

Democratic Peace in South Asia

Ross Masud

Abstract

First of all, it may be pointed out that most of the states of South Asia have some kind of democratic form of government, whether it is a constitutional monarchy, as in the case of Bhutan and Nepal, or a semi-independent regime, as in the case of Afghanistan. Hence we have to focus on Peace in South Asia and don't have to dilate on dictatorship vis-à-vis democracy or something. Almost all states of South Asia have internal conflicts. Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Pakistan and India have all suffered from internal conflicts but the latest entrant in the group i.e. Afghanistan, has suffered the worst - a serious civil war like situation as well as foreign troops. The internal conflicts in these states may or may not have linkages with potential or actual conflicts amongst the states of the region. By and large, all states of the region still have more or less peaceful relations with other states of the region, though relationship between Sri Lanka and India, during the Tamil separatist movement in northern Sri Lanka, came under severe strain and water dispute as well as refugee issue have caused tension between India and Bangladesh. The only exception is India and Pakistan, the two largest countries in the region, which have actually gone to war with each other three times and hostility between the two of them largely prevents South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) from becoming effective. Hence when talking of establishing Peace in South Asia, we have to primarily deal with the hostility between these two countries.

Keywords: Democracy, Peace, South Asia

War and Peace in General

It may be useful to briefly address the issues of War and Peace generally before focusing on

Peace in South Asia. Ever since the establishment of organized human societies, there have been clashes between different societies and there has been need for peace to ensure prosperity and growth. Many a times a dominant society subjugated other human societies that were weaker to ensure peace. In other cases, leaders/rulers of different human societies reached agreements, whether verbal or written, to ensure co-existence for the betterment of all.

In this context we may point out that the Holy Prophet preferred to have the treaty of Hudaibiyyah with the Quraish of Mecca to ensure 10 years peace in 628 A.D (6 A.H) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Hudaibiyyah) rather than attack Mecca and have constant discontentment in Mecca and conflict with it. Initially, the Holy Prophet was described as a messenger of God in the treaty but the Quraish objected and the

*Author is Former Assistant Secretary General, Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization & Legal Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Pakistan

treaty was entered into between Muhammad Ibn Abdullah and Suhayl Ibn Amr after erasing of the words “Messenger of Allah” by the Holy Prophet himself, as his companions were not ready to do so. There was a lot of resentment in a section of Muslims who felt that a victory over Quraish had been given up under the treaty. The Holy Prophet, however, proclaimed it as a victory, which was confirmed by a revelation and the Muslims performed Pilgrimage to Mecca in 629. In any case, the Quraysh of Mecca no more considered Muhammad to be a rebel or a fugitive from Mecca. As the treaty did not last for ten years, non-Muslim reader may think that reference to this treaty here is probably a projection of Islam but for most of the Muslims who believe in violence as a means of enforcing their concept of Islam this is a clear example of the tradition of Holy Prophet that they are flouting.

In any case, the modern era of globalization of issues of war and peace started evolving with the emergence of multi-state system in Europe. International law and international organization also started their development more or less at the same time and a new phase in the evolution of international community commenced. New forces started moulding the European Scene. The emergence of commerce and a large middle class posed a threat to the feudal system and with Reformation the challenges to Feudalism, Papacy and the Empire grew stronger. Thus in the beginning of 16th century several states, similar to the modern states, came into existence. These states competed with each other fiercely and frequently clashed with each other, inside as well as outside Europe. Initially, Spain was the dominant one of these states and was the first empire builder from Europe. The spirit of exploration and the skills of navigation developed by Spain were probably due to the Muslim influence, as Spain remained under Muslim Rule for quite a few centuries. When Spain acquired Habsburg territories in Germany in 1519, Charles was elected as the Holy Roman Emperor. This generated rivalries and formation of a number of competing alliances in which France was a prominent state. This led to a series of conflicts culminating in the 30 years war of 1618– 48 (<https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/modern-europe/wars-and-battles/thirty-years-war>).

It was at the end of this lengthy war that a major peace initiative was taken in the shape of Peace of Westphalia. The Peace of Westphalia was, in fact, a series of treaties signed between May and October 1648 in Osnabruck and Munster. The 30 years war in the Holy Roman Empire and the 80 years war between Spain and Holland were thus brought to an end and Spain recognized the independence of Dutch Republic. The treaties of Osnabruck brought peace to France, Sweden and Holy Roman Empire and allied states. The peace treaty between Spain and Dutch Republic, ratified at Munster, led to recognition of independence of the Dutch Republic.

