

# Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy

Proceedings, Recommendations and Declaration  
of  
The Fifth Joint Convention



Bangalore  
April 6 - 8, 2000

# Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy

Proceedings, Recommendations and Declaration  
Of  
The Fifth Joint Convention

Bangalore  
April 6-8, 2000



PAKISTAN - INDIA PEOPLES' FORUM FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY  
INDIA: B-14 (SF), Gulmohar Park, New Delhi - 110 049  
PAKISTAN : 11 Temple Road, Lahore.

*With editing assistance from :*

Sumanta Bannerjee, Syeda Hameed,  
Chitra Palekar & E. Deenadayalan

*'As-Salam', Caligraphy by :*

**Peggy Mohan**

Our special gratitude to Jalaluddin Rumi and Ali Sardar Jafri  
for the poetry we have borrowed.

*Published on behalf on PIPFPD by :*

**PIFPD SECRETARIAT**

B-14 (SF), Gulmohar Park, New Delhi - 110 049

Ph.: 91-11-26561743, 26514847

E-mail : [pipfpd@pipfpd.org](mailto:pipfpd@pipfpd.org)

For private circulation only.

# CONTENTS

1. Bangalore Declaration	5
2. Overview - Rita Manchanda	7
3. Message from I. A. Rehman, Chairperson, Pakistan chapter	14
4. Message from Admiral L. Ramdas (Retd.), Chairperson, India chapter	15
5. Foreword - "Problems and Prospects" by L. Ramdas	17
6. The thematic subjects, co-chairpersons and rapporteurs	20
7. "The crisis of Governance - India and Pakistan" by B. Narsing Rao	21
8. Report of the Group on Governance	26
9. "Building Peace in Kashmir" by Tapan K. Bose	29
10. Report of the Group on Kashmir	41
11. Resolution on Kashmir	44
12. "Religious Intolerance" by Bhaskar Bhole	46
13. "Military Expenditure and People's Security" by Gautam Navlakha	51
14. Report of the Group on Demilitarization and De-nuclearisation	58
15. Report of the Group on Globalisation and Regional cooperation	60
16. Reports and Resolutions of the Sectoral Working Groups	
a) Gender Issues	62
b) Media & Culture	66
c) Trade Unions	68
d) Teachers and Students	70
e) Trade and Commerce	72
f) Environment	73

## Appendixes

Appendix I - List of Participants from India	75
Appendix II - List of Participants from Pakistan	81
"Only Breath" by Jalaluddin Rumi	86

## **Bangalore Declaration**

of the Fifth Joint Convention of Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for  
Peace and Democracy adopted on April 8, 2000

1. Meeting in a critical time of war, threats of war, nuclearization, and the persistent obstacles placed in the path of the assembly of the peace loving peoples of the two countries.
2. In pursuance of its objectives of normalization of relations, demilitarization and peace, a democratic resolution of the Kashmir problem, promotion of tolerance, democracy and good governance, and joint endeavour against the common threats to the economies of India and Pakistan by unfettered globalization.
3. Being aware of the increasing danger of deliberate or accidental war breaking out with the risk of any conflict escalating to the level of nuclear holocaust.
4. Concerned about repeated incidents of religious intolerance and hatred in both countries rooted in deprivation, backwardness, power politics and misconceived notions of national interest.
5. The Pakistan-India People's Forum for Peace and Democracy in its Fifth Joint Convention held at Bangalore, India, on 6-8 April, 2000.
6. DEMANDS an immediate resumption of dialogue at the highest level, reversal of current military build-ups, horizontal and vertical denuclearization and a comprehensive non-war pact, effective steps towards internal demilitarization and in the interim, until a complete roll back of the nuclear weapons and delivery systems programmes of both countries, a no-first use agreement, consent to the CTBT, rejoining the discussions on the FMCT and move towards the declaration of South Asia as a nuclear-free zone.
7. CALLS upon Governments of India and Pakistan to order cessation of all hostilities along the Line Of Control by all forces directly and indirectly under their control, the various militant organizations of Jammu and Kashmir to eschew violence, the Government of India to release all political detenus, so that the peoples of all sections of Jammu and Kashmir can decide their future in a democratic manner, achieve reconciliation, and the representatives of the Governments of India, Pakistan and of the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir strive together to find a solution acceptable to the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir and the sub-continent in the larger interest of peace and democracy.
8. DEPRECATES all attempts to curtail the facilities of travel and communications between India and Pakistan and calls upon the two Governments to rewrite the protocol and allow all people to travel freely.

9. RESOLVES to link the joint struggle against unfettered globalization with the struggle for democratization of our societies, co-operate in building food security through a sustainable agricultural strategy that excludes the MNC controlled seed- biotechnology-pesticides cycle, share appropriate and small technologies, address water management and distribution issues on a regional basis, extend most favoured nation status to each other, forge a common strategy to tackle environmental degradation of common ecological regions and evolve joint strategies on multilateral negotiations such as WTO and plant breeders rights.
10. DEMANDS the two governments to ensure popular participation in governance through decentralisation and devolution of power to the grassroots with adequate safeguards, provide basic amenities to the people, institutionalise transparency, responsibility and accountability in governance, ensure security of the minorities, prevent crimes against women, end child labour, protect common people against displacement from traditional habitats in the name of development, break the politician-criminal nexus, preserve and extend freedom of expression along with the right of access to information, reverse the trend of politicisation of education leading to a collapse of standards, and defend cultural rights and freedoms.
11. DEMANDS immediate steps for the realisation of women's basic rights and their legitimate aspirations.
12. CALLS upon the educationists and the people in general to work towards ways of inculcating values of cooperation, tolerance, harmony, through all possible means, particularly curricula and prescribed textbooks, print and visual media, undertake investigations of incidents of communal violence to bring the findings to the notice of the people, organise exchanges of children and teachers, and to be aware of and monitor possible misuse of places of worship and religious educational institutions for the promotion of preaching and promotion of hatred and intolerance.
13. RESOLVES further to take concrete steps both jointly and separately in each country including formation of working groups to implement the above resolutions towards the realisation of its aims and objectives.

Signed: Sd/-  
**I.A. Rehman**  
 Chairperson Pakistan Chapter

Sd/-  
**Admiral (Rtd) L. Ramdas**  
 Chairperson India Chapter

Bangalore,  
 April 8, 2000

## OVERVIEW

### Beyond the Peace *Mela* : Rethinking Strategies

By Rita Manchanda

In Bangalore at the fifth Joint Convention of the Pakistan India Peoples' Forum for Peace Democracy, the cynosure of the media's eye was a young Karachi based journalist, Nasir, accompanied by his wife and two minor daughters, honorary child delegates to the conference from Pakistan. When he had first sounded them out about going to India, his daughter Zoya (6 years) had innocently warbled, hamara India, parroting the refrain of an advertising jingle she had heard on Zee TV. Formal schooling had yet to make her self conscious about such an unpatriotic slip, for India was the "other", the enemy. What would she remember of that April week in Bangalore?

There was the sentimentalism which ballooned forth in the cry of " *Ek Mata Do Santan*" (One Mother, Two Children) though more likely it would be its more imaginative articulation in the *Brothers of Chichibaba*, the children's story book which she took home. In this anti war book released at the Forum, scientist D P Sen Gupta tells the story of right handed Guruk and left handed Turuk, two brothers from the land of Chichibaba. They fall out and become implacable enemies raising armies against each till both acquire bombs, 'so hot that the earth will melt like butter'. The children of the two countries *Chinchin* and *Chinchun* frightened of melting like butter, push through a hole in the wall separating the two, and seek safety by coming together, the brothers are transformed and vow to destroy all weapons and live in peace.

Clearly, in the real world, Pakistan - India hostility cannot be wished away, the propensity to violence not so easily transcended. Indeed on both sides of the border there is a remarkable fit between the state ideology based on hostile relations and popular acceptance of hate politics and its concomitant, a national security obsession. It is that "fit" which is coming loose in the wake of cross border people to people dialogue which draws peoples and organisations not normally associated with inter elite political and security dialogues. These include women's groups, environmentalists, social and human rights activists, labour activists, professionals, scientists as well as academics, journalists, retired bureaucrats and armed forces personnel. The objective is to foster new, broad based coalitions capable of democratically reordering national and regional priorities. Without democratisation of the process, the 'no war no peace' dynamics inherent in the India Pakistan relational paradigm, can not be transformed.

Admittedly, at the Forum's mass conventions, there is a groundswell of emotional sentimentalism which tends to reinforce the superficial (and motivated) impression of the Forum's delegates as unrealistic peace

missionaries committing themselves to wishful declarations. Had the founders of the Forum not been 'fanciful' visionaries, would they have dared believe that in 1995 when Pakistan had just closed down the Karachi Consulate and relations dipped to a new low, visas would be issued to 100 Pakistani delegates to attend the first Joint Convention in Delhi. The facile dismissal of peace delegates as "bleeding hearts" obscures the sinewy strength of the Forum as a potent idea symbolising that there is nothing essentialist in India Pakistan hostility, as the state sponsored orthodoxy would have us believe. A 'hundred years war' is not inevitable. In the Forum citizens of India and Pakistan- former Ministers, Cabinet Secretaries, retired Admirals, Major Generals and thousands of concerned citizens, have discovered that even on issues like Kashmir, the areas of agreement are more than the areas of disagreement. "We have to make the governments admit to the possibility of an alternative to the politics" of hate and confrontation. "the possibility of other possibilities", reiterated I A Rehman, the co-chairperson of the Forum.

The Forum's strategy is simple though no less subversive for being that. By bringing together thousands of citizens of India and Pakistan, it undermines the very logic of the demonisation of "the other" based on keeping the two peoples apart. "The more people talk to each other, the more they are exposed to each other's writings, the process of demonising will come apart," the Forum's co-founder Nimal Mukarji had said at the historic first Joint Convention in Delhi in 1995. Six years and five Joint Conventions later, this unique people to people dialogue has demonstrated not only survivability but testified to the emergence of a cross border peace constituency, which setbacks like the Kargil war have been unable to crush and jingoistic governments, unable to deny.

This time, too, for the Fifth Joint Convention in Bangalore, the Ministry of External Affairs issued non reporting and multiple city visas to 200 Pakistani citizens. And that too at a time when the Indian government is self righteously determined to freeze, atrophy and indeed break off links with Pakistan, bilaterally and internationally. However, at the last minute, a constraint was introduced which threatened to stymie the meeting. Political clearance had been given at the highest level but evidently the intelligence agencies had different priorities. The special concession enjoyed by Forum delegates for the earlier Calcutta and Peshawar Conventions, to walk across the no man's land strip between Wagha and Attari, was unexpectedly revoked. Ubiquitous security reasons were cited. For the Forum it was a major blow upsetting not only logistic arrangements and lengthening to six days the journey from Peshawar to Bangalore for NWFP delegates. But politically it hit at the symbolic efforts of the Forum - by having 140 delegates walk across the no man's corridor- to keep up the pressure on the two governments to reopen the land route and multiply links.



In the end, the irony was that while Indian and Pakistani leaders were playing kutfi (child's game of not talking to each other), the Pakistan Interior Ministry and the Indian Home Ministry collaborated by physically blocking citizens from walking across. They must fly or travel by the circuitous bi-weekly Samjhauta Express. It brought home I.A.Rehman's comment at the Calcutta convention, "the elite can visit by airplane but for the others the road and rail links are blocked. The elite can telephone each other but the poor cannot send to each other even a postcard." Even the survival of the sole train link is under threat.

At the international level, Indian diplomacy has been reduced to isolating Pakistan and branding it a 'terrorist' state, and at the bilateral level to minimizing links, leaving only the language of guns to blast each other. Severance of links will reinforce mutual isolation and play into the hands of antagonistic forces with vested interests in mystifying the India Pakistan hostility as essentialist. Initiatives like the women's Peace Bus diplomacy and the Forum's people to people dialogues are aimed at multiplying those links, particularly crucial at a time when official links are atrophying and the jingoists are clamoring for only a military riposte.

The mounting war hysteria reaffirmed the importance of the symbolic value of the Forum's fifth Joint Convention. Barely a year after the Kargil 'war like situation', the military takeover in Pakistan and a surge in the jingoism of a 'winnable' limited war between two nuclear powers, Pakistani and Indian citizens were coming together at considerable risk, to pay the price of peace. It was not despite, but because of Kargil and the bellicose readiness by jihadists and officialdom to trivialise the cost of war and talk of 'final solutions' by military means.

In Bangalore, the local organisers had their hands full, trying to neutralise the negative fall out from the emotionalism whipped up over the tragic Chattisingpura massacre of Sikhs in Anantnag in Kashmir just weeks before. Several potential patrons had pulled back financial support. It was not just incidental that the venue for the Joint Convention was the United Theosophical College. Then there was the irritant of a court case filed against the convenor of the Karnataka chapter of the Indian Forum accusing him (and by implication the Forum) of fostering anti national activities. The case was thrown out. Was it a foretaste of Hindutva forces rearing their heads and threatening the Forum's meet? The result was unprecedented security. Though it was unclear who was protecting whom - delegates/ISI agents or local anti social fascist elements ?

For the first time since the Joint Conventions were held in New Delhi and Lahore, the venue was swarming with police and intelligence agents. Delegates who in Calcutta, had had the free run of the city, now found themselves in Bangalore boxed in. It virtually defeated one of the objectives of the people to people dialogue - letting people discover for themselves the

false myths and prejudices. At the Calcutta Convention the Forum had transited from an activity in a seminar room to a movement as 500 Pakistanis and Indians arm in arm marched down the streets calling for 'no to war and yes to peace'. In Bangalore, the Joint Convention shrank back into four walls. Earlier Conventions in both India and Pakistan had been able to successfully resist the imposition of a security cover. Had the environment turned more threatening?

But when have the Joint Conventions of the Forum not been haunted by war hysteria as India and Pakistan hurtle from one crisis to another. Shrill jingoism accompanied the first Delhi Convention in 1995 and mushroom clouds hung over the fourth Peshawar Convention in 1998, (Calcutta Convention in 1996 alone breathed in the détente of the Gujral doctrine.) Undeterred, the Forum has fostered an open people to people dialogue to expand the base for an independent political debate on the intertwined four plus one themes- Kashmir, Demilitarisation/ Denuclearisation, Religious Intolerance, Governance and Globalisation and Regional Cooperation.

Indeed the sense of *déjà vu* on the eve of the Joint Convention, soon dissolves in the sheer energy and magic of the *mela* and the process of Indian and Pakistanis discovering each other and sharing their common understanding of what the costs of confrontation have meant in terms of denied welfare, militarisation and intolerance. At least 60 % of the delegates are first time members. With renewed fervour they recommended as did the delegates of earlier Conventions, relaxation of visas, decentralisation, basic rights for women, downsizing military expenditure, signing CTBT and a democratic and peaceful settlement of the Kashmir problem which involves the wishes of the people in all areas of Jammu and Kashmir.

However, planning big, entails such massive logistics and home generated financial mobilisation, that the event of the Joint Conventions threatens to become an end in itself leaving the Forum few resources or energies for the necessary smaller year around activities which should ideally culminate in a Convention. At the Bangalore Convention, for many of the founder members of the Forum, it was time for some hard introspection. Was the Forum only a jamboree? Were we little more than travel and tour operators?

In fact after the historic Delhi and Lahore Conventions, these misgivings have formed the subtext of the open debates, as the rhetoric of promises has become longer and the substantive achievements of the sectoral groups of Forum, marginal. Moreover, while all members have to subscribe to the principles of the Lahore (Citizens) Declaration of November 1993, the seemingly motley group which the Joint Convention brings together, seemed more active 'outside' than 'inside' the Convention.

But wasn't that what the Forum was also all about? That is letting people interact in structured or unstructured ways. A group of 50 Pakistani

delegates altogether missed the thematic discussions (the substantive core of the meet) as they had gone for Friday *Namaz* to the distant main *Juma Masjid*. They returned confused and awed that in an Indian city, Muslims casually and freely walked in from the streets to say their prayers at the mosque. It was a lived experience of religious freedom, demystifying the propaganda about Indian Muslims being denied the right of worship. No amount of discussion in a closed room could have as meaningful, especially as accompanying them were a few delegates from the Kashmir valley. Ironically, it was they who affirmed that what they saw in Bangalore was not exceptional. The dichotomy of "inside" and "outside" when it came to the Joint Conventions was meaningless. Walking around the Calcutta University Senate grounds, Pakistani delegates were surprised to find there the bust of H. S. Suhrawardy (later to become Pakistan Prime Minister). The programmed visit to the Muslim Institute in Calcutta incidentally revealed to them that its patrons were not only Muslims but wealthy Hindus as well.

In Peshawar, I remember one Indian delegate who seemed more bent on tourism and visiting the religious sites - Punja Sahib and Nankana Sahib. I was surprised to see him in Bangalore, enthusiastically conferring with delegates from West Punjab about a joint meeting of the two Punjabs in East Punjab.

Whether it was shoppers or the tourists, in their own way they were demystifying "the other", pulling down the walls of prejudice. For us 200 Indians who a year and half ago had journeyed by road to Peshawar, the experience opened up the multi layered complex interconnectivity in our two histories. Our hosts were people who had followed Badshah Khan (or Frontier Gandhi as we described him). His non violent secular politics were a reminder that in the years before martial law and Islamisation, there had been the possibility of the existence of an alternative non violent secular tradition in NWFP. Their fierce assertion of *Pakhtunwah* identity brought home the pressing internal power sharing problems, put on hold because of the Kashmir issue and its legitimisation of militarisation. Down the tourist track by way of the ruins of Taxila and Harappa we connected with a common pre-Islamic, Gandhara Buddhist and Indus Valley civilizational heritage.

This time too in Bangalore tourism took on a richly textured meaning when a bus load of Pakistanis alighted at Srirangapatnam and the Darbar Hall of Tipu Sultan and the temple of Sri Ranganathan within the old fort city. Walking along murals of Tipu and Hyder Ali's war battle scenes and browsing among the civilisational trappings of the regime, there was pride in a common heritage and frustration over what could have been. The mix of Sultanate and Hindu (south) architecture was a reminder of the possibility of alternative models of co-existence characteristic of the Muslim dominions in the south and of Tipu as a symbol of historic pride on both sides of the

border, defying communalisation. At a time when both countries are busy erasing away a common history, a lived journey through these tracts of time was an important political experience and statement.

Dozens of proposals about joint rewriting of history, of exchange of students and summer residency programmes and peace education curricula, were bruited about. On the new fifth theme of Globalisation and Regional Cooperation, joint strategies on multilateral negotiations such as WTO and plant breeder rights were discussed. Against a backdrop of a 28% increase in defence expenditure and the prospect of a nuclear arms race, appeals to downsize expenditure and roll back nuclearisation was urged. The Bangalore declaration was an omnibus wish list which put people's security at the centre and not national security orthodoxy which impoverished peoples, undermined democracy and in the end, even from a conventional security point of view, made people more insecure. It was a tall list, from liberalising visas to signing CTBT - affirmed by a citizen's assembly. There was Admiral Ramdas, a man who for 45 years had been in uniform, standing up before Indians and Pakistanis and asserting "wars don't solve problems, they only create fresh ones".

A hard and daring joint formulation was constructed on Kashmir, urging cessation of all violence by all forces (directly and indirectly under the control of governments and militant groups) and to move towards the facilitation of a process by which the peoples of Kashmir choose their representatives for a dialogue. Would, the Forum accept if eventually they democratically chose to secede? Admiral Ramdas did not flinch. "Tilak when he fought for Swaraj did not fight for Swaraj for only us? Why should we alone have the right?"

