as a profound concern. This sidelining fueled skepticism within the Mujahedeen ranks, raising doubts about the adequacy of representation for their interests and demands. The absence of their direct involvement in the intricate diplomatic maneuvering left them feeling marginalized and uncertain about the outcome's alignment with their aspirations (Klass, 1987).

**Distrust of Soviet Intentions:** The Mujahedeen harbored deep-seated apprehensions regarding the true intentions of the Soviet Union. Their wariness stemmed from a profound suspicion that the Soviet withdrawal might not signify a sincere pursuit of peace in Afghanistan. Instead, they feared it could potentially pave the way for the establishment of a puppet government in Kabul, effectively perpetuating Soviet influence under a different guise. This suspicion was rooted in their historical experience and strategic analysis, leading them to question the sincerity of the Soviet Union's commitment to a lasting peace. The Mujahedeen foresaw the possibility of the conflict transforming into a new phase, one where the battleground shifted from military confrontation to political maneuvering, with the Soviet Union still exerting considerable influence behind the scenes. Thus, their skepticism regarding the implications of the Soviet withdrawal extended beyond mere military considerations to encompass broader geopolitical concerns.

**Ceasefire Implementation:** Despite the ceasefire mandated by the Geneva Accords between Afghan government forces and the Mujahedeen, the translation of this agreement into action encountered multifaceted challenges on the ground. The intricate dynamics of the conflict meant that the cessation of hostilities was often elusive, with both sides frequently accusing each other of breaching the ceasefire terms. This mutual distrust and the prevalence of grievances fueled ongoing hostilities in several regions, undermining the effectiveness of the ceasefire in achieving lasting peace. The complexities of local power dynamics, coupled with varying interpretations of

the ceasefire provisions, further complicated efforts to quell violence and establish stability. As a result, while the Geneva Accords represented a significant diplomatic milestone, their implementation faced significant hurdles, highlighting the enduring complexities of achieving peace in conflict-ridden regions.

**Lack of Enforcement:** The Mujahedeen's apprehension extended to the perceived absence of a robust enforcement mechanism within the framework of the Geneva Accords. They feared that without such a mechanism, there would be little to deter violations of the ceasefire or guarantee adherence to the terms outlined in the accords. This concern underscored their skepticism about the durability of the ceasefire and the overall effectiveness of the agreements in fostering genuine peace and stability in Afghanistan.

**Differing Interests:** The Mujahedeen were not a monolithic group but rather a collection of various factions, each with its own leaders and interests (Stroller & Levine, 1995). These factions had differing views on how to proceed after the Soviet withdrawal, leading to internal divisions and disagreements over the Geneva Accords.

**Power Struggles:** In the aftermath of the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, certain Mujahedeen leaders endeavored to assert dominance in the evolving political landscape, precipitating power struggles and fierce competition among disparate factions. This quest for supremacy within post-Soviet Afghanistan fueled internal discord and rivalries among Mujahedeen factions, each vying for influence and control. The vacuum left by the departing Soviet forces created a volatile environment where competing interests clashed, exacerbating existing tensions and complicating efforts to forge a cohesive post-conflict governance structure.

### **Mixed Reactions**

**Some Acceptance:** While there was skepticism and concern, some Mujahedeen factions did accept the Geneva Accords as a step toward ending the Soviet occupation and achieving at least partial goals of the resistance.

**Wait-and-See Approach:** Some Mujahedeen leaders adopted a "wait-and-see" approach, reserving judgment until they could assess the actual impact of the Soviet withdrawal and the subsequent developments in Afghanistan (Grau, 1996).

Understanding the interests, roles, and dynamics of these key stakeholders and participants is crucial for grasping the complexities of the negotiation process that led to the Geneva Accord of 1988. Each party had its own objectives and constraints, and the diplomatic efforts involved in bringing them together and reaching a consensus were intricate and challenging (Khan, 2007).

### **Challenges in Negotiation**

1. **Disagreements over the Future Government:** One of the most significant challenges in negotiations involving Afghanistan could revolve around the future government structure.



