

In the Name of God, the Most Merciful, the Most Kind



December 14, 2017

## How to Deal with Crimes?

Crimes are lethal for a society as they can disturb the law and order situation and can bring huge losses to human beings in different ways. In fact, crimes are detrimental for both the criminal and the victims. The criminals, who get involved in crimes, may generate temporary benefits for themselves but in the long-run they can face different sorts of trouble. Among them punishment by the law and order system is the most dominant one. Since crimes can disrupt social settings, every society wants to know why they are committed. Some people think that human beings are determined by their social settings, while others suggest that people commit crimes because of their mentality. Though social psychology plays a role in choosing the way to crimes, it should be kept in consideration that human social psychology is developed within a society and there are impressions of social circumstances. There is a saying that a society prepares crimes and criminals commit them. This saying, in reality, describes the role of society in the crimes. But, the choice of an individual may also play a role.

However, the concept is not that simple and there are many complications in understanding the concept. Therefore, it is also important to note that the number and types of choices available for a social animal is highly dependent on the status of the individual as well. Mostly, the people who are economically weak, they have the choices between bad and worse; while the people who belong to the rich strata of the society, they have better choices to make but it does not suggest that there is no crime committed by them. There are many crimes committed by them; unfortunately, many of them go unnoticed or they are ignored completely or the system is not able to make them accountable for them.

Whatever may be the reason of the crimes, their effects are very disturbing and have the capacity to bring serious disturbances in the society; therefore, measures must be there to curb them. There are two strategies to control the crime. The first one is the short-term strategy and the other one is the long-term strategy. The short-term strategy is basically carried out by the law-enforcement system in the society that works through the institutions of courts and police.

Law-enforcement system within a society basically works on the principle of identifying the criminals, bringing them to the justice and punishing them. Every society in this regard has a criminal law that defines and explains the crimes, the criminals and the practices and procedures regarding bringing the culprits to the justice. The societies that have strong courts, police and detentions, they are able to control the crimes to a certain extent. However, as mentioned above this could prove to be only short term.

The countries with weaker law-enforcements systems suffer greatly in providing justice to the alleged criminals. Such societies also suffer from lack of providence of timely justice. There are many cases that take many years in courts and yet remain undecided. The people who are influenced by such cases experience a complete change in their lives, which is from bad to worse and by the time they reach to justice, their lives are already destroyed. It has been also observed that the cases that belong to influential people are pursued immediately while the ones that involve the ordinary people are kept in files and they never reach to the courts. And then there are detention centers that, in fact, do not transform the criminals into useful citizens, which is the basic philosophy of them.

They, on the other hand, turn them into bigger criminals and if unfortunately, which mostly happens, there is a person who has been punished wrongfully; such a person becomes a true criminal after leaving the detention center. Unluckily, Afghanistan is one of the same types of countries that suffer from weak law-enforcement system. Though there has been much development in this regard, serious concerns still prevail and raise questions about the system. The police force in Afghanistan is still in the preliminary stages and it really requires years of attention and support to reach to a truly professional stage. There are many areas in the country where the police do have enough penetration and where they cannot reach to crimes and criminals. Then there are many areas wherein the people still go to traditional courts, which are dominated by religious and tribal leaders instead of going to the courts that are established by the government.

However, the law-enforcement system can provide short-term solution to the crimes. If a society is really interested in controlling them there should be a long-term strategy that must deal with the basic reasons of the crime and try to nip the evil in the bud. There should be efforts to work on efficient administration, better economic condition, political stability, good governance, providence of basic human rights and control of corruption. Justice should reach to all the people of the society alike and the citizens must not feel alienated from the society. Moreover, there should not be discrimination as far as practical implementation of the criminal law is considered. Law should not serve the rich alone as is happening in many societies of the world; rather all should be treated equally in this regard.



## ISIL Should Not be Downplayed in Afghanistan

By Hujjatullah Zia

The self-styled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has filled the air with fear as reports say that the ISIL fighters gained firm foothold in the country after losing ground in Iraq and Syria. The ISIL is likely to recruit the youths in Afghanistan through spreading its propaganda and foisting their radical mindsets upon individuals in tribal belts and remote areas. There are many tribal areas prone to radical mentalities and militancy.