The Chattisingpura massacre, just weeks before, had grimly spotlighted that violence can only beget violence, that the democratic space has to be wrested back by civil society to defeat the forces which understand only violence. In Bangalore, the Forum took the first tentative step to go beyond rhetoric and get involved at the ground level on the Kashmir issue. There is the symbolic import of the National Committee of the Forum (India) deciding to meet in Srinagar in June- a gesture which seeks to break the isolation of fledgling democratic forces in J&K. It will be followed by a first ever civil society meet in Srinagar which will bring together groups and individuals in J&K and outside, with the aim of building cross solidarities and strengthening the capacity for democratic struggle in the state. At its core is the understanding that democratic space in India can not be safeguarded if democratic rights in J&K are suppressed. A parallel process is envisaged in Pakistan in Muzzafarabad.

But beyond the substantive, it is the symbolic value of the Forum's process of bringing more and more Indian and Pakistani citizens together to jointly voice a commitment to peace and democracy. It is too often forgotten in

the din of denunciation about the 'betrayal' of the Lahore Summit Declaration, that its promise of peaceful co-existence was legitimised by the peoples desire for peace. It was not just incidental that at Lahore, the Pakistan government deemed it necessary to have present at the receptions for the visiting Indian Prime Minister, leading members of the Forum as a recognition of the catalytic role being played by growing peace constituencies on both sides. Even at the height of the Kargil war, and the surge of jingoism, the voices for peace refused to be silenced in the media and in peace rallies in Quetta and Calcutta.

Has Kargil shrunk the peace constituency? That question is better responded to by another question as I A Rehman put it. Have the problems of impoverishment unemployment, intolerance and militarisation of our politics, shrunk? For it is this personal experience of the cost of confrontation which has led people to the desire for peace. The large presence of younger Pakistani and Indian delegates at Bangalore gave a poignant resonance to the determination of this second post independence generation, to reclaim the possibility of a future in which the two nuclear armed countries could live in peace. They had grown up knowing nothing other than the hate politics of the India Pakistan divide, and the certain prospect of a blighted future. They came out of curiosity, a few out of conviction. How many would still be there for the next Karachi Joint Convention?

Can the Forum strike a fine balance between the two ? And then again why shouldn't it be enough that the Forum's Joint Conventions act as a catalytic in fostering offshoots of coalitions, both connected and independent of the Forum. It was in the Lahore Joint Convention that representatives of Fishworkers Unions on both sides of the border met and worked out an informal system of cooperation to assist and rescue fishermen caught on the wrong side. A connection established in Peshawar Convention led to the release of three minor children locked up in a Pakistani jail. At the Calcutta Book Fair, the West Bengal chapter of the Forum put up a stall and spun off programmes of visiting Pakistani historians, feminists and cultural activists. The Forum has been involved in women's coalition building for subcontinental peace through initiatives like the 'peace bus' and participation in the 'Women Waging Peace' global network of Harvard University. The mass Joint Conventions of the Forum are central to the vision of fostering a honeycomb of cross border coalitions capable of democratically transforming the India-Pakistan relationship.

The Fifth Joint Convention of the Forum in Bangalore demonstrated how important it was to keep alive and widen a people to people track of engagement, and against all odds. The two governments' facilitation of the process suggests that they too recognise the value of the peace *mela*.

Message From I.A. Rehman

## Chairperson, Pakistan Chapter

Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy

Times have never been kind to anyone who has tried to persuade one's community to think when it is considered unthinkable or to reconsider concepts that are believed to be non-negotiable only on the grounds of their age. Those who launched the Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy six years ago were not unaware of the enormous challenges facing them. But it was perhaps impossible to anticipate the situation that we are today confronted with. The climate for defenders of peace and democracy in both Pakistan and India has considerably worsened since we met at our last joint convention in Peshawar.

The Kargil episode has extracted a terrible cost from the people of Pakistan. Religious militants have not only gained strength, they have also received a kind of sanction that was not publicly conceded earlier. The state has fallen back on a posture towards the Kashmir problem that has never promised a satisfactory settlement. And the country's journey towards a functional democracy has again been disrupted. All this not only threatens both peace and democracy, it also reduces the civil society's ability to influence the course of events.

It will not be fair on my part to say much about the trends in India but even from a distance it does appear that this imperfect state too has become stronger, and its capacity to impose its will on the people and to co-opt liberal elements has increased. This also does not auger well for our shared cause.

However, our hopes are sustained by two factors, First, the world can see that many new adherents have been gained by our forum in both countries, and our demand for peaceful resolution of all matters between our two countries has been endorsed by several other forums. Secondly, we are convinced that the present difficulties will soon disappear because the objective factors that have been determining the people's commitment to peace, tolerance and good self governance are as strong as ever. The common person in India and Pakistan only wishes to realise himself or herself and will be prepared to fight for this with increased vigour.

There is thus only one option before us- to reiterate our commitment to the ideal we have chosen and to redouble our efforts to make our work more methodical, more relevant to the age, and more meaningful.

*I.A.Rehman*

## Chairperson, India Chapter

### Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy

Friends, It gives me great pleasure to welcome all of you to this beautiful garden city of Bangalore. Our very special greetings are reserved for all our valued guests and comrades in arms, from Pakistan who are here. We are indeed happy to usher in the new millennium with the Fifth Joint Convention of the Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy. The century just gone by could perhaps be termed as one of the bloodiest centuries in history. More than forty million people have died due to nearly 275 wars or conflicts all over the world. South Asia has also contributed its own share towards these tragic and avoidable conflicts.

Ever since the conclusion of the Peshawar Convention in November 1998, civil societies in both India and Pakistan have struggled against heavy odds to focus and work for peace and democracy in our respective countries. The 'Lahore Declaration' of February 1999, was unanimously welcomed and one had placed high hopes on this accord. Regrettably this optimism was short lived. The mini-war in Kargil, followed by the military take over in Pakistan which snuffed out democracy there, the hijacking of the Indian Airlines aircraft, the enhanced violence in Jammu and Kashmir, accompanied more recently with sabre rattling by both Pakistan and India, have all been very depressing indeed. Indo-Pakistan relations have hit a real low in many years. This situation when viewed in the context of nuclear weapons capability of both the countries, is truly awesome.

Given this kind of scenario, any peace and reconciliation group would have been tempted to throw its hands up, but we in the Forum are determined more than ever to come to grips with these realities, as the need for the same is even greater in these given circumstances. I would therefore like to congratulate each one of you for the courage you have demonstrated by being present at this Convention. Our objectives will continue to guide us in our work, namely to promote peace through dialogue rather than destruction!

No doubt these challenges will continue to haunt us, but I have immense faith in the collective wisdom, and creativity of this wonderful group of people, who will hopefully come up during our forthcoming deliberations, with novel and workable models to address the many issues that confront us.

Finally I would also take this opportunity to thank and congratulate all my colleagues in the National Committee, and the Karantaka Chapter of the Forum for its sterling efforts in organising this event. The Forum would also like to place on record the magnificent and generous support received from

all our well wishers. Our very special appreciation and thanks also go to the Government of Karnataka for all its support.

We have tried to make everyone comfortable, but do forgive us if there have been any shortcomings.

Here is wishing everyone a very useful and productive few days during the Convention....

In solidarity and peace.

*Admiral L Ramdas*



## FOREWORD

### Problems and Prospects

By Admiral L. Ramdas (Retd.)  
Chairperson, Indian Chapter

Let me at the very outset welcome all our friends from Pakistan, who have demonstrated extraordinary courage by making this trip to Bangalore, despite the prevailing unfavourable conditions, to attend the Fifth Joint Convention of the Forum. We are indeed happy that you are here, and I trust that all of you are reasonably well housed and comfortable. Please do forgive us for shortcomings if any. We will try to put that right if you could kindly let our colleagues from the Bangalore chapter know about them. Meanwhile, I would also like to place on record our grateful thanks and appreciation to the Honourable Chief Minister of Karnataka, Shri S.M. Krishna, and his government for extending their support to this Convention. We did have a few hiccups not very long ago, but the sagacity and courage of our Chief Minister has helped us overcome them.

#### Problems

The past twenty eight months since we met in Peshawar, have been eventful to say the least. We went through a "High" soon after our Convention when the leadership in both our countries signed the "Lahore Declaration" in February, 1999. Indeed you will recall we as the Forum had welcomed this development. Unfortunately, the euphoria was short lived as both our countries moved from this straight into the Kargil war/conflict in April 1999. The after effect of this disastrous "Low" is continuing to impact on our bilateral relations. From a hot war it has now degenerated into a cold war with lots of violence and flaying of innocent civilians. The recent slaying of 35 Sikhs in Anantnag District of Jammu and Kashrnir, was one of the most heinous and despicable acts of violence. Violence of all kinds must be condemned, and we as the peoples of our two great countries must continue to strive more than ever before to bring an end to this form of madness.

Kargil has continued to dominate the mind set of peoples and governments in both our countries. We saw the fall of both the governments in 1999. In India, by the government losing by a solitary vote resulting in fresh elections, and in Pakistan by a military takeover - which is not an unfamiliar route for a change of government in Pakistan. It was indeed a strange coincidence, for just as Mr Vajpayee was being sworn in in New Delhi, General Pervez Musharraf was taking over in Islamabad - both on October 12, 1999. There has been a lot of the usual rhetoric, and war mongering from both sides ever since. Further aggravating the situation came the

hijacking of the Indian Airlines aircraft, which also did not help matters.

The heightened acts of militancy and terrorism, cross border exchange of artillery fire, killings and slayings, generally excerpted violence all around. I watch the television channels of both our countries every day. The propaganda is so good that I often feel that they have been authored by the same multinational handling publicity for both countries, who just substitute the words Pakistan and India in each other's scripts! What do you think, may I ask, is this kind of media blitz doing to the minds of our peoples especially the young ones - except to whip up anti India / anti Pakistani feelings? The propaganda hype has become very bad in recent months, which has made it even more imperative that we inform our leadership that they must stop all forms of violence immediately and also cease lending support of any kind to all acts of violence no matter how justified the cause may appear to be. Only with the termination of violence can we hope to get any form of dialogue going. In my view, dialogue for dialogue's sake is a non starter under the existing, situation when the Pakistani leadership insists on supporting Jihad in Kashmir. We have to re-examine this very important issue carefully and come up with innovative and workable solutions. I do hope we will devote more time and effort in this direction during our deliberations here in Bangalore. Some of you may feel that I have stirred up a hornets' nest, but we do need to have a fresh look at this important issue.

The recent visit of Mr. Clinton's to the sub continent has only made things a little more complex. So long as we are clear in the Forum that we as neighbours have to live in peace then alone will such actions and initiatives emerge that will automatically fall into place. We have come together to defend both peace and democracy. Democracy has received a very serious setback in Pakistan by the recent military takeover. The Forum should not rest unless this is corrected and peoples chosen representatives get a chance to govern and guide their destinies in Pakistan. A military leadership, which has scant respect for a democratically elected government can hardly be the champion and crusader for self determination in Kashmir or elsewhere. Needless to say we appreciate the strong stand taken by many groups in Pakistan who have called for an early return to civilian rule. The recent statement in this regard by Mr. Khattak of the Pakistani Human Rights Commission needs to be applauded.

## **Prospects**

We certainly have many challenges ahead of us. How can we as the Forum, do something concrete to help resolve some of these issues. Many people ask me what has your Forum achieved, has it made any impact on the governments, has it made it any easier for people to travel across the borders, what are you people doing for resolving the Kashmir question and so on. The questions as you can imagine are endless. What is becoming

ers. increasingly clear is that we need to look at some of these things in  
ange of perspective, and perhaps in a slightly different light. We need to see how  
ound. the Forum can act as a catalyst to make our peoples' movement for peace  
' The and democracy more broad based and youth oriented. I feel we need to  
by the invest in the younger generation in order to create and sustain the right kind  
stitute of attitudes on both sides of the border, because the issues that confront us  
, may are not going to disappear for sometime to come. Moreover we have  
acially opened up new wounds which are going to take some time to heal.

?' The This brings me to the urgent need to create a culture of peace, and peace  
made education in both our countries. This is vital to correct the misinformation  
st stop generated in the minds of our youths by the devastating effects of both print  
of any and electronic media. Teesta's KHOJ programme and Anita Ratnam's  
near to initiative in getting children to visit each other in India and Pakistan are  
orm of sterling examples of the form of investment I am talking about. We need  
starter many more such initiatives.

sts on We also need to look at the security implications for both countries more  
ortant seriously. I propose that we consider setting up a Joint Security Advisory  
s. I do Group comprising of say three to four members from both chapters of our  
g our Forum. This group could take stock of various issues and come up with  
red up workable recommendations and suggestions in respect of demilitarisation  
: issue. and, de-nuclearisation and confidence building measures.

things In the areas of trade and development, literally the sky is the limit. Can we  
we as not bring greater pressure to bear on our governments to startup on these  
tiatives issues immediately? The continued insistence of Kashmir first or nothing else  
ther to is unrealistic. For example just imagine if this kind of logic had prevailed, we  
serious as people should have also waited indefinitely to form the Forum. I do  
ld not believe that we need to get going in areas where there is no real problem in  
chance working together immediately. Surely trade, and travel can begin soon. The  
which the greater number of links which bind us, the more will they strengthen  
be the peace and stability in the region. Vested business interests, especially as  
where. economic cooperation grows, will make certain that peace is not disturbed.  
ups in For no body wants war to come in the way of making money. The future of  
recent our countries and our peoples depends more on our economic and social  
Rights revival rather than on Bombs and Bombast. Come let us as the members of  
the Forum from both our countries, link hands and march ahead, and show  
the way to our peoples for a peaceful and prosperous South Asia.

Forum, I would like to end by quoting from the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad Ch 2  
people Verse 34.

on the  
oss the  
on and  
coming

"Astoma sat gamaya  
Tamosoma Jyotir Gamaya  
Mfityoma Amritam gamaya  
Om Shanti, Shanti, Shanti"

## Thematic Subjects

	Co - Chairpersons		Rapporteurs	
	India	Pakistan	India	Pakistan
Democratic Governance	Mr. B. Narasing Rao	Dr. Haroon	Mr. Salil Biswas	Mr Iqbal Haider Butt
Kashmir	Adml. L. Ramdas	Dr. Mubashir Hasan	Ms. Rita Manchanda	
Religious Intolerance	Ms. Rati Bartholomew	Mr. Kwaja Wasim	Mr. M.T. Khan	
Demilitarization and De-nuclearization	Mr Hemchandra Basappa	Mr Karamat Ali	Shreyas	Mr Irian Mufli
Globalization and Regional Co-operation	Ms. Ritu Dewan	Mr. Rashid Rahman	Mr. Ranabir Samaddar	

# THE CRISIS OF GOVERNANCE - INDIA AND PAKISTAN

By

B. Narsing Rao, Hyderabad

India and Pakistan are passing through a critical phase in the entire area of governance. In Pakistan, the subversion of the constitutional order ushered in by the military takeover for the fourth time in its history has once again proved the fragility of democratic structures and the decisive role that the army plays in the polity. Irrespective of who was responsible for the conflict in Kargil, the political system lies in tatters. The very fact that this conflict followed the Lahore Declaration of the two Prime Ministers, raise serious questions about the location of decision making powers in the polity.

That the army had a final say is beyond doubt. The dissensions in the Pakistani political system and governmental structures burst into the open.

This in turn has helped in characterization of Pakistan polity as an unstable entity that cannot be trusted by a self-righteous ruling elite in India.

India went in for nuclear explosions in 1998 and it was immediately followed by Pakistan. Thus commenced the nuclear race in the sub-continent. Both cite security concerns as the main motivation for nuclearization. Apart from the enormous costs involved, and the oppressive burden that it imposes on the people of the two countries, it could not prevent the conflict from erupting so soon after the explosions and the Lahore Declaration. Lessons of history have not been learnt by the ruling classes of the two countries. "Nuclear deterrence" as a theory is out moded. Possession of nuclear weapons has not prevented hundreds of wars in different parts of the world. That a superpower like the USA could not use nuclear weapons in Vietnam is a most glaring example of futility and unsuitability of nuclear weapons, which do not deter anyone from launching aggression, intervening in other countries, or preventing people from fighting for their legitimate national rights. Fifty years after the Second World War, the immorality and untenability of nuclear weapons has been proved beyond doubt. Yet, our ruling elites continue to preach and practice the nuclear mantra, which can only lead to nuclear destruction. A whole set of ideas are propagated to justify and rationalize their actions.

A policy of confrontation is set in motion. "National Security" as a prime concern is invoked to adopt a tough posture towards the other and mass hysteria is sought to be generated, as in the case of India in the recent Kargil conflict, and calls for Jihad in Pakistan. That the intrusions in Kargil happened over a period of time and the inability of the Indian government to detect and act on time is a scathing comment on the monumental failure of governance. A massive media buildup shows the "other" losing on the battlefield generating a jingoistic and chauvinistic fervour that is portrayed

as nationalism and patriotism. Be it "throwing out the enemy" or "liberation", or "jihad", the process deliberately creates and keeps alive a sense of insecurity and paranoia. The visual media has exacerbated such visions, images and beliefs. The bogey of a threat from across the border is kept alive all the time to stress the need to transform the Indian state from its so-called "soft" nature into a "hard" state. This involves strengthening and reinforcing the repressive machinery, centralization of power, intolerance of dissent and enactment of laws, which infringe the rights of the citizen guaranteed by the citizen.

In India, a dangerous process has been deliberately set in motion by the ruling party to redefine history, culture and art. Over the last two years, writers, artists, historians and the world of cinema have been subjected to attacks from organizations like the RSS, VHP and Bajrang Dal, who profess to be true defenders of Hindu culture. And now, the government itself is openly defending their actions. Religious minorities are constantly under threat what with their institutions demolished, priests burnt alive, and new laws as in Uttar Pradesh, that blatantly deny the rights of minorities guaranteed in the Constitution. Be it Deepa Mehta, M. F. Hussain, Asghar Ali Engineer, or historians like Sumeet Sarkar and K. N. Panikkar, the issue involved is one and the same - freedom of expression and the right to dissent. The battle of ideas is on in India.

The ban on the shooting of the film, "Water", has serious implications for the status of women in Indian society. For centuries, widows have been treated as virtual outcasts in Indian society. Woman ceases to be a person once she loses her husband, and she is at the mercy of those around in the family, or become a vagrant. Often she is an object of ridicule. Widows who leave their inhospitable homes and settle down in temple towns like Brindavan and Varanasi for sake of survival on charity, become objects of such sheer exploitation. And this is precisely what the film seems to portray.

Depicting this stark reality is unpalatable to the Sangh Parivar and its allies. Its too well-known that these women are at the mercy of Pandas and their agents who are rapacious and greedy, making money at their expense. Any attempt by women to question their status in society is intolerable for the protagonists of Hindutva. Over the decades, films in Indian languages were made in which, widows and women in particular, are shown as socially ostracised. But, here at this point of time in our nation's life, such issues are being deliberately objected to, as part of the cultural Fascism which is on the agenda of the Parivar. The other side of the coin is Muslim orthodoxy and fundamentalism. Shabana Azmi's shaving her head and acting in the film has been severely condemned by the All India Muslim Mahaz and other similar groups as un-Islamic. Such elements are responsible for forcing the Rajiv Gandhi government to reverse the Shahbanu Judgement of the Supreme Court, which sought to provide protection to divorced Muslim

women. In Pakistan also, women are victims of the worst kind of violence. Murders in the name of honour are common.

The RSS and its allies are laying down codes of conduct and behaviour in every walk of life. In Uttar Pradesh, a campaign has been launched to regulate the dress of girls in schools and colleges. Compulsion and force are used to make them obey their diktats. In this ferocious campaign, the State government connives actively and even issues orders.

An obnoxious piece of legislation was recently passed by the UP Assembly. It is called the "UP Public Buildings, Places of Worship Regulation Bill", which requires permission from the District Magistrate to build a place of worship, or to use a place for the purpose of worship. It empowers the Magistrate to stop construction of a structure for worship and prevent the use of any building for the same purpose. This law is a direct attack on the Freedom of Religion enshrined in the Constitution. Muslims in UP see this as an infringement of their religious rights and an atmosphere of fear is prevalent among them.

