

PROCESS OF NORMALIZATION WITH INDIA AFTER 9/11 2001

**Khalid Mahmood Faisal¹,
Muhammad Iqbal Khan², Pakistan**

The September 11, 2001 Terror's attack on the United States brought occurring change in the political Landscape of the world. In the dramatically changed situation, Washington immediately restored its traditional relationship with Pakistan, much to India's distress. At the same time it also deepened its strategic relationship with India.

The Bharatiya Janta Part's (BJP) elite Including the Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpai himself had wished portray India and South Asia region as an area of great strategic significance to the US in the war against terrorism – prior to September 11, 2001 the India government already had cordial and close relations with US and in spite of the sanctions imposed after the May 1998, nuclear tests. The US preparing for the international war against terrorism has provided India an opportunity to continue its hegemonic design and strengthen its efforts to emerge as the regional and global power. Indians relations with US and other Western countries in the light of India – Pakistan relations and the Kashmir issue. India's effort to take advantage of the anti – terrorism campaign in relation to other South Asian countries, and for its larger agenda to acquire a world power status.

India because of its size population and strategic Location has been trying to establish itself not only as a regional power also as a global player.

George K Tanharn a US scholar says that “India's strategic location, size and population have contributed to Indian's leaders believe in its greatness its pre-eminence in the India's ocean region and its global impotence in this regard various India's prime ministers such a Jawaharlal Nehru Indira Gandhi Rajiv Gandhi Narsimrao and I-K Gujral formulated and articulated their own perceptions regarding various international developments.”¹

A study of India foreign policy over the years shows that there are two major long term goals – “first to attain a hegemonic position in South Asia and second to play a role in the international system. In the South Asia India has always considered Pakistan as it's adversary and has been making effort to establish its strategic superiority by thwarting any gain made by Pakistan. Currently as regards important developments in South Asia the regional and international community focus is on the process of rapprochement between the Pakistan and India – after a dead lock of more then ten months and huge military deployment along India Pakistan border from December, 2001 to October, 2002 the tense situation was finally defused

¹ Ashraf, Fahmida (2002) “Post 9/11 trends in Indian Foreign Policy” Strategic Studies Journal Islamabad, Vol. XXII PP. 57. 58.

by December 2002 after the withdrawal of massive military development along India Pakistan border for the process of rapprochement towards normalization of relations between India and Pakistan began in April 2003. When former India Prime Minister Vajpai during his speech in Siri-Nager extended the hand of friendship towards Pakistan.

Historical Back Ground

Since its creation in 1947 Pakistan security perception remains India centric. The interminable rivalry between the two South Asian neighbours resulted in three and half wars Islamabad have to pay in shape of separation of his Eastern wing during the 1971 war despite the overtones of the conflict being territorial the key players link their hostile relations with their religious Ideology: Pakistan and Islamic states urge to survive with honour against a predominantly. Hindus neighbour that is also perceived as having hegemonic design. The conflict has also led to Pakistan progression from conventional defense to nuclear deterrence in the past couple of decade. The up-gradation of military capabilities was considered necessary to war-off India's hegemonic design and allow Islamabad the capacity to pursue the Kashmir issue. Despite the acclaimed enhancement of capabilities, Pakistan remain far away from gaining its military strategic objectives.

The image of India in Pakistan is that of a hostile nation and the primary threat to Pakistan's security. The countries policy making elite tends to define threat to national security mainly in terms of the peril perceived from New Delhi. Indies hegemonic policies and attitude are considered as the most imposing danger to Pakistan survival. Over the past so years and more, the dominant school of thought that has influenced policy making believes that the Indian leadership has never been comfortable with an independent home land for the Muslims would not lose any opportunity to destroy or invade Pakistan, especially due to comparatively greater military capacity, is seen as a potential threat and as inherently antithetical to Pakistan security interest. Considering this mindset it is not surprising that Pakistan foreign policy has always been an extension of its defense policy. Islamabad has always viewed relations with other cousins, especially its neighbours or states with greater military strength than India. Any hostile statement from across the border reminds the people and policy makers of their deepest fear of India wanting to eliminate Pakistan. The various conflict with New Delhi especially the 1971 war that led to the dismemberment of Pakistan, have left scare that are not easy to erase. This fear had diminished somewhat during the 1980, and part of 1990. However it regained its prominence after the Baharatiya Janta Party (BJP) rise to power in India. This rivalry and threat has a physical manifestation as well in form of the on-going Kashmir disputes and other boundary Issues.

In the same way a dispute over water treaty was settled with India under the auspices of world bank in 1960 when negotiated the Indus water treaty.

“Beginning in late 1980, the both countries enacted a series of additional measures the principal combined building measures (CBMS) of the last forty years are”²

1. “Hotline between military operations directorates 1965.
2. Agreement on the prohibition of attack against nuclear installation and facilities, 1988, ratified and implemented in 1992.
3. Measures to prevent air space violations and to permit over flights and landing by military aircraft in 1992.
4. hot line between the prime ministers of both the countries.

Civilian governments especially those that came to power after 1988 were more inclined to set the Indian Pakistan relations on a better footing.

The dialogue between the Rajeev Gandhi Benazir Bhutto governments after that Lahore process initiated during the second Nawaz Sheriff government bear witness to this fact. Some sources were of the view that it was the army that was the less inclined to engage in bilateral dialogue over prior to 1988.

Process of Normalization imitated by the Simla agreement didn't receive any serious set back during the 70, but the developments in the 80 and 90 did affect the peace some what inadvertently even though both SAARC (South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation) and the India Pakistan joint commission had already become operational during the 80, the Sikh crises in the early 80, the intensification of Kashmir free Dom struggle in the late 80, in India and Pakistan quest for a viable democratic continue to have a direct bearing on foreign relations.

“While the year 1999 saw into major developments the Lahore declaration and the Kargil clashes, two cease fires marked the year 2000 including the one announcement by the Hizb-ul-Mujahideen in late July, and the Vajpai Ramzan cease fire which invoked the position responses from Pakistan leading to the holding of the Agra summit in July 2001 the failure of this summit couple with the tragedy of 9/11 created a rather loaded atmosphere which was effectively exploited by the Indians who accused Pakistan based militant outfits of attempting to destroy Indian democracy by launching an attack on the Indian parliament on 13th December 2002”.³

Indians relations with Bangladesh tend to fluctuate while the bilateral remain un-tackled as the upper riparian state India is increasingly seen in Bangladesh as the enemy that wants to

² Shahzad Aisha (2004) “Pakistan Vision” India Pakistan rapprochement Presence Scenario Pakistan Study Centre Islamabad Vol. V P. I65.