Different parties, including the Afghan government, Mujahedeen factions, and potentially other stakeholders, may have competing visions for how Afghanistan should be governed. These disagreements could involve issues like the form of government (e.g., democracy, Islamic state), the role of specific individuals or groups in the government, and the distribution of power (Bazai, 2008).

2. **Role of Mujahedeen Factions:** Navigating the role and influence of Mujahedeen factions in post-conflict Afghanistan proved to be a delicate and intricate task. Various factions held divergent aspirations, with some seeking substantial political power or territorial control, while others advocated for disarmament and demobilization. This diversity of interests and objectives often led to contentious negotiations and power struggles within the nascent political landscape. Balancing the demands and ambitions of these factions with the overarching objective of establishing a cohesive and stable government posed a formidable challenge, requiring nuanced diplomacy and strategic compromise.
3. **Security Concerns:** Negotiations conducted within conflict zones are invariably fraught with security concerns that demand careful attention. Safeguarding the well-being of negotiators, enforcing ceasefire agreements, and mitigating the influence of spoilers-groups or individuals intent on sabotaging the peace process-present formidable challenges. Balancing the imperative of advancing dialogue with the imperative of ensuring security requires a delicate equilibrium, often necessitating the deployment of robust security measures and the cultivation of trust among all stakeholders. The intricate interplay between security considerations and diplomatic negotiations underscores the complexities inherent in resolving conflicts and fostering sustainable peace.
4. **Humanitarian Concerns:** In conflict zones, there may be pressing humanitarian issues, including the need for access to basic services, the protection of civilians, and the delivery of humanitarian aid. Negotiations may involve discussions on how to address these urgent needs.

### Compromises Made

1. **Power-Sharing Agreements:** To address disagreements over the future government, parties may need to make compromises through power-sharing agreements. This could involve the inclusion of various factions in the government, proportional representation, or rotating leadership roles (Maley & Schmeidl, 2015).
2. **Amnesty and Reconciliation:** Compromises might include provisions for amnesty or reconciliation processes for former combatants, allowing them to participate in the political process without fear of prosecution.
3. **Disarmament and Demobilization:** To address concerns about the role of armed factions, compromises may be made through disarmament and demobilization programs, where fighters are offered incentives to lay down their arms and reintegrate into civilian life.

4. **Security Guarantees:** Parties may agree on security guarantees to build trust and ensure the safety of key individuals involved in negotiations and the broader population.
5. **Transitional Arrangements:** Transitional governments or governance arrangements may be established as a compromise to provide stability while more permanent solutions are worked out.
6. **International Mediation:** In situations with deeply entrenched disputes, international mediators or facilitators may play a crucial role in helping parties find common ground and make necessary compromises.

## **IMPACT ON AFGHAN CIVIL SOCIETY**

### **Civil war between various Mujahideen Factions**

Although Geneva accord provided a safe exit to USSR from Afghanistan but the core issue of governance was not resolved. Civil war started between the incumbent President Dr. Najibullah and the Mujahideen factions. After the disintegration of former USSR in 1991, PDPA government lost its economic support base, thus falling prey to the warring Mujahideen factions. Dr. Najibullah stepped down from the throne of Kabul in March 1992 (Jalal, 2021). Kabul became a bone of contention between the forces of Abdur Rashid Dostam, Ahmad Shah Masaud, Gulbadeen Hikmatyar and the rest of Mujahideen factions. Even Peshawar and Makka Accords between the various groups could not stop the bloodshed in Afghanistan. Burhanuddin Rabbani of Jamiat Islami became the president of Afghanistan during this period until the arrival of Taliban in 1996.

