

# Comparison of Unitary Vs. Federal Political Systems (with an Emphasis on the Appropriateness of Federal Political System and Its Potential Advantages for Afghanistan)

Mohammad Yaseen Jaras

Lecturer in Nokhbagan Institute of Higher Education, Afghanistan

DOI: [10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i09.010](https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i09.010)

## Abstract:

Unitary political systems usually face the problems of power distribution and participation of minority groups in power in third world societies. In Afghanistan, this has caused most of the ethnic groups living in this country, none of which constitute the absolute majority, to suffer and be dissatisfied with the unequal presence in power. The government's lack of attention to the rights of minorities and balanced development cause instability in this country. Therefore, the question that arises is which type of system (unitary or Federal) is suitable for Afghanistan? The existence of a unitary system in the pluralistic society of Afghanistan during the past two and a half centuries has not been the answer to the requirements of the Afghan society; therefore, we are examining the Federal model to create a stable government in Afghanistan. The main purpose of this research is to compare the unitary system with the Federal one and also to address why the Federal model is effective for Afghanistan. The current research used the descriptive method and library data.

**Keywords:** Federal Political System, Unitary system, Nationalism, Afghanistan

## Literature Review

Although Afghanistan has experienced several regimes and political systems and suffered endless wars, it has not yet been able to find a political system that suits the needs of its society. Although Afghanistan has been suffering from unequal distribution of power and ethnic conflicts for a long time, except for a few studies on the concept of federalism and presidential system, no other serious research has been done on comparing the unitary system vs federalism and efficiency of federalism in Afghanistan. "Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History" written by Thomas Barfield (2010) and the book "The Future of Afghanistan: A New Era of International Engagement" by K. J. B. Smith (2011) are among the studies that examine the general situation of Afghanistan and touched the subject of Federal political system in Afghanistan.

Another essay at the name of "The Challenge of Building a Democratic Political System in Afghanistan" by R. J. R. McGregor also discussed the Federal system for Afghanistan and analyzes the complexities of establishing a federal political structure within Afghanistan's unique socio-political context. But in this essay the writer didn't focused enough on Afghanistan and all sides of federal political system in Afghanistan.

Furthermore, recent research indicates that federalism can be a powerful tool for resolving conflicts. According to Graham and Heller (2016), federal systems make it easier for conflicting interests to negotiate and compromise, which lowers the risk of violence and instability. This is especially important in Afghanistan, where power conflicts and past disputes frequently end in violence.

To sum up, research continuously emphasizes the benefits of federalism as a mechanism for promoting democracy and preventing tyranny in Afghanistan.

## Introduction

Since 1880s, Afghanistan has always been governed in the framework of a unitary and most of the time autocratic system. Despite having abundant natural and human resources, this country has not yet been able to achieve economic, cultural and political development. Of course, there are many factors that can cause this country's failure in progress and stability, but one of the most important and significant factors is the unitary political system in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is a multi-ethnic country where more than fifty different ethnic groups live. In Afghanistan, there are still no accurate statistics on the population of these different groups and it is hard to say with certainty which one of these ethnic groups constitutes the majority in Afghanistan. But it can be written that Pashtun, Tajik, Hazara and Uzbek are the four major ethnic groups of Afghanistan. In the past, with the exception of Habibullah Kalakani and Burhandin Rabbani, all other Afghan leaders belonged to the Pashtun people. During their leadership period, there was no way for the participation of leaders of other ethnic groups in the unitary system. Most of these rulers were influenced by their own morals, family and tribal culture, and not only did they act unfairly in the distribution of resources, but also oppressed other ethnic groups as well. This behavior of the Pashtun rulers caused dissatisfaction of the Afghan people and led to internal wars and even the military invasion of powerful countries like Soviet Union and Great

