

ISLAMABAD DEBATE SERIES

“Given its Domestic and Strategic Vulnerabilities, Pakistan has no Option but to Support and Participate in the US-Led ‘War on Terror’ in Afghanistan”

February 16, 2012



**THE INSTITUTE OF STRATEGIC STUDIES,
ISLAMABAD**

“Given its Domestic and Strategic Vulnerabilities, Pakistan has no Option but to Support and Participate in the US-Led ‘War on Terror’ in Afghanistan”

The Institute of Strategic Studies organized a public talk under its Islamabad Debate Series 2012, titled “Given its domestic vulnerabilities, Pakistan has no option but to support and participate in the US led “war on terror” in Afghanistan”, the eminent speakers of debate were Former foreign Minister Inam-ul-Haque speaking in favor of the proposition, and former ambassador to the United States Dr Maleeha Lodhi who pledged to speak against the motion.

The Director General of Institute of Strategic Studies welcomed the distinguished speakers and explicate that the inspiration for the Islamabad Debates was the need for new and far-reaching standpoints on issues of foreign and strategic policies.

The debate began with Mr. Inam-ul-Haque dialogue in goodwill of the proposition. He put across some reservations with regard to the assumptions of the topic and the phraseology employed. He expressed his reservations commenting that the issues relating to foreign policy can be framed in absolutist terms. There are no blacks or whites or solutions to the major policy dilemmas. He said that Foreign policy formulation requires a delicate balancing between available options through objective dispassionate cost-benefit analysis. There are always options and courses

open to a country, but the costs attached to them may be so high that the policy makers choose not to exercise such options. As such, he said that, he was personally not very comfortable with the subject of a debate on a proposition which is couched in very stark terms and said that he also have some quibbles with the language of the proposition. Even the US has given up on the terminology of the “War on Terror” and has opted to use the words “overseas contingency operations”. He said that he feels, it might have been preferable to couch the proposition in less emotive language. Therefore he preferred to ignore the proposition altogether, and speak on the wider issue of Pakistan’s bilateral relation with the United States and why Pakistan needs to remain on friendly terms with the US and not opt for a policy which will play down to Pakistan’s detriment.

He said that the essential condition for a rational debate is to get rid of preconceived notions and look at a situation without a belief in conspiracy theories or being in denial about certain truths. So he intend to first of all comment state what the world looks at Pakistan, then talk briefly about how many people around the world look at the United States, and then conclude by saying why the United States and Pakistan need to continue to work together.

First of all he said that he would like to comment on how the world looks at Pakistan. There is a famous couplet in Urdu, ‘How does the world look at you?’ And I will give you certain very bare statistics. Pakistan is seen as the third most dangerous country in the world, on the Human Development

Index Pakistan is 134 and the third worst country in the treatment of women after Afghanistan, considered to be third worst country in its treatment of journalists, Pakistan is 83rd out of 110 in terms of business friendly countries and 12th on the Index of Dysfunctional States, and the indicators to assess dysfunctional include all the ills that we can find in Pakistan: demographic pressures, population youth bulges, refugees – both foreign and internally displaced persons, group grievances including ethnic, sectarian, religious linguistic and other grievances, human flight from the country, uneven development, a faltering economy with low rate of growth and huge external debt, limited revenue generations, huge fiscal deficits, high poverty levels, negative balances of trade and current account balances, low foreign exchange reserves and unemployment, poor governance, no rule of law, violation of human rights, factionalized elite and external intervention, and all of these factors are available in Pakistan. To put it very politely, internally Pakistan is in a mess.