Minority communities in India find themselves most insecure now than at any time in recent history. Murder of the Christian Missionary, Staines in Orissa, burning down of churches in Gujarat, and re-conversion of tribals in both these States are glaring instances of the on-going process of Fascism leading to tensions and a disturbed society. Bal Thackeray, the Shiv Sena Supremo declares that, "only Hindus have a right to determine India's destiny, Muslims do not have this right", as reported by Samna, the Shiv Sena mouthpiece.

Rewriting history is one of the passions of all Fascist ruling classes. The present regime is engaged in erasing all secular, liberal and democratic values inherited from the freedom struggle. Research bodies like the ICHR, ICSSR, and NCERT are being packed with RSS men who are least qualified to do or supervise any scientific research. Books by respected scholars like Sumeet Sarkar and K. N. Panikkar are withdrawn at the behest of the RSS. Facts are twisted out of context. The entire national movement, its achievements and the values it represented are sought to be erased from history books and a new "nationalism" of the RSS ideology is being incorporated. Rejection of the nature of Indian society as pluralistic is a major premise on which the ideology constructs ideas of hegemony of Hindutva.

In the realm of constitutional and legal structures of the Indian state, a decisive break is being attempted. Whatever the Constitution Review Committee may recommend, the direction being given by the RSS is unambiguous as expressed by its new leader, that the Constitution be scrapped and a new one in its place be drafted by a new Constituent Assembly. Here then, is the real intent of destroying the Constitution's ideology of a liberal, secular democracy and replacing it with a monolithic, hegemonic and authoritarian system.

Under the pretext of controlling terrorism, new laws to replace the notorious TADA are being enacted by various states. Prevention of Terrorism Act in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu provides for designated courts which would presume that the accused has committed the offense whereas the Criminal Procedure Court lays down that a person is to be considered innocent until proved guilty. Such a provision leaves no room for the accused to defend himself, a denial of fundamental rights. In the name of fighting terrorism, ordinary citizens are made victims of state terror, suspending the rule of law. Hardly any criminals, gangsters of the underworld, and terrorists are ever punished; they go scot-free what with the nexus between them and politicians and bureaucrats. In large parts of UP and Bihar, there is no rule of law. Crime and gangsterism are part of the life of the country today. All this points to a decay of the democratic order and a monumental failure of governance.

With the unrelenting pursuit of the policy of privatisation within the framework of globalization, hundreds of industries, particularly in the medium- and small-industries sector, are being closed down, resulting in large-scale unemployment. Even profit-making public-sector industries are being privatised and thrown open to foreign-investment and share holding. Large parts of the country suffer from an acute shortage of water and power, making agriculture an unsustainable occupation and making millions of small farmers and agricultural labourers bereft of any work for their livelihood. "Do away with subsidies" is the cry of the ruling elites. People below the poverty line would be the worst sufferers.

A recent example of the total failure of governance is the massive destruction of life and property caused by floods in Orissa. Thousands died and their homes were destroyed. However, the state government was unable to meet the situation and stood paralysed whereas the Central government simply refused to declare it a national calamity as the state government happened to belong to another political party. Time and again, it has been proved that the Indian state is unprepared to minimise the consequences of natural disasters and mitigate the sufferings of the people. A sad commentary on governance, whereas the repressive machinery goes into action against people fighting for legitimate demands such as the protection of natural resources, environment, etc.

1. Under the circumstances, enlightened public opinion in the two countries has to work for greater democratization involving the largest number of people in the processes and levels of decision making. Enlargement of the scope of democracy and not abridgement is of prime importance for both the countries.
2. Both the governments should create conditions for greater movement of people and exchange of ideas across the borders.



3. Both governments should undertake not to foment the forces of hatred and animosity.
4. Both governments should refrain from encouraging directly or indirectly, groups and forces that try to subvert the society and polity of the other country.

Governance requires constant re-examination. The two countries are not just geographically contiguous, they share a larger civilizational heritage which cannot be wished away. Compulsions of history and geography emphatically point out the urgent need to live as peaceful neighbours, establish mutually beneficial relationships, and work towards a just society in the sub-continent.

## REPORT OF THE GROUP ON GOVERNANCE

Chairperson : Mr. Narsing Rao

Rapporteurs : Iqbal Haider Butt (Pakistan)

Sabil Biswas (India)

It was agreed at the outset by the Group that governance was too broad a theme to be discussed in depth in an hour and the Group would therefore address only a few specific areas.

The discussion revolved around the question of domestic grievances and the failure to solve them both in Pakistan and India. Good governance should ensure participatory democracy for the people and the grievances should create opportunities for the public to participate in the decision - making process. The constitution in India assures certain democratic norms of Governance, but in reality, popular participation in governance is limited to casting votes in periodic elections. The objective of serving the people has been subordinated to a process of achieving self-seeking goals.

In Pakistan democracy is non-existent. Military rulers believe in establishing a controlled democracy which is obviously a contradiction in terms. Civil society which is now being held at ransom must assert itself.

Manipulative methods, false rhetoric and corrupt executive practices have alienated the people to such an extent that they give little credence even to the possibility of democratic functioning. The total lack of transparency and accountability has led to concentration of power in corrupt hands.

The yawning gap between reality and constitutional guarantees is one of the reasons behind the rise of fascist forces which intend to destroy the very nature of Indian polity.

In Pakistan similar anti democratic forces repress the people. This has made for a near total breakdown in the rule of law in both the countries. Certain groups - religious and other wise - are making a mockery of governance by projecting themselves as extra - legal controllers of social and political norms.

In the absence of popular participation in governance, the governments are failing to provide basic amenities to the people, to ensure safety for minorities, to curb open religious intolerance, to prevent crimes against women, to put an end to exploitation of child labour, to protect common people from being displaced from traditional habitats in the name of development and to put an end to the politician - criminal nexus.

Constitutionally guaranteed rights are being violated everyday in various walks of life. In the field of culture, attempts to control freedom of expression is cancelling out constitutional safeguards. In education, increasing politicization is leading to a breakdown in governance as well as educational standards. In Pakistan the education system has been utterly

subverted to serve the interests of the rulers.

The Group felt that decentralization is one way of ensuring participatory goals. A proper division of power between the Centre and the States, between the states and local bodies may create a system which could help people to participate in policy decisions as well as its actual functioning. However, local self-governance has certain built-in problems such as the creation of petty yet tremendously repressive tyranny and corruption. In Pakistan where there is decentralization, it is without the necessary checks. As a result such efforts may be manipulated to devise a system of control which would bring in more repression instead of empowering the people. In certain parts of Pakistan, it could help perpetuate the power of local feudal landlords. Still, the group felt, local self government and decentralization of power could give a powerful impetus to establish or strengthen democratic goals.

The discussion ended with an assertion that in both countries, governments should be committed to national goals and work for transparency, responsibility and accountability in governance.

## **Resolutions**

1. Work towards establishing truly participatory democracy.
2. Call for effective de-centralization with adequate safeguards.
3. Work towards devising watch-dog bodies from among the people.
4. Demand the right of information, especially in Pakistan
5. Demand protection for minorities
6. Demand protection for women
7. Fight against all attempts to subvert cultural freedom
8. Put a stop to politicisation of education while protecting the right of the student and teachers to organise themselves.
9. Call upon both states to fulfill their obligations under their respective constitutions, as well as the - international conventions and covenants, relating to the rights of citizens to which the states are signatories. They must guarantee to all citizens their basic human rights, especially as per
  - (a) Universal Declaration of Human Rights
  - (b) U.N. Covenants on Economic, Social, Cultural and Political Rights
  - (c) U.N. Convention on Elimination of all form of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)
  - (d) The ILO Conventions.

### Group on Governance:

1. Mr. Narsing Rao (India)
2. Iqbal Haider Butt (Pakistan)
3. Salil Biswas (India)
4. Azeez Durrani (Pakistan)
5. Ms. Musurat Gillani (Pakistan)
6. Mr. Pandya (India)
7. Ms. Tara (India)
8. Ms. Debjani Dutta (India)
9. Mr. Moses (India)
10. Mr. Setalvad (India)
11. Ms. Alia Cassim

# Building Peace in Kashmir.

(Draft for discussion by members of Pakistan-India Peoples'  
Forum for Peace and Democracy)

*By Tapan K. Bose*

## Prologue:

In August 1947, the British left, after partitioning the Indian subcontinent into two independent nation states, India and Pakistan on religious-communal lines. There were 562 "princely states" in British Indian Empire. Maharajas, Rajas and Nawabs ruled over these territories under the suzerainty of the British Crown. On the lapse of British paramountcy, these rulers were "legally" free to decide whether to join either of the two new states or remain independent. This legal choice of independence was essentially a hypothetical one. The religious composition of the subjects and the geographical location of these princely states dictated their merger with the newly emerged successor nation states of India and Pakistan. No princely state could become independent.

Maharaja Hari Singh, the Hindu ruler of the mountain kingdom of Jammu and Kashmir, however was anxious for independence. The princely state of Jammu and Kashmir embracing over 128,000 square kilometres was uniquely placed as a buffer territory between India and Pakistan and had common borders with Afghanistan and China. Neither Pakistan nor India was ready to accept an independent Jammu and Kashmir. They kept on pressing the Maharaja to accede to either of the new states. Pakistan claimed this territory, as 72 percent of the Maharaja's subjects were Muslim. India wanted the Muslim majority territory of Kashmir as an emblem of her secularism. Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, the most popular leader of Kashmir's anti-monarchy movement of the thirties and the forties, had encouraged the Indian leaders to believe that Kashmiri Muslims wanted to merge with a secular India. However, the Maharaja had put the Sheikh and other leaders of the Kashmir democracy movement behind the bars. He offered a "stand-still" agreement to India and Pakistan, as he wanted some more time to make up his mind. Pakistan signed the agreement but India refused.

As the Maharaja continued to dither, violence broke out in the Jammu and Punch regions where sections of the local Muslim population wanted to merge with Pakistan. There was a similar revolt in the northern hill territory of Gilgit. In violation of the "stand-still" agreement, Pakistan stopped the passage of food and other essential commodities to Jammu and Kashmir through her territory. In September 1947, tribal raiders backed by Pakistan army invaded the valley. The Maharaja requested India to send in its armed forces. India made it contingent upon his signing the instrument of

accession in favour of India. The ruler signed the instrument of accession, and India accepted it with the proviso that after the restoration of normalcy, the final political status of the territory would be decided through a referendum. Indian soldiers were airlifted to Srinagar on October 27, 1947. India and Pakistan began their first war in less than three months of coming into being as independent states.

In January 1948, India appealed to the Security Council of the United Nations to restore peace in Kashmir. On January 20, 1948, the UN Commission on India and Pakistan (UNCIP) was constituted. (UNSC Resolution S/654) In April 1948, the UN adopted the first Plebiscite Resolution. The resolution called upon Pakistan "to withdraw all its armed personnel including the tribesmen from the territory of Jammu and Kashmir". It asked India "to reduce its armed forces to the minimum level needed to maintain law and order" and to hold a plebiscite as soon as possible on the question of accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan. The plebiscite administrator was to be nominated by the UN Secretary General. ((UNSC Resolution S/726, April 21, 1948.) A UN crafted cease-fire was implemented on January 1, 1949. The plebiscite resolution was reaffirmed.

Between 1949 and 1958 UNCIP made several attempts to implement the plebiscite resolution. Even partition of the territory along the cease-fire line with limited plebiscite in the valley was proposed at one stage. The intransigence of India and Pakistan defeated every effort of the UN.

India and Pakistan created two separate political entities on the disputed territory - "Government of Jammu and Kashmir State" (India) and "Government of Azad Kashmir" (Pakistan) under the stewardship of their yes-men. The emergence of these political entities altered the ground situation as these new "stake holders" started manipulating the people of the divided territory on the command of their masters in Delhi and Karachi. The Kashmiris, who disagreed with New Delhi or Karachi, were soon put behind the bars. By 1958, within ten years of having taken the Kashmir dispute to the United Nations, and having asked for international intervention in the resolution of the dispute, India changed its position on outside mediation in Kashmir. As a result, during 1960 and 1964 India turned down the offers of mediation by President Nasser of Egypt, President Kennedy of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of United Kingdom.

The second Indo-Pakistan war on Kashmir took place in 1965. The third Indo-Pakistan war of 1971, which began on the soil of former East Pakistan and present Bangladesh, spilled over onto the territory of Kashmir. For the last fifty-two years, India and Pakistan have been virtually at war with each other. At times this war has been fought with guns, but most of the time it has been a verbal duel. The so-called "Kashmir dispute" lies at the very core of this enmity. Both India and Pakistan feel incomplete without Kashmir.

Because of this enmity the people of the former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir have been living under virtual war conditions. The cease-fire line of 1949, which became the Line of Control (LoC) after the third Indo-Pakistan war of 1971 continues to be violated by both sides. These intermittent armed conflicts have taken a heavy toll on the lives of Kashmiris over the last five decades.

In 1989 sections of Kashmiris began a militant movement for national self-determination. In retaliation, Indian government let loose a reign of terror in Kashmir valley. Pakistan aided and abetted this armed struggle and tried to use it to further its own agenda in Kashmir. While India calls the movement in Kashmir "Pakistan's proxy war," Pakistan says that it is merely providing moral support to the Kashmiris in their struggle for a just cause.

Since 1948, India and Pakistan have held several rounds of "official dialogues" to resolve the Kashmir dispute and other "outstanding" conflicts. However, these were dialogues between the deaf, where both sides merely asserted and reasserted their respective positions. As a result of this stalemate, the two governments have often resorted to military means for resolving disputes.

The first meeting of Indian and Pakistani Defence Secretaries on the dispute over Siachen glacier began in January 1986. The talks continued for three years, culminating in the meeting of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan in Islamabad in July 1989 where the "broad parameters of Siachen agreement" were worked out. However, when the military commanders of both countries met in New Delhi in August 1989 "to determine the position of their respective forces in Siachen," the talks failed. Despite the agreement on "broad parameters" by the Prime Ministers, Siachen dispute remains unresolved till date. Similarly, the talks on the Wuller Lake Barrage, which began in 1987, after eight unsuccessful rounds ended in a stalemate in 1992. After a break of nearly two years, during which India and Pakistan indulged in the most violent form of verbal sabre rattling, the official dialogue was resumed in 1994. The Lahore Declaration of February 1999, was the culmination of this process. It seemed that the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan, had agreed to shun military means and resolve all the disputes through negotiations. The Lahore Declaration lent vigour to the voices for peace on both sides of the border. The people of India and Pakistan began to hope for meaningful cooperation and peace. This opening created by the Lahore Declaration once again was closed by the latest war in Kargil.

### **The Indian Position on Kashmir:**

1. The state of Jammu and Kashmir is now, and has been since its accession to India on 26 October 1947, an integral part of the Indian Union. Nothing agreed to by India in the UN Security Council of 13

August 1948 and January 5, 1949, or in any subsequent instrument, alters this status or in any way modifies Indian sovereignty over the state.

2. The only component of the Kashmir issue legally admissible in the talks between India and Pakistan on the future status of the state pertains to Pakistan vacating the territories illegally occupied by it. The future status of the state is otherwise an exclusively domestic matter to be resolved, within the four corners of the Indian Constitution.
3. Talks between India and Pakistan in regard to the future status of the state should be held within a strictly bilateral framework and in conformity with the Shimla Agreement of July 1972.

### **The Pakistani Position on Kashmir:**

1. The state of Jammu and Kashmir is now, and has been since the end of British rule over undivided India, a disputed territory. The state's accession to India in October 1947 was provisional. This understanding is formally acknowledged in the UN Security Council resolutions of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949 to which both Pakistan and India agreed and which remains fully in force today, and cannot be unilaterally discarded by either party.
2. Talks between India and Pakistan over the future status of the state should be focused upon securing the right of self-determination for the Kashmiri people through the conduct of a free, fair and internationally supervised plebiscite, as agreed to in the aforementioned UN Security Council resolutions.
3. The plebiscite should offer the people of Jammu and Kashmir the choice of permanent accession of the entire state to either Pakistan or India.
4. Talks between India and Pakistan in regard to the future of the status of the state should be held in conformity both with the Shimla Agreement of July 1972 and the aforementioned UN Security Council resolutions. An international mediation in these talks should not be ruled out.

### **The Current Situation: Kargil war, Indians, Pakistanis and Kashmiris**

The war in Kargil is apparently over. The soldiers and other warring parties have pulled back. Indian and Pakistani citizens have heaved a sigh of relief. Yet, peace remains a distant objective. According to the latest reports, guns have already started booming across the Line of Control (LoC) in Kupwara and Jammu. Several lives have been lost after the cease-fire of Kargil. The sordid saga of sibling rivalry continues.

According to newspaper reports, the Indian army has pulled out 52 battalions from counter insurgency operations in Kashmir in which it has



been engaged for the past 10 years. It seems that the Indian army has decided to disassociate itself from the day to day counter-insurgency operations in the valley and other areas of Jammu. However, the Director General of Police of Jammu and Kashmir has said that he anticipated an increase in the activities of the militants after the Kargil cease-fire. He has asked for more paramilitary forces to deal with the situation. *(Between July 16 and 27 about 60 persons, including women, children and migrant workers from outside Kashmir were killed by suspected terrorists in Jammu region of Kashmir.)*

While the cease-fire of Kargil brought a temporary respite to the citizens of India and Pakistan, for the people of Kashmir it meant a mere shift in the venue of war. The supporters of the Mujahideens in Pakistan threatened to turn their guns against Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif because of his remark that India and Pakistan should try to move away from their hard-line positions on Kashmir in order to resolve the Kashmir dispute through negotiations.

By 1982, the Indian forces had established effective military control over the un-demarcated Siachen glacier area by occupying the heights of Saltoro ridge on the western edge of the glacier. Since the failure of the Siachen talks in 1989, Pakistan has been trying to capture the high mountain posts in Kargil sector to offset its disadvantage in Siachen. In 1997 there was a major confrontation between Indian and Pakistani forces in Kargil which claimed several civilian lives and caused large-scale damage to civilian property. During the November 1998 round of official talks between India and Pakistan, the Indian side is reported to have reneged on the 1989 understanding of demilitarisation of Siachen glacier through mutual withdrawal of forces. India apparently refused to pull back from Saltoro ridge. It instead offered a cease-fire which would consolidate its effective control over the entire glacier.

### **Nuclear weapons increase the stake:**

The war in the Kargil sector of Kashmir, which began in the first week of May 1999, was one of the many skirmishes on the LoC in which the armies of the two countries have been engaged during the last three decades. Normally, such border skirmishes did not get wide spread media attention. They were seen as routine clashes in the distant hills of Kashmir. The governments did not bring back "body bags" of dead soldiers to bring the war nearer the homes of the ordinary citizens. However, this time the stakes were higher. Since the induction of nuclear weapons in their arsenal a year ago, the two countries had acquired greater self-images as "invincible military powers".

This time, Pakistan pushed the "intruders" much deeper into the Indian controlled territory across the LoC in Kargil and Drass than before. India

upped the ante by unleashing its air force at an early stage of the skirmish. Both sides threatened to use "all" weapons. The fear of a nuclear holocaust became real. It was frightening to see how sections of the media of both India and Pakistan manipulated news, as if the press had become the force multiplier of the military. The newspapers and electronic media were competing with each other in portraying their patriotic ardour. On the front pages of the newspapers there was no space for peace. Stories about citizens groups calling for peace and holding of peace rallies were either not published, or buried deep inside. The only other news from Kashmir that appeared in the Indian newspapers were stories of activities of militants. In all these stories while the criminal activities of the militants were highlighted, virtually nothing was reported about the excesses committed by Indian security forces. The media's reluctance to report Indian government's callous handling of the refugees of Kargil was yet another example of its politics and priorities.