Britain. As an example, Dawood Khan's leadership can be taken as an example here. Dawood Khan, with his unbalanced policies and not giving permission for political activity to other parties, paved the ground for coups and political instability in the country in seventies decade. One of the acute problems and issues of many countries, especially third world countries, is how to distribute power and participation in governance. In countries that are nationally and culturally integrated, such problems are less visible and conflicts are more between political parties, groups and personalities. But on the contrary, in multi-national and multi-ethnic countries, this problem exists on a larger level, and it is the struggle over power, the lack of participation of ethnic groups, participatory development, the lack of attention to the rights of minorities, the lack of attention to balanced development, etc. which leads to political instability and dissatisfaction of minorities of countries. Afghanistan is not an exception to this and is considered to be one of these countries. As a multi-ethnic-national country, it has been suffering from this problem for years. This country has many challenges and crises, the centralization of power and the abuse of it by the rulers have created many problems. Afghanistan is a multi-ethnic country that has witnessed many tragic political events since its inception. From internal conflicts between the king's sons to the aggression of superpower countries such as England, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America. Despite having natural and human resources and geographical location (especially political and economic), Afghanistan country has not been able to organize itself as a nation-state and achieve economic, social and political development. Of course, various factors have played a role in this field, the most important of which is the unitary political system and nationalist policies of the government. The unitary political structure has made the rulers of Afghanistan always under the influence of the culture arising from the ethnic background. Therefore, in this article, we are going to focus on unitary political system, which has caused Afghanistan to not achieve political stability, and we will examine the Federal model.

### **Theoretical Framework what is the Political System?**

Political system is one of the hot topics in political science, which recently most political science theorists have addressed its concept and provided various definitions of it. In general, it can be said that the political system is a new approach to understanding political phenomena that includes not only official institutions and organization but also all political activities in society. People like Easton and Max Weber have played a significant role in developing the concept of political system and provided comprehensive definitions of political system. According to Easton, political system means: a system of action and reaction in any society by which binding or authoritative distributions are created and implemented.

On the other hand, Max Weber defines the political system as follows (a human society that claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a certain territory). (Alem, 1994, p. 151) The political system is divided into the following two categories based on the division of power.

#### **1. Unitary Political System**

This type of system is called a government that has a single political centrality and

handles all the affairs of the country in an integrated manner. (Manikkalingam, 2003, p. 5) J.W Garner, an American theorist states that a unitary form of government is where the whole power of the government is conferred by the Constitution upon one single, central order. (Padhye, 2023, p. 181) In this type of government, all elements (organizations, population, territory) are governed by legal persons and a single constitution. As the name of this type of system suggests, the general government system is simple and local administrations do not have much authority. Local governments only have the powers assigned to them by the central government and act mostly as intermediaries between citizens and the central government. (Hafeznia & Allahverdizadeh, 2010, p. 15) Rosenblum: In such countries, government units (province, city, etc.) have no sovereignty and play the role of intermediaries between citizens and the central government, and all sovereignty is exercised by the central government. (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk, & Clerkin, p. 7) In this type of system, the central government is the highest authority of a country and can carry out or dissolve the divisions of the country, Political centrality and having a centralistic system is one of the inherent characteristics of all unitary governments, and this structure was created to carry out the country's administrative affairs as coherently as possible. therefore, most countries have a unitary system, such as France, Iran, Afghanistan, and other countries. But recently, most of the developed countries that have started decentralize their government system and they are trying to make local governments more active in order to get rid of the influence of the central government. Such as Latin American countries and former soviet bloc countries. (Arzaghi & Henderson, 2002, p. 1)

### **Disadvantages of Unitary System**

- A- Central government out of touch with local concerns:** In a unitary government system, decisions are taken from the center and the government does not have the necessary awareness and understanding of the people's needs and wants. Therefore, the leaders may take all the decisions instead of responding to the public needs in the axis of the personal interests. (Zahrin & Mohamed, 2022, p. 129)
- B- Abuse of power:** It is clear that as much as the ruler has more powers, he will be more free to abuse his power. The structure of the unitary system is such that a single person is placed in the final position of the power and this person will be responsible for making decisions after being appointed. Since the ruler has more powers in this type of system, there will always be a possibility that president abuse from power. (Regoli,2019:4:17)
- C- Unfair distribution of national resources:** The unitary structure may cause unfair distribution of resources in the country and some states may be deprived of benefiting from national resources due to political reasons. Or in other words, the government ignores some of the interests of the minorities. (Padhye, 2023, p. 183)
- D- Corruption:** the concentration of power in this type of structure increases the possibility of more corruption. This centralization may create opportunities for corrupt practices, as fewer individuals or entities are involved in decision-making.
- E- People's lack of political participation:** Since the central government determines everything,

people may feel that their activities and efforts can not affect the decisions of the central government. As Juan J. Linz discusses this issue clearly in *Democracy: From City-State to a Global Era* book.

- F- The distance between the people and the government:** people under unitary governments must wait for the central government to initiate and implement policies and this could stifle local initiatives. (Zahrin & Mohamed, 2022, p. 129)

### **The Ineffectiveness Factors of the Unitary System in Afghanistan During the Last Century**

As in the previous essay, we learned about the initial stages of the unitary system, which was full of brutality and ethnic conflicts. In this part of the research we focus on the factors that caused the unitary political system doesn't suit well for Afghan society.

