

PAKISTAN -INDIA PEACE PROCESS: A CRITICAL APPRECIATION

Abstract

The Pakistan-India relationship since 1947 has been the product of a sharpened sense of Hindu-Muslim animosity which led to the division of British India. It has always been unpredictable with a strong inclination towards a sudden upsurge of hostility and an ever waiting-in-the-wings of blame-game such as any incidence of violence, protest, bomb attacks in any one country is immediately blamed on the other. The unresolved J & K issue has been one of the major ones which has further poisoned the relations, in spite of creating professions of goodwill and making a new beginning towards better relations between the two countries.

Due to the continuation of this venomous atmosphere, even during relative periods of peace the military preparedness continues abated on both sides both in the conventional and nuclear weaponry. From partition to the present both states have been involved in four major wars besides many military confrontations as well. The fluctuations in relations have persisted through changes in leaders and governments of both countries.

The following table is a relatively simple illustration of the major ups and downs between the two countries since 1947:

Table. 1 Chronology of relations between India and Pakistan

Relationship	Period
First Kashmir War	Oct. 1947-Dec. 1948
Peace talks	1962-1963
Second Kashmir War	Aug.-Sept. 1965
Tashkent Peace Declaration	Jan. 1966
Indo-Pakistan War	Dec. 1971
Simla agreement	July 1972
Siachen Glacier Issue	
Lahore Peace accord	April 1984 Feb. 1999
Kargil War	May-July 1999
Agra peace summit	July 2001
Military standoff due to attack on Indian Parliament	Dec. 2001-Jan 2002 May-June 2002
Rebirth of the Peace Process	April 2003
Mumbai Attacks	Nov. 2008
Resurrection of the peace process	June 2009-present

Table: Ashutosh Misra, India-Pakistan: Coming to Terms

The story of 1947 Indo-Pak relations started with the partition plan announced on June 3, 1947. Pakistan was established through exercise of self-determination by Muslims of the Muslim-majority provinces either by referendum or by votes of the elected representatives of people. The struggle for this exercise was led by the All-India Muslim League. The Congress, voice of the Hindu

majority of British India did accept the June 3 plan but the top leadership of party All-India congress committee endorsed the decision that the unity of India must be maintained.⁴ Division of subcontinent, pre-independence political rivalry, variety of creeds and customs were at a side, deep bitterness was emerged by communal rioting. Pakistan's initial difficulties were music for Indian ears⁵ and they wanted to punish Pakistan for the sin of partition. India's aim was to push Pakistan steadily towards a state of pandemonium. Although Congress was not happy with the Indian partition but accepted it with deep feelings of resentment and with a future plan of dealing with Pakistan that had all the elements of a nefarious design.⁶

Main issue between India and Pakistan has its roots in the division of areas between these two states and from the very beginning Pakistan had to face serious hazards which were generated by the Radcliff Award. Economic strangulation⁷ was major problem as there was no industry in Pakistan and it produced large share of agriculture and raw material which was sent to Calcutta for processing. For communications also Pakistan was paralyzed by India as coal for its railways was imported from India. To further strangle Pakistan's economy cash balance of 550 million was seized by India. Pakistan was also denied full share of its military assets.

Accession of princely states was another issue. At the time of partition there were mainly three states which decided against joining either country. Of these three the fate of two was decided forcibly by India while the third one is still undecided and has been a source of continuous strife. Bilateral efforts were made for reconciliation when an agreement for the demarcation of boundary between East Bengal and Assam was signed; following this a Minorities Agreement was also signed. But when Pakistan joined US-led anti-Soviet defense pacts Indian reaction was bitter as Nehru said,

“But I have felt strongly that this step is a wrong step and tensions and pears to the world. It adds to the feeling of insecurity in Asia. It is therefore a wrong step from the point of view of peace and removal of tensions”⁸

It took half a century for both India and Pakistan to come over that understanding that they are neighbors for life and it is a fact that cannot be canceled that neighbors have issues which cannot be simply washed away or be forcefully settled and that all problems would be settled through bilateral talks in cycle with dumping the linkage politics.⁹ Their history is simply sixty five years old and during these sixty five years their relations remained unstable and It took almost forty-nine years and nine months to establish the composite dialogue process (CDP) which was achieved in May 1997 in Male, capital of Maldives, under the leadership of Indian Prime Minister Inder Kumar Gujral and his Pakistani counterpart Mr. Nawaz Sharif.¹⁰ This initiative was grand but neither its beginning nor its end brought peace as Kargil War was started. In 2003 step by step approach was adopted by both countries and after several rounds of talks dialogues were turned down again because of 26/11.