He further said that it is in the backdrop of this dismal state of affairs that we have to look at our relations with the world, and particularly the United States. While talking briefly on US he said that US today is a dominating, demanding, and many say an arrogant global hegemony. It is controlling an empire of more than 1000 bases in more than 153 countries and territories. It has by far the largest economy, its defense outlays equal the entire military expenditure of the rest of the world, it has a dominant voice in powerful international economic political and military organizations like the World Bank, the IMF, the Asian Development Bank, the United Nations, the

G8 and G20 and NATO to name only a few. Notwithstanding its protestations, the US has always been an imperialist power. He said that in a recent article written by American about the US, the American body politics has shown a marked susceptibility to messianic free verse. Whenever, especially, an acute attack occurs, a sort of delirium ensues, manifesting itself in a delusion grandeur and demented behavior. The US also demonstrates a strange proclivity to propagate ideals like freedom and democracy and nation building through massive killings of peoples, occupation of countries, destruction of infrastructure of the country intended to be saved. In doing so it has at times resorted to outright falsehoods, openly flouted and berated international law, it has committed war crimes, used chemical weapons, violated human rights of the occupied people, resorted to torture and illegal renditions, and thus after having won the hearts and minds of the grateful dead of the occupied countries, it blithely walks away in search of other nations which it believes may be in need of a savior.” We have seen this happen in Iraq, in Afghanistan, more recently in Libya, and there are those in the American administration, Congress and its think tanks, who are keen to administer a similar medicine to Syria, to Iran, and to, if some of them could have their way, Pakistan as well. He said that in a recent article in Foreign Policy by Mr. Krasner ,he recommended that the United States should end its aid to Pakistan, escalate drone attacks, strengthen ties with India, impose economic sanctions on Pakistan, and carry out cross border raids to kill terrorists.

He said that now having said all of this, and none of this is very complimentary to the United States, he would like to reiterate that statecraft in foreign relations has to be based on an objective assessment of one's own national interests, of our own capacities and our own limitations. He alleged that to design a policy, you have to think through a problem, including the possible worst-case scenarios; you have to calculate strategic, political military and economic costs of the road that you intend to take. State policies cannot be based in empty boasts, nor can they be expressed through emotional outbursts, or threats of Jihad against the infidels. So let us see why good relations with the US are essential for Pakistan. The first point, he said that he would like to make is that a confrontation with the US, what would be the result? Would the European Union and NATO support Pakistan in this? Would for example Japan support Pakistan? India would smirk as we shoot ourselves in the foot. Who will stand with us? Russia? The Islamic world? And the G16 as we know today is practically an extension of NATO. Will Africa stand with you? Will Latin America stand with you? The only country that can offer some support would be perhaps China. But even China has its limitations and will not jeopardize its national interests to support Pakistan. Nor should we put our friends to such a test. Can we, in fact, play China against the US? Will China risk its economic prosperity and adopt confrontationist policies towards the US to please Pakistan? Let us be quite clear. China is neither a challenge to US power in the near term or a replacement mentor for Pakistan in place of the US. Let's see how China itself reacts to provocative policies by the US. You are aware of the New Strategic Guidance issued by the Obama administration in

January this year which establishes US defense priorities in the 21st century. Including what the US calls a strategic pivot to the Asia Pacific, which is clearly aimed at encircling China through building bases and strategic relationships in the countries around China. We have seen major activities recently with the United States setting up forces in Australia, cementing relations which are already very good with Japan, South Korea; Vietnam is among the countries being courted, Indonesia, Philippines even Myanmar and of course India. But how has China responded to this? The Chinese Vice President and heir presumptive of Hu Jintao is now visiting the United States. In the US he has called upon the US to prioritize economic growth, and has promised to address American concerns over the undervaluation of the Chinese currency. He has said the Pacific Ocean has sufficient space for both China and the US. He has welcomed America's constructive role in developing peace, stability and prosperity in the region, and has asked the US to respect and accommodate the major interests and legitimate concerns of the Asian Pacific countries, thus placing China on the side of the interests of the Asian Pacific nations. If China with its economic prowess and growing military muscle and support around the world responds thus to the United States, isn't there a lesson in that for Pakistan?