The treaties initiated a new system of political order in central Europe, which was based on the concept of sovereign states and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. The treaties thus not only brought to an end the perennial and destructive wars in Europe but they also signified the triumph of

Democratic Peace in South Asia

sovereignty of states over empire. It was a milestone in the establishment of an international order. The rules enshrined in the treaties became integral to the constitutional law of the Holy Roman Empire and initiated a trend for later major international treaties and development of public international law. The treaties did not, however, bring peace to all of Europe. France and Spain remained at war for the next eleven years. Nevertheless, the treaties provided a basis for national self-determination of people. Peace negotiations between France and the Spanish King that were to be started in Cologne in 1648 were unfortunately blocked by France.

The Peace of Westphalia involved hectic negotiations that had no exact beginning and ending. All the 109 participating delegations never met in a plenary session but dropped in between 1643 and 1646 and left between 1647 and 1649. Probably the largest number of diplomats was present between January 1646 and July 1647. The Delegations represented 16 European states, sixty-six Imperial States, representing the interests of a total of 140 involved Imperial States, and 27 interest groups, representing the interests of a variety of a total of 38 groups.

In any case, the most significant outcome of the event was the recognition of the principle of the sovereign equality of states. The last vestiges of the medieval unity of Europe disappeared and were replaced by sovereign states “jealous of their territorial sovereignty to the point where the idea of international community became an almost empty phrase and where international law came to depend upon the will of States”. (Leo, 1948)

Another major peace initiative was taken at the end of Napoleonic wars in the shape of Congress of Vienna held in 1814-15 and the treaties resulting from it restored the status quo ante of 1792. The Holy Alliance formed by Great Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia, the victorious powers, decided to convene the Congress a month before the defeat of Napoleon in April 1814 to address the issue of maintaining peace in Europe. The Congress was accordingly convened towards the end of 1814 and concluded in 1815. Apart from the four major powers, who took this initiative, other states like Portugal, Sweden, and Spain etc. also participated. The Congress was immediately concerned with the distribution of territories conquered by France amongst the victorious powers but in the long run its objectives was also to ensure peace for Europe by settling issues arising from wars initiated by the Napoleon. Austria, Prussia and Russia gained most of the territories, while France lost all the territories conquered by her during Napoleonic wars.

Under the Final Act of the Congress, signed in June 1815, Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia were recognized as the Great Powers, a special status in the maintenance of peace in Europe. The Great Powers were to collectively maintain territorial status quo and agreed to refrain from unilateral acquisition of territory. They agreed to periodically meet to play their role of maintaining balance of powers and peace in the continent. Subsequently, this concert of Europe was joined by France in 1818, which gave a more formal shape to the mechanism of Balance of Power to ensure survival of

multi-state system of Europe. The practice of consultation amongst the great powers or “Concert of Europe” thus initiated helped maintain nearly a century of relative peace till the beginning of World War I. Though some critics considered it a reactionary development suppressing emerging national and liberal movements, most of the historians credit it for the relative stability and peace in the continent for about a century. This period of relative peace of about a century till the outbreak of World War I is also called Pax Britannica by some, as Great Britain was the dominant power for most of this time.

The two World Wars brought such devastation that finally the European states again started searching for a lasting peace in the region. In 1957, the Treaty of Rome created the European Economic Community (EEC), or ‘Common Market’ consisting of six countries that subsequently metamorphosed into European Union consisting of 28 states, Croatia was the latest to join in 2013. Many of the members have fought each other for centuries but today goods and nationals of any member can anywhere within the Union without payment of any Customs duties or passport checks. With the exception of the U.K. that is leaving the Union, all member states trade in a single currency.

Indo-Pak Issue of War and Peace

Coming to the Indo-Pak issue of war and peace, we may start with present state of relationship between the two countries. It may be noted that election of Imran Khan in Pakistan had generated a lot of hope for better relations between the two countries but gradually it is fading. We ought to keep in view the fact that only a couple of years back in August 2016 the Indian Home Minister, Mr. Rajnath left a South Asia Association of Regional Countries (SAARC)’s Interior Ministers 7th Meeting at Islamabad (Khan, 2016) after the Interior Minister of Pakistan, Ch. Nisar Ali Khan had emphasized the need to make a distinction between terrorism and legitimate struggles of people for the realization of their right to self determination. He supported the freedom struggle of people of Kashmir sanctioned vide Security Council Resolutions that called for holding of a plebiscite to determine the fate of the disputed State of Jammu and Kashmir. Subsequently, the Indian Prime Minister had also been projecting Pakistan as a terrorism sponsoring country at different international forums all over the world. A year earlier, a leading Indian promoter of peace between the two countries was reported in this context by ABP news, as follows: while speaking during an interview to a Pakistani news channel, Duniya TV, Mani Shankar Aiyar said that it was required to remove Modi, otherwise talks would not move forward and we have to wait for four years (Shankar, 2015).