³ Cheema Pervaiz Iqbal (2004) “Islamabad Policy Research Institute”, Vol. IV, Assessing the role of confidence building measures in the India Pakistan tangle. Indian relations with its neighbours P. 18.

squeeze its tradition water resources. Hundred of border enclaves lift over from the 1947 boundary demarcation have not been streamlined and continue to give bilateral trouble. “Bangladesh has problems with India in the bay of Bangal much exacerbated by a disputed Sellhat island in the bay this dispute impacting on maritime delineations of territorial waters and economic zones is remarkably similar to the sir creek dispute India has with Pakistan.

As Sri-Lanka has feared from India because of its minority complex vis-a-vis the 65 million Tamils that live in the Indian state of India. It began by seeking settled maritime boundaries with India in the Pal strait and Gulf of manner then put its diplomatic pressures behind the creation of un-backed zone of peace in India ocean as an instrument of national security.

“It looked at the 1987 Indian military intervention with suspicion but then saw the withdrawal of the Indian troops from its territory in 1989. In the eyes of many Sri Lankan, after having failed to negotiate an independent position for itself, Sri Lanka implicitly acknowledged India's predominance before signing the 1987 agreement that brought the Indian troops to Sri Lanka.”⁴

Together with Sri Lanka, Nepal has a history of interacting with India before 1947 as an independent state. It has accepted the suzerainty of the 'Indian empire' in the past, which it continues to do subliminally today in a bilateral framework that it seeks also to challenge. Economically dominated and much weakened by cross-border movement of populations, it has sought to balance its relations with India by reaching out to China, which India has looked at with suspicion.

Today, Kashmir has come to be labeled as a 'core' dispute by Pakistan in order to prevent it from being enumerated as one of the 'non-core' issues. “The 'non-core' disputes have become linked to conditions placed by India on Pakistan's conduct. For instance, disputes can be discussed meaningfully if Pakistan stops its 'cross-border' infiltration of terrorists. In this formulation, the existence of 'non-core' issues can lessen the compulsion of discussing Kashmir as the irreducible quid pro quo for Pakistan's stopping its 'cross-border terrorism'. Today as India and Pakistan once again engage in a 'composite' dialogue, the two sides actually betray their real positions by insisting on two different approaches.”⁵

So, it is said that Kashmir problem is the core issue of Pakistan, it is the bone of contention between two states and relations can't be normalized with out settled the core issue. Pakistan's foreign policy orientation in the post-September 11 phase had re- aliened to a new strategic environment which resulted in a convergence with the US and divergence from

⁴ ibid P. 8

⁵ Op-cit P. 7

Afghanistan. In the process, this impact on Islamabad's relationship with New Delhi, especially the December 13, 2001 terrorist attack on the Indian parliament. Since Pakistan independence evolved an Indian- centric orientation in her foreign policy, which has become synonymous with the Kashmir issue. The Kashmir dispute primarily involves the life and future of people of the Land, It directly affects the peace and stability of the south Asia subcontinent region contains a large segment of human race. The dispute reaped three wars. The possibility of a fourth war-probably a nuclear holocaust is looming large. The Kashmir issue is simply this; people of a large territory which is not part of any existing sovereign state were assured by the entire international by a free vote. Until, this assurance has not been honored. At the international level,

▪ **Indian Policy on Kashmir**

Is primarily aimed at three objectives; deflecting Pakistan campaign alleging human-rights violations in Kashmir; emphasizing that the Simla agreement provides the only forum to settle India and Pakistan's bilateral issues: and branding the Kashmiri resistance as a movement among terrorists and fundamentalists.

▪ **While on the other hand Pakistani Approach is.**

Historically, the government of Pakistan has taken an official position on the state of Jamu and Kashmir wholly contrary to that of India. "It has modified this position occasionally as its conflict with India evolved, but there has been little public deviation from the following four core postulates.

- The state of Jamu and Kashmir is now and has been disputed territory since the end of British rule over undivided India in October 1947 was provisional. This understanding is formally acknowledged in UN Security Council resolutions of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949, to which both Pakistan and India agreed. These resolutions remain fully in force today, and can't be unilaterally disregarded by either party.
- Talks between India and Pakistan over the future status of the state should aim to secure the rights of self-determination for the Kashmiri people. This right entails a free, fair and internationally supervised plebiscite, as agreed in the 1948-1949 UN Security Council resolution.
- The plebiscite should offer the people of Kashmir the choice of permanent accession of the entire state to either Pakistan or India.
- Task between India and Pakistan in regard to the future status of the state should be held in conformity both with the Simla agreement of July 1972 and the aforementioned UN

Security Council resolutions. AN international mediatory role in these talks may be appropriate.”⁶

The Kashmir Question at the UN

Between October and December of 1947, the Azad Kashmir forces successfully resisted India's armed intervention and liberated one-third part of the state. Realizing it couldn't quell the resistance, India brought the issue to the United Nations in January 1948. As the rebel forces had been undoubtedly joined by the volunteers from Pakistan, India charged Pakistan with having sent armed raiders in to the state and urged that the United Nations call upon Pakistan to withdraw them. This was coupled with the assurance that, once the raiders were withdrawn, India would enable a plebiscite to be held under impartial auspices to decide Kashmir's future status but unfortunately this plebiscite could not be held yet under the supervision control of the United Nations to settle the dispute, although the government of Pakistan and India reaffirm their wish that the future status of Jammu and Kashmir shall be determined in accordance with the will of the people and to that end, upon acceptance of their truce agreement both governments agree to enter into consultations with the United Nations Commission to determine fair and equitable conditions where by such free expression will be assured. Here the question arises why the plebiscite was not held, the answer is this that when the "Commission reported this to the Security Council, Sir Owen Dixon, an eminent jurist from Australia, was appointed as United Nations mediator to negotiate the synchronized withdrawal of all Indian and Pakistani forces in order to prepare the stage for an impartial plebiscite under the United Nations supervision"⁷

It is commonly acknowledged that with India and Pakistan both now being nuclear weapon states directly confronting each other, this dispute is potentially the most dangerous in the world. It has, therefore, become a major interest of the U.S. to prevent this dispute from exploding into a conflict which can be catastrophic for a large proportion of the human race. Here we can analyze the role of major global players in context to hold the fair referendum in East Timor. Indonesia, "the review of these cases reflects the double standards operation by the major global players dominate the United Nations following the U.N supervised referendum of, 1999, East Timor is now an independence country. The people of East Timor were allowed the right of self-determination a principle that the United Nations has ignored in the case of Kashmir"⁸

Independence of East Timor

⁶ Hassan Riffat Dr. (2004) "National Development and Security Friends Quarterly Journal" Available and Solutions and Proposals for resolving the Kashmir Dispute. V. XII P. 57.