About Afghanistan he said that Afghanistan the US is not going to leave Afghanistan after 2014, let's be quite clear about that. It will maintain bases in Afghanistan. It is shifting from counter-insurgency and nation building to counter-terrorism, which will be less costly in financial terms as well as in terms of American lives. The continued American presence in Afghanistan

will be designed to maintain a military presence next door to Iran, China and to preserve its influence in resource rich Central Asia. Lets look at Afghanistan. Do the Afghans want the Americans to leave? The US and NATO is a cash cow for Afghanistan, and they are furiously milking them. According to reports, 97 percent of the Afghan economy is dependent on the presence of foreign forces, and the total expenditure on these forces comes to \$150billion a year. But do the Afghans want the US to leave and lose the money they are making? If so, why is President Karzai negotiating a SOFA (Status of Forces Agreement) with the Americans? And in any event if the Americans leave, who is going to pay for the Afghan National Security Forces of almost 400,000 that are going to cost more than twice the total revenues of Afghanistan? Does Pakistan want Americans to leave Afghanistan? Have we thought through as to what will happen when the Americans leave? He believed that to his mind the Afghans will resume the civil war, which was won in 2001 by the Northern Alliance with the help and support of the US, and Pakistan is likely to be dragged into the quicksand of that civil conflict.

He further raised the question that why are some of us so keen on Mullah Omer and the Afghan Taliban, the Haqqani group and the Gulbadeen Hikmatyaars of this world that they are prepared to confront the rest of the world over them? He said that our earlier experience with the Afghan Taliban should not make us sanguine that they will be under Pakistan's influence, or will feel obliged to Pakistan even if they should seize power in Afghanistan, which to my mind is unlikely. Previously we could not

persuade the Taliban regime under Mullah Omer to moderate their behavior to allow the functioning of girl schools, not to destroy the Banyaan Buddhas, to return those Pakistanis who were wanted for crimes in Pakistan, to hand over Osama bin Laden to a third country for trial, or even to agree to an international border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. What we got instead was advice that we should pursue the same system that Mullah Omer was pursuing in Afghanistan. Their arrogance was such that the only two other countries that recognized them namely Saudi Arabia and the UAE and financed them had no option but to close their embassies in Kabul. And the only embassy functioning during the Taliban regime was that of Pakistan. Do we want to repeat that experience? If the Taliban should come to power in Afghanistan, we had better be prepared for a huge blowback, much larger than what we are confronting today. After having defeated two superpowers in Afghanistan, the Taliban will set out (and they have already started the proceedings) to conquer Pakistan. It is not Pakistan which will be seeking to have influence in Kabul, it will be the Taliban, Mullah Fazlullah and others of the TTP that are already in Afghanistan and are attacking Pakistani posts, those attacks might increase. And finally if we want to have a say and have a role in bringing peace to Afghanistan and to minimize Indian influence there, we will have to do so in close coordination with the US.

He alleged that now if you are internationally isolated, who will gain advantage of that? Your friends or your enemies? Militarily we are still dependent on the US assistance and equipment, in economic terms there is

a mismatch between resources and the size of our population because of our own misdeeds and failings. And we are dependent heavily on bilateral assistance as well as assistance from donors which are all Western. For technology we are dependent on the West. And finally, in the War on Terror are we fighting for our own survival, or for the survival of the United States? The Pakistani Taliban for example or even the Afghan Taliban has no ambitions to attack the United States or the West in their homelands. They are attacking and killing our people, our civilians, our security forces, they are attacking other Muslims and Pakistani nationals. Not the nationals of the United States and the West. We can regain ourselves by recounting American perfidy and unreliability to our friend. We can hold rallies addressed by rebel rousing mullahs, and equally delusional and failed politicians, and retired military officers spewing hatred against the United States, but to what end? Can their hatred or intolerance or reactionary rhetoric be translated into a policy of survival and prosperity for Pakistan? To my mind the answer is clear. It is No. he concluded by saying that it's most difficult to manage relations with a rampaging superpower. It is an unequal relationship, and that superpower is used to riding roughshod over other states in the pursuit of its own agenda and objectives, but howsoever difficult the discussions with the United States may be, confrontation with the United States and the West is not in our national interest. The only path available to us is to engage in sustained and serious negotiations with the US regarding the terms of the relations. Pretending that we have a

cornucopia of options from which to choose from is total self-deception. We have to face realities to protect our national interests.

