

South Asian Studies

A Research Journal of South Asian Studies

Vol. 28, No. 1, January – June 2013, pp. 25-37

The Mumbai Terror ‘2008’ and its Impact on the Indo-Pak Relations

Umbreen Javaid

University of Punjab, Lahore

Marium Kamal

University of the Punjab, Lahore

ABSTRACT

Mumbai is an easily accessible Indian city through the Arabian Sea from Pakistan. The city is also considered as the hub of large number of executives and foreign tourists. The daybreak of 27th November 2008 observed a chaotic condition in south Mumbai due to the deadly serialized attacks which claimed many lives and hundreds of injuries. The night witnessed an assault on the top community and foreigners. The lethal attack hindered the peace process between India and Pakistan and damaged all efforts that were being made in order to achieve harmonized relations between both states. The Indian authorities raised voice against the terror intentions of Pakistan and symbolized her as the epicenter of terrorism. India blamed Lashkar-e-Tayba for targeting the Indian nationals. The violent approach created trust deficit between the two states which considered as the most serious ongoing problem that confronts Indo-Pak relations.

KEY WORDS: Mumbai attack, ‘26/11’, terror, India, Pakistan, relations

The Indo-Pak Relations Dents (1947 to 2008)

Since the repercussion of independence ‘1947’, the Indo-Pak relations have been passing through tense and bumpy rides. The new states initiated with intense migration and human bloodbath, boundaries and water disputes, religious minorities problems, and the most wounding of them all the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union are direct consequence of independence. Later, India emerged as a stable state rapidly as compare to Pakistan. India superseded Pakistan in terms of constitution, reconstruction and stabilization of economy, and political reliability. “India, as already explained, had been comparatively less scathed than Pakistan in the holocaust of partition. She also commanded greater resources and a far better organized political party, and would have Jawaharlal

Nehru's unbroken leadership for no less than seventeen years." (Burke, 1974, p. 117)

The year of 1948, witnessed the first undeclared war between India and Pakistan over the disputed valley of Kashmir. Later the issue was referred to United Nations. On December 1948 a cease fire was accepted by both states. The situation deteriorated again during the period of review in 1950-51, and both states were about to indulge in war again. Although in the year of 1950 Nehru-Liaquat Pact was also signed to safeguard the minorities of both states.

1953-54 observed an era of Pak-US relations that promised Pakistan with military assistance, President Eisenhower announced in Feb, 1954 that "the United States would extend military assistance to Pakistan". The era emerged with new consequences and fears from the neighboring states and regions. It was marked as the beginning of entirely new phase. Due the Pak-Western alliance the relations with the Arab World and Afghanistan were distorted and became worse, while Indo-Pak relation were paralyzed. Pakistan never feared the Communist Bloc but the undue American support laid its impact, and Pakistan suffered with ill-will of the Communist Powers. Later the Soviet Union supported India on the Kashmir issue and firmed her stance against Pakistan. "The price Pakistan had to pay for alliance with America was much higher than what their country received for it in return, and Indians find it useful for taunting Pakistanis that they let Kashmir slip through their fingers by foolishly alienating India at a crucial moment." (Burke, 1974, p.141)

Nehru felt a direct threat from the Pak-US military alliance, therefore he initiated with the 'Panchsheel', the ideal method to conduct the international relations between the sovereign states. It was an answer to Eisenhower 1954's statement that had been viewed in the form of Indo-China agreement. The years 1954-56 for India were very important; the Prime Minister took an extensive travel, visited twenty six countries, and hosted forty one major representatives of different states for collective peace process. However the Sino-Pak relations were not that indistinct as the Soviet-Pak relations. During 1956 the Chinese and Pakistani Prime Ministers have exchanged good friendly atmosphere and China's stance on Kashmir and Pukhtunistan's demand by Afghanistan was never against the Pakistani aspirations.