The Mumbai attacks: A brief history

Bilateral relations of India and Pakistan changed from sweet to sour when on 26 November 2008 a band of ten well armed and trained attackers about whom it was allegedly said that they had set out by boat from Karachi in Pakistan launched an onslaught to India's economic hub Mumbai by crippling the city for three days. A number of places were attacked including the highly populated railway station Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus by a small number of young men who were loaded with heavy arms.¹¹ Eight of the attacks occurred in south Mumbai on Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus, two elite hotels one was Oberoi trident and the other was the Taj Mahal palace and tower and last one was on the orthodox Jewish owned Nariman house.¹² After a 59-hour siege ended with the shooting dead of the last terrorists holed up in Nariman House which was a Jewish centre, killing 166 people including 22 foreigners.¹³

Deadlock in peace efforts

These stunning attacks in Mumbai posed serious threat to the peace process which was initiated by former president of Pakistan Pervez Musharraf and the former Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpae on 6 January, 2004 in Islamabad. Under this course, two countries held four rounds of Composite Dialogue Process on eight issues and talks were set to resume on 21 July, 2008. Interestingly, Minister of external affairs for India and Foreign Minister of Pakistan met in New Dehli on 26 November some hours before the attacks started in Mumbai **and both** Ministers in their meeting made a pledge that the two countries jointly fight against terrorism in the region¹⁴ but India put all blame on Pakistan and their relations which were on a roller coaster now reached at very low after Mumbai attacks and at that time, tensions were to such extent that both countries were at brink of war. Subsequent investigations revealed that all attackers were from Pakistan, and they were linked to Lashkar-e-Taiba / Jamaatul-Dawa (LeT / JUD).

It was also concluded by India that it was patronized by ISI, Pakistan's intelligence agency and was linked to Al-Qaida.¹⁵ All these allegations destroyed the spirit of the peace process. This was undiplomatic behavior on part of India to trash Pakistan politically without an initial investigation. It was really unfortunate that Manmohan Singh pointed his finger at Pakistan without waiting for the findings of the investigation panel which was set up by him to probe the Mumbai incident.

In this blame game India directly attacked Pakistan as external affairs Minister Mr. Pranab Mukherjee stated in an interview with CNN-IBN'S Devil's Advocate programme, alleged that the terrorists,

“Not come from a different planet, they live and function from and within the territory of a particular country.”¹⁶

While Pakistan's reaction was why they always blame us however Pakistani Premier Mr. Yousaf Raza Gillani condemned the attack while offer of a joint investigation was made by the Pakistani Foreign Minister. A ban was also imposed over Jamat-ul-daawa in accordance with United Nations resolution¹⁷ but India was not satisfied and was demanding of Pakistan to do more. Despite of

intense security threats from India Pakistan remained in denial mode as Pakistan's foreign Minister Mr. Shah Mehmood Qureshi said'

"Our hands are clean and Pakistan must hope for the best and plan for the worst."¹⁸

To satisfy India, it was decided to send ISI Director General Shuja Pasha to India but this decision was reversed and statement was made that Director General was too senior in rank to send for investigation and it was miscommunication; it was decided that a Director of the Inter- Services Intelligence would visit India.¹⁹ Pakistan however carried out raids against LeT in the POK area which was labeled by India as "empty gestures".²⁰ India further alleged that top leaders, such as Hafiz Saeed of LeT and Masood Azhar of JeM were still at large. As Masood Azhar was specially mentioned by India because he was previously in Indian custody and India had to release him on the demand of hijackers of an Indian plane in Kandahar.²¹ On January 5, 2009, a dossier of sixty-nine pages prepared by Indian security and intelligence agencies was handed over to Pakistan but Pakistan denied her involvement which further escalated the situation between India and Pakistan. It was also contended that attacks were possibly the act of Harkat-ul-jihad-e-Islami (HUJI) of Bangladesh and the planning was done outside in Dubai or even in Austria.²² The claims of Pakistan were rendered weak because of the arrest of one Mumbai attacker, Ajmal Amir Kasab, whose arrest was itself a unique achievement.²³