A number of ISIL's high-ranking individuals are said to enter Afghan soil to organize systematic attacks against Afghan government and extend the realm of its militancy in more areas and districts. The ISIL group intends to recruit and train Afghan youths and children so as to use them as war shield. Needless to say, the children coming from poor and radical backgrounds will easily succumb to the bogus claims of the ISIL fighters.

It is believed that spreading propaganda has been one of the highly effective strategy of the ISIL group in recruiting people, including women, from around the world. With its surface, the ISIL group launched spreading propaganda online and attracted many people from eastern and western world. The ISIL's propaganda was strongly painted with the brush of religion and sanctity.

The group's black flag which carried the sacred term "There is no god but Allah, and Muhammad (PBUH) is the Prophet of Allah" misled many individuals. Hence, it still seeks to apply the same strategy in Afghanistan so as to recruit people. The question is that will people fall for the bogus claim of the ISIL fighters which are widely known and condemned for spilling the blood of innocent individuals?

In tribal areas of Afghanistan, mainly where the Taliban dominated for years and applied their radical Sharia, people have been radicalized to some extent and will simply fall for a claim that is tinged with Islamic Sharia without realizing the true fact. For instance, the Taliban have been very successful in recruiting people from tribal belts.

They imposed their warped minds on youths and children in seminaries and gained the trust of locals to send their children to their seminaries. This way, the Taliban did not only recruit youths but also changed the mindset of locals through wrong preaches. Even the Taliban changed the tradition of people. So, now a number of areas are left at the mercy of radicalism and people will succumb to ISIL's propaganda.

It is believed that there is a splinter group of the Taliban that does not practice upon the orders of Mullah Omar's sec-

ond successor Mullah Haibatullah. This faction might have pledged allegiance to the ISIL fighters in Afghanistan. That is to say, there are mixed reports about the relation between ISIL and the Taliban. On the one hand, it is said that the two factions exchange sporadic, bloody battles, but on the other hand, it is reported that the Taliban allied with ISIL. However, this suggests the fact that the Taliban's splinter group has pledged loyalty to the ISIL fighters; whereas the main group is in conflict with it.

To one's unmitigated chagrin, the ISIL fighters gained a sudden and swift foothold in Afghanistan. That is to say, the trace of ISIL was found sooner than expected. The question is that have the ISIL fighters, who were mostly unfamiliar with Afghanistan's geo-politics, gained a swift foothold in the country without being supported by the Taliban? The answer is negative. The primary reports about the presence of ISIL in Afghanistan said that a number of the Taliban pledged loyalty to Al-Baghdadi's caliphate and changed their white flag into black one. After the revelation of Mullah Omar's death and appointment of Mullah Akhtar Mansour as his successor, which was followed by a strong disagreement, scores of members of the Taliban allied themselves with the ISIL fighters. This issue paved the ground for the presence of ISIL in the country.

Subsequently, the ISIL fighters gained firm foothold and ushered in their terrorist activities. Aiming to foment sectarian violence, the ISIL fighters and loyalists targeted ethnic minority groups, mosques, and mourning proceedings. They sought to fuel sectarian tension in Afghanistan so as to gain the support of a certain ethnic group and mobilize it against the others, which was proved abortive.

However, the second tactic is to spread propaganda and poison the minds of youths that will be perilous. Despite losing ground in Iraq and Syria, the ISIL faction is able to carry out large-scale attacks in the country and has changed into a serious threat to national security.

To defeat the ISIL fighters, the state needs to beware people of its propaganda and urge Ulema Council and all religious scholars to preach against the radical and anti-Islamic practices of this group.

If the clergy campaign against ISIL and condemn its activities, it will not be able to extend its realm in the country. It is the responsibility of both states and nation, including religious scholars, to campaign against this terrorist group so as to safeguard the national security.

Hujjatullah Zia is the permanent writer of the Daily Outlook Afghanistan. He can be reached at [zia\\_hujjat@yahoo.com](mailto:zia_hujjat@yahoo.com)

## Trump's Jerusalem Rationale and its Consequences

By Richard N. Haass

It is 50 years since the Six-Day War – the June 1967 conflict that, as much as any other event, continues to define the Israeli-Palestinian impasse. After the fighting was over, Israel controlled all of the West Bank, Gaza, and Jerusalem, in addition to the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights.