The year 1957 witnessed the American economic aid to India; the American strategy would never allow India to fall under the Communist Bloc. It had been observed that the American strategy towards India was more successful than the Pak-US approach. Later in 1958 the Sino-Indian relations began to deteriorate. 1959 was the era when cold war started between China and India, the phase led to border disputes and Sino-Indian war in 1962. "Directly or indirectly, it contributed to the widening of the split between the Soviet Union and China, to the cooling off relations between Pakistan and the United States, to the creation of common interests between Pakistan and China, and to the Indo-Pakistani wars of 1965 and 1971." (Burke, 1974, p. 159) Although, the year 1960 had its positive impact as

well through the joint agreement on the use of Indus River water among the rival states.

The Sino-Indian border conflict paved the way for the US military assistance and the economic aid to India. The Western Power's military assistance to India were provided to be used against China not Pakistan. Therefore they pressurized Nehru to initiate the conflict resolution talks on Kashmir with Pakistan. The years 1962-63 passed with intense talks on Kashmir, however both groups couldn't reach to any acceptable solution. The Kashmir resolution consequences ended in further bitter results and another major dispute of Rann of Kutch appeared on April 1965 which led to the British involvement and later settlement. The issue of the unsettled area was referred to an international tribunal, "The tribunal consisted of Nasrullah Entizm of Iran (nominated by Pakistan) and Alex Beler of Yugoslavia (nominated by India). The tribunal was chaired by G. Lagergren of Sweden. The verdict (2:1) was given on 16th February 1968 and the Kutch Agreement was signed on 4th July 1969. Pakistan got 350 square miles while India got 90% of the territory." (Khan, 1999, p. 17) The events created the base ground for the September, 1965 Indo-Pak war. India blamed Pakistan to initiate by crossing the cease-fire line from Azad Kashmir. Pakistan claimed that India is responsible by closing the Kashmir talks. "Sheikh Abdullah also held India responsible for the war, saying that because India shut the doors for negotiations, Pakistan being a party, had sent the infiltrators." (Burke & Ziring, 1990, p. 330) Both states claimed victory over each other, but according to some other source Pakistan's loss was more than India. The war followed by the Tashkent Declaration on 10th January 1966, it was a peace agreement between India and Pakistan. The declaration was due to an intervention by the Great Powers which pushed the two nations to a cease fire, because of the fears that the conflict could escalate and draw in other powers as well.

1971 was the year when East Pakistan emerged as a sovereign state due to the arrogant and unfair treatment by the people of West Pakistan. Bangladesh came into existence through the Indian support, resulting by an Indo-Pak War. The war effectively came to an end after the Eastern Command of the Pakistani Armed Forces signed the Instrument of Surrender, on 16 December 1971. The fall of East Pakistan brought emotional strain throughout the countrymen. It also paved the way for 1972 Simla Accord between Bhutto and Indira. The agreement laid down the principles to govern their future relations. It bound the two states to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations. The accord also converted the 1949 UN "Cease-fire Line" into a legal international Line of Control between Pakistan and India which however did not affect the status of the disputed territory.

1974 is the year of nuclear upheaval in South Asia, India emerged as the first nuclear regional power in the Sub-continent. The Indian nuclear strength undermined the Pakistani Defense and forced them for equal response, as Bhutto said that "**We shall fight a thousand years to liberate Kashmir and we shall eat**

grass, but we will make an atomic bomb". From 1978 to 1984 both states indulged in another military conflict over the disputed Siachen Glacier region in Kashmir. Siachen is the highest area in northern Pakistan, it is strategically important to Pakistan and China. The Indian forces occupied the Siachen Glacier which was unoccupied and not demarcated area through the Operation 'Meghdoot', resulting in gaining more than 1,000 square miles of territory. "Specialized troops of the two armies have been facing each other since 1984 on the highest battlefield the world ever known." (Khan, 1999, p.30) Both states are suffering to safeguard and secure the highest boarder from the contrary apprehensions.