In initial interrogation it was declared that he was native of Pakistani village named Faridkot. India was so sure that the attackers came from Karachi to Mumbai to spread death and destruction. They were as competent as Al Qaeda, as resourceful as Al Qaeda as innovative and well motivated as Al Qaeda.²⁴ Following intense Indian and international pressure, Pakistani Interior Minister, Rehman Malik, admitted that planning for the attack was done in Pakistan. As U.S. think tank also reported that Mumbai attacks were carried out by LeT but it was also mentioned that it was not clear if Pakistani official agencies were involved or not.²⁵ So in response, Pakistani authorities arrested the alleged 'mastermind', Zaki-ur-Rehman. Five others were also arrested named, Hammad Amin Sadiq, Zarar Shah, Mohammad Ashfaq, Javaid Iqbal and Abu-al-Qama. Both countries continued to exchange further information and Ajmal Kasab who was the only living attacker, after sometime he was declared as a Pakistani citizen.²⁶ No doubt Indian social life was suffered by this but Indian security institutes were also jolted by these attacks because it showed many falls in their security. There was a nationwide criticism over Indian Intelligence Agencies for their security lapses which made it possible for a group of attackers to launch a coordinated expedition.

The official Indian dossier gives brief account of the terrorists' journey from Pakistan by sea that how they hijacked fishing vessel and murdered its crew. There was also a list of 'Made in Pakistan' things like milk powder, Touch me... shaving cream and made in Pakistan pickle²⁷ all these were collected from the boat which was sailed by these terrorists. It was quite strange that foreigners were sailing in their sea and successfully reached on their port, and no one took notice. It was also reported that a photograph of one terrorist was also left on boat. Such

evidence can easily lead some to believe that if there was any Pakistani involvement or involvement of Pakistan's official agencies why would they leave such evidence? It was also said that Indian intelligence agencies had reported to Indian Navy about some suspicious activities but Indian navy denied this that it received no reports from intelligence agencies. If intelligence agencies were feeling suspicions for some movements then why they did not block it?

Radicalism in India

The other factor was the way in which Mumbai attacks carried out are not in accordance in the pattern of terrorism seen after 9/11. Normally, extremist Islamic groups fixed bombs, launched quick violence or sent suicide bombers. Attacks like this continued for few hours and there were also taking hostage but invariably the terrorist would take the hostages to their camps. While in Mumbai attacks, attackers struck in a highly coordinated manner and were established firmly in the hotels for almost three days, using small arms to engage the security forces, which indicate a lot of planning and provision of weapons in large quantities from outside Mumbai.²⁸ India is also facing challenge of coping with local radical groups. These groups are product of the alienation of large but highly marginalised segments of Indian society. Some of them have reported to brutal and radical philosophies to challenge the unjust and exploitative Indian state. Modern communication technology and convenient travel across the globe has made it very easy for such groups to interact with each other, and to get inspired by each other's ideologies. However real identity of such group is local and regional and they function autonomously of each other. India should also examine critically the evidence as radicalism is spreading in India.

Firstly, many dissident and separatist groups are there which use aggression to challenge and to assert India's primacy in their respective areas of operation. These violent groups are in north-eastern states especially Assam and had a long custom of spreading anarchy. There are many other radical groups also present like the Maoists who built their influence by speaking about native injustice in east, central and southern India. These groups can create local threats. Secondly, Hindu extremism is also rooted deeply in parts of India and these groups tend to use violence for the revival of Hinduism. These groups have targeted religious minorities especially Christians and Muslims. This Hindu militancy has affected the minds of a significant number of middle and upper classes, which are using violence especially against Muslims.²⁹ Deadly anti-Muslim riots in 2002 in the western state of Gujarat are an example of this kind of mind-set.

Even though Mumbai attacks were most violent and spectacular in India, there has been a burst in religious violence by both Indian Muslims and Hindu extremist groups.³⁰ Muslim militancy has also developed in India among Muslims because the Muslim youth feel unfriendly and marginalized in the Indian political system. India's official data shows how Indian Muslims find themselves as secondary in Indian politics and economy. A large number of such youths are attracted to radical Islam to challenge the system as they take it as injustice with them so some of them use the discourses and strategies of Al-Qaeda or the Lashkar-e-Toiba which strongly advocate armed resistance against anti Islam

forces. Though involvement of LeT was seen sure from Indian side and the Mumbai saga was also concluded by the death sentence of Ajmal Kasab in May 2010, India must keep check in her home grown jihadi/extremist groups to avoid such incidents.

