

# DIALOGUE

PAKISTAN >>> 2019



DIALOGUE  
REPORT



# **FIRST-EVER DIALOGUE PAKISTAN**

## **“IS PAKISTAN HEADED IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION?”**

**Saturday, 26 January, 2019**  
**Hotel Margala Islamabad**



Organized by:  
Pak Institute for  
Peace Studies (PIPS)



[www.pakpips.com](http://www.pakpips.com)



[PakistanInstituteForPeaceStudies](https://www.facebook.com/PakistanInstituteForPeaceStudies)



[pakpips](https://twitter.com/pakpips)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	3
<b>Key findings</b> .....	4
<b>Introduction</b> .....	7
<b>Inaugural Session</b> .....	9
<b>Dialogue 1: What is the Role of Religion in the State of Pakistan?</b> .....	11
<b>Dialogue 2: Is Pakistan a security state?</b> .....	21
<b>Dialogue 3: Is parliament supreme in Pakistan?</b> .....	32
<b>Dialogue 4: Pakistan’s relations with its neighbors</b> .....	47
<b>Dialogue 5: Is Pakistan suffering from identity crisis?</b> .....	63
<b>Concluding thoughts</b> .....	77

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To move forward as a country, there is need for holding dialogues on pressing national issues, such as center-province relations, role of religion, country's foreign policy – among the most relevant stakeholders, who otherwise do not sit together with each other. Without such dialogues, our debates and answers are no less than clichés, leaving us stuck with the past, even though strides have been made in many spheres of life.

These are the major findings of the daylong “Dialogue Pakistan” comprising of five different thematic sessions on the critical intellectual and policy issues of the country.

Two internal policy questions the country faces every now and then are about the exact parameters in which the state should embrace religion and about the ties between the center and the provinces. Any discussion on these ends up inviting polarizing debate on the primacy of security considerations in the state affairs, which, in turn, elicits heated discussions on civil and military relations.

The report notes that while it has been more than seventy years since Pakistan's creation, many of its debates are still dated back to its genesis. Questions are asked about the role of religion in the run-up to Independence, so that the future is charted. Some fret over the existential crisis. Even our foreign policy, especially regional relations – right or wrong, continues to hinge around relations with our eastern neighbour. This continues despite the fact that the world around and polity inside have considerably changed.

Yet, voices are raised for undoing what has been achieved. Many, for instance, hailed the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment as a great way forward on centre-province relations, and warned against rolling it back. Similarly, the dialogues endorsed the parliament as the platform for ironing out differences among different segments of the society. Pakistan, after all, is an unequal but diverse country; and its variations can be addressed through parliamentary channels. Any attempt of imposing unitary model will backfire.

The dialogues note that the primacy of security organizations in country's decision making owes itself to the varied security challenges, real or perceived, the country faces. What is positive is the realization that holding dialogue is necessary among civilian and military players, who can present their point of views to each other, and then identify a way forward.

The dialogues note that the country's policy-making bodies should realize that unity is possible with diversity. The report suggests that our debate and solutions should move forward.

# KEY FINDINGS

## ***The Need for Dialogue***

- Dialogues on any issue, no matter how critical, can help find mutually acceptable solutions to any problem;
- With the absence of the tradition of holding dialogues, there is little understanding of what a dialogue entails despite the fact that the culture of dialogue is also encouraged by Islam, the dominant religion of Pakistan;
- To resolve societal differences, states should step forward in conducting dialogues.

## ***Role of Religion in the State of Pakistan***

- Any debate on the role of religion in state affairs extends back to its role in the run-up to the creation of Pakistan. Seventy years down the road, there is still debate about what was the precise role of religion in seeking independence and then creating a nation. It is as if the debate has not moved forward!
- The State, irrespective of which government was in power, has used religion since its inception not only in domestic polity but in formulation of foreign policy as well;
- Even remedies of many social ills are sought through religion. The most recent case is of countering terrorism through "*Paigham-e-Pakistan*", a state-backed document, signed by leading scholars of all denominations that denounce violence in the name of Islam;
- Part of the challenge is from the conception of religion in state affairs. To the founding fathers, the idea of religion seemed different than to those who came to rule the country later;
- The role of Islam in politics, to some, dates back to the foundation of a country in which religion played a dominant role. Since 1947, different organizations meant to advise on Islam have been in existence from start. Others argued that religious groups have pressurized successive governments to Islamize laws, which ended up excluding some segments of the society;
- Instead of focusing on what role religion should have, the most pressing challenge facing the state has been of defining relations between the centre and provinces;
- Religion can also be used as a key element of societal development, by allowing them to merge in the society.

## ***Is Pakistan a Security State?***

- Dialogue on national security elicits debate on civil-military relations. Civilians blame the military for overstepping their authority, a claim that the military deflects by stating that they had to respond due to civilian inefficiency;
- Public welfare should be central in any policy making process. Civilians argue that it is not so because of the primacy of security institutions;

- The primacy of security organizations in the country's decision making owes to the varied security challenges the country faces. These organizations step in civilian sphere on the advice of the civilian governments;
- The parliamentary performance of civilians is questioned too. For all the security considerations, no one stops the civilians from legislating for the public. But some argue that even legislative processes are influenced in the name of security;
- Civil-military disputes can be resolved internally, not by inviting foreign players;
- Civilians question the resources spent on the military, which otherwise could've been kept for public welfare. But military players argue that the resources meant for the public welfare are being fritted by the civilians;
- There is therefore a need to hold dialogue among civilian and military players, who can then present their point of views to each other, and thus identify a way forward.

### ***Is Parliament Supreme?***

- Parliament can help iron out differences among different segments of the society, provided it plays its due role and is given rightful importance;
- Whether or not Parliament is supreme is debatable. Its supremacy is often not recognized in practice. Yet, even dictatorial regimes have to seek parliamentary approval for some of the controversial changes in the basic structure of the Constitution;
- There is a strong view that Parliament is not autonomous. It is influenced by other forces, and even political parties are unable to ensure its autonomy;
- Parliament has traditionally been weakened by successive military rules. Lack of seriousness by political parties also contributed in its decline. A recently-emerging challenge for the parliament is whether or not judiciary can strike down parliamentary powers;
- Political parties, parliament, and democracy – these three are interlinked with each other. They strengthen each other;
- In recent times, Parliament took great initiatives, especially related to women rights and integration of tribal areas;
- Parliament should work for quality of representation and adequate representation of religious minorities and marginalised communities. It should also be accessible to people through developing an interface through which they can file their grievances.

### ***What Determines Pakistan's Relations with Neighbouring Countries***

- Pakistan's relations with neighbouring countries are largely determined by how it will strengthen it against Indian hegemonic designs. It is however debatable as to whether that fulcrum is justified;

- No country exists in a vacuum. There have been threats to Pakistan's survival, while the region itself has been under throes of conflict. Even Indo-centrism of Pakistan can be traced to an insecure environment. These realities catapulted security organizations into playing a dominant role;
- For all the internal weaknesses in the country, the central state security mechanism has not broken down. This is a big positive development;
- To some, Pakistan's foreign policy choices are also constrained by how it is viewed for its closeness with China, a rising power. Others argued that we need to come out of us-versus-them mentality, of being either on China's side or the side of the US. Concerning the Middle East, Pakistan finds itself in a difficult situation, as it has good relations with Iran, but wants to benefit economically from Gulf countries, including Saudi Arabia;
- In a decade or two, Pakistan's power differential with India will further widen to the benefit of India. That should be taken into account;
- Foreign policy should cater to internal realities, and today's biggest problem is economy. There is a need to involve multiple players in defining the term "national interest."

### ***Is Pakistan suffering from an Identity Crisis?***

- Pakistan was created to safeguard the legitimate rights of all peoples belonging to different castes, religions, but unfortunately, majoritarian rule prevailed in the country, squeezing the space for minority groups, and thus creating a sense of identity crisis;
- Smaller ethnic groups believe that their identity, cultural values, have been ignored altogether;
- While there is no harm in having national security paradigms, these should exist within the democratic structure;
- Seventy years after Pakistan's creation, one of our perennial debates is still about what led to its creation. The debate is then linked to some sort of existential fear. We need to come out of this fear;
- Policy-making bodies should realize that unity is possible with diversity;
- The 18<sup>th</sup> amendment has been hailed as a great way forward on centre-province relations; any attempt to roll it back may backfire.

# INTRODUCTION

Pak Institute for Peace Studies (PIPS) organized a one-day "Dialogue Pakistan" on 26 January 2019, in Islamabad, on critical policy and intellectual issues of the country. The Dialogue brought experts from all across the country to discuss perennial issues such as the role of religion in the state, Pakistan's foreign policy, civil-military relations, and the identity crisis. The key objective was to discuss oft-contested issues of the country by bringing together key experts on the issue.

PIPS's extensive work shows that the best way to promote harmony in the country is to uphold diversity. This can be made possible by promoting the culture of dialogue, so that people can learn to respect different views. PIPS has already engaged a range of diverse stakeholders including religious scholars of all sects, policy makers, and parliamentarians, on the most pressing issues of the day. Such dialogues are most needed to promote a pluralistic society.

The key theme of the first-level "Dialogue Pakistan" is: "*Is Pakistan heading towards the right direction?*"

Dialogue Pakistan was held in Islamabad, on January 26, 2019, comprising of five sessions. The first session, with which **the conference was inaugurated**, explained the purpose for initiating dialogue in the contemporary Pakistani society. This session was addressed by former Chairman of the Council of Islamic Ideology who explored the roots of dialogue in the Islamic tradition. The second session, "**Role of Religion in the State of Pakistan**", discussed the relationship between the state and religion in the country. It explored how such debates delve back to the early years of Pakistan's creation. The third session, "**Is Pakistan a Security State?**" was meant to explore the concept of national security and whether that entails human security as well or not. It brought to fore the deep-rooted civil-military tensions in the country. The fourth session, "**Is Parliament Supreme?**" assessed the role of the Parliament and political parties who in order to claim the public space do not think of the far reaching consequences their pronouncements may make besides presenting how parliament itself is vulnerable to non-parliamentary practices and actors. The fifth session, "**What Determines Pakistan's Relations with Neighboring Countries**" discussed how Pakistan's regional ties are often chiefly determined by its ties with India for various historical reasons. The final session, "**Is Pakistan Suffering from Identity Crisis?**" elicited grievances from smaller provinces that despite devolution of power are being denied their fundamental rights by the state. The Dialogue concluded with a note of thanks by the Director of PIPS.







## INAUGURAL SESSION

**Opening Remarks by  
Mr. Muhammad Amir Rana,  
Director, Pak Institute for Peace  
Studies**



The purpose of "Dialogue Pakistan" is to discuss critical issues facing the country. I firmly believe that there is no issue on which well-meaning and constructive dialogues cannot be held. Yet, why is it difficult to hold dialogues on seemingly sensitive topics – have we lost authenticity of real conversation or is there any pressure from elite groups?

There is some ray of hope with the recent rising trends of dialogue. For example, several literature festivals have been organized not only in cities like Islamabad, Lahore, and Karachi but also smaller towns like Multan, Faisalabad, and Gwadar. PIPS conducted dialogues since its inception with a wide array of stakeholders such as religious scholars, teachers, students, and government officials. Therefore, it is hoped that Dialogue Pakistan 2019 will generate healthy discussion on some of the untouched subjects in the country and I assure you that this dialogue will find receptive audience.

**Keynote Remarks by Dr. Khalid Masud, Former Chairman, Council of Islamic Ideology**



There is great significance in promoting a culture of dialogue. This is right now missing in our society. With no trend of holding dialogues, we don't even know what a dialogue is anymore. Recently, dialogue has been supplemented with verbal and physical abuses. This has been observed at all levels, whether in the streets, on media, or the floor of the Parliament. For media, non-intellectual discussions are often a source of entertainment. Even talk shows discourage two-way communication. This is how state institutions too shy away from holding dialogues.

The word 'dialogue' refers to communication not necessarily between two people, but across multiple ideas. It is often wrongly translated into '*munazira*', in which

speakers try to disapprove the viewpoint of the Other. A more apt translation will be '*mukalma*', which inferred to mean an exchange of views. Dialogue promotes understanding through words, and is not restricted between two or three people but may involve many people.

Holding dialogue is significant in modern times for two reasons: One, dialogues enables understanding of the diversity of opinion. Many contemporary problems have emanated from inability to adjust with diversity. They are the outcome of socio-cultural differences. Dialogues can help find solutions to such problems. Two, the alternative to any dialogue is enforcement of opinion. Thrusting opinion on others provokes conflicts, and war is no solution to any problem. During the last two decades, armed militants, extremists, and terrorists not only brought death and destruction but also sowed the seeds of division in Pakistan's body politic.

States today can convert differences among disparate groups into consensus by promoting dialogues. Dialogues will enable people to exchange information, discuss their problems and find solutions. Dialogue connects people with constructive activities.

The culture of dialogue is encouraged by Islam. The verses of Holy Quran, revealed in a span of 23 years, are in itself different forms of dialogue. It answers questions. Prophet (PBUH) also used dialogues and agreements during his life to resolve conflicts. Quran also calls for using effective reasoning and eloquent communication.

"Dialogue Pakistan 2019", will discuss some of the serious problems of the country pertaining to democracy, nationalism, identity, relationships with neighbouring states, and national security.

In the end, protecting fundamental human rights makes a state stable, whereas ignoring them can weaken the state. It is hoped that the Dialogue Pakistan will address critical problems leading to their resolution.







## Dialogue 1:

# What is the Role of Religion in the State of Pakistan?

**Moderated by Khurshid Ahmed Nadeem, TV anchor and columnist**



The role of religion in the state has been in existence since the country's inception. Its vital role has been discussed in the country's formation and its security paradigm.

Pakistan has long considered itself as the legatee of the Subcontinent's Islamic civilization. At the same time we need to know if the religious heritage of the people of this land has been in sync with the view that the State has so far peddled.

Many countries have moved beyond taking religion as an important ingredient of nation-building. But Pakistan came into fruition on the demand of a separate homeland for Muslims of the Subcontinent. At the same time, questions are raised on how to treat non-Muslims of Pakistan, now that the country has been created".

**Dr. Qibla Ayaz, *Chairman,  
Council of Islamic Ideology***



There is difference in what the founders thought Pakistan was for, and how they perceived it to be. They believed in slogans that attached Pakistan with Islam. These slogans came from the people and not the leadership. Religious fervor compelled religious scholars like Zafar Ahmed Usmani and Shabbir Ahmed Usmani to participate in the Pakistan Movement.

The demand to run the state as per Islam has always been there. From early on, the government constituted institutions were tasked to reconcile Islam with the laws of the land. These include: the Islamic Commission (1956), the Islamic Advisory Council, the Council of Islamic Ideology (1973).

Religion's role in the state and society has been mixed. Religious sentiments have influenced not only domestic polity but foreign policy as well. At the same time, remedies of many problems including terrorism are being sought through religion, the most recent case being that of "*Paigham-e-Pakistan*", a state-backed document that denounces violence in the name of Islam.

It was in response to religious sentiments that Friday was declared public holiday. Such sentiments have direct bearing on internal security. Even now, seminaries are being engaged to address extremism.

More conferences and discussions should be hosted on similar topics, in the universities. In 1975, the first "Seerat Chair" was formed, which primarily was tasked to look into details of how state can learn from the life of the Prophet (PBUH). Such chairs can be dedicated in every university.

**Maulana Muhammad Khan Sherani, *Former  
Chairman, Council of Islamic Ideology***



For all the differences, unity is desired. It is natural, and therefore I am suggesting that there should be one system for one universe that promotes unity despite diversity. Like human body which has different limbs working for the body, there is need for a singular system which may have different parts. Cooperation can be achieved through dialogues."