With the format of debate Dr Maleeha Lodhi said that what Pakistani foreign policy essentially needs at this particular juncture in time is a geostrategic evaluation that acknowledges the structural transformation of the international environment, as well as the primacy being accorded to economic regeneration by the US and indeed other countries that are confronting the euro-zone crisis as it is called. She alleged that it was important to do so because even the foreign policy debate that the Pakistani parliament is going to undertake which is driven by the Pakistani foreign ministry, should really not have just been about the United States, it should have been about Pakistan's place in a wider world, because the relationship with the United States cannot be isolated from what else is happening in the world. She argued that Pakistan needs to undertake a serious review of the entire gamut of our foreign policy, and not undertake a US-centric or a one-country centric view. But she went on to say that she would agree with Inam Sahb, and she said she thought she would end up agreeing on more than they would disagree on, because she said she was not sure that the debate should be purely cast in either/or language, and seen through only a binary prism, simply because doing so does not enable Pakistan to do justice to the complex and complexity of the issues at hand. The world exists in shades of grey, and the choices that usually have to be made need to reflect that. She decided to challenge the premise in the

topic of the debate, saying that if the question was framed this way, Pakistan might have to end up dealing with false choices. The topic talks about the US pursuit of the War on Terror in Afghanistan, whereas we think we know we are past the post9/11 decade, in which, as it is pointed out, the phrase has been retired from the Western official lexicon. And Western policies are turning away from war, and especially from large-scale military intervention. The topic does not recognize that important shift – a shift that in part reflects the unedifying experience of the past decade. This is not a shift that is occurring on its own, it also reflects the fact that the outcomes which were sought from these large scale military interventions were not achieved or accomplished. And therefore, the cost in terms of both lives and treasure for the countries that did this intervention was very high. She maintained that Pakistan needs to be clear on this count, and we need to be clear on another count too. What is it that Pakistan is expected to support and participate in, as the topic says? Is it an enterprise of war, is it a way of finding a way out of war? Is the whole situation shifting to an enterprise of peace-making? Is it both? A point should also be made about domestic vulnerabilities. The topic assumes that domestic vulnerabilities should force Pakistan into a certain foreign policy stance. By domestic vulnerabilities what is principally meant is the dire economic straits that Pakistan is in which poses the greatest threat to Pakistan's stability today. While all foreign policy should flow from national objectives, Pakistan ought not to regard certain vulnerability as unchangeable, and then predicate foreign policy choices onto that. By taking this approach, what Pakistan is

effectively doing is pretending that external policies or alignments can redeem Pakistan's domestic weakness. The basis of foreign policy decisions should be, or should lie in the convergence of interests, whether with the United States or with any other country. Where there is no convergence, Pakistan has to dissociate with elements of another country without being unfriendly with them. Fundamentally Pakistan should also apply the 'people's test' – if the country's foreign policy is out of sync with the aspirations of the people of Pakistan, that foreign policy is not going to be sustainable, rather it is going to become dysfunctional. Dr Lodhi argued that Pakistan could not afford to see foreign policy as a way of resolving the country's vulnerabilities – by this logic it would be hard to argue that in the past decade Pakistan's alignment has reduced the country's vulnerabilities. The empirical evidence out there, Dr Lodhi stipulated, if anything, shows that Pakistan's vulnerabilities have been aggravated. Where alignments are based on expediency, not convergence of interests, that relationship becomes very turbulent and rocky, and such a relationship becomes very difficult to sustain, with mutual disappointments and mutual expectations being dashed all the time. She said that the sources of our domestic weakness have to be addressed by national policies at home and we know what these are; structural economic reform, mobilizing domestic resources and institutional restructuring. She said that foreign policy must aim to promote, strengthen and reinforce such an effort if it is undertaken at home. She further said that if we are pursuing the part of economic reform we need external policy to match that and to work in conformity with that