Back then, the world saw this military outcome as temporary. United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, the backdrop to what was to become a diplomatic solution to the problem of the stateless Palestinians, was adopted some five months after the war ended. But, as is often the case, what began as temporary has lasted.

This is the context in which President Donald Trump recently declared that the United States recognized Jerusalem to be Israel's capital. Trump stated that the US was not taking a position on the final status of Jerusalem, including "the specific boundaries of the Israeli sovereignty" there. He made clear that the US would support a two-state solution if agreed to by both sides. And he chose not to begin actually moving the US embassy from Tel Aviv, even though he could have simply relabeled what is now the US consulate in Jerusalem.

The attempt to change US policy while arguing that little had changed did not persuade many. Most Israelis were pleased with the new US stance, and most in the Arab world and beyond were incensed.

Just why Trump chose this moment to make this gesture is a matter of conjecture. The president suggested it was simply recognition of reality and that his predecessors' policy failure to do so had failed to yield any diplomatic benefits. This is true, although the reason diplomacy failed over the decades had nothing to do with US policy toward Jerusalem, and everything to do with divisions among Israelis and Palestinians and the gaps between the two sides.

Others have attributed the US announcement to American domestic politics, a conclusion supported by the unilateral US statement's failure to demand anything of Israel (for example, to restrain settlement construction) or offer anything to the Palestinians (say, supporting their claim to Jerusalem). Although the decision has led to some violence, it looks more like an opportunity lost than a crisis created.

What made this statement not just controversial but potentially counterproductive is that the Trump administration has spent a good part of its first year putting together a plan to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This announcement could well weaken that plan's already limited prospects.

What the Trump administration seems to have in mind is to give outsiders, and Saudi Arabia in particular, a central role in peacemaking. Informing this approach is the view that

Saudi Arabia and other Arab governments are more concerned with the perceived threat from Iran than with anything to do with Israel. As a result, it is assumed that they are prepared to put aside their long-standing hostility toward Israel, a country that largely shares their view of Iran.

Progress on the Israeli-Palestinian issue would create a political context in the Arab world that would allow them to do just this. The hope in the Trump administration is that the Saudis will use their financial resources to persuade the Palestinians to agree to make peace with Israel on terms Israel will accept.

The problem is that the only plan to which this Israeli government is likely to agree will offer the Palestinians far less than they have historically demanded. If so, the Palestinian leaders themselves may well determine it is safer to say no than to sign on to a plan sure to disappoint many of their own people and leave them vulnerable to Hamas and other radical groups.

The Saudis, too, may be reluctant to be associated with a plan that many will deem a sellout. The top priority for the new Saudi leadership under Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman is to consolidate power, which the prince is doing by associating himself with an effort to attack corruption in the Kingdom and by pursuing a nationalist, anti-Iranian foreign policy. But neither tactic is going entirely according to plan. The anti-corruption effort, while so far popular, risks being tarnished by selective prosecution of offenders (which suggests that it is more about power than reform) and reports about the crown prince's own lifestyle. And the anti-Iran efforts have become inseparable from what has become an unpopular war in Yemen and diplomatic embarrassments in Lebanon and Qatar. Meanwhile, ambitious plans to reform the country are proving easier to design than to implement, and are sure to alienate more conservative elements.

The problem for Trump and Jared Kushner, his son-in-law who leads US policy in this area, is that the Saudis are likely to prove much less of a diplomatic partner than the White House had counted on. If the new crown prince is worried about his domestic political standing, he will be reluctant to stand shoulder to shoulder with an American president seen as too close to an Israel that is unwilling to satisfy even minimal Palestinian requirements for statehood. All of which brings us back to Jerusalem. Trump argued that recognizing the city as Israel's capital was "a long overdue step to advance the peace process and the work towards a lasting agreement." More and more it appears that Trump's move will have just the opposite effect. (Courtesy Project Syndicate)

Richard N. Haass is President of the Council on Foreign Relations and the author of *A World in Disarray*.

Chairman / Editor-in-Chief: Moh. Reza Huwaida

Vice-Chairman: Kazim Ali Gulzari

Email: [outlookafghanistan@gmail.com](mailto:outlookafghanistan@gmail.com)

Phone: 0093 (799) 005019/777-005019

[www.outlookafghanistan.net](http://www.outlookafghanistan.net)

The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors and do not reflect the views or opinions of the Daily Outlook Afghanistan.