Different people understand differently the meaning of words like religion and the state. In terms like "traditional religious thought" religious thought is one concept whereas the rest is hypocrisy. The words needed to be unpacked before the role of religion in the state can be discussed and then afterwards a dialogue can be held.

**Dr. Syed Jaffar Ahmad, Former  
Director, Pakistan Studies  
Center, Karachi University**



In the run-up to the creation of Pakistan, there were two schools of thoughts among Muslim polity regarding the future of India and these were represented by different political parties. For instance, the All-India Muslim League talked about provincial autonomy, territorial integrity, and equal rights for Muslims. Jamat-e-Islami on the other hand considered Muslims as one nation sans geographical limitations. Their leader, Maulana Maududi, a proponent of political Islam, opposed All-India Muslim League and the idea of Pakistan.

Post-independence, the civil and military bureaucracies in the country led the entire project of nation building. With time, Pakistan emerged as a security state, in which religion was used to advance domestic and international goals. Even a state does not have any one specific concept of Islam; it keeps changing with time.

Religious groups have pressurized governments too, which as a result had to take steps to exclude different segments of the society. In early 70's it was owing to pressure of religious groups that the 1973 Constitution mandated that President of Pakistan shall be a Muslim. In 2010, under the 18<sup>th</sup> Constitutional amendment, the faith of Prime Minister was also mandated to be Islam. During General Zia's regime (1977-1988), Islamization was aggressively pursued compelling more progressive elements to surrender.

**Dr. Fateh Muhammad Malik, Former  
President, Islamic International University,  
Islamabad (IIUI)**

The poet-ideologue Muhammad Iqbal talked of Muslims as a nation, the reference was in the modern sense of the word. Iqbal talked about spiritual unity as critical for any nation. He brought this concept from a French philosopher, and not any religious scholar. Pakistan too came into existence on the basis of the Muslim nationhood concept.

It was only after the demise of the founding leaders like Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan that the state drifted into another direction away from the



one laid down by its founders. Pakistan came into being with mutual efforts of the people and their leaders, rather than any military coercion.

**Dr. Fateh Muhammad Malik,**  
*Former President, Islamic International University, Islamabad (IIUI)*



## **DISCUSSION**

**Khurshid Ahmed Nadeem, TV**  
*Anchor and Columnist*

Pakistan is a democratic state, with a proper social contract in existence. The 1973 Constitution, which guides the country, greatly defines the relations between the state and Islam. Islam is even declared as the state's religion. In this case, he said that the state-religion link needs to be revisited.

**Dr. Syed Jaffar Ahmad, Former Director,**  
*Pakistan Studies Center, Karachi University*

The 'two nation theory', which separates Muslims and Hindus as two different 'nations', and was used in the run-up to Pakistan's creation, was a political device that became out-dated after Pakistan's independence. In the newly-created country, a more serious issue was of creating unanimity among the federating units.

Jinnah had already defined the relationship between religion and the State on 11 August 1947, when he had said that religion is a personal matter and the state will have no business in it. The speech could have been pursued further, but with the passage of the Objectives Resolution in 1949 it put political constraint on Liaquat Ali Khan, who did not have any political roots.

The passage of this Resolution had its own history. India, ruled by Congress, was able to work on its Constitution, whereas Muslim League in Pakistan lagged behind on this front. There was pressure in the Indian press for India to complete its Constitution, and we hadn't even started. That is why the Objectives Resolution was presented and it was endorsed by the religious leaders.

However, the Objectives Resolution sowed confusion as to whether Pakistan will ever be as Jinnah envisaged it or not. The resolution says that the sovereignty over the entire universe belongs to Almighty Allah alone, and the authority to be exercised by the people of Pakistan through their representatives. This in itself created confusion, which continues till today, and we continue to this day to ask each other who is supreme?

**Dr. Parvez Hoodhboy, Academic, Nuclear**  
*Physicist*

I ask from Maulana Sherani Sahib, "Is there any mention in the Quran regarding a state with geographical boundaries? Or if not is that why leading Islamic scholars like Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad and Maulana Madudi were against the

formation of Pakistan? Was their reasoning correct that the Quran's concept of state is not territorial?"

I would also like to ask from the audience, "Should we not derive pleasure from the fact that India is becoming a non-secular state?"

**Maulana Muhammad Khan Sherani, Former Chairman, Council of Islamic Ideology**

The Quran provides a framework of unity and cooperation and I agree with Maulana Azad's viewpoint regarding the definition of statehood in the Quran.

**Fateh Muhammad, Former President, Islamic International University, Islamabad (IIUI)**

Whatever is happening in India and Pakistan is basically a deviation from their founders' ideology. The founders used the word *deen* for Islam, rather than *mazhab*. One chapter of Iqbal's book was titled "Islam as a revolt against religion. Pakistan, should stick to the concept of *deen*, as presented by Iqbal. Only then can we get rid of extremism.

All schools of thought should be free to practice their belief system and sect-based politics should not be allowed in Pakistan. Nowadays a specific type of extremism is being promoted under the banner of Islam in Pakistan.

**Mansoor Akbar Kundi, Professor, Gomal University**

Religion has been exploited to gain influence and power and I am scared to live in a country where people don't have fear of God or legislation". "Their link with religion is weakening.

**Dr. Syed Jaffar Ahmad, Former Director, Pakistan Studies Center, Karachi University**

In India secularism has been compromised by the Indian National Congress as well as Bharatiya Janata Party. However, now it has reached the peak since BJP came into power. Resultantly, the country's social fabric will deteriorate even further.

**Amir Hazarvi, Social Media Activist**

We seem to be still entangled in the two-nation theory. I would like to know if religion has benefited Pakistan's development and also if it has played a positive role in promoting law and order?

**Atique, a student from BZU**

Allama Iqbal was not in favor of a separate homeland although our nation thinks otherwise. The Allahabad address was misreported and if Pakistan is an ideological state then why couldn't

**Participant**

What extent did religion play a role for Pakistan's creation? Those who migrated to Pakistan at its birth were attracted to religious slogans like "La Ilaha Illa Allah" (There is no God but Allah) but then why was it not enough to keep it intact?

**Dr. Qibla Ayaz, Former Chairman, Council of Islamic Ideology.**

In Pakistan and the Middle East, the social aspect of religion has been ignored, particularly those advocating political Islam. Religion could be a key element of societal development, had religious values been allowed to be merged in the society.

Instead, top-down change brought by state and law has been preferred over social change.

**Maulana Sherani, Former  
Chairman, Council of Islamic  
Ideology**

The Internal Security Policy of the last government has two salient points. One, the enemy is not outside borders, and secondly the enemy resides within. Also, it is evident from this policy that Pakistan's armed forces are responsible for the State's security and so they are going to tackle the enemy within in other words, it means that the Muslims residing within Pakistan are to be tackled by the Pakistan Army. The Protection of Pakistan Act allowed a 15 Grade army officer to shoot any citizen suspected of terrorism. And if someone claims to be innocent, he will have to prove it or face the consequences".

In accordance with the 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment, the military courts can also solve civil cases. Not long ago, the ones who were venerated as Jihadis at another times are being considered as terrorists and thus are liable to be tried under the Army Act.

One wonders if Pakistan of today is Jinnah's or Yahya's. Since after 1971, it cannot be said that the leftover country was created on the basis of Muslim nationhood, but due to supremacists.

**Fateh Muhammad Malik, Former President,  
Islamic International University, Islamabad**

Although East Pakistan got separated on the basis of ethnicity, it is still a Muslim country. It did not merge with India nor did Bangladesh change its Muslim identity.

**Dr. Syed Jaffar, Former Director, Pakistan  
Studies Center, Karachi University**

We romanticize Allama Iqbal's ideas by completely ignoring his statements. The 1930 address is also presented in half on the basis of which people say he wanted a separate homeland. When in the whole address he did not talk about partition of the Sub-Continent.

Islam provides some principles on which an Islamic State can be created but Allama Iqbal had only wanted an autonomous, majority-based region where the Muslims could pursue their political aspirations. Only then, in his opinion would Muslims protect India like it is done in Arabia. Allama Iqbal had written to Maulana Maudodi and asked him to come to Punjab from Hyderabad Deccan. Also, he had asked Syed Salman Nadvi to come and join him. When Chaudhry Rahmat Ali had coined the term Pakistan Allama Iqbal's teacher had written to him and asked if this was his idea but he had said that it was not his idea. Before the elections were held in 1937 Allama Iqbal had written several letters asking him to write about the Muslim majority areas and not the separate home land that he had talked about in the Lucknow Act.

**Fateh Muhammad Malik, Former President,  
Islamic International University, Islamabad**

Ordinarily, we discuss issues without giving adequate reference to the context that it said in. This was said by Allama Iqbal in response to a discussion about Muslim majority areas not otherwise.







## Dialogue 2:

# Is Pakistan a Security State?

**Moderated by Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS Director**



The dialogue has been designed in a way that different sessions are interlinked with each other. The previous session talked about the relationship between the state and religion. This has been one important question faced by Pakistan. The question is: What is the relationship between religion and the state, and what basic role religion should play in state building? What should be the characteristics of a state? What should be the grounds of state building? How should it move forward? What is it that Pakistan should have done for state building? In one way or the other, all these questions are linked to security. This session pertains to security. Not only regional security, but also how to provide the correct basis for building the state structure of Pakistan? When we talk about security, the first question that comes to our mind is of confusion, as if we are in a process of nation building. Is that so?

**Opening remarks by Farhatullah Babar, Secretary General, Pakistan Peoples Party, former Senator KP**



First of all, I would like to thank Mr Amir Rana for inviting me, since through participation in such activities, one becomes aware of different viewpoints. Whether Pakistan is a Security State or not? And what should be the state structure are interesting questions and my answer to these questions is a one liner: Yes, Pakistan is a Security State.

In a security state public welfare is determined by the security institutions to pursue self-claimed

public interests. According to Article 37, Pakistan should be a welfare state but we haven't acted upon it and therefore the Constitution is not being practiced. The reason for this is that security institutes have been determining issues pertaining to public interests.

(Mr Farhatullah Babar referred to the Dawn Leaks incident when the information of an in-house meeting of Prime Minister's House was leaked.) At that time, a lot of noise was made by security institutions that Pakistan is under threat because they have defined the domain of public interest. During the same time span another secret official meeting of military was held in Sargodha. The meeting minutes were leaked and reported in 'The Times of London' by a Pakistani journalist, but nobody made any noise. According to this report, young officers asked the army chief as to why he has given leverage to the civilian government? As per the report, the chief responded by saying that "the officers should keep quiet because we know what is our mandate. However, nobody bothered to ask why this news was leaked or has been reported in a foreign newspaper? The reason is plain and simple that Public interests are determined by security institutions.

Similarly, the Memogate incident is not that old either. It would be the first time in history that the Chief of the Army Staff (COAS) and the Director General, Inter Service Intelligence (ISI), went against their own Supreme Commander in the Court. This is because security institutes had already decided what were the public interests at that time. This kind of incident wouldn't have happened in any other country. The point is, in a security-driven state, public interests and welfare are defined by the security establishment. And Pakistan's public welfare is defined by its security establishment.

**Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS Director**

Pakistan has been facing a specific kind of situation in the past three decades. During this period, it was too sensitive about internal threats.

**General Amjad Shoaib, *Defense Analyst***



First of all, Pakistan is not a security state. In such states, movements are restricted and one cannot travel around freely in the country. But no such restrictions can be observed in Pakistan since there is freedom of mobility as well as expression over here while the environment of a security state is very different in this regard.

We should not be confused between the concept of a security state and a welfare state. In a welfare state, the state is responsible for fundamental needs of its citizens. The state provides them education, food and shelter and in return heavy taxes are levied on them.

In Pakistan, even in the midst of security threats, the government and the security institutions sit together to identify and then find

strategic solutions to these threats. With mutual coordination between different organs of the state the estimate of the intensity of internal or external threats is done. It is true that the role of security institutions will obviously be more assertive when the state has more kinetic threats since national security does not just include war threats but also includes threat to food security, economic stability and climate change led disasters.

Article 245 says that armed forces or any other law enforcement agency is not permissible to fire or conduct any inquiry unless asked to do so. The general impression that any army personnel walking on a road can fire on any innocent is wrong as well. They can employ their constitutional authority only in a specific situation or a specific region.

The Dawn Leaks was not a 'leak' but propaganda. It would be called leak if anything discussed inside would have come out. The propaganda-based story could have threatened our national security in a way that someone could go to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) against ISI for supporting internationally-banned outfits and individuals like Hafiz Saeed and Lashkar-e-Taiyyaba. If government had accepted it, then ISI would have been under restrictions and limits may have been imposed on its functionality. Memogate is similar story. Why do we want America to solve our internal security problems and why these cannot be resolved within the country?

The problem is that the parliament failed to strengthen and stabilise itself. Also, the government doesn't discuss formation of foreign policy and security policy in the parliament. Now who has stopped the government from discussing such matters in the parliament, he asked. Similarly, a specific amount of budget is dedicated to ensure the establishment of a welfare state; economic development has to be ensured. But why parliament doesn't do this? Who has stopped it from utilization of resources or to not spare budget for health and education? The estimated defense budget will be spent to deal with security threats. If threats are external, it is not going to decrease. We need to promote economic



development to deal with this. If resources are available then who is responsible for policy making? Who inquired about the loss of PIA, railway or Steel mills? Problems can be resolved if parliament play role in production of resources and economic development.

**Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS**

**Director**

The speaker has linked the concept of security to economic stability and human welfare. At the international level, especially at the United Nation (UN), the concept of human security and stability are viewed quite differently than Pakistan. The link between human and economic security and the traditional concept of national security needs to be deliberated upon. I would like to request Professor Pervaiz Hoodboy to share with us his views regarding this issue.

**Parvez Hoodboy, Academic,**

**Nuclear physicist**



We have been following the same concept of security that is predetermined by the army and it dominates and remains our first priority. Social welfare and justice on the other hand are not a priority for us.

Regarding the working of the parliament I don't think parliament has played any prominent role in the foreign policy formulation, testing of nuclear weapons, or when it comes to relationships with India, China, America, Afghanistan, Iran and Saudi Arabia. In my opinion foreign policies are made in the GHQ especially evident when guests' arrival in Islamabad because whenever any prominent personality visits Islamabad, he/she meets civilian authority as if it is necessary. Otherwise matters are settled and decided with the military administration. Secondly, see how many foreign visits the Army Chief had made in the last two months. Other countries perceived it weird but it is common in Pakistan.

Parliament has a limited role in internal affairs. For example, army raised objections on the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment, which was solely presented by the parliament. This illustrates army's concerns about parliamentary autonomy. And reversal of 18<sup>th</sup> amendment would allow army to freely utilize the financial resources.

It is interesting to know that during trainings, army officers are briefed about issues like reforms in political parties and economic stability rather than promoting awareness on defense-related issues. Unlike rest of the world, we don't take this seriously. For instance, officers of Naval Academy in the US are trained on matters of security issues rather than administration. But in Pakistan, army officers are trained in everything because army considers itself the sole guardian of the country. They interact with civilians, allow them to work to some extent but don't trust them. Because army is patriotic, which it certainly is. Army believed that national security should not be limited to border security. Internal problems are the actual problems. This is why army has been working to promote its concept of security via mass media. It has influenced mass media, mainly TV channels and FM radio. Few among you may know that

ISPR is running 62 FM channels. Late Asma Jahangir even filed a case in court in this regard. I don't know if anybody is following that case or not.

**Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS  
Director**

Two questions that I would like the audience to respond to in the light of the on-going discussion are: first, as General Amjad Shoaib said, who is stopping the Parliament from legislating for economic development? Economic issues are coming time and again in our discussion pertaining to security.

My second question is, as Professor Parvez Hoodboy said, we are heading to restricted politics. In this environment how can the state deal with diversity? What would be the impact of unity of the state's interests?

