



Pakistan
Young Leaders'
Conference 2010

Foreign Affairs



Director: Rizwana Abbasi
Assistant Director: Hasan Talal Maitla and
Syed Hussain Shaheed



The Foreign Affairs is an important element of states' policies in global hierarchy. States never succeed in isolation in the field of International Relations. To build alliances and cooperation, resolve conflicts and disputes states foreign policy tool stand as an essential factor.

Pakistan in present time is going through a difficult trauma (situation on the western border region linked to Afghanistan) and historic territorial conflict with India on the Issue of Kashmir in its eastern border. These two issues have becomes so complex which require a thorough discussion and debate that how Pakistan should move in its foreign policy making process to resolve these two complex issues. Therefore, the purpose of this committee is to put across thoughts and vision from young scholars and ambassadors as to how our nation can come out of these two traumatic problems.

Rizwana Abbasi, Hasan Talal Maitla and Syed Hussain Shaheed

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Topic A: The Af-Pak Policy	2
Topic B: The Kashmir Issue.....	3

Introduction

The Foreign Affairs is an important element of states' policies in global hierarchy. States never succeed in isolation in the field of International Relations. To build alliances and cooperation, resolve conflicts and disputes states foreign policy tool stand as an essential factor.

Pakistan in present time is going through a difficult trauma (situation on the western border region linked to Afghanistan) and historic territorial conflict with India on the Issue of Kashmir in its eastern border. These two issues have becomes so complex which require a thorough discussion and debate that how Pakistan should move in its foreign policy making process to resolve these two complex issues. Therefore, the purpose of this committee is to put across thoughts and vision from young scholars and ambassadors as to how our nation can come out of these two traumatic problems.

Topic (A): Af-Pak Policy

The attack of 9/11 at the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon with subsequent US military intervention in Afghanistan has metamorphosised Pakistan's security calculus unexpectedly. The ongoing insurgencies in Afghanistan's territory have introduced profound repercussion to Pakistan's security milieu. However, Pakistan a major player in this war has extended unprecedented services in multidimensional spheres. Pakistan has suffered miserably. Today, Pakistan's tribal regions, bordering Afghanistan, which are an important base for the re-grouping of the Taliban, are major challenges for the coalition's forces as well as the government of Pakistan. A turbulent Afghanistan and the Taliban's ideological and cultural base camp in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) have become a threat to the political stability of Pakistan. FATA is governed through non-political system of Political Agents (PAs) under Frontier Crimes Regulation (FCR). With the influx of the Taliban and foreign fighters, the writ of the government has gradually withered away. As a result, this war has escalated from Al-Qaeda (combatants) to Taliban and Pashtun (non-combatants) since indiscriminate bombing targeted both categories without realizing the future implications. In the aftermath of the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, the US left this war-trodden country in the lurch, the network of militants intact and disengaged from Afghanistan. This network politically associated with various warlords in Afghanistan, brought devastation for almost a decade until the emergence of the Taliban, a so-called stabilizing force.

The Afghan society, wary of perpetual conflict, found a better alternative in the form of the Taliban, not by choice but by compulsion. The international community could have gradually transformed and empowered the Taliban Administration through constructive engagement and consequently brought security and stability and introduced political reform. In case of the Taliban, who reduced the crime rate to negligible proportions and managed to curtail poppy cultivation to the lowest level in the history of modern Afghanistan, no concerted efforts were made toward the social and political transformation of their leadership. It is this failure, which has germinated seeds of mistrust and confidence deficit, between Taliban and the West. This vacuum was intelligently exploited by Al Qaeda, and Osama Bin Laden, who by then, developed differences with certain US policy-makers, once his benefactors, and embarked on an anti-US tirade while capitalizing on this emotionally charged human capital. These are the people who are at loggerheads vis-à-vis Coalition forces engaged in Afghanistan and are being abetted by their sympathisers settled in FATA. The US' indiscriminate strikes inside Pakistan on the one hand further fuels the anti-Americanism among even the peace loving populace inside FATA, while on the other hand it discredits the Pakistan Government and Armed Forces for apparently aligning with the US policy of unilateral pre-emption.