Yet, hardly a month had elapsed since this interview of Mani Shankar Aiyar, when Narendra Modi arrived in Lahore on 25th December 2015 for a meeting with his Pakistani counterpart, Nawaz Sharif, in a surprise visit – in fact, the first visit to Pakistan by an Indian premier in more than 10 years. He was received by Nawaz Sharif with a hug at the tarmac of Allama Iqbal International Airport. He was on his

Democratic Peace in South Asia

way back home after a trip to Afghanistan where he went after concluding a two-day visit to Russia. Watching him walk with Nawaz Sharif, hand in hand, on TV screen, one could hardly believe one's eyes.

The pundits on both sides of the Indo-Pak boarder, who repeatedly opined that Indo-Pak animosity is so deep-rooted that there can be no rapprochement between the two countries, must have been hiding their faces but only for a short while. Unfortunately, the short lived peace hype soon gave way to the normal hostility between the two countries. There was Pathankot attack and an Indian Naval Officer caught stoking sabotage in Baluchistan and thus the possibility of establishing good neighbourly relationship between the two states again receded. Apparently, the pundits had to hide their faces only shortly and must have been convinced of their conclusion that there can be no lasting rapprochement between the two states.

That there can be no modus Vivendi between the two countries is, however, too pessimistic a conclusion and I don't agree with it. We should keep in mind that Modi only highlights the sentiments of Hindu fundamentalists presently and does not represent the sentiments of a vast number of Indians. In this context an interesting development was reported by The Times of India (27th June 2015) - it was the appointment of a Muslim Pilot as Guardian of his Hindu friend's children by Delhi High Court. The Muslim couple's bid to raise two Hindu orphans, in fact, earned praise from the court. Moved by what it termed a "noble endeavour", the High Court appointed Mohammad Shahnawaz Zaheer, a commercial pilot, as the guardian of twins Ayush and Prarthana under the Hindu Minority & Guardianship Act. The newspaper reported that when its representative visited the Zaheer household earlier, it found the twins bonding well with the family and Zaheer said, "The HC order streamlined everything to allow the twins to integrate with us. I have a three-storey house and my in-laws and parents live with me. Ayush and Prarthana are the cynosure of their eyes. Since the court appointed me as guardian, now they will get a passport and can travel abroad with us." The court also entrusted one Arun Saini, a willing neighbour, to make sure the children receive Hindu religious instructions and can visit temple for prayers. Zaheer said that he didn't want them to ever convert and that they would be raised as Hindus. The two children had lost their airhostess mother and pilot father within a year's time in 2012 and were at the mercy of the family driver who took care of their basic needs.

In fact, by and large, Indians and Pakistanis get along very well at the individual level in Europe, America and other parts of the world in spite of the hostility between the governments of the two countries. The musicians, artists and sportspersons of the two countries have good relationship with each other despite their rivalry. The hope of peace is not, therefore, completely unrealistic.

Historical Emergence of Hindu-Muslim Rivalry

In any case, we need to trace the emergence of rivalry between Hindus and Muslims to address the issue of peace between the two countries. After the advent of Muslims in Sindh and Northern India, conversion of Hindus, largely of lower castes, led to a process of cultural accommodation and assimilation. Sugata Bose and Ayesha Jalal have asserted that “what available sources do permit is a plausible argument to be advanced, to the effect that not only were creative Indo – Islamic accommodations of difference worked out at various level of society and culture but that India, or al-Hind, became the metropolitan centre of an Indian ocean world with a distinctive historical identity that stretched from the Mediterranean to the Indonesian archipelago”⁷. It may be pointed out here that most of the conversion to Islam was brought about by Sufis and not the conquerors or Mullahs.