### **Voices of peace, voices of sanity:**

During the past five years, the voices for peace and normalisation of India Pakistan relations have gained considerable momentum. The increasing demand on both sides of the border for lifting the ban on India-Pakistan trade, the growing viewership of Pakistan television in India and Indian satellite television channels in Pakistan, the lengthening queue of people seeking visas outside the embassies of India and Pakistan and the starting of a bus service between Lahore and Delhi are indications of the fact that the peoples of India and Pakistan want and need peace.

Indian and Pakistani civil society institutions and public forums have already started working on humanitarian issues together. The growing popularity of Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy, the partial success of the joint campaigns for the release and repatriation of prisoners and the joint campaign for the protection of human rights defenders in both countries are evidence of a growing alliance. These are the building blocks for a sustainable peace. They show that the civil societies of the two countries are slowly moving towards reconciliation, that together they will be able to heal the scars and the wounds of the partition of 1947.

When guns start blazing and soldiers die, it is natural that patriotic passions will rise. Under these circumstances, ordinary people who do not want war, feel compelled to support the soldiers fighting on the front and the war efforts of the government. In such situations the voices for peace become feeble. Unlike the days of the 1965 and 1971 Indian-Pakistan wars, this time the ordinary peoples of the two countries showed far less jingoistic fervour. In both the countries significant sections of citizens continued to call for caution and asked for an end to hostilities. This had a restraining effect on the war hysteria that was being whipped up by the ultra nationalists through

the media and on the streets.

Weak and small as they might have been, at the time of crisis these voices represented the urge of society to live in peace. It was heartening to note that Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy and other democratic organisations throughout the ten-week long Kargil war remained active in both countries. Joint statements were issued calling on the two governments immediately to end hostilities, demilitarise the LoC and to begin dialogues for resolution of all outstanding disputes, including Kashmir. The members of the Forum in several cities of India and Pakistan in collaboration with other civil society organisations and NGOs held public meetings and peace rallies to mobilise public opinion for peace. While the statements of the Forum and news about its activities were published by a few of the leading newspapers in India and Pakistan, the majority of them ignored it.

### **The Importance of Kargil**

As newspaper reports indicated, the people of the Valley were least bothered about the ongoing war in Kargil. They were more concerned about the loss of business due to lack of tourists, and the fate of the refugees, and apprehensive of brutal reprisal by security forces on suspicion of helping the enemy. The loud claims of Pakistan that it was Kashmiri freedom fighters who were waging a liberation war in Kargil and that Pakistan army was not involved, found very few takers in the Valley. Other than a section of the leaders of the All Parties Hurriyat Committee, no Kashmiri had come forward in support of the "freedom fighters" in Kargil. The average persons in the valley were neither excited by the activities of the so-called "freedom fighters" nor were they sympathetic to the Indian soldiers. It seemed that they were patiently waiting for this current crisis to blow over.

No peace rally was held in Srinagar or elsewhere in Kashmir. The Kashmiri intellectuals and other civil society actors who support the work of Pakistan-India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy were afraid to express their support in public because of the threat of the guns. In the prevailing gun culture of Kashmir, "peace" has become a dirty word. It is risky for the moderate Kashmiris to speak out for peace as they have been targeted by Indian and Pakistani war machines as well as by the militants and *mujahideen*.

### ***Kashmiriyat* - Kashmiri Nationalism:**

Kashmiri nationalism or *Kashmiriyat* was the main source of inspiration of the political reforms movement in the thirties in the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir. The movement was anti-monarchy, anti-colonial and pro-democracy. *Kashmiriyat* represented human dignity, social justice, freedom of conscience and religion and economic security for the common

masses. It is obvious that in their endeavour to create a broad coalition of peoples, the leaders of Kashmiri national movement did not adequately address the issues of minority rights, ethnicity and regional autonomy. The linguistic, cultural and religious diversity of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir was subsumed in the overarching concept of *Kashmiriyat*. It was essentially a political alliance, which attempted to build a secular democratic national liberation movement. It also tried to build alliances with the other anti-colonial national liberation movements in the subcontinent.

Unfortunately, while the leaders of Kashmiri national movement were trying to build a partnership on the basis of equality, the Indian National Congress and Indian Muslim League wanted the Kashmiris to submerge themselves in either of the "two nations" of which they had become the self appointed brokers. Under this dual pull, Kashmiri national movement finally split on ethno-religious lines. The non-Kashmiri speaking Muslims of Punch, Rajouri and the Northern Areas who had closer linguistic, social and economic ties with west Punjab remained with the Muslim Conference. This section, which was led by religious preachers, a section of the land owning classes and traditional tribal chiefs, supported Muslim League's call for the creation of Pakistan as the homeland of Muslim "nation" on the subcontinent.

Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah and his supporters, the majority of whom did not belong to the landed gentry and the upper classes, formed the National Conference. It had a great following among the Kashmiri speaking, predominantly Muslim population of the Valley. While a small section of the Kashmiri Pandits, the Hindu minority of the Valley, joined the National Conference, the majority of the Kashmiri Pandits, and the Hindus of Jammu as well as Buddhists of Ladakh were organised on religious and ethnic lines under the banners of Kashmir Hindu and Buddhist Mahasangh and Praja Parishad. Despite these differences, Kashmiri national movement remained broadly united in its struggle against the autocratic rule of the Dogras. The National Conference's commitment to radical land reforms, economic support to the dispossessed and establishment of a democratic system of government inspired the masses of Kashmir.

The Muslim League and the Congress ignored the strength of Kashmiri nationalism and its appeal to the common masses of the region. This ignorance led Pakistan in 1947 to believe that Kashmiris would rise in support of its armed actions in the Valley. India's interpretation of the resistance put up by the Kashmiris against the invading forces as a sign of their desire to become an integral part of India was equally faulty. Kashmiris have resisted both these assumptions in their own way, and have paid a very heavy price for it.

## **Kashmiri Civil Society:**

For the last five decades, Kashmiris have lived under virtual war conditions. According to conservative estimates, more than two million Kashmiris have been uprooted from their homes during the last fifty years. The so-called LoC has remained a war zone. Not a year goes by without major exchanges of fire across this line. Every skirmish has taken its toll on Kashmiris. On the both sides of the divide, be it the Indian administered three- fifth of the territory of the former princely state, or the two-fifth of the territory controlled by Pakistan, Kashmiris have been ruled by puppet governments imposed by rulers in New Delhi and Islamabad.

Pakistan and India have been dealing with the two halves of Kashmir under their respective control like colonial masters. Their efforts to create pro-India and pro-Pakistan Kashmiris have fractured the civil society of Kashmir. Emergence of India or Pakistan- sponsored interest groups and the usurpation of political power at local levels by these groups have deepened social and political fissures, alienating vast sections of Kashmiri masses from the local ruling elite. The highhandedness of the states and their local agents, rampant corruption, ruthless suppression of democratic movements and all dissent, gave rise to violent retaliation.

Civil society is the terrain of democratisation. It is the sphere of social interaction between state and society and between communities. For obvious reasons, India and Pakistan did not want a vibrant civil society in Kashmir. They deliberately controlled the growth of citizens' initiatives and public associations through legal and administrative measures. The Kashmiri society today has become polarised on ethnic and religious lines. *Kashmiriyat* or Kashmiri nationalism, which inspired all sections of peoples and communities of the region in the thirties, has lost its appeal.

## **Indian Jammu and Kashmir:**

In Indian Jammu and Kashmir, during the last fifty years, the three dominant ethnic communities, Kashmiris, Dogras and Ladakhis have had very little social and cultural interaction. The Kashmiri Pandits and the Kashmiri Muslims have drifted further and further apart. The Indian state's policy of divide-and-rule, and the practice of empowering one community to the disadvantage of the other, created deepening rift between classes and communities. The inability of the emerging Kashmiri Muslim middle classes to look beyond its self-image as the "majority", and its clamour for the lion's share of all benefits and concessions was one of the major reasons for the alienation of minority communities from *Kashmiriyat*, the all embracing nationalist identity of the thirties.

The militant movement which began in the valley in 1988-89, has only agenda today, the right of "self determination". It is yet to develop its social, economic and cultural policies. The failure of the movement to broaden its

agenda has resulted in the loss of its democratic characteristics. This is why there is virtually no support for the on-going Kashmiri self determination movement in Jammu and Ladakh. This is also the reason for the final departure of Kashmiri Pandits from the Valley. Moreover, today there seems to be little scope for reconciliation, as the Kashmiri Pandits who left the Valley feel that "self-determination" means merger with Pakistan.

### **Pakistani Azad Kashmir:**

The situation in Pakistan held parts of Kashmir is not very different. Ethnically divergent communities of Sudans, Jats and Gujjars inhabit Muzaffarabad, Rawalakot, Mirpur and Kotli regions that are known as "Azad" Kashmir. Gilgit, Baltistan and the northern areas, are the home of the Dardic people. The entire population of Pakistan controlled Kashmir is Muslim. The majority of the population belongs to the Sunni sect of Islam. However, the depth of the appeal of Kashmiri nationalism can be gauged by the fact that though the majority of the people in Pakistan-held Kashmir are non-Kashmiris and do not speak Kashmiri language, most of them still want to be known as Kashmiris. Perhaps there is another explanation. It is the ethnic divergence which has made it necessary for these communities to cling to the common identity of "Kashmiri".

In Pakistani Kashmir too, dissent is not tolerated. The northern areas comprising Gilgit-Baltistan are virtually under direct colonial rule. They do not even have the most basic democratic rights. The Pakistan government has ruthlessly crushed the popular movement for democracy in Gilgit and Baltistan. The entire region is virtually controlled by Pakistan army and its Inter Services Intelligence (ISI).

In the early seventies, when the Mangla Dam was constructed in Mirpur district of Pakistan controlled Azad Kashmir, thousands of acres of fertile land of the Jat peasantry of the district were inundated. Virtually no compensation was paid to the farmers who lost their land. Mirpur derived no benefit from the Mangla project. All the water and electricity went to Punjab. Unable to get justice from Pakistan, the Mirpuris finally turned against Pakistan. During the seventies large number of Mirpuri Jats had migrated to England. Today, they form the mainstay of Kashmir independence movement abroad.

All newspapers in Azad Kashmir and northern areas are controlled by Pakistan's ISI. Intelligence departments harass all dissenters, they are arrested under false charges, tortured and detained for long periods without trial and dubbed as Indian agents. In Pakistani Kashmir, Kashmiri language has lost its space. The National Students Federation (NSF) of Azad Kashmir calls for independent Kashmir. Most of its activists are not Kashmiri speaking; yet they are demanding Kashmiri language to be made the national language.

Unlike the militant groups in Indian Kashmir, who have not been able to develop alliances with democratic forces in India, the NSF of Pakistani Kashmir has been interacting with democratic parties and groups in Pakistan. While in India held Kashmiri, human rights groups have remained isolated from other Indian human rights groups, students organisations and human rights activists of Pakistan held Kashmir have been able to build alliances with Pakistan's human rights movement. Some of them also actively participate in the programmes of Pakistan national chapter of PIPFPD and Pakistan Peace Coalition in different cities of Pakistan.

### **Situation since the rise of Militancy:**

After the rise of the militant movement in the Valley in 1989, the moderates, the thinkers and the ideologues of Kashmir who could have initiated dialogues between communities and classes were either killed or forced into silence. Kashmiris who were known for their hospitality and humanism seem to have lost their capacity to help each other in times of crisis. It has been reported that a very high percentage of the population of the Valley, particularly women, is today mentally paralysed. They suffer from immobilising depression and need treatment.

While sections of Kashmiri human rights activists routinely highlight the violation of human rights by Indian forces, their actions remain confined only to investigation and reporting. Very few seek judicial remedy. There is virtually no humanitarian initiative for the large number of orphans, widows and victims of torture. Even initiatives of Kashmiri women like the "Mothers of the Disappeared" have come under attack. In the early days of militancy, people who spoke of need for reconciliation and return of the Kashmiri Pandits were seen as unpatriotic. Some of them were condemned as enemy agents and killed.

Reconciliation and unity among various religious and ethnic groups is necessary for a secular democratic solution. Since 1947, there has been no attempt to evolve a consensus on forging unity among the different entities in Kashmir. Till 1947, the Valley people complained of suppression by the Maharaja. After 1947, Jammu people started to make similar complaint against the government in the Valley. The ruling elite has been trying to divide Kashmir into several regions on communal lines. Guns and the cries of Holy War have destroyed the cultural foundations of Kashmiriyat - the cultural ethos of having lived together for centuries.

### **Alliance Building: The task of Civil Society**

Alliance building is an important function of civil society. A society turns to violence when it loses its capacity for dialogue with the opposition and build alliances with peacemakers across the political social and cultural divide. What we need is an alliance of civil society initiatives for peace and

reconciliation. As the South African experience demonstrates, it is only through these alliances for peace and reconciliation that a society can hope to rid itself of colonial oppression, violence and hatred. The communal and ethnic divide in Kashmir has to be bridged. Civil society actors and concerned NGOs of India and Pakistan have to work together with Kashmiri civil society actors and NGOs to counter the process of militarisation and strengthen the forces of democratisation.

The process of building solidarity between Indian/Pakistani civil society groups and Kashmiris has been hampered by the failure to recognise that just as the democratic agenda has been compromised in Kashmir, so too has it been compromised in India and Pakistan. For too long, violation of human rights and denial of democracy in Kashmir have found no echoes in the national human rights communities of India and Pakistan. If that pattern is to be broken, there is need for Kashmiris to be more sensitive to democratic crisis and human rights violations in India and Pakistan. Similarly, Indian/Pakistani civil society-organisations need to join efforts and strengthen the voices of Kashmiri groups.

It should be recognised that there exists a close nexus between the democratic rights of the people of Kashmir and of the peoples of South Asia, which means that the struggle of the Kashmiri people for their democratic rights cannot be separated from the South Asian people's struggle for democratic rights.



## REPORT OF THE GROUP ON KASHMIR

Co-Chairpersons: Admiral Ramdas and Dr Mubashir Hasan

The discussions were essentially structured around three draft resolutions/proposals on the Kashmir issue- the first by Tapan Bose, the second by Dr Mubashir Hasan who reworked on that draft, and the third proposed by the Madhya Pradesh chapter.

In addition, Tahira Abdullah tabled on behalf of Amit Chakravarty ( who was unable to come to Bangalore,) a proposal to take the Kashmir issue to the International Court of Justice at the Hague and ask for an advisory opinion. However, several of the delegates at this rather crowded working group argued that Kashmir was not a juridical issue to be referred to the ICJ, just as it was not a mere territorial issue. It was a political issue which involved the wishes of the people in all areas of Jammu and Kashmir.

In essence, the difference between the two resolutions of Tapan Bose and Dr Hasan, revolved around the issue of holding 'elections' in J & K as a process by which the Kashmiris can choose their own representatives to conduct a political dialogue with the governments of India and Pakistan. Dr Hasan and several other delegates felt that at this stage - before the ground work for building as wide a consensus as possible was laid, going in for elections would unleash extreme violence. However the need for urging the two governments to facilitate a process by which the Kashmiris could choose their genuine representatives was recognised. Both the resolutions rested on the Forum's position as articulated in the successive Joint Declarations of the Forum reaffirming the rights and wishes of the Kashmiris in all areas of J & K to be taken into account.

Certain specific changes to the draft resolutions were proposed, including one, calling for a halt to the use of rape as an instrument of war in Kashmir, and two, the release of political detenus to create the conditions for a political dialogue.

On behalf of the Madhya Pradesh chapter, V T Joshi explained their proposal to urge the governments of India and Pakistan to accept the LoC as an international boundary and to make it a soft border - the logic being that a military solution was not possible and to keep harping on the human problem of the Kashmiri people would condemn us to hostility and conflict.

Several delegates fundamentally disagreed with a proposal which altogether bypassed the Forum's basic position - that the Kashmiris had the ultimate right to decide. It was not for the Forum to provide a solution but to urge a process which would enable the Kashmiris to decide. It was emphasised that the peoples living in all areas of Jammu and Kashmir (both sides of the LoC) must decide.

Some felt that India should unilaterally take the initiative. The process, it

was felt, would take time, as had been the experience in Northern Ireland or South Africa - even three-four years. Modalities could be worked out - like initiation of free traffic, free trade etc.

Others raised the possibility of third party intervention by a person like Nelson Mandela. Many others asserted the need to pursue bilateralism as enshrined in the Simla agreement and reiterated in the Lahore summit declaration. Foreign powers must not be allowed to meddle. It was recalled that they were responsible for the first Partition of the sub-continent.

Some raised the question of looking at the UN Resolutions on Kashmir as providing a framework to tackle the problem - and the option of plebiscite. While there were many reasons, it was indicated why such an approach was not viable. It was pointed out that the UN Framework for the resolution of Kashmir did not offer the Kashmiris, a third option - independence. However it was suggested that we could recognise the moral authority of the UN Resolution on Kashmir which both India and Pakistan have accepted.

There were others who attempted to relocate the Kashmir problem in the context of its linkage with the fate of India's Muslim population, and sought to circumscribe their right to self determination as threatening the unity of the country. They raised the question - how many partitions would result if we were to go the whole hog with the people's right of self determination?

However it was pointed out that self determination did not necessarily mean independence. And about the fear of opening up a Pandora's Box threatening the disintegration of states, it was emphasised that the very logic of the theory of the nation state legitimises creation of more states. - "Who decided that we've reached the end of nation state making?" - it was asked. We can not deny the Kashmiris their right to decide, when it is a right which we claim for ourselves.

The issue of the genuine representation of all the groups in all the areas of Jammu and Kashmir was repeatedly stressed. The need to involve civil society of Kashmir in building solidarities was pointed out, and the modalities of giving the people of Kashmir an opportunity to ascertain their wishes - through elections or some such mechanism,, their timing, involvement of eminent persons to monitor, etc. - were discussed intensely.

Delegates from Jammu & Kashmir in particular, highlighted that Kashmir was not a territorial dispute or a legal matter. It involved the people of Kashmir - i.e. all the peoples of Kashmir. With reference to the Indian Home Minister's offer of a tripartite dialogue , it was noted that it was not a real dialogue as it was conditional and limited to only a few groups. Dialogue must be at different levels and with all shades of opinion.

## **Admiral Ramdas outlined a road map of a peace process :**

- Stop all forms of violence
- On both sides, i.e. India governed Kashmir and Pakistan governed Kashmir, dialogue should take place at all levels to build a consensus
- Then consider how to choose /elect their representatives.

The suggestion that it was not possible to control violence- was passionately contested. Finally, it was asserted that the Forum's job was not to give a solution. The Forum's concern was to urge the facilitation of a process for a democratic and peaceful solution of the Kashmir dispute.

## Resolution on Kashmir

Adopted by the Plenary on April 8, 2000

Convinced of the indivisibility of peace and democracy, the Pakistan India Peoples' Forum for Peace and Democracy is gravely concerned at the state of hostile relations between India and Pakistan and its impact on their domestic politics as also on the two civil societies.

Alarmed by the "limited war" in Kargil area of Jammu and Kashmir last summer by forces that possess nuclear weapons with the potential of causing a nuclear holocaust;

Realising that the hostility between the two countries has encouraged forces of reaction to whip up war hysteria and jingoism with the concomitant attack on people's freedom in the name of "national security"

Recognising that peace as a condition of democracy requires a degree of normalcy in relations between the two countries,

Considering the urgency for creating conditions conducive for beginning peace talks among all concerned and mindful of the central role that all the people of Jammu and Kashmir must play in its resolution, we the members of the Pakistan India Peoples, Forum for Peace and Democracy call upon the governments of India and Pakistan to order cessation of all hostilities along the Line of Control by forces directly or indirectly under their control;

Simultaneously, we call upon the government of India to halt its military campaign, which is imperilling the life and liberties of the people of Jammu and Kashmir; and also call upon the government of Pakistan to exercise all control and restraint over the mindless violence of the *mujahed* and *jihadist* groups.