Unitary system was established in Afghanistan after Amir Abdul Rahman Khan came to power, but until Habibullah Khan's term, Afghanistan did not have a powerful central government and was governed scatteredly under the rule of various ethnic leaders in the country and did not have political order. And it was administered in the form of Malik al-Tawaifi. But when Habibullah Khan took office, the constitution was approved for the first time in 1923 and the Afghan government took its first step to become a modern government. (Sardarnia & Hosseini, 2013, p. 46)

After that Amanullah Khan, the only modernist king of Afghanistan, embarked on extensive reforms in the affairs of governance, although his reforms were opposed by the traditionalist people of Afghanistan and these reforms did not take place in Afghanistan. But despite all the reforms and modernization of the unitary structure in Afghanistan, the unitary system has always been unable to meet the needs of the people and lead the country towards prosperity and development. (Ataei, 2010, p. 246)

- a. Incompatibility of the unitary system with the social context of Afghanistan:** Afghanistan is a multi-ethnic country. More than fifty different ethnic groups live in this country (Musavi, 2008, p. 21) In terms of genealogy, Afghanistan has been given the title of the country of minorities and in terms of ethnic diversity, it has the fourth place in the vast continent of Asia after Malaysia and China (Taniwal, 2019, p. 13) Some researchers have divided the ethnic groups of Afghanistan into two categories: large ethnic minorities such as Pashtun, Tajik, Hazara and Uzbek and small minorities such as Qazalbash, Baloch, Peshaei and other ethnic groups are included under this category. (Ahmadi, 2022, pp. 113-130) In the 2003 Constitution of Afghanistan, ethnic groups living in this country are listed in sixteen categories. However, Afghanistan is not only diverse in terms of ethnicity, but it also has diversity in terms of language and religion. According to some sources, Afghanistan has forty to fifty languages and dialects that belong to different tribes and clans. Among them, Persian and Pashto are the official languages of Afghanistan, which have the most speakers. (Rahimi, 2008, pp. 91-103) Also, in terms of religion, the majority of the people of Afghanistan are Muslims, and their common point is Islam, but in the field of religious practices, they have significant differences. The Hanafi and Shi'i religions have the most followers among

the Muslim people of Afghanistan. Besides that, other religions such as Ismailia, Hinduism, and Judaism also have followers in Afghanistan, but their influence is far less than that of Muslims. (Mohammad, Udin, 2021 p.1) Considering the social structure of Afghanistan and the background of the structure of the political system in Afghanistan, it can be concluded that one of the main factors of the inefficiency of the unitary system is the multiplicity of ethnicities and languages in Afghanistan. As discussed in the first chapters of this article, the unitary system has a unitary structure and the head of government has too many powers. Therefore, the unitary structure in a society that has ethnic and religious diversity has created a hierarchical relationship among the ethnic groups in the country and has left the ruler's hand open for abuse of power, unfair distribution of national resources, and depriving minorities from political participation throughout history, which has caused Afghanistan's instability over the years. If we look at the history of Afghanistan, we can find many examples of ethnic and family conflicts of the government. Mirwais Balkhi wrote in this regard in the book "American Nationalization". In the government of Amir Abdul Rahman Khan, the elites belonging to the Mohammadzai tribe were given special respect and every man of this tribe was paid about 400 rupees and every woman about 300 rupees monthly from the government budget. (Balkhi, 2020, p. 85) Unitary systems have caused political crisis and instability in most of the countries that have ethnic minorities, such as Turkey, Syria, and Iran, where the Kurds and Baluchis have faced many crisis and difficulties due to the independence movements.

- b. Ethnic nationalism:** Exclusivism and ethnic totalitarianism arising from chauvinism is one of the reasons for the existence of a unitary system and its inefficiency in Afghanistan. The monopolists considered centralism as a platform for realizing their goals and always insisted on the centralization of the system. Since the 1880s, when the British and Soviet Union were in Afghanistan's neighborhood, the massive movement and transfer of people in Afghanistan was done by the neighbors to support the Pashtun kings in order to guide Afghanistan according to strategic plans and goals of the great powers and turn Afghanistan into a country of Pashtuns. The change in the structure of the political system and the beginning of ethnic conflicts in Afghanistan with the arrival of Amir Abdul Rahman Khan, which started while British Empire located in the southern borders of Afghanistan. Since then, many efforts have been made in the direction of ethnic identification and relocation of Pashtun peoples in non-Pashtun areas. One of the most prominent of these efforts is forced migration of Hazaras from central provinces. (Dowlatabadi, 2018, p. 174)

