

**PAKISTAN-INDIA PEACE PROCESS  
(2008-2009)**

**EDITOR  
DR NOOR UL HAQ**

**ASSISTANT EDITOR  
NARGIS ZAHRA**

## CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b>	v
1. Indus Water Treaty Will Not be Abrogated: India	1
2. Accord to Exchange Security Information Signed with India	1
3. Soomro Stresses Need for Including Kashmiris in Peace Process	2
4. Accord with India to Double Flights	4
5. The Future of Peace Process	5
6. Fourth Round of Composite Dialogue	7
7. Pakistan-India Relations	8
8. Looking Out for Pakistan First	11
9. Prospects of 'New Era' of Relations with India	11
10. Advani Admits he Sabotaged Agra Summit	15
11. Foreign Minister Level Review of the Fourth Round of Composite Dialogue	18
12. Energizing the Normalization Process	21
13. Indo-Pakistan Water Talks	24
14. Indo-Pakistan Ties: Management of Contradictions	25
15. The Water Bomb	26
16. Kishanganga Dam Controversy	29
17. What was Achieved in India-Pakistan Talks	32
18. Damaging the Peace Process	33
19. Dialogue Under Stress	35
20. The Wrong Dialogue	37
21. Tension Vitiates Build-up to SAARC Summit	38
22. Pakistan-India Peace Process; The Way Forward Foreign Minister of Pakistan	40
23. Pakistan and India Clash over Kashmir at UN	46
24. Baglihar is Back	48
25. India was Ready to Attack Pakistan: John McCain	51
26. Indo-Pakistan Tensions and U.S Options	52
27. Pakistan Offers Grand Reconciliation: Qureshi, Mukherjee	54
28. Singh Reiterates Tough Stance: Talks at Secretaries' Level Planned	57
29. Text of India-Pakistan Joint Statement at Sharm-el-Sheikh	58
30. Indo-Pakistan Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism	59
31. U.S. Requests China to Help Develop Indo-Pakistan Ties	67
32. India not Sincere about Resolving Dispute: Foreign Office	68
33. U.S. Wants Resumption of Indo-Pakistan Talks: Hillary	68

34.	Pakistan-India: A Year Since Mumbai Attack	70
35.	India Placed a Pause on the Composite Dialogue: Foreign Minister of Pakistan	71
36.	India Fuelling Terrorism in Pakistan: Foreign Minister of Pakistan	74
37.	Ending Indo-Pakistan Impasse	75
38.	India not Sincere about Talks: Prime Minister of Pakistan	78
39.	Track-II Forum Floats Idea of Siachen 'Peace Park'	79
40.	Pakistan Delegates for Improved Trade Ties	80
41.	Joint Indo-Pakistan Watershed Management Proposed for Chenab, Jhelum	81
42.	Climate of Distrust	82
43.	Eyewash Efforts of USA to Defuse Indo-Pakistan Antagonism	85
44.	Indian Designs	88
45.	The Road to Peace	89
46.	Indian Army Reworks War Doctrine for Pakistan, China	91
47.	Fully Alive to Threats	92
48.	Deepak Kapoor's Statement Absurd, Irresponsible: Foreign Minister of Pakistan	94
49.	India's Provocative Military Doctrine	94
50.	India's Challenge	98
51.	Water Woes	100
52.	Krishna, Qureshi Discuss Terrorism on Phone	102
53.	India's Unhelpful Attitude	102
54.	Pakistan Warns India Against Hegemonic Mindset	105

## PREFACE

The composite Dialogue Process between Pakistan and India was initiated by Prime Minister of India, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee and General Pervez Musharraf, President of Pakistan in January 2004. They had identified eight issues, i.e., Peace and Security including CBMs, Jammu and Kashmir, Siachin, Sir Creek, Wullar Barrage, Terrorism and Drug Trafficking, to be discussed bilaterally between the two countries. Although the process moved at a snail's pace and failed to solve any of the issues, it was termed as irreversible. As late as July 2009, Prime Minister of India Manmohan Singh and the Prime Minister of Pakistan Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani in a joint statement at Sharm-el-Sheikh agreed to a "way forward in India-Pakistan relations" and de-linking peace talks from action against terrorism, but no headway has been made. The Indians have made the peace process hostage to the terrorist attack in Mumbai in November 2008 and have refused to resume it unless, according to them, Pakistan takes "credible action against alleged perpetrators". They ignore the fact that Pakistan has outlawed the alleged militant groups and their network has been dismantled. But it would be legally difficult to punish any person or persons without evidence.

Pakistan itself is a victim of terrorism<sup>1</sup> more than any other country in the world. The country is facing Mumbai like attacks almost every other day. The terrorists are attacking all conceivable places: hotels, mosques, educational institutions, playgrounds, bazaars, graveyards, funeral processions, political dignitaries, security personnel and installations that to date include the Naval Headquarters in Islamabad and the General Headquarters of the Army in Rawalpindi. The economic cost of the war against terror during the last eight years comes to US\$ 35 billion and has caused several thousand casualties of civilians, and members of police and armed forces; more than 3000 persons during the last year, i.e., 2009 alone. The security forces have killed and arrested several hundred terrorists. Pakistan armed forces have fought terrorists in

---

<sup>1</sup> The roots of terrorism in this region can be traced to Afghan Jihad against the Soviet Union, which commenced in April 1978 and was sponsored by the U.S., the West and Pakistan, which, in turn, became a victim of terrorism after September 11 attacks on U.S. twin towers.

Lal Masjid (Red Mosque) in the heart of the capital in July 2007, later in Swat and are presently chasing them from Waziristan.

Although it is alleged that Indian Consulates in Afghanistan, located close to Pakistan's borders, are engaged in a proxy war against Pakistan by supporting the terrorists, Pakistan is still keen to commence the peace process. It appears that the interests of the terrorists and Indians have converged in as far as hurting the Pakistan Armed Forces and weakening the country is concerned. Pakistan's commitment to fighting terrorism provides a heaven-sent opportunity to Indians to pressurize Pakistan to submit to the solution of issues on Indian terms, which Pakistan does not accept.

The recent provocative statement<sup>2</sup> by the Indian Army Chief General Deepak Kapoor announcing Indian Army's revision of its "doctrine" and "pro-active strategy" to fight a possible "two-front war" with Pakistan and China, and a tit for tat reply by the Pakistan Army Chief, only stiffens respective positions and prolong the stalemated Indo-Pakistan peace process. Already, Prime Minister of Pakistan, Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani, has observed that India is "not sincere in resuming composite dialogue", and attempts to "normalize relations between the two countries were being stalled."<sup>3</sup> Both countries should realize that it is in their mutual interest and in the interest of the region as a whole to fight jointly against terrorists operating in each country to a lesser or greater degree, avoid blame-game, and negotiate for resolving, and not simply managing, disputes. There is no alternative to resolving all issues including Kashmir and river waters, for the overall peace and progress of the region.

The *Factfile* contains selected articles, statements and media reports on the subject published from January 31, 2008 till January 14, 2010.

January 14, 2010.

Dr Noor ul Haq

---

<sup>2</sup> *Times of India* (New Delhi), December 30, 2009.

<sup>3</sup> *Dawn* (Islamabad), December 1, 2009.



## INDUS WATER TREATY WILL NOT BE ABROGATED: INDIA

Indian Water Resources Minister Professor Saifuddin Soz on Wednesday announced that there was no chance of abrogating the Indus Water Treaty (IWT) with Pakistan.

Addressing a press conference here [New Delhi] , Soz announced that India would harness the irrigation and hydroelectric potential of the country's Western rivers to the fullest. Referring to the World Bank's verdict on the Baglihar Dam project, he said it had been clearly established that India could use its water for irrigation and other development purposes. He said two more projects — at Burser on River Chenab and at Ujjh on a tributary of River Ravi — were also in the pipeline.

The minister said that India, in 2007, had sent the daily flow data of 280 hydrological sites on the Indus Basin, along with flood warnings, to Pakistan under the aegis of the IWT.

On the preservation of water bodies in Kashmir, he cautioned against some "fake NGOs" riding on sentiments and issues. Calling for a movement to dislodge encroachers, he asked the Jammu and Kashmir government to fight for the restoration and preservation of water bodies in the valley.

The minister said he has termed certain rivers "national assets" to address water disputes between the country's states. He said a group of ministers had finalised their recommendations on the issue and these would be put before the cabinet soon.

Iftikhar Gilani, *Daily Times* (Lahore), January 31, 2008.

## ACCORD TO EXCHANGE SECURITY INFORMATION SIGNED WITH INDIA

India and Pakistan on Monday signed an agreement to exchange security information, officials said, opening up a new channel of communication between the two countries.

The accord clears the way for regular contact between India's military-funded Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis (IDSA) and Pakistan's state-run Institute for Strategic Studies (ISS).

"The purpose is to build channels of communication at the level of scholars, because exchanges of security studies had been limited because

of the strained ties we have had,” ISDA director Narendra Sisodia told AFP.

The former Indian defence secretary, who signed the accord with his counterpart in the ISS, Shireen Mazari, said it was a landmark deal because “except for contacts at international forums, we never had open discussions on security issues.” The pact, first mooted by India in 2004, stipulates that the two think tanks will send experts to participate in state-sponsored workshops in India and Pakistan and later engage in joint military research projects.

The dialogue has led to closer political contact and greater transport links, but the two armies have shunned direct contact except for annual discussions on unresolved disputes.

The two sides hailed the agreement as an “important” deal and said it would contribute to the peace process.

“This collaborative arrangement is considered an important confidence-building measure between India and Pakistan,” an official statement issued after the signing said.

The pact would help “establish direct academic and scholarly ties, exchange of ideas on issues of common concern and conduct of scholarly conferences, seminars and round-tables,” it added.

IDSA’s Sisodia however cautioned the accord between the IDSA and the ISS would not replace any official dialogue.

“We should not expect this to be a surrogate for anything official,” he said.

“Holding any dialogue with Pakistan on a non-official level had never been easy and hence huge gaps still exist,” added Sujit Dutta, the head of IDSA’s South Asian Studies unit.

“However, this may help us to achieve some frank exchanges of views which will see where our thinking goes,” he said.—AFP

*Dawn* (Islamabad), February 5, 2008.

## **SOOMRO URGES FLEXIBILITY FOR KASHMIR SETTLEMENT: STRESSES NEED FOR INCLUDING KASHMIRIS IN PEACE PROCESS**

Caretaker Prime Minister Mohammadmian Soomro on Tuesday said that Pakistan believes that the key to an amicable solution of Kashmir issue lies in getting the Kashmiri leadership from both sides to come to a common platform and display flexibility to achieve a durable solution.



"We have made it clear to the Indian side that the Kashmiris are a stakeholder in the bilateral dialogue process and they must, therefore, be the principal beneficiaries of any eventful outcome," he said while addressing a function held here at Pakistan National Council of the Arts on the Kashmir Solidarity Day here Tuesday.

He said that history of Pak-India relations is a testimony to the fact that without resolving the core issue of Jammu and Kashmir, the confidence building measures (CBMs) and improvement of relations prove to be fragile and even short-lived.

"We believe that the peace process has to move beyond the CBMs, which are largely a means towards an end and certainly not an end in themselves, therefore, we need to address the malaise and not just the symptoms," he added.

He stressed the need for associating the Kashmiris with the peace process to enable all sides to reach a mutually acceptable and sustainable solution. "Despite the enormity and magnitude of the task involved, we are firmly committed to the peace process and would not be found lacking in our resolve for the resolution of all outstanding issues with India, including the core issue of Jammu and Kashmir," he added.

The caretaker prime minister said Pakistan has demonstrated its willingness to move beyond conflict management and towards conflict resolution. "It remains the core issue between Pakistan and India. Its just resolution can change the destiny of over one billion people of our region."

He said that an amicable solution to the lingering problem would also significantly contribute to international peace and security. The interim premier lamented the fact that over 700,000 Indian security forces are stationed in the held Kashmir which act with impunity.

He said these forces, empowered with draconian laws, deny the fundamental rights especially the right to self-determination to the Kashmiri people. "It is our firm belief that final disposition of the Kashmir dispute will be in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of Kashmiri people," he added.

Prime Minister Soomro expressed the hope that the spirit and flexibility showed by Pakistan will be reciprocated by India, which will open new vistas of cooperation and development of the two peoples.

He greatly lauded the exemplary strength and fortitude Kashmiris have demonstrated, against all odds, towards their ultimate goal. Earlier, speaking at the function, AJK former President and former Prime

Minister Sardar Abdul Qayyum said that the four-point suggestion of President Pervez Musharraf would be the first step towards the resolution of Kashmir issue. Meanwhile, peaceful demonstrations were held here in the federal capital as elsewhere to mark the Kashmir Solidarity Day.

Political parties, religious groups and NGOs organised various programmes to show solidarity with the people of Occupied Kashmir and expressed the resolve that support to the just cause would continue till its liberation.

All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC) also held a rally from the Foreign Office to the Indian High Commission where Kashmiri leaders in their speeches threw light on the significance of the day, asking India to shun double standard. They staged a sit-in there for some time.

Kashmiri leaders asked New Delhi to set aside its double standard, as on the one hand it wanted to win a permanent seat in the UN Security Council, while on the other, it was reneging on the commitment to honour the UN resolutions towards the settlement of Kashmir issue.

APHC Convenor Syed Yousaf Nasim and others said that Occupation of Kashmir and denying the Kashmiris their right to self-determination was a slur on the face of India. They flayed New Delhi for continuously abusing the human rights of Kashmiris and sought its forces' pullout from Held Kashmir, paving way for restoration of normalcy and giving the right of self-determination to them.

As in the past, February 5 was a public holiday, and there was hardly any activity at commercial centres, markets, and traffic also mostly stayed off highways and roads. Earlier, speaking at a function at his residence, People's Muslim League President and former Prime Minister Azad Kashmir Barrister Sultan Mehmood noted that it was time to push proactively for the resolution of Kashmir problem.

He paid homage to those who had laid down their lives as well as to Kashmiri women and youth languishing in jails. He noted that political instability in Pakistan was also one of the major reasons and maintained that strong and democratic Pakistan was a key to resolution of Kashmir problem.

Asim Yasin & Mumtaz Alvi, *Dawn* (Islamabad), February 6, 2008.

## ACCORD WITH INDIA TO DOUBLE FLIGHTS

Pakistan and India have agreed to increase the number of flights, destinations and airlines operating between them.

According to a memorandum of understanding signed here on Friday after two days of talks, both sides would be able to use three airlines each, instead of the present one, for operations on designated routes.

Weekly flights will be increased from 12 to 28 for each side.

New destinations planned under the agreement are Chennai (India) and Islamabad.

Currently flights operate only between Karachi and Lahore and New Delhi and Mumbai.

The agreement to increase the number of airlines is an opportunity for private airlines to exploit the potential market. The revised arrangement would be reviewed after one year.

“Both delegations agreed to meet again at a mutually convenient date within one year to review the capacity, frequency framework and additional destinations in each other’s territory, keeping in view the market demand,” the foreign ministry said after the talks, adding that the current revision had been made because of developments that had taken place in the aviation industry over the past few years.

Officials hoped that the revision would increase people-to-people contacts and business and trade between the two countries.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), February 16, 2008.

## THE FUTURE OF PEACE PROCESS

The outcome of February 18 elections is nothing less than a revolution. The verdict reflects the ardent desire of the electorate to make a complete overhaul of the policies, both internal and external, pursued by the previous regime. But there are certain measures taken by the previous government that deserve appreciation. One of these initiatives is the ongoing composite dialogue and peace process with India resumed more than four years ago. It would be, therefore, a good gesture on the part of the leaders of the triumphant parties if they announce their pledge to continue the peace process for the resolution of bilateral disputes.

On the face of it, there should be no problem with the Pakistan-India peace process under a PPP-PML-N coalition. Both parties support a process of talks with India for peacefully resolving all outstanding bilateral disputes, including the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir. The slain leader of PPP, Benazir Bhutto had unreservedly supported the ongoing peace process with India. PML-N leaders Nawaz Sharif had

criticized Musharraf for showing extra-flexibility on Kashmir without any reciprocity from India. But we should not forget that the stalemate persisting since 1994 in Indo-Pak dialogue was broken under Nawaz Sharif as Prime Minister, when both Islamabad and New Delhi agreed to hold bilateral talks without any pre-conditions in 1997. The process led to Vajpayee's historic journey to Pakistan and the issuance of Lahore Declaration in February 1999. Knowledgeable sources are of the opinion that the two leaders had agreed on a timeframe for holding a focused discussion on Kashmir, and had the Nawaz government not toppled in 1999, the two countries might have achieved some tangible progress on Kashmir. The ongoing peace process is a continuation of the Lahore Declaration in which Pakistan and India had committed themselves to promote peace and security in the region by agreeing on a number of nuclear and non-nuclear CBMs.

Last year Pakistan and India routinely kept the schedule of bilateral talks under the Fourth Round of Composite Dialogue Process by holding expert level meetings on Sir Creek (May,17-18, Rawalpindi), Promotion of Friendly Exchanges (June, 28-29, Islamabad), Terrorism and Drug Trafficking (July, 3-4, New Delhi), Tourism and Culture (July, New Delhi), Economic and Commercial Cooperation (July 31-August 1, New Delhi), Wullar Barrage (August 30-31, New Delhi), and on Nuclear CBMs (October 19, New Delhi). The turbulent political conditions in Pakistan created by the declaration of emergency on November 3 and assassination of Benazir Bhutto on December 27 had inevitably caused the peace process to slow down. The announcement of the election schedule had also put the peace process on hold. A peaceful and orderly election and the positive moves by winning parties towards forming stable coalition in the centre provide enough reason to hope that the new government would pick up talks with India under the on-going peace process from where the previous government left it without wasting much time.

The talks under the new dispensation in Islamabad, however, should prove more meaningful and fruitful. Hitherto, the peace process has achieved progress only on the CBMs front; but so far as the area of conflict resolution is concerned, Pakistan and India have not been able to secure any tangible success. The two countries have not even inked agreements on Siachen and Sir Creek, although, reportedly, major differences over these two issues have been removed. Similarly, there has been no forward movement on Kashmir, despite the fact that the two sides have exchanged a number of ideas and proposals on the settlement

of the dispute. Indian Prime Minister's observation that Kashmir has never been so intensively discussed between Pakistan and India as under the on-going Composite Dialogue Process notwithstanding, in practical terms there is no change either in the on-ground situation in Kashmir or in the traditional Indian position on the issue. Just as democratic transition in Pakistan was the focus of international community due to its implications for the war against terrorism, the world would now closely watch how Pakistan and India ensure further progress of the on-going peace process by moving forward in the area of conflict resolution. On its part, Pakistan has done every thing possible to create a conducive atmosphere for the resolution of bilateral disputes, including the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir, but the absence of reciprocal response from India has led to disappointment and dismay in Pakistan and apparently stalled the peace process. The success of the peace process would not only serve the most vital interests of Pakistan and India, indeed, the whole region is going to benefit from it.

Major powers like the US, Japan, EU, China, Russia and Canada, who are eager to promote investment and trade relations with the countries of South Asia are held back due to the uncertain prospects of security in the region. This would certainly adversely affect the economic development in the region without which the menace of terrorism cannot be eliminated. The most distinctive feature of a democratic government is that it is more responsive to the needs of the people. What the people of South Asia need is peace, security, development and progress so that they are able to get rid of grinding poverty. Since the new democratically elected government in Pakistan would not be facing any crisis of political legitimacy, it is hoped that that it will pursue the process of peace and normalization with India with greater confidence.

Dr. Rashid Ahmad Khan, *Nation* (Islamabad) February 26, 2008.

#### **FOURTH ROUND OF COMPOSITE DIALOGUE INDIA TO CONTINUE TALKS WITH NEW FM**

The Indian government has informally conveyed a message to Pakistan that it would hold the review meeting of the 4th round of the composite dialogue process with the new foreign minister, sources privy to the Foreign Office told The Post on Monday.

After the completion of 4th round of the composite dialogue process, a review meeting is pending which was to be held at the foreign

ministerial level to analyse the whole dialogue process and initiate the next round under the composite dialogue.

The sources disclosed that despite efforts from the Pakistani side to hold the review meeting, the Indian side is reluctant to sit with Caretaker Foreign Minister Inamul Haq. The sources held that Indian think tankers were waiting for the new democratic set up in Pakistan to start the dialogue process. Pakistan and India has started the fourth round of the composite dialogue process in order to resolve all bilateral issues with mutual understanding in January last year. Though no significance progress has been made so far, both sides have agreed to continue talks in a positive sense.

Pakistan and India have completed talks on eight important subjects.

However, after the election the Pakistani side contacted India for holding the review meeting but the Indian government conveyed informally that the meeting would be held with the new foreign minister of Pakistan.

Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee informed the Lok Sabha on Monday that India "stands ready" to resume the composite dialogue process with Pakistan "as soon as" a duly-constituted government is in place in the neighbouring country.

Iqbal Choudhry, *Post* (Islamabad), March 4, 2008.

## PAKISTAN-INDIA RELATIONS

In the present century, South Asia happens to be one of the insecure geographic regions of the world. South Asia is the abode of more than one and a quarter billion people, which is nearly one fifth of the world's total population. Poverty, illiteracy and corruption dominate the lives of the people. These problems have remained unresolved over the years. The major political barrier that stands in the way of solutions is the mutual rivalry of the states of this region.

Since the birth of India and Pakistan in 1947, deep-rooted mistrust and hostility have always jeopardised relations between the two states. They have fought three full-scale wars and numerous border skirmishes and, who knows, currently they might have reached on the brink of the fourth war that in all probabilities might be a nuclear conflict. There are a number of conflicting issues between India and Pakistan but Kashmir is the core issue that has decisively led to the deterioration of their

relationship. The disputed Kashmir State has assumed much strategic importance for both countries and has become the cause of arms race between them. Over the last six decades, a number of series of direct and indirect talks have been held between India and Pakistan to normalise the relationship for seeking a just solution of Kashmir dispute but every attempt has failed primarily due to Indian indifferent approach towards the issue.

Even in the post-cold war era that has marked a decisive international shift away from conflict to cooperation, there is yet no hopeful sign for a change in Pakistan-India relations. Instead, in the backdrop of years Kashmir insurgence, Pakistan and India have appeared more and more entrenched in acrimonious relationship. In the past all efforts for bringing them closer and creating conducive environment have went in vain.

As discussed earlier, since partition, India-Pakistan relations have highly been violent and conflict prone. Besides three wars, nuclear explosions, Kargil crisis and other gruesome incidents such as shooting of Pakistan's Navy aircraft, demolishing of Babri Mosque, brutal killings of innocent Muslims in Indian Gujrat and constant killings in occupied Kashmir have added multiple dangerous dimensions to Pakistan-India relations.

It may be recalled that the end of Kargil crisis following the meeting between the US president and prime minister of Pakistan, on July 4, 1999 did not induce a new spirit to India-Pakistan relations to come to its normal course. Thereafter, the situation turned from bad to worse. After the Kargil episode, India took a big step to accelerate the arms race by increasing its budget, which continues to increase every year and it is feared that it can result in possible danger of low intensity war between India and Pakistan at any critical moment. India has been wrongfully viewing Pakistan responsible for this entire situation and in view of the understanding reached in the Lahore Declaration in 1999, Pakistan's attitude had been characterised as a 'betrayal of trust' by the Indians.

It may be recalled that India used the 'trust' factor as a diplomatic ploy to decline the Pakistan's offer for dialogue and also to ward off the then growing international pressure from an early commencement of bilateral talks with Pakistan. Earlier, by adopting a policy of holding talks with freedom fighters and occupied Kashmir political parties, India had altered the situation in its favour. India's deceptive policies and

uncompromising attitude towards the Kashmir issue particularly its ill response to hold plebiscite in held Kashmir has sabotaged all previous attempts for peace in South Asia. Thus the normalisation process between India and Pakistan had been ceased. It was revived during the early phase of the current decade but it too has failed to produce any fruitful result especially in the context of Kashmir.

Only recently, efforts for normalisation were made through back door politics and adoption of some CBMs. It may be noted that the CBMs are supposed to create trust between rival parties for the management and resolution of conflicts but in case of India and Pakistan, the absence of trust is the basic hindrance for the successful implementation of CBMs. There exists basic mistrust and suspicion between India and Pakistan on historical, religious, cultural and political grounds.

Keeping in view the past record, it appears that the CBM exercise cannot be very successful in South Asia, particularly between India and Pakistan. The Kargil crisis signalled that how fragile was the status of CBMs in Indo-Pak relations. With this reality in mind, there is a need for Pakistan to be very cautious of the Indian mindset. During the recent years, politics of CBMs between the two countries has been on rampage which has caused considerable damage to the interests of Pakistan.

We must not forget that India is merely interested in trade and has least interest to solve the Kashmir question. This is a sort of "one way CBM track" policy which should be outrightly discouraged.

It is quizzical that India, on one hand, promotes CBMs while on the other, enters into a jointly build surface-to-air missile programme with an anti-Pakistan country namely Israel. More importantly, it has shown its muscles conducting its first test of a nuclear-capable missile from an undersea platform thereby completing its goal of having air, land and sea ballistic systems. In this way, India has whistled an arms race in South Asia. In this scenario, what would be the impact of the ongoing CBMs between India and Pakistan which discourage such adventures. Very recently, India has jacked up defence spending by 10 percent to \$26.4 billion, the deepest hike since the Independence of Bharat. What does this predict? This should serve as an eye-opener for Pakistan who must immediately get alarmed and shun off the CBM strategy which is a useless effort to exchange friendly gestures with an unfriendly country who holds an olive branch in one hand while a sword in the other.

Dr. Sarfaraz Hussain Mirza, *Nation* (Islamabad), March 6, 2008.