In 1990 the Indo-Pak relations deteriorated due to the Kashmiri uprisings, and Pakistan was blamed for the separatists' movement. The matter was a compound crisis of domestic and political issues; it had become more alarming due to the nuclear capability. With the mutual realization and US intervention the issue was settled. In 1992 the Hindu-Muslims riots in India jammed the bilateral relations among both states on the demolition of Babri Mosque. Although, these riots can be traced out since 1853 by the Hindu extremists, they claimed that the land known to be Ram's birth place and the mosque was built on the rubble of a Hindu temple by Babar in 1527. The demolition occurred after a religious ceremony turned violent and resulted in several months of inter-communal rioting between Hindu and Indian Muslim communities, causing the death of at least 2,000 people most of whom were Muslims. The year 1993 followed with multiple Bombay blasts that led to a phase of suspect and mistrust among both states. The Indian authorities blamed Pakistan for the occurrences and she denied for any role in the explosions.

1998 is marked as the year of 'Nuclearization of Pakistan', as an immediate response to the Indian nuclear tests on 11th and 12th May 1998, Pakistan conducted five nuclear underground explosions of varying intensity at Chaghi in Baluchistan. India never paid heed to Pakistan's demand for talks on the 'non-proliferation zone in South Asia'. Talks, Later in 1999 the Lahore Declaration occurred between the Indian Prime Minister A.B Vajpayee and the Pakistani Prime Minister Mohammad Nawaz Sharif. It was a bilateral agreement to avoid the nuclear race as well as both non-conventional and conventional conflicts. The event boosted the confidence level of both countries and contributed in friendly atmosphere. The treaty was ratified by the parliaments of both states and came into force in the same year.

Nonetheless things never went as it seem in 1999. We had another turmoil in the Indo-Pak relations 'The Kargil', It was an armed conflict between both states that took place between May and July 1999 in the Kargil district of Kashmir and along the Line of Control. "Pakistan-sponsored Jihadis and regular units occupy territory on the Indian side of the LOC; border crisis, with strategic undertones; gross Pakistan miscalculation of Indian response." (Khalid, 2012, 13) The Kargil conflict failure was due Musharraf's miscalculation, "Pakistan acted upon its long-held belief that the Indian political leaders were weak and would vacillate and

even fail to retaliate against a daring military strike by the Pakistanis.” (Ray, 2011, p. 181) The conflict brought Pakistan under the international pressure and Pakistan was forced to withdraw from the occupied territory. The conflict drew Indo-Pak relation down the drain and earned bad image for Pakistan’s armed forces.

In 2001 the Indian Parliament attack befallen an ‘invaded terrorist act’, India claimed that the Indian Parliament attack was structured by the Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed. It was a terrorist’s act against the Parliament of India in New Delhi. The assault led to killing of many Indians and it paralyzed the Indo-Pak relations. “Indian has buildup armed forces after terrorist attacks; direct pressure on Pakistan, indirect pressure on United States to force Pakistan to stop/reduce support for jihadi and terrorists.” (Khalid, 2012, 13) The Indian authorities become more cautious in her relation with Pakistan due to the element of terrorism, it claimed that Pakistan was the nursery of global terrorism. Many other terror incidents were associated to Pakistan as the Mumbai blasts in 2006, the attack on the Indian Embassy in Kabul, and the Mumbai attacks in 2008. Many more terror incidents were proven the Indian fascists as the main culprits as the Samjhauta Express blast 2007, Mecca Masjid 2007, the Ajmir Sharief 2007, and the Malegaon bomb blast in 2008.

The Mumbai Terror ‘26/11’

A series of attacks occurred on seven different places in south Mumbai which began around 10:30 pm on 26 November 2008, killing 173 people and left 293 injured. In the beginning the terrorists were with unknown identity, the carnage witnesses claimed that the attackers were quite young aging less than twenty five years. Initially it was announced that they were twenty five in number, but later it was discovered they were only ten terrorists. “Given the fact that the terrorists did not have any demand and obviously wanted to inflict maximum damage, the only possibility was that they killed many people as they could before they took safe positions inside.” (Teltumbde, 2009, p. 2)

“It has been termed India’s “9/11“. But contrary to popular belief, it was not the ‘deadliest’ attacks on the Indian soil. In Mumbai itself, the 2006 Train bombings killed 209 innocents. Since its formation, India has been a victim to numerous terrorist attacks. Since 2010, India has lost 1,120 innocent lives in 60 ‘Islamic’ terrorist attacks. The national institute of counter terrorism of United States of America has calculated that between January of 2004 and March of 2007, the death toll in India from all terrorist attacks has been 3,674, second only to Iraq in that same period.”(The Mumbai Bombings over the Past Years, Retrieved from