Mahmoud Tarzi is one of the most well-known figures in the creation of nationalist movements in Afghanistan. Some have given him the title of the father of ethnic nationalism. He, who was exiled during the time of Amir Abdul Rahman for conspiracy against the government, sought refuge in the court of Sultan Abdulhamid II of the Ottoman Empire and settled in Turkey. He got acquainted with Western culture and institutions in the schools of Damascus and Constantinople, and also gained external executive and administrative experience by working in the provincial secretariat of the Ottoman government. By the time Habibullah Khan took power after his father's death, Tarzi returned back to Afghanistan and shared his ethnic nationalist plans with the

king, and started working in this direction. He propagated nationalism by establishing the newspaper Siraj Al-Khabar and creating a group of elites to falsify history. (Badakhshi, 2013 p.55)

As a result of these efforts, Afghan nationalism has brought a kind of pride, arrogance, and self-confidence to the Pashtuns and embodied an imaginary superiority. But for other ethnic groups, the ideology of oppression and domination has been interpreted. Therefore, such a sense of nationalism has caused a crisis in national identity and state building in Afghanistan.

- c. **Abuse of power:** The unitary system's structure is designed to place a person in the final seat of power and grant them considerable power. Abuse of power is one of the prominent disadvantages of this type of structure. In a country like Afghanistan, which has a history of ethnic conflicts and social diversity, the ruler's misuse of his powers to secure personal, ethnic and political interests is very likely. In all periods of history, kings and presidents have abused their power in Afghanistan. Even in the Islamic Republic government of Afghanistan, which was created after the invasion of the United States and its allies on Afghanistan. Despite the fact that the government of the Islamic Republic can be called the most democratic political system in the history of Afghanistan. But during the twenty years of its lifetime, examples of corruption and abuse of power by the presidents can be seen many times. Like Hamid Karzai abused his authority in determining the election result in favor of Ashraf Ghani in the 2014 presidential elections. In this election, Hamid Karzai allowed Ashraf Ghani to commit massive fraud for his own benefit. As for the first time, Steve Cole in the book " Directorate S" revealed a telephone conversation from the head of the Election Commission (Zia-ul-Haq Amarkhil) during the fraud in favor of Ashraf Ghani. (Coll, 2018, p. 649) It's worth mentioning as well that President Ashraf Ghani fled with millions of dollars from the government budget when the regime fell. (SIGAR, 2022/6/7) Ethnic divisions and alienation of the people from the government have been caused by the abuse of power by the rulers in Afghanistan. Assigning more powers to the ruler has always made the governance process challenging, leading to economic, political, and security crises in Afghanistan.

## 2. Federalism Political System

The word federalism is synonymous with decentralized political system and in many sources, federal is used instead of the phrasal word of decentralized Political System. Federalism comes from the Latin root Foedus or Federation, which means union or contract or agreement, is a political concept in which a group of units (states, provinces, countries, etc.) are committed to each other and there is a central government on their behalf. The phrase federalism refers to a system of government that creates what is commonly referred to as a federation, and its supporters are called 'Federalists'. (Pedram, 2010, p. 193) In contrast to the unitary system, this system has a scattered political center, resulting in power being divided into different states and provinces. Two or more independent governments with multiple constitutions come together to establish a new central government and transfer part of their sovereignty to it according to their respective interests in this structure. (Ogunnoiki, 2017, p. 55) Local governments can act freely

to advance their domestic politics under this Political system since they have authority within their territories. However, the central government has the final say over matters of foreign policy advancement, including international relations and security. The political will of the entire nation is greatly influenced by these local administrations. Examples of nations with this kind of political systems are Pakistan, India and Switzerland.

### Advantages of Federalism System

Scientists and experts have widely expressed their opinions about the Federal political system and its types, but in this article we will discuss some of the prominent advantages of the Federal political system.