However, the present democratic regime in Pakistan also seems to be failing to grapple with the under-developed tribal areas. The US intervention in the tribal regions of Pakistan and its military strikes, particularly the ground action in Angoor Ada, has provoked anti-Americanism deeply inside Pakistan. These incursions have proved rather counter-productive and earned discredit to the US world-wide. There is need to separate the local population from the Taliban who are intermingled with them. The US leadership is blaming Pakistan for doing not enough to eliminate Taliban in its tribal regions and their infiltration in Afghanistan. Contrary to this, it is not that easy for Pakistan to handle its unsettled long Western border where Pashtun and Taliban are deeply embedded for long time. 'No Pakistan government can expect to stay in power for long if its commitment to that effort in Afghanistan is at the price of destabilising Pakistan itself.' The US government needs to understand that its policy is a failure in Afghanistan and it will not succeed without the help of Pakistan. Francesc Vendrell, the departing EU envoy to Afghanistan, stated, "We are not destined to fail but we are far from succeeding". He added: "I do leave with a sense of regret that we have made so many mistakes ... we have got to do a hell of a lot to make things right". Apparently, the mistakes have left little chance to win the war by peaceful means. The committee addresses the policy options which both Pakistan and the US administration need to bring higher up their agenda if they aim to win this war.

Keeping in mind the importance of a peaceful and stable Afghanistan to Pakistan, what options should Pakistan pursue:

- With regard to the Afghan government, given that the Afghan Taliban claims to champion the alleged grievances of the Pashtuns who are 'persecuted' by the Afghan government?
- With regard to the Western Coalition forces and the US forces in particular which seek now to limit airstrikes that kill Afghan civilians and concentrate instead on moving troops closer to population centres so that Afghans will feel protected from the Taliban?
- With regard to the Afghan Taliban, which now seeks to project itself in a more moderate light by banning suicide bombings against civilians and the burning down of schools? In particular, is it realistic to separate out the 'hard line' Taliban from the 'moderate' Taliban whose interests may be accommodated by the Afghan government?

Topic (b): The Kashmir Issue

The region we speak of loosely as Kashmir is large and diverse. Geographically, it has many barriers, and it covers plains, glaciers, mountains and lakes, forested foothills and high ranges such as the Himalayas and the Karakoram, stretching up to K2, the second highest peak in the world. The geological pressures which gave rise to the mountains were mirrored historically by the political pressures on a region squeezed between the spheres of British, Russian and Chinese influence. Today it is still squeezed, between India, Pakistan and China. The population likewise is diverse and subject to contending pressures. Some are deeply disenchanting with their political fate, some fight for change, and many are caught in conflicts in which they are at best troubled by-standers and at worst victims. Interest in Kashmir typically revolves around two issues: the situation in Indian-administered Kashmir and the situation between India and Pakistan.

The difficulties and disagreements at the international level and within Indian-administered Kashmir relates to the desire among some of the population, in particular in the Vale of Kashmir itself, for independence, or a link with Pakistan, or greater autonomy within India. Each party would put forward additional factors, most obviously the alleged territorial ambitions of the other.

The situation in Indian-administered Kashmir traces the following contours: the failings of the local politicians and political system, which culminated in the outbreak of insurgency in 1989, India's response through security operations, and the associated complaints of human rights abuses, the flight of the Hindu population from the Vale of Kashmir, alleged destabilisation by Pakistan, a resumed political process, an influx of militants/freedom fighters (depending which side you are on), and war weariness among some portions of the population. The contours of the situation between India and Pakistan are forbidding: a fundamental disagreement over the status of the territory at the end of the colonial period, two wars and a third in which some fighting occurred in the area, a United Nations process which itself became a figure of grievance, numerous failed talks and agreements, contradiction over almost every aspect of the situation, nuclear weapons developed for the express purpose of defence against one another, and routine shelling across the ceasefire line agreed at the end of the last war.

However, the situation is not without hope. The two governments have engaged in a process of rapprochement. Small substantive progress has been made, and a timetable for further talks was agreed in which each side tried to satisfy its delicate requirements. But the recent Mumbai attack resulted in a virtual standstill of all talks and negotiations.

