

Neither a Hawk Nor a Dove: An Insider's Account of Pakistan's Foreign Relations Including Details of the Kashmir Framework

By Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri

Oxford University Press, Karachi, 2015

Pages: 851, Price PKR 2450

_____ Syed Ali Abbas

Inspired by *Friends no Masters*, Khursheed Mehmood Kasuri *Neither a Hawk nor a Dove* is an excellent reading with some inside details of his political background and grooming up, mostly concentrating upon the political career of this paternal and maternal grandfathers and his own fathers' tracing his descency from historically known renowned personalities.

Referring to the title of the book Khursheed Kasuri mentions this first meeting with Pervez Musharraf who questioned him abruptly whether he was a Hawk or a Dove. Khursheed Kasuri answered none of them (P.1). It was presumed that the title will be relative to the country, whether the foreign policy will be sharp or passive. But unlike the presumption it came only to be more personal.

Narrating and introducing his book, Khursheed Kasuri explains that "the period converged in this book was also, when I was foreign Minister from 2002 to 2007. The book has been updated to date 2014 (and in some cases 2015) with an analysis of the late situation based upon personal experience and insights gained during my period (p.xxiii). In the light of this statement it can be concluded that this

'analysis' in the post 2007 era, is mostly conjectural and subjective. He adds "During the tenure as Foreign Minister, Pakistan Foreign policy favored on promotion of regional and global peace and security as well as the country's economical and social development and the welfare of its citizen: (p. *ibid*). Surprisingly this statement is no qualified in the details of the book which concentrated on more political issues and relations with India, besides some reflections on the relationship with USA, China and the Middle Eastern countries.

Chapter 1 contains, as mentioned earlier, a history of the Paternal and Maternal grandfathers, and his own father's political career. It provides his contacts with the great political and non-political personalities of Pakistan such as Air Marshal Asghar Khan, Malik Ghulam Gilani, Nawabzada Nasruallah Khan, Mian Mumtaz Muhammad Khan Daultana, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Khan Abadul Wali Khan, Arbab Sikandar Khan Kalil, Sardar Shaukdat Hayat Khan, Syed Amir Hussain Shah, Maulana Abdul Hameed Khan Bhashani, Hussain Shaheed Suharwardi, Abdullah Malik, Sheikh Rafi Ahmad, Sheikh Muhammad Rashid, Nawab Akbar Khan Bugti, Khan Abdus Samad Khan Achakzai, Abdul Hamid Jatoi, Mir Ghaus Bazenjo, Prince Agha Abdul Karim Khan Ahmadzai of Kalat, Begum Naseem Jahan, Faiz Ahmad Faiz, Mazhar Ali Khan, Begum Tahira Mezhar Ail Khan, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Begum Nusrat Bhutto, Benazir Bhutto, Mina Muhammad Nawaz Sharif and Imran Khan.

Political relationship is common. Leaders meet for gaining and understanding whether or not they succeed. To what extent such meetings had developed a political understanding and to what limits the untold story is not explained.

The second chapter Pakistan Security Dilemma, Quest for strategic balance begins with the wounds of partition, the mass immigration form either side of the border with killing and plundering. (I have passed through this crises in

October 1947 and have seen personally the great tragedy). Malir Kotla was indeed a safer place for the Muslims besides many others such as Muzaffargarh, Amroha as some others, where Muslim population still exist. (I had a personal talk with the elder brother of my father, Abdulllah Shah, the Chief Minister of Malir Kotla when he came to attend my marriage in June 1946. I asked him about his coming to Pakistan. He said that there was nothing wrong in Malir Kotla).

Where riots were common are explained by the author in dimensions of partition. However, how it reacted in the post-partition period is examined troubled relation with India, which beset Pakistan into security problems, more so when Pakistan refused to devalue its currency. There were times when open was against Pakistan were planned but not executed through Kashmir war was still on behind the curtain.

Pakistan's anxiety on regular threats from India was natural which brought here closer to the USA. This is well explained by the author in Pak-US relations an interacting balancing act. The unhealthy Pak-Afghan relations had historical background which began some years before the partition. Unfortunately this aspect is totally ignored by the author, thought the impact of other developments is still current.

Abdul Gaffar's contact with the Indian National Congress was more ideological that political though it was capitalized by the Congress in her interest. Further Abdul Ghaffar Khan had links with Afghanistan, more than friendship which the Congress exploited against the League's stand for the Muslim majority provinces to prevent a separate Muslim home land. Pakhtunistan issue was Indian inspired, and so referendum where the Durand line, internationally recognized weakened the Indian stand. However, the issue was alive even after the creation of Pakistan, and as a result Indian became closer to Afghanistan which is current even today despite Pakistan

extends hand of friendship. The author has rightly pointed out that it was Indian money which helped in growing Indo-Afghanistan relation (p.99).