- a. **Keeping the government from turning into a dictatorship:** The Federal system's ability to keep the government from turning into a dictatorship is among its most significant benefits. The tendency to become a dictator is reduced as a result of people's significant involvement in political issues. Within this framework, the populace keeps an eye on how the ruler and government are doing and they oppose their harmful actions. (Hamilton, 1788/2/8)
- b. **Empowering local communities:** The transfer the power and authority from the central government to local governments creates an institutional framework for local communities and empowers them to pursue their local goals. (Youvan, 2024, p. 4)
- c. **Reducing the burden of central government responsibilities:** By dividing power into different zones, the burden of the central government's responsibilities is reduced, and this allows the central government to act better in promoting national and transnational politics. (Pedram, 2010, p. 166)
- d. **Paying attention to the right of ethnic and religious minorities:** The Federalism political framework enables marginalized ethnic, religious, and indigenous groups to play significant political roles. Under this arrangement, minorities are not only not excluded but, in accordance with the law, are also given the opportunity to participate in politics and enjoy security. (Rahimi,2008:74)
- e. **Cutting down on corruption:** The Federalism political and administrative system has a direct relationship with the reduction of administrative corruption. Since in this system the local officials are determined by the local people's votes, the people have direct access to the provincial and local officials, and they will be pressured by the people in case of violations and inadequacies. (Youvan, 2024, p. 7)
- f. **Political equality:** People will engage in governance activities more when they are given the opportunity to participate politically. This not only prevents the centralization of power but also establishes a system to suit the needs of all societal segments. People who participate in politics will have an equal role in influencing governmental policies. (Turner, 2005, p 206)
- g. **Senior officials will be more accountable:** Since the governor and local officials are chosen by the people by voting in the federal system, the public will have greater access to them and these higher position persons will feel more responsibility to the people for their actions. (Youvan, 2024, p. 6)
- h. **The government will become more effective:** Since the people always participate in political affairs and the representatives are chosen by the local people. As a result, local representatives are

in the best position to figure out the precise nature of local demands and ensure their effectiveness. (Youvan, 2024, p. 6)

### Examples of Nations with Federal Political System

The separation of powers between federal and regional organizations is the main issue with federalism. Therefore, among the federal governments of the world, these four democratic countries are regarded as models for the division of power and each of them has its own characteristics. We'll go over a few samples.

**1- United States of America:** The United States of America, whose constitution uses the phrase "we the nation of the United States," is acknowledged as the creator of the system of unity and pluralism and as the forerunner of modern federalism, having done so since 1787.

The states under a federal system have come together to form a unified republic based on the US Constitution. The Senate and the House of Representatives are the two houses that make up each state's legislature and represent the legislative branch. The executive power rests with the governor, who is directly appointed by the people at the same time as the parliament elections. The president is in charge of the executive branch, which is legally separate from the legislative and judicial branches. The president is in charge of the executive branch, which is legally separate from the legislative and judicial branches. The President is advised by the members of the Cabinet. Executive department heads and the vice president make up this group. The Senate and the House of Representatives are the two branches of Congress that each have a certain amount of legislative authority. Federal courts and the Supreme Court together make up the judiciary, which has the authority to implement justice. The interpretation of federal laws and regulations, as well as the US Constitution, forms the framework of the judiciary. One aspect of this is settling disputes between the executive and legislative departments. The constitution lays up the framework for the federal government. (Boadway & Watts, 2004, p. 2)

The confederation system ruled this nation from its inception, as seen by American history, and with the course of time and the creation of the constitution, all the states came together under the federal system. In the beginning, there were thirteen states, which gradually increased to fifty states. (MORRIS, 1979, p. 453)

Since the Civil War, two political parties have dominated American politics: The Democratic Party and the Republican Party. There are, of course, some smaller parties as well. For example, the Green Party, and the Libertarian Party. It is often understood that the Republican Party is the "conservative right-wing" party, and the Democratic Party is the "liberal left-of-center" party.

**2- Germany:** Germany has been a nation under federal rule for generations but throughout history, with each centralization of power in this country, it has endangered federalism. Germany's federal system was established by the war's victorious armies in 1949, after World War II. The Allies established federalism in Germany because they determined that it was the best way to stop Germany from becoming a center of power that would endanger international peace once more. The German model of federalism is considered one of the best models of federalism today. The Federal Republic of Germany consists of a large political unit (central federal government) and sub-political units (states). There are 16 states in this country, which are called Lander,



## The Swiss model's similarity to Afghanistan

The Swiss Federal model can be regarded as one of the most effective federal models in the world today, and it has many similarities with Afghanistan. From a geographical standpoint, Switzerland and Afghanistan have comparable characteristics in terms of social context. By following this model, Afghanistan can resolve many of its conflicts and crises and achieve political stability. In this part of the article, we discuss a number of similarities between this model and Afghanistan.