just as China has been demonstrated successfully. She said that the foreign policy choices should not rest on excuses that we cannot change our domestic situation until there is more external support because what we have seen in past half century that such external assistance delays reforms at home and it acts as the substitute where it really should be a supplement to internal reforms. She challenging the central theme of the topic said that Pakistan has no option but to participate US-led war on terror in Afghanistan. She said that framing the choice in this manner puts us behind the curve and puts us behind the important developments and events that are taking place. It means ignoring the shift underway in US policy and redefinition of US objectives in Afghanistan she said that US seems to go beyond war on terror in a move accelerated by elimination of OBL and the American determination that the threat of Al-Qaeda has substantially been reduced. Washington now says that there is no military solution to conflict in Afghanistan and set along with the other NATO countries at summit in Lisbon with 2014 deadline for what they call "Transition". That is the date on which most NATO combat troops will draw down and there is even hint recently of accelerated troops withdrawal from Afghanistan and an end of US combat role somewhere in 2013.the US is directly talking to the Taliban representatives and helping them set up a political office in Qatar. She said that the real question that could not ignored in this context is that Pakistani foreign policy establishment would have to deal with in going forward is going to how to wage peace rather than war. She further emphasize that what is the strategy required to vein down this longstanding conflict in our

neighborhood and raises several questions for Pakistan. As for as Pakistan's stand on the Afghanistan's embryonic nascent afghan peace process is concerned the record of history could help it to put up in sharper relief, just after 9/11 when US was reading to launch war against terror, Pakistan set three things to US which are:

- It (Pakistan) urged US to find a diplomatic solution and not wage war and punish innocent people.
- Pakistan warned against on staying on in Afghanistan and being perceived as an army of occupation and if US have to do a military intervention it must be short and surgical.
- Distinguish between Al-Qaeda and Taliban.

The way to deal with the international terrorism was to delink them instead of binding them, too isolate Al-Qaeda and narrow down the conflict instead of widening it. Pakistan's council was ignored and the war on terror policy was enunciated targeting the suspected individuals as well as the countries in which they were suspected to be located in. This extensive and controversial extension of the right of self defence became the bases of the military action in Afghanistan. In the invasion of Iraq the anticipatory notion of self defence was used, the US reserved for its self the right to defend itself if it thought a threat was emerging anywhere, which a classic preemption and unilateralism which became the Bush Doctrine and these elements have not disappeared from US policy, even when Obama administration came out with the first strategy review. Costing back to that

time war as a response to terrorism has a far reaching consequences. War on terror plunged the region into protracted instability and it lost the US hearts and minds across the Muslim world. For Pakistan consequences were especially dire, a prolonged war next door, execution of deeply flawed strategy and confused objectives that kept changing and pushed the war into Pakistan (into our tribal territory, cities) and undermine our security and destabilize our country and US-NATO military presence become a recruiting sergeant for extremist in Pakistan. The war on terror has been so destabilizing for Pakistan. The diplomatic challenge for Pakistan is how to aid the process of peace making in Afghanistan. If the Pakistan's and US interests converge with regards to Afghanistan our foreign policy should be predicated on that. She said that she deliberately reframe the question of debate because in the dynamic world it is essential to read the prevailing environment correctly, analyze and shape up the policy requirements accordingly. The critical choices and challenges for Pakistan today are to strengthen itself domestically and reduce external vulnerability and dependency and not pursue the policies that lead to the greater external dependency. She further emphasize that a foreign policy that has no option is not a foreign policy rather being forced to do something. Our foreign policy option should be created by strengthening ourselves domestically and needs to play a constructive role in the search for peace in Afghanistan with its interests potentially converging with those of US in working for a political settlement and play that role because Pakistan's geography and demography are what impel its afghan's policy, a long undefined border

with Afghanistan and common ethnic ties that are binding the people on both sides of the border. She said that this is very clear that what Pakistan's interests are; it is not interests to dominate but to protect itself and safeguard. The goal of reestablishing all its internal stability should be prime mover for Pakistan to play a role in the afghan reconciliation effort something which president Karzai has been talking about for several days to seek our (Pakistan's) help. The question of Pakistan's support and participation should be reformulated in the context of the stated US objectives of seeking a political solution in Afghanistan. The process to safeguard and meet the Pakistan's strategic interests just as others are doing is a legitimate course to pursue. We must engage vigorously to the peace efforts. The end of kinetic operations and mutual reduction of violence in Afghanistan are entirely in Pakistan's interests and assisting of the reconciliation process would bring these goals within reach. All of this, if it works out, should ultimately lead to the end of post 9/11 era and end of this war on terror approach which militarizes the response to terrorism and set the region to the path of peace and stability