**Farhatullah Babar, Secretary  
General, Pakistan Peoples Party,  
former Senator KP**

The idea that Parliament is not doing its work properly needs to be reviewed. Several times parliamentarians have requested for briefing about rules and regulations of the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). The findings of the Kargil inquiring have yet to be shared just like the information regarding the army officers' assets as well as that of civil officers and politicians. The answer is always that this information "is secret and sensitive.

Parliament can question and it did but what can be done when

questions are unanswered. A recently-published booklet "*Killed in the Chamber*" reveals how questions were not responded on the floor of the House. When parliament inquired about the money trail of 90 Acre property of former Army Chief General (Retd) Raheel Sharif, the answer again falls under the head of secrecy and sensitivity. Even a 'Tweet' addressing the issue dictated us by saying that "don't try to instigate war among state institutions". All this is presumable happening under the dictates of law and the Constitution.

Two things are evidently kept in control in an authoritarian rule i.e. material and intangible things. By material things is meant financial resources or the defense budget. Like Parvez Hoodbuoy said "put your hand in a wallet and take out as much money as you want." However, the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment limits such behavior. An example that readily comes to my mind is that when the parliament tried to formulate "Right to Information Act", it is on record that the response was that the parliament needs to obtain NOC from the Ministry of Defense.

I want to make it clear that the parliament has fulfilled its constitutional responsibilities and tried to play its role within its capacity. In fact, the parliament is restricted and is not allowed to do its work freely.

**Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS Director**

Do we need a new social contract, or should the Constitution be reviewed or should amendments be made in the current Constitution?

**General Amjad Shoaib, Defense Analyst**

I don't think there is such a thing in the Constitution that needs to be reviewed. But parliament is free if it wants to bring a new social contract or hold discussions to review the Constitution then it should do so.

The actual problem is the economic crisis. Parliament should show how the circular debt reached to more than 1 trillion. Gen (retd) Raheel

Sharif's 90 acres are questioned, but what about 16,780 acres of Bahria Town owned by Zardari? Where did this money come from? Why are all state institutions running in a loss? Things are not necessarily in black and white as has been presented over here.

As far as the question of army interference in external affairs is concerned, when we receive a letter seeking opinion on any specific issue we provide it but never bother to ask if our opinion has been considered or not. Of course when the country is in a state of war then institutional support has to be given. Don't you see that Pentagon plays a dominant role in America? Trump promised during his election campaign to call back forces from Afghanistan but then ended up sending more than 4000 forces to Afghanistan.

Why is the country under 95 million debt? How was the loan taken for projects like Metro and Orange Train? Who will pay off this loan? Why those people are not questioned, who made offshore properties from corruption? These are the mega issues. Tell me why a person whose assets are outside the country will be loyal to his state? We should talk about the genuine problems of the state but we discuss imaginary things. Nobody talks about Kulbasha, the Indian spy. Is it not linked to our State's security? We should not misguide our people. Questions asked Farhatullah Babar in the parliament are not linked to public welfare. If his questions were answered, would that solve the problems of the general public?

### **Muhammad Amir Rana, *PIPS Director***

I think we don't have a good economist who would have informed us about the actual status of Pakistan's actual financial condition or identified factors causing such conditions. But my question is still there. I will repeat the same question to Prof. Parvez Hoodboy: "Do you think the State owned security policy proposed by General Jehangir Karamat would be helpful to improve the power sharing of the security establishment and the civilian government?"

### **Parvez Hoodboy, *Academic, Nuclear Physicist***

Yes, definitely we can hope for a culture of cooperation among powerful institutions. But I would like to inform Gen Amjad Shoaib that we don't have any enmity against Pak Army. Army should do as its mandate demands i.e. defend our borders. Their duties do not include establishment of housing societies, cement factories, or air companies. If army does its work within the Constitution then we don't have any objection.

The negative results of a security state as evident are that Pakistan's economy has deteriorated. First America and now China has been giving us aid, which is hurtful for our dignity. In order to assess reasons of economic loss, we will have to evaluate the general expenses and the army budget. Bangladesh was not progressive and its population was more than Pakistan. But today Pakistan lags behind Bangladesh. Their total national production is greater than Pakistan's national production. The reason is that Bangladesh has maintained good relations with its neighbors and strengthened itself to stand firm in this world.

But we are still committed to conquer Kashmir and we have fought three wars in 1948, 1965 and 1999. The war of 1965 was a tie, and we lost the other two. One Army General started a war through which Pakistan suffered. We cannot even ask reasons as Farhatullah Babar has said that it will be labeled as a matter of national security.

Our borders were not even defended properly in 1971 but of course if our country is defended properly then we will certainly be proud of our army.

**Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS**

**Director**

Do you, General Amjad Shoaib, think traditional paradigm of national security can be changed with progress in the state's economy?"

**General Amjad Shoaib, Defense**

**Analyst**

You cannot move forward without a good economy. We went into a loss because our imports are 32 billion rupees as compared to 16 billion rupees of exports. Expenses are greater than income, and favoritism is exercised during recruitments. Industrialists and few parliamentarians involved in power theft have not been arrested. Circular debt has been paid from personal income. Expenditure should be in line with income. We will have to raise our income to pay for higher expenditures but we are not in a condition to enhance our revenues.

Secondly, why has it been said that housing societies and businesses cannot be run by the army to generate funds for their activities? When journalists, Sui northern gas, oil and gas companies, lawyers, and judges can have their colonies then why army cannot have housing societies? Forces all around the globe run such kind of businesses to meet defense expenses. Armies around the world do businesses for the welfare of its employees. Majority of residents in defense

colonies are civilians. Why don't you see that people prefer to live there? People like to live there because of cleanliness, better health and education facilities. They pay 100% taxes over property and utility bills. There is no power theft. We have been providing a better lifestyle to facilitate our employees. Where is the harm in it? Army holds 43% shares in Fauji Fertilizers, cement factories and other industries while rest of 57% are held by either by the government of Pakistan or civilian banks or business units. The most important thing is that these are 100% taxpaying bodies and donot enjoy any subsidy. Electricity and gas are provided on same the rate as it is provided to industrial units of Sialkot and elsewhere.

So we are benefitting in two ways. Army officers are recruited in a young age (16-17 years old) and get retired mostly in early 40's. If we open schools for their children and produce our own resources to facilitate them then what is the problem? Instead, if we ask the government to pay our bills then the government will have to increase its budget to thrice of the available budget. Are we not responsible for the welfare of young men who have been sacrificing their lives to ensure our security? We don't want changes in the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. In fact, after transfer of power and resources to provinces, their capacity should also be increased. For this reason, problems have emerged.

You are free to talk about this. If one parliament brings an amendment and other parliament changed it, it is still by the parliament. If you don't want changes in this amendment, nobody can force you.

**Moed Yousuf, Foreign Policy Expert**

With due apology, the word "dialogue" should be erased from the banner if we have to continue in this fashion. I would like to remind you that we are here for a dialogue and not a talk show. We are not here to make jokes or disrespect others. After listening to this discussion as a citizen, what I have understood is that ironically both sides i.e. civil and military have been arguing over who is

the most corrupt? As a citizen, I feel threatened by both irrespective of who is the most or least corrupt because in my opinion we should talk about getting together to work for the common good. Why can't all the interest groups strategize about how to move forward together? Or is this military and civil bureaucracy of two different states? I hope that everyone present here realizes that this is not an election campaign. Instead, we are here for a dialogue while this discussion seems to be a fight more than anything else.

Every state has a national security plan and it takes steps in line with that security plan. Pakistan has a national security policy but is it a state-owned policy? There is a National Security Division in the Prime Minister's Office. It took us five years to make a national security strategy and that has still not been completed. Various sessions were held in this regard. I participated in one session. We took hours to decide what should be the first priority: Kashmir or public welfare? The basis of this discussion is wrong. We cannot move forward until we decide public welfare of a citizen is to take priority over everything else."

**Muhammad Amir Rana, PIPS**

*Director*

We wanted to have a discussion on what is a security state and what are the characteristics of a security state, and what is the real concept of a security state.

As you know, Pakistan is being projected as a transit state. We wanted to bring this under

discussion as to how a security state was converted into a transit state where neighbors from all sides feel threatened?

**Dr. Abdul Malik Baloch, Former Chief**

*Minister, Balochistan.*

General Amjad Shoaib gave two opinions simultaneously. First, he said he doesn't support quashing of the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. Secondly, he said provinces lack capacity for transfer of authority to them. It means, in your viewpoint, provinces are not capable enough to settle their own tasks. If a senior fellow like you believes that, then the provinces must be lacking something. Capacity building is a long process. How can capacity building take place in a province or less developed area that has suffered deprivation for the last 70 years? I would suggest no changes should be made in the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. Do not undo the success we achieved after learning a hard lesson by the circumstances that led to the fall of Dhaka. If changes are made to the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment it would give rise to resentment and anger among the weak provinces.

## QUESTION

As we lost trust in politicians after it became evident that they are corrupt and now we look upon the army and although army is less corrupt, but I wonder if it comes to the fore that the army is also as corrupt as the politicians then who will we turn to?

**Usman Bajwa, Participant**

Why are military-related questions being thrown only to a former military officer? Why cannot we ask military related questions from a civil bureaucrat or a politician? Secondly, if I want my son or relative to join army then I am sure he will become an army officer but I also know that in my next ten generations no one can become a politician.

**Irfan Hussain, Participant**

Firstly, General Amjad said that 'Defense Housing Societies have been made for army employees' welfare but here I would like to point out that these State of the Art facilities available are only for rich people and a poor man cannot even dream of going there.

Secondly, steps should be taken for the welfare of other law making institutes like the police as well.

Thirdly, in international politics, friends or foe are not permanent. My question to you is: why are our strategic capabilities only focused on India and not for other countries. For instance, I would like to know what is being done to safeguard Pakistan's interests in the CPEC?

**Emma Shaukat, Participant**

We are aware of our problems. Why don't we learn good things from each other? We should appreciate good things and try to adopt them.

**Yasmeen Lehri,  
Former MPA, Balochistan**

I wish we as Pakistanis could understand that our victory should also be the other's triumph. Secondly, patriotic youth are turning against the state since interest seeking landlords got together under the slogan "Pakistan Zindabad" and committed atrocities under the garb of better governance. In our efforts to form a security state, our own security is now at stake. We need to understand that we cannot be proven good globally, until we resolve our domestic problems.

**Safiya Haider, Microbiologist**

The bivil-military conflict is continuing since the inception of Pakistan. When will this tension end?

All over the world, parliament is supreme and military establishment is subservient to it. But it is different in Pakistan. General Amjad said people are free to walk around. In my opinion this statement is a slap in the face of the missing person's families and members of the Pashtun Tahafuz Movement (PTM.)

**Maulana Sherani, Former Director, Pakistan  
Studies Center, Karachi University**

I would like to bring your attention to the UN resolution 2220 that deals with socio-political matters. According to its Chapter 1, Article 1, sub clause no 3, in this agreement, even those governments are included that are not run by indigenous people but are governed as overseas territory. In my opinion, we need to determine which category do we fall in as a state since the welfare state deals as a party against crimes and the other form of state i.e. a security state itself perpetuates crimes.

**QUESTION**

The increased debt volume and how it will be paid also came under discussion and it was stated that it's not a new dilemma since from at least a quarter century Pakistan has not been in a situation where it can repay loans. Loans are directly linked to the GDP and our GDP is very low. Our financial budget has dropped from 10-12 billion to 6-7 billion. What I would like to know is whether there has been any reduction in the defense budget in the light of this development?

**Arif, Participant.**

General Amjad has said that the army runs businesses the world over. He gave reference of Turkey and Egypt. Can he give example of any other countries as well? He has mentioned that army officer retires early. I would say army officer

start working when he is 18 while civilian get employed in late twenties. Hence, duration of job is almost similar.

You have said that everyone pays tax in a welfare state. In our country, security officers pay tax on basic salary while the civilians pay tax on gross salary. It was also mentioned that previous governments took loans for Metro and Orange Train projects. My question to you is: If Children of army officers can go to school in the army transport then isn't it the poor's right to go to school in local buses as well?

Similarly, government official's pay was deducted for dam fund. 9 billion were collected while 13 billion were spent on advertisement eliciting funding for the Dam. What is this? Also, COAS has left the matter of signing Kalbhoshan Yadhav's death sentence to the civilian government. When will such matters be settled amicably?

**General Athar Abbas, Former Director General of Inter Services.**

I respect Farhatullah Babar and Prof. Parvez Hoodboy. I have learned a lot from listening to their views as well as reading their articles in the newspapers. I agree that the army has flaws that need to be corrected to productively move forward. I would urge both that growth is not possible through leg pulling. In my opinion the politicians are responsible for giving rise to grievances.

**Farhatullah Babar, Secretary General, Pakistan Peoples Party, former Senator KP:**

As Moeed Yousuf has said this discussion doesn't look like a dialogue but looks like a "munazara," similarly I would like to reiterate that this discussion is to promote a culture of dialogue and discussion and is thus not meant to degrade each other.

General Amjad has mentioned that 90 acres of General Raheel Sharif's land is visible to all but 25000 acres of land belonging to Malik Riaz has been ignored; he is quite right and this is why I believe several dialogues like this one should take place so that we may move forward. Especially, a dialogue should be held between the top civilian and military leadership in which we should sit face to face and discuss corruption cases. They may ask me about corruption and I will tell them the cases are subjudice; similarly I will inquire as to when are the accused going to be arrested? Also, I will question about the commercial use of lands that were allotted for defense purpose at the last moment by the Caretaker Prime Minister. Both sides have made mistakes. This is not the right time for such discussion. Only day before yesterday, the Supreme Court inquired the Army about the establishment of wedding halls near the cantonment area but if I ask the same question, it will be projected as if I am working against national interests. I agree with General Athar Abbas that we should not try to move forward by pushing others behind and instead hold dialogues to discuss these issues so we could move forward".

**General Amjad Shoaib, Defense Analyst:**

Dr. Malik asked an important question. I didn't say that the provinces do not have capacity. Instead, I have said that processes should be put in place for smooth functioning. You should have provided resources to the provinces so they could utilize authorities conferred to them under the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. You have to enhance the size of the police force so you may deploy provincial police in the place of federal units. For that purpose you

need to train them, which requires resources. Availability of such resources should be ensured. We don't have any problem with the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. Instead we just want them to get benefit from resources and be independent. Why this impression prevails that conspiracies are being made against the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment? It is not in danger and it is the duty of the Parliament to amend it.

It has also been said here that defense housing societies are for the elite class. It is not like that. This society is gradually becoming elite. Plots in DHA are offered at low price and easy terms. 80% plots are allotted to retired army officers while 20% are for civilians. But with the passage of time, rich people have started to buy plots there. A person like me with no source of income would prefer to sell the plot at a higher price so he could find a source of income. This is what I am doing. So this should be discussed in that context. The story of welfare should be brought under discussion through dialogue. But keep in mind one thing that army pays its expenses from such commercial activities. When I was posted in Rahim Yar Khan, we didn't have a cantonment for troops. For 30-35 years, we have kept troops in a rented place. We didn't take a penny from the government and built a cantonment from the revenue generated by these commercial activities. Army bore all expenses from its own pocket. We are well aware of our country's resources. And you have been trying well to fulfil our requirements but couldn't do so. That is why revenue is generated from commercial activities. In Panu Aqil, we utilized

barren land by leasing it to the civilians and earned revenue to fulfil our expenses. During my tenure, all constructions in Rahim Yar Khan were done from such revenues.

Dialogues should be held to discuss issues in the light of the changing realities of today. I was retired 19 years ago. Under Army Rules and Regulation, an officer above colonel rank has to show his assets every year. Intelligence evaluates assets and ratio of increase in it. And one more thing, greedy army personnel would never sacrifice their life in areas like FATA and Waziristan because lust for money will deter him from performing his duties.