- 1- Switzerland is located at the crossroads of Western, Central and Southern Europe. Afghanistan is located at the crossroads of Central Asia, South Asia and the Middle East as well.
- 2- Afghanistan and Switzerland are both landlocked countries.
- 3- Not only does Afghanistan have mountains, but Switzerland also does.
- 4- Other than Persian there are two other major languages spoken in Afghanistan such as Pashto & Uzbek. In Switzerland except for Romanian, there are three official languages: German, Italian, and French.
- 5- Switzerland is among regional powers such as Germany, France and Italy. Afghanistan is also among regional powers such as Pakistan, Iran, China, India and Russia.
- 6- Afghanistan has ethnic pluralism and Switzerland also has these different ethnicities such as German, Italian, French and Romanian. (Tanham, 17 June, 1997)

## The Background of Afghanistan's Attempts to Decentralize its Political System

Afghanistan has been run under a unitary system of government since the year 1880. Afghanistan was divided and ruled by chiefs under a tribal or feudal system before these years. During this period, taxes were collected from the people and used for the personal and military expenses of the military leaders. However, the government of Afghanistan switched from a tribal kingdom to an absolute monarchy with the arrival of Amir Abdul Rahman. Amir Abdul Rahman made the creation of a powerful central government the priority of his government, and in this regard, committed a lot of violence and crime. (Dowlatabadi, 2018, p. 55)

The tyranny and discrimination against other tribes by the ruling tribe intensified in Afghanistan after the emergence of a strong central government. The massacre of the Hazaras during the reign of Amir Abdul Rahman is the most horrific instance of unjust oppression in Afghanistan's history, though there are many others. Even now, discrimination and ethnic nationalism exist in Afghanistan. Over the past century, ethnic nationalism in Afghanistan has sparked numerous civil wars, and since the latter half of the 20th century, numerous individuals and movements have rebelled against the country's unitary government. These rebellions did not consider the unitary political system suitable for Afghanistan.

Tahir Badakhshi was an outspoken opponent of a unitary political system who participated in multiple civil rights movements and even left behind research on the federal system.

Finally, as a result of these struggles, he was executed by the government of that time on the 30th of October 1979 in Polcharkhi prison in Kabul. (Muradi, 2011, p. 6) After the death of Tahir Badakhshi, efforts for decentralization and minority rights by political parties and currents not only did not end, but continued with more seriousness. Apart from all these words, even today, Federalism models is at the top of the topics of scientific seminars and research circles. With the collapse of the republican system after twenty years, now the people of Afghanistan need more

than ever to discuss and think about the Federalism system. Additionally, the debate for federalism in Afghanistan has heated up more than it has in the past.

### **What Makes the Federal System Appropriate for Afghanistan?**

Afghanistan's population is made up of Pashtun, Hazara, Tajik, Uzbek, Baloch, Nuristani, and other ethnic groups. Based on the most recent data, no single group can be considered to be the majority in terms of Afghanistan's statistical influence. Every nationality has its own customs, language, and distinctive cultural features. All Afghans have an inherent right to live in line with their culture and customs in a totally peaceful environment and enjoy all national benefits without facing any form of discrimination. All these things should be provided by the political system of a country, which during a century, the unitary system has not been efficient for these things and has not been able to provide peace, stability and welfare of the citizens. Consequently, the characteristics and features of the federal system may be taken into consideration. It has the potential to establish a stable political structure that serves all of Afghanistan's ethnic communities. Other countries that have the cultural and geographical similarities of Afghanistan, the federal system has been able to respond. such as Switzerland, the United States, Canada, Germany, etc. These countries have proven that the coexistence of groups of people from different ethnic backgrounds, languages, and cultural traditions does not lead to conflict but rather to unity. Federalism can be a suitable political structure and prevent the emergence of political conflict due to the non-enforcement of the rights of nationalities in the country. And in the end, federalism will be a kind of reconciliation and fusion between the diversity in the current fragile political structure of Afghanistan. Many Afghans politician today support and have consistently worked toward a federal structure for their nation. Politician like Abdul Rashid Dostum, the leader of the Afghan National Movement party and Abdul Ali Mazari the leader of Wahdat party. (Mohammadi, 2015, p.160) Supporters of the federal system are found both inside and outside of Afghanistan. Former US Secretary of State Colin Powell and German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer were among those who supported the federal system at the Bonn Conference. (Safari, 2020,6,8)

Therefore, in Afghanistan, the necessity of establishing a federalism system is not based on difficult historical moments, but based on the realization of democracy and the goals of solving permanent crises in the country, and according to recent studies and researches, the federal system in Afghanistan is only solution that can work Afghanistan problems out. We go over a few of the factors that make federalism the best kind of system of government in Afghanistan here.