⁷ Nabi Ghulam Dr. (January-March 2004) *South Asia Kashmir Past & Present Future*, Karachi. P.177.

⁸ Ali Muhammad & Ahsen Muhammad, (2002) *The Globalization or decolonization the Muslim world in the 21st century* Ta-Ha Publisher London P. 102.

Here the controversial roll of United States can be easily observed in case of independence of **East Timor**, In his statement of 19th October 1999 president of united states Bill Clinton said, "The United States is committed to helping the people the East Timor not only obtain the legal recognition of independence but also develop the institutions they need thrive as an independent state. In December 1975, the Security Council passed resolutions 384 that recognized the "in alienable" the right of the people of East Timor to self determination and independence in accordance with the principal of the charter of the UN and called upon Indonesia to withdraw its forces from territory. In 1976 resolution 389 of the Security Council once again reaffirmed this position. It is worth noting that with in less than a quarter of a century the East Timor have been granted the right of self determination a right that has been continually denied to Kashmir for more than half a century".⁹

Here it is difficult to fine even a single case where the major global powers have intervened to resolve a problem in the Muslim world purely on humanitarian grounds rather than because of there own politico-economic interests. Where as concern the foreign relation of Pakistan have been under constant strain since the day of its independence from the 1948 Kashmir war, to 1971 debacle to the Kargil conflict While India has been a major determinant of its foreign policy. At the same time, the US has been another constant factor in its foreign relations. US Pakistan relations have seen many phases, warm and friendly allied and under strain. The main reason of long out standing the problem of Kashmir is the UN timely death of its founder the Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah and the assassination of its first Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan in 1951 created politically UN stable conditions for seven years. There after the military generals took over the reins of par from the political leadership and there was no consolidation of democracy in the country for the next 13years. There fore political stability baffled Pakistan which was reflected in its national security and foreign policy. "For Pakistani leaders since 1950 and 1960 Kashmir has always proved to be a problem in domestic politics. For example both late Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan and late President Ayub Khan were victims of there respective Kashmir Policies. Liaqat Ali Khan faced the wrath of a few Pakistan Army Officers who plotted the 1951 Rawalpindi conspiracy case to depose him from power of his UN satisfactory policy towards Kashmir. Similarly, the late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto accused Ayub Khan for his sell out on Kashmir at the Tashkent summit following the 1965 India Pakistan conflict and uses the issue to defeat him in the elections".¹⁰

“Pakistan raised the Kashmir issue at the human rights commission in Geneva that the people of Jammu and Kashmir have been denied the right of self-determination in March 1990 the Pakistani envoy Zafar-ul-Haq sought to raise the Kashmir issue again related to the right of self-determinations at the UN in October 1999 and again high lighted the same issue at UN

⁹ ibid PP. 103-104.

¹⁰ Bidanda M Chengappa, (2004) Pakistan Islamisation Army and Foreign Policy A.P.H publishing Corporation New Delhi PP. 111-112.

human rights commission by the Pakistan foreign secretary Sheharyar Khan 6th September 1991 at the (Non Alignment Movement) NAM Foreign Ministers at Agra.”¹¹

▪ Nuclear Explosion.

Pakistan's overt nuclear weaponisation in May 1998, as an immediate response to the Indian nuclear test added another dimension to the Kashmir problem. After the May 1998 explosions the BJP "government adopted a more overt aggressive policy towards Pakistan, various BJP officials issued threatening statements after one another. In his first interview to **India Today** after the tests, Indian Prime minister Vajpai said "we have a big bomb now and that the BJP government would not hesitate to use these weapons in self defense. "The same language was used by the Indian Home minister L.K Advani on" May 18 1998"he warned Pakistan to role back its anti-Indian policy especially with regards to Kashmir another BJP Spokes man Krishen Lal Sharma also warned Pakistan on May 19, 1998 and said that" it would pay a heavy price for fueling the conflict in Kashmir he also said that BJP government should take a tough stand and foil Pakistan's attempts to stoke militancy regarding the freedom movement going on in Indian-occupied Kashmir"¹² after this nuclear tests the Indian leaders probably assumed that Kashmir issue could be settled on Indian terms hence, such aggressive statements were issued.

It's a fact of matter that "Indian regional policy took at any particular moment that is invariably reverted to carrot and stick approach of making the smaller neighbors conscious of India's gigantism some examples are India's military intervention in east Pakistan in 1971, military involvement in Sri-Lanka 1987, military help to Maldives government in 1988 and now in view of Maoist uprising in Nepal, India's offer of extending military help to the Nepali's government its military action December 1961 to annex Goa the sino-India conflict in 1962 leadings to India's defeat, the Bangladesh crises, though India manage to break up Pakistan yet internationally".¹³

It is very clear that India's role as non-aligned state had ended and Indian foreign policy became more reactive to international event and aggressive in its own region in pursuance of India to seek a big power status. Therefore on May 25, 1998 Home minister Advani threatened to Pakistan that India would undertake hot pursuit to chase insurgents from Kashmir back into Pakistan. This attitude shows that India want to establish the regional power with hegemonic design in South Asia. Pakistan again attempted to improve ties with India when Prime Minister A.B Vajpai met with them Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif at Lahore in February 1999 however,

¹¹ ibid P. 110.

¹² Ashraf, Fahmida (2002) "Strategic Studies" Journal Islamabad Post 9/11 trends in Indian Foreign Policy, Vol. XXII PP. 55-56.

¹³ ibid P. 54.

the Lahore diplomacy was neutralized with Pakistan's Kargil war a year after nuclear explosion and international attention focused briefly on the core issue of Kashmir question there after New Delhi-Islamabad relations remained cold till President Musharraf was invited in July 2001 to India for the Agra summit but unfortunately the talks between two countries could not come up with their expectations and bilateral dialogue failed. Pakistan foreign policy has over the year become so obsessed with the Kashmir issue to the extent that it even influences her relationship with other countries. So much so that Pakistan's perception of friendship or hostility with other countries is linked to their support over the Kashmir issue. Therefore Kashmir issue is a vital and sensitive part of Pakistan foreign policy. At this position no one Pakistani government proposes to change the course on Kashmir it would be difficult to do so "this is because the government has over five decades of national hood condition domestic public opinion about the correctness and significance of the Kashmir cause through state controlled Television and Audio Media".¹⁴

The post September 11 2001 US campaign for the international war against terrorism has provided India an opportunity to pursue its hegemonic design and strengthen its efforts to emerge as the regional and global power. India's relation with US and other Western countries in the light of Indo-Pak relations and the Kashmir issue India's effort to take advantage of the anti-terrorism campaign in relation to other south Asian countries for its larger agenda to acquire a world power status. Immediately after September 11 India speedily joined the US-led campaign against terrorism with a view to motivating Washington to declare Pakistan a terrorist state due to the latter's supports to the Taliban regime, and to the Kashmiri elements. Simultaneously India also calibrated a strategy of international escalation of tension with Pakistan in the wake of terrorist attacks one out side the Siri-Nagar state Assembly's building on October 1 and the other one on the Indian parliament on December 1 2001. In spite of Pakistan out right condemnation of these terrorist attacks the Vajpai government threatened Pakistan with the limited war.