<http://www.ukessays.com/essays/history/the-mumbai-bombings-over-the-past-years-history-essay.php>

The '26/11' is the only attack that received hype on media and considered as 'the only attack on India'. It has been projected as the '9/11 of India' due to the targeted elites and foreigners by the Muslim militants. It was the first time when the elite establishments were targeted in the Taj and the Trident rather the common people; around 61 persons were killed in these two hotels and 37 foreigners, the attack on foreigners guaranteed international media coverage for the attackers. In the final report submitted to the court, the Mumbai police stated that, "The assault was meticulously planned and executed only after the completion of long and arduous training with thorough preparation and briefing. The primary intention of the terrorists was to create unprecedented raw fear and panic in the minds of the Indian citizenry and foreign visitors to Indian soil." (The Mumbai Bombings over the Past Years, Retrieved from <http://www.ukessays.com/essays/history/the-mumbai-bombings-over-the-past-years-history-essay.php>)

The preliminary investigations revealed that the assailants came by the Arabian Sea-route from Karachi "on the Pakistani cargo vessel Al Husaini. On 23 November 2008 they hijacked an Indian fishing trawler, the M V Kuber, within Indian waters. Then, they murdered four sailors leaving the captain alive, and proceeded to Mumbai. On nearing the Mumbai shore they killed the captain. On reaching the shore, heavily-armed terrorists divided into four teams, one with four men and three with two men each." (Jannepally, 2010, p. 11) Initially heavy gunfire was exchanged between the police and the terrorists. The Commandos of the National Security Guard (NSG), which is India's elite ant-terrorism force, was engaged in battle with the terrorists till Thursday night 27 November 2008. The city within hours crammed with fear and writhed with pain, the routes were deserted and the residents were prohibited from coming out.

Two terrorists attacked at the Mumbai's main railway station the 'Chatrapati Shivaji Terminus', they killed 58 innocent communal passengers and wounded 104 until they were confronted by the police. "Gunmen opened fire from AK-47 rifles at the city's busiest railway terminal, CST, killing nearly twenty people." (Kumar, 28-11-2008 *Dawn*, p. 1) Later the terrorists were intercepted with the Mumbai police, one terrorist was killed and the other, Amir Ajmal Kasab, was wounded and captured, "If it had not been for Tukaram Omble, that humble policeman who caught the terrorists Ajmal Kasab alive, taking a shower of bullets from his AK 56 into his body, we would have been absolutely clueless about even the identity of attackers as we still are about other pertinent". (Telumbde, 2009, p. 2). Later a trial court on 6 May 2010 sentenced Ajmal Kasab to death on 86 charges for which he was convicted. Kasab was executed by hanging at Yerwada Jail in Pune on 21 November 2012.

The other attackers occupied the Nariman House a Jewish commercial-residential and an education centre run by the Chabad Lubavitch. The Jewish rabbi and his family were been taken as hostage by the terrorists holed up in Synagogue.

Later the Jewish Rabi and his wife were killed including six other individuals, it was reported that some of the casualties observed with physical torture marks as well. "The other terrorists headed towards the Trident-Oberoi hotel where they continued the killing spree for nearly 42 hours before they were gunned down by the security forces. Before they died, they had killed 35 persons, including nine foreigners. The fourth, a four-man, team headed to the Taj Mahal Palace hotel. The terrorists briefly entered the Leopold Café, a spot popular with foreigners, spraying its customers with automatic weapons' fire, killing 10 people. The siege, at the Taj hotel, ended 60 hours later when the last of the four terrorists was killed by the NSG. Here they killed 36 guests including nine foreigners." (Jannepally, 2010, p. 14) The attackers were also seeking foreigner's passports from the hostages. Both hotels were under attack by AK-47 rifles, and the upper floors of both hotels were set on flames through the used hand-grenades.