**Parvez Hoodboy, *Academic, Nuclear Physicist***

First of all I would like to clear the misunderstanding that I have said that the army is at fault. If army does its assigned job then nobody has the right to criticize it. The thing that should be kept in mind is that a guard can never be the owner of the house. All is well if these rules are followed.

The important question is how can we move forward? Our country is considered backward regarding educational development. We are nowhere in the field of science and technology. Look at India, it has sent satellites to Mars and reached the Moon. We send satellites to the moon with the help of China. This is the actual status of science and technological development in our country.

A lot has been said about the state of economy within Pakistan. The question is how to move forward in a holistic manner? One thing is for sure that in my opinion if we keep on focusing on the Kashmir issue with all our might then we will not be able to function as a normal state. 3 wars have been fought and every time we have faced defeat. We have been accused and criticized of providing a safe haven to jihadist organizations by the world. FATF has put restrictions on us because Hafiz Saeed and Jaish-e-Muhammad have been



operating overtly. Nothing will change unless we become a normal state.

Look at Bangladesh and other countries who have been working for socio-economic prosperity, whereas we are stuck with the issue of Kashmir's independence. We should respect the bravery and struggle of Kashmiris against Indian atrocities but focus on our internal problems rather than solving global issues" he concluded.

**Muhammad Amir Rana, *PIPS Director:***

Thank you everyone. We didn't realize how discussion from India would turn to the issue of equitable distribution of resources between the civilians and the military leading to the conclusion that this civil-military conflict or national security paradigm stems from the unjust distribution of resources. Next time we will discuss civil-military relations based on the just distribution of resources.









## Dialogue 3:

# Is Parliament supreme in Pakistan?

*Moderated by Muhammad  
Ismail Khan, Senior Project  
Manager, PIPS*

Pakistan is a diverse State and only if its diversity is maintained will the issues assailing it be solved amicably. Religion is important but parliament is the national institute that provides a platform to diverse views and only the Parliament can offer solutions under the aegis of the Constitution to sort out polarization. However, is the Parliament really autonomous in the current scenario?



**Parvez Rashid, Senator, Punjab,  
Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz**



As a member of the Parliament, I have never realized that the Parliament is functioning independently. In my opinion, the Parliament is autonomous in writing but not in practice. Countries either have written constitutions or unwritten ones. In Pakistan, we have both, and unfortunately, unwritten is acted upon. For example in Ayub, Musharaf, and Yaha's era, written constitution was not operative while there have been times when One could strongly feel the presence of the unwritten constitution. The unwritten constitution is so powerful that politicians, general public, and media, are aware of their limitations and therefore a lot of issues cannot even be discussed on the floor of the parliament. I would like to admit that my party as well as all the other political parties' agenda have not been formulated independently. It is not that we do not want to work minus the constraints imposed on us since we have had a long struggle and we have sacrificed with our very lives to promote the causes that we believe in and still our struggle continues. In my view, therefore parliament is not autonomous.

**Afrasiab Khattak, former Senator, Khyber  
Pakhunkhwa**

Our state carries the legacy of evolving from an imperial state. Civil-military bureaucracy was established prior to formulation of the Parliament. That is why parliament as an institute has never become as powerful as the civil and military bureaucracy. Pakistan has a long history of martial law and during Zia regime, assemblies acted as a court of law because case hearings were done in the provincial assembly. It is as if the 'rulers' wanted to clarify who was in power. Thus the parliament suffered after every invasion and had to take fresh start innumerable times. Till 2009, the House of parliament did not even have the Wifi facility. Thus the parliament is a case of outmoded development. After 1971, the authoritarian institutes never accepted the constitution and it was violated after every martial law. The constitution propagates a parliamentary system whereas the presidential system is favoured. The 18<sup>th</sup> amendment was an attempt to include such things in the Constitution that were omitted during martial law.



Thus the ruling Constitution is not de facto but is de jure. We are living under a civil martial law. Under the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment, Article 6 was amended, and it states that any person who abrogates, subverts or conspires to abrogate or subvert the constitution shall be guilty of high treason. Still efforts are required to claim autonomy. In 2012, the authoritarian institutions tried to influence parliament via politicization of the judiciary. Therefore, national struggle is required for an autonomous parliament.

**Hafiz Hussain Ahmad, former Senator, Balochistan, Jamiat Ulema Islam (F)**



History of Pakistan shows that individuals freely exercise their authority as compared to institutions. Every powerful individual is striving to increase her/his influence. Fazal Ilahi Chaudhry was a weak president as compare to Prime Minister Z.A.Bhutto. Similarly, when Nawaz Sharif became Prime Minister, people like Rafique Tarar were nominated as president because Nawaz Sharif wanted to consolidate

all power under his command. In short, every politician tried to solidify her/his role instead of strengthening the institution, and thus are responsible for a weak parliament. For example look at the opposition. We are busy bashing each other for furthering our personal gains. Parliamentarians have the power and designation but they lack authority. Even Chief Justice doesn't have the authority to settle all issues. It's been 70 years and we are still trying out new things. Growth is not possible due to some constitutional limitations. For autonomous parliament, all political parties need to sit together and put aside their personal interests.

**Dr. Nafeesa Shah, Member of National Assembly, Sindh, Pakistan Peoples Party:**

Our party authored the 1973 Constitution. Whenever democratically elected government has come into power after a martial law ended, it has done so after PPP made sacrifices. The constitution declares politicians as peoples representatives and the State exercises its authority through its representatives. Parliament is supreme because it is the supreme legislative body responsible for constitutional amendments. It defines the relationship between different state institutions like judiciary or bureaucracy as well as determining how the public accounts will be handled? How state would run? To what extent are the Prime Ministerial powers?



In the past 11 years, since the ouster of Musharraf, many initiatives like the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment to 25<sup>th</sup> amendment were taken by the parliament. From the 18<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> amendment, we have made big strides since the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment was a big way forward. The parliament redefined state structure to presidential system in General Pervez Musharraf's era and then again we went back to the parliamentary system and strengthened the Senate. Thus the parliament took initiatives during the PPP tenure that were not taken in the last 70 years. It has made big strides in reintegrating the tribal areas affected security too.

In the current debate of judicial activism, the question is: does judiciary have the right to strike down parliamentary powers? That, for me, in the present limited context, is very dangerous.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> amendment, the advisory role of the Court was discussed. In my opinion this should be discussed further. In the past constitutional amendments have been passed which brought changes in the State's basic structure. For example, the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment where Nawaz Sharif tried to become "Ameer-ul-Momineen" – or the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment where General Pervaiz Musharraf found reason for keeping two positions. All these were passed in the parliament and validation was sought from the parliament. However, discussion on the floor of the parliament led to striking down these amendments leading to establish that the parliament is supreme and has ultimate authority to amend the state structure. In my opinion, the court does not have the

right to find cause for or against amendments carried out by the parliament in the constitution.

**Muhammad Ismail Khan, Project Director, PIPS**

It is widely believed that non-political actors played a role to weaken the parliament. But can any responsibility be fixed on the Parliament and the political parties in this regard? What is the role of political parties in weakening the role of Parliament? Don't they make decisions in core committees and use non-parliamentarian platforms to take constitutional decisions? Don't we also need to see what the role of parliamentarians in weakening it is?

**Parvez Rashid, Senator, Punjab, Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz**

Being a political worker, I won't accept such charges on political parties. I have very solid reasons for that. After 1958, political workers and political parties have been striving for their survival till today. Political activism got solely focused on how to survive the onslaught on democracy. Even in today's reality, the One who swears at politicians, alleges that they are corrupt has succeeded in the elections. In my opinion, to insult and belittle politicians is tantamount to negating the whole political process because enemy of politics is the enemy of democracy. It is similar to how extremism turns into terrorism. Especially when he has come into power through counting of votes and not casting of votes then in such an environment the political parties are busy striving for their defense and survival though it is really tough to be in the defensive because one has to carefully weigh every move to avoid annihilation.

**Muhammad Ismail Khan, Project Director, PIPS**

Political parties don't want to discuss 'proscribed' topics. Are the political parties not then also responsible for damaging the very process?

**Afrasiab Khattak, Former  
Senator, Khyber Pakhunkhwa**

In the historical perspective, the Pakistan movement was not strong in parts of what later became Pakistan and the Punjab Unionist party won the provincial election of 1946. In this party's views, Congress and Muslim League were wrong but the British were deemed as right. Politics was highly influenced by landlords and feudal landlords and this trend continues till this day.

Also, political engineering and formation of test tube political parties is a norm. Parties of 1990's learnt a useful lesson that conspiring against other parties is not worth pursuing and that is why they drafted a "Charter of Democracy." Dictators established National Accountability Bureau(NAB) and some politicians have faced political victimisation through NAB. Political parties' meetings and their strategic plans have no secrecy within the country, due to which oft times they have to conduct meetings abroad. Pakistan Peoples Party was a strong party but such manoverings have sabotaged it. Ideally the government institutions should act within their constitutional limits and not interfere with the working of the political parties.

Dynastic politics is another problem in Pakistan. New people should be given chances but it is not possible unless political process is allowed to prevail in the country. Even nation building is not possible without a stable political process. Political parties should also focus on reforming the working mechanism within.

Currently, there is lack of democratic freedom due to autocratic form of government. Political parties are not free to exercise their will. Recent government could not fulfil its promise of providing employment opportunities to youth. Even curbs have been placed on the media and it is very upsetting to see that a large number of media personnel have lost their jobs as a consequence. Political sacrifices are significant for nation building. It is due to the sacrifices of democratic people that we are here sitting and discussing these issues today. Political struggle is the historical asset of a nation but demoralization by putting politicians in jail on trumped up charges.

**Muhammad Ismail Khan, Project Director,  
PIPS**

An impression exists that parliamentary decisions are influenced by the religious parties who, although lose in the elections, but are still relevant, cause they exert pressure by joining hands with non-political institutes. Thus parliamentary decisions are in actuality made out of the parliament. Since 1947 till to-date the parliament has made constitutional amendments under the pressure of religious parties. Don't you think this practice has weakened the political system and the parliament?

**Hafiz Hussain Ahmad, former Senator,  
Balochistan, Jamiat Ulema Islam (F)**

In Pakistan, political parties are not irreligious in essence nor are religious parties apolitical. Therefore, in my opinion, there is essentially no difference between the two except that the 'Hidden forces' chose who to sponsor in keeping with their own agenda. Therefore, what actually needs our focus is the fact that cheques were distributed at the Faizabad Dharna. Therefore, more importantly, we should ask who distributed these cheques at the Faizabad protest? Parliament itself has made its role inferior. For instance, in the case of Nawaz Sharif's accountability, the Parliament could have shown its supremacy but



Nawaz Sharif instead of offering himself for scrutiny in front of National Accountability (NAB) wrote to the Supreme Court for redressal. In other words, it was demonstrated that the Supreme Court is superior to the Parliament. It is my request that the politicians need to look at how they themselves have acted to weaken the parliament so we may devise a way forward. 5 years ago National Reconciliation Ordinance (NRO) was formed with mutual consensus of the opposition and the government. But it is also our fault that TORs for its reform were delayed. It is my opinion that the Parliament has to fight a tough battle for its supremacy otherwise the status-quo will continue if we do not bring reforms with reference to NAB. Otherwise, the old constitution will continue. Therefore, I would request that we should accept our mistakes and we should be heading towards reforms without wasting a single chance this time. Also, the elected political parties, who are part of the parliament, should fulfil their responsibilities. Religious parties outside of parliament cannot be blamed for everything.

**Muhammad Ismail Khan,**  
*Project Manager, PIPS*

Your (Dr Nafisa Shah's) party played a prominent role in legislating for minorities and women. Much of the discriminatory legislation regarding minorities and women has been made during non-democratic eras. Under this backdrop do you think that the Rights protection movements can move forward under the parliamentary process?

**Dr. Nafisa Shah, Member of National Assembly, Sindh, Pakistan Peoples Party**

First, I would like to talk about the role of political parties. Pakistan People's Party (PPP) emerged in the 70s based on a strong ideological basis. It made great efforts for people's rights, including farmers and other classes in the society. After East Pakistan's succession in 1971, PPP took initiatives for the stability of the country. Within five years of East Pakistan's separation, PPP was successfully able to form a constitution and several other initiatives for legislation and nation building. This party has given two globally renowned leaders to Pakistan\_ Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Benazir Bhutto. You know what happened to the Prime Ministers of Pakistan? Therefore, despite problems arising out of civil and military conflict, issues arising out of judiciary's interference, the Parliamentarians will have to strengthen the parliament. Parliamentarians need to work for Parliamentary supremacy and stable democratic system by promoting the level of trust. Political parties are institutions and should work as institution and not as individuals therefore Party reforms are required. We need to promote democratic values. Cabinet Ministers and Prime Ministers don't come to the parliament often. Now who will trust the Parliament? Who will file his petition for resolution in Parliament? Therefore, internally steps should be taken for the supremacy and autonomy of the Parliament. How parliament can be strengthened when parliamentarians will seek advice from courts? Having a transparent and sovereign parliament should be above all.

**Munir Ahmad, Participant**

Our political history illustrates that Parliament cannot be sovereign in the midst of unfair elections. In a stroke, politicians change their allegiances. Who pulls their strings? Under these conditions how can the parliament be independent? Compared to other political parties, religious parties have often compromised national interests over petty personal interests. Political parties should be cautious of their association with such politicians and political parties.

**Abdullah Dayo (FES)**

A social contract between the state and citizens is formed in the Parliament and then the state is responsible for the provision of basic human needs and their fundamental rights. But, personally I seek help from private institutes to fulfil my basic needs. I would like to know under these circumstances if there is a social contract existing within Pakistan or not?

**Maria Jamshed, student of Political Science:**

In the first dialogue we heard that all problems in Pakistan are due to religious interference in state affairs, later, in the second dialogue we were impressed upon that the civil-military conflict is responsible for the instability in the political process and then we have been informed that the current government has been brought to power through 'managed' results. What about other political parties? Are they not corrupt? My question to you is: who is reliable? Is it the state, the army, politicians or the religious parties?

**Student**

Dr Nafisa Shah you have still not answered the question about women rights. Also, why male speakers were not asked this question? Are they least interested to discuss the issue of women rights? Shouldn't they be interested in this issue as well?

**Dr. Nafisa Shah, Member of National Assembly, Sindh, Pakistan Peoples Party**

Well, in the last 11 years and especially in the last 5 years of PPP rule, the issues linked to women rights were legislated and an environment for women empowerment was promoted through consistent focus. We decided during our party's tenure that we will form a inter-party group titled 'The pride of Pakistan' for encouraging female representation in politics. This group will be sans political party affiliations and its sole aim would be to protect the right of political participation for women since in a lot of areas women are not allowed to even vote during elections. We at PPP also stated that 10 per cent women representation during elections is mandatory. We also passed a resolution in the parliament that if in any constituency women cast less than 10 per cent vote then the result of election in that constituency will not be accepted. Until or unless political parties do not give party tickets to women to ensure their presence in the National and provincial assemblies till then the status of women cannot be elevated in Pakistan. Also, PPP is not only striving for women rights but it has been working for a stable and strong state. How parliament could work for the development of a state when 50 per cent of its female population lacks representation in the parliament? We have been working on these issues a lot more than our capacity and have consistently made headway towards a stable future. However, in order to push this agenda forward we need more support from our male colleagues to ensure that women political rights become a reality in Pakistan.

**Hafiz Hussian Ahmad, Former Senator, Balochistan, Jamiat Ulema Islam (F)**

Parliament should take steps to ensure a citizen's fundamental needs are fulfilled through its sphere of influence. Currently, no social contract exists in Pakistan. But Parliament has the authority to develop a social contract. All political parties need to sit together to form a social contract that ensures fundamental rights of its citizens.