Sections of the chapter warming relations with China, Vigor and new vision in Pakistan Foreign Policy 1972-77, Islamic Summit, 1974, Revival of Pakistan-US relation following Russian invasion on Afghanistan are good analyses of the period which hardly need a review. Political struggle between Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif which extended to decade is a dark period of Pakistan history like the frequent dismissal of the constituent and National Assemblies under power of section 92-A of the constitution, granted to the Governor General/President.

During this period some unfortunate incidents happened which Pakistan overlooked. India occupied some important posts on the Pakistan side of the L.O.C. in the Leh Valley, and later captured the Siachin glacier. The Kargil issue indeed winded with some hotness, the relationship between the Prime Minister and the Army Chief. The failure of Kargil improved the differences clamming that the Army Chief deliberately hid the issue from the Prime Minister. Whether or not this was possible is debatable and as such being ignored. Nevertheless it goes without saying that what Pakistan gained militarily it was lost on the peace table under pressure. Even if time was gained in the negotiation for the withdrawal to troops it could save many lives of the Pakistan army.

The result was the military coup, which threw back the political activity in Pakistan for another decade. It was during this period that author assumed the responsibility of the Foreign Minister, more so under the effects and tension of 9/11.

Section II of this chapter: "Assume Office: is a well explained narrative some background of the past foreign policies. But finally he deals Indo-Pakistan relations, its drew backs, faith and loyalty and how should be reframed. The author concludes that hostile relations between India and

Pakistan have not given any dividends. People to people contact between artists, traders and academics could bring better atmosphere. He also suggests that how exchanges between the two countries bring some trouble to Indian Muslims whose desire is closer relationship between the two. It did happen several times without developing an understanding. Even recently Pakistan Television (private group) along with Indian media made few efforts but all in vain. The question is after all why such attempts do not succeed. The answer is lack of sincerity somewhere. I am not saying it as a Pakistani, but also as a student of History, I can judge the Pakistanis are not vindictive by nature. They are amicable, generous and large hearted but whether or not the counterparts have these qualities is a question mark. The author has quoted the ear of the Mughals where both Hindus and Muslims lived amicably. That was just the reign of Akbar. The Rana of Chittor remained unfriendly and they did so until 1857. But the Chittor family did not harm the Mughals that others however friendly with Akbar. Under Augrangzeb they came only throwing their veil against the king, revolting and never allowed, him the king to remain in peace. It were they who carried the agrarian crises under the Later Mughals which obliged Shah Walli to say: "Take out your swords and do not sheet them unless you have killed all the non-Muslim". This was not practical, which reflects the feeling of a person who had seen the fall of the Mughals with his own eyes.

What I want to say is that Hindus are friendly to Muslims only when they are in a subordinate position. In power they behave differently which is evident from the history of the Pakistan Freedom Movement and even Indo-Pakistan relations thereafter till today. Mody's government is the best example of this working which the author accepts (Chapter on Mody).

Further, the author observes: "it is important to note that there has been historical revisionism in a massive scale in both Pakistan and India following partition in 1947. The

revisionism has been greater in Pakistan for which we have accordingly paid a greater price. But it is important to refer to historical revisionism in both the countries sustain as it makes understanding each other much more difficult" (P.124).

This is an immature reflection of the discipline of history. History always keeps changing. After the creation of Pakistan, it was important to explain the struggle for freedom for the youngsters, born in Pakistan. There was already enough writings in the struggle of Indian independence. The revision there was they purged out the names of Muslim Leaders including the struggle of independence, particularly Jinnah. Pakistan historians continue to highlight the role, however, negative, of J.L. Nehru, Patel, Gandhi and other Congress Leaders including Abul Kalam Azad. It may be incorrect to presume that Pakistan's history created the big gap between the people of India and Pakistan. In fact the failure of the partition which was the sole object of the Congress and creation of Pakistan was never accepted from the core of their heart. Some more lines shall be added at a proper place when the author's discussion on the possible solution of Kashmir issue is explained during his tenure as Foreign Minister.

The author observes: "I strongly believe that it serves Pakistan' national interest to normalize relations with India, enmity with India has cost Pakistan both economically and politically" (p.133). This is true, but shake hands, need two hands to meet. Had there been such feelings on the other side of the border, perhaps, relations between the two countries had grown much earlier. Yes if you are prepared to work in the interest of India regarding her supremacy, India shall extend hand of friendship. This is added by the fact that friendship on equal basis shall never be acceptable to India, since she is in the air as so called super power of Asia, threatening China.

The author adds: "Hostile and tense relation between Pakistan and India has had a negative impact on the status of

Muslims of India" (p.140). it is a wishful thinking. Even Pakistan and India became closer to each other with maximum understanding, a remote possibility, the status of the Muslims in India shall remain unchanged. Infact Indian Muslims are the target for their voting for Pakistan in 1945-46. (the people of Sindh were under the influence of Ayub Khoro, Punjab under the Unionist and Frontier under the Red Shirt Leaders). The Muslims of India responded to the call for Pakistan much sincerely and got it. Unfortunately, they could not find a place in Pakistan except a few who did migrate. But the majority had to adjust in India. As such Muslim in India have suffered immensely since the partition which is attested by Sachar Report 1995).