- 1- **Preventing tribal disputes:** The ethnic composition of Afghanistan is diverse, and over a long period of time, certain ethnic groups have had their rights while, the rights of some other ethnic groups have been oppressed by the rulers. Biased policies of the central government have pushed people away from the government and created ethnic divisions throughout history. But with the establishment of the federal government and the separation of powers among the states, the people's needs are met and the tribes' resentment will be prevented. Federalism can be an effective alternative to bring the nation under the rule of law, provide long-term and reliable stability, and overcome the current crisis without using violence.
- 2- **Federalism promotes both the social welfare and the unity of the people:** Contrary to popular

belief, federalism is not bound to end to the division of Afghanistan. Federalism not only does not cause division, but also causes the unity of Afghanistan. Experience of countries like Canada, US, India, and others shows that federalism provides a broad and strong basis for integration, peaceful coexistence, collaboration, and social and economic development among different parts of society founded on citizenship and national rights. Under this system, every ethnic group or autonomous local government has an equal role in society and has the ability to defend both its own rights and interests as well as those of the entire country in general.

- 3- **Participation of all social classes in major political decisions:** The federal system is a model of a great democracy because it allows the government to build a gradual and organic relationship with the people through state centers and other institutions around the country. All three sections of government—legislature, the executive, and judiciary—are chosen by people's votes and the elected people make themselves accountable to the people.
- 4- **Preventing autocracy:** Under a federal system, authority is divided vertically on the horizontal side into three basic powers (executive, legislative, and judicial). It prevents the power from falling into the hands of a small circle and prevents the abuse of power.
- 5- **Federalism is an efficient structure for protecting minorities both in terms of race and religion:** Afghanistan's history is filled with incidents involving ethnic and religious genocides, as well as numerous battles between different ethnic and religious groups. Therefore, in Afghanistan, which has ethnic divisions, federalism will be a suitable platform to eliminate these divisions.

## Conclusion

One of the basic problems in societies, especially in third world societies, is how to distribute power and the participation of groups in the structure of the political system. This has always had its own problems in multi-ethnic societies. Afghanistan, which is a multinational country without an absolute majority, has always had a crisis of equal participation of ethnic groups in the system. Therefore, some of these problems are considered to be caused by the unitary political system, which is not suitable for the heterogeneous and ethnic structure of Afghanistan, so they raise the issue of changing the system as a solution to this problem. As we discussed in the research, Federalism can be the only appropriate way to decentralize power and fair participation of all ethnic groups living in Afghanistan in power. It appears that federalism and its unifying type have the capacity and potential to resolve the current tensions in Afghanistan if the positive and negative aspects of this system are evaluated in light of the structural characteristics and conditions of Afghan society, as well as the successful experiences of other nations.

However, there are obstacles like the possibility of disintegration, intervention of foreigners in the internal affairs, linguistic and ethnic distinctions, geographical variations, political immaturity, racial dispersion, and heterogeneous ethnic composition. Even though the federalization plan for a country like Afghanistan that has experienced unitary systems will face challenges, but based on what we have studied in this research we can conclude that federalism can be offered by using the right mechanism. With the implementation of this system, the problems of one tribe's dominance over others and the concentration of power in Afghanistan

will be essentially resolved. It will also solve the problem of lack of social justice and lack of balanced development, which Afghan people have suffered a lot from these angels. Every ethnic group residing in Afghanistan will see themselves in power under the federal system. Although the author's research in this area has shown that federalism, like other political systems, has numerous benefits but still a deeper understanding of this system in Afghanistan requires further research and analysis.