"An official Indian think tank in New Delhi has also suggested that India should strike at some areas of Azad Kashmir. It is the view of this think tank that Pakistan is not likely to retaliate to any Indian incursion into the Azad Kashmir. This is probably based on the reasoning that Pakistan may not wish risk a general war with India over some territory in Azad Kashmir".¹⁵

Indian offered all co-operation and facility to US military operations in its war against terrorism Indian Prime Minister Vajpai in his letter to US President Bush dated September 11, 2001, wrote "we stand ready to co-operate with you in the investigations into this crime and to strengthen our partnership in leading international efforts to ensure that terrorism never succeeds

¹⁴ Bidanda M Chengappa, (2004) Pakistan Islamisation Army and Foreign Policy A.P.H publishing Corporation New Delhi PP. 112

¹⁵ F.S Lodhi Safdar LT. Gen. (Rtd) (2002) "Defense Journal" Will Kashmir Explode? Vol. V Karachi P.37.

again. India immediately identified three year bases in Jammu, Punjab and Gujarat each in addition to un specified port facilities as a part of its offer for operational support to the US"¹⁶.

Taking advantages of international communities focus on the issue of terrorism in the Post-September 11, 2001 period India has emphasis its efforts to isolate Pakistan and to convince to the international community to declare Pakistan a terrorist state. "Mr. Jaswant Singh visited the US and held meeting with the US secretary of state Colin Paul defense secretary Donald Rums Feld and national security advisor Condo Leezza Rice during his discussion Mr. Singh stressed that US had no option but to address terrorist operations in Kashmir".¹⁷

After the event of 9/11 the Indian government of BJP contacted to the international community for putting the pressure on Pakistan a specific action to build _more pressure along the line of control and the international border with Pakistan. After the September 11 attacks the Indian army was put on a "red alert" along the line of control in occupied Jammu and Kashmir and on Punjab international border to foil any attempt by militants to infiltrate into the country. "In November 2001 Indian Prime Minister Vajpai visited to US and U.K. Prime Minister Vajpai and President Putin signed the Moscow declaration on terrorism for strengthening the bilateral strategic partnership between the two countries".¹⁸ In the same way Mr. Jaswant Singh the foreign Minister of India also visited Japan in December 2001, an 11 page joint declaration was issued it called for a total elimination of terrorism in all region and extending the fight against terrorism to those who provide support to sustenance and safe heaven to terrorist. Mr. Jaswant Singh paid another visit to U.K and call on the British Prime Minister Tony Blair, in January 2002, India and Britain signed a joint declaration condemning all those who supported and finance terrorism. Here it may be noted that the joint declaration specifically equated the December 13,2001 attack on the Indian parliament and the earlier October 1st 2001 attack on the Indian occupied Kashmir's legislatives assembly with those of September 11 attacks in the US. In March 2002, then the China and held discussions on the issue of countering terrorism.

The main aim behind these visits was to link the Kashmiri freedom movements to terrorism for this purpose the "Indian Ministry of defense released its annual report on May 13, 2002, to coincide with the visit of US assistant secretary of state, Ms. Rocca, in which it alleged that Pakistan was an epicenter of Islamic fundamentalism and cross border terrorism."¹⁹

In the after math after December 13, 2001 attacks on Indian parliament building, the Indian government adopted an aggressive posture towards Pakistan and moved its strike

¹⁶ Ashraf, Fahmida (2002) "Strategic Studies" Journal Islamabad Post 9/11 trends in Indian Foreign Policy, Vol. XXII PP. 57-58.

¹⁷ ibid P.59

¹⁸ Op-cit PP. 59-60

¹⁹ ibid P. 61

formations, comprising tanks and heavy artillery closer to the India Pakistan border. "India also put its missile system in place, and ordered the mobilization of its forces, shifted its air assets along the line of control (LOC) and borders with Pakistan, and moved its naval ships to the Arabian Sea, closer to Pakistan and, Indian's Home Minister, L.K Advani, on December 19, 2001 demarche Pakistan to:

- Strike against the alleged militant Islamic organizations and groups allegedly undertaken Jihad in India.
- Cessation of support to cross border terrorism into Indian controlled Kashmir.
- Hand over 20 individuals accused of terrorism in India.”²⁰

In the second phase, parallel to diplomatic measures reduction of diplomatic staff in each other country and India's withdrawal of its high commissioner from Islamabad, the Indian leadership had stepped-up a Nuclear war rhetoric. Vajpai claimed that India was ready for a nuclear war with Pakistan.

Thus September 9/11 only decelerated the de-Islamisation programme already under way in Pakistan in the pre 9/11 period this was evident from the Pakistan President Gen Musharraf's January 12, 2001 televised address to nation. In his address he said that "Sectarian Terrorism has been going on for the years. Everyone of us is fed up of it. It is becoming unbearable our peace-loving people are keen to get rid of the Klashankof and weapon culture. It is because of this that we banned Lashkar-e-Jhangvi and Sipah-e-Muhammad and the Sipah-e-sahaba and the Tehreek-e-jafria Pakistan would be under observation. If there is any political activity, in sighting of sectarian hatred or propagation of extremism in any mosque the management would be held responsible and proceeded against according to the law. Under tremendous pressure from US and Britain, and less pronounced sources from Europe-Union (EU) Pakistan moved in steps and stages to arrest leaders of militant outfits operating in Kashmir and banned their organizations. US took the lead by branding Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jasih-e-Muhammad as "foreign terrorist organizations" and Pakistan followed the suit. General Musharraf announced his decision to ban these militant organizations in televised address to the nation and invited Vajpai for talks.”²¹

On the above said views we can analyze that the Pakistan and India's military stand of indicates that India's political leadership has shown little responsibility and restraint while initiating a dangerous brinkmanship and the analyses the Post September 11 the Indian foreign policy trend shows that the present BJP government had adopted an aggressive attitude for attaining its too long term foreign policy goals to attain a hegemonic position in South Asia be to

²⁰ Khan Zulfiqar Dr. (2002) "Islamabad Research Institute (IPRI)" Pakistan Indian Military Stand of a nuclear dimension Islamabad PP.109-110.