It is often pointed out that Kashmir has symbolic weight for each side. However, it is arguable that something harder than imagery is needed to bring this issue to the front of political and strategic thinking. Democratic India has made few concrete moves to assert control over the whole territory, despite its affection for rhetoric on the subject. Under civilian rule Pakistan has sometimes seemed willing to balance this issue with other aspects of the relationship.

In contrast, military rulers in Pakistan have used the idea of a hostile neighbour in India to justify their rule and various governments have used the Kashmir issue for populist ends. On one account the Pakistani state sees benefit in the imagery of completion and Muslim solidarity offered by Kashmir. The continuing failure to make good the "loss" of a contiguous Muslim majority area in Kashmir helps to create a sense of crisis demanding a military solution. An alternative view stresses the effects of the rule of General Zia in the 1980s. Broadly, these were aimed at advancing his security interests in Afghanistan, by providing a religious basis for opposition to the Soviet presence, and at grounding his rule in the conservative religious and tribal hierarchies to which he pandered. In later years these forces found their expression in support for the insurgency against Indian rule in Kashmir.

India claims that Pakistan has sponsored the insurgency, and in particular its transformation in recent years from a local movement based on political demands for greater autonomy or self-determination to one dominated by religious ideas of a categorical nature. Pakistan denies giving military or material support to the insurgency, but its military establishment has seen benefit in it, since it preoccupies India's security forces, saps its economy and affects its image abroad.

Much recent optimism was based on the strong performance of the Indian economy, and the belief that this will provide material incentives for peace outweighing the symbolism of conflict. Some commentators suggest that the two governments are willing in private to consider a solution based around formalisation of the existing *de facto* division. India might be prepared to withdraw its claim to the areas it has never ruled, while Pakistan might be content for the substantial non-Muslim populations in Jammu, in the Indian-administered part of Punch and in Ladakh to remain within India. However, the fate of the Vale of Kashmir, the vexed heart of the region and of the disagreements, may be harder to resolve.

Each side has its demands. India wants to see an end to militant infiltration from areas under Pakistani control, while Pakistan wants to see an act of self-determination for those living under Indian rule. It may be that there is a further, common requirement: a leader who can advertise change as progress rather than defeat.

The water crisis is also a bone of contention between the two countries. Kashmir is the point of origin for many rivers and [tributaries](#) of the [Indus River](#) basin. Pakistan has been concerned that in a dire need, India (under whose portion of Kashmir lies the origins and passage of the important rivers) would withhold the flow and thus devastates the agrarian economy of Pakistan. The Boundary Award of 1947 meant that the headwaters of Pakistani irrigation systems were in Indian Territory. The [Indus Waters Treaty](#) signed in 1960 resolved most of these disputes over the sharing of water, calling for mutual cooperation in this regard. However the recent building of dams in Indian Territory has created concern in Pakistan as it may disrupt the flow of water coming from India. Pakistan's Permanent Indus Waters Commissioner stated on 20 Jan. 2010 that water flows in the river Chenab had declined by 40 per cent to about 6,000 cusecs from a 10-year average of about 10,000 cusecs, mainly because of construction by India of over a dozen hydropower projects upstream, reduction in rainfall and diversion of river waters.

With a turnout of almost '50%' in the 2008 elections in Kashmir, India attempted to show the world that the Kashmiri people approve the existing status quo. These claims were complemented by a slowdown in civilian deaths in 2008. However the mammoth protest which took place in the same year on a land dispute overshadowed the rosy picture which India was depicting as over 40 demonstrators were killed and 300 injured by the Indian security forces. This event invited widespread condemnation including from the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

For the people of Kashmir, a resolution of the international differences surrounding them, the removal of militancy and an end to security force operations would allow a more relaxed life. In addition Kashmiris on either side of the Line of Control might hope to secure adequate hearing for their voices within a newly clarified situation. This might help them to move beyond the kind of concerns that gave rise to the insurgency in Indian-administered Kashmir.

Keeping in view the problems this issue creates for Pakistan, you should include the following questions in the resolution paper:

- How much are both India and Pakistan interested in resolving the dispute? You should consider the strategic interests both the countries have in the disputed territory.
- Should the attempt to resolve the dispute be through bilateral talks between India and Pakistan only or the International Community should be involved as well?
- How significant is the opinion of the people of Kashmir? Does Pakistan's policy respect the views of the people of Kashmir regarding their future?