We appeal to the various militant organisations of Jammu and Kashmir (and their over-ground supporters) and the state security forces to eschew violence and particularly the use of rape as an instrument of war, and to agree to resolve all political and other differences exclusively through peaceful and democratic means. We urge them to declare cease-fire voluntarily with immediate effect and to create conditions conducive for democratic and peaceful negotiations.

Recognising that it is the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir who have the democratic right to decide their political future, and that they must get an opportunity to meet and confabulate.

We also call upon the political parties, the militants and the groups who support them in India held Jammu and Kashmir as well as in Pakistan held Jammu and Kashmir to dedicate themselves to achievement of reconciliation, and mutual trust, and to the protection and vindication of the human rights of all as a mark of respect to those who have died or been

injured, and the thousands of families who have been rendered homeless during the last five decades of violence.

We also call upon the governments of Pakistan and India to confer and cooperate with all the representatives of the people in all areas of Jammu and Kashmir. Both governments should facilitate a process by which the peoples in all the areas of Jammu and Kashmir can choose their representatives who can then engage with the governments to determine their future. As a first gesture, the Government of India should immediately release all political detenus. The talks between the representatives of the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir may be held both at bilateral level as well as at a tripartite level. The talks between Government of India and the representatives of India held Jammu and Kashmir as well as between the Government of Pakistan and the representatives of Pakistan held Kashmir, should be held in the presence of a group of eminent persons of the respective countries so that the process of dialogue remains transparent, free from intimidation and negotiations do not breakdown.

As a step towards beginning purposeful negotiations, we call upon the political parties and other groups in different parts of the former state of Jammu and Kashmir to acknowledge the fact that governments of India, Pakistan as well as different groups of peoples of Jammu and Kashmir hold divergent views on questions of continuance of status quo and of legitimate political aspirations of the participants, especially of the right of exercising sovereignty, wholly or partly, over the whole or part of the territories of the former state of Jammu and Kashmir.

We also call upon the political parties and other groups on both sides of Jammu and Kashmir to recognise the difficulties that the governments of India and Pakistan would face to modify their historical public stances. We also urge the governments of India and Pakistan to recognise the inalienable right of the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir to decide their political future. This is why it is important that all the three parties, representatives of the governments of India and Pakistan as well as that of the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir, together must strive to find a solution that may be generally acceptable to the peoples of Jammu and Kashmir and the subcontinent in their larger interest of peace and democracy. They should recognise that durable peace and tranquillity in the subcontinent takes precedent over all other considerations. For this reason they would strive in every practical way towards reconciliation and rapprochement keeping in view that in all agreements contraction of sovereign power in one political domain can be a gain in another.

We believe that it is from such an effort that the contours of a likely solution will emerge.

# RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

by

Prof. Bhaskar Bhole

While we are moving towards a new millennium, our country is found to be in the grip of people who have very little respect for the values of tolerance, equality and reason which are so basic for democratic order. The self-styled defenders of Indian culture are seen time and again demonstrating barbaric intolerance towards anything they perceive as being inimical to their concept of culture. Whether it be a controversy regarding Hussain's paintings or a film to be made by Deepa Mehta on the agonies of Hindu widows, the fanatics treat with intolerance everything they dislike, disapprove, disagree or differ with. In such a situation it will be useful to trace the roots of religious tolerance and also the ways and means to achieve it at least for those who are still in a mood to think independently and act rationally.

Religious toleration was initially thought of in the form of a doctrine regulating the relationship between the state and the various sects of Christianity represented by their respective churches. Although the Reformation cannot be associated directly with the parenthood of toleration, its principle that a man should follow the religion of his king implied a theoretical equality of all religions and so paved the way for toleration. Toleration then meant that the citizen could adopt or discard any religion without the interference of state authority.

It also implied that in the society where a particular religion is recognized as state religion, the government should allow the people to practice any other religion of their choice. All citizens should be equally free to have their places of worship, to profess and preach the doctrines of their belief, within the limits of public morality and decency. Though the Acts prescribing penalties for blasphemy still remained intact, their implementation became gradually scarce. It was universally agreed that religious dissent was best opposed by refuting rather than suppressing. Following John Locke's prescriptions (1689) in this respect, toleration was preferred to persecution or repression because of the relative ineffectiveness of the latter, and also because of the confidence gathered by then that the civil society was not likely to collapse into anarchy if religious dissent is tolerated.

The next stage in the evolution of the concept of toleration was in the context of interrelationship between the believers of different religions or sects. It was at this stage that toleration was seen as the only way in which men of different religious affiliations could coexist peacefully and continue their efforts to reach at the ultimate truth in the light of their faiths.

Tolerance became more and more an acceptable principle of inter religious coexistence with the rising influence of rationalist secular attitude and the decline of religion as a sole factor of social regulation.

But even at this stage, the principle of toleration was accepted more through indifference rather than the positive conviction of its desirability and rightness. The compulsions created by the emergence of strong religious minorities, too numerous to be coerced without creating problems of law and order and hence being a constant potential source of disorder, were quite often the major factor behind the endorsement of the principle of toleration. Here toleration assumes a character of political issue - namely to work, as a policy needed for reinforcing the common political loyalty among the people of different religious commitments. The minorities of all hues were of course more interested in claiming toleration for themselves rather than vindicating it as a moral principle to be honored universally.

It was more or less these very attitudes of the majority and minority communities, which lay at the back of several constitutional provisions framed with a view to creating the climate of toleration in the newly independent India. The Constitution, in accordance with the Objective Resolution of 22 January 1947, provides for equality to all the Indians in terms of status and opportunities as well as equality before the law. Every citizen is assured freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, association and action subject to law and public morality. Adequate safeguards are given to minorities, tribals and the backward classes. The emphasis that the Constitution makers laid on the principle of fraternity reflects their concern for creating the sense of brotherhood and tolerance amongst the heterogeneous Indian masses divided by different races, religions and cultures. Fraternity could not be achieved merely by abolishing untouchability in one of the religious communities, but by abolishing all communal or sectional anti-social feelings, which stand in the way of unity of India.

The Indian constitution also provides that the state shall protect all religions equally, that it does not itself hold any religion as official and that each individual shall be free to profess, practice and propagate the religion of his/her choice without any state interference. That the concept of toleration was most paramount in the minds of the framers of the Indian Constitution could also be seen through the provisions assuring that in free India, the personality of each individual shall be treated as equally sacred and that no discrimination shall be made between the citizens on the basis of their caste, creed or culture. The addition made to Part IV of the Constitution by the forty second amendment under the title of Fundamental Duties includes one important duty of citizens namely " *to promote harmony and the spirit of common brotherhood amongst all peoples of India transcending religious, linguistic and regional or sectional diversities and to renounce*

*practices derogatory to the dignity of women"*

This brief review of the constitutional provisions makes it abundantly clear that the framers were inspired by the doctrine of toleration, which they regarded as the only way to foster unity in this society full of all kinds of diversities. They knew it well that democracy as a way of life cannot be sustained without mutual harmony and co-operation. For them democracy did not mean merely a political device, but necessarily a system based on philosophy of reason, tolerance and compromise; where differences are settled through argumentation and deliberation and where the principle of live and let live rules the relationship between the majority and the minorities.

It is, therefore, not an accident that the fifty year old constitutional document preaching religious toleration, secularism and the respect for the rights of minorities has become the target of the so called 'review' by forces which do not believe in these values. The fears are justifiably expressed all over the country that the review may prove to be the beginning of an end of these values in the Indian political system.

In this respect it is very important to take into consideration the grounds of upholding religious toleration. If they are negative grounds, such as the doubtful character of religious belief, or the impossibility of deciding the rightness of any one of the religious doctrines, or similarly if there are the compulsions of settling of political issues of numerically larger minorities, or the indifference towards religious doctrines and practices, they will make the consequent toleration temporary and superficial. Moreover, such an advocacy of the principle is likely to make the men of any religious convictions stand against such religious toleration, which for them would be unreasonable and inadmissible.

Toleration should not be inspired by expediency; it should rather be a matter of positive commitment. If we tolerate something because there is no alternative, then we are required to put up with something, which is otherwise unpalatable and condemnable. Such a tolerance is bound to be contaminated and short-lived because nobody would like to be tolerated in this negative sense. We should have a positive tolerance for something we respect, honour and love. It should be supported by the sentiments of equality, fraternity and humanity for those who are 'tolerated' and a deep respect for their faith and culture. Our tolerance should not result from the indifference or lack of attachment for the community we choose to tolerate. Tolerance should not be conditional. One should cherish it as a value having the validity in itself.

Unfortunately those who are bent on playing the politics of religious fanaticism do not accept this positive content of tolerance. Their strategies not only falsify the generalisation that polytheistic religions are by nature more tolerant than monotheistic religions, but they also vitiate the longstanding



tradition of religious tolerance which was built here by the teachings of saints belonging to Sufi as well as Bhakti movements. This tradition which luckily still survives at a popular level even now upholds the ideals of synthesis, spiritual fraternity, tolerance and universal harmony. It silently rejects religious hatred and sectarian dogmatism.

India's freedom struggle has left the contradictory legacies of religious orthodoxy represented by the revivalist, exclusive and cultural nationalist forces, and the other one of philanthropy, forbearance, justice, fraternity, peace and all embracing love represented by the common masses. All religions were founded on the same moral laws.

In nature there is a fundamental unity running through all diversity. Religions are no exception to the natural law. They are given to mankind so as to accelerate the process of realization of fundamental unity. Gandhi tried to generate the generosity especially in the Hindus as they were in majority in India. He wanted them to lead the process of communal harmony in this multi-religious society.

Unfortunately we find today that the Gandhian perspective on religion and religious tolerance is being sidetracked. Looking at what has happened on the subcontinent during the last fifty years, it is imperative that we should accept that *all faiths constitute a revelation of truth and all are imperfect and liable to error*. But the religious zealots go on spreading the views that their religion is superior and those of all others are inferior. They claim infallibility for their faith and believe that salvation could be attained only through it.

These zealots think it quite justifiable to arrest the spread of other religions even by using coercive methods. Some of them even think it to be their sacred duty to do so. In their heart of hearts they find nothing wrong in the state authorities persecuting those whom they consider heretics, atheists, dissenters or *"enemies of the nation"*. They seriously subscribe to the view that a single religion makes a stronger nation.

In the name of building a strong nation they nurture hatred, prejudices and positive dislike towards all those whom they perceive as their *'unlikes'*. This intolerance has its roots in the process of their religious socialization. It is further strengthened by the economic rhetoric, social distances widened by the defective development strategies, distortions in the understanding of the past generated by fabricated histories and finally the psychological insecurities cultivated by the misleading and repetitive propaganda.

All efforts towards combating intolerance must take into account all these complex factors involved in the process. The strategies to counter the evil and aggressive forces of fundamentalism also need to be equally multifaceted. They should include the circulation of authentic information about all religious groups, especially about the minorities, laying stress on

the cultural similarities and common experiences of all the communities. We should also find out more and more areas of contacts and co-operation between the peoples of different creeds and cultures; underlining the common aspects of the teachings of different religions; and effectively projecting the folk traditions of religious co-existence and co-operation. We should recognize the tremendous power of the newly emerging and all pervasive medium like "internet" which is beyond the state control and recognizes no political borders. This medium can be used very powerfully for spreading false rumours as well as real stories of courageous and brave efforts to transcend the communal loyalties. This medium is very economical, can reach a specific target group swiftly and in a very cost-effective manner and we should consider its use to overcome the syndrome of "*us good and righteous and them bad and bigoted*".

# Military Expenditure and People's Security

By Gautam Navlakha

## The Context

Introduction of economic reforms since 1991 has meant increase in rural poverty by 3.42% between 1991 to 1999, according to the latest National Sample Survey which has also found that 40% of the Indians live below the poverty line, wholesale prices have increased by 90 % between 91-98; and external debt risen to \$99 billion. During this period corporate profits rose by 300% and their contribution to employment remained marginal at 0.19%. Indeed employment growth in the organised sector has fallen from 1.44% in '91 to 1.09% in '97.

Out of the central government's total expenditure of Rs 338,486 crores in 2000-01, allocation for the military and central para-military is estimated to be Rs 80,000 crores, i.e. 24% per cent of the total expenditure. (Re: Expenditure Budget Volume 2 000-01). The allocation last year (99-00) for military and para-military expenditure was Rs 63,000 cr. Under the prevalent notion of "national" security, external and internal security are intertwined and treated as one. Besides, the Indian Constitution circumscribes the central government's power over law and order which is a state subject. It also speaks of "Armed Forces of the Union" which encompass para-military forces. For administrative and accounting reasons these come under the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA). But their formation, training, and deployment in fighting internal wars make them equivalent to the army's infantry battalions. Also after the May 1998 nuclear bomb explosions there is no reason to exclude the allocations provided for Departments of Atomic Energy and Space. All this adds up to Rs 80,000 cr.

If interest payments, which take up 30 per cent of the total revenue expenditure, are added to this along with 17 per cent that go as grants to the states and the Union Territories, then only 29 per cent is actually left. Of this, Rs 34,000 crores are reserved to pay for the wage and travel bills of the government establishments, leaving only Rs 64,000 crores for subsidies and social welfare of the people. The allotment for social services (health, education, housing etc. ) has risen from Rs 12,820 cr in 1995-96 and is estimated to be Rs 30,000 cr in 2000-01. Food subsidy has declined to Rs 8100 cr in 2000-01. Motivated concern about size of the fiscal deficit promptly results in reducing purchasing power of the working people, at a time when job security has shrunk, statutory minimum wages are all but a forgotten issue, and when profligacy and conspicuous consumption carry on unabated. But new issues are entering the agenda, such as the ISI backed internal security threat (although the much promised white paper on it is still

in the making after nearly two years), propaganda about minority appeasement, etc., and making "national interest" synonymous with the building of the war machinery and infringement of people's rights. The strength of our armed forces under the Union Ministry of Defence is said to be 1.2 million. The central para-military forces consist of another 600,000 under the Union Home Ministry. In addition there are 3.5 lakh armed police (out of an estimated total police strength of 13 lakhs) with states and union territories. The stress on armed might to restore authority, as well as contain and curb social discontent, has increased, while the need to win popular consent has receded into background.

In order to appreciate the burgeoning military expenditure, it is worth noting that the total plan and non-plan expenditure of the Indian government is now estimated to reach Rs 3,38,486 cr in 2000-2001! In comparison with the government's generosity towards the military behemoth, a miserly 5% of its budget is allocated for education - at a time when 414 million Indians are said to be illiterate ! It is also at a time when food subsidy has declined to Rs 8100 crores - when according to the government's own National Sample Survey the number of impoverished people have gone up from 34.88 cr in 1997 to 40.63 cr in 1998.

India's GDP is expected to be Rs 2,181,650 cr in terms of market prices in 2000-01. In other words, the real military spending, at Rs 80,000 cr plus in 2000-01, will be 24 % of the total expenditure and 3.7 % of the GDP! Even if some figures are contested, it will not bring allocations below 3.5 per cent of the GDP. Almost 75 per cent of the outlay is accounted for by recurring expenditure for a 1.7 mn personnel's pay, allowances, training, exercises etc.

The cost of man-power required for fighting internal wars (Rs 14000 cr), the cost of maintaining presence in Siachen and Kargil heights (Rs 6000 cr), development of nuclear arsenal (Rs 3500 cr), delay (Rs 1000 cr) - a total of Rs 24,500 cr etc. is the amount that can be immediate peace dividend if a peaceful solution for internal conflicts and disputes with neighbours is attempted.

The Ministry of Finance (MOF) has claimed on the basis of an internal study of over 50 years of defence spending, that for half of this period defence allocations were not fully utilised, and for 10 years fiscal targets were barely met. Even more devastating is the purported finding of the Comptroller and Auditor General which says that spares stockpiled worth Rs 30-40,000 cr are spurious and worthless!

## **Internal Wars**

India has fought one "limited" war in the past 28 years but its armed forces remain the busiest army fighting internal wars. Officials refuse to provide exact force deployment. However, more than one third of the army is engaged in fighting internal wars. If para-military forces are added to this not

less than 60 percent of the security apparatus is deployed against our own people. For instance in Jammu and Kashmir there are three corps: XIV (Pathankot), XV (Srinagar) and XVI (Leh). Each corp comprises three divisions. In the North-East there are two corps III (Tezpur) and IVth (Dimapur). Apart from this 85 percent of the Para-military Forces (RR, AR, BSF, CRPF, ITBP, IRF, NSG etc) numbering more than 6 lakhs are deployed in J&K, NE and AP and Bihar. The Union Home Minister had contented sometime back (November 1, 1999) that the size of the PMFs was "inadequate" and therefore his ministry "proposed raising 50 new battalions of BSF and CRPF". In addition to this, according to reports, the government is contemplating raising 20 battalions of Assam Rifles, 12 battalions of Rashtriya Rifles, and 35 battalions of India Reserve Force to fight insurgencies and extremism. In short, there are plans afoot to raise 117 battalions in the coming years. These are assisted by armed constabularies from several states fighting less than 3000 militants in J&K, 10,000 militants in Assam Manipur, Nagaland, and Tripura. In addition there are said to be 2500-3000 communist revolutionaries in AP and Bihar. This massive deployment of force is part of the strategy to saturate the insurgent area and overwhelm the militants. It has also become an excuse to divert resources for militarisation.

Current wisdom claims that internal security problems are now intricately tied to the external source of threat and therefore they can no longer be considered separately. While the Ministry of Defence in its annual report for 1998-99 spoke of "Militancy in regions of India actively supported from across the border has vitiated the security environment in the country", the Ministry of Home Affairs in its turn, in their annual report for 1998-99 stated that "The internal security situation in India continues to be influenced by 'proxy war' unleashed by Pakistan...". The externalisation of internal security achieves two things. In the first place the internal processes that cause the emergence of insurgency are pushed into background and thereby search for political solutions becomes contingent upon military success against insurgents. Secondly, this blurs the difference between external threat and internal security in which atrocities, civilian casualties, destruction of democratic institutions acquire the character of unavoidable collateral damage.

The Army is trained to occupy territory and subjugate people. Low intensity conflict is a long duration conflict dependent on man-power because of heavy casualties. It is said that 50 security persons are required to eliminate or neutralise one trained militant. According to the Union Home secretary there are 3000 militants in J&K and 10,000 in NE. If the above is true then the deployment of troops is higher because it is not the size of the militants rather the popular support for militancy that dictates the heavy deployment of troops. As for how much of our military allocations are directly related to internal security they have to be pieced together. If we exclude capital costs

from our considerations, the table below provides an estimate of the price we are paying for fighting our own people.

### Table

Account Head	Ministry	Allocation
Central Paramilitary forces (80%)	MHA	Rs 6500 cr
Rashtriya Rifles	MOD	Rs 550 cr
Army (1/3rd of wage bill)	MOD	Rs 4500 cr
Loans Write-off (Punjab's SRE)	MOF	Rs 1000 cr
Grants to cover SRE	MHA	Rs 700 cr
<b>Total</b>		<b>Rs 13250 cr</b>

The Security Related Expenses (SRE) of the state governments, part or the whole of which are borne by the central government, are not known. All we know for instance is the Centre's decision to take on the entire cost of fighting insurgency in Punjab and thereby it wiped out Rs 8000 cr outstanding against the state government. Similarly we know that 90 per cent of the SRE's in North Eastern states are borne by the Centre. The actual figures are not available but loan and interest write off in 1999-2000 under Demand No 29 of the MOF is shown as Rs 964 cr. Most of it is related to SRE. And if states own share of the SRE's are added then the cost would rise higher. For the GOI the cost of internal wars is well above Rs 13,250 cr.