The author further suggests that Pakistan should give up by emotional stand on Kashmir, whatever important (p.143). What should be done is to recognize the present situation of Pakistan wants nothing except that the Kashmir issue be resolved in accordance with the wishes of Kashmiri people. I agree with the author that large majority on both sides of the border desires peace with honour (p.146). What is s peace with honour is perhaps debatable. In India feelings are hot on the development of commercial interests without the mention of Kashmir. In Pakistan honour is only the peaceful solution of Kashmir acceptable to the Kashmiri people.

Chapter 3. The beginning of the normalization of peace with India. The author confirms that India focused more on terrorism and Pakistan on the Kashmir issue without any compromise between the two. Meanwhile there was some understanding on the CBMs which is more to the interest of India than Pakistan. It is stated that a number of parliamentarian came to Pakistan to attend SAFMA (South Asia Free Media Association) held in Islamabad in August 2003. It had provided an opportunity to exchange thoughts on the unresolved dispute between the prime leadership in Pakistan and India. But the author considered it useless as people to people contact could bring better understanding (p.163). Without entering into the debate it can safely be

said, that no CBM shall ever succeed visa via India. Even Aman Ki Asha so much propagated on T.V. channels failed. Like Chapter-III India and Road less travelled, the 4 chapter: interrupted Symphony, contents of Backchannel settlement on Kashmir.

In both chapters he explains his efforts to make peace and understanding with India including the 8 point agreement for future negotiations (These negotiations were stopped following the Bombay incident). Meanwhile the backchannel Diplomacy began initially to some understanding but eventually to failure. Musharraf, Swaran Singh talks did come to some conclusions. This is revealed by an Indian writer in 2011. This was right time to resume dialogue to remove since it was abandoned in 2007. A tenure agreement on porus border gradual and increasing autonomy and Self government for various sub regions of undivided Jammu and Kashmir" (p.352). This was possible if India was ready to pull out her army form the valley.

Partition of Kashmir between Hindu majority are and Muslims was an old issue discussed between the leader of India and Pakistan without results. In fact the truth is somewhere else. Hindutva is an idealism in India activists in the mid-nineteenth century and expanded by the extremist in the 20s. Indian freedom movement helped making it popular amongst the Indian Masses, multiplied by the communal rioting before and after the India partition in 1947. Today there is hardy and section of Indian society which is not actively involved in it. What Hindutva means is long story may not be fitting in this review. There is plenty of material on it both in India and Pakistan for people who are interested in its detail. Briefly it stands that India is for Indians. Those other than Hindus have no right to live in India unless they adopt Indian culture, religion and salute National flag and anthem. Secondly India was supreme and these truth who did not accept, should be dealt with accordingly. The idea was practiced for the first time in the Congress Rule (1937-39) and it is too will known to the

students of history. Congress was not in full power then. It was under the British control with some autonomy in the provinces. After the partition the Congress was in full swing and people like J.L. Nehru had accepted the practice of Hindutva. Hindutva today is spread to all sections of India, except Muslims who have suffered for being Muslim since 1947. (see Sachar Report 1995). Under Hindutva India has never left an opportunity to harm Pakistan and Kashmir. She shall never accept any positive step promising Kashmiris their political right. There is sufficiently a large group in held Kashmir of the Muslims who eco the Indian music. There assembly of whatever nature does work and make manifesto the public view in favour of India. The large majority of the Muslims not represented is quiet except the Hurriat. The Hurriat Leaders always under pressure controlled by almost a million troops in the valley. However, India shall concede to everything against her interest provided she is under pressure. Once international pressure on India over, the Kashmir issue was successfully resisted by the Indian Prime Minster. Since then international interest in solving the Kashmir issue is off the record.

There is some where our failures also. Negotiations between India and Pakistan over the issue could not continue because of the frequent changes of Pakistan government. Martial Law regime took a couple of years to manage negotiations with India which was all in vain.

Chapter 5, 6, 7 and 8 on Pakistan Army and India, Afghanistan, Pakistan and the USA, and the Pakistan's Diplomatic outreach are interesting chapters but comments on these appear unnecessary. Similarly Foreign office the last chapter is being ignored in this review for it reflects the routing working of the Department.

To conclude let me suggest that the book in hand is an excellent narration of semi autobiography and reminiscence. It is good reading and well illustrating something not known to the people. I shall strongly recommend this book to the students doing research on Indian history, particularly South

Asia. I am sure this book shall be equally popular in India for a better understanding of Pakistan foreign office and its working.