### **Emergence of Taliban**

The civil war created a disorder in Afghan society. The war torn country and its poor inhabitants were left at the mercy of brutal warlords. A new religious group comprising mostly of the Madrassa students “Taliban” emerged from Kandahar under the leadership of Mullah Omar. They took control of Kabul in September 1996 (Maley, & Jamal, 2022). The northern alliance under Dostam and Masaud were defending their areas in northern Afghanistan. As most of the UNO member states did not recognize the government of Taliban as legitimate, Burhanuddin Rabbani represented Afghanistan in the UNO during that period (Sedra & Goodhand, 2006). Taliban remained isolated during their 5 years rule due to their extremist rules and regulations. Especially their treatment towards women was not acceptable to the civilized world. Here again a question arises that “Why did USA left their blue-eyed Mujahideen factions in disarray? Geneva accord also failed to resolve the issue of poor Afghan Refugees.

### **9/11 2001 and fall of Taliban**

USA fixed the responsibility of 9/11 2001 attack on world trade center in New York on Al-Qaida network. Osama bin Ladin the supreme leader of Al-Qaida network were residing in Afghanistan. The USA demand of handing over Osama bin Ladin was turned down by Mullah

Omar thus allowing them to invade Afghanistan. USA with the help of NATO forces and northern alliance of Dostam within Afghanistan attacked the government of Taliban and took control of Kabul (Ahsan, 2002). Once again Afghanistan became a battlefield between the big powers. The geo-strategic interests of great powers left the poor and innocent afghan society in mayhem.

### **IMPACT OF GENEVA ACCORD ON PAKISTAN**

**Proxy Warfare and Afghan Factions:** Pakistan had played a central role in supporting various Afghan Mujahedeen factions during the Soviet-Afghan War. With the Geneva Accord's signing and the Soviet withdrawal, Pakistan faced the challenge of dealing with the different factions it had supported. The accord required Pakistan to balance its relationships with these factions while maintaining regional stability. This unresolved issue became a primary concern of Zia-ul-Haq for his disagreement on Geneva accord (Begum, 2017).

**Desire for a Friendly Government in Kabul:** Pakistan sought to ensure that the post-agreement Afghan government was sympathetic to its interests. It aimed to prevent Afghanistan from aligning with its arch-rival, India. This gave Pakistan a significant stake in influencing the composition and policies of the new Afghan government. The victorious Afghan Mujahedeen factions were not ready to accept the government of Dr. Najeebullah. They started civil war immediately after the soviet withdrawal.

**Refugee Crisis:** The withdrawal of Soviet forces triggered a massive influx of Afghan refugees into Pakistan. This humanitarian crisis had far-reaching social, economic, and security implications for Pakistan (Barfield & Nojumi, 2010). Managing this refugee population and addressing its impact on Pakistan's stability were major challenges. The USA left Afghanistan and Pakistan in a mess. Refugees were unwilling to go back to their war-torn country thus creating a socio-economic crisis in civil society of Pakistan.

### **Differences between Gen. Zia ul Haq and Muhammad Khan Junejo**

The Geneva Accords of 1988 were a set of agreements aimed at ending the Soviet-Afghan War. While General Zia ul Haq and Muhammad Khan Junejo both played roles in the Pakistani government during this period, they had differences in their approach and stance toward these accords. As the President of Pakistan and the de-facto ruler of the country during the 1980s, Zia-ul-Haq had a significant role in the negotiations leading up to the Geneva Accords (Saikal & Maley, 1989). He was one of the key players in these negotiations, representing Pakistan's interests. Muhammad Khan Junejo was the Prime Minister of Pakistan during Zia's regime. While he held a prominent position, his role in the negotiations was more limited compared to Zia. The President of Pakistan was the primary decision-maker in foreign policy, particularly regarding Afghanistan.

General Zia-ul-Haq was generally supportive of the framework for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. The withdrawal of Soviet troops was a key objective for Pakistan, as it would remove a major source of regional instability and conflict. His stance on the Geneva

accord was more pragmatic. During the negotiation process he repeatedly asked to resolve three basic issues of the Afghans (Coll, 2004).

1. The issue of future government in Afghanistan.
2. The concerns of different Mujahideen factions, as they wanted due share in the government of Afghanistan.
3. The future of Afghan Refugees. As most of them were residing in Pakistan.