Now way back in 1973 the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament in its 113rd report had expressed concern at the expansion of central paramilitary forces and called for an inquiry into this. Expectedly, nothing was done and the growth in para-military forces have carried on relentlessly. And it is directly related to the GOI's singular contribution in turning political problems caused by uneven regional development and unequal socio-economic relations into a civil war like situation with government forces pitted against our own people who are being coerced into submission.

This creates the justification for increase in the strength of PMF's which are trained along the lines of army's infantry formations against our people not just in NE & J&K but in Bihar, AP, MP, Orissa, Maharashtra. And conflicts located in the political economy of our country are being seen as 'defiance of authority'.

According to the official accounts, internal wars are spreading and so is the stupendous increase in budgetary allocations and deployment of security forces. A closer scrutiny reveals that two things are happening. In the name of improving law and order money is being spent on PMF's, euphemistically called "Police", formed along the lines of infantry formations of the army and their deployment and operations being alien to police function. They are deployed not to keep two warring groups apart, or for crime detection

ce  
but primarily against the aggrieved people, either landless agricultural workers, Dalits, Tribals, or other nationalities. Central grant to states channelised through MHA is also geared towards raising armed constabularies. As a result normal police functions have declined, or are in a decrepit state. Indeed the dismal law and order scene in Delhi, policed directly by the MHA shows how thoroughly incompetent the GOI is when it comes to ordinary law and order situation and it therefore cannot be trusted with internal security. Indeed a combination of decline in the role of the police and the burgeoning role of PMF's shows the steady erosion in democratic institutions which constricts resolution of popular grievances.

e  
e  
f  
r  
r  
l  
This step up in suppression of the people has gone hand in hand with the argument that Pakistani ISI is behind much of the armed opposition faced by GOI forces. What began as an exercise to obfuscate GOI's role in causing the insurgency eventually became an "undeclared war", which was meant to suggest that this had nothing to do with political processes internal to the country. As part of BJP government's known antipathy towards Pakistan and anti-minority proclivity, the MHA makes exaggerated claims about the ISI, while maintaining complete silence over the terror campaigns of the 'sangh parivar'. Indeed just as resources are being diverted towards military buildup, the government is augmenting its power at the expense of the people. Towards this end, the government has proposed to re-introduce the notorious TADA, and that too in a more vicious form. For instance the period of remand is extended, confessions are admissible as evidence, right to bail restricted, punishment enhanced, burden of proof reversed, appeals to High Court denied, and the crime itself is so vaguely defined that almost any crime could invite charges under this draconian law. This is happening at a time when communal- fascism is allowed a free run by an indulgent government and people's faith in police is at an all time low.

## **Coercive Diplomacy and Force projection**

Kargil war allowed India's war-mongers an opportunity to push ahead with a debilitating weapon acquisition programme which threatens to force India's neighbours to increase their own military expenditure. Military procurement is moving once again towards outright imports. As far as foreign exchange is concerned data is not available easily and has to be pieced together through comparison of Commerce Ministry statistics with that of the RBI. For instance according to the Commerce Ministry data, between 1991- 92 and 1995-96 trade deficit grew from \$1.55 bn to \$4.53 bn. During the same period the RBI data shows the trade deficit as being \$2.79 bn and \$8.94 bn. Eighty percent of this difference between the two data is on account of military imports. And conservatively, 40 % of the cumulative trade deficit of \$32 bn in this period must be on account of military purchases. In the coming year government intends to acquire an aircraft carrier from Russia and refurbish it; plans to purchase 60-66

Advanced Jet Trainer and 10 Mirage 2000 fighters; 300 T-90 missile firing tanks; self-propelled guns and multi-barreled launchers etc. This would result in foreign exchange outgo of no less than \$6-7 bn.

Such acquisitions trigger off a disastrous arms race. This is precisely what happened in May 1998 when the Indian government made it virtually impossible for the Pakistan government to not undertake nuclear bomb tests of its own. And now when that country is embroiled in an economic crisis it is being goaded to undertake matching military procurement policy. It is not accidental that this is happening at a time when the government of India refuses to renew dialogue under one pretext or the other. The aggressive posturing by the government in their relations with neighbouring countries is best shown in India's dealing with Nepal. This landlocked neighbour is being strangled and being coerced into accepting India's terms. It should also be kept in mind that militarisation is being fuelled under a new doctrine of "winnable" war. The Minister of Defence has claimed that a "limited war" with Pakistan is not just possible but winnable. Against the background of a step up in the war of attrition in Kashmir, and increase in attacks on minorities as well as infringement of people's freedom, our sub- continent is posed with the biggest threat to life and liberties of the people.

It was claimed that the N-weapons test by the two countries brought about a situation where chances of war have receded. But the Indian Army chief said recently that N-deterrence "only restricts an all out war employing weapons of mass-detsruction.....(If) militancy grows too big both the initiator i.e. Pakistan and the affected nation i.e. India are tempted to use conventional weapons". This only emphasises the need for vigilance.

All this requires a change in political approach to problems; from discarding hostile policy towards neighbours to dismantling the regime of terror used to crush insurgencies.

### **Summing up**

If the political and financial cost of fighting internal wars has assumed threatening proportions, the remedy lies in overhauling the present policy regime which privileges repressive means over finding democratic solution. Since counter-insurgency is man-power dependent, substantial amount of military wages and allowances are linked to internal wars. Thus a change in political approach can enable a cutback in personnel which could help save thousands of crores. Dis-engagement and pullback from Siachen, freezing nuclear weapons programme etc. can help pay for essential acquisitions and result in a substantial cut in this un-productive expenditure and increase in the welfare and development activities of the government. The misuse of scarce resources not only denies their application for purposes of



development which benefit the underprivileged but in turn aggravates social discontent and sap the energy of the people. The notion of "national security" is making the sub-continent insecure, threatening people's freedom, apart from bankrupting us financially and politically.

# REPORT OF THE GROUP ON DEMILITARIZATION AND DE-NUCLEARIZATION

Chairperson: H. Basappa, India

Rapporteurs: Irfan Mufti, Pakistan

Shreyas, India

The group broadly discussed the concept of security and argued for not merely a militaristic definition but defined it rather as a people oriented security to life, social benefits and fundamental freedoms guaranteed to them.

The group also felt the increasing danger of nuclear war and greater risk of accidental war in the absence of any direct communication within these two countries. The group also showed concern while leaders from both sides have been recklessly threatening to use nuclear weapons against each other.

The group also noted with great concern, the contemporary developments such as unprecedented military build-ups, growing nuclear stockpiles, increase in defence budgets, Kargil misadventure, growing militarization of states and vulgarization and politicization of religion in both countries. The group also took note of the economic fallout of nuclearization in increasing poverty and under-development of the people in these countries. We feel that already scarce resources of this region are spent on nuclear madness, developing weapons of mass destruction, increasing military strengths and defence and not on the development of the people.

The group reiterated its commitment to the course of peace and democratization of society and even within the functions of PIPFPD.

The group made the following recommendations:

1. There should be an immediate resumption of dialogue and communication, in good faith, at the highest diplomatic level. Moreover the leaders of these countries should be asked to practice restraint on exchange of nuclear threats to each other.
2. The group while acknowledging the fact that the nuclear weapons are a reality, felt that it is not an uncontestable reality. The group recommended an immediate dismantling of present military build-ups and the need for moving towards horizontal and vertical denuclearization.
3. Both these countries should immediately sign an agreement for no-first use of nuclear weapons. They should also go into a comprehensive no-war pact with each other.
4. There should be a complete freeze on nuclear and missile programmes and ultimately leading to a rollback of nuclear programmes in both these countries.

5. Unconditional signing of CTBT and immediate resumption of discussion on FMCT. The group also recommended that both these governments should put in joint efforts and advocacy in international forums to remove deficiencies in these documents.
6. Both countries should show their commitments and take long-term strategies to gradually declare South Asia as nuclear free zone and simultaneously and collectively work for global disarmament.
7. Take specific measures to demonstrate their commitment that they will not deploy nuclear weapons for the next three years and call a halt to research on nuclear advancement.
8. Made an appeal to scientists in both countries not to take part in developing nuclear weapons. It also recommended the holding of a South Asian conference of scientists.
9. Emphasized on adopting democratic means for containing violence and militaristic forces across the borders.
10. The Forum should use the existing documentary films on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, preferably translate them in local languages, to educate and make the masses in both countries aware of the nuclear holocaust. The group also recommended the use of print and electronic media to influence public opinion and educate them in promoting the concepts of peace and love.
11. Greater democratization within the PIPFPD, with setting up of joint sectoral groups, who should work closely with each other and should have a minimum of three meetings each year. A standing committee, comprising of five members from each side, should be formed. The committee should meet regularly to review and draft agenda for national plans of action and future conventions. Institutional support should also be provided to sectoral groups and activists working for peace and democracy in these two countries.
12. We feel that these measures could lead us to the formation of a Joint Security Advisory Group. The Group should work towards developing an alternative people's perspective on security in their respective countries as well as in the South Asian region.
13. The group also reiterated the earlier demand of the Forum to downsize army and reduction in defence expenditures at the force level.
14. The group condemned using military and paramilitary forces in maintaining law and order in each country.

# REPORT OF THE GROUP ON GLOBALISATION AND REGIONAL COOPERATION

Co-chairpersons:

Rasheed Rahman (Pakistan)

Dr Ritu Dewan (India)

The workshop on 'Globalisation and Regional Cooperation' recognises the need for struggle against forced integration of South Asian economies and the necessity of forging a joint struggle against the common threats to the economy and polity of India and Pakistan by unfettered globalisation. It was pointed out that this struggle to counter the threat of globalisation has to be linked to the struggle for democratisation of our respective societies. Hence the struggles of dalits, women, workers and other marginalised sections need to be linked to the movement for alternative development in the sub-continent. In this context it is essential to emphasize the interlinkages between the processes of democratisation and anti-globalisation.

The workshop identified the following common areas of concern:

1. The need to cooperate in building food security through a sustainable agriculture strategy that will exclude the multinational controlled seed/biotechnology/pesticide cycle. The possibilities of sharing appropriate and small technologies that provide for greater autonomy to agricultural and rural producers were explored. Water management and distribution issues need to be addressed on a regional cooperative basis.
2. The danger posed by the processes of concentration of capital and decentralisation of production, informalisation of the labour force, multinational control over foreign trade, dumping of dirty technology by MNCs, and impact of short term financial flows on the economies was highlighted. The need to forge closer regional trade through strengthening the SAPTA and ultimately moving to a South Asian Free Trade regime to counter these was recommended. The need to immediately extend MFN treatment to exports from neighbours was emphasised. Greater contacts between the business and trade of the two countries needed to be developed.
3. Sharing of information through a bulletin and a web-site on the impact of globalisation in the two countries was essential. Several areas were identified on which a data bank needed to be urgently built up -- disinvestment patterns, trade regimes, concessions given to MNCs, employment structures, social sector spending, feminisation of poverty, increasing inequalities, etc. The information should be widely disseminated and translated by local chapters of the PIPFPD.
4. Both the countries share common ecological regions, like the Himalayas, the Kutch and the plains of Punjab, which face identical

issues such as degradation and environmental destabilisation. This provides the basis for forging a common strategy.

5. The two countries need to evolve joint strategies on multilateral negotiations, including the WTO, Global environment, Plant Breeders Rights, etc.
6. A permanent committee of 4 to 6 members be set up in the PIPFPD to initiate and implement the recommendations.

re  
d  
e  
is  
e  
e  
s  
r-  
s

a  
f  
3  
)  
|

# REPORT OF THE SECTORAL GROUP ON GENDER ISSUES

Chairperson: Dr Zarina Salamat (Pakistan)

Rapporteurs: Tahira Abdullah (Pakistan)

Madhu Bhushan (India)

1. The Working Group on Gender issues met during the afternoon session on 7th April. After self-introductions the group selected for further discussion just a few of the many issues identified as being both important and relevant to the mandate and work of the PIPFPD.
2. **The following issues were selected:**
  - i. Women and mobilization for peace;
  - ii. Women's political empowerment;
  - iii. The feminization of poverty;
  - iv. Violence against women;
  - v. Women and health and education issues.

## **Women and mobilization for peace**

3. Views were expressed that women have long been in the vanguard of the human rights and peace movements in the sub-continent, but that now there appears to be a need to reclaim their space there, instead of accepting relegation or marginalization of women to "women's issues" within the "women's movement". This is now a view emanating not just from the policy-makers and officialdom, but increasingly - and distressingly - also from the hierarchy of the progressive civil society movements, including the peace movement and the Forum itself.
4. It was, therefore, recommended that there is a need to change attitudes towards the centrality of gender issues within the PIPFPD itself, by bringing gender into the mainstream of the Forum's four themes and by recognizing women as experts and contributors in their own right. There is also a need for the PIPFPD to take up initiatives and issue-based activities, as well as setting up a joint committee to work on gender issues common to both countries.

## **Women's political empowerment**

5. Views were expressed that women's political empowerment and participation are just as important as economic. The differing systems and issues facing Indian and Pakistani women were discussed, e.g., the Panchayat system in India, and the recently announced 50% reservation for women at the local bodies tier in Pakistan for the December 2000 LB elections. In the current milieu, the continuing need for reservation

of women's seats at all tiers was stressed. It was, however, strongly felt that bringing increasing numbers of women into the current political systems, mainstream political parties and ruling elites - which are corrupt and insincere and insensitive - will not address the core issues facing the vast majority of our people in both countries.

6. It was, therefore, recommended that there is a need - not just to fit women into the existing system - but to evolve a new vision and an alternative paradigm of political empowerment and to work towards changing the systems of political thought and political processes. This is necessary to achieve the effective mainstreaming of women in a political sphere which recognizes the centrality of peace, human rights, religious tolerance, and good governance.

### **The feminization of poverty**

7. Participants in the discussion noted with serious concern women's increasing poverty and denial of basic minimum needs, due to globalization, inflation and bad economic and financial management; and the negative impact on women of (a)international pacts such as IMF-led Structural Adjustment Programmes and WTO, and (b)increasing militarization and nuclearization, and war and ongoing conflicts.
8. It was recommended that the Forum should advocate that women's economic issues be addressed on a priority basis through affirmative action, policies and programmes. There is a need for women to utilize the electronic media and information technology, in order to enter the economic mainstream.

### **Violence against women**

9. There was an indepth discussion on the alarming increase in many forms of violence against women. There is a great similarity in Indian and Pakistani manifestations of violence, e.g., dowry/stove deaths, rape and marital rape, honour killings, physical and mental cruelty, forced marriage, non-recognition of right to choice in marriage, the stigma of divorce and desertion, child custody, sexual harassment, child prostitution and trafficking of women, mistreatment and sexual violence in public sector shelters, crisis centres and police stations, indifference and hostility of the courts and the medical profession, lack of redress, etc. Where large numbers of NGOs are providing free legal aid, shelters and other support, the public sector is lacking in both facilities as well as supportive attitudes.
10. It was recommended that advocacy should be carried out for laws to protect women as victims and, in certain cases, as double victims, be enacted where needed, strengthened if need be, strictly enforced and

implemented - which is currently not the case. Discriminatory legislations e.g., (Hudood Ordinance in Pakistan) to be repealed. The objectification of women in the media, particularly in advertisements, should be stopped. Gender sensitization of the relevant officials is urgently needed to deal with violence at all three levels: state/custodial, societal, and domestic.

## **Women and health and education issues**

11. It was agreed that women lack adequate information, education and counselling (IEC) on and access to basic and reproductive health services and reproductive rights.
12. It was recommended that advocacy should be carried out for legislation to be enacted to ensure reproductive rights and provision of, and access to, basic and reproductive health services, including STDs/HIV/AIDS, as a basic human right. IEC services need to be provided on priority basis. The skewed sex ratios in both countries - i.e., the missing millions of females - need to be reversed through checks on amniocentesis, female foeticide, infanticide and high female mortality rates. The girl child needs special care and protection. Mal- and under-nutrition among girls and women require to be addressed urgently.
13. It was agreed that education is crucially important, both formal and non-formal, and for men just as much as for women, particularly in the light of the need for concerted male attitudinal changes. There is a need to focus on adolescents and youth. Awareness campaigns run by NGOs need to be stepped up and taken up by the public sector too.

## **Conclusion**

15. *The working group on gender issues,*
  - i. noting that successive governments in both countries made pledges, including ratifications of internationally binding instruments, to improve the status of women,
  - ii. but failed due to lack of political will and commitment, recommends that lobbying and advocacy for women's priority issues need to be taken up at all fora and at all levels - policy, planning, central/federal, state/provincial, local bodies and all concerned persons in the public, private and NGO sectors. The PIPFPD needs to recognize this and to collaboratively and jointly take up gender issues most relevant to its mandate on a priority basis.
  - iii. states that India and Pakistan rank amongst the lowest in human development, particularly by the Gender Empowerment Measure. Half our population is deprived of equality, justice and access to opportunities within their respective national mainstreams. We, as



conscious men and women, refuse to accept the status quo and strongly call upon our respective governments to uphold the fundamental and indisputable principles of justice and equality. We call upon all progressive sections of society to join us in our struggle and raise a collective voice for our rights.

- iv. reiterates our commitment to continue our struggle for the cause of achieving a peaceful, tolerant, just, egalitarian, progressive, non-theocratic, democratic social order for women and men.

## REPORT OF THE SECTORAL GROUP ON MEDIA AND CULTURE

Co-chairpersons : Dr Satya Paul (India)  
Mr Anwar Pasrich (Pakistan)  
Rapporteur : Mr Sumit Chakravarty (India)

The Group met on April 7 from 3-45 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. . Eighteen persons participated in the discussion.

In his opening remarks Mr. Satya Paul, as the Co-chairperson of the group highlighted the importance of media and culture in bringing the peoples of the two countries closer to each other. He brought into focus the positive role of the media during the freedom struggle and deplored the current negative approach of the media in spreading disharmony, hatred and violence among the peoples of India and Pakistan.

Several speakers spoke in favour of exchange of publications and a liberal visa regime to facilitate frequent visits by the two countries' journalists. It was felt that newspapers and journals should have the freedom to appoint correspondents in the two countries. The launching of a joint media newsletter or bulletin, preferably bi-monthly, was also proposed.

Some speakers complained about the two governments' attempts to suppress information with regard to violation of human rights and atrocities on the people as in J&K. The glorification of violence and conflict between the two countries by the media instead of highlighting the peace efforts was denounced. The threats and hardships faced by the media from the government and militants were also mentioned.

Some speakers expressed concern over the fall in journalistic standards as a result of which in-depth research on vital issues was absent.

Some others referred to the proprietors' attitudes in shaping the course of media coverage.

Some speakers classified media into missionary, commercial and modern, and pointed to the hardships faced by the Pakistani media in preserving freedom of the press under military rule in particular, an experience Indian media had not gone through. It was further observed that whereas in the past Indian journalists were writing with a sense of objectivity that earned them respect in Pakistan, the recent trend in the Indian print media to be aggressive and condescending towards Pakistan was not conducive to the improvement of bilateral relations.

*On the basis of the discussions the following recommendations were made:*

- i. The establishment of a website of the PIPFPD as also a common internet connection and e-mail for the purpose;
- ii. Networking of journalists' unions;
- iii. Exchanges of representatives of INS and PNS as also the different journalists' organisations of the two countries.

- iv. Free flow of publications;
- v. Liberal visa rules for journalists so as to preclude police reporting and restrictions on the mode of transport to be used;
- vi. Freedom for publications to post correspondents in each others' country.

Ms. Sheema Kermani (Pakistan), who initiated the discussion on culture, drew attention to the pivotal role of culture in bringing the peoples together and in this context regretted the disregard and disrespect being shown by delegates to cultural programmes thereby reflecting their non-seriousness.