**Afrasiab Khattak, former  
Senator, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa**

Actually we are part of a system that is democratic in name only because otherwise it does not have the democratic attributes. It is believed that political parties are inefficient and incompetent. Also, all of you know what happened after Nawaz Sharif filed a case against Parvez Musharraf? No one talks about the role courts have played but everyone likes to discuss the role of the parliament. Only if all the institutions work within the mandate accorded to them by the Constitution will the issues assailing the government be sorted out amicably. Parliament has constitutional authority, but how is the parliament supposed to work effectively when its mandate in accordance with the Constitution is ignored. Change is not possible unless there is respect for the Constitution of Pakistan. If political parties will not strive for democracy, movements like Pashtun Tahafuz Movement would continue to surface in the country. Social contract is only possible when citizens (*awam*) are treated fairly but people here have been treated not as first grade citizens but like second grade citizens, almost like they were treated in the imperialist India. 52 per cent of Election Result Forms are without the signatures of a polling agent. So, what is the credibility of this electoral exercise then? Why the judiciary has not taken *suo moto* notice of this irregularity?

Political parties should stand up and fight for their rights. Our people fought against dictators and they have the capacity to fight for the

supremacy of the parliament. At the least they should publish a white paper to highlight the irregularities committed in the elections. Differences are inevitable but we should learn from our mistakes and move forward otherwise our situation will not change. Government and opposition political parties should sit together to address their differences. We don't have tribal differences that go on for generations. In fact to disagree is divine. Our common goal should be to achieve a federal democratic state.

**Muhammad Ismail Khan, Project Manager,  
PIPS**

Parliamentary supremacy is always linked with transparent electoral process. It is often said that parliamentary supremacy is not possible without free and fair elections. Therefore, can reforms in the electoral process take place while the parliamentary system carries on in order to maintain supremacy of the parliament?

**Parvez Rasheed, Senator, Punjab, Pakistan  
Muslim League-Nawaz**

We were educated in the Lord Macaulay's system, while today's youth has been educated under Zia's educational system. Word "citizen" is absent in the curriculum of Zia's regime. People educated in that era lacked the capacity to understand the term social contract. However, being a citizen, I deserve to be informed about the reasons for the wars our country fought. How can I believe that a social contract exists if as a citizen the government has not even deemed it necessary to inform me? Also, if such a contract exists then we should have an institute to address people's grievances. Who can a citizen turn to if she/he has a grievance? Didn't you observe what happened to the two major mainstream political parties of Pakistan? The leader of PML (N) is still sitting in the Adiala Jail. As a matter of fact, corruption is not the greatest ill in Pakistan but the way the politicians are being restricted from functioning and actually the working of democratic functions made impractical and ineffective shows

that over here citizen have no rights nor is the parliament supreme.

**Muhammad Ismail Khan,**  
*Project Manager, PIPS*

Parliament carries sanctity. What kind of framework or strategy could be effective in the wake of internal and external challenges? What can be done for the sovereignty of the Parliament?

**Parvez Rasheed, Senator,**  
*Punjab, Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz*

Praying or wishing cannot solve such problems. A slave has to fight for his freedom. We have spent our lives responding to such challenges in our own way. Now it is time to see how this generation responds to these challenges. Apparently it does not seem that the powers that be want a sovereign Parliament. Also, I do not think that our youth has really bought this narrative of 'corrupt politicians'. If, it was so, rigging on such a massive scale would not have been carried out. Financial system for national budget under the Prime Minister is very transparent and through accountability financial bungling can be very easily caught. Also, the government has a relatively small budget so how can the scale of corruption be so high.

At the risk of repeating myself, I would like to say that corruption is not a big problem in Pakistan. Freedom of a citizen is a big problem over here and the supremacy of the Parliament is an even bigger problem. Such problems cannot be resolved unless citizens are not free

to bring autonomous and sovereign parliament to power through elections.

**Afrasiab Khattak, former Senator, Khyber Pakhunkhwa**

Youth has not accepted the narrative of corruption. If they had accepted it, then there wouldn't have been the need of electoral or political engineering. It is just a game of promoting self-interest and power. In this game, people are not convinced by arguments alone. In this regard, one will have to struggle, mainly the people of Punjab will have to work very hard. We, as a nation, have to strive for parliamentary supremacy and this is the right time to struggle for it. I can see a wave of awakening in Punjab against the level of interference by the powers that be. They are now aware of the need for a transparent Parliament and against institutional interference in parliamentary affairs. Under such circumstance I am hopeful for positive outcomes. Though let me reiterate that there are no short cuts. We will have to struggle really hard for a democratic country.

**Hafiz Hussain Ahmad, former Senator,**  
*Balochistan, Jamiat Ulema Islam (F)*

Efforts should be initiated for stability and supremacy of the Parliament. CPEC linked sense of deprivation in Balochistan also needs to be addressed. Legislation for free and fair elections and accountability are issues that should be settled in the parliament. Civil supremacy will only be followed by such actions.

**Dr. Nafisa Shah, Member of National Assembly, Sindh, Pakistan Peoples Party**

First of all, steps should be taken for transparent, free and fair elections. Transparency of previously held elections should also be insured and if any charges have been levelled then those should be investigated. Parliament should work for quality of representation and adequate representation of minorities and marginal communities thus the

capability criteria of contestants should be determined by the parliament. Balance between the federal and provincial powers is important. Parliament should be accessible for people. People don't even know the value of their relationship with the parliament. Parliamentary committees should encourage people to have an active relationship with them. Suo motu was popularized because people

thought it would be the solution of their problems. Such problems should be settled in the Parliament. People should be allowed to file petitions in the Parliament and if any settlement has to be made then it should be ensured as well. Such initiatives would boost people's confidence in the Parliament. From civil-military relationships, judicial issues to students unions, all state problems should be discussed in the parliament. Parliament could be an effective platform to devise feasible solutions of the state's problems.







## Dialogue 4:

# Pakistan's relations with its neighbours

***Chaired by Inamul Haq, Former Foreign Minister/Foreign Secretary, Pakistan***

In today's world, no region can really be isolated and the major powers of the world are neighbours of all the other countries of the world. So in the discussions that we will be having, I am sure, references will be made to major powers also and their role in this region.





**General (Retd.) Athar Abbas,**  
*former Director General, Inter-Services Public Relations*



Please accept my heartfelt thanks for being invited to this event. I am not a foreign policy expert. I am just a student of security policy and defense matters. I had a stint as an ambassador also. Therefore, I have seen a lot during my experience of dealing with these subjects. And I also remained at the helm of affairs for four and a half years tenure that I had spent as DG-ISPR.

I don't think there is any country in the world that we can name who would like to have hostile relations with others, particularly its neighbours. In fact, every country would like to have good relations, and to create a conducive environment and at least have working relations with neighbours.

But then the world is not that simple, due to historical baggage. There are conflicting issues and matters. There are divergent foreign policy orientations of the two countries, and so on. So, what should be the formula through which they can work together? I think "live and let live" is a very old dictum. There will be conflicts because of so many reasons; the issue is how best you can manage your conflicts. That's the key and in that, you need to take care of your national interest.

The problem comes in defining national interest – who defines national interest? If we have a single-minded approach, in defining our national interest we may be disregarding that of others. Either we should do what suits us or that which is mutually benefitting. As it turns out the vested interests of the elite may lie in the political, military, or civil matters. It's a norm thus that the vested interests of these elite are cleverly aligned and declared as a national interest. It may not be serving the people. It may not be in the public interest because somehow in certain political systems for example the voice and the pressure from the public sometimes is non-existent. Sometime they don't have a voice in the corridors of power where they can push their interest along with or through their representatives. So in this model, the elite decide, what is good and bad for the public and that prevails!

Second is that we do not exist in a vacuum. To be very specific, I think we have a very unique origin and a very different history. It was a matter of survival due to threat to our very existence and that is why we developed into a security state. The large role of the security organizations also owes itself to certain external events which were not ordinary. Take the example of the Islamic revolution in Iran, Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, and then of course, the Kashmir Issue all these factors created an environment where there were immense security problems to the State and these factors really restricted the foreign policy options of the country.

Given the environment, Pakistan has done fairly well and is moving in the right direction. There are some areas that were mismanaged but then there

are others which were handled well. This is how the states move. In my judgment, Pakistan has done fairly well. Yes, there are problems pertaining to political instability, civil military relations, and external threats. Even the armed forces that I represent, I can only say that yes, there are faults and weaknesses requiring improvements. A dialogue is certainly required between the civil and military. The central state security mechanism has not broken down. Just look at what's happening in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya or Syria for that matter. Despite our problems, we are lucky to have a strong federal security force that can and has saved us through difficult environments like internal terrorism, and the issues arising out of broader insecurity issues.

**Inamul Haq, Former Foreign Minister/Foreign Secretary, Pakistan**

Gen. Athar Abbas has made two fundamental points. One is highlighting who defines national interest and that national interest is defined by the elite of a country. It has always been like that. Nobody consults the masses about what the national interest is or should be. A certain group of people whether political or otherwise come into power, and then they make their own definition of what the national interest is or should be.

And the second point that is fundamental is that the security of the state is essential for the running of the state. If the state doesn't provide security, it cannot be governed properly, and the suffering masses will continue to suffer unless

their security is assured and their borders are secured and we are living in peace with each other.

**Moeed Yusuf, Associate Vice President, United States Institute of Peace**



First of all, I would like to thank Mr Amir Rana and PIPS for inviting me. The title actually is quite intriguing and smartly put: what determines Pakistan's relations with its neighbours? It does not say "who". So I want to stay clear of that and comment without passing a value judgment on whether this is right or wrong, good or bad.

I just need one word to explain what has defined Pakistan's relations with its neighbours. Not only that but Pakistan's overall foreign policy. And that word is: India. I think if you summarize the various facets of Pakistan's foreign policy, in each of them, you will find a lens that says what happens to my rivalry, my relationship, my power equation with my eastern neighbour. That's the thesis that I am proposing here and I will further expound on it.

To me, if you want to understand South Asia, you basically got to look at it as a competition between the two largest players in the region i.e. India and Pakistan. And why is this competition so unstable and why does the rivalry endure. As I look at it, you've got India as the largest player in the region by its size, by its population as well as it is in the centre geographically. Therefore, it sees itself as the natural hegemon of South Asian. Every single neighbour that India has, except for one, has accepted its hegemony. The power differential is so large that they cannot pretend to challenge this hegemon and its hegemony. So at any time when these smaller powers have challenged India and there have been a lot of times then they have ultimately realized that they have to co-exist with this larger entity. And once they do their relationship with this central actor works out reasonably well. Episodes between India and Nepal, India and Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, have arisen from time to time but ultimately that is a very clear power differential that keeps this relationship definitely uneven but not in a constant state of hostility. There are events that create tensions and then they cool down.

There is one player in this region, only one other player, which does not accept India's hegemony. And this player is neither smart nor so weak that India can essentially impose its hegemony on it. In fact this player has actually very successfully used other external actors to balance vis-à-vis India over the years. This player of course is us and Pakistan's competition, I think has been to become a parallel hegemony or hub if you will, of the

region rather than being just another satellite to India. But Pakistan on its own has never been strong enough to operate as a parallel hub, and this is the tension that translates into perpetual hostility and rivalry. The hegemon is not strong enough to relegate Pakistan to a satellite, but Pakistan is not strong enough in its own right to become a truly parallel hub of the region. And so the tussle of 70 years to me is this balancing act that can never be balanced because of the unevenness in this equation. Why do I say that India has driven this decision of what our relationship is not only with the neighbourhood but with the world?

There are five pillars, in terms of relationships that Pakistan has based its foreign policy on. The first one is its relationship with the US. If you unpack the relationship with the US starting with SEATO and CENTO and the 1950s, what was the fundamental thing that we wanted the US to do for us? The U.S. reached out to Pakistan because of the Communist threat and Soviet Union and everything else but our interest was essentially to get support from the US to balance viz. a viz. India. And that continued throughout the Cold War and even today, when we are having this conversation, every time there is this thing about US-India strategic alliance and US dumping Pakistan. So that's been front and centre of that conversation throughout.

Then, there is China. It is one of the most unnatural alliances; there is no cultural or religious link. The relationship is truly strategic. Because India was the common threat for both China and Pakistan we forged a relationship that is the strongest one that we have in the world. If you take out India from that equation, I think Chinese behaviour would have been very different.

The third one that I put on the table in terms of importance to me is Afghanistan. And if you look at Pakistan's relationship with Afghanistan, the perpetual concern that we have had is about Afghanistan creating a two-front situation for Pakistan and that two-front is one, it's basically India and Afghanistan coming together and there is history that shows that that has happened in

the past. So it's not as I said earlier, I am not passing a value judgment on whether this is right or wrong. There are genuine reasons why things happen but that's a separate conversation that I can leave for later.

There has been only one concern for us in the past 17 years with reference to Afghanistan. Fundamentally to my mind, it is about the concern that the US projects in Afghanistan post 9/11. It was seen as a perpetuation of Indian influence in Afghanistan. And even today as the settlement is working its way out, one of the concerns that Pakistan will keep having is what will ultimately happen to that space that India has occupied especially in the south and east of Afghanistan. You take India out of that equation. I think Pakistan's options in Afghanistan would be different and perhaps Pakistan's choices in Afghanistan may have been much different.

The fourth pillar is less neat when I fitted in my model of this India argument which is the Muslim world, through championing the Muslim Ummah, Saudi Arabia the UAE, the sort of Gulf and the Sunni crescent if you will. But even there if you look at the OIC, one of the principles is there has been no India, but Pakistan is a major player. If you look at virtually every single regional arrangement that India is part of, Pakistan is excluded from it and vice versa. And Pakistan has seen the "Look West" policy, if you will, that we keep talking about rather than look east fundamentally was driven by the fact that we have to be conscious of the threat coming from India. And sort of this entire idea of

looking to the Middle East I think is also driven by that concern that we have had.

And the first and final pillar that I'll put out is what I call the neglected world, Africa, Southern America, partly Europe, but most importantly East and Southeast Asia. Traditionally these are the neglected parts of Pakistan's foreign policy. Why, one, because India actually had much more connections and ousted Pakistan from that diplomatic space. And second we never found a real strategic use of this part of the world, Europe maybe is a bit of an exception to that, but definitely Southeast Asia and the rest is such a world where we never found real strategic interest, when it came to our space in South Asia, and our competition with India as we saw it.

I am not making the argument that Pakistan's choice was right or wrong. The question posed to us was what drives Pakistan's relationship with its neighbours. But I've expanded that to the world, and the answer I'm providing you is, it's one word, it's India. Virtually every single decision we've made, not specifically but broadly, the lens of what happens to our threat from India, relationship and power competition with India has been front and centre of these decisions.

**Rahimullah Yousufzai, *Senior journalist, Peshawar***



I am not an expert on this issue. I am a journalist and I wish to remain just a journalist. I will try to talk about sub-questions that were proposed. One of the questions was: Who is responsible in Pakistan for the ups and downs in Pakistan's foreign policy? Let me say that because of the situation on the borders we face inherent security issues, also, Balochistan is quite unstable, and we had problems in the East Pakistan – all these challenges have been shaping Pakistan's foreign policy.

We had border disputes, and still continue to have them with India, not only on the western borders but also on the eastern borders. After the independence of Bangladesh it has been able to resolve their border disputes but these were not resolved as long as it was East Pakistan. We still have unresolved border disputes with Afghanistan and India. This has been shaping Pakistan's foreign policy.

We have actually gone to war with India mostly due to the Kashmir issue. The first war was in 1948, then in 1965, and then Kargil. The East Pakistan problems arose because we did not give rights to the Bengali people and the Indian interference also played a role. We have always had a foreign policy especially focused on India.