The Indian officials and media totally associated the Mumbai violence to Pakistan, the media also indicated to the complete failure of the security system, neither the police, intelligence services, RAW nor CBI had any prior clue of the assault. It also highlighted the need to look inward rather than concentrating on Islamabad only.

"The attack by armed gunmen on 26 November last year could have been prevented by the Indian navy, the coast guard and the Mumbai Police with the existing resources at their command, failing which, had not security been lowered at the hotels, due to misappraisal by the state police, the gunmen could have met some resistance, and entry could have delayed. Even if all this had failed, the 58-hour long stand-off could have cut short, if the commandos had not arrived 12 hours later, due to unavailability of a plane at Delhi ferry the commandos, or if they did not have to wait, for more than an hour at the Mumbai airport, for a bus to take them to the scene of the crime." (Navlakha, 2009, p. 1)

The Pakistani establishment also had this viewpoint and questioned the Indian authorities to un-blame Pakistan on their own failures. Even the Navy Chief, Admiral Suresh Mehta on 3 December 2008, admitted that it was a "systemic failure." The fact is whether India or Pakistan both are suffering from the presence of communal-fascist groups. Many calamities against Muslims occurred in India due to the engagement of the Hindu fascists groups as the Malegaon bomb blast in 2008, the Samjhauta Express blast 2007, Mecca Masjid 2007, and the Ajmir Sharief 2007. "if Mumbai attack stands out because of the fact that the armed gunmen happened to be Pakistani, then where do we place the Samjhauta Express blast (February 2007) in which 64 out of 68 were Pakistani, including six minors, killed on Indian soil?" (Navlakha, 2009, p. 3) The official bias dominated the Mumbai aspect; it ignored the better reality and fueled the masses with the anti-

Pakistani sentiments. Although the Indian authorities have mentioned many times that the incumbent government is not involved in the Mumbai attacks, the non-state actors are the key culprits, but it also alleged the ISI. However it is the high time to realize the faced realities with a broader perspective, and to understand the core fascist's players that are portraying barriers in the peace process among both states.

The Indian and Pakistani Stance on '26/11'

Many local and private Indian TV channels have announced and suspected that the terrorists belonged to or affiliated with the Deccan Mujahedeen. Later one of the attackers spoke to one of the TV channels highlighting his affiliation to an Indian Islamists group asking to end the Indian Muslim's persecutions. One of the British newspaper revealed that the lone surviving terrorist 'Ajmal Amir Kasab' had its roots from a village in the Okara district, Punjab in Pakistan. However the Indian agencies linked the terror attack to Pakistan, according to an Indian Navy spokesman; they have mentioned that around twenty four terrorists had been landed in Mumbai through a merchant vessel 'the MV Alpha from Karachi'. The police added her stance that the suspects reached to the Gate of India through the rubber boats.

“Maharashtra Police investigators say they have evidence that operatives of the Pakistan-based Lashkar-e-Taiba carried out the fidayeen-squad attacks in Mumbai—a charge which, if proven, could have far-reaching consequences for India-Pakistan relations. Police sources said an injured terrorist captured during the fighting at the Taj Mahal hotel was tentatively identified as Ajmal Amir Kamal, a resident of Faridkot, near Multan, in Pakistan's Punjab province.”(Swami, 28.11.2008 *The Hindu*, p. 1)

The Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in his address to the nation on 27 November 2008, mentioned that the “The well-planned and well-orchestrated attacks, probably with external linkages, were intended to create a sense of terror by choosing high-profile targets,” He said that New Delhi would “take up strongly” the use of neighbours' territory to launch attacks on India.” (India sees 'external link' as troops battle militants, 2008, p. 1) India blamed the Lashkar-e-Tayba (LeT) for their involvement in the deadly attack on Mumbai and asked the Pakistani civilian government to crash down the terrorist activities that were emanating from Pakistan.