Questions/Answers/Comments:

The Director General ISSI, Ashraf Jahangir Qazi comment to the Mr. Inam's speech that he have actually spoken on, in a sense, on both sides of the proposition – the proposition was deliberately formulated to provoke debate, not that it represents necessarily the views. He said that what he got from what Mr. Inam said was that on balance we should be with the US,

and although you refuse to be bound by the wording of the proposition, in order to avoid things we should find a way not to be openly opposing current policies in Afghanistan which is supporting what America is doing by bringing about a reorientation of policies. He personally remarked that according to his views the problem with supporting American policy in Afghanistan means that you are supporting what America's agenda is in this region which is larger than Afghanistan, and extends to policy towards Iran, policy towards China, policy towards the resources of Central Asia, and this is a larger agenda which does not, in my view, Pakistan has no interest in allying itself with America in pursuit of a broad agenda which may be part of Americas strategy.

Mr. Inam further comment that he thought that might be coming. He understood that having friendly relations with the United States does not mean supporting US agenda in the region. In the first place we have talked about us intentions towards China, Iran and Central Asia. We know that the international community is in a battle for resources –China is engaged in that, the US is engaged in that, and lets not start thinking for other countries, we need to think about ourselves and our national interests. If China feels threatened by the US, it has sufficient economic strength and military strength and intellectual strength to formulate its own policies. It is not dependent on Pakistan for its policies in the region, and nor is it going to ask Pakistan to confront the US because as I stated very clearly, China is not confronting the US even in Asia Pacific, and we all know that the

Americans are trying to move into the South China Seas. Again, yes, Iran is under threat from the US, but that does not mean that we have to support the US in its threats against Iran and we haven't done so. And without doing that we have been able to maintain a working and friendly relationship with the United States. Again, it is a function of diplomacy to isolate your problems and not allow them to impinge upon your policies which you feel are in your national interests. In Central Asia again there is a battle for resources, but Russia and China are much better placed than Pakistan to defend Central Asia from any American intervention. Pakistan does not need to support the so-called American regional agenda. And that agenda is primarily for maintaining and sustaining American leadership and hegemony in the world. That is not going to change whether we like it or not, but we should be concerned with how that agenda impinges on our already vulnerable reality in Pakistan. Are we going to improve that reality? Improve our vulnerabilities? Strengthen ourselves by confronting the United States? Or are we going to do so by continuing to work with the United States and also, when you are negotiating with a country, you can also offer implicit advice. And at times, the United States does listen to advice. We may not be able to change its agenda, but certainly we can advise the United States not to undertake actions which will be to the detriment of our country, to the detriment of our people, so I'm not suggesting supporting US agenda in the region, he held that he is suggesting safeguarding our own national interests."

Director General ISSI, Ashraf Jahangir Qazi further comment and asked that As far as America is concerned, a condition of their friendship towards you (Pakistan) , co-operation with you is that you do support their policy here, because they may have dropped the words “War on Terror”, but these words were never an official description of policy and of course they may have shifted but it still involves military-led strategies in Afghanistan and the overall purpose as we see it is that its aimed at some sort of hegemony. Here to avoid confrontation, our policy should be to dissociate ourselves from America’s dysfunctional policies in Afghanistan and the region, and if America is upset with that you need to explain your minimal cooperation. We need to dissociate ourselves from the American War on Terror in order to more efficiently conduct our own domestic War on Terror and your position seems to contradict that, it seems to require that we avoid confrontation by allying with America. You are not allowed to enter into this polite conversation with America – American policy is, as Bush put it, “You are either with us or against us”. What is your (Mr. Inam) response?”