²¹ Bidanda M Chengappa, (2004) Pakistan Islamisation Army and Foreign Policy A.P.H publishing Corporation New Delhi PP. 84-85

acquire the recognized status of an international actor since the last 3 years India has conducted Anti-terrorism meetings at bi-lateral levels with the US, EU, Britain Russia and central Russia states and establish joint working groups on terrorism with some of those states so that India would continue the aggressive policy towards Pakistan, using both fronts to gain the maximum mileage. "During the period of Post 9/11 the Indian government tried his best to isolate Pakistan internationally and more importantly in the relation to the Kashmir dispute for this purpose in March 2002, the Indian' external affair Minister Mr. Jaswant Singh visited China and held discussion on the issue of counter terrorism, but, Islamabad has "always looked at Beijing for material and diplomatic support. The military assistance provided by china during the Pak-India war of 1965 and Islamabad continued accessibility to China's military hard ware, makes china extremely significance. More important is the Sino- Indian tension over the question of military superiority in the Asia continent that has been beneficial from Islamabad's standpoint."²² Despite the relative appeasement between Beijing and New Delhi that has let to China not taking a position firmly in favour of Pakistan over the Kashmir issue, it is believed that as long as the rapprochement between China and India is limited it would serve Pakistan's interest.

The Post 9/11 world opened a new era of foreign relation for Pakistan it offered opportunities as well as challenges in adjusting its foreign policy it had to take in account the increasing Indo-US and Indo-Israel corporation especially in defense. So, war against terrorism had profound implication for Pakistan-India relations on December13-just three months after 9/11 a terrorist attack took place on the Indian parliament. "India pinned the blamed on Pakistan to support terrorists. This situation created a red alert position between the both countries that stand off continued till October 2002. This confrontation became the focus of world attention, looking at it in the nuclear dimension the dimension of terrorism was more pronounced this time. It was believed that this confrontation was for both the antagonists for the Bhartia Janata Party (B.J.P) in view of the pressure on the coalition after loosing many state elections, and for Pakistan's military regime, to garner public support in view of the opposition's pressure."²³

Instead of Pakistan had condemn the attack on Indian parliament but situation could not changed and tension continued between both countries till October 2004. This situation changed. "During a South Asian Association for Regional co-operation (SAARC) meeting in Katmandu on January 3rd 2002 President Musharraf had already prepared the mode for his speech on January 12.He had in an away already won the first phase of this Pakistan-India stand off with a small conciliatory but very media tic gesture. After addressing the SAARC delegates, he went over to Indian Prime Minister Vajpai and offer to shake hands. Vajpai, taken by surprise

²² Agha Siddique Ayesha Dr. (Jan. March 2004) "South Asian Journal" Pakistan Security Problems of Linearity Karachi P. 46.

²³ Sattar Nouman Dr. (2004) "National Development & Security Journal" War Against Terrorism Implication for Pakistan Vol. XII, Rawalpindi P. 7

obviously was not able to refuse this gesture of peace. This body language probably had a much wider effects on the international media than many speeches".²⁴

The same positive response was given by the government of India when his Prime Minister "on April 18, 2003 Mr. Vajpai addressed a rally in SiriNagar appealing for talks with Pakistan on all issues, including, Kashmir, he held out his "hand of friendship in the hope of better relations between the two neighbours."²⁵ On another occasion on May 2nd, 2003, the Indian Prime Minister Vajpai made an important announcement in parliament: He now wanted to start his third and last attempt at finding definitive and peaceful solution to the India-Pakistan conflict. His aim a was to initiate a "decisive and conclusive" dialogue aimed at ending the decades of hostility between the two countries reactionally Pakistani Prime Minister Mir Zafar Ullah Jamali responded immediately by offering his full co-operation and suggesting a nuclear-free sub continent in which both country would have to abolish there respective nuclear weapons.

This journey started to normalize the relations between the both countries when the Chairman of the MMA the Alliance of Pakistan's sixth islamist parties Maulana Fazal-ur-Rehman went on a trip to India calling for reconciliation between the two nations, "A new appeal or constructive dialogue came from President Musharraf, on August 12, 2003, he was speaking in Islamabad after meeting a delegation of Indian members of parliament"²⁶ forget Kargil Musharraf said." A November 25th-26th 2003, guns fell silent on the long border between India and Pakistan.

The cease fire was the good development in contest with the Indo-Pak foreign relations "it was first positive influence on Kashmir at the end of November when the All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC), agreed unconditionally to take part in a first-ever formal meeting with Indian's Deputy Prime Minister Advani."²⁷

As a first gesture of normalization India and Pakistan restored diplomatic relations by sending back there respective High Commissioner, road and train links were reopened in May 2003, Pakistan may probably be anxious make sure that Indian Prime Minister attends the annual SAARC conference in Islamabad in early 2004. But India was insisting that bi-lateral talks would be took place only if Pakistan stops supporting cross-border infiltrations the time may be ideal for such talks both sides seems to be finally driven by a genuine desire for peace. "This situation changed under the pressure of Western countries as well as United States of America (USA). When they expressed their reservations over the situation of Sub-Continent. The senior

²⁴ Madalena Marya L.Carvalho-Fischer and Matthis (2004) Pakistan under Siege after September 11, 2001, Van Guard Books Lahore. P.97

²⁵ ibid P.131

²⁶ ibid P. 132

²⁷ Op-cit P. 133

western diplomats based in New Delhi, thus commented on the Indo-Pak relations in this way the Western leaders have expressed their grief over escalating tension between two countries." ²⁸ The US deputy secretary of states Richard Armitage, in an interview to the BBC said "the international community was frightened to death that we were on the verge of nuclear war".

In its national security strategy of the United States of America issued in September 2002 "the White House indicated that it would, invest time and resources into building strong bi-lateral relations with India and Pakistan." ²⁹ The US thus planned to build more balance relationships in South Asia a partnership with Islamabad and strategic relationship with New Delhi.