The Pakistan civilian government who acceded in 2008 under the presidential capacity of Asif Ali Zardari, in response to the Mumbai terrorist attack, strongly condemned the terror act and denied its involvement. The Prime Minister Syed Yousaf Gilani also expressed his sympathy and grief over the victimized nationals. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan Shah Mehmood Qureshi was in New Delhi before the attack. He shared his grief with his counterparts and expressed the

attack as a “horrendous tragedy”. Nonetheless, In December 2008 India demanded Pakistan’s serious action against the terrorist elements that carried the attack on Mumbai and asked for the extradition of three wanted persons by the government of India 1) Maulana Masood Azhar 2) Tiger Memon and 3) Dawood Ibrahim and also accused Jamaat-ul-Dawa (JuD) under serious obligations. Later Pakistan refused from the extradition of the above mentioned individuals. In January 2009 India came over with the Mumbai attacks evidence; it also continued with accusing and prompting Pakistan as the epicenter of global terrorism.

“The 11,280-page charge sheet in the Mumbai terror attack case was filed against the perpetrators of the attack on 25 February that indicated that a conspiracy was hatched in Pakistan and masterminded by the Lashkar-e- Tayba and also included comprehensive evidence, including a confession by one of the perpetrators, to set out an unassailable case. Significantly, the charge sheet did not make any reference to the ISI or suggest that a section of the Pakistan establishment was involved in any way in the attack.” (Zeb, 2009, p. 10)

Pakistan cooperated with India in tracking down the Mumbai culprits and supported its peace agenda to resolve the issue. In an interview the President Asif Ali Zardari said, “Let me assure you [that] if any evidence points to any individual or group in my part of the country, I shall take the strictest of action in the light of the evidence and in front of the world.” (Thapar, 2008 ‘Devil’s Advocate’, p.1) Pakistan firmed on its stance that the Mumbai attack was carried out by the non-state actors that had no links with the incumbent government and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). The Pakistan security forces on 9th December 2008 launched a raid on Lashkar-e-Tayba and banned the organization. It also arrested its senior leader Zakiur Rehman Lakhvi besides 12 other activists. The United Nation’s Al-Qaeda and Taliban Sanctions Committee under the UN Security Council Resolution 1267 on 10th December 2008 banned Jamat-ul-Dawa (JuD), Al-Rashid Trust, and Al-Akhtar Trust. The Pakistani authorities on December 12, 2008 launched a countrywide crackdown on the JuD responding to UNSC resolution. The Police made some immediate imprisonments and also implemented force shut down on their operative offices. Hafiz Saeed was put under house arrest.

However, on January 7, 2009, Pakistan's Information Minister Sherry Rehman officially accepted that Ajmal Amir Kasab belonged to Pakistan. Later on February 12, 2009, Pakistan's Interior Minister Rehman Malik confirmed that parts of the attack had been planned in Pakistan. In response to this acknowledgement that the Mumbai attacks were partly planned in Pakistan and it also had arrested six suspects, including the “main operator”.

The '26/11' Impact on Indo –Pak Relations

Since 2003 the Indo-Pak relations are on the voyage of reconciliation, the peace process dialogues were highlighted and prioritized due to some major requirements of India “some of reasons which are India’s failure to achieve any of its objectives after a human and financially costly year-long stand-off, the Indian business community’s strong desire to have access to the Pakistani market, Indian energy deficiency that stunted growth and the threat of adverse effects on foreign investment when tens of thousands of foreigners including 60,000 Americans left India along with US advice requesting its citizens to not visit India.”(Zeb, 2009, p.5) While, Pakistan’s stance was towards the ‘resolution of Kashmir through peaceful negotiations’, on the other hand the American stance was also tilted towards the reconciliation process between nuclear states India and Pakistan due to their heavy involvement in Afghanistan’s War on Terror. The US strategy by Richard Lugar was “war was averted (between India and Pakistan), barely, thanks to intense, discreet diplomacy by the United States.”

However, in 2004 Pakistan was highly optimistic about the Indo-Pak peace process, later, the Indian Prime Minister and the Pakistani president met in New York in a successful meeting under the agenda of peace. Afterwards on December 2004 the Foreign Secretaries of both states met with more positive implication on the agenda of peace among both states. The peace process were often shaky because of the suspected terror activities by Pakistan. Perhaps the Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh brought up the issue of ‘cross border terrorism’ in his address at UN. As response, President Musharraf reminded the Indians that UN resolutions on Kashmir still remained unimplemented during his address to the General Assembly. However, both states agreed to continue and try to carry forward the peace process despite all existing impurities. President Musharraf hoped for optimal logical conclusion to precede for peaceful decision according to the Kashmiri also aspirations.