These attacks put question mark on Indo-Pakistan relations and from these events like attack on Indian parliament and now Mumbai saga one can easily distinguish the forces which shape the bilateral relationship. These attacks have also shown several flaws in governance of both countries. No doubt India is vulnerable to armed attacks for several years and is putting its energies to tackle threat of domestic terrorism but Indian government is biased in its policies and this is the main reason that violence is spreading in its territory. On the other hand Pakistan is suffering more serious problem of governance and also facing a new wave of terrorism.³¹ Our army also has a history of taking risky tactics like backing up mujahideen to exert pressure on India as former president and CEO Pervaiz Musharraf stated in his interview that mujaheedins' activities and Kargil adventure have changed Indian attitude and they were ready to tackle issues by negotiation.³²

Nature of civil-military relation in Pakistan is critical to Pakistan's relation with its estranged neighbor and stable democratic government is necessary for the peaceful solution of Kashmir, a land with its unending history of political violence which has created a paradigm of pathological politics.³³ The Mumbai attacks triggered the fear about nuclear war but this time there was no nuclear component to the crisis. In reality nuclear threat at any serious level never occurred to South Asia and it always remains firstly at level of signaling via verbal statements and missile tests³⁴ and during the Mumbai crisis the nuclear threat was just verbal, while in 2001-2002 crisis nuclear threat was more serious because both sides had mobilized their armies for war. The awareness of risk brought positive change and start of Composite Dialogue Process helped to stabilise the condition.

These attacks no doubt also effect the Indian Muslim community and although Muslim clergy denounced these attacks but they had to bear the bitter response of big majority of non-Muslim Indians. Dar-ul-Uloom Deoband declared India as Dar-ul-Aman.³⁵ In the meantime these attacks also affected the state elections at about the same time as attacks occurred and few months later on national elections. These attacks also hit the business sentiments of India because its major fear was that confidence of investors would down they would not invest anymore. The initial worries were also that it will hit Indian tourist department as several foreigners were killed and Indian government had failed to protect them. However actual negative effects were on the peace process which was initiated by previous governments.

The instability of bilateral relationship shows that in both states there are still some non-state actors who are not ready for a peaceful South Asia. Whenever both states are close to a peaceful solution of different issues some state actors in both countries act to reverse the situation by tangling both governments on domestic and international front as Indian Prime Minister Mr. Singh once said that,

“I and General Musharraf had reached nearly an agreement a non-territorial solution of all problems but then General Musharraf got into difficulties with the chief justice and other fronts and therefore the whole process came to a halt.”³⁶

The suspension of peace process after Mumbai attacks shows that there is an unstable equilibrium in South Asia but there is need to critically examine the black sheep present in both states which do not want peace on permanent basis. But it can be said that Mumbai attacks were a failing charade because its purpose was not completely fulfilled. India defamed Pakistan and even whole world was criticizing it but in return Indian intervention in Baluchistan was highlighted. The other thing, because of recent findings now cat is out of bag that there are some fanatics who are against peace and stability but one can judge that most strict elements are in India because whenever there was start of dialogue process such incidents in India suspended it as in 2001 attack on Indian parliament and in 2008 Mumbai episode and this is still in doubt that whether Pakistan was involved in it or it was an inside job as on 14 July 2013 former Indian home ministry officer and investigator Satish Verma disclosed that attack on Indian parliament and Mumbai attacks were inside job. It is disturbing that these official talks have always been vulnerable to outside forces like attacks of terrorists in India and Pakistan and Mumbai attacks were no doubt clearly designed to disrupt the peace process. Incident of Samjhota express attacked by extremist Hindus was the same issue. So it seems that extremists on both sides are bent on derailing the peace between the two countries but they should become more realistic in their approach and should sort out these extremist groups that oppose the peace, because due to these extremists peace in the south Asian has become a mirage. India and Pakistan have mistaken into open conflict in Kashmir. An agreeable conclusion of the issue to the full satisfaction of the people of Kashmir can become a win-win situation between these two powers. Both must resolve regional problems for their own good and for the interest of global peace.