▪ SAARC Organization Background

The South Asian Association for regional co-operation (SAARC) was established in 1958 with the objective that economic social and technical co-operation among the countries of South Asia would contribute significantly to their national and collective self-reliance, and also that, increased cooperation, contacts and exchanges among the countries of the region will contribute to the promotion of friendship and understanding among their peoples. Keeping in view the regional situation, with sharp geographic, economic developmental, demographic, and social disparities, the bases for co-operation mentioned in the charter of SAARC is respect for the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, political independence, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and mutual benefits are the basic principles of said organization SAARC. During the eighteen years of its existence, SAARC has made some important institutional achievements, however, the progress is slow as regional co-operation in South Asia has been spoiled by political tension over bi-lateral disputes for example Indo-Sri-Lanka tensions regarding the Tamil conflict in Sri-Lanka Indo-Bangladesh conflict of boundary demarcation and Indo-Pak tension over Kashmir dispute yet tensions between India and Pakistan delayed the holding of the 11th SAARC summit that was held in Nepal in 2002. Similarly schedule was announced for the 12th summit to be held in 2003 in Pakistan but unfortunately it could not be held due to Indian military stand of against Pakistan during 2002-2003. After the year the 12th SAARC conference eventually held in Islamabad on January 4-6, 2004 witnessed some dramatic developments that have helped in re-strengthened the spirit of regional co-operation, which was earlier somewhat sidelined in South Asian affairs because of the bi-lateral political issues between member states, particularly India and Pakistan. The SAARC leaders stressed the need to promote regional co-operation despite the constraints. On the occasion of this summit Prime Minister of the republic of India, Atal Bihari Vajpai, stressed: "we have to change the South

²⁸ Khan Zulfiqar Dr. (2002) "Islamabad Research Institute (IPRI)" Pakistan Indian Military Stand of a nuclear dimension Islamabad P. 111.

²⁹ Khan Karim Muhammad (2004) "National Development and Security Friendly Journal" US South Asia Policy after 9/11 and its implication for China Vol. XII Rawalpindi P. 133.

Asia's image and standing in the world. We must make the world transition from mistrust to trust, from discord to concord and from tension to peace".³⁰ The same feelings were expressed by the Prime Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on this occasion, Mir Zaffar Ullah Khan Jammali, he said" the potential and promise of SAARC is now where near realization. Globalization presents us with challenges and opportunities. This calls for an equal emphasis on strengthening of SAARC: raising its international profile" and building its external interface for trans-regional co-operation.

In South Asia, with its 1.4 billion population and 40% of world's poor people are living here so there is a need of time to give high priority to social sector development for the poverty elevation in the region. For this purpose a South Asian economic union was proposed during the summit in 2002. However, the state members stressed the need for establishing a suitable political and economic environment therefore the Islamabad declaration signed at the conclusion of the summit on January 6, 2004, desirable co-operation in all fields including economic co-operation, poverty elevation science and technology, health care, environment, combating terrorism, information and communications, sub-regional and intra-regional co-operation, and enhancing political co-operation. "During the 12th SAARC summit held in Islamabad another important development has been adoption of the additional protocol on suppression of terrorism. Its supplements the SAARC regional convention on suppression of terrorism signed in 1997 during the third SAARC summit held in Nepal" after the September 11, terrorist attacks, US policy regarding war on terrorism, and the United Nations security resolution 1373 of September 28,2001 the SAARC council of Ministers, during the 23rd meeting in Katmandu, Nepal, in August 2002 proposed the drafting of an additional protocol on terrorism for up dating the existing SAARC convention on suppression of terrorism".³¹

It is to be noted that the 1987 convention the suppression of terrorism did not include this aspect of the financing of terrorism further more, in the new additional protocol on, the suppression of terrorism was inducted any action intended to cause death or serious bodily injury to a civilian when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context is to intimidate a population are to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from, doing any act or as an act of terror. This is, however a dangerous approach and may result in misused by the implementing parties.

▪ **Pakistan-India Joint Statement**

A significant development was the signing of the joint statement by the President Musharraf and Prime Minister Vajpai on January 6, 2004. The main provisions of the statement

³⁰ Ashraf, Fahmida (2004) "Strategic Studies" Journal Islamabad 12th SAARC Submit a Step forward, Vol. XXIV P. 41

³¹ ibid P. 48

were the position expressed by the two leaders on behalf of their governments regarding the bi-lateral relations between the two countries. "The President of Pakistan and Prime Minister of India met during the SAARC summit in Islamabad. The Indian Prime Minister, while expressing satisfaction over the successful conclusion of the SAARC summit appreciated the excellent arrangements made by the host country. Both leaders welcomed the recent steps towards normalization of relations between the two countries and express the hope that the positive trends set by the confidence-building measures (CBMs) would be consolidated"³² Prime Minister Vajpai said that in order to take forward and sustain the dialogue process, violence, hostility, an terrorism must be prevented. President Musharraf reassured Prime Minister Vajpai that he would not permit any territory under Pakistan's control to be used to support terrorism in any manner.

The two leaders agreed that constructive dialogue would promote progress towards the common objective of peace, security and economic development for our peoples and for future generations, the both leaders were also of the confident that the resumption of the composite dialogue will lead to peaceful settlement of all bi-lateral issues, including Jammu and Kashmir for this purpose they agreed that the process of normalization would be forward and the schedule was chalk out for the composite dialogue to commence the process in February 2004. "Nepali analyst Anand Kumar observed that SAARC which had earlier been bogged down in mutual rivalry of India and Pakistan," finally aim out of limbo". For the first time the members that nations, especially India and Pakistan, decide to give preference to economics and poverty removal programmes over political bickering".³³ Indian analyst, Edward Faleriro, commenting on the summit described it as a land mark in the life of this organization.

The successful conclusion of the 12th SAARC conference has been welcomed by the international community, and most importantly with in the South Asian region in which dramatic change took place in shape of Vajpai-Musharraf talks. After this situation to carry the process of normalization the track two diplomacy was adopted.

Track Two Diplomacy

Track two diplomacy is a process of non-state or un-official dialogue between disputing states initiated with the help of a third party or citizens having access to their government who could influence public opinion. In south Asian context the retired beuro-crates and military officers, scholars, media persons and NGO's have taken a leading role in track two diplomacy. Track two diplomacy requires a functional and vibrant civil society, non-state institutions and organizations, pressure groups, intelligentsia and free private press to achieve its goals. The same practice was adopted in both countries. The members from all walks of life visited the two countries and met to the concerned persons to understand their views about the bi-lateral disputes

³² ibid P. 50

³³ ibid P. 52

which are long out standing in the region. The purpose of these efforts was to increase the understanding among the masses of this region. For this purpose the revival of cricket series between India and Pakistan has opened new avenues of confidence building measures with their resolution to promote bi-lateral relations between the two nuclear rivals. The first cricket match between these two neighbours in Pakistan after 15 years has been given extra ordinary coverage by the international media through out the world and they linked it to CBMs between the two countries. With the change of government in India in May 2004 after the Loak Sabha elections, their were concerns in Pakistan as well as within the international community regarding the continuity of peace process between India and Pakistan. On May 14 2004 while congratulating Mrs. Sonia Gandhi leader of congress on winning elections. “Mr. Butcher, US state department spokesman, commented on the future prospects of the India-Pakistan peace process and said that Washington would keep encouraging the two countries to settle their differences through dialogue. While talking to the reporters in Beijing, senior officials of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, Liu Jianchao, said "we hope both Pakistan and India would maintain the momentum of improving their relations"³⁴. Speaking at the Pakistan Institute of International Affairs in Karachi on May 13 2004, the ambassador and head of the European commission in Pakistan, Mr. Iikka Unsitalo, referring to the dialogue process said "we very much hope that surprised results announced today after election in India would not in any way de-rail the process". US secretary of state Colin Paul, in an interview publish on May 28 2004 expressed the hope that new government in India would continue with the frame work of peace process between India and Pakistan.