To this question Inam-u-Haque responded that he thought that American policy is not static, it keeps evolving, and now we hear that the Americans are talking to even the Taliban and are offering concessions to them. Now lets talk about this so-called strategic dissonance between Pakistan and the United States that our analysts talk about a lot – that our interests and the interests of the United States are different in Afghanistan. That the US wants Pakistan to fight against the Taliban while it is negotiating with them

itself. Basically America has= lived with the fact that Pakistan is not prepared to do certain things. The United States has been asking us to go into North Waziristan for the last so many years we haven't done so. Your relationship hasn't suffered as a result of your not taking actions that the US wanted you to do. If you have seen the budget proposals of the years 2012-13, they have still allocated \$2.4 billion assistance to Pakistan out of which \$800 million is for counterinsurgency and about \$1.5 billion is under the Kerry-Lugar bill. So the US has not written you off as an ally or friend, but that does not mean the US should expect or that you should accept supporting US policies blindly in the region. We have been telling the US on the issue of Iran that it would be foolish of the US to try and attack Iran's nuclear programme, and secondly there is no way that the US could expect Pakistan to be supportive of such a policy. So you have to make your own red lines very clear in terms of your policies in the region. On certain things they will continue to exert pressure on you, for instance the Haqqani safe havens. They feel that perhaps you are too closely aligned to Hikmatyaar. He said that he do not think that Hikmatyaar enjoys any military strength today but still the Americans continue to name him. The only sticking point to my mind today is the Haqqani group. And even with the Haqqani group you have been persuading the Americans to enter into discussions and talks with the Haqqanis and one such meeting has taken place although it led nowhere. So it is as black and white and stark as. The Americans do not expect you to support their agenda in the region, because they are fully aware of your own limitations in the region also. On the War on Terror you

are differentiating between fighting the militants inside our country and what the Americans are doing in Afghanistan, and you have a point there. The Afghan narrative is that of a liberation struggle against an occupying country and Taliban find resonance within Afghanistan for that narrative. But in our country we are faced with a situation where these people such as the TTP and others who are fighting the state of Pakistan are drawing inspiration from Afghan Taliban and we have to ensure that the two do not work against our interests. I am not quite sure if the Afghan Taliban comes to power in parts of Afghanistan, after the Americans withdraw into their bases, they will not be supportive of the TTP – he alleged that he can't make an assessment or a judgment on that. But I think it should be in our interest to make sure that any non-state actor or group which threatens a country or a state should not be nurtured or supported.

The DG then proceeded to make the statement that what we need in Afghanistan is a political process and what the Americans seem to be pursuing seems to be a military-led political strategy which doesn't end up being a political process and in those circumstances you can have continuing instability in Afghanistan which can feed over into Pakistan, and it isn't in Pakistan's interest.

Q: America has confronted with three choices (mentioned above), what should we have done when we make such a plea, it rejected our position and confront us with the choice and we accept those choices leading to a situation in Afghanistan which produce instability there, instability feeling back here should not we have an unqualified response to that or should we remain very moans to that response? Should we enter carry out some reservation and continue to support by opening up the convoy to Afghanistan or should we stand up and say this is not working in the favor of peace and is having blow back in Pakistan and have an impact on our development agenda and cannot support it? How should we response to a situation?

A: in response to the question by Director General of Institute, Ms. Maleeha Lodhi said that war as response to terrorism has been discredited across the world. You may have limited intervention but large scale intervention there could find few supporters of it in US. We should recognize that era of large scale military intervention is over and Libya proved that point. We are living in an n era of massive global transparency where is not possible for many of countries to hide the things which they have been used to. There is no one US policy right now, the white House wants political settlement and Pentagon thinks it should fight on and that provides us with some space that has been part of the problem. Where we are positioned is, if we wish for the kinetics to begin to end we need to be

little more proactive than we have been in trying to shift the dynamic between fight and talk. What is feasible and not feasible we don't know just because America wishes to achieve some objectives does not mean that they achieved it; it gives other countries a space.