References

-
- ¹Anam Iftikhar, *Lecturer, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore.*
- ²Muhammad Ibrar Ahmed, *Lecturer, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore.*
- ³Mrs Rubina Shoeb, *Lecturer, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore.*
- ⁴AbdusSattar, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1947-2005): A Concise History* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2007), 6.
- ⁵K. M. Arif, *Estranged Neighbors India-Pakistan 1947-2010*, (Lahore: Dost Publications, 2010), 21.
- ⁶Ibid.
- ⁷Ibid, 22.
- ⁸Jawahar Lal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy (selected speeches, September 1946-April 1961)*, (Delhi: The Publication Division, 1961), 471.
- ⁹Ashutosh Misra, *India-Pakistan: Coming to Terms*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹Veena Das, “Passionate Performance”, Austin Sarat, Carleen R. Basler, Thomas L. Dummen (ed.), *Performances of Violence*, (Amherst: university of Massachusetts Press, 2011), 121. Project Muse, accessed on 18/06/2013.
- ¹² Ibid.

-
- ¹³ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/india/9985109/Mumbai-terror-attacks-the-making-of-a-monster.html>. Accessed on 12/05/2014.
- ¹⁴ Rasheed Ahmad Khan, "Mumbai and the Peace Process" *The Nation* (Islamabad) 6December, 2008.
- ¹⁵ Arvind Gupta, S. Kalyanaraman and Ashoke K. Behuria, "India-Pakistan Relations after the Mumbai Terror Attacks: what should India do?", *Strategic Analysis*, vol.33 no.3(2009):320. Taylor and Francis accessed on 14/06/2013.
- ¹⁶ <http://ibnlive.in.com/news/zardaris-words-must-be-followed-by-action/80560-3.html>.accessed on 15/06/2013.
- ¹⁷ *The Nation* (Lahore), 15/12/2008.
- ¹⁸ *The Hindu* (New Delhi), 30 November, 2008.
- ¹⁹ <http://ibnlive.in.com/videos/79374/india-pak-threatened-from-same-forces-zardari.html>.accessed on 15/06/2013.
- ²⁰ Ashutosh Misra, *India-Pakistan: Coming to Terms*, 46.
- ²¹ <http://ibnlive.in.com/news/zardaris-words-must-be-followed-by-action/80560-3.html>.accessed on 15/06/2013.
- ²² Ashutosh Misra, *India-Pakistan: Coming to Terms*, 46.
- ²³ Praful Bidari, "Wisdom of Restraint", *Frontline* (Chennai), 20 December, 2008. Selection from Regional Press, Vol. xxvii: no. 23, 88.
- ²⁴ B. Raman, *Mumbai 26/11: A Day of Infamy*, (New Delhi: Lancer Publisher, 2009), 22.
- ²⁵ US Report: Terrorists Had Help From Inside India, *Dawn*, 20 January, 2009. Ipri Fact File vol.xi, No.2 Islamabad, 2009, 70.
- ²⁶ Muhammad Waqas Sajjad, Mahwish Hafeez and Kiran Firdous, "The Search For Peace-Pakistan And India" *Strategic Studies*, vol. xxx, no.1 & 2(2010), 10.
- ²⁷ Tom Ireland, "Famous" *The Missouri Review*, vol.33, no.1 (2010): 24. Project Muse. accessed on 18/06/2013.
- ²⁸ Hassan Askari Rizvi, "Pointing Fingers", *Daily Times*(Islamabad), 30 November, 2008.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Rahul Roy-Chaudhury, India Versus Pakistan, *The Rusi Journal*, vol.154 no. 4 (2009):63. Taylor and Francis. Accessed on 14/06/2013.
- ³¹ RSIS Monograph No. 17: Rajesh Basrur, Timothy Hoyt, Riffat Hussain, Sujoyini Mandal, "*The 2008 Mumbai Attacks Strategic FallOut*", 35.
- ³² See Pervaiz Musharraf's interview for the program "Devil's Advocate" <http://www.hindu.com/2009/07/25/stories/2009072556070900.htm>. accessed on 21/5/2014.
- ³³ Ishtiaq Ahmed, "The Partition of India: A Paradigm for Politics in India and Pakistan", *Asian Ethnicity*, Vol. 3, no. 1(2002): 9. <http://www.sacw.net/partition/IshtiaqAhmed2002.html>. accessed on 20/5/2014.
- ³⁴ Rajesh Basrur, Timothy Hoyt, Riffat Hussain, Sujoyini Mandal, "*The 2008 Mumbai Attacks Strategic Fall Out*", 38.
- ³⁵ *Daily Times*, 3 March, 2009.
- ³⁶ Suhasini Haider, "Tie-Up With Left Possible, But Not at Cost of N-Deal: PM", *CNN-IBN*, 2 May 2009, accessed on 18/5/2014. At <http://ibnlive.in.com/videos/91645/special-tieup-with-left-possible-says-pm.html>.