These issues were not fully addressed in the Geneva accord, so he warned the Prime Minister and his cabinet members to refuse the signature ceremony. On the other hand the USA diplomatic mission convinced Mr. Junejo to sign the agreement and committed to support his government. After signing the Geneva accord, differences between Zia-ul-Haq and Junejo deepened and it ended with dissolution of the Parliament on May 29, 1988 (Aziz, 2016).

### **Shaping Post-Accord Afghanistan:**

This section examines the role of international diplomacy in shaping the future of Afghanistan after the signing of the Geneva Accord in 1988. It highlights how diplomatic efforts by various international actors contributed to the reconstruction and stabilization of Afghanistan in the post-conflict period:

**Reconstruction and Development:** Following the Geneva Accord, a concerted international effort was mobilized to facilitate the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan. This comprehensive endeavor encompassed significant investments in infrastructure, education, healthcare, and various other essential services vital for the country's recovery. Diplomatic channels played a pivotal role in garnering financial assistance from donor countries and international organizations, underscoring the importance of collaborative efforts in addressing the complex challenges facing post-conflict societies. The commitment to reconstruction and development reflected a collective recognition of the imperative to rebuild Afghanistan's social and economic fabric, laying the groundwork for long-term stability and prosperity.

**Political Transition:** Diplomatic negotiations took center stage in guiding Afghanistan's political transformation post-accord. Serving as a roadmap for forming a transitional government and laying the groundwork for a sustainable political resolution, the accord facilitated intricate diplomatic maneuvers. Key international bodies, particularly the United Nations, played a crucial role in brokering dialogue among diverse Afghan factions, adeptly navigating the intricacies of factional interests and aspirations. Through meticulous negotiation and diplomatic mediation, an interim government began to materialize, marking a pivotal stride towards stabilizing Afghanistan's volatile political terrain and cultivating a governance framework that embraces inclusivity. (Savranskaya & Blanton, 2020).

**Security and Stabilization:** International diplomacy extended its purview to encompass tackling the multifaceted security challenges confronting Afghanistan. Through diplomatic

negotiations and collaborative efforts, the groundwork was laid for the deployment of international peacekeeping forces, exemplified by the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA). These peacekeeping forces played a pivotal role in upholding security and stability throughout the transitional phase, working in tandem with local authorities to mitigate potential security threats and facilitate the smooth transition towards a more secure and stable Afghanistan.

### **The Role of the United Nations**

This section explores the pivotal role played by the United Nations in international diplomacy surrounding the Geneva Accord and its broader implications for global diplomacy:

**Neutral Mediation:** The United Nations assumed a pivotal role as a neutral mediator and facilitator in navigating the complexities of the Afghan conflict. Leveraging its impartial stance, the UN earned the trust of conflicting parties, enabling it to skillfully navigate negotiations and foster meaningful dialogue. Its status as an unbiased arbiter facilitated constructive engagement among stakeholders, paving the way for diplomatic breakthroughs and promoting the prospects of lasting peace in Afghanistan.

**Peacekeeping and Stabilization:** The UN's role extended beyond diplomacy to include peacekeeping and stabilization efforts in Afghanistan. UN peacekeeping missions, such as UNAMA, played a crucial role in maintaining security and supporting the implementation of the Geneva Accord (Stobdan, 2008).

**Global Diplomacy:** The United Nations' active engagement in the Afghan conflict underscores the organization's significant role in global diplomacy and conflict resolution efforts. It serves as a compelling example of how international institutions can effectively contribute to fostering peace and stability in regions grappling with protracted conflicts. By leveraging its diplomatic prowess and multilateral framework, the UN demonstrates its capacity to facilitate dialogue, broker agreements, and coordinate international efforts aimed at resolving complex conflicts and promoting sustainable peace-building initiatives.