## LOOKING OUT FOR PAKISTAN FIRST

As a Pakistani I am outraged at the killing of an innocent Pakistani (given that his guilt was never proven) by the Indian state and then twenty days later the dumping of his body at Wagah border -- what else can one call this concluding action on the part of the Indian state?

However, I am more angry at my own government for its lack of care regarding its citizens arrested by other countries, especially India, but also the US. Just a few days earlier, we had Mr Ansar Burney making a sickening drama about the release of an Indian prisoner, who later admitted he was a spy, when he did not have the basic decency to at least show up to receive Pakistani Khalid Mahmood's body at Wagah. For that matter, no official government representative was present to receive the body. Nor was there any demarche issued from the Foreign Office to the Indian High Commissioner. Is international publicity and kudos all that matters to our politicians and bureaucrats? Even more distressing is the state of our human rights champions who have yet to take up the cases like Khalid Mahmood's even as they make much of Indian prisoners in Pakistani jails. And what of our High Commission in New Delhi? Why were they so inactive on this count? Now one is being told that PTV, the state's propagandist network, refused to take up and project the issues raised by the killing of Khalid Mahmood. Utterly shameful, when you think of the publicity Ansar Burney garnered for himself in the case of the Indian spy's release.

So for those of our leaders who have already declared their intent to cosy up to India, regardless of issues like Kashmir, let the killing of cricket fan Khalid Mahmood be a warning about the chasm that exists between our over-enthusiastic passion for embracing India and India's continuing suspicions and hostility towards Pakistan. A more realpolitik approach to dealing with India would stand us in much better stead. Let us learn our lesson from the price we are paying as a result of coming to the aid and assistance of the US with simply no preconditions or sober considerations post-9/11...

Shireen M Mazari, *News International* (Rawalpindi), March 12, 2008.

## PROSPECTS OF 'NEW ERA' OF RELATIONS WITH INDIA

There is a consensus in both countries for having close and cooperative relations and a framework for enduring peace. The newly elected leaders

in Pakistan can quickly move forward with us on this. We would welcome this and meet them half way.”

Indian Prime Minister Dr Manmohan Singh: In a reaction to PPP co-chairman Asif Ali Zardari’s interview to an Indian newspaper in which he reportedly called for a new approach to deal with the Kashmir issue and argued that the two countries cannot remain a hostage for another generation to that intractable conflict, Manmohan Singh has felt upbeat and hoped a new era in Indo-Pakistan relations was about to begin. The sentiments may however go a long way in seeking a qualitative change in approach held by the two sides on unresolved issues for the last six decades.

During the last one year, domestic crisis of Pakistan caused delay in efforts seeking meaningful progress in composite dialogue. Singh’s hope, which he expressed during his address to the Indian parliament on March 5, saying that he saw a ‘ray of hope’ in the statements of new leaders of Pakistan’s main political parties is however not backed by any concrete evidence. It is assumed that a new chapter in Indo-Pakistan relations will open just because there will be a new, civilian, government in Pakistan. Singh’s call for putting the past behind and striving for collective security and prosperity is a rhetoric used again and again. The reality on the ground is quite different.

When Asif Zardari suggested that the issue of Jammu and Kashmir be left to future generation to resolve, there was a sharp reaction from various Kashmiri groups based in the Indian controlled Kashmir. They challenged the commitment of both PPP and PML-N on supporting the cause of Kashmiris’ right of self-determination. While Zardari tried to make his position clear amidst the hostile reaction, the fact remains that Pakistan’s policy on Kashmir, like that on the nuclear issue, Afghanistan and the United States will continue to be the privileged domain of the establishment. Does it mean that despite having two-thirds majority in the National Assembly, the PPP and PML-N will not have enough say in shaping key foreign policy matters and, as in the past, will not be able to have a policy of their own in areas considered the sole jurisdiction of the security and state apparatus? Only time will tell how democratic Pakistan has taken its course.

Regarding Kashmir, however, the positions of New Delhi and Islamabad can be analysed in three perspectives. First, the historical perspective which means continuing with the parochial mindset which already prevails in New Delhi and Islamabad. More than Pakistan, it is

the Indian mindset which is intransigent to the core and is devoid of flexibility. Rigidity on the Kashmir issue is deep rooted in the Indian psyche.

In a sense, India lost a rare opportunity in October 2004 by refusing to accept President Pervez Musharraf's pragmatic and flexible 'out of box' solution which called for demilitarisation of the regions of J&K, soft borders through travel and trade, granting of maximum autonomy to the five regions of J&K and withdrawal of Indian and Pakistani forces. New Delhi failed to reciprocate these proposals and continued with its age-old policy of considering Kashmir as its integral part. If Pakistan insisted on seeking the resolution of the Kashmir issue under the UN Security Council resolutions, India continued with its uncompromising stance of turning the line of control into an international boundary and calling the Kashmiris' liberation struggle acts of violence and terrorism.

Second is the political perspective under which no government in India can take an independent position from the military. Theoretically, the Indian military is subservient to the civilian regime, but in the last two decades, one can observe compliance of civilian leadership with the military as far as issues of national security and J&K are concerned. Indian military is not supposed to indulge itself in politics or issue political statements. But, recently, the Indian Chief of Army Staff General Deepak Kapoor in a CNN-IBN interview remarked that, "with the elections now having taken place, I think the security situation in Pakistan, if it now gets stabilised, should improve."

Such statements are the domain of the civilian government and not of the military. But, General Kapoor in the interview went to the extent of stating that "when the things were turbulent we were a little worried and therefore we were very vigilant on the borders. But now that elections have taken place and, hopefully, in the next few days we would be able to work with a democratically elected government to solve some of our differences." In a sense, the Indian army chief undermined the position of the elected civilian regime in Delhi.

With the Indian army's growing vested interest in the Siachen, Jammu and Kashmir and in other regions where insurgency is going on, it seems the political parties in the ruling coalition are unable to restrain generals from giving policy statements. In case of Siachen, historical record shows that during the period from the government of Rajiv Gandhi till that of Manmohan Singh, Indian army has resisted the initiative of different governments in Delhi to pursue a flexible approach.

Earlier, the former Indian Chief of Army Staff, General J.J. Singh had advised an Indian prime minister not to pursue a flexible approach on Siachen which resulted in sabotaging the Indo-Pakistan understanding which was almost reached in the previous round of composite dialogue. Therefore, it will not be a matter of surprise if the Indian military, on account of the fragility of coalition governments for the last 12 years, gains enough space to prevail on security issues, particularly those relating to J&K.

It is not the Indian army which is a major impediment in efforts for resolving the Siachen conflict and the issue of J&K, political leaders belonging to both the Congress and BJP are also responsible for sustaining stalemate in the settlement of Jammu and Kashmir. Imbued with overconfidence because of India's burgeoning economy and New Delhi's growing relations with Washington, the Indian leaders are simply not interested in reciprocating to Pakistan's proposals or seeking a departure from their age-old stance of J&K being the integral part of the Indian Union.

Neither New Delhi wants to withdraw around half a million regular and border security forces from its controlled parts of Jammu and Kashmir, nor does it favour to give autonomy to J&K as was envisaged in article 370 of the Indian Constitution. Taking advantage of the post-9/11 political climate in which New Delhi successfully depicted jihadi groups fighting against the Indian security forces as terrorists, India is in no mood to relinquish its advantageous position by giving up its control over the territory.

International and regional perspectives also impact on the Kashmir issue and Indo-Pakistan relations. Unlike the cold war days when one superpower was pitted against another in a proxy war, no major player in international community would allow an outbreak of hostilities in South Asia. It was for this reason that in the winter of 2001-2002 and summer of 2002 the United States, along with Britain, China and European Union made serious efforts to diffuse Indo-Pakistan tension.

Now, after the launch of a composite dialogue, the holding of ceasefire along the LoC and normalisation of New Delhi-Islamabad ties, there is no likelihood of global actors supporting policies which can again upset status quo in the subcontinent. India has certainly taken advantage of international community's passive role in J&K and consolidated its position by denying the people of that state an opportunity of having freedom.

When India prefers to maintain a status quo in the disputed state at all costs and reject any new idea or proposal which aims at resolving the age-old issue, how can there be a ray of hope for peace in Indo-Pakistan relations? When there is still much mistrust between the two sides, the future shape of relations between Islamabad and New Delhi may not be much different from what it has been in the past. Mere emergence of a democratic dispensation in Pakistan will not make much difference.

India's casual attitude and delaying tactics in resolving the urgent issues with Islamabad became possible because of Pakistan's domestic instability and turmoil. Pakistan's growing bad image abroad because of the state's ruthless handling of lawyers' struggle for the restoration of judiciary, the imposition of emergency, uninterrupted cycle of violence, terrorism and suicide attacks had helped Indians form a discriminatory attitude. If New Delhi thinks of opening a new chapter in relationship, then it should seriously negotiate with Pakistan to settle all the burning issues in a just and fair manner.

Dr Moonis Ahmar, *Dawn* (Islamabad), March 15, 2008.

### ADVANI ADMITS HE SABOTAGED AGRA SUMMIT

Indian opposition leader Lal Kishan Advani has claimed that inviting President Pervez Musharraf to Agra in July 2001 was his idea, but he also admitted in comments published on Monday that it was his rejection of the draft agreement discussed between the two sides, which torpedoed the summit talks with Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee.

The Times of India quoted Mr Advani as saying in his new book *My Country, My Life* that the failure of the Agra summit "was a huge PR disaster for the NDA government."

Mr Advani said that "the Pakistan leader's televised breakfast meeting with Indian editors, blasting India's position on cross-border terrorism and Jammu and Kashmir ensured the collapse of the summit in acrimony and mutual blame-game."

Consequently, the Vajpayee government was "accused of poor planning and allowing Musharraf to launch an audacious bid to ambush Vajpayee on commitments which would recognise Kashmir as the core issue between India and Pakistan with no references to cross-border terrorism or Islamabad's commitment to a peaceful resolution of the dispute under the Shimla Agreement."

Mr Advani recalled in his book that President Musharraf in his book, *In the Line of Fire*, had accused the BJP hardliner of scuttling the summit. Mr Advani's book offers a rare admission by him that President Musharraf was not entirely wrong.

From India's point of view, two unwelcome things happened at Agra, he writes. "Firstly, the exercise of drafting a joint declaration proved highly unsatisfactory. The inconclusive draft, which (foreign minister) Jaswant Singh brought from his meeting with Pakistan's foreign minister, Abdul Sattar, was discussed at the informal meeting of the (cabinet committee on security) that the prime minister convened in his suite on the evening of the July 15. I noticed that there was no reference to cross-border terrorism in the draft. 'This cannot be accepted,' I said. My view was unanimously endorsed by all present in the room."

Similarly, Mr Advani claims credit for the genesis of the summit following a bloody standoff with Pakistan over Kargil. "The six-month-long break in combat operations was soon drawing to a close, and Atalji, in informal discussions with Jaswant Singh and me would ask us 'Ab aage kya karna chahiye'. (What should we do now?)." I too had been thinking about the issue for quite some time. During those days, I was in close contact with a senior Pakistani diplomat... On the Pakistani side, it seemed that Gen Musharraf, who had since then assumed the tag of President from CEO, in June 2001, was keen on ending his country's isolation.

"For that purpose, he too was keen on resuming talks with India. I said to myself that we should test the mind of this military ruler who does not carry political baggage and seems to be his own master in a country where democratically elected leaders have never exercised real power... Thus, one day in May 2001, when the Prime Minister had called Jaswant Singh and me for lunch at his residence to discuss the next course of action, I suggested to him, "Atalji, why don't you invite the General to come to India for talks? It does not matter that your Lahore initiative failed. It was highly appreciated both at home and abroad. Similarly, your invitation to him will be welcomed as an act of statesmanship, both within India and internationally." Jaswant Singh concurred with the suggestion and the prime minister accepted it."

Mr Advani describes his first meeting with Gen Musharraf at the Presidential Palace in Delhi thus:

"Our initial banter was centred around the fact that both of us had studied at St Patrick's high school in Karachi which I have mentioned

earlier. After exchanging pleasantries, I said, "General, although you were born in Delhi, you are visiting your birth place for the first time in 53 years... there are lakhs of families on both sides that are not even as fortunate as we are; they have never visited their native places. Isn't it odd that this should be the case even after the passage of more than a half-century? Shouldn't we find an enduring solution to the issues that are keeping our two countries and two peoples apart?"

"Of course, we must," Musharraf observed. "What are your ideas?" "The most important thing is to build trust in each other." He nodded in agreement, and again asked how that could be done. "Well I will give you an example. I have just come back from a fruitful visit to Turkey. I understand that you have a special liking for Turkey, having spent your formative years in that country."

"Yes, my father was posted there. I can speak fluent Turkish." "I had gone there to conclude an extradition treaty between India and Turkey. Now, what great need does India have to have an extradition treaty with Turkey? If an extradition treaty is needed, it is between India and Pakistan, so that criminals committing a crime in one country and hiding in another can be sent back to face trial." Musharraf's first response, not quite knowing where the conversation was headed, was: "Yes, why not? We should have an extradition treaty between our two countries."

"Even before we conclude a formal extradition treaty, you would be making a great contribution to the peace process if you handed over Dawood Ibrahim to India, who is the prime accused in the 1993 Mumbai serial bomb blasts case and who lives in Karachi," I continued. Musharraf's face suddenly turned red and unfriendly. Hardly able to conceal his discomfort, he said something that I regarded as quite offensive.

"Now, Mr Advani, that is small tactics," he remarked. I could sense a sudden change in the atmosphere of the room, in which five Indian officials were seated on one side and five from Pakistan on the other... Musharraf, his unease palpable, replied assertively: "Mr Advani, let me tell you emphatically that Dawood Ibrahim is not in Pakistan."

Mr Advani then gives an interesting reason for disbelieving Gen Musharraf, saying: "Several years later, one of the Pakistani officials who was present during the meeting said to me. The statement recalled the initiatives by the two governments to improve the situation for very

much that it can quickly resume.”

*Dawn* (Islamabad), March 18, 2008.

## FOREIGN MINISTER LEVEL REVIEW OF THE FOURTH ROUND OF COMPOSITE DIALOGUE, ISLAMABAD, 21 MAY 2008

PR. No.134/2008

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Makhdoom Shah Mahmood Qureshi, and External Affairs Minister of India, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, met in Islamabad on 21 May 2008 to review the progress made in the Fourth Round of Pakistan-India Composite Dialogue.

1. This was preceded by a meeting between the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, Mr. Salman Bashir and Foreign Secretary of India, Mr. Shivshankar Menon, on 20 May 2008.

2. The talks were held in a friendly and constructive atmosphere.

3. They reviewed the progress made in the Fourth Round of the Composite Dialogue encompassing

- (i) Peace and Security, including CBMs;
- (ii) Jammu and Kashmir;
- (iii) Siachen;
- (iv) Sir Creek;
- (v) Wullar Barrage/Tulbul Navigation Project;
- (vi) Terrorism and Drug Trafficking;
- (vii) Economic and Commercial Cooperation; and
- (viii) Promotion of Friendly Exchanges in Various Fields.

4. They noted the positive contribution to improvement of relations by the Composite Dialogue process since its resumption after the joint statement of 6 January 2004 and the subsequent Summit Statements of 25 September 2004, 18 April 2005, 14 September 2005 and 16 September 2006. The Ministers reaffirmed their determination not to let terrorism impede the peace process and take all necessary steps to eliminate this scourge against humanity. They further resolved to carry forward the peace process and to maintain its momentum.

5. The Ministers noted that in 2007 and over the course of the Fourth Round of Composite Dialogue there had been a number of important bilateral achievements, including:

- MoU to increase the frequencies, designated airlines and points of call in either country.



- Agreement for the trucks from one side to cross the border up to designated points on the other side at the Wagah-Attari border.
  - Increase in frequency of Delhi- Lahore bus service from two to three trips per week.
  - Signing of Agreement on 'Reducing the Risk from Accidents relating to Nuclear Weapons'.
  - MoU between the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) to facilitate the sharing of information between two agencies.
  - Completion of the Joint Survey of Sir Creek and adjoining areas.
  - Two meetings of the Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism.
6. The two sides signed the Agreement on Consular Access, which was finalised during the Fourth round of Composite Dialogue.
7. They exchanged views on the issue of Jammu and Kashmir and agreed to continue discussions to build on convergences and narrow down divergences. They also agreed to continue with the implementation of Cross-LoC CBMs with a view to enhancing interaction and cooperation across the LoC. In this regard, they decided:
- a) To increase the frequency of Muzaffarabad - Srinagar and Rawalkot-Poonch Bus service from a fortnightly to a weekly basis.
  - b) To finalize modalities for intra-Kashmir trade and truck service as early as possible.
  - c) To implement other measures to expand and facilitate travel a meeting of Working Group on Cross-LoC CBMs would be convened within two months .
8. They reaffirmed the importance of ceasefire in place since November 2003 and the commitment of both sides to cooperate to safeguard it.
9. They agreed that progress has been made under the Composite Dialogue process on promoting a stable environment of Peace and Security including CBMs. The Expert Groups on Nuclear and Conventional CBMs should consider existing and additional proposals by both sides with a view to developing further confidence building measures in the nuclear and conventional fields.
10. Both sides exchanged views on Siachen and reiterated their commitment to seeking an early amicable solution.

- 
11. Both sides expressed satisfaction on the progress made on Sir Creek, with the completion of the joint survey, the exchange of maps, and the discussions thereafter. They agreed to further facilitate the process for an early resolution of this issue .
  12. Both sides reiterated their commitment to fight terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, and re-emphasized the need for effective steps for the complete elimination of this menace. In this context, it was agreed to continue cooperation in the Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism whose next meeting would be held within two months . Both sides agreed to refrain from hostile propaganda.
  13. Both sides emphasized the need for further strengthening cooperation to eliminate drug trafficking and welcomed the finalization of an MOU on Cooperation between Pakistan's Anti-Narcotics Force and Narcotics Control Board of India.
  14. Both sides reiterated the importance of enhancing mutually beneficial economic and commercial cooperation and agreed to discuss further steps for facilitating trade and redressing the trade imbalance. In this regard, Indian and Pakistan Railway officials would meet in June for resolving all technical issues to enable increase in to and fro freight movement. They also agreed to facilitate the process of early opening of bank branches in the two countries.
  15. Both sides appreciated the work being done by the Judicial Committee on Prisoners, which will meet in Pakistan shortly; welcomed the finalization of the Consular Access Agreement that will help addressing humanitarian aspects relating to persons under detention in each other's country and; agreed to provide on a regular basis updated and comprehensive list of prisoners in each other jails.
  16. Both sides agreed to the need for promoting friendly exchanges between the two countries.
  17. Both sides agreed to the early finalization of the Visa Agreement which will help liberalize the visa regime and facilitate people-to-people contacts.
  18. The two Ministers reiterated their commitment to the Iran-Pakistan-India gas pipeline project and had a useful exchange of views in this regard.
  19. The two Foreign Ministers also exchanged views on promoting the Pakistan-India peace process, reinvigoration of SAARC and agreed to work towards promoting regional cooperation for enabling South Asia to

realize its full development potential. It was agreed to work for promoting sustainable development and food and energy security.

20. It was decided that the two Foreign Secretaries will launch the Fifth Round of the Composite Dialogue in New Delhi in July 2008.

21. The External Affairs Minister of India , Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, called on the President and the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

May 21, 2008.

[http://www.mofa.gov.pk/Press\\_Releases/2008/May/PR\\_134\\_08.html](http://www.mofa.gov.pk/Press_Releases/2008/May/PR_134_08.html)

## ENERGISING THE NORMALISATION PROCESS

Enhanced economic activity between the two countries will help in partially reducing impact of the current global economic downturn and help in building peace constituencies.

India and Pakistan have made reasonable progress since 2002 in normalising their relations by undertaking a host of significant Confidence Building Measures (CBMs). Effective implementation of ceasefire on the Line of Control; introduction of the “Missile Notification Regime” and limited nuclear risk reduction measures; opening of border crossing points and increase in trade to 2 billion dollars are some of the gains. This has been achieved at the government-level in the four rounds of composite dialogue and complimented by efforts of Track-2 and back channel diplomacy. Interestingly, the people of both countries are the main drivers of the peace process.

There is no doubt that internal compulsions and global events did influence India and Pakistan to abandon confrontation and take the path of dialogue. Overt nuclearisation of India and Pakistan in 1998; the impact 9/11 and the “war on terror”; and the requirement of peaceful borders for economic growth in a globalised environment were major contributory factors.

Moreover, Pakistan’s support of insurgency against Indian rule in Kashmir became untenable when the US and other major powers started accusing the Kashmiri mujahideen of having ties with terrorist organizations. The policy also backfired due to its adverse socio-political fallout in Pakistan. The Indians had also started to use the Balochistan and Afghanistan cards besides using international pressure to countervail Pakistan’s support for the militants. These events made the two countries realise that there is no military solution and a political dispensation has to be found for dispute resolution.

Despite the “marked improvement” in Pakistan-India relations as characterised by President Bush, the two key countries of South Asia have to do a lot more to establish a balanced, mature and functional relationship that would be in the interest of its masses and the region as a whole.

In the span of six decades India and Pakistan have engaged in three wars and several major skirmishes, including Kargil; nuclearised South Asia; allied with competing powers; and fought endless diplomatic battles in multilateral and international forums. Even now they never miss an opportunity to blame each other for any incidence of terrorism, and mistrust abounds in both establishments.

All this has to change. But how?

Of course resolution of the Kashmir issue is central to an enduring peace. Pakistan has made several attempts at finding an equitable solution. Abandoning reliance on the UNSC resolutions and accepting the reality that a settlement of Jammu & Kashmir had to be carved out without any change in the territorial limits of the two sides, President Musharraf moved far ahead of the conventional position to the chagrin of traditionalists.

New Delhi failed to respond even to these liberal offers. It is prepared to build economic, political and cultural linkages between the two sides of J&K, but incrementally, and examine proposals that would improve the lives of the people without any change in borders. New Delhi is aware that a settlement of the J&K dispute and improved relations with Islamabad would enhance India’s regional and international stature. But it has demonstrated a definite propensity to settle Kashmir on its own terms directly with the APHC and other parties of the resistant movement including militant groups. In essence it wants to present Pakistan with a *fait accompli*.

Fearful of India’s dominance, in the past Pakistan supported insurgency in Kashmir. In response, India has been supporting insurgencies in Balochistan and deepened its influence in Afghanistan and Central Asia. Islamabad, fearful of India’s expanding regional influence, retains links with the Taliban to advance its interests. The two countries are caught in a vicious circle that breeds mistrust and destabilises the region. Pakistan and India should have an integrated security policy and doctrines that combine both external and internal threats.

Moreover, strategic and military competition between the two countries is depriving them of valuable resources for economic and social

development, and as Pakistan's economic base is smaller, the impact is greater.

It seems Islamabad will have to wait for an opportune time to press for a resolution to the Kashmir dispute. Meanwhile, it should continue to engage India to improve the human rights situation in Kashmir and seek reduction of its security forces in the area. Ease of travel restrictions, development of close cultural and trade linkages and cooperation in energy, environment and tourism would be invaluable CBMs. The IPI gas pipeline and similar projects in other fields will greatly enhance both countries' security.

It is expected that in the next (5th) round, efforts will be made to ease visa restrictions and examine the possibility of opening new routes between the two sides of Kashmir and on the international border. Enhanced economic activity between the two countries will help in partially reducing impact of the current global economic downturn and help in building peace constituencies. The time is ripe for settling the Sir Creek issue as the law of the seas convention stipulates that all maritime disputes between countries be settled by 2009.

There is also scope for developing additional CBMs in nuclear and conventional fields. Cruise missiles should be included in the Missile Notification regime. Security dialogue should include formal discussion of nuclear doctrines and India's plans for building anti-ballistic missile defence systems as these have a direct impact on Pakistan's security. Agreement on an annual meeting of the two chiefs of the army or joint chiefs to review regional security would be a major CBM.

As regards countering India's build up of strategic power, the best option for Pakistan would be to develop institutional capacities for achieving political stability, sustained economic growth and social cohesion.

So far, what has been lacking is the political will of the leaders in building momentum in the peace process. The establishments on both sides have yet to cross the frontiers of their self-imposed inhibitions and abandon the legacy of distrust. It is eventually the people's pressure that will drive the peace process forward. And once again an opportunity presents itself for the two democracies to seize the moment.

Talat Masood, *Daily Times* (Lahore), May 22, 2008.

---

## INDO-PAK WATER TALKS IN CITY ON 31<sup>ST</sup>

India has finally agreed to send its 11-member team to Pakistan on May 30 to discuss threadbare the controversial water projects and take up routine agenda, The News has learnt. "The 11-member team will reach Lahore on May 30, 2008, to start formal 4-day session from the very next day," official sources at Permanent Indus Commission (PIC) and Ministry of Water and Power confirmed.

Besides the routine agenda taken up on annual basis, the Pakistani team will also raise the contentious issues with particularly focus on Kishanganga and Baglihar hydropower cum water storage project of India on the Chenab River coming from Occupied Kashmir. "The Pakistani team will urge the Indian side to give an exact date for inspection of the Baglihar project to determine whether or not the work is underway in accordance with the decision of the World Bank appointed neutral expert last year," the sources maintained.

The PIC is only a permanent body that exists between Pakistan and India since 1960 Waters Treaty was signed by the two rival countries with World Bank playing a role of a facilitator. Pakistan's major concern of the day is to ensure, on the spot, inspection of the Baglihar Dam as early as possible after the World Bank's neutral expert had determined "differences" and allowed its construction with some important modifications.

The Commissioner of Pakistani side of the PIC Syed Jamaat Ali Shah also confirmed that the Indian side of the PIC with its Commissioner Aranga Nathan was arriving Pakistan on May 30. "All the four days of the meetings would be in Lahore and not in Islamabad."

...