Mr. Anwar Pasricha (Pakistan) as co-Chairperson of the group highlighted the significance of culture because of its wider reach among the people through performances in comparison with the media, and the impact of such performances on the public mind.

Some Pakistani participants expressed their concern over the growing vulgarity in the cultural performance shown on Indian TV and films. While sharing this concern some Indian delegates spoke of educating the public to preserve our own sub-continental culture. However, a fear was expressed that in the name of preserving sub-continental culture there could be a throwback into some kind of fundamentalist straitjacket, and this must necessarily be prevented. One participant from J & K spoke of the rainbow culture, Kashmir bridging the culture of India and Pakistan. Some speakers referred to culture as the mirror of the growth of civil society.

*The following recommendations were made:*

- i. Organising tours of artistes to each other's country with increasing frequency;
- ii. Liberalising visa rules for cultural artistes;
- iii. Joint production of India-Pakistan telefilms, films, theatre;
- iv. One-hour time-slot on TV for secular cultural performances of each other's country through adequate support by sponsors;
- v. Checking the spread of Western culture in the name of globalisation;
- vi. Setting up an Internet channel for communication among cultural personalities.

It was suggested in order to implement the above recommendations a **permanent joint group** should be constituted.

*At the plenary it was suggested that*

- a. Steps must be taken to ensure that hatred is not spread through publications and/or the electronic media that would vitiate relations between the countries.
- b. An Indo-Pakistan Journalists Organisation be set up to promote greater interaction and closer co-operation between media practitioners of the two states.

# REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECTORAL GROUP ON TRADE UNIONS

Chairperson: Salim Raza (Pakistan)

Rapporteur : Pranab Ghosh (India)

## Ten delegates from India and Pakistan participated.

From the country report of Pakistan the deleterious effects of the army rule on the lives and livelihood of the workers of Pakistan emerged.

Trade union membership has been dwindling. MNCs and TNCs are coming in a big way. But they are not engaging in manufacturing. So transfer of technology is not taking place. MNCs are interested in dumping the goods. More and more factories are closing down adding to the already acute unemployment. The military rulers are putting their men as heads of Public Sector Corporations e.g. Karachi Port, Karachi Shipyard, Electrical Supply Corporation etc.

Attacks on the trade union movements are taking place in various ways. Union leaders have been suspended on flimsy grounds. Working hours have been increased. Manufacturing taxation is being increased. Import duties are being lowered. Labour judiciary and labour departments have been rendered ineffective. Labour laws have been amended to preclude dismissed workers to be on the Trade union bodies. In government corporations workers / employees are being declared as civil servants - thereby depriving the workers of the protection of labour laws and trade union rights. Scab unions and those affiliated to ICFTU only are being encouraged, but they do not have any representative character. Negative consequences of WTO and the so-called globalisation and liberalisation are being faced. It was suggested that Indian and Pakistani trade union movements should come closer and make conjoint endeavours to fight against the adverse effects and the common dangers posed by the emerging US-centric TNC hegemony and forge a united approach to peace, friendship and prosperity.

The delegates of India, dwelt at length of the onslaught of globalisation and liberalisation in India and agreed that there were commonalties in the situations being faced by the working class in both the countries. It emerged that in India more workers are in the unorganised sector who are mostly deprived of the minimum wages laws. More and more workers in the organised sector are getting shifted to the unorganised sector through the process of downsizing, outsourcing, engagement of contract and casual labour.

The Group took note of the dismal condition of the agricultural workers and their want of trade union rights and collective bargaining power.

The Group also took note of the problem of women workers who are the backbone of agricultural work as well as the unorganised sector in the urban areas. They are also denied trade union rights and collective bargaining rights.

The problems of building workers and domestic servants bonded labour and child labour also came into sharp focus.

## **RESOLUTION**

1. A joint strategy be evolved by the working class movements of both the countries to ward off the negative aspects of globalisation and liberalisation, to protect the acquired rights, and for improvement of the labour laws.
2. PIPFPD would act as the catalytic agent to bring the central trade unions / federations of both the countries closer.
3. PIPFPD would work towards holding a joint convention of the trade unions of both the countries and to evolve structures for implementing the joint strategy.
4. There should be collection and dissemination of labour related information and data.
5. Industry - wise trade union contacts should also be encouraged.
6. The problems of agricultural workers, women workers, building workers, bonded labour and child labour would be kept in view in our all future work.
7. On behalf of the PIPFPD, Mr. Gul Rahman (Pakistan) and Mr. Pranab Ghosh (India) will initially act as co-ordinators in their respective countries to initiate the process of forging a united strategy as envisaged above.

The convention would urge the two Governments to relax visa regulations for facilitating exchange of trade union delegations.



5. The group also felt that the syllabus should include the understanding of the basic tenets of all the religions to inculcate the values of understanding and tolerance amongst children and youth.
6. There should be large scale exchange of educational literature between both the countries.
7. Exchange facilities should be provided to facilitate the establishment of e-mail friendships between a large number of students which could be a precursor to exchange programmes.
8. Exchange programmes of students and teachers should be undertaken more vigorously and constantly.
9. Exchange programmes should be designed to be multifaceted and should include heritage, culture, racial and educational aspects.
10. Students and teachers' exchange programme should include participation from both urban and rural areas and must have representation from all sections and communities of society.
11. Specific cities and organisations should be tied up in the studies / teachers exchange programme to ensure that they are implemented consistently.
12. Programmes of teachers of both the countries should be undertaken to facilitate better introspection and understanding.
13. Corporate sponsorships should be mobilised for the student / teacher exchange programmes.
14. The factors behind the increase in the education of the girl child in Pakistan should be studied and the same should be applied to India and those portions of Pakistan where the girl child's education is lagging behind, to improve the education of the girl child in the sub-continent.

## RESOLUTION OF THE SECTORAL GROUP ON TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. To maintain cordial and business friendly atmosphere, basic issues should be solved on priority, and competent authorities in both the countries should be approached to achieve this end.
2. Instead of big business groups, small traders should be encouraged to get involved in business between the two countries.
3. Genuine and registered business groups should attend Forum conventions and discuss business with their counter parts.
4. Free movement of businessmen should be ensured in the two countries.
5. Multiple visa facilities should be provided to trade and commerce people of both sides.
6. Constitution of a trade and commerce committee, responsible for framing and adopting proper measures to create a congenial atmosphere for the business community, like
  - a) doubling the number of exportable / importable items from the existing state ; and
  - b) formation of a pressure group of business community representatives to influence the competent authorities to achieve the Forum targets.

Presented  
by  
Khalim Basir  
(Pakistan)



## REPORT OF THE SECTORAL GROUP ON ENVIRONMENT

The Group on environment unfortunately did not have any Pakistani delegate present during its meeting.

The Group felt that most developing countries faced common problems and concerns in the international arena. This was especially true of South Asia. The experiences of Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, Pakistan and India were very similar in the area of environment, largely because they faced similar economic, cultural and social pressures in the global scenario. The group also noted the fact that in the field of environment, every positive change in government policies, or legal measures dealing with environment, were due to efforts of activists alone, and therefore it was crucial that activists, NGOs, Trade Unions and other concerned organisations and individuals came together to tackle the issue of environmental degradation. The PIPFPD could therefore play a significant role in this area.

### **The PIPFPD could intervene in two major areas :-**

1. Where Pakistan and India shared a common ecological space. For example sharing of water resources, a common coastline, and a common mountain range - the Himalayas. In ecologically sensitive areas like the Kutch desert, where common wetlands, fisheries, mangroves need attention of groups from both countries. There are industries located in the border region like power plants of the Reliance group of industries in the Jamnagar area of Gujarat. The discovery of oil in the Kutch region has implications of oil spills and pollution that need to be addressed urgently.
2.
  - a) Both the countries face similar problems and shared experiences of unsustainable "development". Like other developing countries, Pakistan and India suffer similar pressures from the developed countries on issues like dumping of nuclear wastes, transfer of obsolete technologies, production of energy and clean energy, and Multilateral Environmental Agreements, where groups should come together to lobby for people-friendly agreements.
  - b) Pakistan and India face similar problems due to internal pressures also, like the issues of rapid and unplanned expansion of cities, rural migration to urban areas and related environmental problems. Garbage and disposal of garbage has become a major health and environmental issue. Non-availability of energy and clean energy in the urban environment is another problem. Obsolete drugs have glutted the markets of both the countries and this group expressed serious concern in this matter. There are many such issues that both countries face in common. Environment and related issues need to

be addressed from the point of view of this shared experience and worked with on a common platform.

### **Action Plan**

1. The first task is to identify groups both in Pakistan and India that could work together on common environmental issues.
2. Sharing of information is the first step that can be taken, and a mechanism needs to be set up to do so.
3. A website of the PIPFPD is being set up, and initially a page can be devoted to report on common environmental issues. Concerned groups on both sides of the border could further disseminate this information.
4. SAARC studies should be compiled and shared.
5. National Conventions of PIPFPD in the two countries should include environmental issues in their agenda.
6. Journalists who are specialists on environment can play a facilitating role.
7. Armed forces can be involved in preserving the environment in areas under their control.

Presented by:

Nityanand Jayaraman

Suhasini Mulay

Atul Setalvad

Bawa

## LIST OF DELEGATES FROM INDIA:

- |                          |                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Syed Basheer          | 40. Vidya Bal                 |
| 2. Hasan Mansur          | 41. Nask Sandhya              |
| 3. Hasorath Mansur       | 42. Prajl Bidnar              |
| 4. Venu Gopal Varma      | 43. Madhav Sathe              |
| 5. S.N. Nagarajan        | 44. Harsh Kapoor              |
| 6. D.P.Sengupta          | 13 rue Coste Fresch,          |
| 7. B.Kanwar              | Combaillaux, "(Herault),      |
| 8. Patmardhan Anand      | France- 34980'                |
| 9. Dr. S.G.Reddy         | 45. P. Murthy                 |
| 10. G.N.Ganhar           | Executive Committee Member,   |
| 11. Nadi Hayer           | 51-B, First Avenue, Ashok No. |
| 12. M.Bala               | Chennai-600083                |
| 13. Pulak Chandra        | Tel: (O) 4894306/4899662,     |
| 14. Parpia Hab           | (R)4894283                    |
| 15. P.A. Mazar           | 46. Sultan Shahin             |
| 16. Meenkshi Devi        | E-22, Indra Prastha Apts.,    |
| 17. Asma Khaleeluddin    | 114,I.P.Extn. Patparganj,     |
| 18. Ram Dass Rao         | Delhi - 110092                |
| 19. Mr. A.S.Nathmo       | Tel: (O)2425806,              |
| 20. S.Pardian            | (R)2425806                    |
| 21. Dinakar              | 47. B. Narsing Rao            |
| 22. John T.K.            | Chairman, A.P. Chapter,       |
| 23. Isabella             | PIPPFD 8-2-677/B/1, Road No.  |
| 24. S.Vijaya Kumar       | 12, Banjara Hills,            |
| 25. Nityanand Jayaraman  | Hyderabad-500034              |
| 26. Bina Sarkar Ellias   | Tel: (R)3317719               |
| 27. Ritu Dewan           | 48. Sushobha Barve            |
| 28. R.Ramanutam          | City Coordinator, Mumbai      |
| 29. Patar Ashok          | Mohalla Committee, Flat No.3, |
| 30. M.J.Khan             | Kumaram, 10 Worll Sea Face,   |
| 31. Syeda Hameed         | Mumbai-400018,                |
| 32. B.S.Alia             | Maharashtra                   |
| 33. B.S.Meghania         | Tel:(O)4931642, (R)4929858.   |
| 34. Vivek                | 49. Dinesh Mohan              |
| 35. Kothapalli Ravi Badv | Secretary, Sanchal Foundation |
| 36. Dr. C.J. Nimal       | E-57, Panchshilla Park,       |
| 37. Mrs. Shashi Dai      | New Delhi-110017              |
| 38. Dr. Taj Shookahi     | Tel: (O)6591147 (R) 6494910,  |
| 39. Neela Bhagwaj        | (F)6858703                    |

50. Divil Kumar  
State Executive Committee  
Member, Jana Saahiti  
VUYYURU-521165,  
Andhra Pradesh  
Tel: (O)08676-33200,  
(R)33555
51. Jaidev S. Vagaria  
BK No. 1506, Room No.1,  
Section 30 A  
Ulhas Nagar- 421004  
Tel:(R)531165/528804
52. K. Nandini  
Founder Member, JAGRITHI  
Kakinad-PO, Kochi-30, Kerala
53. Surendra Mohan  
X-B-1, Sah Vikas Apts,  
68 Patparganj Delhi-110092  
Tel:(O) 3325571, (R)2242801
54. Manjoo Mohan  
Secretary, MDS,Secretary,  
HMS X-B-1, Sah Vikas Apts.,  
68 Patparganj Delhi-92  
Tel:(O)3325571, (R)2242801
55. Rati Bartholomew  
NATCOM Mebar, PIPFED  
P-34, Tara Apts, Alaknanda,  
New Delhi-19 Tel:(O)6442721
56. Anita Ratnam  
Director, Samvada # 303,  
Rams Infantry Manor, 70  
Infantry Road Bangalore-  
560001, Karnataka  
Tel:(O)5580585,(R)3336339,  
(F)5587493
57. Sumit Chakravarty  
Editor, Mainstream Weekly  
B-62, Gulmohar Park (FF),  
New Delhi-49  
Tel: (O)6497188, (R)6967201,  
(F)6569382
58. Jaisinghani  
V.S. Proprietor,  
Indus Advertising Agency 3-F,  
Naaz Building, Lamington  
Road, Mumbai-4  
Tel:(O)3880254,(F)3856509
59. Laxman Bhatia  
B-26, Press Enclave, Saket  
New Delhi-110017  
Tel: 6964036
60. Lt Col. Ajit Singh  
V&PO, Jahan Khelan,  
Distt. Hoshiarpur (Punjab)  
Pin- 146110 Tel:(R)01882-72227
61. M.P.S.Mann  
E-504, Som Vihar Apartment,  
Major Somnath Sharma Mrag,  
New Delhi-22 Tel: (O)6173037
62. Tara John  
Administrator,  
Women in Development Trust  
Deenabandupuram, (Via)  
V.R.Kuppam Chittoor District,  
Puttur-517599, Andhra Pradesh  
Tel: (O)08572-38856,(R)38857
63. John Inba  
Associate Adiministrator,  
Women in Development Trust  
Deenabondupuram, (Via)  
V.R.Kuppam Chittoor District,  
Puttur-517599, Andhra Pradesh  
Tel: (O)08572-38856(R)38857
64. Hemchandra Basappa  
Co-ordinator,  
Documentation &  
Dissemination Centre for  
Disarmament Information,  
21, Railway Parallel Road,  
Nehrunagar, Bangalore-560020,  
Karnataka  
Tel: (R)3441752, (O)2861921

65. Mohan  
Punjabi 63, Nibbana Pali Hill,  
Bandra (W), Bombay-50  
Tel: (R)6495544/6492277
66. Setalvad  
Sita NIRANT', Juhu Tara,  
Mumbai-400049  
Tel: (R) 6602119,  
(F) 6603925
67. Atul Setalvad  
NIRANT', Juhu Tara,  
Mumbai-400049  
Tel: (R)6602119, (F)6603925
68. Preamsar Gupta  
PIPFDP, Maharashtra  
Committee A-404, Montana,  
Lokhandwala Complex Andheri  
(W), Bombay-400053,  
Maharashtra Tel: (R)6361593
69. Satya Paul  
Secretary General, South Asian  
Frateranlty 6, Lajpat Bhawan,  
Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi-24  
Tel: (O) 6427650, (R)6534595,  
(F)6222150
70. Maneesha Tikekar  
A/3, Vinayak, Gandhinagar,  
Bandra East Mumbai-400051,  
Maharashtra  
Tel: (R)6418205/6443592,
71. Suhasini Mulay  
B-42, Friends Colony (W),  
New Delhi-110065  
Tel: (O) 6923648
72. Bawa, Vasant Kumar  
President, Shanthi Foundation,  
Hyderabad Shanthi Bagh,  
703/3 Rd. No.12, Banjara Hills  
Hyderabad-500034,  
Andhra Pradesh  
Tel:040-3399752
73. Dr. A.Karam Naik  
Managing Trustee, Rehmani  
Foundation A-32, Rosary  
House, 9th floor, Gunpowder  
Road Bombay-400010  
Tel: (O) 3741104, (R)3742232,  
(F) 3730689
74. Teja Singh  
277, Exchange Road,  
Jammu Tawi-180001 J&K  
Tel: (R)543734
75. C. Sadasiva  
98/1, Arjun Nagar,  
New Delhi-110029  
Tel: 6171531
76. Syed Saif Shahin  
E-22, Indraprasatha Apts.  
114 I.P.Extn.  
New Delhi-110092  
Tel: 2425806
77. P.K.Murthy  
President,  
All India Federation of Trade  
Unions 102, Bhavia  
Construction, E. Soamia Nagar  
Ameerpet, Hyderabad
78. Pro. Afaq Ahmad Gulkuda  
8-IDGAG Hills,  
Bhopal-462001, M.P.  
Tel: (O)767749,  
(R)541414/544025
79. V.T.Joshi  
Chairman, MP Chapter  
(PIPFDP) 25, Nupur Kunj,  
E-3, Artera Colony, Bhopal-16  
Tel: (O)0755-564589
80. Mrs. Bimla Krishan  
D-302, Lake View Enclave,  
Sharula Hills Bhopal-562013,  
M.P.  
Tel: (R)545947

81. Ram Krishan  
D-302, Lake View Enclave,  
Sharula Hills Bhopal-562013,  
M.P.  
Tel: 545947
82. K.M.Gupta  
E-4/207, Area Colony,  
Bhopal-461016,  
M.P.  
Tel: 0755-566289
83. Syed Malhar Hussan  
COVA, Director 20-4-10,  
Near Bus Stand, Chairman,  
Hyderabad Pin-500002,  
Andhra Pradesh  
Tel: (O)4574527/4572984,  
(R)3210877/3233879  
(F)4567087
84. Ulhas Rane  
Brindavan, 227, Rajmahar  
Vilas-II, First Main  
Bangalore-560094, Karnataka  
Tel: (O)3417283, (R)3417336
85. Mrs. Farukh Khaiser  
Bazm-E-Niswan Charitable  
Trust, Secretary 24/12,  
St. Micheal's School Road,  
Shantinagar Bangalore-560027,  
Karnataka
86. Dr. Sukhbir Kaur  
A-539, Ranjit Avenue,  
Amritsar-143001 Punjab  
Tel: (R)503274
87. Prof. A.S.Mahal A-539, Ranjit  
Avenue, Amritsar-143001  
Punjab Tel: (R)503274
88. Ved Bhasin  
Kashmir Times, Residency Road,  
Jammu-180001  
Tel: (O)543676, (R)437090,  
(F)542028
89. Vithal Ranjan  
Chairman, COVA, Hyderabad,  
Andhra Pradesh Tel:(R)7172884
90. J. Ravikumar Stephen  
Chief Facilitating Officer,  
Foundation for Action Based  
Learning and Research,  
7, Kalmegam Street Extn.  
East Tambaram, Chennai-600059  
Tel: (O)2365731, (R)2385755,  
(F)2385755
91. Lalita Ramdas  
Jt. Director, PIPFPD,  
'Ramu Farm', P.O.Kamarle  
Alibagh-402201, Maharashtra  
Tel: (O)02141-48711,(F)48733
92. Admiral Ramdas  
Chairperson, PIPFPD, 'Ramu  
Farm', P.O.Karmarle  
Alibagh-402201, Maharashtra  
Tel: (O)02141-48711,(F)48733
93. Debjani Dutta  
C/O Dunayan, 36/1A,  
Garcha Road Calcutta-700019,  
West Bengal,
94. Subodh Mitra Simanta Pally,  
P.O. Santiniketan,  
Distt. Birbhum West Bengal  
Tel: 03463-53903
95. Debasish Sarkar  
177D, Bode Pukar Road,  
Calcutta-700039 (W.B.)  
Tel: 033-3332368
96. Ranabir Samaddar  
C3/8, Mahavir Vikas, Sector3,  
Salt Lake Calcutta-700091,  
West Bengal  
Tel: (O)4681396, (R)3371801
97. Krishan Bandyopadhyay  
35 D, Raja Nabakrishan Street,  
Calcutta-700005 Tel: 5545393