**Lessons for International Diplomacy:** The UN's pivotal role in the Geneva Accord offers a rich case study for scholars and practitioners of international relations and diplomacy. It provides invaluable insights into the intricacies of navigating diplomatic negotiations amidst complex conflicts and achieving meaningful agreements. By examining the UN's involvement in the accord, students can gain a deeper understanding of the challenges and triumphs inherent in international diplomacy, as well as the strategies employed to foster post-conflict recovery and stability in conflict-affected regions.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Geneva Accord of 1988 stands as a seminal moment in the annals of diplomatic history, offering a compelling case study in the efficacy of international diplomacy in resolving long-standing regional conflicts. This research has undertaken a comprehensive examination of

the accord and its aftermath, uncovering a tapestry of insights and lessons that reverberate through time.

The historical significance of the Geneva Accord cannot be overstated. In the crucible of the Cold War, this diplomatic achievement demonstrated that even in the face of entrenched ideological divisions and prolonged conflicts, diplomacy could pave the path to peace. It illuminated the power of dialogue and negotiation in surmounting seemingly insurmountable obstacles, an enduring testament to the indomitable spirit of diplomacy.

Throughout our journey, we explored the complex interplay of regional dynamics. Neighboring states, with their divergent interests and strategic calculations, played a pivotal role in shaping the outcome of the Afghan conflict. This underscores the paramount importance of understanding and engaging with regional stakeholders in conflict resolution endeavors.

Crucially, the role of international institutions, epitomized by the United Nations, came to the fore. These institutions showcased their potential as impartial mediators and stabilizers in post-conflict scenarios. The United Nations, in particular, provided a model for effective international mediation and post-conflict oversight that continues to resonate in contemporary diplomacy.

In the aftermath of the accord, we witnessed the myriad challenges inherent in post-conflict scenarios i.e. reconstruction, security stabilization, and political transition. The Geneva Accord underscored the need for meticulous post-conflict planning and international cooperation to navigate the treacherous waters of post-war recovery.

The lessons drawn from the Geneva Accord's legacy are profound and enduring. Diplomacy remains a vital tool in resolving even the most protracted conflicts, emphasizing the need for relentless diplomatic engagement and negotiation. Inclusivity and representation in peace talks enhance the legitimacy of agreements, and international mediation, rooted in impartiality, is a linchpin of successful diplomacy.

As we conclude this study, we are reminded that the lessons learned from the Geneva Accord are not mere relics of the past. They are guiding beacons in an era characterized by complex regional conflicts. By applying the insights gleaned from the Geneva Accord, we pave the way for a more peaceful and stable world, where diplomatic solutions triumph over discord, and where hope eclipses the shadows of strife.

The legacy of the Geneva Accord beckons us to navigate the diplomatic challenges of today and tomorrow with wisdom, persistence, and unwavering commitment to the transformative power of diplomacy. In doing so, we honor the accord's enduring legacy and its resonance in the ever-evolving tapestry of global diplomacy. It is evident that the lessons learned from the Geneva Accord are not confined to the pages of history but remain relevant today. In an era marked by complex regional conflicts, the Geneva Accord reminds us that diplomatic efforts, informed by inclusivity, international mediation, and post-conflict planning, can guide us toward a more peaceful and stable world.

Although it was a landmark achievement to end the Soviet-Afghan war but it left profound impacts on the Social and Political structures of both the Afghanistan and Pakistani Societies. The issue of a stable government in Afghanistan was not resolved and thus led to a never ended civil war. Afghan refugees were left in mayhem, whether to go back to their war-torn homeland or live a cumbersome life in Pakistan. Same was the case with Pakistan, the influx of afghan refugees created many socio-economic issues; especially after the 9/11 2001 event, Pakistan paid a heavy price of human and capital losses due to cross-border insurgencies. Being guarantors of the accord it was the responsibility of both the USA and USSR to thoroughly monitor and resolve these issues.