MRS Sonia Gandhi speaking to the reporters on May 13 2004 pledged to continue the dialogue process with Pakistan. On later the new Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, also expressed his government's willingness to the continue the process. After a gap of six years, on June 27-28, 2004 the foreign secretaries of both countries held their first meeting in New Delhi to discuss the issue of “peace and security, including CBMs (Combined Building Measure Steps) and the Kashmir dispute. Further more, they were agreed that the meeting of the remaining six subjects of the composite dialogue on Siachen, Wullar Barage, Sir Creek, terrorism and drug trafficking economic and commercial co-operations, and promotion of friendly exchange in various fields, would take place between the third week of July and the first half of August 2004”.³⁵

In the next meeting which held on the schedule on the level of foreign secretaries of both countries the issues were discussed. During the discussion India raised the issue of terrorism and infiltration in Jammu and Kashmir, where as the Pakistani side stressed on an end to human right violations, with drawl of draconian laws, ending of the combat operation by Indian troops, and

³⁴ Ashraf, Fahmida (2004) “Strategic Studies” Journal Islamabad India-Pakistan Dialogue under Congress Govt., Vol. XXIV P. 23

³⁵ *ibid* P. 30

also the reduction of the Indian troop in the state. As regard the proposal of Siri-Nagar Muzaffar Abad bus service which was given by former Prime Minister of Pakistan Mir Zaffar Ullah Jammali differences remained regarding the travel documents and procedures. "During the dialogue Pakistan raised the involvement of Indian agencies in terrorist incidents in Pakistan the activities of Indian consulates in Afghanistan and continuing the state terrorism in Indian-held Kashmir and claimed that there were 55 terrorist camps in Indian held Kashmir and other parts of India which targeted Pakistan. The Indian sides also give a list of 25 wanted persons which they accuse are hiding in Pakistan. Pakistan reiterated that none of them including Daud Ibrahim were in Pakistan".³⁶

As a good will gesture, India and Pakistan announced it would release 41 Indian civilian prisoners, most of them detained for visa violations and 408 fisher men detained for transgressing Pakistan's territorial waters. Now that the first phase of the composite dialogue process has ended and there has been some progress as regards people-to- people contact and the level of diplomatic relations between the two countries, such as decisions to liberalize visa policy on both sides and establishing of hotline between foreign secretaries of two countries release of the civilian prisoners were the main features of first phase dialogue between the two countries. However as regard the specific issues between India and Pakistan, keeping in view their respective national interests, there is no change in the official positions. The Ex-chairman of ALL Parties Hurriyat Conference Syed Ali Gillani expressed his reservations on starting friendly bus service from Muzaffar Abad to Siri-Nagar. He reiterated that "under the international pressure to reopen the Muzaffar Abad Siri-Nagar road is an effort to convert the LOC into an international frontier. It would be harmful not only for the Kashmiri's but also for the both countries".³⁷ While the other Hurriyat leaders traveled through such bus from Siri-Nagar to Muzaffar Abad and officially welcomed warmly in Muzaffar Abad.

Therefore, progress in case of issues such as, Jammu and Kashmir, Siachen, Wullar Barage, and Sir Creek, are presently not substantive, though the dialogue process would and must continue. However, the important point to note is that both sides have expressed satisfaction over the developments during the first phase and their resolve to continue the process as well. But "during the visit to USA on 13-18 September, 2005. President of Pakistan Gen Musharraf call on the Prime Minister of India Mr. Manmohan Singh and continued the dialogue over the bi-lateral issues more than four and half hours in USA, but the negotiation failed to produce any meaningful progress on any of the major political issues separating the two countries. The two leaders were left to simply reiterated their expectations, with out any

³⁶ ibid P. 36

³⁷ Ahmad Khurshid Prof: (March 2004) Tarjman-ul-Quran Presidential address to the nation Lahore P. 7

substantiate these hopes. Surprisingly, no progress was registered even on Siachen, though Manmohan Singh had earlier promised to make it a mountain of peace".³⁸

The massive earth quake that devastated most of Northern areas of Pakistan and Azad Kashmir, as well as smaller areas in Indian occupied Kashmir, has caused unprecedented death and destruction all around, on this occasion along with international community the Indian government also offered for co-operation in relief work. This offer was accepted by the government of Pakistan, thus the Indian relief supply was timely and value able and was accordingly appreciated by the government and the people of Pakistan. But this good gesture was immediately followed by rather crude attempts by New Delhi to gain political mileage out of this tragic situation, when it offered to send its military helicopter to join in the relief work. That India should have mad this offer, knowingly well the state of our relations and the presence of a large number of military bases in Azad Kashmir was simply a poorly thought. On the other hand Pakistan has done well by making a series of unilateral offers, including the offer to open the LOC (Line of Control) to allow people from across the line to come and join relief efforts in the quick hit areas. It has also offered mobile telephone companies to open linkage with their brethren across the Lac. These gestures should go a long way in bringing joy and happiness to many Kashmiri's. "For Pakistan new suggest that the LOC should become irrelevant could be fraught with risks more serious than the proposal to convert LOC into an international frontier it is an initiative that need s to be very care fully examined by competent legal and diplomatic experts, for it could have long term consequence for our historic stand on Kashmir".³⁹

The Kashmir that is the bone of contention between the two countries is a core issue and other disputes could not be solved unless this problem can't be settled. For this purpose the President Musharraf presented three alternate solutions to the Kashmir issue during an extempore speech in October 2004 the first, being complete impendence of Kashmir. "But the pill was two bitter for the colonialist minded civil and military establishments of Pakistan to swallow, and the General couldn't afford to annoy them, so he gave in, and has kept silent about the matter ever since".⁴⁰

India and Pakistan stand committed to the Kashmiri's getting their inherent right, including the right to opt for independence. The popular wordlist should be accepted by India, Pakistan, all Kashmiri's and the international community as the final settlement of issue, and then implemented, therefore it is necessary that referendum should be held under the United Nation supervision in which Kashmiri's would be determine weather Kashmir should perpetuate its independence, became a part of India or Pakistan. If the Kashmir issue remain unresolved it can

³⁸ Fatimi Tariq Earth Quake and LOC: **The Dawn** Vol. LIX 297 dated October 29, 2005 P. 6