The civilian leadership either does not take ownership or is not allowed to take ownership of the foreign policy.

We also have unresolved issues with Afghanistan. It was Afghanistan that opposed Pakistan's membership in the United Nations and brought up

the issue of Pakhtunistan and refused to accept Durand Line as an international border. There were border clashes too, but we never had a full-fledged war. We also saw that in the 1965 war, Afghanistan supported Pakistan. So there have been ups and downs in the relationship with Afghanistan but mostly we have a strained relationship. Both countries have harboured dissidents from the other side. This has been happening since the 60s, and it is still happening. We have Afghan Taliban, Haqqani Network, who were able to find refuge in Pakistan and then there are TTP, Lashkar-e-Ahrar, Baloch separatists who find refuge and support in Afghanistan. This has been actually the policy of both countries and that's why we are not able to resolve our problems with Afghanistan at a permanent basis.

If the on-going peace talks move forward and there is a peace agreement, even then we would be concerned about the sanctuaries that both provide to dissidents.

We cannot say that one institution or entity is responsible for the ups and downs in Pakistan's foreign policy. And we cannot say that Pakistan is solely responsible for the ups and downs in those relations. We have been able to do a very difficult balancing act viz. a viz. Saudi Arabia and Iran.

**Inamul Haq, *Former Foreign Minister/Foreign Secretary***

It has been pointed out that India remains the fulcrum of all relationships in the world for us. Allow me to differ slightly. Being a practitioner of foreign policy after serving in different capacities, let me say that perhaps yes, India has been a factor. But it's the circumstances we find ourselves in and we found ourselves in after independence and the situation that we are now living in that has determined what our policy towards our neighbour and towards the world at large would be.

And even today, if I look objectively at what is happening in India and in Pakistan, in terms of relationship, it appears to me that perhaps India is more obsessed with us than we are obsessed with

India. It's very rarely that I see a program on Pakistani TV channels which is India focused, which criticizes India with great passion. It is in Pakistan that Indian movies and Indian plays were allowed till the Supreme Court stepped in.

But if you look at the debate that is going on in India, and the politics that has played in India, that is all Pakistan-focused. The BJP hopes to win the next election on an anti-Pakistan platform. In Pakistan, no political party ever refers to India during an election campaign. It can perhaps be stated that India is always in the back of our minds but we do not show much apprehension of India publicly.

Why does India, which is a much bigger power do that? India sees itself as the hegemon of the region, as Moeed pointed out. And it also sees that one country is not bowing to its wishes. It wishes to bring Pakistan within the circle of its hegemony in South Asia and it finds that Pakistan looks for Countries other than India to be friends with or to be perhaps some would say, subservient to then its immediate neighbour.

Let us look at what is happening in the world at large also and then bring it to our region and see how the region reacts with. As I see it, the single hegemon of the world, the United States, is led by a president who these days is beginning his campaign for re-election. He had made three major promises before he was elected in 2016. One was to build a wall and Mexico will pay for it, so as to keep the immigrants out. The second was of bringing troops home and

concentrate on what is happening within the United States, where he was to build its infrastructure. He is trying to fulfil the first promise by demanding that billions of dollars or more should be allocated for the building of the wall, in the face of Democratic opposition.

He's also trying to fulfil his second campaign promise by withdrawing from Syria and indicating that perhaps 7000 troops or so would be withdrawn from Afghanistan within a short period of time. And we all know that negotiations are going on between Zalmay Khalilzad and the Taliban team in Qatar. And one might also say that perhaps the Taliban have given a cold shoulder to Pakistan by not holding these talks in Islamabad as was expected earlier. When Zalmay Khalilzad arrived in Qatar, the Taliban leadership started the conversation with him that has been going on for four days. The promise, President Trump will probably not be able to keep is of infrastructure building. But if he fulfils these two promises of withdrawing American troops from Afghanistan and Syria and also building a wall, he may have a strong platform for re-election.

Now let's come back to this region. The United States has chosen India as a power partner, and Pakistan appears to have chosen China as a partner because of the economic assistance that China is providing Pakistan through CPEC and other ways.

But let's also be clear that the camps are not very well-defined. India is maintaining good relations and is straddling the dividing line between Russia, China and the United States. India is a member of SCO and BRICS. It has a regular trilateral meeting at the foreign ministers level every year between Russia, China and India which was converted into a summit in November at the G-20 meeting in Argentina, where President Xi Jinping, President Putin and Prime Minister Modi met separately, in which the Chinese president made a fairly long statement calling for cooperation and strengthening of relations between the three countries. There is more than almost 100 billion dollars trade between China and India. So India is straddling the fence.

Russia has very close relations with India. It sold 400 missiles to India and did sanctions were made. Russia is not very clear about what its future with China will be because it is afraid of Chinese influence into Siberia as Russian population shrinks and Chinese power expands.

Afghanistan to my mind is a small player in the field in the sense that Pakistan is openly apprehensive about Indian influence in Afghanistan, as well as about the so-called two-front situation. Let's be quite clear as Rahimullah pointed out Afghanistan and Pakistan has never had the best of relations even during the period of Zahir Shah. Even during the time of the Taliban, the Taliban did not pay heed to the advice that Pakistan gave. They did whatever they wanted. Even after 9/11, when we sent two delegations to Afghanistan, one composed of the political leadership of the country at that time and the other composed of the Ulema of Pakistan, both were rejected by the Taliban. When we earlier suggested to them not to destroy the Bamiyan Buddhas they did not pay any heed to us. When we recommended to them to start schools for girls, they refused to pay heed, we offered to build the schools and to provide the teachers, but even then they thanked us politely but they did not allow us to open any schools. So I do not know why we believe that Pakistan cannot leave Afghanistan alone. Because the reverse is true too: India and Afghanistan have always had good relations. And despite those good relations, during the two wars that we had with India in 1965 and 1971, Afghanistan never did anything to move against Pakistan and it did in fact assure Pakistan that it would

take even its forces away from that border. Because Afghanistan will not interfere. It is not in the interest of Afghanistan to start a war with Pakistan. If it wants to have good relations with India, I believe we should allow it to have good relations be they political, economic, social or otherwise. We should have no qualms about India training them. Afghanistan, after all is an independent country. Pakistan should not seek to influence its decision making through pressure. We can try to use persuasion but we must never try to use pressure against Afghanistan to bring it along the line that we wish to pursue.

Iran is a difficult country for us. We have very close relations with the Arab world. The kingdom of Saudi Arabia is seen by most Pakistanis as the spiritual home of Islam, which it is. Saudi Arabia has also provided financial assistance to Pakistan whenever we needed it. It has also persuaded other Gulf countries to provide assistance to us. And it is a declared enemy of Iran. King Abdullah once told American leadership to cut off the head of this snake. Today in the Middle East, Israel, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and some other Gulf States are practically in an alliance against Iran. It is the United States which has pulled out of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and has re-imposed sanctions against Iran.

Pakistan finds itself in a difficult situation because it wishes to have very good relations with Iran, but it is also constrained by the fact that it wishes to continue to have economic benefits from the Gulf countries which provide employment to millions of Pakistanis and which helped Pakistan when it was in economic trouble. But I still believe that we must continue to work to have the best of relations that began with Iran. Iran is a permanent neighbour of Pakistan. Iran can at some stage be a major provider of energy for Pakistan. The Iran Pakistan gas deal which was a pipeline deal signed in 2013 has still not been implemented because we have not been able to build the pipeline.

Pakistan is in economic trouble and also internal trouble. Our focus today must be to set our own house in order. Pakistan will have no influence

with either its neighbours or the world at large. Pakistan is in an economic mess. Palliatives like three billion dollars from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and three billion dollars from the UAE and a few billion dollars from other sources are not going to resolve our economic problems. They are just stopgap arrangements for one year. We have a recurring current deficit of more than 20 billion dollars every year. And unless we plug that gap, our debt is going to continue to increase until such time as we become insolvent. We have to be very clear about the way we are headed. And therefore we must pull out our tentacles and work on the economic development of the country, strengthen its economy, if we wish to gain any respect with our neighbours and with the world at large.

**Pervez Hoodboy, *Academic and Nuclear Physicist***

I would like to ask Maj. General Athar Abbas that Pakistan is accused by all of its neighbours, India, Afghanistan, Iran and even China of exporting cross-border terrorism. Is this because of a bad press or is there actually some truth behind it? How do you see our relationship with *jihadis* change over the year? I know people will be surprised about China, but you are aware that China through the Financial Action Task Force meeting in Paris did indicate to Pakistan that it was not willing to block the resolution, because it does believe that there are *jihadis* or were *jihadis* such as in the shape of Islamic Army of Uzbekistan which was responsible for events in Xinjiang. So would you like to tell us

if the thinking within the Army has changed over the last decade or so?

**General Athar Abbas, *former Director General, Inter-Services Public Relations***

East Turkestan Islamic Movement (ETIM) was the main concern of Chinese. It had its elements operating from FATA, and there were a number of operations which were conducted against the ETIM and Islamic Army of Uzbekistan. Tahir Yalidar Sheikh and other leadership were eliminated. And now you can see FATA does not have a sanctuary of terrorists. I won't claim that there are no terrorists or TTP there, but there are no sanctuaries now operating either within, attacking citizens of Pakistan or in Xinjiang. So these concerns were addressed by Pakistan very seriously, and why not.

Secondly, I would say that in case of Jihadi, yes this was the decision of the policy makers. The leadership at the time decided that once the Americans wrapped up from Afghanistan, that model [of insurgency] was to be replicated to Kashmir. We can debate whether it was a good or bad decision, but it was done. And all those *jihadi* organizations when it came to Afghanistan turned against Pakistan. And you would know how many Pakistan Army soldiers and officers have been killed. So we have equally suffered. The Army has equally suffered along with the nation in the hands of these *jihadists*. Now you can conclude that it was not the right policy at that time.

As to the issue of the present jihadi organizations that emerged with different names, these are constraints of the state. The state is not operating in a vacuum. Pakistan is not a dysfunctional state. It has courts. If Hafiz Saeed goes to the court and court gives a decision, the most the Pakistani government or Pakistani Army can do is to detain him for three months. After that he has to be set free. As was the case with Mr. Lakhvi, who I know was detained because of the pressure on Pakistan Army. We were facing question like why you are setting him free. Well, there was no case because Indians were not sending their witnesses for the



Mumbai crime so he had to be set free. So, these are the problems and constraints of the State which we have to operate within.

In the case of India, just a one-liner: India wants to have the cake and eat it too. India is a big neighbour. Too much security of a neighbour starts becoming insecurity for its smaller neighbours. Second, see the stated policy statements of Indian officials. Their NSA Ajit Doval is on record saying that now there will be no overt operations and there will be no war as such, but only covert operations and through overt operations Pakistan would be destabilized. Where is the opportunity for India to conduct covert operations I may ask? Destabilized chaotic Afghanistan is a platform for India to operate from. What is happening in Balochistan through Afghanistan is also on record. These are the issues we are confronted with.

Some may say that India's role in Afghanistan is over-exaggerated. I do not subscribe to that view. I think had I been a RAW chief there, had I been a national security adviser, if something is given to me in a platter and there is an enemy, don't you think, I would choose that too? If the objective is to destabilize the neighbour, weaken it or dismantle it then why not? There are fault lines and these fault lines have been identified by the enemy or by Indians and they are striking in a very subtle manner. It's through war, through media, state colluding with media and creating a national narrative. And that is based on hatred and hatred has consequences.

We are neighbours. Today we are enemies; tomorrow we will have to go to the dialogue table. And when you want to go to a dialogue, this kind of environment which has been created by Indian State authorities colluding with the media then it can become problematic. They have climbed to a poll from which coming down can be difficult.

**Moeed Yousuf, *Associate Vice President,*  
*United States Institute of Peace***

So, in the spirit of continuing to be provocative, I think the lens is wrong. So I always hear the debate and not what you said or what you said Inam sahib. We end up debating facts and to me actually it is completely irrelevant beyond a point. I have no doubt whatsoever that whatever information internally officials are privy to is correct. They're not just putting things out of nowhere. India must be doing things more than perhaps most people acknowledge. As you said if you're RAW chief sitting there why would you not use that fault line. The question for a policymaker from my perspective is always what options do I have to tackle that problem without throwing myself under the bus. I think the problem has not been what India is doing or what Pakistan is doing. Think of it this way. If I am an Indian Hawk, let us for a second assume that I am a Nationalist who wants to destabilize Pakistan. What do I need to do? I actually need to make sure that I keep giving Pakistan enough evidence that I am destabilizing Pakistan. Then the Pakistani state mind will continue to be consumed by this tactical problem. I keep getting evidence that India is doing this or that or whatever. I keep focusing on that problem while India grows at 8 per cent economically and we are growing at 3 per cent. And in 10-years time, there will be no conversation to be had because the differential will have grown so much. So I actually completely agree that we shouldn't as a nation think how much India is doing and how much Pakistan is doing? The real question to ask is the way we have to respond must be one where in the long run that deep differential closes. And there is a conversation of compromise rather than one where the differential grows so much that there is

actually no conversation. So let me just leave you with this data point. If India keeps growing the way it is growing and if we grow the way we are growing. In 2030 to 2035 the India Pakistan power differential will be what India's differential is with Sri Lanka today. I'm not making this up, you can go and check. At that point the conversation would be even more lopsided. So to me, I think getting consumed by the fact of what India did to us today or what we did to them tomorrow is only playing into the hands of that hawk if you will. It ultimately wants exactly this. For Pakistan to continue doing what we are forced to do. And for India to do what it can do given where it stands. That's the paradigm we need to come out of rather than get sucked into further.

**Rahimullah Yousufzai, Senior  
journalist, Peshawar**

Just briefly, since China was mentioned and we have been interacting a lot with Chinese officials and diplomats and experts. Let me say that China is more than satisfied with what Pakistan is doing concerning the ETIM and IMU. I remember General Musharraf announcing publicly that Pakistani forces have killed Mehsud, who was leader of ETIM, he was killed in an Pakistani army operation in Waziristan. Recently the new leader of ETIM Abdul Haq was killed in Afghanistan in a drone strike. So they all shifted to Afghanistan now. And IMU, We all know they have also shifted and most of their leaders have been killed in Afghanistan. So I think Pakistan has gone out of the way to help China in tackling this issue by not only taking

military action but also providing them intelligence and allowing the Chinese to base their intelligence agents in Pakistan. I think that Pakistan cannot afford to annoy China and to provide any safe havens to the Chinese militants. So I think that is what has to be done.

**Zafar Ali, participant**

We cannot repeat any mistakes in the Cold War by having a unidirectional foreign policy, and we had allied with US and now we have shifted to China and Russia and other powers. So how do we maintain a balanced diplomacy by keeping U.S., Russia, and China as our friends?

**Engr. Juniad B. Masood, Participant**

My question is to you specifically, Mr. Inam. The tax problems rely too much on the remittances without defining the privileges and benefits to the overseas Pakistanis. Would you please highlight a little on this issue as well?

**Abdullah (Daily Times)**

PTI was elected in 2018 and the popular quotation about it is that it is a political face of the establishment. It is possible to shape a good foreign policy in this case?

### QUESTION

Why our foreign policy is always event-centric, reactive and influenced by big powers?