## REFERENCES

- Ahsan, S. J. (2002). Re-emergence of Afghanistan after Bonn Conference. *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 55(1/2), pp. 55-101. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41404008>
- Aziz, S. (2016). A Leaf from History: Junejo gets through the Geneva Accord. Dawn. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1234661>
- Barfield, T. & Nojumi, N. (2010). Bringing More Effective Governance to Afghanistan: 10 Pathways to Stability. *Middle East Policy*, Vol., xvii (iv). [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thomas-Barfield/publication/227998289\\_Bringing\\_More\\_Effective\\_Governance\\_to\\_Afghanistan\\_10\\_Pathways\\_to\\_Stability/links/59e121e4a6fdcc7154d368e8/Bringing-More-Effective-Governance-to-Afghanistan-10-Pathways-to-Stability.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thomas-Barfield/publication/227998289_Bringing_More_Effective_Governance_to_Afghanistan_10_Pathways_to_Stability/links/59e121e4a6fdcc7154d368e8/Bringing-More-Effective-Governance-to-Afghanistan-10-Pathways-to-Stability.pdf)
- Bazai, A. M. (2008). *An Assessment of Pak-Afghan Relations, Since 1947 Upto 2001*. A Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the Department of International Relations, University of Balochistan. <https://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/bitstream/123456789/877/1/1899S.pdf>
- Begum, I. (2017). *The Impact of the Afghan Soviet War on Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Coll, S. (2004 ). *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to september 10, 2001*. The Penguin Press: New York, USA.
- Goodson, L. P. (2011). *Afghanistan's Endless War: State Failure, Regional Politics and the rise of Taliban*. University of Washington Press, USA.
- Grau, I. W. (1996). *The Bear Went Over the Mountain.Soviet Combat Tactics in Afghanistan*. National Defence University Press.Washington DC, USA.
- Jalal, S. U. (2021). Peeking into Afghan's history: A study from 1988 to 2010. *Global Political Review*, VI(1). <https://doi.org/10.31703/gpr>.
- Khan, I. A. (2007). Understanding Pakistan's Pro-Taliban Afghan Policy. *Pakistan Horizon* 60(2), 141-157. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41500068>

- Koops, J A, Macqueen N, Tardy T & William P (2015). *The Oxford Handbook of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*. Oxford University Press, United Kingdom. <https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-03459734/document>
- Klass, R. (1987). *Afghanistan: The Accords*. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/fora66&div=65&id=&page>.
- Maley, W. & Jamal, A.S. (2022). Diplomacy of Disaster: The Afghanistan ‘Peace Process’ and the Taliban Occupation of Kabul. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, . Vol, 17(1) pp. 32-63. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-bja10089>
- Maley, W. & Schmeidl, S. (2015). *Reconstructing Afghanistan: Civil-Military Experiences in Comparative Perspective*. Routledge, London and New York. <https://books.google.com.pk/>
- Saikal, A. & Maley, W. (1989). *The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan*. Cambridge University Press. New York, USA.
- Savranskaya, S. & Blanton, T. (2020). *Gorbachev and Reagan: The Last Super Power Summits. Conversations that ended the cold war*. Central European University Press.
- Stoller, R.J. & Levine, I. S. (1995). *The Search for Peace in Afghanistan*. [https://www.google.com.pk/books/edition/The\\_Search\\_for\\_Peace\\_in\\_Afghanistan/HFS\\_DjwEACAAJ?hl=en](https://www.google.com.pk/books/edition/The_Search_for_Peace_in_Afghanistan/HFS_DjwEACAAJ?hl=en)
- Stobdan, P. (2008). The Afghan Conflict and Regional Security. *Strategic Analysis*. Vol. 23 (5), pp. 719-747. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09700169908455080>
- Sarwar, A. (1999). *The Geneva Accords on Afghanistan: Pakistan's Perspective*. Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the University of Peshawar.
- Sedra, M. & Goodhand, J. (2006). *Bargains for Peace? Aid Conditionalities and Reconstruction in Afghanistan*. Clingendael: Netherlands Institute of International Relations. <https://www.clingendael.org/>
- Shahi, A. (2008). The Geneva Accords. *Pakistan Horizon*. Vol, 41(3) pp. 23-49. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41393867>