Jamaat Ali Shah said that both sides of the PIC have to submit reports to their respective governments in next month on the discussions on the platform of the annual meeting of the body. "As our year starts from April, we will try to settle the disputes within it (the year)."

Pakistan has been urging India for the meetings of Baglihar and Kishangana in the last six months but received a cold response as New Delhi may start commissioning of Baglihar project on the Chenab River within the next two to three months.

In his Feb 12, 2007 report, the World Bank's appointed neutral expert, Prof Raymond Lafitte, had unfolded his decision determining the

“differences” between the two countries under the water treaty. Both Pakistan and India claimed victory of their respective stands.

Pakistan, in its objections submitted before the expert, had raised four concerns on the design of the Baglihar project and sought modification on freeboard, level of power intakes, pondage and spillway. “The neutral expert found that Indian calculation on freeboard was inaccurate; it was determined by him (Prof Lafitte) that crest level should be set at the lowest level by India. The expert directed India to reduce the freeboard by 33 per cent from 4.5 metres to 3 metres.”

*News International* (Rawalpindi), May 26, 2008.

## INDO-PAKISTAN TIES: MANAGEMENT OF CONTRADICTIONS

The just concluded visit of Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee to Islamabad (May 20-21), and the tenor of domestic developments in both India and Pakistan over the past week, suggest that many opposing impulses are at play in both polities and that astute management of these multiple contradictions will hold the key to nurturing stability in the troubled bilateral relationship.

The Mukherjee visit was important in that it was the first high-level political contact by the United Progressive Alliance government with the newly elected civilian dispensation in Pakistan, and while no major breakthrough was expected, the commitment to the composite dialogue process agreed to in January 2004 by the Vajpayee-Musharraf communiqué was reiterated. Both sides repeated long-held positions as regards terrorism and the ‘core’ issue of Kashmir respectively, and made modest progress on issues of consular access to prisoners and increased communication links — matters that will be further pursued in July in keeping with the incremental nature of the bilateral talks.

It merits recall that the Mukherjee visit took place against the backdrop of the Jaipur terrorist tragedy, and while it is encouraging that there was no familiar finger-pointing, the reference to India’s concerns and expectations as regards terrorism that flow from the January 2004 agreement were highlighted.

Interestingly, the Pakistani leadership noted that terrorism was ‘a common menace’ that had to be ‘fought jointly’ and the Jaipur attack was roundly condemned by Islamabad. Notice must also be taken of the Mukherjee-Pervez Musharraf meeting where the Pakistani president chose to stoke the ‘core’ issue of Kashmir even while extolling the virtues

of conflict resolution through appropriate confidence building measures (CBMs)...

It is equally significant that a Zardari interview made some very radical observations about the relationship with India which include, inter alia: “If the bilateral relationship can emulate Germany and France, then Pakistan can be a ‘force-multiplier’ for India; Pakistan with its land and water resources can feed India and the world; PPP and PML-N want to do away with visa restrictions for India.” ...

*Sentinel* (Guwahati), May 26, 2008.

## THE WATER BOMB

We are all aware that Pakistan is faced with a number of serious problems and threats, each of which seems to be more serious than the other. However, of all the problems none is more threatening than the schemes of Hindu India to block the water of Pakistan's Rivers, thereby causing water famine in the country.

Unfortunately, awareness of this threat has been lacking on the part of Pakistan's rulers in the past. But we cannot afford to ignore it any longer because the consequences will endanger not just the agriculture, economy and the stability of Pakistan but its very survival. India knows this vulnerability of Pakistan and fired by its eternal enmity to this country has been moving ahead with plans to hit Pakistan hard in the sensitive sphere of water. India, as you would also know by now, is constructing 58 dams and water reservoirs on Pakistan's Rivers, Chenab, Jhelum and Sindh.

Realising the great danger that Pakistan is about to face through acute scarcity of water, we have held several conferences and exclusive sessions with professional experts in this field at the Nazria Pakistan Trust. What role would Nazaria have if the country's survival was not ensured first! The picture that emerged from the evaluation of the situation by the experts is far grimmer than what we had generally known through media reports.

History has acknowledged now that the unannounced dishonest alteration in the Punjab boundary line made by Radcliff and Mountbatten at the time of the Partition in August 1947, by which the two very important headworks of Madhopur on the Ravi and Ferozpur on the Sutlej were given to India, laid the foundation of depriving Pakistan of the water resources that historically and geographically



belonged to it. The Indus Basin Treaty (IBT) of September 1960, whose provisions clearly favoured India, and which the dictatorial Ayub regime accepted although it was against our national interest, was, similarly, designed to deny Pakistan even its rightful share of the water of the three allocated Rivers in the years to come.

Added to the foreign sinister schemes is the painful factor of an 'India lobby' among our policymakers, which has let India go on violating the Indus Basin Treaty by building dams and diverting/blocking waters that belong to Pakistan.

To divert the water coming into the Mangla Dam, India is building Ohri Two Dam at River Poonch, Kishan Ganga Dam at River Neelum, and 19 Hydel-Projects at River Jhelum, aimed to be completed by 2012. Mangla Dam receives its stock of water from Rivers Jhelum, Neelum and Poonch. If this water is stopped, Mangla Dam would turn into a dry clay field.

India is going ahead with the controversial Baghliar Dam on River Chenab, while Pakistan government, after raising belated objections, has still not taken the decisive steps that are necessary to have this project stopped. Its pathetic proof was seen at the fourth round of the so-called Composite Dialogue between the two countries held in Islamabad from 19-21 May 2008. According to the officials, "The contentious issue of the Baghliar Dam could not find place in the agenda of the foreign ministers' talks despite Pakistan's insistence."

The government has all the experts and the data for evaluation of the dangers that this Dam poses to Pakistan. Just the few details mentioned below will give you an idea of the dangers to come, if the government does not confront India on the water issue.

Baghliar Dam is of such a large size that, whenever it so wants, India can block 7000 to 8000 cusec-ft of water per day. Besides, India has already built 14 hydroelectric plants at River Chenab's northern part and is building still more plants to enable it to block the entire water of Chenab for 20 to 25 days. If India were to store the water of Chenab and Jhelum for just 2 to 3 months, Pakistan's agriculture would be ruined, with dreadful consequences for the nation. India plans to formally begin the operation of Baghliar Dam on June 30, 2008.

If Pakistan fails to move quickly, the Indians, by completing their ongoing projects would have a powerful weapon in their hands. Blocking of the water of Chenab and Jhelum would result in:

- Denial of water to a vast region, including Multan, Jhang, Faisalabad, Gujrat, Okara, Sahiwal, Vehari, Bahawalnagar, Bahawalpur and Rahimyar Khan.
- 406 Canals and 1125 Distributaries will become dry, rendering 35 lakh acres of cultivated land barren, and eventually ruining a total of 70 acres of fertile land.
- The Marala Headworks, through which water from Chenab is poured into River Ravi that had dried up after it went into India's control under the IBT, will stop functioning. The Ravi feeds the Canals along the border, which serve as a most important Defence Line. If Chenab's normal flow stops, Ravi would have no water and the Border Canals would become dry.

The Sindh Tas Water Council Pakistan, which has been engaged since 1984 in the in-depth study of India's designs of denial of water to Pakistan, has discovered that India is actually working on a secret mega-plan that was drawn years ago with the aim of bringing Pakistan to its knees, when the time came, by subjecting it to total starvation of water. This mega-plan is being financed and implemented by a consortium consisting of India and three other countries (one of which is Israel), two multinational companies, one trans-national NGO and three secret agencies.

I was not exaggerating when a few weeks ago I warned our government to beware of India's "Water Bomb."

We have no option now but to urgently take bold and decisive measures against the Indian schemes of subjecting Pakistan to devastation. But, no measures can be effective nor can succeed if Pakistan's policies of giving India the image of a close trading and social partner and a friendly neighbour who poses no threat are not changed.

Indeed, we have seen these misconceived policies proving demoralising and harmful to our country, while facilitating India in promoting its schemes and strengthening its aims against Pakistan.

The "water bomb" is a reality that Pakistan's rulers must not overlook in the artificial scenario created by the so-called "confidence building measures."

Majid Nizami, *Nation* (Islamabad), May 27, 2008.

## KISHANGANGA DAM CONTROVERSY

Pakistan claims that the Kishanganga project would reduce the power generation capacity of the 969-megawatt Neelum-Jhelum plant by about 11 percent. It also contends that the diversion would result in an ecological disaster for the area

When Pakistan and India signed the Indus Waters Treaty (IWT) in 1960, it was thought that it would forever put to end water as an issue between them. However, today it appears as if that promise was unfounded.

This is borne out by the number of water-related disputes that keep cropping up between the two countries every few years. First it was Sallal Dam, then Wullar Barrage followed by Baglihar Dam.

Now it is the Kishanganga Dam that has embroiled the two countries in a dispute. Their Indus Waters Commissioners have recently concluded a second round of talks on the issue and are to meet again next month in New Delhi for another round.

What is the nature of this controversy and what are the prospects of a negotiated settlement?

The controversy owes its genesis to India's plan to build a 330-megawatt hydro-power plant in Indian-held Kashmir across the Jhelum River. The dam site is located 160 km upstream from Muzaffarabad and involves the diversion of Kishanganga River (called the Neelum River in Pakistan) to a tributary named Bunar Madumati Nullah of Jhelum near Bunkot. The diversion will change the course of the Neelum by about 100 km, which will then join the Jhelum through Wullar lake near the town of Bandipur in Baramula district. As a result of this diversion, the Neelum and Jhelum rivers, which at present join each other near Muzaffarabad at Domail, will meet in Indian-held Kashmir.

Pakistan regards the project as a violation of the IWT. It raised a number of objections in 2004 as a result of which India revised the design of the dam in order to meet Pakistan's objections. Pakistan, however, was still not satisfied with the revised design and raised fresh objections.

During the current round of negotiations these objections, which relate to gate structure, height and size, level, diversion plan, storage capacity, power intact and free board were discussed. However, there was no agreement on any one of them because the two sides refused to budge from their stated positions. Discussions could not be completed on the technical and legal aspects of the issue because of paucity of time.

Of all the objections that Pakistan has raised, diversion of the Neelum is perhaps the core issue. Pakistan argues that India can store water but cannot divert it because under the IWT, it is under obligation to release as much water downstream as it stores. In its opinion, the diversion would reduce the flow of water into Pakistan by about 11 percent in summer and about 27 percent in winter, which would be contrary to the IWT as the Western rivers that are in question belong to Pakistan.

Similarly, Pakistan claims that the project would reduce the power generation capacity of the 969-megawatt Neelum-Jhelum plant by about 11 percent. It also contends that the diversion would result in an ecological disaster for the area. It has no exact data at present but has commissioned an international firm to prepare an environmental damage assessment report.

Pakistan also objects to the construction of the Kishanganga project on the ground that it would affect power generation capacity of the plant that it is building on the Neelum-Jhelum confluence. Besides, it argues that the feasibility study of the Neelum-Jhelum project that it has completed entitles it to stop India from building a storage facility for diverting water. In its view, the planned use of the river Jhelum by it is as good as the term “use of water” in the IWT.

India categorically rejects Pakistan’s line of argument. To begin with, it disputes the contention that the diversion would reduce the flow of water into Pakistan. In its view, the quantum of water would remain the same as before. The only difference that the diversion, in its opinion, would make would be that instead of meeting in Azad Kashmir as is the case at present, the Neelum and Jhelum rivers would meet in the Indian-held Kashmir.

India also rejects Pakistan’s contention that the completion of the feasibility study of the Neelum-Jhelum project has created an acquired right in favour of Pakistan. On the contrary, it asserts that commencement of work on the Kishanganga project gives an edge to India’s claim.

Examining the claims of the two countries regarding the superiority of their right on the ground of “existing use”, we note that it is the Helsinki Rules on the Uses of the Waters of International Rivers which cover the matter. Article 8(2a) defines “existing use” as “a use that is in fact operational...from the time of the initiation of construction directly related to the use.” Given the fact that we do not dispose of the requisite

information on the Kishanganga and Neelum-Jhelum projects based on the definition of the “existing use”, it is not possible to pronounce in the matter.

One thing is, however, clear. If Pakistan is to successfully challenge India on the issue it would have to show that the diversion of the Neelum would significantly reduce the flow of water into its territory and cause appreciable damage to the environment of the area.

This brings us to the question of the possibility of a negotiated settlement. India always advocates the bilateral approach as the best and the only way for conflict resolution of IWT-related issues. It claims that bilateralism rather than third party arbitration has emerged as the norm between the two countries.

Pakistan disagrees with the Indian contention and insists on the continuing validity of the IWT. However, it is ready to give the bilateral approach a try on the condition that India spell out a timeframe for a negotiated settlement. This is what it did during the negotiations on the Baglihar issue and also during the recently concluded round of talks.

However, going by newspaper reports, India’s response to the matter is unclear, though the latter has apparently agreed to resolve the issue during the next round of negotiations.

We should take the Indian promise with a pinch of salt because it is an old Indian tactic to keep Pakistan embroiled in an interminable rigmarole of negotiations while continuing with the work at hand.

This is the lesson from the Baglihar negotiations where India used all kinds of tactics to present Pakistan with a fait accompli. For example, it did not let a Pakistani team make an on-site inspection of the dam for quite some time on the ground of security. Then on two occasions, when Pakistan was ready to seize the World Bank for arbitration, it made requests for more efforts at bilateral settlement while all along it was proceeding with mala fide intentions by continuing the work on the dam. Finally, even after the appointment of a neutral expert, the Indian PM termed it as “premature” and the Indian Water Resources Minister asked the World Bank to leave the two parties alone to settle the matter bilaterally.

India seems to be employing the same tactics of procrastination in the present case. For example, when, during the recently concluded session, Jumaat Ali Shah, Pakistan’s Indus Waters Commissioner, asked that his six objections be treated as questions, which is a condition sine qua non for invoking article 9 of the IWT relating to third party

arbitration, his Indian counterpart reportedly requested him to desist from it and let them remain as objections.

This is just the start of the merry-go-round of dilatory tactics by India. We will certainly see more of them in the months and years to come. Will the Pakistani side be able to checkmate them this time? Only time will tell.

Ijaz Hussain, *Daily Times* (Lahore), June 18, 2008.

## WHAT WAS ACHIEVED IN INDIA-PAKISTAN TALKS

Here is the agreed outcome of the meeting between the foreign ministers of India and Pakistan:

- The 5th Round of the Composite Dialogue would be launched on 21-22 July with discussions on (i) peace and security including CBMs, and, (ii) Jammu and Kashmir.
- The Technical Working Group on cross-LoC Confidence Building Measures will meet in Islamabad on July 10 to concretise decisions regarding bus services, trade and truck services across the LoC announced in May.
- The Technical Working Groups of the India-Pakistan Joint Economic Commission complete their meetings such that the Joint Commission could meet by the end of the year.
- The respective deputy chairs of the Indian and Pakistan Planning Commission had felt that an institutional mechanism for regular dialogue and exchange of views between them would be useful.
- The ministers noted the detailed discussions which took place on issues such as wind and thermal power and power supply arrangements and issues.

The mutually beneficial cooperation in Rapid Mass Transport Systems was also noted.

- After completing their visit to jails in Pakistan, the India-Pakistan Judicial Committee on Prisoners will now visit jails in India in the month of July to make further recommendations with regard to issues concerning prisoners and fishermen in custody.

It was agreed that the work of the Judicial Committee has proved to be an effective way to proceed with the issues.

- The ministers noted that the Railway authorities had agreed to increase interchange of rakes to five daily from current levels of two daily.

The proposal of opening the Kokhrapar-Munabao route in freight was also discussed and will be examined.

- They decided that henceforth the meetings of the Anti-Terrorism Mechanism would be held regularly.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), June 28, 2008.

## DAMAGING THE PEACE PROCESS

It is not surprising for most Pakistanis to read or hear about Indian allegations that Pakistan was involved in the bombing of the Indian embassy in Kabul recently. In fact, what was somewhat surprising was the time the Indian agencies took in putting the blame on Pakistan. The past is studded with examples when the Indians lost no time in blurting out accusations against Pakistan for almost all adverse incidents only to realise later that these were undertaken by their own citizens.

Two different interpretations of who were involved in the tragic incident of Indian embassy were published in Pakistani newspapers. While the Americans indicated quite categorically that Pakistan was not at all involved in the attack, the Indian media accused Pakistan but the Indian officials refrained from making such accusations initially. However, last Sunday the Indian Security Advisor M.K. Narayanan accused Pakistan in response to a question by a TV channel.

Not only the National Security Advisor stated that India has “a fair amount of intelligence” (on the involvement of Pakistan) but also categorically stressed that Pakistan’s intelligence agency ISI was involved. In the same breath he suggested that the ISI needs to be destroyed. He even suggested retaliation and stated, “I think we need to pay back in the same coin.”

Two questions deserve to be analysed at this stage. Why was the Indian accusation delayed whereas past history is filled with prompted accusations? Second, how would such unsubstantiated accusations impact on the ongoing peace process between India and Pakistan? The fifth round of the Indo-Pak peace process is beginning tomorrow. Most observers consider this round is going to be crucial as the newly elected Pakistani government’s representatives would be participating in the process this time.

Most neutral observers appear to be somewhat unanimous in asserting that there exist combinations of factors that may have caused the delay in Indian accusations. First, it has been Indian practice to immediately put blame on Pakistan as not only because the hardcore Hindus would quickly accept but many Indians easily fall prey to Indian media's propaganda barrage. Besides, in the past the Indian authorities discovered that most of such incidents were undertaken by the indigenous groups and not by any outsiders.

The over-projected attacks on Indian parliament and Mumbai blasts are perhaps good examples of quick reaction and eventual discovery of the truth. The Indian courts awarded sentences to perpetrators of attack on Indian parliament to its own citizens. It needs to be reminded here that initial Indian reaction was to put the blame on Pakistan-based groups and accuse Pakistan's effort to eliminate Indian leadership.

Similarly, many bomb blasts including the Mumbai train blasts were initially attributed to Pakistani efforts only to discover later that those were undertaken by the angered section of their own society. Despite the existence of joint investigation of the burning of Samjhota Express in which many Pakistanis were burnt to death, so far nothing tangible has seen the light of the day.

Undoubtedly, putting the blame on a known adversary not only buys time but also elicits sympathies and condemnation from India's friends. It is a known fact that most friends of India would express sympathies not because they are assessing the situation objectively but how best it could serve their national interests with regard to India. The Afghan president's recent outburst reflects not only his faithful compliance to outsider influential elements in Kabul but also the level of his helplessness in which he finds himself.

The practice of putting blame on others also enables to cover one's own inabilities and weaknesses. While the Indians have mastered this approach over the troubled land of Indian-Held Kashmir (IHK) when they regularly pushed the notion of cross border terrorism, the Afghan regime is also currently and religiously following their tutor's practices. Despite having recognised the fact that India was over-projecting the notion of cross border terrorism, many important countries opted to accept the Indian version of the events in IHK not because they believed in it but their national interests dictated such a policy pursuit.

The second question whether or not such an approach could have an adverse impact on the ongoing peace process is perhaps equally



significant if not more important. Asked by the TV channels whether such acts would impede peace process, the National Security Advisor dismissed the question by stressing that the ISI has never been part of the peace process. He said that the improvement in India-Pakistan relations is sought through a comprehensive dialogue mechanism and anti-terrorism was just one piece of this mechanism.

Compared to the Indian National Security Advisor's interpretation, the Pakistanis seem much more perturbed over the Indian allegations of Pakistani involvement in the attack on the Indian embassy in Kabul. They believe that allegations without any tangible evidence tend to not only take a heavy toll of overall atmosphere that has been secured during the last four years' concerted efforts but could also radically impact upon the next round of composite dialogue.

The foreign ministers of the two countries are scheduled to meet on July 21 with the objectives of starting the fifth round of India-Pakistan composite dialogue. Many observers are expecting that this round may yield some tangible results. Already, disappointment, especially among the Pakistanis, is on the increase as they feel that so far no real progress has been witnessed in disputed areas such as Sir Creek, Siachin, Wullar Lake and Kashmir.

Since the joint survey has already taken place over Sir Creek and many observers are already optimistically predicting that an agreement may be worked in this round over this particular dispute but an irresponsible and a ludicrous statement like the one that has been issued by the Indian National Security Advisor could not only vitiate the atmosphere but could also damage the peace process. It is not too farfetched to assume that once again the spanner has been thrown by an important Indian official to delay the process like the one thrown by the Indian army when the Siachen dispute was about to be resolved.

Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, *Post* (Islamabad), July 20, 2008.

## DIALOGUE UNDER STRESS: INDIA

Pakistan and India struggled to hide their exasperation with each other at the start of a fifth round of composite dialogue between their foreign secretaries here on Monday New Delhi warned that the recent attack on its embassy in Kabul had put the talks under stress. Islamabad said given its enormous sacrifices it could not be put on probation in the war on terror. A source close to the talks between Foreign Secretary Salman

Bashir and his Indian counterpart Shivshankar Menon described the atmosphere at the Hyderabad House as unexpectedly muddled. Mr. Menon is believed to have told Mr. Bashir that not only had the dialogue been put under stress but the talks were also at risk following the devastating attack in Kabul on July 7.

After the round of the dialogue on peace and security, Jammu and Kashmir and other confidence-building measures (CBMs), Mr. Menon told reporters that the talks were happening at a difficult time of our relationship with Pakistan. Unfortunately, there have been several issues in the recent past which have vitiated the atmosphere and the composite dialogue process is under stress, Mr. Menon said.

In this context, he referred to recent alleged violations of the ceasefire along the Line of Control, cross-border terrorism and alleged incitement to violence in Jammu and Kashmir. There have been public statements by some leaders in Pakistan, who are reverting to the old polemics, Mr. Menon said, adding that all these things had culminated in the suicide bombing at the Indian embassy. Our investigations so far point towards a few elements in Pakistan to be behind the blast, he said, but refused to identify the elements, saying investigations were continuing.

At his separate news conference after the talks, Mr. Bashir tried to give a positive spin to his meeting with Mr. Menon, whom, he said, he regarded with considerable respect. However, a correspondent's question about the Kabul blast seemed to change the mood. Please don't consider Pakistan to be on probation. We do not have to prove our credentials to anyone. We are engaged at the forefront of the fight against terror. Pakistan is not the epicenter of terrorism, he declared. Mr. Bashir obliquely blamed Afghanistan for starting the current round of accusations. Though he did not name Kabul directly, he left no one in doubt about the foreign location where Pakistan's name was being besmirched with unhelpful allegations.

If Pakistan were to get involved in the blame game, it too had a litany of issues in Balochistan and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas where it could point the finger at India, but this was not what he had done in the talks, Mr. Bashir said. We have faced terrorism in our cities and towns for far too long, he said in response to a question from a western journalist. More than 100,000 troops were engaged in fighting the scourge, and many had been lost, he said.

Please do not create impediments. I am not saying this to India but to the international community... Please do not make statements that make it difficult for us to address the issues at hand. Don't make statements that hurt us, he said. While Mr. Bashir said he savoured the tea and biscuits as well as a sumptuous lunch thrown between the two rounds of talks, there were those close at hand who thought that the absence of an official dinner was a giveaway that relations needed a lot of tweaking. Officials said the next opportunity could be in Colombo on the margins of the SAARC summit in early August when the foreign secretaries, their ministers and prime ministers might be able to stop the slide.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), July 22, 2008.

## THE WRONG DIALOGUE

The fifth round of the composite dialogue between Pakistan and India has gotten off to a rocky start. In the restrained world of diplomacy, the events in New Delhi amount to a bucket of cold water poured over the Pakistan foreign secretary, Salman Bashir. Indian Foreign Secretary Shiv Shankar Memon's blunt statement that Pakistan's alleged involvement in the suicide bombing of the Indian embassy in Kabul has put the composite dialogue under stress has deepened the tension between the two countries. While the Indian accusations and rhetoric have grown sharper, no evidence has yet been forthcoming from the Indian or Afghan side of Pakistan's involvement in the deadly Kabul blast. So it is no surprise that Mr Bashir responded testily to a reporter's question about the bombing, stating that Pakistan is not on "probation" and that we "do not have to prove our credentials to anyone" in the war against terrorism. It is not all bad news on the India-Pakistan front though. New CBMs on cross-LoC movement of people in Kashmir have been announced; Pakistan has permitted the expansion of trade with India; and the foreign ministers of the two countries are to meet at the sidelines of the Saarc summit next month. However, Mr Menon's accusations that Pakistan has fomented violence recently against India in Kashmir and Afghanistan will certainly have vitiated the process of rapprochement. This will negatively affect the moves to settle political disputes since an overwrought climate does not help the diplomatic process. Most immediately, the flaring of tensions on our eastern border with India just as the pressure on our western border with Afghanistan has increased is a worrying strategic

development. Pakistan cannot afford a confrontation with the ‘old enemy’ — India — as it tries to convince a sceptical public of the threat posed by the new enemy — militancy. This will play right into the hands of the hawks in the establishment who still view India as Pakistan’s foremost enemy and are alarmed by the growing Indian presence in Afghanistan, which has long been considered Pakistan’s political and military prerogative. A diplomatic row between India and Pakistan also does not bode well for progress towards resolving the six-decade-old Kashmir dispute. Incremental CBMs notwithstanding, there is little under discussion between India and Pakistan at the moment that could yield a long-term solution. The last big idea was President Musharraf’s four points (identification of Kashmir’s regions; demilitarisation; self-governance; and a joint management mechanism) mooted two years ago. The proposal received a cold reception in India and Prime Minister Gilani has also distanced his government from it. But as long as relations between Islamabad and New Delhi remain frayed, new proposals for a durable peace will almost certainly not emerge. Therefore both India and Pakistan must do more: India must back up its allegations with credible evidence if any; Pakistan must work to convince India of its peaceful intentions.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), July 23, 2008.