**Inamul Haq, Former Foreign  
Minister/Foreign Secretary**

What is the policy shift in Pakistan? Why has our policy shifted from the U.S.? It is not us who have shifted our policy and in fact it is The United States that has decided to shift the policy towards India and that decision was not taken recently, It was taken In the late 90's and I can give you a list of how relationship between India and the U.S. has developed and how Pakistan has been in a way separated from the US policy. So maybe we

have no option but to move towards China. I didn't think the Pakistani diaspora were the subject of our discussion. But I do not believe that we should necessarily link the remittances with special privileges and benefits for the diaspora. They are sending remittances worth about 20 billion dollars. But what are you offering them in return? Is there anything specific that you can offer them in return. They are treated as Pakistanis when they come back and they are treated equally well or badly as we treat other Pakistanis. The third question is why foreign policy has become reactive? There are certain developments which one needs to react to. And only powerful countries have policies that are not reactive in nature. So let's first of all decide that we are not the most powerful country in the world and we do not determine the policies of the rest of the world. Proactive and reactive is a pretty useless debate. You go according to the situation. Let's not get into this domestic debate about PML (N) being the face of the military or PTI being the face of the military. The security institutions of the country and the political leadership have to work closely together. Foreign policy is not made in isolation, the civilian government needs input from the intelligence agencies as well as from its economic ministers. So let's not try to be simplistic about the military deciding the foreign policy of Pakistan or the civilian leader being the face of the military. I have heard this phrase also that other countries have armies and in our country army has a country. So let's step out of this debate. Grow up and try to formulate a policy which caters to the needs and requirements of our

country. And today your fundamental need is to improve the real economic situation. Your foreign policy will follow. If you have respect in the world economically, if you are economically strong and powerful then other countries will respect you and listen to you and pay heed to what you say. Otherwise nobody will give a damn.

**Gen (Retd.) Athar Abbas, former Director  
General, Inter-Services Public Relations**

Foreign policy is an extension of our national policy. How robust and all inclusive the national policy is will only determine what the foreign policy is going to be like. It cannot be that national policy is not being taken seriously because of the infighting and whatever fissures that we have and fault lines that we have and foreign policy is being blamed that it is not delivering. Second balance, yes that's the challenge, If India has been selected as a strategic partner of the U.S. then it's a challenge for Pakistan. And the solution is not in blocking or severing your ties with the West. We have to work out the options available very carefully. I fully subscribe to what Moeed has said, there are no two opinions on that. We should not be consumed by India. We should instead be focused on achieving economic security. It should be the lead policy of our country because otherwise we will have no way out.

**Moeed Yousuf, Associate Vice President,  
United States Institute of Peace**

Three quick things! One this may surprise you but I actually think interestingly in the past six months or so you can see the one silver lining that I pick up in national policy anywhere where things are actually the foreign policy. Inam Sb used this term, "straddling the fence." If you look at the word post-Cold War. All non-superpowers or elite club countries that have been successful are ones that have managed to be in multiple power camps at the same time. We are no longer in a world that offers us the US vs. THEM kind of campaigning. And so I think for the first time

quite frankly in years I see Pakistan with whatever constraints it has trying to balance relationships rather than dump money and go with one. I mean this idea that we can ditch the US because China is there. You know it's crazy. But I will also say that I haven't picked this up in the leadership whether civilian or military. I think this is more public conversation. I think that is an acute realization that there needs to be a relationship with all the multiple actors around. And if Pakistan is moving to us regionalism, I think that's a very good thing because ultimately that has to open up for us to reduce some of the deficiencies that we have. The point about reactive policy, I mean 9/11 I think was not the best example. I have a very different take on this. I actually do believe we have a serious problem of reactive policymaking not only in foreign policy but across the board. And to me that is a very specific reason why we always react to things. Certain things you have to react to I mean of course but Think about the following. Nowhere in the Pakistani system across the board in any ministry, any department, anything you want. We no longer have the space, time or capacity to think strategically. Every single official, you can go to and talk to, there a former official sitting there and they will bail me out. Morning to evening their job is fire fighting. Is one crisis to the next to next? Not because they don't know to do strategic thing. It's the environment that Pakistan has operated in and over time we have completely lost the ability. To have people whose job is to think long term, think strategically think beyond the horizon and come back with answers

that will then help the day to day fire fighting? I said this was a civil and military side. We actually unfortunately have become professional fire-fighters just given where things have gone and this is a big problem. Look at our think tanks; Raise your hand if any of you think that our think tank culture is where it needs to be to provide policy input. We have serious problems there and we need to fix that. That's even the strongest countries in the world, I sit in the US. They don't have the capacity within their public system to do this. That's why they've created this entire concept of think tanks in revolving doors and whatever and we are missing that completely. So that's I think one of the big reasons that we remain reactive and the example I keep giving people is FATF. What in FATF did we not know what's going to happen Three years ago. This tells me one thing that we couldn't predict. Why did we not wake up to it, not because people didn't know it was coming. It never became a priority till somebody hit something on the head. So I think we do have a problem, structure problem we need to create spaces and I think this Government's idea of creating task forces is the right one, whether it works and delivers it is a separate debate, but I think they're trying to fill that hole.

**Rahimullah Yousufzai, *Senior journalist,***  
***Peshawar***

The question was asked to me by a lady in the back, that was, why does Pakistan listen to the big powers because they are big powers. Because they have the power would it be. We are vague and weak economy and serious security issues. That's why we have to listen to them.









## Dialogue 5:

# Is Pakistan suffering from identity crisis?

**Haris Khalique, *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

Is Pakistan suffering from identity crisis? If not then what kind of crisis prevails? We all know about the issues/crisis prevails. We do not want to repeat the problems because we are all aware of them. But we will start from here. Dr. Syed Jaffer, please tell us the ideological aspects of these problems. Rest of the world has been facing the same problems. I would request you to elaborate how our problems are similar to the whole world and what are the other problems that prevail only in Pakistan?





***Dr. Syed Jaffar Ahmed,***



I would use historical references to answer such questions. After few years of independence, conflicts arose in Pakistan and those conflicts are still unresolved. Pakistan was supposed to be a constitutional and democratic state committed to safeguard the legitimate rights of all peoples belonging to different castes, religions, and to respect diversity and difference of opinion besides protecting cultural heritages. If foundation of Pakistan was laid on such premises then there would be no need to ask the question whether Pakistan is suffering from identity crisis or not? Quaid-e-Azam's speech on September 11 is an important document. In this speech, the state's characteristics were defined. But as our state grew within the national security paradigm and became a national security state, it turned the whole ballgame around. I accept that national security is the basic problem of all countries in the world. But here we have to consider the state structure and see if the

state structure is democratic, federal or it is based on national security? If the state's structure is based on national security paradigm or if Pakistan is a security state then the state should decide what role the democratic political parties can play in a security state. If it is a democratic state then the problem of national security will be observed within the democratic state's structure. But as Pakistan is based on the national security paradigm, we have seen weak governance. Military institutions consider politicians to be less trustworthy. Prime Ministers were disqualified based on their relationships with India. Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto apart, Fatima Jinnah was called an Indian agent during the 1965 elections.

What can we do in this regard? This is how our nation building has been done. As a result, our preferences have been changed. In the previous session, it has been said that our economy is deteriorating. It happened because the state's preferences do not include health, education and economic development. We have to correct these things. I would like to mention another problem i.e. mental crisis. There are two ways, either we analyze Indian threat in a realistic way or we compare and imitate whatever India does. For example, we have Santosh Kumar if India has Dilip Kumar. We will make a movie on Jinnah if they have made a movie on Gandhi. If they have Agni missile test then we shall have Ghauri missile. I often question my students that if we follow India for everything then what will we do if one day we wake up with the reality that India doesn't exist on the world map. So, in my view, this is the biggest crisis. This is an existential crisis that we don't believe in our existence. We are afraid of our existence even after 70 years of independence. Hence, we have to believe that Pakistan is an independent state and it will exist irrespective of Indian existence.

***Haris Khalique, Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

I would like to ask Dr. Abdul Malik as to why we have built a state where diversity, differences and

pluralism has no space? There must have been some reasons for this. What would you like to say in this regard?

**Dr. Abdul Malik, *Former Chief Minister, Balochistan***



We have one country but we are still confused about our existence. Some people believe that the two nation theory laid the foundation of Pakistan. Others believed it is not the two nation theory but the independence movement which was the result of voices raised by deprived people of Uttar Pradesh and other regions. Some also believed that it was the result of progressive thoughts that surfaced in reply to conflict between Russia and Britain. However, this country came into existence. This is our country. But unfortunately, facts were not accepted here. Since we are Muslims, we have to accept nationalism. But I believe that as a Baloch, or a Pashtun we should respect and value our history, tradition and cultural heritage. World

respects and values history and cultural heritage. We have tried a lot. We have examples from across the world that if regional domestic languages were not considered a national language, these should be given space in the Constitution as a mother tongue. We did not get any answer to this. There is no threat to identity but if we don't accept the reality, it will become a menace. A deprived group will raise its voice based on nationalism. For example, Muhajir community gave sacrifices for this country and initiated "Muhajir Qaumi Movement" based on deprivation. I do not understand why our national security paradigm's reasoning is linked to enmity with India and Afghanistan. If we succeed in developing friendly relations with them then our focus will be formation of a welfare state than on prioritizing a security state. It will provide solution to the above-mentioned problems. We should be realist. Security is important and superior in every democratic state. Similarly, it should not be at the cost of rights and the lives of citizens. The situation cannot be improved without reviewing things. People often asked me what as to what is the solution to the problems of Balochistan? I have always replied that people of Balochistan should be free to choose their representatives. Problems cannot be solved if elections are not transparent and free. However, in actuality the elections were on July 25<sup>th</sup> but the voting started on July 24<sup>th</sup>. What else could be the result of such elections? I will say that we will continue to suffer from financial, mental and identity crisis if we escape reality. Situation will not improve in the absence of economic development. And it is not possible until or unless the menace of extremism and terrorism is addressed.

**Haris Khalique, *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

Why don't policy-making institutes understand that national unity is possible amid diverse cultural, linguistic and national identities? Other opinions should be welcome in this regard.

### **Sohail Sangi, Intellectual**

It would be better if you would have asked them for the second opinion. I can tell what my perception about them is.



In the early days of Pakistan, structural development was under elite civil-military bureaucracy influence. They pursued their own interests. This led to discrimination in the country. When we were becoming part of Pakistan, we wanted to be its part with our own identities like Sindhi, Balochi, and Pashtun. But we were told to forget our earlier identity and merge with a new identity. A narrative was built that underlined to give-up other identities once you became a Pakistani. Similarly, in case of Bangladesh, the elite civil bureaucracy was afraid of a Prime Minister from Bengal, so they followed one unit concept to pursue their own interests. Situation is not different in today's Pakistan. It has become one unit and tried to hurt the existence of multiple identities. Not only identities, but cultural and

traditional values have been ignored. Politics and policy formulation was based on elite's financial interests and ownership of resources. Therefore resources and economy were the real problem that led to other problems.

### **Haris Khalique, Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.**

If the situation doesn't change, how will the country move forward?

### **Afrasiyab Khattak, Former Senator KP.**

In fact, there is no such problem with the people living here. The signs of one thousand year old Islamic civilization, Middle East, Gandhara, and Sindhi civilization are present in Pakistan. Country is enriched in this regard. But when a separate homeland came into existence then uniformity was enforced. For instance, Bengali played a prominent role in establishment of Pakistan. During 1946 elections, Muslim League got majority of votes in Bengal. Muslim League was not successful in West Pakistan but our students are not taught about this history. Leaders like Hussain Shaheed Suhrawardy, and Mujeeb-ur-Rehman played prominent role in making of Pakistan but when they urged to declare Bengali as a national language then people like Ayub Khan and Sikandar Mirza called them opponents of Pakistan and accused them of promoting colonialism. On February 21 1952, Bengali students were murdered in the name of linguistic crisis in Dhaka. On this day, movement for partition of Bengal was started. United Nations started to celebrate this day as international day of mother languages. World has learned from our mistakes but we are unaware of what we have done and what we have been doing now. Pakistan is a multi-cultural country but unfortunately diversity is not accepted in this state. Indian constitution gave 22 languages the status of mother languages. Under the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment, we urged to include all mother languages in the constitution. But it has been said that there is one language and other languages cannot be included in the constitution. In Turkey and Iran people

have been living with multiple identities. Look at Arab world, they all are Arabian and Muslims as well but they are living with their individual identities. But in Pakistan, why uniformity over unity is emphasized? State is not restricted to one nation. Several nations could be part of one state. Diversity is not a weakness but the strength of a state.



During our government in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), five languages were accepted at the governmental level. These included Hindko, Saraiki, Pashtu, Kohistani, and Kohati. Children may also get education in these languages. This brought us closer and promoted unity among us. Diversity is strength if we accept it. But if we suppress diversity, restrict it and project it in negative way then it will become a menace. Pakistan is a democratic, parliamentary and federal state. But in practice, the system is neither democratic nor parliamentary.

Culture of domination and enforcement prevails to maintain hegemony. This mentality of enforcement is due to non-democratic forces. Countries don't move forward with the culture of enforcement. In practice, Pakistan should be a democratic and parliamentary state. We will have to accept that to live with different identities is possible. There is no problem with people. They are willing and they have been living with diversity. State will have to accept that different nations have been living here. We claimed to be a nation state without knowing if we are able to pursue the characteristics of a nation state. We need to learn from the partition of Bengal. Mahmood-ur-Rehman Commission has not been brought under discussion. In order to make the country move forward, free dialogue should be held where everyone should accept the State's federal, democratic and parliamentary system. A legal action should be taken against people who do not follow the state's system.

**Haris Khalique, *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

You have given the reference of Quaid-e-Azam. Don't you think his ideology will create confusion? How can we make Pakistan a multinational state when it came into existence on the basis of two-nation theory that was presented based on a religious divide?

**Dr. Syed Jaffar Ahmad, *Former Director, Pakistan Studies Center, Karachi University***

The two-nation theory was a political device. He appraised that the Muslims would become a political minority. During elections, he wanted Muslim representation more than their proportion. It was a political device. In 1927, he was ready to forego separate electorates. He had been talking about the provincial status of Sindh and Balochistan. Quaid's speech on August 11 explained that if the two nation theory shall continue in Pakistan or the state will be established based on something else. He knew that the presence of 16 per cent ratio of non-

Muslim population would get tangled into the politics of majority and minority. He wanted to move forward based on Pakistani nationalism. We wouldn't have been facing this situation if we would have pursued Pakistani nationalism rather the two nation theory and protected different cultural heritages, taken care of diverse nations, and set up a democratic, multicultural and multinational parliamentary federal system.

**Haris Khalique** *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.*

I would dare to disagree here. If our forefathers were convinced to accept and respect multicultural society and wanted to pursue democracy then why did the state take police action against Qalat? Don't you think the concept of unitary state is what they have had it in their minds from the outset?

**Dr Abdul Malik**, *Former Chief Minister, Balochistan*

I think amid other states, Qalat had a different status. Though it was under the Viceroy rule but still it was autonomous. What is interesting to mention is that Quaid-e-Azam was the lawyer when this case was presented before the Viceroy. Whether Qalat was occupied or merged, some people accepted this merger and some didn't. Those who accepted this merger said, "being Pashtun and being Baloch, we want to be a part of this country but our rights should be preserved". What are those rights? By the rights they meant that their culture, values, nationalism, language and resources

should be protected. But what will happen if you use our resources on gun point? Let's take the example of Sui. Sui gas was discovered in 1957 but if you visit Dera Bugti or Sui, lifestyle of domestic people has not developed. Take the example of Rekodiq and Saindak. What's happening in CPEC? Nobody knows whether it is an economic corridor or a strategic corridor. Currently, China's share is 93% and the federal share is 7% but I am not a shareholder of even 1%. Similarly, resources distribution of Sui gas is not fair. It dropped from 72 per cent to 18per cent when Saindak ended, Gwadar is gone. Still I don't have the right to scream?