98. Md. Sulaiman Khurshid  
42, Taltalla Lane,  
Calcutta-700016  
Tel: (O)2444876, (R)2454926
99. Pranab Ghosh  
18A, Ballygunge Station Road,  
Calcutta-700019 Tel: (R)4600345
100. Rita Manchanda  
B-10, Green Park Main,  
New Delhi-110016  
Tel: (R)6867694
101. Shishir Kumar Jha  
2416, 24th Cross, IFIM,  
Banashankari-II Style  
Bangalore-500070, Karnataka  
Tel: (O)080-6713172,  
(R)080-6661800
102. Alladi Sitaram  
Indian Scientists Against  
Nuclear War (ICANW)  
2nd Floor, Clairmont Apts.  
Rest House Crescent  
Bangalore-560001, Karnataka
103. Salil Biswas  
B-19/7, Uttarayan, 102,  
B.T.Road, Calcutta-700035,  
West Bengal  
Tel: (O)4408689, (R)5576772
104. Namita Choudhary  
52, Ramkrishan Pally,  
Calcutta-700078, W.B.  
Tel: (R)4151124
105. M.A.Qasim  
Asst. Secretary, Anjuman  
Taraqqul Urdu, W.B.  
C/o The Muslin Institute,  
21/A, Haji Md. Mohsin Square,  
Calcutta-700016, W.B.  
Tel:(O)2444876
106. Prabal Das Gupta  
C.S.S.Deptf. Indian Association  
for the Cultivation of Science,  
Calcutta-700032,W.B.
107. Misbahuddin (Parwaiz Anjum)  
Asstt. Secretary, Educational Co-  
ord. Committee 50-B, Diamond  
Harbour Road, Calcutta-700027  
Tel: (O)2264102, (R)4492246
108. Subhasis Chatterjee 25,  
Vivekananda Road Extn.  
Calcutta-700032  
Tel: (R)4258794
109. Sandip Bhattacharya  
41/1, Buin Roy Road,  
East Calcutta-700008  
Tel:(R)4581666
110. C.R.Bijoy  
Doctor's Quaters,  
Sri Ramakrishan Hospital  
Colmbatore-641044, Tamilnadu  
Tel: (R)0422-212430,(F)300567
111. Jamal Kidwai  
Consultant, OXFAM India Trust  
B-3, Geetanjali Enclave,  
New Delhi-110017  
Tel: (O)6957052, (R)6932480
112. Mahaendra Sharma  
12-D, College Lane,  
New Delhi-110001  
Tel: (O)3354408, (R)6357323  
(F)3354407
113. E.P.Menon Vallabhaiketan,  
Kumara Park East,  
Bangalore-560001, Karnataka  
Tel: (O)080 5299856,  
(R)2269862
114. Altaf Ahmad  
Treasurer, CIEDS No.26,  
17th Main, H.A.L. 2nd Stage,  
Bangalore-8  
Tel: (O)5296191,(R)5446013,  
(F)5278628

115. S.Shanta Bai  
Social Worker, VIMOCHANA,  
No.26, 17th Main, H.A.L.2nd  
Stage, Bangalore-8  
Tel: (O) 5269307, (F) 5278628
116. Vishwambhar Pati  
Indian Scientists Against  
Nuclear War (ICANW) Apt.  
305, Abu Apts., 10 Artillery  
Road Bangalore-560008,  
Karnataka  
Tel: (O)8603002, (R)5554246
117. Ujjwal Ranjan Jha  
Vice President Karnataka State  
Council 105-A, Noble House,  
Baswanager, Bangalore  
Pin-560037, Karnataka  
Tel: (R/F)5235043
118. J. Vimalanathan  
Executive Director, NESA 93/2,  
Charles Campbell Road,  
Cox Town Bangalore-560005,  
Karnataka  
Tel: (O)5483642/5487654,  
(R)5445431, (F)5485134
119. C.T.Joshi  
Journalist, No. 12, 2nd Main,  
4th Cross, Nagappa Block,  
Sriamapura, Bangalore-560021,  
Tel: (R)3324456
120. Kadir Zaman  
16-10-49, Malakpet,  
Hyderabad-500036
121. Sumanta Bannerjee  
D-33, Press Enclave,  
New Delhi-110016
122. Lajpat R.M.
123. Mayuri Arun Samant
124. Vijay Pratap
125. Satyajit M
126. Rama Melkote
127. Dr.A.R.Varma
128. Madan Rao
129. T.Jayashree
130. Mir Ayoob Ali Khan
131. Nanak Singh Nishter



## LIST OF DELEGATES FROM PAKISTAN:

- |     |   |     |  |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 1.  | Riffat Hussain<br>PILER, 141-D(Annexe), Block-2,<br>PECHS., Karachi                                       | 13. | Syed Mujahid Ali<br>Editor Sunehra Daur, 275<br>Panorama Centre,<br>Fatima Jinnah Road, Karachi                  |
| 2.  | Syed Abdul Naseer Rizvi<br>F-3, Raza Square, Block-10,<br>RashiMinhas Road, Gulshan-e-<br>Iqbal, Karachi  | 14. | Muhammad Nawaz<br>L-3123, Block-2, Matroville,<br>111-Abul Hasan Ispahani<br>Authority, Karachi                  |
| 3.  | Umar Abbas<br>36/A-6, Rabia City,<br>Gulistan-e-Jauhar, Karachi   | 15. | Muhammad Ali Shah<br>Syed Muhallah, Goth Ibrahim<br>Hardri, Karachi  |
| 4.  | Mohd. Naseem<br>46/1, 22nd lane, Phase VII, Defence<br>Housing Authority, Karachi                         | 16. | Sabahat Ali Khan<br>Fl: I-1, Noman Terrace, Phase-3,<br>Gulshan-e-Iqbal, Block-11,<br>Karachi                    |
| 5.  | Mir Zulfiqar Ali<br>1/607, Shah Faisal Colony, Karachi  | 17. | Adnan Razi<br>11/10, Drig Road, Karachi-8  |
| 6.  | Karamat Ali<br>Flat # 17,2nd Floor, Waqar<br>Building, Near Mehran Clinic,<br>Block-A, SMHS, Karachi      | 18. | Shaikh Latif Ahmad<br>Qureshi House # R-505, Sector2-<br>B Madina Road, Jacob Line,<br>Gulshan-e-Zahoor, Karachi |
| 7.  | Sharafat Ali<br>R-28, Paradise Cottages, Block-<br>12, Scheme33, Abul Hassan<br>Ispahani Rd. Karachi      | 19. | Rochi Ram<br>605, Garden Falcon, Apt. Violet<br>Street, Garden East, Karachi                                     |
| 8.  | Muhammad Baqir Naqvi<br>B-116, Block-1, North<br>Nazimabad, Karachi                                       | 20. | Raees Akhtar<br>H.N.-207, Al-Fazal Town,<br>Phulcli, Hyderabad   |
| 9.  | Abdul Saleem Siddiqui<br>G-205, Chappal Gasrden, Abul<br>Hasan Ispha Rd. Karachi                          | 21. | Muhammad Ehsan Sheikh<br>House No. 193, Block-C, Unit<br>No.7 Latifabad, Hyderabad                               |
| 10. | Dalpat R. Sonavaria<br>257 Father Geneinez Road<br>Catholic Colony, No.1 Karachi                          | 22. | Khurshid Ahmad Sheikh<br>A/116-306, Jamia Masjid Rd.<br>Hiraabad, Hyderabad                                      |
| 11. | Merajuddin Khan<br>50/1, Phase 6, Off 13 Street,<br>Khyaban-e-Muslim, Defence<br>Housing Society, Karachi | 23. | Ms. Sheema Kermani<br>50-B, Khyban-e-Shaheen,<br>Defence Housing Authority,<br>Phase V, Karachi                  |
| 12. | Mohammad Nazir<br>A-70, Indus Mehran, Malir,<br>Saudabad, Karachi   | 24. | Mrs. Sanobar Nazir<br>A-70, Indus Mehran, Malir, Karachi   |

25. Azhar Saleha Athar  
R-6, Ruffi Villas, Block-13D,  
Gulshan-e-Iqbal, Karachi
26. Rasool  
Bux Palijo Village Mungar Khan  
Palijo, P.O. Jangshahi, Distt.  
Thatta
27. Farhat Zaidi  
R-9, 10th East St. Defence  
Society, Phase 1, Karachi
28. Mrs. Mussarat Jabeen  
R-9, 10th East St. Defence  
Society, Phase 1, Karachi
29. Ms. Mehvish Hussain
30. Rahat Saeed  
5-C, 6/16, Nazimabad, Karachi
31. Muhammad Sabihuddin Ghausi  
A-6, Shams Square, 83, Slynn  
Street Garden East, Karachi
32. Mrs. Sadaf Tanveer Gondal  
7-A, Aziz Ave, Canal Bank,  
Gulberg V Lahore
33. Khadim Hussain  
H.No. 462, St. 107,  
1-8/4, Islamabad
34. I.A. Rehman  
5-Temple Road, Lahore
35. M. Saleem Raza  
2-C, 7/3, Nazimabad, Karachi
36. Dr. Sohail  
Syed Tariq Medicare Hospital,  
22-23, Shaheed-E-Millat Rd.  
Karachi-74000
37. Mrs. Ghazala Tariq  
Medicare Hospital, 22-23,  
Shaheed Millat Rd.  
Karachi-74000
38. Dr. S. Haroon Ahmed  
13-Hilal-e-Ahmer House,  
Clifton, Karachi
39. Mrs. Anis Haron
40. Abdulhusen Haidermota  
303&305, Kashif Center,  
Shara-e-Faisal, Karachi
41. Zafar Malik  
46-B/IV, Wapda Town, Lahore
42. Biyyathil Mohyuddin Kutty  
D-4, Shahzada Plaza, Gul  
Meher Street, Business Recorder  
Road, Garden East Karachi
43. Zia Abdul Rehman
44. Zafar Hussain Qazi
45. Zafar Ali Khan
46. Zaeema Saga
47. Tariq Javaid
48. Sultan Mehmood
49. Syed Sajad Haider Rizvi, JRC
50. Sofia Naveed
51. Shahzad Ahmad
52. Shahid Nadeem
53. Safdar Hussain Tarer
54. S.M. Anwar Pasricha
55. Rana Maqbool Hussain Khan
56. Rahat Ali Dar, (JRC)
57. Naveeda Hashmi
58. Muhammad Tanveer, Dr. (JRC)
59. Muhammad Saeed Awan
60. Muhammad Rashid
61. Muhammad Naeem
62. Muhammad Kamran Bashir, SAP
63. Muhammad Akram Varrich
64. Muhammad Akram
65. Mian Maqsood Ahmad
66. Mian Abdul Aziz
67. Mhammad Zaman Khan
68. Mehr-un-Nisa Khanam
69. Masood Ashar
70. Khalid Bashir Engr.
71. Liaqat Ali, Adv.
72. Liaqat Naseer, Advocate

73. Javaid Iqbal  
74. Iqbal Haider Butt, (JRC)  
75. Imtiaz Ahmad Lali, Advocate  
76. Imtiaz-ul-Haq  
77. Hussain Naqi  
78. Gulshan Tariq Mrs.  
79. Farrukh Sohail Goindi  
80. Dr. Faqir Hussain Saga  
81. Cindrella Nishat Zaigham  
82. Ch. Muhammad Sarwar Adv.  
83. Dr. Ihsan-ul-Haq  
84. Aziz Mazhar  
85. Ahtisham-ul-Haq Dar  
86. Abdul Rauf Malik  
87. Abdul Hameed Khan  
88. Muhammad Nisar Safdar  
89. Farzana Anwar  
90. Muhammad Kamran Islam  
91. Moulyi Obaidullah Bhutto  
Karachi  
92. Mrs. Zareena Salamat  
13-A, Sattelite Town, Rawalpindi  
93. Chaudhry Muhammad Iqbal  
H. 802, Said Pur Road, Arsad  
Pura, Rawalpindi  
94. Tahira Abdullab  
H.No.15, St.3, F-8/3, Islamabad  
95. Khadim Hussain  
H.No. 462, St.107, I-8/4,  
Islamabad  
96. Syeda Nasreen Sultana  
H.No.159, St.44, G-10/4,  
Islamabad  
97. Malik Muhammad Ali Bhara  
H-4, St. E, Block X, Gharib  
Colony, Vehari  
98. Muhammad Iqbal Malik Chak  
Jmeraliwala Vill. Kabir Pur,  
T& Distt. Multan  
99. Fayyaz Hussain Vill. Gopal pur,  
The. And Distt. Multan  
100. Ashfaq Ahmad  
Arshi Chak Kikar Wala, Vill.  
Kabirpur, T.& Distt. Multan  
101. Abdul Hakim  
431/TDA, The & Distt. Layyah  
102. Muhammad Qasim Anwar  
249/4, Aurangabad,  
Nazimabad, Karachi  
103. Muhammad Sajid  
Mouza Gopal Pur, Multan  
104. Shahzad Anjum  
Basti Bhawalpur, Sukha, Multan  
105. Zerqa Saleem  
3609 A. S Jalil Abad Colony,  
Railway Rd. Colony, Multan  
106. M. Raez Ahmad Khan  
Plot No. K-1315-A, Corangi  
Town, Karachi  
107. Malik Rahat Mahmood  
64-Patial Bagh, Jinnah Rd.  
Quetta  
108. Muhammad Qasim  
Lahore Hotel, Abdul Sattar Rd.  
Quetta  
109. Fida Hussain  
Village Seemlasht, Po/Ps Tehsil  
Chitral District Chitral  
110. Saad Roomi, Mr.  
Vill. Morder, P/S & Teh  
Murkaho, Chitral  
111. Ayub Shah, Mr.  
H.No. 928, Patti Lahorian  
Moha. Ander Sheher,  
Pesahawar  
112. Mohammad Azam Afridi, Mr.  
Afridi House, Dohra Road,  
Govt. College of Technology,  
Kohat Rd, Peshawar  
113. Azhar Jamil Mr.  
H.No. 2372, Moh. Jattan,  
Yakatoot, Peshawar

114. Dost Muhammad, Mr.  
Ashraf Kali, Ladi Kotal, Khyber  
Agency
115. Aimal Khan Moh.  
Zareen Baba, P.O. Akora  
Khattak, Teh & Dist Nova
116. Gul Rehman Khan  
Vill. & PO Nisatta, Moh.  
Azizkhel, Dist Charsadda
117. Issa Khan Mr.  
Noor Street Zaryuab Extension,  
Zaryuab colony No. 2, Dalazak  
Road, Peshawar
118. Jamila Mrs.  
Moh. Dagi Khel, P.O.  
Nowshera Kalan, Teh.&  
Dist. Nowshera
119. Khawaja Mohammad Waseem  
19-B, Street No.4, Defence  
Officers Colony,
120. Muhammad Khurshid Khan  
2-A, National Bank Colony,  
O/S Kohati Gate, Peshawar
121. Mahasal Khan, Mr.  
3-A, Babar Road, Peshawar
122. Naveen Chander Mr.  
H.No. 2441, Karim Pura, Peshawar
123. Qamar Un Nisa Mrs.  
50, G-3, Street-5, Phase II,  
Hayat Abad, Peshawar
124. Rahim Shah Afridi  
Muslim Abad, Kakshal, Peshwar
125. Riaz Gul Khattak  
Shaheen Books, Spogmay  
Plaza, Jamrud Road, Peshawar
126. Sartaj Ahmed Khan  
Vill. Isazar Drosh, PO& Teh  
Drosh, Dist. Chitral
127. Sher Muhammed Khan Moh.  
Bunr. Vill & PO/PS Migora, The  
Saidu Sharif, Dist Swat,
128. Sher Zaman Usman Abad,  
Pabbi, Dist. Nowshera
129. Sultan Muhammed Nothia  
Qadeem, Moh. Khan Abad,  
Near Dist Council Office Pesh
130. Col. Sayed Gul Badshah  
Bukhari #2, Islamia Road,  
Peshawar Cantt
131. Syed Minhaj Ul Hassn Dept of  
History, University of Peshawar
132. Tariq Ahmed Khan  
Mohallah Tewas Khan
133. Zain Ul Abidin  
Vill. Morder TehMolkhow,  
Dist. Chitral
134. Shah Jehan Moh.  
Sarai Bari Cham,  
Hoti Mardan
135. Haji Muhammad Adeel  
Ziarat Road, Gunner Lane,  
Peshawar Cantt
136. Muhammad Haleem Jan  
H.No. A 3/2, Khalid Lane,  
Peshawar
137. Siddiqa Bano Mrs.  
H.No.3/2A, Khalid Lane,  
Peshawar
138. Benazir Mrs.  
Vil Nasitta, PO Nisitta,  
Moh. Aziz Khel, Dist.  
Charsadda
139. Sarfraz Khan Dr.  
5-Khalil Colony, Kanal Road,  
University Town, Peshawar
140. Arshad Waheed  
2-Gulgashi East, New Chungi  
No. 6, Basan Ravi, Multan
141. Dr. Mubashir Hasan  
4-K, Gulberg 2, Lahore
142. Mahlika Samdhani  
44-A, TECH Society, Lahore

143. Manzoor Ahmad
144. Rashid Rahman  
5-A, Nisar Road, Lahore Cantt.
145. Surayya Alam  
90- Upper Mail, Lahore
146. Mir Sikandar Ali  
Talpur Vill. HoziGhanwar  
Khan, Talpur, The & Distt.  
Hyderabad
147. Asad Iqbal Butt  
D-185/4, federal 'B' Area,  
Karachi
148. Zain-ud-Din Ahmad  
5-A, Waris Road, Lahore
149. Mrs. Hajrah Mumtaz  
H. 9-A, St. 65, F-7/3, Islamabad
150. Mrs. Fatima Shah  
4-K, Gulberg11, Lahore
151. Izhar-ul-Haq  
Advocate 32-C, G.O.R. 111,  
Shadman, Lahore
152. Riffat Aziz  
Mrs. Vill. And Post Office  
Kabal, Swat
153. Ijaz Ahmad Durrani  
Vill. Raheema, P.O. Sardehri  
The. Charsadda, Peshawar
154. Shahid Fiaz  
Street No. 25, Muhallah Canal  
Park, Muridkey,  
Distt. Shekhupura
155. Hanif Balochi
156. Dr. Mohd. Shaimi
157. Mohammad Asif Dar
158. Malik Mohammad Ali
159. Nusarrat Hilali
160. Syed Abdul Ahad Agah
161. Shakeel -ur-Rehman
162. Mohd. Ahtagham  
3/2 A, Khalid Lane Peshawar

## Only Breath

Not Christian or Jew or Muslim, no Hindu  
Buddist, Sufi or Zen. Not any religion  
or cultural System. I am not from the East  
or the West, Not out of the ocean or up  
from the ground, not natural or ethereal, not  
composed of Elements at all. I do not Exist.  
am not an Entity in this world or the next,  
did not descent from Adam or Eve or any  
Origin Story. My place in placeless, a trace  
of the traceless. Neither body or soul  
I belong to the beloved, have seen the two  
worlds as one and that one call to and know,  
first, last, outer, inner, only that  
breath breathing human being.

*Jalaluddin Rumi*