### TENSION VITIATES BUILD-UP TO SAARC SUMMIT INDIA-PAKISTAN RELATIONS

The 15th Saarc summit, which will open in the Sri Lankan capital Colombo on Aug 2, is unlikely to focus on bread-and-butter issues because of a trust deficit between Pakistan and India.

The tone of the summit has already been set in New Delhi, where foreign secretaries of the two countries conducted the so-called composite dialogue under “stress” just a few days before the summit in a country which has been embroiled in a civil war for long and where, according to Sri Lankan journalist Ayesha Wijeratne, 35,000 illegal firearms are in circulation.

Hence terrorism, and not poverty alleviation and human development, would top the agenda.

While Indo-Pakistan relations have fallen to a new low as New Delhi accused Pakistan of complicity in the bomb attack on its embassy

in Kabul, Sri Lankan authorities have reportedly mobilised a massive security net of around 5,000 soldiers for the summit.

According to reports, the Indians have also mobilised a massive security entourage, including highly skilled Black Cats. India is reportedly also deploying three warships and two guided-missile destroyers and several helicopters to protect Prime Minister Manmohan Singh.

The meetings on the sideline of the summit would thus assume greater significance as both India and Afghanistan would like to isolate Pakistan and bring it under greater pressure on terrorism.

After surviving a no-trust move over the nuclear deal with the US, India is pushing the Afghans to adopt a hawkish stand during the summit vis-à-vis Pakistan.

This would pave the way for a greater Indian role in Afghanistan and enhancement in its build-up in Kashmir. At the same time it would help New Delhi divert attention from the growing disillusionment of the left and the marginalised.

India has not only picked on Pakistan, but has also adopted a hard line towards Bangladesh over transit trade. There were reports that New Delhi had put Dhaka on notice for conceding its demand for allowing overland transit facilities. But Dhaka has so far refused to allow Delhi land transit facility, saying it is not in its “national interest”.

A Bangladeshi journalist was surprised at India’s stance towards a LDC, a few weeks before the Saarc summit. Officials in the Sri Lankan capital want South Asian leaders to address the energy problem. It is expected that the summit would be contemplating ways to reduce dependency on fossil fuels and hydro carbons as well as exploring alternative methods of energy like solar power.

There is a need to build a South Asian identity based on diversity and a common history. The meeting should also consider the idea of a no-war pact and declare the region nuclear-free.

### **Visa-Free South Asia**

Free movement of people in the region or, in other words, a visa-free South Asia should be their main concern. Another area that demands urgent attention is the draconian security apparatus that gives a free hand to authorities to commit atrocities against their own peoples.

It is time to ensure rights to all workers, especially women, in accordance with the International Labour Organisation Convention, United Nations covenants and national constitutions.

Among other issues that should be discussed are enhanced cooperation among member states in combating terrorism, climate change and poverty alleviation.

Creation of alternative regional trade and economic cooperation framework that meet the needs and aspirations of small producers and labour is also a need of the hour. This will ensure the defeat of neo-liberal instruments such as the World Trade Organisation and regional free trade agreements.

Unless countries in the region have more trade among themselves, on the pattern of European countries, they cannot confront the negative fallout of globalization and neo-colonialism.

The 15th Saarc summit is being held at a time when the world is threatened by a long period of recession and denial of political, economic and other rights to the poor. It is also being held at a time when governments of the region are increasingly invoking draconian security laws.

It is time to revoke such laws if the region has to survive and make progress. It is time to evolve no war pacts not only between countries but also between different communities within a state.

The Saarc leaders will fail if they do not take decisions for improving rail, road and sea links. It is time they ensured food sovereignty by building alliances of peasants and agricultural labour. This would involve the creation of seed and grain banks, promotion of participatory research and sustainable technologies and the rejection of monopolistic and environmentally destructive technologies.

Shamim-ur-Rahman, *Dawn* (Islamabad), July 31, 2008.

**ADDRESS BY THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF PAKISTAN AT THE  
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON  
"PAKISTAN-INDIA PEACE PROCESS: THE WAY FORWARD"**

Dr. Professor Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema,  
President, Islamabad Policy Research Institute,  
Mr. Richard Asbeck, Resident Representative, Hanns Seidel Foundation,  
Distinguished scholars,  
Ladies and Gentlemen

I would like to thank the Islamabad Policy Research Institute for providing me this opportunity to share my thoughts with the distinguished participants of this conference on “Pakistan-India Peace Process: The Way Forward”. I am delighted to address this august gathering.

Ladies and Gentlemen

A glance at the map of our region will show that Pakistan lies at the confluence of some of the most well endowed and resource-rich but conflict afflicted regions of the world: South Asia, West Asia, Central Asia, the Middle East, and the Persian Gulf .

Our geo-strategic location thus gives us an unrivalled relevance not only in our own region but also the regions beyond. Simultaneously, it places on Pakistan the onerous responsibility of prudent conduct of its relations not only with its immediate neighbours but also with the rest of the world. We confront serious challenges emanating from our geo-political environment with equally serious implications for our security and development. Seen in this perspective, our relations with India assume pivotal importance for the peace and progress of our entire region.

Let me start by affirming the high importance that Pakistan attaches to the peace process with India . Our Government is fully committed to carrying forward the process. All major political parties and the Parliament sincerely desire improvement of bilateral relations.

We have reaffirmed this resolve at multiple levels of our interactions with the Indian leadership including the recent meeting between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan , on the sidelines of the Colombo SAARC Summit.

Ladies and Gentlemen

For over four years, Pakistan and India have been engaged in a Composite Dialogue process. Discussions have been held on eight segments ranging from cooperation in bilateral trade to people to people contacts to addressing all outstanding issues including Jammu and Kashmir .The overall objective has been to construct multi-faceted good neighbourly relationship with India and build durable peace in the region.

Consequently, there has been significant improvement in the atmospherics between the two countries. High level visits have been

taking place frequently. People to people contacts have deepened. Bilateral trade has increased. And communication links like bus and train and air services between the two countries have been enhanced.

While bilateral relations have improved in several fields, all tracks of the process have not proceeded at the same pace. Bilateral disputes remain unresolved, including the issues of Sir Creek, Siachen, and Jammu and Kashmir.

Lately, there have been some adverse developments. Unhelpful rhetoric has increased, particularly with regard to the bombing of the Indian Embassy in Kabul and the ceasefire violations on the Line of Control.

While we understand the concerns expressed and the need to address them, it is important to avoid hostile statements. We must not allow the positive atmosphere to be vitiated. On the bombing of Indian Embassy in Kabul on 7 July, let me state here that it is a highly regrettable incident, which we have condemned. Our own Consulate in Herat has also been subjected to a terrorist attack. We feel that if there is any evidence it should be shared with us to enable us to look into the matter.

Recent reports of ceasefire violations at the LoC are a matter of common concern. We are fully committed to safeguarding the understanding on ceasefire reached since November 2003. There should be more effective coordination between the respective authorities on ground, namely the sector commanders and Director Generals of Military Operations, to prevent occurrence of such incidents.

The important point here is that we should not lose the gains made through the four years of the Composite Dialogue process. It is important to ensure that this process is not de-railed. It is in the interest of the peoples of the two countries.

Ladies and Gentlemen

I would also like to underscore the need to resolve the Kashmir issue. It is Pakistan 's principled position that there should be a just and peaceful solution of this longstanding issue in accordance with the aspirations of the people of Jammu and Kashmir . For its part, Pakistan has expressed its readiness to engage constructively with India to find a solution that is acceptable to all parties, in particular the people of Kashmir . However, there is a growing public perception in Pakistan that a matching response from India has not yet been seen.



Meanwhile, Pakistan and India have agreed on a host of Kashmir-related CBMs. We welcome these measures as these have enabled the divided families to meet and bring relief to the lives of Kashmiri people. On the eve of the launching of the fifth round of the composite dialogue and the Foreign Secretary-level talks on Jammu and Kashmir, several new steps have been announced for more effective implementation of these CBMs. These include increase in the frequency of Srinagar-Muzaffarbad and Poonch-Rawlakot bus service from fortnightly to weekly, introducing triple entry travel permits, expeditious processing of travel requests in emergency cases and transfer of application forms through e-mails. We are also currently seized with efforts to start cross LoC trade as soon as possible. I would hope that a delegation from the AJK Chamber of Commerce would visit its counterpart in Sri Nagar as soon as possible and make concrete recommendations about starting the cross LoC trade. Recent events of unrest and violence in Kashmir have once again underscored the need to find an early solution of the Kashmir issue in accordance with the aspirations of the Kashmiri people. We have expressed our concern over the excessive use of force to suppress the protests and killing of Sheikh Abdul Aziz, a senior Hurriyat leader. We believe it is important that human rights of the Kashmiris are respected and their voices heard. We regard it important that an enabling environment, free of violence, is created to sustain discussions on this issue under the Composite Dialogue.

Ladies and Gentlemen

Pakistan attaches considerable importance to our substantive talks on issues of peace and security.

As responsible nuclear weapon states, both Pakistan and India must continue their endeavors to promote strategic stability and restraint. It is a matter of satisfaction that considerable progress has been made in agreed nuclear CBMs including the Agreements on Pre-Notification of Flight Testing of Ballistic Missiles, and Reducing the Risk from Accidents Relating to Nuclear Weapons. Likewise, substantial progress has been made to build confidence in the conventional field. We must continue this process of confidence building and think of new and creative proposals. On its part, Pakistan would continue to implement, in letter and spirit, all the related understandings and agreements in the nuclear and conventional fields reached between the two countries.

I also wish to underscore the importance that we attach to the early resolution of Siachen and Sir Creek issues, which in my view are 'doable'. All that we need is the political will for their expeditious resolution.

Progress on these two issues is necessary to assure the people of the sub-continent that the Composite Dialogue process is result-oriented. It will also enable us to move speedily in other areas.

On Siachen, Pakistan has offered a package proposal on disengagement of troops, their redeployment, and monitoring of the area. The proposal is intended to bridge the differences. The resolution of this issue can truly turn the area into a "mountain of peace" as suggested by the Indian Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh.

On Sir Creek, engagement at the level of experts has been constructive. We have completed the joint survey of this area and have exchanged the maps. A final solution can now be well within our reach. We must give earnest attention to arriving at a mutually acceptable solution as soon as possible.

Over the past four years, good progress has been made on promoting friendly exchanges in various fields. This has contributed towards building better understanding which is of immense importance. Both the countries now intend to liberalize the visa regime in order to facilitate the people to people contacts.

Ladies and Gentlemen

It will be our endeavor to make our engagement on economic and commercial cooperation a win-win proposition. There has been a significant increase in the volume of bilateral trade from around US\$ 200 million before the beginning of the peace process to US\$ 1.98 billion in 2007-08. This is one of the tangible results of the peace process. We have recently announced an increase of 135 items in the Positive list for trade with India . The changes announced in our trade policy should augur well for bilateral trade to the mutual benefit of the two countries. Presently, the heavy trade imbalance against Pakistan is a matter of concern. Both countries need to work towards a more balanced trade as well as address the non-tariff barriers impeding Pakistan 's exports to India .

Ladies and Gentlemen

Let me reiterate that Pakistan remains committed to fighting terrorism and extremism. We are cooperating with the international community to fight this menace. Pakistan and India are addressing the issue through

multiple channels, including at the Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism whose third meeting was held in Islamabad on 24 June, 2008. Interior Secretary-level talks are another important forum.

Ladies and Gentlemen

On water issues, it is important to adhere to the Indus Waters Treaty. In addition, I believe that the two countries should engage in constructive cooperation, in such areas as conservation of water resources through research, capacity building, and sharing of technology and best practices. We should be able to think ahead and address together the looming crisis of water scarcity that could confront us in the not so distant future.

Ladies and Gentlemen

The issue of prisoners held in the each other's custody has a humanitarian dimension. We welcome the excellent work being done by the Judicial Committee on Prisoners. Both sides must implement the recommendations of the Committee to ensure humane treatment of prisoners and expeditious release of all those prisoners who have completed their sentences. We should also fully implement the Consular Access Agreement, signed during the ministerial review of the Fourth Round of the Composite Dialogue on 21 May this year

Ladies and Gentlemen

Pakistan 's national priority is ensuring socio-economic development for which we require a stable and peaceful neighbourhood. We are hopeful that a sustained engagement between the two countries would not only help in promoting bilateral cooperation but also regional collaboration.

To this end, we are happy to note that regional cooperation under the ambit of SAARC has picked up momentum. We welcome in particular the Colombo Statement on Food Security. Pakistan remains fully committed to making SAARC an effective vehicle for promoting regional cooperation.

Ladies and Gentlemen

Normalization of Pakistan-India relations is of critical importance, in realizing the vision of a peaceful and prosperous South Asia: fast joining the ranks of more developed countries of Asia; well positioned to benefit from the trends of our times; and well poised to meet common challenges

such as poverty alleviation, sustainable development, climate change, and food and energy security.

As developing countries, Pakistan and India share common perspectives on a number of issues. In a fast changing global environment, we need to consult and coordinate our efforts to achieve the goals of peace and development. I believe it is the shared intent of the leadership of our two countries to endeavour for achieving a bright and prosperous future for our peoples and for South Asian region, as a whole. I thank you all.

August 26, 2008.

[http://www.mofa.gov.pk/FM\\_Speeches\\_Briefings/Pakistan-IndiaPeace%20Process.htm](http://www.mofa.gov.pk/FM_Speeches_Briefings/Pakistan-IndiaPeace%20Process.htm)

## PAKISTAN AND INDIA CLASH OVER KASHMIR AT UN

Pakistan and India clashed in the UN General Assembly's open debate on Monday over the disputed Kashmir territory after an Indian delegate called it a part of India.

"Jammu and Kashmir is an internationally recognised disputed territory according to several UN resolutions. The Security Council's demand for free and fair plebiscite under the UN auspices still remains to be implemented," Ambassador Abdullah Hussain Haroon said rejecting Indian claims.

Citing the current violence in Indian-occupied Kashmir, Mr Haroon said the occupation forces had brutally killed innocent protesters.

The Kashmiri political leadership has been put behind bars to silence their call for freedom. Such actions, he said, created tension and aggravated the situation on the ground.

Mr Haroon exercised his right of reply to a statement by Indian delegate Rajeev Shukla claiming Kashmir to be a part of India, and insisting that an earlier speech by the Pakistani ambassador amounted to "unwarranted" interference in the Indian internal affairs and that it was also "factually incorrect".

Mr Shukla said: "The people of Jammu and Kashmir exercised their right to self-determination at the time of India's independence and have since then repeatedly participated in free, fair and open elections at all levels. In contrast, Pakistan pretends to be concerned over human rights,

yet denied even a semblance of such rights to the people of Pakistan-occupied Kashmir.”

In a hard-hitting response, Mr Haroon said the Indian claims about Kashmiris’ exercise of the right to self-determination through elections had been rejected not only by the UN Security Council but also by the people of Kashmir.

“The current response to announcing elections is in front of the whole world. The Kashmiri leadership has once again rejected the so-called elections, they have been put behind bars, and widespread protests in Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir are going on”.

As regards human rights violations, Mr Haroon said Pakistan had only echoed what had been said and reported both by the international and Indian human rights non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and media about Indian occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

“Pakistan remains committed to the ongoing dialogue between the two countries and considers it an important vehicle for promotion of cooperative and good neighbourly relations as well as peace and security in the region. It is, however, important that the process of engagement produce results in addressing the outstanding issues. It should move from a stage of conflict management to conflict resolution,” he added.

While participating in the committee’s debate on “Right of peoples to self-determination”, Mr Haroon said the exercise of that right had empowered suppressed and disenfranchised peoples to strive to achieve equality before the law and to determine their own political, economic, social and cultural systems.

Today, he said, the existence of that right continued to engender hope among millions of the poor and vulnerable, whose fundamental rights to chart their own destiny had been the suppressed or denied.

In strengthening the right to self-determination, he said the following principles must be constantly reaffirmed: first, the forcible occupation of a people’s territory whose right of self-determination had been mandated by the United Nations should be recognised as a clear violation of international law; second, the right to self-determination must be exercised freely and unfettered by overt and covert coercion or influence; third, the right was immutable and could not be extinguished by the passage of time; and fourth, the legitimacy of a people’s struggle for self-determination could not be compromised by tarnishing it with accusation of terrorism levelled by occupying powers.

Turning to the situation in Indian-occupied Kashmir, he said that six decades had passed since the Kashmiri people were promised they would be able to exercise their right to self-determination by the United Nations Security Council. However, the inability to remove troops from that area had delayed self-determination and, now, the complete removal of troops ordained by the Security Council resolution could not be ignored.

An improvement in the human rights situation in the Indian-occupied Kashmir, he said, would facilitate and enhance the dialogue process between India and Pakistan. He called upon all parties to seize the opportunity provided by the ongoing dialogue to find a negotiated settlement on the Jammu and Kashmir issue.

Masood Haider, *Dawn* (Islamabad), November 5, 2008.

## BAGLIHAR IS BACK

While India officially maintains that it never violated the Indus Waters Treaty, the Indian commissioner, during the recent commission meeting, reportedly confessed that India did violate the Treaty by filling the Baglihar reservoir

After the neutral expert's verdict on Baglihar Dam, if we thought we were done with the issue, we were sadly mistaken. This time, the issue is in the shape of water — about 200,000 acre feet of it — that Pakistan has accused India of 'stealing' while filling the Baglihar reservoir. The matter is so serious from Pakistan's perspective that President Asif Zardari took it up with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in New York on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly session in September.

The national security advisor of Pakistan also broached it with his Indian counterpart last month in New Delhi. Then Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani raised it with Singh in Beijing on the sidelines of the recently concluded Asia-Europe summit. And now President Zardari has decided to write to the Indian prime minister, asking him to redeem the promise made to him in New York to resolve the issue.

The controversy began when India allegedly filled the dam in contravention of the Indus Waters Treaty. According to Pakistan's Indus commissioner, Jamaat Ali Shah, India released between 30,000 and 35,000 cusecs of water (and at one point, 23,000 cusecs) between August 19 and September 5. This was in violation of Article 18-C of Annexure E of the Treaty, which obligates India to undertake the filling of a dam on the

Chenab between June 21 and August 31, and release at least 55,000 cusecs downstream at Marala headworks.

This was also in violation of the understanding that the Indus commissioners of the two countries had reached according to which India was to fill the dam during the rainy season. As far as reparation for the loss is concerned, Pakistan has refused to consider monetary compensation and insists on the 'water for water' formula. Jamaat Ali Shah cites the Sallal Dam precedent where India compensated Pakistan under this formula.

As expected, India's official position on the matter is diametrically opposed to Pakistan's. Its Indus commissioner, G Arangnathan, maintains that India filled the dam within the timeframe laid down in the Treaty, and is hence not in violation of it. He contends that Pakistan received less water than stipulated under the Treaty because there was less than normal rainfall this year. He has accused Pakistan of politicising a 'technical' issue and of playing 'arithmetic gymnastics'.

During the meeting of the two commissioners in October in New Delhi, Arangnathan proposed a visit to the Marala headworks to which Jamaat Shah agreed.

Will this visit help resolve the issue, or is it simply a delaying tactic as believed by many Pakistanis? What options are available to Pakistan to get the matter resolved to its satisfaction?

It is not clear how the Indian commissioner's visit will help resolve the conflict. He has explained the purpose of the visit as verification of the data regarding the water flow that Pakistan claims to have received at Marala during the period in question.

Jamaat Shah is justified in questioning the timing of the visit. In his opinion, it would be useless now as the right time for such an inspection was August-September when Pakistan made the charge about reduced water flow. In fact, undertaking a visit at this point in time looks like a delaying tactic. Besides, the idea behind the visit looks utterly dubious when the Indian commissioner concedes to Pakistan's claim that water flow was reduced. Incidentally, if he is certain about his 'reduced rainfall' explanation, he should not have refused to share the hourly data of water flow in the period in question, which Shah had requested him to furnish during the commission meeting.

While India officially maintains that it never violated the Indus Waters Treaty, the Indian commissioner, during the recent commission meeting, reportedly confessed that India did violate the Treaty by filling

the reservoir as charged. He, however, justified it on the ground that it was compelled to do so because of 'unavoidable structural constraints'.

However, when Pakistan's commissioner proposed that he commit to compensating Pakistan through the water-for-water formula (Shah wants water from the Sutlej for the next Rabi crop), based on Pakistan's claim but without accepting the violation of the Treaty, the Indian commissioner refused to oblige. The two sides then agreed to refer the matter to their respective political leaderships for settlement.

What options are available to Pakistan to get compensation from India?

First and foremost is the continuation of the political dialogue at the highest level. It is pertinent to mention that the Pakistani commissioner's recent visit to the dam site and the commission meeting in October were made possible due to the green signal from the top Indian leadership. This is a cause for concern rather than celebration because it means that instead of these being technical matters, any issue arising under the Indus Waters Treaty is dependent on Indian goodwill for its resolution.

Incidentally, this is a legacy of the BJP government, which turned the Baglihar Dam issue into a political dispute, instead of keeping it technical, as was the case in the past, by frustrating Pakistan's repeated requests for on-site inspections and commission meetings.

The Pakistani Foreign Office spokesperson has declared that a settlement of the water issue would be forthcoming 'in a few days'. Given the absence of concrete evidence in the matter, and India's past record on keeping its promises, we simply cannot share this optimism. It would be wise to tread with caution. Perhaps conscious of this reality, President Zardari has indicated that in case he fails to get the desired response from the Indian leadership, he would approach Muslim countries, the 'Friends of Pakistan' and the UK to put pressure on India. Perhaps he should also approach members of the UN Security Council currently not among the Friends of Pakistan.

The second option available to Pakistan is invoking Article 9 of the Indus Waters Treaty on conflict resolution. After the debacle Pakistan suffered in the verdict on Baglihar Dam, many Pakistanis may be wary of invoking this clause. This may be more so keeping in mind that the option is very expensive, tedious and protractive.

However, we cannot afford to take this attitude for two reasons: First, we need to remember that if we lost the Baglihar case, it was



because we did not argue it well. Second, we should not be haunted by the above-mentioned incubi when it comes to affirming that the waters of the western rivers belong exclusively to us. We need to remember that Article 9 is the ultimate guarantor of our rights under the Indus Waters Treaty.

Ijaz Hussain, *Daily Times* (Lahore), November 5, 2008.

### INDIA WAS READY TO ATTACK PAKISTAN SAYS JOHN MCCAIN

US Senator John McCain has voiced his deep concern over tense South Asian situation, saying India was preparing for some kind of attack on Pakistan in the wake of last month's Mumbai attacks. The former Republican presidential candidate's statement preceded a relative de-escalation in the tension as both Islamabad and New Delhi stressed avoidance of war and talked peace over the weekend.

"The Indians are on the verge of some kind of attack on Pakistan," such as an air attack on suspected militant camps, he told a daily newspaper in his home state Arizona published Monday.

Pakistan saw some positive signs over the last two days in Indian leaders' statements but recommended New Delhi de-activate its forward air bases and move its ground troops back to peacetime locations to resume friendly atmosphere. "I think it's a very dicey situation," McCain told *The Daily Courier*, noting how both countries have nuclear weapons.

"We're going to be in for a very difficult time there," added McCain, who earlier this month visited both New Delhi and Islamabad as part of US efforts to avert any standoff between them.

The world capitals including Washington and Beijing have been making diplomatic efforts to urge Pakistan and India to ease the situation. McCain's remarks corroborated Islamabad's position last week on New Delhi readying its forces as the Pakistani officials said India had resorted to some "potentially dangerous" moves.

Meanwhile, leaders on both sides have called for peace with Pakistan emphasizing cooperative efforts against violent extremism.

*Nation* (Islamabad), December 31, 2008.

---

## INDO-PAK TENSIONS AND U.S OPTIONS

In the wake of the terrorist attacks in Mumbai, Pakistan's government is scrambling to show grief-stricken Indians and the world that Pakistan is actually able and eager to mount successful counterterrorist operations. In the meantime, India is still considering its military options, and the US is finding itself in the awkward position of biased mediator, but a mediator with options, nonetheless.

Indian ire in the immediate aftermath of the attacks was so unmistakable that it prompted Islamabad to sound the loudest alarm bell in its arsenal: insisting that it could only fight one war at a time, Pakistan warned Washington that a vengeful India would compel Islamabad to redeploy the 100,000 troops currently assisting the US war on terror in northwest Pakistan to its eastern border.

Hearing the message, President Bush dispatched Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to Delhi to calm the Indians to ensure that Pakistan has the resources and flexibility to fight the militants.

Yet from Washington's perspective, both the political and military implications of heightened tensions between India and Pakistan especially the kind that involves Pakistani troop movements open many new doors to a war on terror that appears increasingly bleak.

First, India is not alone in its profuse criticism of Pakistan's failure to fight the very terrorists it bred during the anti-Soviet Afghan jihad in the 1980s. Seven long years into the war on terror, Washington remains convinced that Pakistan is still unwilling and/or unable to make good on its counterterrorism commitments. It was difficult enough to compel Islamabad to deploy 20 per cent of its roughly half-million-man army to the northwestern border during President Bush's first term, and that contribution only led to a steadfast resurgence of the Afghan Taliban and the near-steroidal growth of the Pakistani Taliban.

Facing dim prospects, over the last 18 months the Americans have begun taking matters into their own hands and dispatched much-resented unmanned aerial vehicles to kill senior Taliban and Al Qaeda leaders with greater frequency. With president-elect Barack Obama insisting that he will allocate more US soldiers and resources to the real war on terror in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Washington's relationship with Islamabad has nowhere to go but down, especially as the Pakistani Taliban rip the country apart. It is in this context that a redeployment of Pakistani troops frightens Washington.

But according to a flood of recent press reports, if India seems likely to attack Pakistan, then both the Pakistan Army and the militants they are supposed to destroy could find themselves facing the same grave threat in India. Various militant factions and supporters of the Taliban all the way from South Waziristan to the Swat Valley could put their wars with Nato and Islamabad on hold and find their way to Kashmir or the Indian border.