Balochistan's say is missing in the recent agreements. I tried during my regime but couldn't do so. If Gwadar is not beneficial to me, it doesn't provide employment and investment opportunity, and Baloch are turned into a minority, then what would I get from CPEC? If this region is the strategic center, then we will suffer from wars and new alliances. Like for the past thirty years we have been suffering from tension between Pakistan and Afghanistan. We want to strengthen this country. This can be achieved via democracy and Rights based federal parliamentary system. There will not be problems in a welfare state that ensures provision of education, health and justice. But if I am deprived of fundamental basic rights, I will create problems.

**Haris Khalique**, *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.*

Sohail Sangi, how to move forward in a situation where everyone is agreed on the nature of problems we face. It is worrisome that government officials have been seeking solutions rather providing answers. I want to ask how can we move forward?

**Sohail Sangi**, *Intellectual*

I agree that aforementioned challenges exist. When Dr. Abdul Malik was talking, I was wondering if he was autonomous or not. In fact, democratic government is not free here. They

don't have any contribution in the policy formulation. On the other hand, Dr. Abdul Malik is seeking jobs in CPEC which may be deemed to be against the national interest. If Afrasiyab Khattak talks about post FATA operation planning, it is also against national interest. If I seek share from Thar coal power plant then I will be instructed to get power from solar energy rather seeking share from coal power plant. Another interesting fact is that till 1994, in Sukkur, import of wheat from barrage to desert areas was restricted to the amount that can be carried on their heads. This desert region was part of Pakistan. This kind of discrimination happened. That is why we need to review our policies. Power elite have influenced autonomous governments. Situation will not change if the government is not autonomous. We should avoid leg pulling, sit together and have a dialogue to resolve problems. Otherwise, we would not be able to move forward.

**Haris Khaliq** *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.*

Afrasiyab Khattak, on one hand, the problem of ratio of resources among federation and provinces, once solved, is back on the table again. I mean, on one side they don't accept constitutional command of federal units; on the other hand, they have been trying to form new provinces. Once they have formed one unit to compete with Bengal. Now they have been talking about further provinces. Why is this contradiction there?

**Afrasiyab Khattak**, *Former Senator KP.*

I am in favour of new provinces. These can be changed. And this should be done by the parliament. But autonomous power institutions have psyche of dominating and suppressing others. When we proposed 18<sup>th</sup> amendment in the parliament, then it was said that this amendment is poisonous and dangerous like 6 points of Mujeeb-ur-Rehman. But why don't they talk about operation done by Yahya? That was the real poison. Those Bengalis who contributed in the establishment of Pakistan have been projected as noxious but nobody can ask. I believe opposing the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment would bring grave consequences. Truth is: we cannot impose anything. You should know what you want? Do you want federation or confederation? Do you accept constitution or not? In the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment, we have underlined that nations want federation to follow horizontal and vertical democracy. If you deny the constitution then we will repeat Bengal's formula. You should not be annoyed then because you have introduced this formula. Instead of Bengal's majority, they were coerced to accept partial representation. We urge for equal representation in the National Assembly. If specific curriculum for the provinces promote differences then what about Bengal and Balochistan conflict? In case of Bengal, have they studied a specific curriculum that promoted separatism or the curriculum was not compatible? Is the curriculum responsible for the discontentment of Balochistan's people?

The 18<sup>th</sup> amendment may have errors and it has but the solution also resides within. For instance, when a drug regulating authority was required, all provinces were on page to form a federal agency and it was formed. Then, distribution of resources and power is another challenge. Its solution also resides within the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. We can ask provinces to empower local administrations. This will boost link between state and local people. However, powerful elite is straight against the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment without even identifying the actual problem in it. They didn't like the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment because it was drafted with parliamentary

consensus and the consensus among provinces is the sign of a federation.

Former Chief Justice Saqib Nisar criticized Senate and National Assembly. He questioned how long we debated to bring the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. We had 9 month's discussion for 18<sup>th</sup> amendment but who allowed Parvez Musharraf to amend the Constitution in one day? Why he was not questioned about it? No one dares to question a dictator. Those judges should be questioned who allowed him to make constitutional amendments. I have noted two judicial decisions that were projected as a product of 18<sup>th</sup> amendment. One is rules and regulation of medical education and the other is regarding Sui gas. It is believed that 18<sup>th</sup> amendment has created these problems. I would like to say that there should be a dialogue. Parliamentary institutes should be united to promote the agenda of a federal, parliamentary and democratic Pakistan.

**Haris Khalique *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

There is a question which arises from the problems related to culture and identity, that the creative expression of Pakistan's literature, where is it in the literature of Pakistani languages, and how it is connecting them with one and another. Where the resistance is and what is its history?

**Dr. Syed Jaffar, *Former Director, Pakistan Studies Center, Karachi University***

As a member of progressive literary society, I believe people of big cities cannot even imagine what kind of creativity and expression in local languages and in deprived regions of KP, Balochistan, Interior Sindh, and Southern Punjab is being written by young writers and poet. I visited Samara in interior Sindh. Young poets performed very well. If you closely observe, word "Dam" has been included in the poetry. Poetry of Southern Punjab reflects the issue of scarcity of water. If you visit GB, conversations there would be enough to open your eyes. We are bound to big cities updates due to media. We are unaware of news from other cities. In particular, creativity among youth is beautiful. In Balochistan, I went through an essay where the writer explained how many children were named Akbar Khan after the murder of Akbar Bugti. Our youth in big cities like Karachi and Lahore is not aware of this information. I would suggest that people of big cities take into consideration such regions. They must see growth of real literature in these neglected areas.

**Haris Khalique *Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

It is interesting to know that the forces considered promoting instability in Pakistan are actually now appreciating federation. Such forces are working to strengthen Pakistan. And those who claimed themselves as custodian of nationalism and sign of federation and unity are actually the cause of deterioration caused in Pakistan.

**Ateeq, *BZU-Multan***

My question is to Mr Afrasiyab Khattak. According to media reports, 3.5 million Bengali living in Karachi have been a victim of identity crisis. Why this issue has been ignored? My other question is that why media is projecting Pashtuns as terrorists during recent anti-terrorism campaigns?

### **Kiran Shah**

I would like to ask that who is more reliable and who will provide us guidance from the civil-military bureaucracy?

### **Abdullah**

A new narrative for social reconstruction was either declared or enforced, what should be the characteristics of an agreed national narrative for problems linked to the identity crisis?

### **Afrasiyab Khattak, Former Senator KP.**

As a rights activist, I would like to say that no one should be stateless. If such people are here then their fundamental rights should be protected and their problems should be solved under the international law. Their identity documentation linked problems should also be focused. Secondly, certain profiling against Pashtuns has been done. This is wrong and it should not have been done with any nation. Nobody cares how many innocents have been killed in the military operations. So the point is, such problems do exist and they should be resolved.

### **Syed Jaffar Ahmed, Former Director, Pakistan Studies Center, Karachi University**

The ratio of Bengalis in Karachi is less than 3.5 million. But the main problem is the fear of local population in Sindh. That is why gradually they have been turning into a minority. Secondly, the problems of illegal Bengali migrants

in Pakistan including their children born here should be solved under international rules and regulations. They should not be deprived from their fundamental rights.

Who will lead the youth? I would like to say that 60 per cent of youth bulk in Pakistan is greater as compared to many other countries in the world. National narrative which is drafted at upper level and floated will not be accepted. During a session today, I questioned as to who are we to decide what should be the national narrative? The solution is, problems should be brought under discussion in the National Assembly. It will come from the grassroots and will be accepted. Discussions should be held in Punjab. Internal problems should be discussed. There should be proper rules for the representation of different communities of Balochistan, including Baloch, Hazara, and Pashtun in the provincial assemblies. In Sindh and KP, internal provincial conflicts should be discussed. Such kind of sessions should also be held at universities. Local events should include discussions. This way, a collective wisdom will surface. Give it the shape of a narrative. People will accept it. This will be the acceptable national narrative. If few scholars will try to promote something drafted secretly then consequences will be same as of previous narratives.

### **Shahzad (Student):**

What politicians or democratic powers have done for the people of Gilgit Baltistan who were provided ID cards but not the Pakistani identity?

### **Mahrukh (Student):**

Political parties with different identities or slogans take part in elections. How should we cast our vote to move towards a Pakistan which Quaid-e-Azam wanted?



**Dr. Abdul Malik, Former Chief Minister, Balochistan**

Everyone sitting here is agreed that we will have to discuss basic problems to promote stability of this country. Whether problems are related to democracy, nationalism, or right based ethnic issues; we are in favour of stable Pakistan. And this is possible when problems will be solved. You don't accept parliament. You don't allow elections. As Akram Sahib has said that no elections were held in the previous 70 years. And everyone knows how elections were held. Political parties are the main pillar of a country. Efforts have been made to sideline politics. Balochistan Awami Party (BAP) is one example. This party won seats and made representation in the provincial assembly. What will be the consequences when parties are formed over night? Nothing can be done until this narrative is changed.

**Sohail Sangi, Intellectual**

We have seen representative parties of small provinces and nations were restricted to move forward, for example, the National Awami Party. Later on, they made Pakistan Oppressed Nations Movement (PONAM) but again they were dictated to move ahead. In Balochistan, parties surfaced on individual basis but problems remained unsolved. Situation is a little different in Sindh. People's Party is a national party there. I think the element of nationalism is not missing but its nature has been changed. National parties will have to struggle together. This way, there are good chances that they may get solutions of their problems.

**Haris Khalique Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.**

People are talking about GB. Would you like to say something about it?

**Afrasiyab Khattak, Former Senator KP.**

I think we should apologies from the people of GB for what we have done to them. They have been punished for going against the Maharaja and preferring to be part of Pakistan. In return, their national and constitutional status is not defined till date. Unfortunately, recent court decision also read that their status cannot be changed. It will hurt their disputed status. But this is wrong. A joint publication of Kashmir and GB underlined that it will not affect their status. These people have been deprived of basic rights for the past 70 years.

The important question is if Anti-Terrorist Act can be implemented there to counter political activists then why they are not provided with basic rights?

These people cannot get Constitutional Rights as Pakistanis, this attitude should be changed. Once I tried to bail out a political activist. The arguments came from the other side that these activists promote regionalism. When I asked how they promote regionalism. The reply was that they promote language and culture. Where would people of GB find identity? Would they go to Sweden If not to Pakistan? How strange is that? As a democratic activist, we should struggle for GB. A region where life is stagnant during heavy snowfall, it doesnt have a local or national grid. There is no education board and all exams are conducted under the federal board. They have to come to Islamabad to get certificates of Matriculation and intermediate. We should support their struggle for basic rights. Disputed region is an excuse. Similar excuse was made with Bengalis when they were asked to accept less representation despite their majority. There is no such issue. Has Indian occupation of Kashmir resolved the problems? People of Kashmir are still striving for their rights. Under the garb of

administrative issues, for 70 years, they are being punished for participating in the independence movement of Pakistan. Don't know for how long this will be continued. These are lame excuses.

### ***Participant***

Though regional languages should be included in the national circle, a national language is essential for national unity. Why Urdu doesn't enjoy the status of a national language in practice?

### ***Zahid Kakar***

My question is to Dr. Abdul Malik. You hinted that establishment forms various parties and interferes in politics. Don't you think political parties could emerge more powerful than them?

### ***Qasim***

My question is that despite being in power and solving our problems, you have been demanding the solutions. Similarly, leaders in South Punjab have been demanding solutions. How should we perceive this? Are you really helpless to solve our problems or solution to the provincial problems is not in your preferences?

### ***Sohail Sangi, Intellectual***

It is good that we all are present here today and agree that the way things are being done in this country is not the right way. Country doesn't move forward this way. National interests can only be protected in a democratic, parliamentary state that ensures civil rights and interests and

where national governance is in practice.

### ***Syed Jaffar Ahmad, Former Director, Pakistan Studies Center, Karachi University***

Talking about national language or linguistic issues, mind that if I am agreed with Quaid-e-Azam's ideology doesn't mean I am agreed with everything he has said. If Gorge Washington can be criticized in the US, Mao in China, disagreement with Quaid's ideology is quite possible. In 2011, in Dhaka University, Bangladesh, I was questioned about language. I answered that my arrival here wouldn't have been on visa if Quaid wouldn't have refused to accept Bengali as a national language in his 1947 speech. Great people are also human beings. They also can make mistakes. But we should not repeat those mistakes.

### ***Afrasiyab Khattak, Former Senator KP.***

None of languages is bad. All languages are good. Not only in Pakistan, but in whole South Asia, we use Urdu as a means of communication. Languages promote understanding. Efforts should be made for the advancement of Urdu. Regional languages should also be promoted. In past few years, literature on war has been produced in Pashtu but people are not aware of it. Similarly, work is being done in Sindhi, Balochi, Punjabi and other languages. The real problem is that we don't have access to each other. I believe that literature of other languages should be translated and appreciated. It will strengthen our interaction and promote unity.

### ***Dr. Abdul Malik, Former Chief Minister, Balochistan***

Not only in Balochistan but overall the democratic powers of Pakistan should work together to strengthen democracy. There are so many restrictions. For instance, democratic progressive movements have been banned. You cannot talk about student union or anything else. I once asked Vice Chancellor of Balochistan University

that where you are heading by restricting politics of the middle class people. In this way, university will be full of elite class people because a common man will learn politics from here and if you won't let them do so then where do you lead the country?

Presently, there is a big space in our country. All democratic powers need to be united to think about financial, democratic and parliamentary system. How to maintain, improve this system, and how to promote mutual affection and love should be our focus.

***Haris Khalique Author, poet and Human Rights Activist.***

Referring to Seraiki Wasaib, one young man asked a question that despite being a leader you are seeking solutions. Please talk about this issue?

***Dr. Abdul Malik, Former Chief Minister, Balochistan***

We are not leaders here. In this country, you won't see political activists who have come ahead via political struggle. Certainly we are people's representatives and we have struggled to strengthen the democratic culture. Unfortunately, politicians are vulnerable to allegations of corruption. 300 politicians were banned in the Ayub regime. I think we should continue our struggle for the survival of democracy so that people of Pakistan should come out of despair. Otherwise politics will disappear from here.







## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

***Muhammad Amir Rana, Director, PIPS***

Thank you all. This was our first dialogue. Next year, we will try our best to make it more effective. We will need your feedback in this regard. I would like to thank my team for their efforts to make this event possible.

As we have been talking about politics, I would add a comment here that if politicians won't come from educational institutes then from where will they come. Such politicians will be those whose names have been used to scare us. Our youth wants to become doctors, engineers etc. Nobody wants to become a politician but all their hopes and expectations are attached to politicians. I would like to end the program with this sentence. Thank you.



Pak Institute for Peace Studies (PIPS) is an independent think-tank committed to provide an in-depth understanding and objective analyses of regional and global issues. PIPS provides international strategic thinkers a forum to play an active role in understanding and researching real and perceived threats to regional and global peace and security. The objective is to engage leading regional and international strategic thinkers, academicians and media persons in pursuance and production of knowledge of national, regional and global security issues and to promote awareness about the importance of peace and democracy. The goal will be achieved through independent policy analysis, and collection, processing, interpretation and dissemination of information and skills/training.

PIPS carries out and disseminates policy analyses and research studies on the regional and global strategic issues such as conflict and development, political violence, religious extremism, ethnic strife, terrorism (including state terrorism), economics, governance and democracy, foreign relations, and cultural learning of policy-making processes. It also conducts dialogues, trainings and other educational programs for strengthening partnerships and resolving inter-state conflicts, and clashes between the government and the public. At the national level, the institute is dedicated to build a knowledge base for peace and enlightenment of the society. PIPS is building one of the largest database on peace and security issues at the regional level.

PIPS has also developed a vast regional and global network for information sharing and research on some of the key security issues facing Pakistan, which also have a profound impact on regional and global security.



---

**PAK INSTITUTE FOR PEACE STUDIES (PIPS)**

---