## References

1. Boadway, R., & Watts, R. (2004). *FISCAL FEDERALISM IN CANADA*, Queen's University, 2.
2. Ahmadi, A. (2022). The Impact of Afghanistan's Electoral and Parliamentary System on the Political Participation of Micro-Ethnic Minorities. 113-130.
3. Alem, A. (1994). *Foundations of Political science*. Tehran, Tehran, Iran: Nai.
4. Arzaghi, M., & Henderson, V. (2002). *Why Countries Are Fiscally Decentralizing*. Department of Economics, Brown University, 1.
5. Ataei, M. A. (2010). *Contemporary History of Afghanistan*. KABUL: Maiwand.
6. Badakhshi, G. (2013). *The Stateless State: A Critique of the Structure of the Political System in Afghanistan*. Kabul: Saeed.
7. Balkhi, M. (2020). *American Nation Building*. Kabul: Amiri Press.
8. Coll, S. (2018). *Directorate S: The C.I.A. and America's Secret Wars in Afghanistan and Pakistan*. New York: Penguin.
10. Dowlatabadi, A. (2018). *Hazaraha from Massacre to Restoring Identity*. Kbul: Maqsoodi.
11. Gunlicks, A. (2003). *The Länder and German Federalism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
12. Hafeznia, R., & Allahverdzadeh, R. (2010). *The Relationship between the Broad Political System and National Solidarity: A Case Study of Iran*. Scientific Article of the Ministry of Science, 15.
13. Hamilton, A. (1788/2/8). *Federalist No. 51*. New York Packet. Retrieved from <https://guides.loc.gov/federalist-papers/text-51-60>
14. KJ. (n.d.). LM. Linder, W. (2012). *Federalism: The case of Switzerland*. Federalism in a pluralistic developing (p. 3). Karachi: University of Karachi.
15. Manikkalingam, R. (2003). *A Unitary State, A Federal State or Two Separate States?* Sri Lanka: Social Scientists Association.
16. MORRIS, R. B. (1979). *Federalism: USA Style*. 453. Retrieved from [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-009-8931-3\\_6](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-009-8931-3_6)
17. Muradi, S. (2011). *The Path for National Thought in Afghanistan*. Kabul.
18. Musavi, S. (2008). *The Hazaras of Afghanistan: An Historical, Cultural, Economic and Political Stud*. Kabul.
19. Mohammadi, A. (2015). *Afghanistan and Modern Government*. Kabul: Amiri
20. Ogunnoiki, A. O. (2017). *FEDERALISM AS A POLITICAL IDEOLOGY AND SYSTEM*. International Journal of Advanced Academic Research, 55. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Adeleke-Ogunnoiki>
21. Padhye, A. (2023). *UNITARY FORM OF GOVERNMENT - A CONSTITUTIONAL AND COMPARATIVE CRITIQUE*. Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences, 181.
22. Pedram, L. (2010). *Federalism is the only or the best?* Kabul: National Congress.
23. Rahimi, M. (2008). *A Critique on the Structure of the Political System in Afghanistan*. Kabul: Saeed.
24. Rosenbloom, D., Kravchuk, R., & Clerkin, R. (86). *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector*. 1989: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
25. Safari, M. (2020,6,8). *The Challenges of Federalism in Afghanistan*. Institute for Strategic Studies of the East. Retrieved from <https://www.iess.ir/fa/analysis/2257/>
26. Salem, D. M. (2020). *The Necessity of Decentralization of Afghanistan's Political and Administrative System*. Etilaatroz.
27. Sardarnia, K., & Hosseini, S. (2013). *Social challenges of modern state building in Afghanistan*. Scientific Journal (Ministry of Science), 46.
28. SIGAR. (2022/6/7). *Ashraf Ghani's Flight with Millions of Dollars*. SIGAR. Retrieved from <https://www.sigar.mil/pdf/evaluations/SIGAR-22-35-IP.pdf>
29. Tanham, G. &. (17 June, 1997). *AFGHANISTAN: THE SWISS SOLUTION*. Washington Post. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1997/06/18/afghanistan-the-swiss-solution/8ab728c6-79f4-4731-828a-3faba28dcbdd/>
30. Taniwal, M. (2019). *Ethnicity Policy in Contemporary Afghanistan*. Kabul: Kateb Scientific Press.

- 
31. Turner, M & Hulme, A. (1952) Governance, administration and development making the state work, 106.
  32. Youvan, D. C. (2024). Decentralization and Localism: A Path to Empowered Governance and Community Resilience. 4. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381805393\\_Decentralization\\_and\\_Localism\\_A\\_Path\\_to\\_Empowered\\_Governance\\_and\\_Community\\_Resilience/link/667fb6ec0a25e27fbc14eaab/download?\\_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9u](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381805393_Decentralization_and_Localism_A_Path_to_Empowered_Governance_and_Community_Resilience/link/667fb6ec0a25e27fbc14eaab/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9u)
  33. Zahrin, Z., & Mohamed, A. (2022). REVISING THE UNITARY VS. FEDERATION CLASSIFICATIONS. Journal of International Studies, 129. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364791589\\_REVISING\\_THE\\_UNITARY\\_VS\\_FEDERAL\\_CLASSIFICATION](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364791589_REVISING_THE_UNITARY_VS_FEDERAL_CLASSIFICATION)