In the meantime, US and Nato forces in Afghanistan would be in the unfamiliar position of having neither friends nor foes on the other side of the Afghan/Pakistan border. And this would present Washington with equally unfamiliar flexibility.

The US presidential transition could alter this dynamic, but under these circumstances, the most likely benefit to the US would manifest in southern Afghanistan, where the resurgent Afghan Taliban would face potentially crippled supply lines of weapons and equipment, which are currently flowing from the Pakistani Taliban and the tribal clans loyal to them in the NWFP and especially Fata. If those middlemen are busy at Pakistan's eastern border, there will be fewer available at the western border.

Another possibility is that, like their Pakistani counterparts, the Afghan Taliban might also flock to the Indian border or LoC to fight the Indians. Numerous Taliban leaders and foot soldiers are foreign-born and tied to the militant Pakhtun world by marriage and lifestyle; but many are jihadists at heart and would drool at the prospect of a glorious war on numerous fronts. Though less likely, in either scenario, the Afghan Taliban would be stretched uncharacteristically thin without support from across the border, and the US/Nato/Afghan forces would be less hindered to improve security and perhaps earn a little loyalty from local Pakhtun tribes in southern Afghanistan. At the very least, there would be fewer obstacles to US intelligence gathering and infiltration, which is always in desperate need of a boost.

Either way, however, a substantive contingent of the Pakistani Taliban and their supporters will probably remain in the NWFP/Fata and continue supporting the Afghan Taliban.

In the end, Pakhtuns are notoriously territorial, and some will not be interested in repelling the Indians from the land of their ethnic rivals in Pakistan's eastern provinces. In this case, Washington would be able to test Pakistan's claim that has limited as Islamabad's assistance has been

since 2001 the war on terror would be in a far worse state without Pakistan's help.

Willfully testing this claim has always been too risky for the US because the price of being wrong could be frightfully high. But if Islamabad refuses to keep its contingent of soldiers on Pakistan's western border anyway, then as a silver lining, Washington might be able to test this notion and use it as a basis for strengthening or drastically altering the US-Pakistan relationship.

After all, even if every observant western official already knows that little will change on the ground without the Pakistani soldiers, then mounds of supporting evidence for such assertions would be critical for the Obama administration to justify greater and deeper incursions into northwestern Pakistan to eliminate Al Qaeda and its support structure.

Naturally, Washington will have to test these waters more before diving in, but the situation in Pakistan is likely to get much worse before it gets any better.

Given the presidential transition in Washington, it is still unclear if the US will be in a position to improvise its military approach to southern Afghanistan, at least in the near term.

Nevertheless, if tensions remain high between India and Pakistan, the US might benefit in the long term from the internal solidarity in Pakistan and the decreased intensity of conflict in the tribal regions on both sides of the Afghan-Pakistan border.

Obviously, a calamitous war between the two South Asian rivals is far too high a price to pay to obtain a temporary calm in western Pakistan that may or may not benefit anyone. But if escalation is the path that India chooses despite Washington's calls for restraint then high-octane sabre-rattling on both sides of the Indo-Pak border (especially if it lasts for many months) could actually suit Washington rather well.

David H. Young, *Dawn* (Islamabad), January 13, 2009.  
<http://www.dawn.com/2009/01/13/op.htm#2>

## PAKISTAN OFFERS GRAND RECONCILIATION: QURESHI, MUKHERJEE

Foreign Minister Shah Mahmood Qureshi has said that Pakistan is ready for grand reconciliation with India and the next round of peace talks will begin in mid-July in New Delhi. Our government is ready for grand reconciliation for the resolution of longstanding issues that need to be

resolved peacefully through dialogue and in a manner that is dignified and commensurate with the self-respect of the involved parties, Mr. Qureshi said at a joint press conference with Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee after the political review of the fourth round of composite dialogue on Wednesday. Although the foreign minister did not unveil the specifics of the grand reconciliation offer, it was a clear indication that Pakistan was ready to show flexibility on some thorny issues that had been straining their relations and impeding progress in talks taking place since 2004, if India reciprocated. Mr. Qureshi said Pakistan was open to innovative ideas that could facilitate the dialogue and create a more enabling environment. "We don't have a shut mind. Mr. Mukherjee said India was equally determined to resolve all core issues and overcome hurdles in improving its ties with Pakistan. I'm going back with a sense of satisfaction, he said. Notwithstanding the cheerful mood of the two ministers, it was apparent that they had made no substantial progress on major issues and were banking on the working relationship they had built during the talks to make progress in the next round.

The only highlight of the talks held after a hiatus of seven months was the signing of an accord to provide consular access to prisoners in each other's jails and agreement on some minor confidence-building measures. Both sides avoided making any statement that could vitiate the cordial atmosphere in the dialogue. The two countries were hopeful of progress on certain major issues in coming months. Mr. Qureshi said the schedule of Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's visit to Pakistan later this year would be announced after "some more progress". The foreign minister will visit New Delhi in June. He said there were certain areas where progress had not been appreciable and which needed to be focused. He specifically pointed out the Jammu and Kashmir issue saying there had been no significant forward movement in this regard. Along with the CBMs, this core issue has to be meaningfully addressed, he said, adding that inclusion of Kashmiris in the process would be useful. Mr. Qureshi emphasised that progress on all eight segments of composite dialogue had to be in tandem.

Referring to Siachen and Sir Creek, the foreign minister said resolution of certain issues was doable. He said Pakistan was hopeful about them after the interaction. During the talks, Pakistan tabled new proposals on Siachen, which Mr. Qureshi said could bridge the differences and help the two sides move forward. Mr. Mukherjee said progress had been made on Siachen but more time would be required for

deliberations on the issue. He cautioned that no timeframe should be fixed for progress.

He said economic cooperation was one of the principal subjects in his talks with Pakistani leadership. He said there was a lot of scope of economic cooperation which could also complement the progress on resolving major issues.

He said economic cooperation should not be held hostage to lack of progress on unresolved issues. Negating the impression that India was engaged in an arms race, he said the Indian government was more concerned about pressing economic issues and addressing problems of poverty and backwardness. But at the same time he observed that his government could not be oblivious of the country's defence requirements.

Both sides agreed to enhance their counter-terrorism cooperation by activating the Anti-Terrorism Mechanism and holding a meeting in this regard before the fifth round in July.

Pakistan urged India to resolve the issue of transit fee for the Iran-Pakistan-India gas pipeline, terming it a good CBM. The two ministers agreed on making the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation more effective.

### **Joint Statement**

A joint statement issued after the talks enumerated the Kashmir-related CBMs agreed in the meeting, including an increase in the frequency of Muzaffarabad-Srinagar and Rawalkot-Poonch bus services, modalities for intra-Kashmir trade and truck service and implementation of other measures to expand and facilitate travel for which a meeting of the working group on cross-LoC CBMs would be convened within two months. The two sides reaffirmed the importance of ceasefire along the Line of Control and their commitment to cooperate to safeguard it. The statement said the experts' group concerned should consider proposals by both sides to develop further CBMs in the nuclear and conventional fields.

Both sides agreed to finalise an agreement to liberalise their visa regime and facilitate people-to-people contacts. Mr Mukherjee also met Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani and President Pervez Musharraf.

Baqir Sajjad Syed, *Dawn Magazine* (Islamabad), May 22, 2009.

## SINGH REITERATES TOUGH STANCE: PAK-INDIA TALKS AT SECRETARIES' LEVEL PLANNED

The Pakistan-India peace process, stalled for eight months, got a fresh lease of life when President Asif Ali Zardari and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh met on the sidelines of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) summit here on Tuesday. The two sides agreed that their foreign secretaries would meet on "mutually convenient dates" to be followed by another meeting of the two leaders on the sidelines of the Non-Aligned Movement summit in Egypt in July.

"The two foreign secretaries will meet at mutually convenient dates and discuss the steps to be taken on either side to deal with extremism and terrorism and from those discussions the political leadership will re-engage at Sharm-el-Sheikh (Egypt)," Foreign Minister Shah Mehmood Qureshi said after the meeting.

The one-to-one meeting between President Zardari and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh which began with a "warm handshake" lasted for about an hour. Earlier, Mr. Mehmood Qureshi and Indian Foreign Secretary Shiv Shankar Menon and National Security Adviser N.K. Naraynan joined the two leaders for a photo session. Mr. Qureshi replied in the negative when asked if the engagement between the two foreign secretaries was part of the composite dialogue process, but said: "It is a positive step forward." He termed the meeting between the two leaders a "positive development" and said "the only sensible course was to talk to each other".

He said the people of South Asia wanted peace, security and development and wanted the two nations to live in harmony. Asked if Pakistan would raise the water dispute with India, the foreign minister said that all contentious issues could be raised when the talk process began. The Foreign Office in a statement issued after the talks said: "The two leaders among other things discussed the question of resumption of the composite dialogue. Pakistan believes that the resumption of composite dialogue, and addressing seriously and with sincerity, a range of issues, is the only way forward.

"The president reiterated the desire of the government of Pakistan to cooperate with India in bringing the perpetrators of the Mumbai attacks to justice. It is imperative that the Pakistan-India joint anti-terrorism mechanism be re-activated." The president expressed the hope that Pakistan's relations with India would enter a new era and the existing

outstanding issues and disputes, including Jammu and Kashmir, would be resolved.

The statement said that Pakistan remained committed to friendly and good neighbourly relations with India. “My mandate is to tell you that Pakistani territory should not be used for terrorism against India,” the Press Trust of India quoted Prime Minister Singh as telling President Zardari. It said that after Mr Singh’s comments Mr Zardari immediately asked journalists to be escorted from the room so the meeting could be continued in private. PTI reported that Mr Singh was also understood to have conveyed India’s “unhappiness” over Pakistani inaction against terrorism aimed at India.

Mr Singh also expressed disappointment over the release of Jamaatud Dawa chief Hafiz Mohammad Saeed suspected by India of being among the masterminds of the Mumbai attacks.

The two countries have already completed four rounds of the composite dialogue, but the fifth round was halted by India after the Mumbai attacks in November last year. President Zardari and Prime Minister Singh are in Russia to attend as observers the summit of SCO that groups China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. The two leaders last met in Sept 2008 on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly session in New York.—Agencies

*Dawn* (Islamabad), June 17, 2009.

<http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/front-page/singh-reiterates-tough-stance-pakistania-talks-at-secretaries-level-planned-769>.

## TEXT OF INDIA-PAKISTAN JOINT STATEMENT

The following is the joint statement issued after talks between the prime ministers of India and The Prime Minister of India, Manmohan Singh, and the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Syed Yusuf Raza Gilani, met in Sharm-el-Sheikh on July 16, 2009.

The two Prime Ministers had a cordial and constructive meeting. They considered the entire gamut of bilateral relations with a view to charting the way forward in India-Pakistan relations. Both leaders agreed that terrorism is the main threat to both countries. Both leaders affirmed their resolve to fight terrorism and to cooperate with each other to this end.

Prime Minister Singh reiterated the need to bring the perpetrators of the Mumbai attack to justice. Prime Minister Gilani assured that



Pakistan will do everything in its power in this regard. He said that Pakistan had provided an updated status dossier on the investigations of the Mumbai attacks and had sought additional information/evidence. Prime Minister Singh said that the dossier is being reviewed.

Both leaders agreed that the two countries will share real time, credible and actionable information on any future terrorist threats.

Prime Minister Gilani mentioned that Pakistan has some information on threats in Baluchistan and other areas.

Both Prime Ministers recognised that dialogue is the only way forward. Action on terrorism should not be linked to the composite dialogue process and these should not be bracketed. Prime Minister Singh said that India was ready to discuss all issues with Pakistan, including all outstanding issues.

Prime Minister Singh reiterated India's interest in a stable, democratic, Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Both leaders agreed that the real challenge is development and the elimination of poverty. Both leaders are resolved to eliminate those factors which prevent our countries from realizing their full potential. Both agreed to work to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence.

Both leaders reaffirmed their intention to promote regional cooperation. Both foreign secretaries should meet as often as necessary and report to the two foreign ministers who will be meeting on the sidelines of the forthcoming UN General Assembly.

*Times of India* (New Delhi), July 16, 2009.  
<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/default1.cms>.

## INDO-PAK JOINT ANTI-TERRORISM MECHANISM PERSPECTIVES FROM PAKISTAN

Both leaders agreed that terrorism is the main threat to both countries. Both leaders affirmed their resolve to fight terrorism and to cooperate with each other to this end.... Prime Minister Singh reiterated the need to bring the perpetrators of Mumbai attacks to justice. Prime Minister Gilani assured that Pakistan will do everything in its power in this regard. He said that Pakistan has provided an updated status dossier on the investigations of the Mumbai attacks and had sought additional information/evidence. Prime Minister Singh said that the dossier is being reviewed....Both leaders agreed that the two countries will share real time credible and actionable information on any future terrorist threats....

Dr. Manmohan Singh and Syed Yusuf Raza Gilani, in a Joint Statement, Sharm El Sheikh, 16 July 2009 India-Pakistan anti-terrorism cooperation can rightly be classified as a 'fisherman model' that is, you catch a fish when it comes to you! This implies an absence of a sustained and pro-active interaction versus the issue of terrorism, undermining peace and stability within and beyond their respective territorial boundaries. Why it is so? How can both India and Pakistan jointly move forward towards eradicating terrorism? How did India and Pakistan resolve to form a bilateral or Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism? What factors or variables have marred and continue to impact the smooth sailing of JATM? Finally, how to ensure sustained Indo- Pak interaction through Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism?

### **(I) Joint Mechanism: A Short History**

Havana meeting of the Non Aligned Movement, in September 2006 concluded on a positive note. Manmohan Singh and Pervez Musharraf, emphasized that the peace process must be maintained and it's "success was important" for both the countries . This marked a resumption of the derailed "composite Indo-Pak peace dialogue" following the 11 July 2006 Mumbai multiple train blasts. Both sides "resolved to create a joint institutional mechanism to identify and implement counter-terrorism initiatives and investigations." This marked a new beginning to tackle terrorism as a "collective threat" in the Indo-Pak equation. It was a bold step to move beyond finger pointing through media and engage directly through an institutional framework. The first meeting of JATM (March 2007) was held in the backdrop of tragic Samjhotha Express incident and defined the parameters of bi-lateral anti-terror cooperation. This meeting defined the framework of the mechanism and agreed that specific information to be exchanged for "helping investigations on either sides related to terrorist acts and prevention of violence and terror acts in the two countries." It was also agreed that while the anti-terrorism mechanism would meet on quarterly basis, any information which is required to be provided on priority basis would be immediately conveyed to the respective heads of the mechanism.

Second meeting of the JATM (October 22, 2007) led to the update on the information shared in the earlier meeting and resolved to cooperate with one another to identify measures, exchange specific information and assist in investigations. However, prior to the meeting,

both sides traded accusatory remarks about subversive activities within their respective borders.

Pakistan's foreign spokesperson said: "We had indications of Indian involvement with anti-state elements in Pakistan". On the Indian side, National Security Adviser MK Naraynan charged Pakistan, "for building up and stirring Sikh militancy in northern Punjab State". India also blamed the ISI for bomb blasts in Hyderabad, Ajmer, and Ludhiana. This love and hate relationship continued and prior to the third and last meeting of joint anti-terror mechanism, Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee expressed concern over the possibility of Pakistan's nuclear assets falling in the hands of radicals and threat of proliferation of Weapons of Mass destruction.

Third meeting of the Joint Anti-Terrorism Mechanism held in Islamabad on June 28, 2008 in the backdrop of the Kabul blast of Indian Embassy; both sides exchanged fresh information about terrorism incidents including Samjhota Express. They reviewed the steps taken on the information at the earlier meetings. Pakistan Foreign Office Spokesman stated:

"The two sides agreed to continue to work to identify counter-terrorism measures, assist in investigations through exchange of specific information and for preventing violence and terrorist acts".

## **(II) Will Joint Mechanism Work?: A Critique**

Was joint-anti-terror mechanism a useful medium to exchange information on the past terror incidents such as, Mumbai Train blasts (2006) or Samjhota Express Feb 2007? There are multiple interpretations ranging from severe criticism to highly optimistic notes. A critical variable that marred the effectiveness of joint anti-terror mechanism has been a persistent divergence while interpreting the creation of joint anti-terror mechanism across the Indo-Pak border. For instance in case of India, this development was interpreted as sign of giving into the "Pakistan's trap". Yaswant Sinha condemned the joint statement by Singh and Musharraf as "an unprecedented capitulation of India before Pakistan on the issue of cross-border terrorism." He added that "resumption of the Foreign Secretary-level talks between the two countries in the background of increased violence from Pakistan is not acceptable to us." Indian analyst B Raman reflected it as a double game of President Musharraf; he wrote: "Musharraf is now prepared to revert to the pre-July, 2005 jihadi lull and co-operate with India in the investigation of any

acts which have taken place since July, 2005, in return for Indian co-operation in dealing with what the Pakistani authorities' project as cross-border terrorism in Baluchistan." On the Pakistan side, Former foreign secretary Ambassador Shamshad Ahmed observed: "In our anxiety to have the dialogue resumed, we rushed into signing an unnecessary agreement at Havana on establishing a joint anti-terror mechanism. This gives India another tool to manipulate the dialogues it did after the Mumbai blasts. The peace process that we are following now is no longer about resolving our disputes with India or redressing our grievances over India's transgressions in Siachen and Sir Creek. This peace process is now all about "terrorism" which has become our betonies and which we have undertaken to fight, first on behalf of the US and now on India's behalf." On the other hand, there are numerous pronouncements particularly from the government, media and academic side that termed the very creation of JATM as a positive break from the past.

Foreign Minister Kasuri viewed this development as an "optimistic trend that it would address concerns of both the countries and help bridge the trust deficit" Likewise, Indian National Security Adviser MK Narayanan also saw "it as an opportunity.... The mechanism could also take care of certain issues such a money-laundering under a broader framework" Benazir Bhutto was the most optimistic: "I believe that Indo Pak relations can be creatively re-invented....there is a consensus amongst the political parties of India and Pakistan, a consensus between our military and security establishments that peace must be established. We also agree that the one serious danger to the peace process comes from militants and terrorists. Therefore the challenge for us is to dismantle the militant cells so that they cannot hold the foreign policy of two independent nations hostage to their acts of terrorism..... In this connection, I welcome the decision by both India and Pakistan to work together on anti-terrorism efforts and to share information in this regard. This is a positive step forward..... Militancy and terrorism are the roots of violence, senseless destruction and loss of lives..... With terrorism now a global issue, cooperation between India and Pakistan to work on eliminating terrorism from the region offers an important opportunity to reinvent the relationship" At this juncture one must note that both sides, India and Pakistan though committed to institutionalize abi-lateral counter-terrorism mechanism were fully aware of the presence of differences as natural to begin with. To quote former Pakistan's Foreign

Minister Khurshid M Kasuri: “I think in both countries' interest, the joint security mechanism is a success.

Whereas India has concerns, Pakistan also has concerns and it is much better that we have a mechanism where both countries can voice their concerns.”

This leads to another key point that divergence in perceptions about the issues to be discussed under the new mechanism also existed from the day one and explains the punctuated output of this interaction to date. On the question of Kashmir dispute, while New Delhi pressed for its inclusion as a cross-border issue”, Islamabad maintained “violence in Kashmir is not part of anti-terror mechanism”. Similarly in almost all the meetings both sides exchanged dossiers relating to the wrong doings or involvement of one another in numerous terror incidents and happenings. While the joint statements of all the three joint anti-terror mechanism meetings (March 2007, October 2007 and June 2008) reiterated essential need to combat terrorism, no tangible solution of any major terrorist incident was recorded.

One can argue that JATM is not a final platform to deliver solutions but essentially a diplomatic and institutional framework to exchange data while sitting across the table rather than communicating through media only. This is the essence of its creation and its effectiveness lies in not being trashed whenever terror hits either India or Pakistan. To quote an Islamabad based research analyst, Dr Shaheen Akhtar: “JATM has emerged as a shock absorber which pre-empts any derailment of India-Pak dialogue process”.

### **(III) One Issue Different Expectations**

Throughout 2008-09, Pakistan has been advocating are turn to “dialogue” as critical to act jointly against the threat of terrorism. A briefing by Pakistan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs Briefing said: There is a mechanism which was put in place jointly by Pakistan and India. This is a mechanism which is there to be invoked in order to take care of our mutual concerns vis-à-vis security and terrorism....This is a mechanism which is kind of embryonic at this stage and in order to strengthen it we need to make use of it... Terrorism is a global problem and in order to deal with this menace we ought to have a cooperative engagement. What we expect from India is to resume the Composite Dialogue, to invoke the bilateral arrangement which we have i.e. the Anti-Terrorism Mechanism with view to addressing our mutual concerns in this regard rather than making

statements which are part of politicking and might be helpful only for their election campaign.

New Delhi froze the dialogue process including the JATM following 26/11 Mumbai attacks. Pakistan's Foreign Minister Shah Mahmood Qureshi expressing "shock and horror" at the terror attacks in Mumbai Pakistan Foreign Minister Qureshi, called for "strengthening the joint anti-terror mechanism and offered to set up a hotline between intelligence chiefs of the two countries. ...Warned against "making insinuations against each other" in case of terror attacks and stressed the need for a cautious approach towards tackling the common scourge.....Pakistan wants to cooperate. We have to face the common enemy in terrorism and it is a global challenge."

At the same time Minister Indian Foreign Minister Pranab Mukherjee observed: "There is a need for effective steps to address the menace of terrorism which threatens societal and state stability in our region. The institutions which we have set up within the Dialogue framework such as Home Secretary level talks and the Joint Anti Terror Mechanism have been meeting regularly. In fact the Union Home Secretary had a meeting yesterday in Islamabad with his Pakistan counterpart, and the Joint Anti Terror Mechanism had met in a special session to discuss the terrorist attack on our Embassy in Kabul a few weeks ago. We agreed that it is important that these institutions should show concrete results".

## **(V) Recommendations**

The following key pointers can be deduced as a "Way Forward" for re-inventing trust based bilateral equation:

- Issue of Counter-terrorism at the local, national, bilateral and regional level is essentially a team work at the state and society level. There is a dire need to invest in re-framing and projecting a balanced image of one another. This in turn, requires political will backed by institutional will to break from the "zero-sum" mentality in perceiving and pursuing ones security policy.
- There is dire need to contextualize terrorism as a phenomenon that is a product of not only external environment or work of "foreign hand". There is critical need to locate and address the grievances (political, social, economic, etc) and bridge the gaps/caveats within a system of governance that often result in

terrorist related incidents. Here, responsible behavior on part of the policy makers should be exercised to the maximum. Plus, media on both sides should exhibit prudent and pro-active behavior to highlight the benefits of sustainable peace between India and Pakistan. Both governments should not ‘abuse’ media to gain national, bilateral and international attention and create ‘hostile image’ of one another.

- The aforementioned recommendations must be complemented by enlarging the spectrum of “security matrix” of both India and Pakistan. That is, for a stable and prosperous mutual relationship “security of people called human security” must be a key to the strategic planning on both sides. This requires a judicious mix of traditional and nontraditional security priorities. For example, human security as postulated by the United Nations.
- Thus, holistic conception of security is the best medium for assuring a collective and coordinated approach towards counter-terrorism. Here, one cannot contest the central role of security residing with the state given a fact that present security challenges (including Terrorism) are complex and requires broadening of the security paradigm. Thus, it is strongly recommended that human security must complement state security in practice for nurturing a credible joint anti-terror Indo-Pak mechanism.
- Another plausible recommendation to both New Delhi and Islamabad is to learn from the experience of others. An Innovative step can be to create “safety net or pool” of intellectuals from both sides that should together undertake analytical studies on how to remove trust deficit at the institutional level by looking into the successful cases of conflict resolution around the world. These studies should be considered as essential reference material for the delegations to be engaged in future bi-lateral discourses on the issue of terrorism.
- Lastly, one must not judge the effectiveness of labeling JATM as “not delivering much” institutional mechanism but should look at it as “primary or sub stage” in the process of building a positive and sustainable bi-lateral equation. Its success should be measured in not being “discarded” but being “retained or paused instrument” as point of contact between the India and Pakistan. The ultimate goal should be use JATM as a preventative and proactive forum to ensure peace in one another quarters.

- There is urgent need to not build up media -hype regarding the Peace process between the two neighbours – India and Pakistan. Both sides need to be realistic, gradualist and pragmatic versus their respective desired results from the Peace dialogue including joint anti terror mechanisms. That is, policy practitioners should understand that mutual distrust of decades cannot be removed in one joint meeting but be prepared to invest time and energy in keeping the bi-lateral mechanisms on track. Both sides must recognize that elements against the direct dialing on issues such as terrorism will always try to off-set the process by staging terrorist attacks here and there. The effectiveness of any bilateral interaction depends on its ability to survive the jolts and come out more resolved in favor of “dialogue” than “military, political, diplomatic stand off”. Both governments, should not be fixated in laying out sketch of approaching or re-activating stalled bilateral counter-terrorism mechanism. Here, statement of Indian External Affairs Minister S.M. Krishna, “any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan can only be based on fulfillment of its commitment, in letter and spirit, not to allow its territory to be used in any manner for terrorist activities against India,” – does more damage than repair a trust deficit equation between India and Pakistan. That is, open-mindedness and willingness to listen and respect each other standpoint must be followed in letter and spirit. Both should perceive each other as “partners” engaging in a “collective enterprise” versus terrorism. If interaction starts within the framework of “us versus them” both sides will end up “only talking” and not moving forward in a pro-active way. Plus, it leaves a room to engage in rhetoric competition where both sides deliberately engage in “war of words” and realpurpose of direct and sustainable interaction is lost from the very beginning.
- In nut shell, the starting point for an effective joint counter-terror mechanism lies in recognizing the essential value of “talking” directly than sliding into “confliction based syndrome” – a persistent feature of past Indo-Pak relations. This fact is well captured in the following words of the former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill: “To jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war”.