³⁹ ibid

⁴⁰ Khan Amman Ullah the Honorable solution for Kashmir and Kashmiri's, **The News** Vol. 15 No. 215 Dated September 14, 2005 P. 6

irreparably loss the national interest of both countries, because the Kashmir dispute not only dominates Indo-Pak relations, but has also become central for peace and stability in South Asian region. The Kashmir dispute basically involves three parties, namely, India, Pakistan, and the Kashmiri's. Pakistan and India are the two main parties according to the UN resolutions. The third party is the Kashmiri's, whose right of self-determination has been recognized in the UN resolutions. "Therefore for the solving Kashmir dispute in any durable manner, a viable solution would have to have the full support of the Kashmiri people. Moreover, the Indian official statements to describe the mass Kashmiri resistance movement, as terrorist activity being wage by infiltrators form Pakistan in nay attempt to nullify the indigenou nature of freedom struggle in Occupied Kashmir. The facts of the matter is that despite the government of India's repressive measures and the excesses being committed by more than 700,000 Indian armed forces personal, the freedom movement has not been suppressed. Pakistan and India on there own can't decide the future of Kashmiri's who are to exercise the right of self determination. Therefore, Indian attempts to administratively divide the state will not subdue the freedom struggle in the occupied state nor will any many polluted elections, by India as the expression of the will of people of Kashmir".⁴¹

In the same way the principle is important that the people of Jammu and Kashmir alone have the right to decide their future political status and linkages, however long and torturous may be the period of denial of this opportunity. Two things have to be acknowledged in all fairness, one, there is no military or militant solution to the problem second, it is the people who are the final orbiter and their verdict must be allowed to pronounce and accepted by all, irrespective of India's and Pakistan's concerns and interests. "It is instructive to reflect on the way the political leadership of Canada has tried to handle the cubic issue, or the British and Irish leaderships opted for the Good Friday process on Northern Ireland. The resolution of the East Timor Imbroglio also provides some guidance towards working out a mechanism for the solution of the Kashmir problems. If Saarland opted to be part of Germany, France did not disintegrate. If the people of East Timor decided to have their own independent state, Indonesia did not disintegrate because of that. India has stronger and more integrated than Indonesia with its thousands of Islands and regional diversities. If the Kashmiri's opt for India we must accept their wishes what ever be its consequences".⁴²

Interestingly, the thinker of India and intelligentsia is of the opinion that the Kashmir problem should be solved politically and there is no other way out. As the same "the Indian army Chief General S. Padmanabhan had been of the opinion that the Kashmir problem should bee solved politically thereby ruling out a military option. This was also the opinion of is predecessor General VP Malik who had publicly said a few months before his retirement that the Kashmir

⁴¹ MG Chitkara (Spring 2003) "Strategic Studies" The Kashmir Dispute India's Polarised public Opinion Vol. 2-3 Islamabad PP. 202-204.

⁴² Ahmad Khurshid Prof: Kashmir Imbroglio and a way out **The Dawn** dated November 27, 2004 P. 13.

dispute should be solved politically.”⁴³

Where as concern the nuclear policy of Pakistan is a hot issue in the eye of United States now a day, “while the US leadership has extended assurance to Pakistan that the nuclear deal with India is not against it, its serious implications for the country’s security cannot be overlooked. Pakistan must persevere in its demand for being accorded a status at par with India. Its role in the war against terror has been phenomenal and has vastly served US security interests.”⁴⁴

Assuming, after 9/11, that PAKISTAN would be bracketed with Taliban. New Dehli tried to paint PAKISTAN into the terrorist corner. Exploiting world wide outrage against terrorism, Indian leaders accused PAKISTAN of sponsoring terrorism bracketed it with the Taliban and adopted the pose that India, too, was not a victim of terrorism. PAKISTAN pointed out that India was not a victim, but a perpetrator of state terrorism. The Indian propaganda line field because PAKISTAN adopted provident policy that made it a frontline ally in the fight against terrorism.

The agreed component of the dialogue included peace and corporation, terrorism, drug trafficking, and friendly exchange. Over the next four year Foreign Secretaries completed four rounds and started the fifth in July 2008. In addition, separate meeting between senior officers were held to discuss Confidence Building Measures (CBMs), bilateral disputes and normalization issues.

The sensational terrorist attacks in Mumbai on 26 November 2008, in which more than 160 persons were killed, triggered serious tension Between PAKISTAN and India. The Indian authorities trace the outrage to Laskhar-i-Tayyeba. Upon receipt of an official report from India, Pakistan federal authorities initiated a thorough investigation which revealed that crime was planned in Pakistan

The Prime Minister of Pakistan and India agreed in July 2009 that ‘action on terrorism should not be linked to the composite dialogue process.’ And further that the two countries would share real time credible and actionable information on any future terrorist threats.’ The Pakistani Prime Minister also mentioned that ‘Pakistan has some information on threats in Balochistan and other areas’¹

.There was not a post-2008 blossoming in Indo-Pakistan relations, despite the fact that some in Pakistan saw President Zardari as taking a soft tune towards India and the prevalent

⁴³ F.S Lodhi Safdar LT. Gen. (Rtd) (2002) “Defense Journal” Will Kashmir Explode? Vol. V Karachi P.37.

⁴⁴ Siddique Muhammad Tayyab, “ Implications of Indo-US alliance **The Dawn** Vol. LIX No. 337 dated: December 10, 2005.

¹ Abdul Star Pakistan foreign policy 1947-2009 (2010) Oxford University Press Karachi PP-312, 314, 317, 318

view that New Delhi would engage more with civilian than military leader's. Dialogue remained hostage to terrorist activity.

The much more serious terrorist outrage in Mumbai on 26 November 2008, in which Let was implicated, dealt an even more grievous blow to the faltering composite dialogue process.

The issue of terrorism dominated relations between the countries before talks resumed at Foreign Secretary level in June 2010. These were conducted in an atmosphere of low expectations. Indeed it was clear that US pressures arising from the shifting strategic tide in Afghanistan, rather than any change of outlook in New Delhi, were the main factors in their resumption. The issue of terrorism and the future of Afghanistan as much as the long-running Kashmir dispute will determine Indo-Pakistan relations in the period up to 2014.²

Kashmir has remained a flash point between India Pakistan, despite India's repeated endeavors to make it an ordinary bilateral dispute between the two states. Kashmir has continued to be a matter of concern for the great powers.³ By khalid mahmood faisal PhD scholar(Pol,Science) Islamia university Bahawalpur. Muhammad Iqbal PhD scholar BZU Multan

² Ian Talbot (2012), Pakistan a new history Oxford University Press Karachi. P-220

³ Hafez Malik (2008) US relation with Afghanistan-Pakistan Oxford Press University P-10