India’s worries did not end about the cross border terrorism and asked for dismantling the terror structure completely to flourish the peace process between India and Pakistan. While Pakistan kept on pressing for the resolution of Kashmir as the core issue in the peace process. India asserted on the conflict management process without any resolution for Kashmir, Siachin and Sir Creek while Pakistan were emphasizing on the conflict resolution process rather management. Anyhow things turned around after the Kabal Blast July 2008 on the Indian Embassy that claimed 54 lives and wounded 141 persons. The Afghani President Hamid Karzai blamed Pakistan for the deadly attack indicating the connection of the blast with Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan. Unfortunately the international community supported the Indian stance and demoralized Pakistan for their growing terrorism, Pranab Mukherjee once described, “Pakistan remains a nursery of global terrorism, said visiting Indian Defence Minister Pranab Mukherjee in a talk at Harvard University in Boston on Monday. “Post 9/11, Pakistan has

reportedly helped the US to fight terrorism along its western border with Afghanistan. But it has done precious little to dismantle the infrastructure of terrorism on its eastern border with India.” (India accuses Pakistan of being ‘nursery of global terrorism, 2006).

The Mumbai mayhem on 26 November 2008 proved to be sunset of the ongoing indo-Pak peace dialogues. India postponed all the secretary levels talks on trade, Siachen and Sir Creek. It also canceled the cricket tour of Pakistan, the meeting of Indian Pakistan Joint Commission on Environment and tensed the visa issuance process for the Pakistani nationals. India opened all the option and highlighted its war alertness to encounter terrorism and concentrated to influence the international community against the Pakistani extremism. Pakistan responded with the same preparedness, the Pakistani military and Political authorities made it clear that they ready to face the war consequence in order to defend their country. “Both India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons, and western observers did not believe the current tensions will lead to war, though this was probably the objective of the Mumbai attack. Both countries put forces on high alert and Pakistani also pulled out troops from the insurgency-hit areas to deploy them along borders with India.” (2008 - Mumbai Attack 22/11, 2008)

However, on 16 December 2008 A. K Antony, the Indian Defence Minister declared that no war would be proclaimed against Pakistan. But he also warned Pakistan to act against terrorism if she sought normal relations with India. The sudden change in the Indian policy has been driven from internal policy shift and the western influence on ‘no war between India-Pakistan due to their greater interests in Afghanistan’. “A White House spokesman, Gordon Johndroe, said the United States was in touch with both countries and urging greater cooperation in investigating last month’s Mumbai attacks, which India blames on Pakistan-based militants. “(2008 - Mumbai Attack 22/11, 2008)

“The Indian media have made much of president-elect Barak Obama’s statement that India has a right to protect itself. Yet Washington and London would hardly appreciate a full-blown crisis that necessitates Pakistan to redeploy its forces from the west to the east. Indeed, this is diametrically opposed to Obama’s stated plane for South Asia, which aim at keeping India-Pakistan ties on an even keel so that Pakistan can concentrate on tracking the Taliban and Al Qaida. ” (Raghavan, 2008, p. 2)

India’s fear of equal nuclear retaliation by Pakistan may not help in achieving her objectives that’s why the Indian military opted the strategy of ‘Cold Start’. It is a military doctrine, it involves various branches of India’s military conducting offensive operations as part of unified battle groups. The Cold Start doctrine is intended to allow India’s conventional forces to perform holding attacks in order to prevent a nuclear retaliation from Pakistan in case of a conflict. “The claim that the army’s new doctrine of ‘Cold Start’ enhances our ability to punish Pakistan is

equally wrong-headed.” (Raghavan, 2008, p. 1) However, India did not respond to the Cold Start strategy to encounter terrorism, it adopted the policy of multilateral diplomacy. The opted policy is subtitled for those states who are confronting with political and economic instability, which “of course, provides an opportunity for a nuanced multilateral effort to nudge Pakistan in the desired direction.” (Raghavan, 2008, p. 3)