Shabana Fayyaz, *IPCS* (New Delhi), *Issue Brief 126*, September 2009.



## U.S. REQUESTS CHINA TO HELP DEVELOP INDO-PAK TIES

The United States wants China to help improve relations between India and Pakistan and to work with it to ensure that neither Pakistan nor Afghanistan is used as a base for terrorism, says US President Barack Obama.

Mr. Obama emphasised both points in his remarks in Beijing on Tuesday and they were also included in a joint statement issued after talks between the US president and his Chinese counterpart Hu Jintao.

‘President Hu and I also discussed our mutual interest in security and stability of Afghanistan and Pakistan. And neither country can or should be used as a base for terrorism,’ said Mr Obama.

The text issued by the White House in Washington also quoted him as saying that the two sides ‘agreed to cooperate more on meeting this goal, including bringing about more stable, peaceful relations in all of South Asia’.

President Hu, who spoke first in the briefing, however, did not mention Pakistan or South Asia.

But a joint statement, issued after their talks, included both. A text of the statement, also released by the White House, quoted the two governments as saying that they welcomed all efforts ‘conducive to peace, stability and development’ in South Asia.

‘They support the efforts of Afghanistan and Pakistan to fight terrorism, maintain domestic stability and achieve sustainable economic and social development, and support the improvement and growth of relations between India and Pakistan,’ the statement said.

‘The two sides are ready to strengthen communication, dialogue and cooperation on issues related to South Asia and work together to promote peace, stability and development in that region.’

The joint statement is the product of weeks of discussions between the two sides and that’s why it’s likely to be taken seriously in South Asian capitals.

Diplomatic observers in Washington describe this as a significant development as it indicates America’s recognition of China’s growing influence in Asia.

In doing so, the United States also has accepted the fact that China could play an important role in not only improving India-Pakistan relations but also in bringing stability to Afghanistan. The

acknowledgement runs contrary to predictions of US foreign policy experts that the US would not accept China's growing role in Asia.

Diplomatic observers, however, noted that the Indian government, which has always opposed third-party mediation between India and Pakistan, is likely to be worried about the new development.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), November 18, 2009.

<http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn-content-library/news/world/19-us-requests-china-to-help-develop-indo-pak-ties-hh-06>

## INDIA NOT SINCERE ABOUT RESOLVING DISPUTE: FO

Foreign Office spokesman Abdul Basit said on Friday that India was not sincere about resolving the Kashmir dispute and water-related issues with Pakistan.

He said in an interview with PTV that the Indian attitude indicated it did not want peace in the region.

Deploing Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's statement that Pakistan had not taken adequate measures in connection with the Mumbai attack case, Mr Basit said the entire world had praised Pakistan's sacrifices in the fight against terrorism, except India.

In this regard, he referred to the recent US-China joint statement issued at the end of President Barack Obama's visit to Beijing and other similar statements by world leaders praising Pakistan's sincere efforts in combating terrorism.

Mr Basit dismissed as baseless a report published in Washington Times about presence of Al Qaeda and Taliban leadership in Pakistan. The report said that Taliban leader Mullah Omar was in Karachi.—APP

Our Correspondent adds from Washington: "The Washington Times report is totally baseless," said Nadeem Kiani, a spokesman for the Pakistan Embassy in Washington.

"No Taliban or Al Qaeda leader is hiding in Pakistan," he said.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), November 21, 2009.

## US WANTS RESUMPTION OF INDO-PAK TALKS: HILLARY

The United States is negotiating some measurements with both Pakistan and Afghanistan to determine success in the fight against extremists, says US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

In three separate interviews to US, Afghan and British media outlets, released by the State Department on Friday, the secretary also acknowledged that the United States was encouraging India and Pakistan to resume their efforts to seek a negotiated settlement of the Kashmir issue.

“I don’t think that they’re benchmarks ... what we’re trying to do is create some measurements that can determine whether we’re succeeding,” said the secretary when asked if the US was negotiating specific benchmarks with Afghanistan and Pakistan to pave the way for the withdrawal of international troops from Afghanistan.

Referring to her talks with the Afghan defence minister in Kabul this week over better integration between the Afghan and international forces in Afghanistan, she said: “That’s a good benchmark. That’s the kind of benchmark we’re looking at, because what we want to see is how we determine that we’re making progress on the path ... where your military will have what it needs to begin to take responsibility for much of the country.”

Mrs Clinton said that over the last 10 months, the US and Pakistan had developed a much higher degree of cooperation and communication. She noted that only 10 months ago, the two countries didn’t have the necessary trust that “you have to have in order to listen to the other side and say, okay, I agree with you and I’m going forward”.

“The cooperation between our militaries, the personal relationships that have been established between, for example, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mullen, and chief of the army in Pakistan General Kayani, are incredibly important in helping to break down barriers,” she added.

“So when we said at the beginning of this administration that we were disappointed that the Pakistani government was not going after the Taliban — because we saw them as a direct threat to the Pakistani government — and that then the Pakistanis themselves reached a consensus they had to do that, we thought there was a very significant change in attitude.”

The US, she said, would continue to press them to go after all of the extremists in Pakistan.

“Are you looking at tackling the Kashmir problem to try to help Pakistan really move its focus to the border with Afghanistan?” she was asked.

“Well, we’ve encouraged both countries to resume a dialogue that they were engaged in which came to a halt and yet holds a lot of promise. They had made progress, I’m told, in sorting through some of the longstanding difficulties they face, and most particularly the status of Kashmir. But it’s clear that any solution has to come from the two countries themselves,” said the top US diplomat.

“You’re not pushing?”

“Well, we are encouraging them to get back into dialogue. We think that is important. But with respect to any resolution, that’s up to them,” she responded.

Anwar Iqbal, *Dawn* (Islamabad), November 21, 2009.

## PAKISTAN-INDIA: A YEAR SINCE MUMBAI ATTACK

About a week before the Mumbai attacks, Pakistan's president during an address to a conference in New Delhi via videolink made a proposal regarding Pakistan's commitment to a "no first use nuclear weapon policy". While speaking on the occasion he also made the famous remark: "there is a little bit of Indian in every Pakistani and a little bit of Pakistani in every Indian." At the time of the attacks, as the president was under fire domestically for having made just the wrong proposal and equally wrong remarks, the composite dialogue, a process initiated in 2004, was already in progress on the Indian soil. Pakistan's foreign minister was there on Nov 26, 2008.

One year on, things look different. Pakistan has hinted at several forums the possibility of Indian interference in Balochistan and is now openly suggesting Indian involvement in the current wave of terrorism emerging from its tribal belt. This is exactly the reverse of how things looked one year ago.

Several developments have taken place during the course of the year and, unfortunately, not exactly in favour of the peace process. Apart from a general election in India that kept the congress majority intact, the composite dialogue remains stalled. The legal proceedings against the suspects have not progressed to India's satisfaction. Jamaatud Dawa chief Hafiz Saeed, the man blamed by the Indian side, remains at large after what is seen in India as a "non-serious prosecution" nor is there a "genuine crackdown on the Lashkar-e-Taiba." The arrest in the United States of Tahawwur Rana and David Headley and their confessions about

working for Lashkar and plans to launch terror attacks in India is not helping matters either.

Worst of all, neither side can predict a future where another terrorist attack on Indian soil is impossible.

To sum it up, Indo-Pak relations remain strained for the time being. On the Indian side, one view supports dialogue with the democratically elected government of Pakistan and especially so when the country is itself a victim of terrorism. The other side sees it as a futile exercise because Pakistan's security establishment and the elected government, in its view, are not on the same page. They cite the withdrawal of decision to send the ISI chief for a joint investigation with Indians soon after the attacks, the response of Pakistani media and the treatment of Hafiz Saeed as examples to prove their point. The elected government is incapable of taking foreign policy decisions, they say.

So where do we go from here. The solution, most probably lies in talking to each other and not otherwise. As I.A. Rehman suggests the sooner we do it the better. A resumption of composite dialogue contains the seeds of a solution for peace in the region. The two neighbours must shed this mistrust of each other because we do not want another Mumbai-like tragedy ever again.

Editorial, *News International* (Rawalpindi), November 22, 2009.

## **"INDIA PLACED A PAUSE ON THE COMPOSITE DIALOGUE" SHAH MAHMUD QURESHI, FOREIGN MINISTER**

It was during your visit to India last year that the horrendous acts of terror took place in Mumbai, the financial hub of our neighboring state.

*Question:* How do you look back at those events and what do you think has their impact been on the Indo-Pakistan relations?

*Shah Mahmood Qureshi:* Pakistan strongly condemned the terrorist attacks. We even proposed to India that a Joint Commission be set up to work together on the investigations. Besides, we offered a high level visit to India. New Delhi did not respond positively. Later, we carried out extensive investigations into the incident. Two Lashkar-e-Taiba (defunct) training centres and four hideouts of the terrorists were hunted down. Later, the boat on which the terrorists sailed from Pakistan was taken in possession. Similarly, 11 bank accounts used by the terrorists have been traced and action taken in accordance with our procedures. Indian government shared some material on Mumbai attacks with us on January

5, 2009, whereas the attack took place more than a month ago, on November 26, 2008. The material was carefully examined. Since the information provided by India was inadequate and incomplete, our investigating agencies sought further clarifications. The additional information required by our authorities needs to be authentic which could stand the scrutiny of law. In a significant and parallel development, the trial of the seven accused in the Mumbai case continues. Statements of more than 100 prosecution witnesses have been recorded. On October 10, the Anti Terror Court judge framed charges against the 7 accused including Hammad Amin Sadiq, Zaki ur Rehman Lakhvi and others. Hearings on the matter have been held whereas non bailable warrants have been issued against Ajmal Kasab and Fahim Ansari, who are in custody in India. In the aftermath of the Mumbai attacks, India placed a pause on the composite dialogue. Pakistan believes that resumption of dialogue is in the best interest of the region. It is important that dialogue should be put back on the track. Cooperative engagement between the two countries is paramount to fighting against terrorism.

*TNS:* Pakistan and India have been unable to reach a major breakthrough on Kashmir, Siachen or any other issue on the eight-point Composite Dialogue agenda, despite long peace process launched earlier in 2004. Earlier, the neighboring nuclear states held many rounds of parleys. What, in your view, are the main reasons for these repeated but unsuccessful negotiations?

*SMQ:* Pakistan wishes to have friendly, cooperative and good neighbourly relations with India. We would like to continue to work with the India to resolve all outstanding issues between our two countries, peacefully and in a just manner. Pakistan is committed to a just and peaceful resolution of the Kashmir dispute. The CBMs agreed upon between the two countries on Kashmir have paid dividends. The cross-LOC trade is continuing. So is the case with the bus services between the two sides of Kashmir. In our view, the resolution of Siachen and Sir Creek would be a major CBM in the relations between Pakistan and India. The resolution of these disputes will go a long way in ushering in an era of peace and stability in South Asia.

*TNS:* To revive the peace process, which came to a halt after the Mumbai attacks, Pakistan has arrested many people blamed for the horrendous attacks but India is still not willing to restart negotiations. Will Pakistan continue with what many believe is its 'appeasement

policy' towards India? Isn't it time to tell India that Pakistan has done enough and now it's their turn to come forward and reciprocate?

*SMQ:* Pakistan is not following a policy of appeasement with India. In our view, it is important that both the countries follow the path of dialogue to address each other's concerns. Both Pakistan and India need to patiently interact with each other. Both are important countries of South Asia. Both are neighbours. This reality requires a mature and pragmatic approach to resolve our issues.

*TNS:* What does the future hold for the Indo-Pakistan peace process? Will both sides recommence their efforts to resolve their bilateral issues?

*SMQ:* Pakistan believes that sustained dialogue is necessary to allay each other's concerns. Breakdown of dialogue only works to the advantage of those who do not want to see peace in the region. We are convinced that continuation of composite dialogue is in the larger interest of the people of Pakistan and India. It is our hope that India will also realise this.

*TNS:* It was your predecessor Khurshid Kasuri who claimed that Pakistan and India once came very close to settling the Kashmir dispute. It was believed to be the result of a so-called 'secret diplomacy'. Presently, is back-channel diplomacy going on to put the peace process back on track and also to help resolve the Kashmir issue and other bilateral disputes?

*SMQ:* Back channel issues need not be discussed through media. As regards the progress made earlier, the question should be put to my predecessor.

*TNS:* Water sharing is another major dispute between Pakistan and India and now we hear Islamabad will seek international arbitration to resolve issues on Kishenganga hydroelectric project. Is it true? Also, could you tell us how deeply will the water disputes impact the Indo-Pakistan ties in years to come?

*SMQ:* The water dispute between Pakistan and India is a very important one. Wullar barrage is one of the subjects discussed with India under the composite dialogue process. The fourth round of the Secretary-level talks on Wullar barrage in New Delhi in August 2007 did not translate in a forward movement.

For the commissioning of the Baglihar project, India filled up its reservoir in August 2008 and did not abide by the specific provisions of the Indus Waters Treaty. We raised the issue at various levels with the

Indian side, also with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh. Pakistan has also raised objections on the diversion of flow and design of the Kishenganga project. The issue has been discussed with the Indian side on various occasions. The pending issues related to Kishenganga are, therefore, to be resolved in accordance with the *relevant provisions of the Indus Waters Treaty*.

*TNS*: What will be your message to India on the first anniversary of Mumbai attacks?

*SMQ*: Pakistan offers commiseration and our sincere condolences to those affected by the dastardly act of terrorism. Pakistan itself is a victim of terrorism. Both the neighbouring countries must enhance their cooperation in combating the menace. We believe that conflict, confrontation and tension are exactly what the terrorists want. In this regard, I welcome the recent remarks made by the Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in which he expressed his readiness to resume talks with Pakistan. This is a welcome reiteration of the understanding reached at Sharm-El Sheikh.

We have always said that Pakistan and India should not allow terrorists and militants to define and drive our agenda on issues of peace, security and stability in South Asia.

*News International* (Rawalpindi), November 22, 2009.

## INDIA FUELLING TERRORISM IN PAKISTAN: QURESHI

Foreign Minister Shah Mehmood Qureshi has said that India is supporting terrorism in Pakistan, including in areas bordering Afghanistan.

In an interview with the German news agency DPA, Qureshi claimed that Pakistan was ‘compiling hard evidence of India’s involvement and interference in Balochistan and FATA’.

Qureshi urged India to ‘refrain from such nefarious activities’, adding ‘unless (India) dispenses with its visceral animosity towards Pakistan, attaining viable peace and security in South Asia will be even more elusive’, he added.

The accusation came two weeks after a joint Press conference by Information Minister Qamara Zaman Kaira and Army spokesperson Major-General Athar Abbas during which they disclosed that Pakistan had concrete evidence of Indian involvement in the South Waziristan militancy. Abbas told the newsmen that a huge quantity of Indian arms



and ammunition, medical equipment and medicines used by Taliban militants had been recovered from the restive district.

Hundreds have died in bomb attacks and raids carried out by the insurgents as well as by retaliatory actions by the country's military and paramilitary troops.

Qureshi noted that India was reluctant to resume peace dialogue even though the seven Mumbai massacre accused belonging to LeT were being prosecuted in Pakistan. The trial against them 'has now begun and we are pursuing it more vigorously, it is a very complex trial having both internal and external dimensions', Qureshi added.

"New Delhi should support Islamabad in its efforts against terrorists who have killed thousands of people in several suicide bombings and other strikes across Pakistan," the FM said. "We believe that sustained engagement and result-oriented dialogue is necessary," said Qureshi.

"Breakdown of dialogue only works to the advantage of those who do not want to see peace in the region. There is no other alternative. It is for India to respond and reciprocate," he said, adding "Pakistan stands ready to resume the Composite Dialogue anytime for lasting peace with India."

On Friday, Foreign Minister asked India to open its eyes and take notice of terrorism in Pakistan. "India should not remain oblivious to this situation. We are facing Mumbai-like incidents daily. India should review the facts," he added. "In my opinion Pakistan's mindset is constructive as it took immediate steps to improve the atmosphere after Mumbai incident. Now the ball is in India's court and she has to decide what she wants in future," he maintained.

Abdul Sami Paracha, *Nation* (Islamabad), November 23, 2009.

## ENDING INDO-PAK IMPASSE

Those who hoped that the Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's recent statement, expressing his readiness to discuss all issues with Pakistan would presage an end to the persisting diplomatic impasse were bound to be disappointed. Mr. Singh actually said little that was new. During his visit to Srinagar on October 26, he said he was not setting pre-conditions but the "practical aspect" was that talks would not make headway unless Pakistan took effective action against terrorism. His readiness for talks was therefore placed squarely in the context of

Pakistan being able to create an "atmosphere that is fruitful for negotiations". This pronouncement was neither accompanied nor followed by any move by Delhi to re-engage Islamabad in a dialogue. Quite the contrary. Delhi declined to respond to the 'road map' for resuming talks that Pakistan had conveyed to Indian officials on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly session in New York.

It is quite customary for Indian leaders visiting the troubled Valley to talk peace. The timing of Singh's remarks provides an even better indication of his intent. His peace rhetoric coincided with the visit to Pakistan, of US Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton.

The remarks also came ahead of his upcoming visit to Washington - the first state visit of the Obama Presidency. Thus one aim could have been to preclude the possibility of the US injecting itself into the Pakistan-India equation on Kashmir.

Far from foreshadowing any resumption of the Pakistan-India dialogue, suspended since the Mumbai terrorist attack a year ago, Singh's statement signaled more of the same, albeit calibrated in a way that prompted Islamabad to welcome it.

In actual fact, his government has rebuffed repeated Pakistani offers to restart the formal dialogue.

In New York, when the Foreign Ministers of the two countries met in September, Pakistan proposed that the foreign secretaries should meet between September and November to pave the way for the resumption of the composite dialogue that could be announced at the Port of Spain, during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM). Not only did this proposal not fly but Delhi also said no to the idea - encouraged by Washington and London - of renewing the backchannel. The UNGA meeting between Foreign Ministers Shah Mahmud Qureshi and S.M. Krishna failed to break the deadlock and turned into a restatement of positions by both sides.

India insisted on Pakistan taking decisive action on the Mumbai attackers before the start of any dialogue; Pakistan called for the unconditional resumption of the composite dialogue process even as it reassured Delhi of its commitment to deal with the perpetrators of the Mumbai attack. India rejected Pakistan's argument that the peace process should not become a hostage to acts of terrorism. Indian officials also questioned the utility of the composite dialogue - the broad gauge structure of Pakistan-India diplomatic engagement since this framework was drawn up in 1997 - indicating that they now envisaged future talks to

be recast around the issue of terrorism. This notion of a selected and fragmented dialogue has only deepened the impasse.

Bilateral exchanges have now been reduced to encounters on the sidelines of multilateral conferences. Efforts by Pakistani officials to invite the Indian foreign secretary, Nirupuma Rao to Islamabad for 'talks about talks' have also come to naught.

The question now is whether the US-led international community can encourage India to modify its no-talks posture. Prime Minister Singh's visit to the White House on November 24, offers an opportunity to the Obama Administration to play a role on an issue that impinges directly on its regional goals, especially at a time when Washington is about to roll out its new strategy. When Hillary Clinton visited Islamabad last month, she heard a clear message from her Pakistani interlocutors about the need for the US to engage with issues that are at the heart of Pakistan-India tensions: Kashmir, India's escalating arms buildup, Delhi's provocative 'cold start' military doctrine, and the water issue. The same message was also conveyed to the American national security adviser General James Jones.

During the 2008 Presidential campaign, Obama had repeatedly spoken about the importance of devoting "serious diplomatic resources" to resolve the Kashmir crisis as a way of stabilising the region to enable Pakistan to focus on its western frontier. The Obama Administration would do well to heed the counsel contained in a remarkable and richly researched new book, written by an experienced American diplomat, Howard B. Schaffer. 'The Limits of Influence: America's role in Kashmir' comprehensively charts the history of efforts made by the parties to the dispute and the US to resolve Kashmir.

Howard Schaffer served in both Pakistan and India during the Seventies, and twice as deputy assistant secretary of state responsible for South Asian affairs. While disagreeing with his prescription for a settlement - which can only emerge from a peace process that includes Kashmiri representatives - his conclusion, that the time may be ripe for a fresh effort to resolve the Kashmir dispute, is one that one fully concurs with.

Schaffer argues persuasively why US perspective on resolving the Kashmir deadlock should now change. Among the reasons he cites as arguing for an enhanced US role are: vastly improved relations between Washington and Delhi, the unresolved Kashmir issue acting as an impediment to India's prospects for gaining a seat at the international

high table, and the fact that a Kashmir settlement has become even more important to American interests in South Asia and beyond. With Washington's stakes having substantially changed since the last time it tried to seriously engage with the Kashmir dispute in 1962, the Obama Administration, Schaffer says, may well be able to give the Kashmiris, Indians and Pakistanis the ability to get across the "elusive finish line" they have never reached on their own.

These recommendations are valuable ones for the Obama team to review as the White House prepares to receive Singh later this month. The Bush Administration squandered an opportunity to push a Kashmir settlement when it was negotiating the nuclear deal with India. The Obama White House should not pass up another opportunity to help secure a durable peace in South Asia.

Maleeha Lodhi , *New Nation* (Dhaka), November 25, 2009.

### INDIA NOT SINCERE ABOUT TALKS, SAYS GILANI

Prime Minister Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani said here on Monday that India was not sincere in resuming composite dialogue with Pakistan, adding that attempts by Pakistan to normalise relations between the two countries were being stalled.

"India is stalling the dialogue process and the European Union must play its role to bring it back to the negotiating table for resolving all outstanding issues, including the core issue of Kashmir, between the two countries," Prime Minister Gilani said during a meeting with German Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle, soon after arriving here on a two-day visit.

The prime minister said that improvement of ties between the two countries was crucial for stability in South Asia...

The prime minister said Pakistan had been facing frequent Mumbai-like incidents and, therefore, the only way forward was to improve ties with India by resuming the composite dialogue.

He appreciated Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's desire to resolve core issues, including Kashmir, and said that Pakistan strongly believed that a friendly environment should prevail for the continuation of dialogue.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), December 1, 2009.

## TRACK-II FORUM FLOATS IDEA OF SIACHEN 'PEACE PARK'

Former foreign secretaries and a number of foreign affairs experts from Pakistan and India are of the opinion that the entire Siachen glacier area should be turned into an international peace park under the supervision of United Nations.

The idea was floated at a three-day Track-II dialogue on conflict resolution and peace-building held recently in Bangkok.

The Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, an Indian think-tank, suggested that the required authentication of the actual ground position line "could be achieved by attaching marked maps and satellite photos obtained by national technical means with the demilitarisation agreement".

The dialogue was sponsored by the US Ploughshares Fund after the composite dialogue process was stalled in the wake of Mumbai attacks.

The 11-member Indian delegation, led by Maj-Gen (ret'd) Dipankar Banerjee of the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS), included a number of former diplomats and researchers.

The seven-member Pakistani delegation comprised former foreign secretaries Riaz Khokhar and Najmuddin Sheikh and former diplomats and academicians.

They discussed a number of issues, including confidence-building measures, cross-border interactions, Siachen dispute, sharing of Indus river waters, possibility of forging a common strategy for Afghanistan, expansion of trade and the challenge posed by religious radicalism and terrorism.

Informed sources said that the Indian suggestion to demilitarise the region was "an indirect admission that the melting of glaciers was because of its military presence".

The Indian side called for declaring the entire glaciated region falling within the NJ9842, K2, KK pass triangle an international science park and 'peace zone', making it the locus of weather studies, enabling both sides to cope with climate change impacts.

"This will require political authentication of the actual ground position line and delineation of the Line of Control from NJ1982 thence north to the glaciers without leaving any no-man's land as prescribed under the Karachi agreement of July 1949," the Indian side said.

The Pakistani perspective, presented by UNDP consultant Arshad H. Abbasi, emphasised the link between military presence in the glaciated

region and the glacier's "unprecedented rate of shrinkage". It was proposed that Siachen "should instead be turned into a peace park".

The Indian side agreed that Siachen did not have a strategic, political or economic significance and a roadmap for demilitarising Siachen could be achieved over "two summers" according to plans laid down by the DGMOs and foreign office representatives on both sides.

Pakistan, too, did not have a particular interest in staying at the present position, according to an Indian paper.

"Demilitarisation can be achieved and the Indian army, as a precaution, can keep a battalion in state of high alert," said Brig Gurmeet Kanwal – an Indian delegate.

He said that the region could be turned into an international science park with the involvement of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and opened for mountaineering and skiing expeditions with the presence of army officers from both sides.

Former foreign secretary Riaz Khokhar did not give much weight to Track-II dialogue because it was not officially acknowledged on both sides and said it was not clear if the formal dialogue would start from where it was stalled, adding that Indian attempts to hold negotiations "directly with Kashmiris" had not worked.

He said the Indian desire for a permanent role in Afghanistans affairs could lead to "a 20-20 match between Pakistan and India".

Indians, he said, also wanted to reopen Indus Waters Treaty but this had been rejected by Pakistan, and even Indians agree that the treaty had worked well.

Khaleeq Kiani , *Dawn* (Islamabad), December 3, 2009.

## PAK DELEGATES FOR IMPROVED TRADE TIES

"Pakistan and India can join hands and work together to enhance bilateral business ties as there is immense scope on this front." This is the general opinion of the 90 delegates who crossed over to India through Attari check post to participate in the five-day Punjab International Trade Expo-2009 today.

As many as, 160 delegates were to participate in the event, but only 90 of them managed to reach the first day. The remaining delegates are expected to reach tomorrow.

The delegates, led by the former senior vice-president of the Lahore Chamber of Commerce and Industry Sohail Lashari, were of the view

that both the Indian and the Pakistani governments should make joint efforts to improve bilateral. “The increased trade ties could work as a potent medium to ensure building up of peaceful atmosphere and usher in an era of prosperity” they opined.

Trade between the two countries had suffered a severe setback after the 26/11 terror attacks. From a meagre 350 million dollars in 2003-04, it can, however, touch the mark of 10 billion dollars in 2010 in case relations are strengthened.

“If both the countries want to grow economically, they have to smash the barriers. We would be able to compete with the rest of the developed world from the day when this happens,” said Sohail.

*Tribune* (Chandigarh), December 3, 2009.

## JOINT INDO-PAK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROPOSED FOR CHENAB, JHELUM

With a view to save the future water in Jhelum, Chenab and Indus rivers, Pakistan has proposed a joint Pak-India watershed management of the said lifeline. The watershed of the said rivers lies in India. The same watershed also stands for the Indian rivers of Ravi, Sutluj and Beas.

In the wake of zero management by the Indian authorities, which had been burning down huge swaths of forests to flush out the Kashmiri freedom fighters in the catchments areas of the said rivers, water flows have alarmingly reduced in the River Chenab and experts are of the view that the River Jhelum would become a seasonal river in case its watershed was not properly preserved. The massive deforestation has devastated the economy of the area, which damaged the water flows in both Pakistani and Indian rivers.

In the 1970s, Pakistan used to receive a generous water inflow in Jhelum and Chenab Rivers but now even in the summer season this inflow stands reduced to dismal low levels. Experts attribute this drastic reduction to the destruction of forests in the catchments areas by the timber mafia in connivance with the Indian authorities. Pakistan, under the proposal, offered to jointly develop and manage the watershed in the catchments area.

The quantum of water flows in the River Chenab stood at 26 million acre feet in 1922-61 period, which has alarmingly tumbled to 20.6 MAF because of the massive deforestation in the catchments area of the river.

Pakistan came up with this prudent proposal during the Indo-Pak track II dialogue on Conflict Resolution and Peace Building in Bangkok from October 5-7, 2009, with support from the Ploughshares Fund, according to the minutes of the meeting available with The News.

The Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies facilitated and organised this vital and crucial dialogue with the aim to provide members of the strategic community on both sides with a common platform to discuss issues that plague the Indo-Pak relations and reflect on the possibilities of charting alternative course in the near future.

The significance of this Track II initiative was further reinforced by the stalling of the composite dialogue process at the Track I level in the aftermath of the Mumbai attacks. The discussions, spanning over eight sessions, touched a number of issues, including the bilateral ties ranging from analysing Confidence Building Measures, cross-LoC interactions, the Siachen issue, sharing of the River Indus waters, possibility of forging a common strategy for Afghanistan, expansion of the Indo-Pak trade, to evolving better joint mechanisms for countering terrorism.

Foreign Office Spokesman Abdul Basit said he was unaware of any such meeting held in Bangkok from October 5-7, 2009. He said right now there was no Track II diplomacy going on between the two countries. "However, this meeting might be arranged privately."

Asked if the proposal to jointly develop and maintain the watershed of the said rivers carries the weight in favour of Pakistan, Basit said he will only be in a position to answer when he will have a formal outcome of the Bangkok meeting. However, in the meeting, Indian experts came up with proposal to joint water management over three western rivers allocated to Pakistan by the Indus Water Treaty signed in 1960, which Islamabad forcefully rejected.

*News international* (Rawalpindi) Decmeber 4, 2009.

## CLIMATE OF DISTRUST

I found a big difference between perceptions in India and Pakistan on the anniversary of last year's terror attack in Mumbai. India reconstructed the 60-hour tragedy and vowed not to 'tolerate' any such act in the future.

Pakistan said that it had expressed its horror adequately in the past and that by dwelling on it India was avoiding the composite dialogue. And there was a string of familiar accusations and counter-accusations.



The reactions underline their mistrust of each other. The two countries have more or less the same bent of mind as they did when the British left in August 1947. The present stalemate only emphasises that the curse of alienation has not ended despite the passage of time. Even today, Pakistan remains the number one enemy in India as is the latter in Pakistan. And governments on both sides go out of their way to hurt each other at international forums.

Had we kept at least travel and trade separate from our disputes, we might have retained some contact to build upon now. If nothing else, it would not have allowed the situation to deteriorate to the extent it has. The media in both the countries could have played a constructive role. But it has not been able to rise above jingoistic nationalism and self-righteousness.

In any case, Pakistan, although belatedly, has initiated the process to prepare the ground for talks. India had laid down two conditions: one, bringing the culprits of the Mumbai carnage to justice, and two, dismantling the structure of terrorists in Pakistan. Islamabad has filed cases against seven suspects in custody, including Zakiur Rehman Lakhvi. However, it is Hafiz Saeed who is the face of the Lashkar-i-Taiba and Jamaatud Dawa. For India, what Pakistan does to him is the litmus test of its efforts to combat terrorism. This is also clear from President Barack Obama's letter to President Asif Zardari where he warns against using militant groups to pursue policy goals. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh must have given a list of places attacked by the Lashkar. They included Parliament House and Akshardam Temple in Gujarat. The arrest of David Headley and Tahawwur Rana indicates the Lashkar hand behind these attacks.

Unfortunately, Pakistan has taken its time to register cases against the alleged perpetrators of the Mumbai attack. This has given the impression that Islamabad is dragging its feet.

However, Pakistan can also blame India for the slow court proceedings against Kasab, the only terrorist caught alive. There is some weight in Home Minister P. Chidambaram's defence that it should not appear as if the trial in Mumbai is before a kangaroo court.

Still the fact remains that one year has passed since the arrest of Kasab. Now the defence lawyer has been changed for his tactics to go slow. The case will be further delayed because there are 400 witnesses and 580 affidavits — all will have to be examined all over again. Was it necessary to have so many witnesses testify? The delay may create

suspicion in Pakistan which is already unhappy about information regarding the Mumbai attack being given in bits and pieces.

The second condition put forth by India is that Pakistan should dismantle the infrastructure of terrorists. I am confident that an assurance by Pakistan Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani can allay New Delhi's fears. When the Pakistan Army has claimed that it has dismantled much of the terrorism infrastructure, including suicide-bomber training camps in Waziristan, it can easily carry out the same operation against terrorists operating against India.

Indian opinion would feel assured if Islamabad were to say categorically that the terrorists would not be allowed to operate from Pakistani soil against India. Here the security agencies come into the picture. They seem to have 'allowed' the seven persons allegedly involved in the Mumbai attack to be brought to book.

There may be realisation that terrorism against India is too heavy a price to pay. The billions that Pakistan is set to receive under the Kerry-Lugar Act is like a Damocles' sword hanging over its head. Washington's special team is keeping a tab on what is going out in cash or kind and how it is being utilised.

Coming to talks, their resumption would also benefit New Delhi. Talks would send a message to the Taliban and other jihadis that relations between the two countries are on the mend. What Pakistan is doing against them is what the two countries should be doing together. Were the two to combat terrorists jointly, it would be good for both.

Pakistan is our first line of defence. Such statements like a limited war against Pakistan made by the Indian army chief are irresponsible and provocative. They reflect poorly on India's credibility.

Pakistan is in the midst of a war for its survival. However, its people too need to sort themselves out. They have created a culture of what might be called 'subjective history'. Former foreign minister Sartaj Aziz has said in his book, *Between Dreams and Realities* that '...events are seen through coloured glasses, conclusions are rooted in preconceived notions and heroes and villains are identified within this biased framework...'

The rise of Islamisation may have its fallout in India, particularly when the Taliban say that India is their next target. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has reiterated that people-to-people contact should deepen. It is a welcome statement. But how can this be possible when it is almost impossible for a Pakistani to get a visa? At least, the prime

minister can unilaterally lift all restrictions on the sale of Pakistani newspapers in India.

*(The writer is a senior Indian Journalist based in Delhi)*

Kuldip Nayar, *Dawn* (Islamabad), December 4, 2009.

## EYEWASH EFFORTS OF USA TO DEFUSE INDO-PAKISTAN ANTAGONISM

Indo-Pakistan relations have remained strained since the inception of two states in August 1947. Some of the reasons of undying animosity are the Hindu-British nexus during the British rule in India which persecuted the Indian Muslims and played a perverse role while dividing India. Pakistan was loaded with innumerable complex problems so as to extinguish its life during infancy. Kashmir was annexed forcibly by Indian forces in 1948 and the dispute has not been resolved to this date. Throughout 62 years of its history, Pakistan has remained the victim of Indian machinations. Even after truncating it in 1971, it continued with its expansionist and hegemonic policies to subdue Pakistan and to extract peace on unequal terms. Indian political leaders have been winning elections by castigating Pakistan and beating war drums. Pakistan being small in size and militarily weak has all along endeavoured to normalize relations with India but its efforts were either rudely spurned or subjected to deceit.

Fixated by its ardent desire to be accepted as a regional power, it has been incessantly building up its military muscles and has employed covert means to keep Pakistan politically destabilized and economically weak. Pakistan's refusal to accept its hegemony has kept Indian leaders on a war path. It considers Pakistan to be the sole stumbling block in its path to attain regional ascendancy and big power status. Nuclearisation of Pakistan has frustrated its evil designs since it can no more bully or blackmail Pakistan by threatening to wage a war. It has therefore once again resorted to covert operations coupled with propaganda warfare at a massive scale to achieve its objectives. This time it has aligned itself with USA, Britain, Israel and Afghanistan and is using Afghan soil to launch clandestine operations in Baluchistan, FATA and NWFP including Swat. Since India has already made deep inroads in Sindh, it is therefore concentrating on other regions.

In pursuant of their common objectives, foreign powers have been extending a helping hand to India for the last eight years despite the fact

that Pakistan has been nominated as front line state to fight US war on terror and has rendered maximum sacrifices. During this testing period in which Pakistan suffered immensely at the hands of so-called friends, the two antagonists came close to war twice.

Having inflamed greater part of Pakistan through sabotage and subversion, India has the brashness to cry out that it is victim of Pakistan sponsored terrorism. Hypocrisy of India can be judged from its habit of blaming Pakistan for the crimes it commits against Pakistan. Any act of terror, real or fabricated, taking place in India is promptly pasted on Pakistan without even carrying out preliminary investigations. It bellows and bawls loudly to gain sympathies of the world and to portray Pakistan as the culprit. It had done so when it cooked up a terrorist attack on Indian Parliament in December 2001 and termed it as another 9/11. Media hype was created and every Indian bayed for blood of Pakistan. Biggest ever troop mobilization was carried out and its forces stood in eye ball to eye ball contact for ten months. Its subsequent in house inquiry could not find any clue to substantiate its allegations blurted out at the spur of the moment but by then the damage had been done.

India behaved in similar audacious and babyish fashion when Mumbai incident occurred. Indian leaders removed the mask of friendship, called off composite dialogue in a huff and reverted to their obdurate and cantankerous posture. They are duplicitous, unprincipled and shameless. While falsely blaming Pakistan of terrorism without evidence, they haven't felt even pinch of embarrassment after Pakistan unearthed heavy involvement of RAW in all its troubled regions. Likewise, India and its partners remain mum on wide scale terrorism going on within India.

Indo-Pakistan antagonism did not cause any anxiety to USA as long as US-NATO forces were keeping Afghan security situation within manageable limits and India was conducting subversion against Pakistan right under its nose. Once security conditions in Afghanistan deteriorated and Afghan Taliban gained an upper edge over occupation forces from 2008 onwards, US leaders started preaching peace between India and Pakistan. They are vainly trying to convince Pakistan that extremist forces and not India pose an existential threat. Pakistan is being continually pressed to shift bulk of its forces from eastern border towards western border to defeat terrorists and to forget about Indian threat. While giving verbal assurances, the US has not taken any practical steps

to allay fears of Pakistanis nor has India brought any change in its attitude. US efforts are at best superficial and lack sincerity of purpose.

India at the cost of 70% poverty stricken people is spending large chunk of its budget on its military to enlarge and modernize its forces. Indian Army has 34 combat divisions, three armoured divisions, seven independent armoured brigades, five RAPID divisions, two airborne brigades, two artillery divisions, independent artillery brigades, over 200 nuclear bombs and wide variety of ballistic missiles. Besides, India has formidable air force and navy. Out of thirteen Corps, seven Indian Corps are poised against Pakistan. India refuses to shift its bias of military force away from its western border on the silly plea that it is vulnerable to terrorist threat from Pakistan. It has now deceptively expressed its readiness to shift some forces from occupied Kashmir under fond hope that it would impel Pakistan Army to shift its centre of attention towards FATA. Gen Deepak Kapoor is eagerly awaiting such a move so that his forces could exploit the imbalance at an opportune time.

India has become largest nest of terrorism where Hindu terrorists and insurgents are on a rampage. In all terrorist acts taking place from 2006 to 2008, in which 40-60% victims were Indian Muslims, Pakistan was blamed but it transpired later that Hindu terrorist groups duly patronized by RAW and Indian Army were responsible. Apart from Hindu terror, dozens of separatist and insurgent movements are raging in various parts of India and shaking the very foundations of Indian Union. All its nuclear and missile sites are located within the Red Corridor in eastern India where uncontrollable Maoist movement is reigning supreme. Indian Army is deeply involved in criminal activities including racism, arms and nuclear fissile material smuggling. These ground realities do not vex US and western leaders. Instead of declaring India as hub centre of terrorism and most dangerous country in the world, biased western leaders have given these titles to Pakistan and are hounding it under the mantra of do more. Pakistan has been taken for granted and made into a sacrificial lamb to cover up Indian subversive activities and to hide failures of US military in Afghanistan.

Successes achieved by Pakistan Army in Waziristan as opposed to dismal performance of US-NATO forces in Afghanistan have flummoxed our detractors. To cloud the spectacular achievements, US leaders have come out with absurd allegations that Osama led Al-Qaeda is based in FATA since 2002 and Mullah Omar led Afghan Shura is in Quetta. To overcome discomfiture of Helmand operation fiasco, frustrated Gordon

Brown stated that Pakistan should highlight its military successes modestly. He forgets the exultations and megalomaniac behaviour of Bush and Blair after occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. We have also not forgotten their exclamation 'we've got em' after Saddam was nabbed. Reality is that Pak Army is playing its part commendably without blowing trumpets. It is now the actors on other side of Durand Line who have to do a lot more. If Obama sincerely wants to soothe Indo-Pakistan antagonism and convert Pak-American relations into meaningful friendship, he and his cronies should come out of superficial mode, stop meddling into Pakistan affairs and earnestly work toward finding an amicable solution to Kashmir dispute.

Brig. Asif Haroon Raja, December 5, 2009.  
<http://www.opinion-maker.org/navigation.do?mode=showArticles&id=1125>.

## INDIAN DESIGNS

It was good to see the Foreign Minister, Shah Mahmood Qureshi, finally realising the need to take up the issue of India's involvement in terrorism within Pakistan and conceding that enough substantive evidence exists to this effect. His statement came at a time when Pakistan and India exchanged fire across the LOC. India has been targeting Kashmiris in Occupied Kashmir and IHK marked twenty years of struggle which broke out in 1989 and has been sustained by the indigenous Kashmir people at the cost of thousands dead and disappeared at the hands of Indian Occupying forces.

Meanwhile, India's aggressive intentions in the region have been increasingly visible for some time now, with Pakistan as the main target. It is not just Indian involvement in Balochistan and FATA through Afghanistan that has become a source of instability for the region in general and for Pakistan in particular. India's RAW has also been intervening clandestinely within Pakistan's domestic political space for decades now and funding a campaign against projects designed to improve Pakistan's capacity in fields like agriculture - as in the case of the Kalabagh Dam.

At the same time, to further undermine our agricultural potential and development, India has been contravening the Indus Waters Treaty with a regularity that suggests India's complete disregard for international commitments and international law. Indian actions on the waters issue now threaten Pakistan with a water crisis as India has not only continued

with illegal construction of dams but also blocked off water from the Chenab River.

In recent times we are seeing India's opportunistic targeting of Pakistan's nuclear capability with a concerted propaganda campaign in the West. At the same time India continues to test more missiles and move forward on a vast nuclear arms accumulation programme, aided by the US and Russia in complete contravention of their NPT obligations.

India is desperate to acquire major player status in the region and globally but is not succeeding too well on that count, especially in terms of its desire to get a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. But then India's human rights record is murky to say the least. It has gone against UNSC resolutions on Kashmir and continues to deny the Kashmiri people their basic right of self-determination enshrined in the UN Charter as well as UNSC resolutions on Kashmir. It continues to oppress the Kashmiris with draconian laws and military occupation.

In fact, over the years India has become an increasingly militarised state, building up its nuclear and conventional arsenals. While China is often cited as the *raison d'etre* for all this arms accumulation, on the ground the bulk of the forces and hardware are deployed against Pakistan. India has to realise that unless it behaves like a responsible power committed to conflict resolution with its neighbours, it cannot move either in its region or beyond as a major player.

Editorial, *Nation* (Islamabad), December 15, 2009.  
<http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Editorials/15-Dec-2009/Indian-designs>

## THE ROAD TO PEACE

Expressing the view that the road to peace in the subcontinent lies through the resolution of Kashmir, former US Ambassador to Pakistan Ronald Spiers has called for bringing the issue off "the backburner" to the forefront and settling it. From the Pakistani end, High Commissioner to India Shahid Malik has bemoaned New Delhi's cold and escapist attitude towards the composite dialogue with Islamabad, whose resumption could help the two countries find common ground to peacefully resolve the various contentious matters between them. Mr Spiers, who made his observations in a letter to The New York Times that published an article by Mr Zardari, endorsed the President's view that there could be no lasting peace in the region without solving the Kashmir dispute. The US

Ambassador was also right in his assessment on another issue; i.e. he had not seen any possible method of dissuading President Zia from manufacturing the atomic bomb as long as India was on the same path.

Mr Malik, who was speaking to CNN-IBN, shied away from using the words, "India has backed out" of its commitments made at Sharm El-Sheikh when the interviewer wanted to put them in his mouth; instead, he chose to put it in a diplomatically more acceptable and subtle terminology, "not fulfilling", which any way carried the same connotations. One would wish the Indian leadership to dispassionately assess the implications of the High Commissioner's remarks that the present diplomatic vacuum (the absence of contact to resolve disputes) was strengthening the forces, which do not want the two countries to make progress. At the very least, India should listen to a third party, Ambassador Spiers, who has made more or less a similar statement when he predicated Kashmir's solution to peace. There is little doubt that peaceful conditions would provide a fillip to the development of the subcontinent.

While the Pakistani High Commissioner quoted from the joint statement of Prime Ministers Yousuf Raza Gilani and Manmohan Singh, issued at Sharm El-Sheikh, to prove that India had agreed to delink composite dialogue from terrorism, he did not hesitate to deal with the Indian allegations against Pakistani elements in the Mumbai tragedy. He made it clear that it was wrong to say that Islamabad was adopting delaying tactics in conducting a trial; in fact an FIR had been filed but the demands of justice had to be met rather than hurrying up the decision to meet the wishes of the party across the border. He pointed out what the Pakistani leadership has been repeatedly maintaining - that India was not furnishing "credible actionable evidence" to prove the guilt of the accused in a court of law. One would hope that New Delhi displays sincerity in viewing terrorism, which is a global menace, abides by its commitment to delink the stalled dialogue from terrorism and settles disputes in a peaceful manner.

Editorial, *Nation* (Islamabad), December 22, 2009.  
<http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Editorials/22-Dec-2009/The-road-to-peace>.



## ARMY REWORKS WAR DOCTRINE FOR PAKISTAN, CHINA

The Army is now revising its five-year-old doctrine to effectively meet the challenges of a possible 'two-front war' with China and Pakistan, deal with asymmetric and fourth-generation warfare, enhance strategic reach and joint operations with IAF and avy. Work on the new war doctrine -- to reflect the reconfiguration of threat perceptions and security challenges -- is already underway under the aegis of Shimla-based Army Training Command, headed by Lt-General A S Lamba, said sources.

It comes in the backdrop of the 1.13-million strong Army having practised -- through several wargames over the last five years -- its 'pro-active' war strategy to mobilise fast and strike hard to pulverise the enemy. This 'cold start strategy', under a NBC (nuclear-chemical-biological) overhang, emerged from the 'harsh lessons' learnt during Operation Parakram, where it took Army's strike formations almost a month to mobilise at the border launch pads' after the December 2001 terrorist attack on Parliament.

This gave ample opportunity to Pakistan to shore up its defences as well as adequate time to the international community, primarily the US, to intervene. The lack of clear directives from the then NDA government only made matters worse. "A major leap in our approach to conduct of operations (since then) has been the successful firming-up of the cold start strategy (to be able to go to war promptly)," said Army chief General Deepak Kapoor, at a closed-door seminar on Tuesday.

The plan now is to launch self-contained and highly-mobile 'battle groups', with Russian-origin T-90S tanks and upgraded T-72 M1 tanks at their core, adequately backed by air cover and artillery fire assaults, for rapid thrusts into enemy territory within 96 hours. Gen Kapoor identified five thrust areas that will drive the new doctrine:

*One*, even as the armed forces prepare for their primary task of conventional wars, they must also factor in the eventuality of 'a two-front war' breaking out. In tune with this, after acquiring a greater offensive punch along the entire western front with Pakistan by the creation of a new South-Western Army Command in 2005, India is now taking steps -- albeit belatedly -- to strategically counter the stark military asymmetry with China in the eastern sector. There is now "a proportionate focus towards the western and north-eastern fronts", said Gen Kapoor.

*Two*, the Army needs to 'optimise' its capability to effectively counter 'both military and non-military facets' of asymmetric and sub-conventional threats like WMD terrorism, cyber warfare, electronic warfare and information warfare.

*Three*, the armed forces have to substantially enhance their strategic reach and out-of-area capabilities to protect India's geo-political interests stretching from Persian Gulf to Malacca Strait. "This would enable us to protect our island territories; as also give assistance to the littoral states in the Indian Ocean Region," said Gen Kapoor.

*Four*, interdependence and operational synergy among Army, Navy and IAF must become the essence of strategic planning and execution in future wars. "For this, joint operations, strategic and space-based capability, ballistic missile defence and amphibious, air-borne and air-land operations must be addressed comprehensively," he said.

And *five*, India must strive to achieve a technological edge over its adversaries. "Harnessing and exploitation of technology also includes integration of network centricity, decision-support systems, information warfare and electronic warfare into our operational plans," he added.

Apart from analysing the evolving military strategy and doctrines of China and Pakistan, the Army is also studying the lessons learnt from the US-launched Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan in 2001 and Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003 and their relevance to India.

Rajat Pandit, *Times of India* (New Delhi), December 30, 2009.  
<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Army-reworks-war-doctrine-for-Pakistan-China/articleshow/5392683.cms>.

## FULLY ALIVE TO THREATS!

The blustering Indian army chief needed to be reminded that the talk of war between nuclear-armed countries amounted to not only causing but also courting serious trouble. General Deepak Kapoor's fiery rhetoric about his strategy of massively overusing 'superior' conventional weaponry, if given practical shape, would be a recipe for widespread destruction in the entire subcontinent and, indeed, India's own suicide. His boast the other day that New Delhi was readying itself to wage a successful two-front war, with China on the one hand and Pakistan on the other, was sanely and adequately answered by General Ashfaq Kayani while he was addressing senior officials at the GHQ on Friday. Although he did not specifically refer to the threatening vision of General Kapoor,

the Pakistani COAS, as his remarks quite clearly indicate, was responding to him. He underscored what, one expects, the Indian General should have known before he flaunted his country's destructive military capability and evil designs, "Proponents of conventional application of military forces, in a nuclear overhang, are chartering an adventurous and dangerous path, the consequences of which could be both unintended and uncontrollable." One hopes the warning now sinks in and General Kapoor cools down to see the truth and wisdom of his counterpart's counsel that peace and stability in South Asia and beyond should be the logical golden rule governing relations between countries possessing nuclear weapons.

As for Pakistan, General Kayani made his preference for peace and stability known. That was the principle underlying the country's security paradigm and was designed to be secured through a policy of "strategic restraint". Yet, if attacked, he was emphatic that the army was "fully alert and alive" to the entire spectrum of threat that continued to exist in conventional and non-conventional domains. Conscious of New Delhi's mad quest for the acquisition of sophisticated military hardware, he assured the nation that his forces were able to deter and defeat the enemy's dangerous designs.

With growing economic strength and the added nuclear muscle that the US has willingly provided it, in violation of international law (NPT), whose strict adherence it demands of every other state, India has come out in its true colours. Pakistan's current predicament on the one hand and the task of containing China's expanding influence assigned to it by nuclear benefactor US must have prompted General Kapoor to indulge in self-destructive day-dreaming. In 96 hours during which he thinks he can capture the enemy territory, Pakistan's as well as Chinese, a lot more could happen. He could have unwittingly started off a Third World War, with the subcontinent forming the main theatre.

Editorial, *Nation* (Islamabad), January 3, 2010.  
<http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Editorials/03-Jan-2010/Fully-alive-to-threats>

## DEEPAK KAPOOR'S STATEMENT ABSURD, IRRESPONSIBLE: QURESHI

Foreign Minister Shah Memood Qureshi reacted sharply to Indian army chief General Deepak Kapoor's statement towards Pakistan and China and extended a hand to Iran for peace and stability in the region.

Qureshi categorically stated that Pakistan could not be threatened by the Indian army chief's irresponsible statement.

General Kapoor had said he was willing to take on Pakistan as well as China should the need arise. Speaking to journalists in Karachi, the minister said the government does not believe in sensationalism and always looks forward to forging strong ties with neighbouring countries.