Conclusion

Since 1947 India and Pakistan are unable to reconcile on any assenting point to resolve their inherited disputes. The historical trial proves their incoherent relations and unsettled issues that never allowed the two states to harmonize. The twenty first century witnessed the new phase of terrorism that led the Indo-Pak relation in unceasing turmoil. The series of terror acts on India and the Indian fanatics’ assaults on Muslims laid its unending impact on the ongoing peace process. The 2008 Mumbai assault on the elite Indian nationals and foreigners has proved the extreme militants capability that undermined the stability of one of the busiest main city of India for many days. It also raised many questions on the Indian security and intelligence system that could not sense and protect the city and the elite establishment from the faced mayhem.

The Mumbai attacks proved to be as direct stabbing on the Indo-Pak peace dialogues. The incident acted as the deadly end and key point of distrust among both states. It indulged the subcontinent in the wave of terrorism and defamed Pakistan as the global nursery of terrorism. The Mumbai attacks gained limitless support from the international community due to the direct assault on the foreigners. Indians claimed Mumbai terror the 26/11 as the 9/11 of India and urged for unjustified pressure on Pakistan to stop terrorism, ignoring their own fascists group terrorism on the Indian Muslims. Nonetheless we also cannot overlook Pakistan’s non-state actors’ involvement in the Mumbai Terror act. Pakistan also has its grounds that cultivate extremism although terrorism is a western spawn which now appears as consistent threat to adjacent power and other fear holding states.

The real dilemma is lying in the inherited religious animosity that can be traced from the initial days of Islam in the sub-continent. The deep routed old Indian sacred testimony never paved way for the new liberal equalizing religion that superseded their cast system and ruled the majority by towering minority. The Indo-Pak genetic disputes still can be felt through the ongoing terror acts. The ultimate reconciliation only can be met by overcoming the religious fundamentalism within both states and an end for western interests and interference.

References

- 2008 - Mumbai Attack 22/11. (2008).
http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/indo-pak_2008.htm.
- 'India accuse Pakistan of being 'nursery of global terrorism'. (27-09-2006). Daily Times.
- Burke, S. (1974). *Mainsprings of Indian and Pakistani Foreign policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Burke, S., & Ziring, L. (1990). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*. Oxford University Press.
- India Sees 'external Link' as Troops Battle Militants,. (n.d.). <http://mg.co.za/article/2008-11-27-india-sees-external-link-as-troops-battle-militants>.
- Jannepally, H. R. (2010). *The 2008 Mumbai Attack and Press Nationalism: A Content Analysis of Coverage in the New York Times, Times of London, Dawn, and the Hindu*, A thesis presented to the faculty of the Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University.
- Khalid, I. (2012). *Management of Pakistan India Conflicts: An Application of Crisis Decision-Making*. Punjab University.
- Khan, R. (2000). *Pakistan-India Relations and the Role of Newspapers*. Punjab University.
- Kumar, A. (28-11-2008, 11 28). Dawn.Pakistan.
- Navlakha, G. (2009). Lesson from the Mumbai Attacks, Economic & Political Weekly.
- Raghavan, S. (2008). Terror, Force and Diplomacy, Economic & Political Weekly.
<http://www.epw.in/commentary/terror-force-and-diplomacy.html>.
- Ray, J. K. (2011). *India's Foreign Relations*. Routledge Taylor & Francis group.
- Teltumbde, A. (2009). Capitalizing on Calamity 26/11 and Jingoist Politics, Economic & Political Weekly. <http://www.countercurrents.org/mumbai.htm>.
- Thapar, K. (2008). An Interview in Devils Advocate Programme.
- The Mumbai Bombing Over the Past Year. (n.d.).
<http://www.ukessays.com/essays/history/the-mumbai-bombings-ovet-the-past-years-history-essay.php>.

Biographical Note

Prof. Dr. Umbreen Javaid is Director, Centre for South Asian Studies & Chairperson, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore-Pakistan.

Marium Kamal is Research Assistant, Centre for South Asian Studies & M.Phil scholar at Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore-Pakistan.