"Pakistan stresses to maintain peace in the region...but while India itself asserts progress in the composite dialogue process, the talks remain stalled," he said. Pakistan's foreign policy is very clear and calls to restart a result-oriented composite dialogue with India, he further said. Shah Mehmood Quershi also stressed the need to strengthen Pakistan's relations with Iran.

Qureshi noted the sacrifices made by the nation in the war on terror. He said the Pakistan People's Party focuses on politics of reconciliation and therefore had formed an alliance with the PML-N and the MQM.

January 4, 2010.

<http://www.onepakistan.com/news/top-stories/28470-Deepak-Kapoors-statement-absurd-irresponsible-Qureshi.html>.

## INDIA'S PROVOCATIVE MILITARY DOCTRINE

In remarks reported last week, Indian army chief Gen Deepak Kapoor reaffirmed that India was evolving a new military doctrine, and he outlined some of its key elements. The changes in the strategic environment held out by this pronouncement have significant implications for Pakistan and should give the country's security managers much pause for thought. In November India's army chief spoke of the likelihood of a limited war "under a nuclear overhang" in the subcontinent. His latest remarks go further to indicate that:

- The Indian army is revising its five-year-old doctrine to meet the challenge of war with China and Pakistan.

- The development of the "cold start" strategy is progressing "successfully."
- Five "thrust areas" will determine the new doctrine:
  - i) Dealing with the eventuality of a "two-front" war.
  - ii) Countering "both military and non-military facets of asymmetric and sub-conventional threats."
  - iii) Enhancing "strategic reach and out-of-area capabilities" to protect India's interests from the Persian Gulf to the Malacca Strait.
  - iv) Attaining "operational synergy" between the three services.
  - v) Achieving a technological edge over adversaries.

The emerging doctrine appears to be both aspirational and emulative. Aspirational because its breadth and sweep reflects a mindset that seeks to create "big power" dynamics by projecting India as a rival to China and aiming to develop a capacity to act in two combat theatres simultaneously. How and whether this can actually be attained is another matter.

The doctrine also emulates the US Pentagon's Quadrennial Defence Review undertaken every four years and borrows superpower language to assert the need to build "out of area" capabilities and acquire "strategic reach." This is the most presumptuous tenet of the doctrine which employs the idiom of big powers without, however, the capability to back it.

It raises other questions. What exactly are the interests that these capabilities are intended to defend? Protecting the littoral states of the Indian Ocean against whom? Will the pursuit of "strategic reach" not run up against the strategic interests of other powers in the Persian Gulf? For Pakistan several aspects of the doctrine have serious implications that need to be assessed. The "cold start" doctrine seeks to counter the Pakistani argument that, however "limited," a war is not possible between two nuclear-weapon states – an argument that was validated by the 2001-02 military standoff between the two neighbours.

First announced in 2004, after the failure of India's coercive diplomacy and military mobilisation (Operation Parakram) of 2001-02, the doctrine tries to build the case that India does have a war-fighting option – "cold start" under a WMD overhang. This seeks to convey to Pakistan and the world that the capability being developed to wage "limited war" will enable India to operationalise its forces within 96

hours to strike offensively against Pakistan without crossing the nuclear threshold.

The concept of limited war in the "cold start" strategy is dangerous strategic thinking. As Pakistan's army chief Gen Ashfaq Parvez Kayani has emphatically pointed out, proponents of the use of conventional force in "a nuclear overhang" are charting a course of dangerous adventurism whose consequences can be both unintended and uncontrollable. The notion of limited war will push the subcontinent onto a slippery slope and heighten the danger of escalation. India's strategy aims to achieve surprise and speed in a conventional strike against Pakistan. It overlooks the fact that in a crisis the nuclear threshold will be indeterminate. The threshold cannot be wished away by speed in mobilisation.

In fact, the shorter the duration needed for a mobilisation the greater the risk of escalation and the likely lowering of Pakistan's nuclear red lines. Squeezing the timeframe will only make the situation more dangerous and unstable. The long fuse in a crisis provided by the time required for assembly and deployment of forces has so far helped to avoid a catastrophic war.

If operationalised, the "cold start" doctrine will force Pakistan to re-evaluate its policy of keeping its nuclear arsenal in "separated" form and move towards placing its strategic capability in a higher state of readiness, including deploying a "mated" capability -- i.e., mating warheads to delivery systems. The action-reaction cycle will move the subcontinent to a perilous state of hair-trigger alert.

Similarly destabilising would be the espoused goal to secure a "technological edge" by India's effort to acquire a missile-defence shield and build its PAD (Prithvi Air Defence) capabilities.

India may feel that the acquisition of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems (possessed by only the US, Russia and Israel) will give it the capability to neutralise Pakistan's missile capabilities. This would be a dangerous presumption.

The deployment of ballistic missile defence (BMD) capabilities is likely to enhance fears that an offensive pre-emptive strike, conventional or nuclear, could be undertaken behind the BMD shield. Such a capability in the context of the "cold start" doctrine would increase the possibility of a military adventure by providing an illusion of "comfort."

This would enhance the incentive for Pakistan to multiply the numbers of missiles and increase operational readiness to avoid the

destruction of these assets in a pre-emptive strike. Pakistan will likely be obliged to take a series of other counter-measures to break through the BMD system.

This is a recipe for a costly and unnecessary arms race. A much better option is to pursue the strategic stability regime offered by Islamabad to Delhi that would stabilise nuclear deterrence by, among other steps, the mutual commitment not to develop or induct BMD systems into the region. But this does not seem to fit into India's ambitions.

As for the "threat from China," the Cold War-like language of the Indian doctrine seems out of sync with the times. It indicates Delhi's continuing desire to play the role of a balancer or strategic counterweight to China and employ its burgeoning relationship with Washington to counteract Beijing's rising influence.

But the international environment is at present not favourable to the fulfilment of this strategy. Unlike its predecessor, the Obama administration seems not to buy into fanciful schemes to contain China by promoting countervailing power centres. Instead, it is more interested in deepening the engagement with Beijing in an era being referred to as the G2 partnership, an alliance of overlapping US and Chinese interests. The symbiotic relationship between the two countries is today the pivot of the global economy. The emerging Indian doctrine seems to over reach in seeking a capability to deal with a two-front war. This becomes even more apparent when seen from the perspective of the experience of the world's most powerful military. The US has struggled to simultaneously prosecute, much less successfully conclude, two protracted wars (in Iraq and Afghanistan) despite the central and long-standing premise of its strategic doctrine of being prepared to fight "two wars" at a time.

It is therefore rather rich for India to claim that it can acquire the capability to deal simultaneously with two fronts, and that too against two nuclear powers. This is reckless translation of rhetoric into doctrine. Given how unrealistic it is to think that such a capability can be built, is the purpose of the doctrine, then, to use the China "threat" to acquire the latest military technology from the West? This raises another question: is that capability intended to be eventually deployed against Pakistan?

Once the full dimensions of India's military doctrine have been evaluated Islamabad will need to review its own options and reassess its operational plans and assumptions. Its strategic calculations should entail

a careful reading of Indian capabilities and intentions while also making a distinction between ambition and reality.

Gen Kapoor's enunciation of a provocative doctrine is one more reason why Pakistan cannot ignore the more enduring challenge to its security, even as it confronts the urgent internal threat posed by terrorism and militancy.

Dr Maleeha Lodhi, *News International* (Rawalpindi), January 5, 2010.

## INDIA'S CHALLENGE

The statement by Indian army chief Gen Deepak Kapoor regarding his army's capacity to fight a two-front war upset a lot of people in Pakistan. Both Pakistan's army chief and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee rebutted such superfluous claims. Pakistan's military high command did not mince its words in dissuading its Indian counterparts from giving any thought to 'military adventurism', and highlighted the severe implications of this and of the Pakistan military's capacity to respond.

Such exchanges represent the heightened tension between the two traditional rivals. For many political pundits the year 2010 does not bode well for bilateral ties. The tide of peace and amity has been reversed even though people thought that the peace process, started during Musharraf's reign, was 'irreversible'. At that time, one of the major reasons for hope on both sides was that a possible deal could be negotiated between an elected government in India and a military dictator in Pakistan, who, it was assumed, could carry his institution along in reaching out to New Delhi. Now things are back to square one with hawks on both sides intensifying tensions. Kapoor's statement and its response from Rawalpindi is not the last time that such an exchange will take place. Needless to say, such exchanges do not bode well for peace in the region. The Indian army chief had spoken of a capability that India desires but does not possess at the moment. Taking on two neighbours militarily and ensuring a ceasefire on its conditions is New Delhi's dream. But it does not have the capacity to translate this into reality. In fact, India does not even have the capability to successfully try out 'cold start', its strategy to allow the Indian military to strike specific targets inside Pakistan and pull back without incurring a high cost. The basic assumption is that if India targets terrorist training camps or headquarters in Pakistan and pulls out



without holding Pakistan's territory or annihilating its military, Rawalpindi will have no excuse to deploy nuclear weapons.

Theoretically, such an adventure is possible because it is based on another calculation that the Indian army will not waste time in regrouping but would already be regrouped to carry out a strike. Official sources believe that activating 'cold start' could mean Pakistan deploying nuclear weapons at forward positions or keeping them ready for use. Such a situation would result in India deploying its arsenal as well, making the atmosphere highly charged.

Thus far, the Indian strategy is not in place. It requires complete inter-services harmony and would essentially be a joint services operation which could only succeed if well simulated. So far, there is no indication that India has this capacity. There are internal problems in establishing a new force structure. The establishment of this would indicate that headway is being made in bringing necessary changes to the organisational structure.

So, should Pakistan just laugh off Kapoor's statement? It would be wiser to understand the nuances of the statement which are more important than the actual content of what he said. It basically indicates the shifting of plates in terms of civil-military relations in India. This is not to suggest that the Indian military is getting ready for an internal coup or that it could take over politics or even wage a war on its own.

However, Kapoor's statement is one of the many symbols of the growing significance of India's military in the country's security and foreign policy paradigm, particularly as far as Pakistan, China and the US are concerned. It is no longer the military of Nehru's days that sat silently waiting for orders from Delhi as it saw the Chinese army creeping into areas India considered part of its territory.

The modern-day Indian military has access to the media and has managed to build a partnership with it to get its message across when it is in need of public pressure on the political government regarding a particular issue or policy. Furthermore, the military's overall significance in military security decision-making has increased for a number of reasons.

First, the current lot of Indian politicians is comparatively less skilled to deal with security issues than their predecessors and so tend to seek advice from military officers on security issues.

Second, given India's desire to become a global player and its acquisition of modern technology to achieve this objective, the

significance of the armed forces has increased. Third, India's security partnership with the US has bolstered the Indian military's significance.

Finally, (as in Pakistan) senior commanders who retire from the service find jobs in think tanks. This has allowed them to influence the national security discourse in the country. For instance; the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry recently published a report on national security and terrorism proposing extreme measures. Thus, senior retired military officers and hawkish civilian experts drive the thinking of businessmen and traders who are key to peace in the region. This is indeed unfortunate and depicts a reduced capacity of the civilian sector in India to take on or oppose the military's perspective.

From Pakistan's perspective the important thing is that Indian politicians might find it difficult to go against their military's opinion in case there is a crisis in the future. Not to forget the fact that both the Indian and Pakistani military have changed qualitatively as far as their class structure goes.

Greater indigenisation of the officer cadre and troops has meant larger numbers from the lower, lower middle and middle classes. One of the distinguishing features of these classes is their sympathy for socio-cultural traditions that have a significant religious flavour. Consequently, the men in uniform might view matters of war and peace differently.

Such factors as mentioned above are difficult to quantify but have a greater bearing on military planning and decision-making than what one would imagine. Under the circumstances, any misadventure or misperception could cost heavily.

These are two neighbours who do not know or understand each other and this makes an accidental conflict or some other dangerous miscalculation possible. Perhaps it is time that the two rivals began to understand each other.

Ayesha Siddiqua, *Dawn* (Islamabad), January 8, 2010.  
<http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/columnists/14-ayesha-siddiqua-indias-challenge-810-zj-02>.

## WATER WOES

With winter setting in, the corresponding rains have not yet arrived. The result has been a shortage of water for agriculture, for which it is nothing less than lifeblood. However, while agriculture is suffering, the water shortage has also meant that canals have to be closed. As a result, production of hydro-electricity will go down; with the result that load

shedding will increase. While electricity has been cut off for the domestic consumer, it has also been absent for the tube wells that are the fallback of the farmer. The shortfall is now 4025 MW, and this is the time that a callous administration has decided to shut down further releases from the Mangla Dam. When one considers what was said by PML(Q) Senator Muhammad Ali Durrani to the participants of a protest walk in Bahawalpur, it becomes clear what the real problem is. Senator Durrani has accused India of a plot to turn the Bahawalpur civilisation into a Death Valley. Senator Durrani wanted the federal government to build pressure upon India to obey international law, as well as the Indus Waters Treaty it was violating to divert water for its own use. Senator Durrani was particularly eloquent, because in that area river water is not just used for agriculture, but also domestic use, and thus Indian diversions do not just prevent agriculture, but they also affect living in the area.

That India is behind this mischief is indubitable. Its shifting of the waters of Kashmir, which it has illegally occupied, down South, all the way to Rajasthan, is too well known. Also, in the most recent attempts, it has made diversions for the Wullar Barrage and now the Baglihar Barrage, which are not only causing crippling shortages in Pakistan, but are also in violation of the Indus Waters Treaty. At the same time, the Pakistani government, in its eagerness to restart the composite dialogue, has not only virtually let these violations go by default, but has also dragged its feet on the eminently feasible Kalabagh Dam project. This has not conveyed to India that Pakistan was making a sacrifice at the altar of federalism, because federating units had manufactured objections to the project, but that Pakistan did not need either large storages or any more hydel.

Therefore, the government must abandon its present spineless, and tackle the problems of the citizens in right earnest. Not only does this mean electricity load shedding, but also gas load shedding. Even one is enough to make life a misery during winter. Combined, they make more misery for those already rendered miserable. The government must also take up not just with India, but the international community, the guarantees and promises it has made, and stop its strangling of Pakistanis, not just Pakistani agriculture. This issue is of prime importance, and must not be placed on the backburner at anyone's bidding.

*Nation* (Islamabad), January 12, 2010.

<http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Editorials/12-Jan-2010/Water-woes>.

## KRISHNA, QURESHI DISCUSS TERRORISM ON PHONE

The Indian Foreign Minister told his Pakistani counterpart in talks over the telephone on Wednesday that Pakistan should “unravel the full conspiracy” behind the Mumbai attacks and crack down on militancy.

India's S.M. Krishna and his opposite number Shah Mehmood Qureshi spoke in the backdrop of fraught relations between the nuclear-armed neighbours following Mumbai and recent military flare-ups on the border.

India has “paused” a formal peace process with Pakistan after the 2008 strike on Mumbai, which it blames on Pakistan-based militants and some state agencies. The two sides have however met on the sidelines of international gatherings since then.

Pakistan has put seven men on trial for the attacks, but India has been demanding swifter justice.

Krishna “underscored the need for bringing the perpetrators of the attack to justice expeditiously and requested that India be kept informed of the progress of the trial,” an Indian Foreign Ministry statement said.

“(Krishna) also pointed out that Pakistan needs to take effective steps to dismantle the infrastructure of terrorism which exists in Pakistan and continues to be used for anti-India activities,” it added.

A Pakistani man accused of being the lone surviving gunman of the Mumbai attacks is on trial in India, while a Chicago man has been charged in the United States for helping plan the strike. -Reuters

*Dawn* (Islamabad), January 13, 2010.

<http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/18-india-pakistan-ministers-discuss-terrorism-on-phone-am-04>

## INDIA'S UNHELPFUL ATTITUDE

India's long tradition of democracy has given the country an image of a responsible and restrained nation. But this view is not shared by India's neighbours, especially the smaller ones.

The past 60 years have shown India's tendency to throw its weight about and browbeat its neighbours. With those that are bigger and more powerful, India tends to adopt a moralistic and intellectually superior tone, as noted by some American leaders. With its smaller neighbours, it does not hesitate to take off its gloves.

Of course, we are no paragons of virtue either, and in many cases, it has been our own arrogance and folly, more than Indian machinations, that have contributed to our failures and losses, whether in view of the East Pakistan debacle or the Kargil adventure.

It had, however, been expected that with the restoration of a democratic dispensation in Pakistan and with virtually all major political parties committed to establishing a cooperative relationship with India, New Delhi would engage in a comprehensive dialogue aimed at resolving the differences that have plagued ties between the South Asian neighbours.

The Mumbai terror attack in November 2008 angered the Indian government, which thereafter had to cater to massive popular outrage. The consequent decision to suspend the dialogue with Pakistan was understandable.

Since then, the Pakistani leadership has been engaged in a major effort to convince New Delhi that it was sincere in its desire to cooperate with India with the common objective of confronting the extremists. In fact, the most remarkable thing was the near unanimity with which the Pakistanis not only condemned the Mumbai attacks, but also acknowledged that their country needed to take concrete steps to assuage India's anguish.

None of this, however, appears to have had much impact on the Indian establishment. Even the expectations raised at the Gilani-Singh meeting in Sharm El Sheikh were snuffed out when Manmohan Singh's colleagues publicly expressed their misgivings.

Then again, while Singh's statement last October in Srinagar that he was not setting preconditions for the dialogue had raised fresh hopes, it did not indicate anything new, for he placed his readiness for talks in the context of Pakistan being able to create an environment conducive to negotiations. His pronouncement neither accompanied nor followed any move to re-engage Islamabad. Instead, Delhi declined to respond to the road map for resuming talks that Pakistan had conveyed to Indian officials.

This led many to believe that Prime Minister Singh's remarks in Srinagar were merely meant to coincide with US Secretary Hillary Clinton's visit to Pakistan, as well as his own visit to Washington a few weeks later.

In the meanwhile, the Pakistanis kept pleading for the resumption of dialogue, while the Indians continued to rebuff these offers. The Indian

foreign minister ridiculed even the offer of back-channel exchanges. It was then that realisation dawned on the Pakistani leadership that the country's repeated requests were becoming demeaning.

In the meanwhile, India appears to have raised the ante, with the Indian army chief Gen Kapoor remarking that "the possibility of a limited war in a nuclear overhang is still a reality, at least in the Indian subcontinent".

What has been particularly galling is the failure of the Obama administration to act on its seemingly wise policy pronouncements during the election campaign. Instead of encouraging India to reduce its presence in Afghanistan and ceasing to stir up trouble in Balochistan, the US appears to have gone along with Indian allegations, agreeing to inject into the US-India joint statement a provision "to work jointly to deal with terrorism emanating from India's neighbourhood".

This was strange, coming from an administration that had publicly expressed a desire to promote Indo-Pakistan normalisation and to work for the resolution of the Kashmir problem.

The Indian army chief's latest statement in which he spoke of his army's capacity to fight a two-front war has evoked great surprise and disappointment. But while it conveyed hostility and belligerence, his words are neither realistic nor achievable as India does not have the capability to successfully initiate its much-heralded 'cold start' strategy, much less wage two wars against two neighbours simultaneously.

This does not mean, however, that we can dismiss these statements as mere rhetoric. It could be more evidence of the increasing inclination of the Indian forces to have a role in the India-Pakistan equation.

According to some observers, there has been a slow but perceptible change in India where an increasing number are reported to have insisted on being given more than merely a 'hearing' on issues relating to Pakistan, especially Siachen and Sir Creek. The Indian armed forces have gradually come to believe that given the growing challenges that India faces both domestically and on its frontiers, a more visible role for it is in order.

Another important factor is the newfound confidence acquired from the special relationship that the US has so eagerly conferred on India, not only as its strategic partner, but also as a potential counterweight to China. No less important could be the growing influence of rightwing parties and religious groups that want India to adopt more nationalist policies vis-à-vis its neighbours.

Whatever the reason, our leaders should not react in haste or with similar belligerence. What must be avoided at all costs are provocative steps, such as refusing to cooperate against the militants or brandishing nuclear assets.

Instead, what is required is a dispassionate analysis of what these signals portend for Pakistan and sensitising our friends to Indian actions. While we must not be distracted from the objective of seeking a peaceful resolution of our differences with India, we must not show undignified haste towards that end.

Tariq Fatemi, *Dawn* (Islamabad) January 14, 2010.  
<http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/19-indias-unhelpful-attitude-hh-04up>.

### PAKISTAN WARNS INDIA AGAINST HEGEMONIC MINDSET

Pakistan warned India on Wednesday against its relentless pursuit of military preponderance and said it would have severe consequences for peace and security in South Asia and the Indian Ocean region.

The National Command Authority, which met here under Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani, took serious note of recent Indian statements about conducting conventional military strikes under a nuclear umbrella and said such irresponsible statements reflected a hegemonic mindset, oblivious of dangerous implications of adventurism in a nuclearised context.

The NCA also took note of the developments detrimental to the objectives of strategic stability in the region. It observed that instead of responding positively to Pakistan's proposal for a strategic restraint regime in South Asia, India continued to pursue an ambitious militarisation programme and offensive military doctrines.

"Massive inductions of advanced weapon systems, including installation of ABMs (anti-ballistic missiles), build-up of nuclear arsenal and delivery systems through ongoing and new programmes, assisted by some external quarters, offensive doctrines like 'Cold Start' and similar accumulations in the conventional realm, tend to destabilise the regional balance," the meeting noted.

A statement issued by the PM House said: "Pakistan cannot be oblivious to these developments." It was the first meeting of the NCA after President Asif Ali Zardari promulgated the National Command

Authority Ordinance and divested himself of the powers of its chairman in November last year.

The meeting expressed satisfaction over the safety and security of Pakistan's strategic assets and effectiveness of its strategic deterrence. It emphasised the importance of Pakistan's policy of credible minimum deterrence and maintaining strategic stability in South Asia.

The authority reaffirmed Pakistan's policy of restraint and responsibility and its resolve to continue efforts to promote peace and stability in South Asia. It underscored the need for preventing conflict and avoiding nuclear and conventional arms race in the region.

The NCA noted that the India-specific exemption made by the Nuclear Suppliers Group and subsequent nuclear fuel supply agreements with several countries would enable New Delhi to produce substantial quantities of fissile material for nuclear weapons by freeing up its domestic resources.

It reiterated that while continuing to act with responsibility and avoiding an arms race, Pakistan would not compromise on its security interests and the imperative of maintaining a credible minimum deterrence.

The meeting reviewed plans for generation of nuclear power under IAEA safeguards as part of national energy security strategy to ensure sustained economic growth and welcomed the renewed international interest in nuclear power generation to meet the challenge of climate change.

As a country with advanced fuel cycle capability, it said, Pakistan was in a position to provide nuclear fuel cycle services under IAEA safeguards, and participate in any non-discriminatory nuclear fuel supply assurance mechanism.

The NCA expressed satisfaction at steps taken by Pakistan at the national level for nuclear safety and security, which would continue to be important considerations in the context of national nuclear power development plans.

## **N-disarmament**

It reaffirmed that as a nuclear weapon state Pakistan was committed to working as an equal partner in international efforts for general and complete nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, the NCA stressed the need for non-discriminatory policies and



accommodation of the reality of Pakistan's nuclear weapon status for promoting global non-proliferation goals.

The meeting emphasised that promotion of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament objectives in South Asia were linked with regional security dynamics and the need to address existing asymmetries and resolution of outstanding disputes.

The NCA stressed that as the sole disarmament negotiating forum the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva should play its due role in global nuclear disarmament. As far as a Fissile Material Treaty at the CD was concerned, Pakistan's position would be determined by its national security interests and the objectives of strategic stability in South Asia, it said.

"Selective and discriminatory measures that perpetuate regional instability, in any form and manner, derogate from the objectives of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and, therefore, cannot be accepted or endorsed. Pakistan will not support any approach or measure that is prejudicial to its legitimate national security interests."

An official told Dawn after the meeting that India's 'Cold Start' strategy was a threat to strategic stability of South Asia. India's growing military prowess, capabilities and aggressive designs implied war-provoking intent by practical manifestation of the 'Cold Start' doctrine.

He said the hit and mobilise concept would further squeeze space for diplomacy and political manoeuvres for avoiding a conflict. This strategy was likely to increase the threat in an unpredictable manner at various rungs of the escalation ladder, he added.

He said it was inherently flawed to further engage nuclear South Asia in an arms race rather than diverting efforts and resources to alleviate social needs of poor segments of society. Strategic equilibrium prevalent in the subcontinent would be impacted with negative repercussions, he said.

Explaining the concept of the 'Cold Start' doctrine, a defence analyst said it envisaged applying linear ground forces for multiple thrusts, backed by massive fire power well before Pakistan completed its mobilisation and international community could intervene.

He said the doctrine laid stress on offensive strike, but without giving battle indicators of mobilisation to maintain chances of strategic surprise while remaining below nuclear threshold. Political decision for war would be taken at the outset.

Talking about the broad contours, he said traditional operational art of maintaining distinction between strike and defensive formations would be done away with. The war was planned to be fought by integrated battle groups (IBGs) synergised and supported by Indian Air Force and Navy.

Since the IBGs would be pre-positioned closer to international border and the Line of control, these would commence operations with least build-up and preparation and would thus achieve surprise under the doctrine, he added.

Shaping the battlefield through new concept of war, incorporating all available technical-driven assets and fire power platforms would remain the hallmark of an Indian offensive.

Analysts observed that in Indian military planners' view there was space available for a short notice, short-duration war with curtailed objectives despite the nuclear factor. Nuclear capability has added to Pakistan's security by impinging upon India's liberty of action under the nuclear overhang.

As the efficacy of all-out conventional war within the nuclear environment became questionable, India started studying the possibility of a limited conflict with curtailed application of military instrument and objectives.

*Dawn* (Islamabad), January 14, 2010.

[http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/front-page/16-pakistan-warns-india-against-hegemonistic-mindset-hs-](http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/front-page/16-pakistan-warns-india-against-hegemonistic-mindset-hs-07)

07.