The Muslim kings and emperors who ruled over India for over one thousand years were not, in fact, colonial rulers - they made the sub-continent their own home. These rulers by and large did not make any discrimination between religious communities and gave equal opportunity to all and ensured social justice irrespective of religious beliefs or affinity. Khiljis, Lodis, Syeds and Mughals consciously kept the indigenous Muslims, who formed most of Indian Muslims, at a safe distance from the apparatus of power. Iqbal Ansari, in fact, asserts that it would be incorrect "to call this period of dynastic rule of Persian and Turkish origin as Muslim rule. Islam did make its presence felt during this period on Indian social and cultural life. But Islam did not play a dominant role in statecraft. The conquest of India by Islam was again not on the agenda of the Muslim kings. Islam and its promotion was not even a major factor in state policies."⁸

Interestingly in Delhi, which remained the capital of Muslim rulers for 647 years (1211-1858 A.D.), Muslim inhabitants remained a minority all this time. Most of the Muslim converts were in territories away from the seat of rule of these kings and were artisans, craftsmen, and tillers and enjoyed hardly any privileges under the system of Muslim rule. On the other hand, high caste Hindus enjoyed greater privileges under the patronage of the Muslim monarchies and most important jobs like ministers and commanders of army were occupied by non-Muslims, especially Hindus, like Man Singh who was Army Chief under Akbar, the most popular emperor, known as Mughl-e-Azam.

Even Aurangzeb, who is considered to be the most rigid Muslim emperor of India, was not against local leaders on the basis of religion. When he was sent to Deccan in 1655 as a Prince, Shivaji approached him by presenting himself as a servant of Mughal Empire and obtained confirmation of his territories from the imperial authority⁹. Expecting Aurangzeb to be engaged in prolonged war with the king of Golconda, Shivaji, however, invaded Mughal land and took a large booty from Junar but failed in the case of Ahmadnagar. On seeing rapid conquests of Aurangzeb, Shivaji once again tried every excuse and pretext to obtain forgiveness for his rash

Democratic Peace in South Asia

attack and offered devotion and service at the time when sick Shah Jahan recalled Aurangzeb. The Prince granted forgiveness to him provided he contributed to the royal army¹⁰.

Shivaji, however, failed to refrain from attacking Mughal territories afterwards and it was his capture of some vessels carrying pilgrims to Mecca that especially offended Emperor Aurangzeb. An army was, therefore, sent to Deccan under the command of Raja Jai Singh and Dilir Khan was deputed to assist him. When the two started siege of Singhgarh and Purandar, Shivaji lost hope and again sought assurance of his safety and favour from the Emperor. He withdrew from his army and with some attendants proceeded to Raja Jai Ram's camp. On his humble profession of fidelity an agreement was concluded under which he gave up twenty out of thirty forts that he possessed (Mountstuart, 2008). Expecting to be made Mughal Viceroy in Decca he left Rajgarh for Delhi in late March 1666. Not receiving the protocol at the court of Aurangzeb that he expected, he slipped out from his virtual confinement. He again encroached upon Mughal territory but Mughal commander, Jaswant Singh, who was favourably inclined towards Hindus, managed peace for Shivaji with Aurangzeb on terms that exceeded his hopes and his title of Raja was recognized, a new Jagir was granted to him and considerable territory was restored to him (Mountstuart, 2008).

Some years later, when Aurangzeb led his army to south in 1682 he focused on subduing kings of Bijapur and Golconda, both Muslims, in the first instance. Sambhaji, son of Shivaji, entered into a defensive alliance with the king of Golconda at this time but Aurangzeb did not let this draw his attention to Sambhaji and made it a ground, on the contrary, to take up a fight with king Abul Hassan and sent an army to invade the kingdom of Colconda. (Mountstuart, 2008) It was after both the kings had been subdued that Governor of a District, came to know Sambhai's whereabouts and was able to catch Sambhaji with a small body of troops and sent him to imperial headquarters with his attendant, Calusha, in December 1688.¹⁴ This shows that it was not a simple Hindu-Muslim conflict but more of a North versus South Conflict in the power game of those days.

It is true that Aurangzeb by nature was harsh and it cannot be said that he did not commit excesses but the following extracts from remonstrance against imposition of Jizya, by Raj Singh, addressed to Aurangzeb would show that Emperor Aurangzeb was not such a tyrant after all and could tolerate strong criticism:

“I submit the following words in a spirit of devotion to the public welfare:-

It has recently come to my ears that your Majesty has ordered that money under the name of Jizya should be collected from Hindus and the imperial needs supplied with it. May it please your Majesty! That architect of the fabric of empire, Jalaluddin Akbar Padshah, reigned with full powers for 52 years. He adopted the admirable policy of perfect harmony in relation to all the various sects, such as Christians, Jews, Muslims, Dadu's followers, sky-worshippers, malakias, materialists, atheists,

Ross Masud

Brahman and Jain priests. The aim of his liberal heart was to cherish and protect all people. So, he became famous under the title of ‘the World’s Spiritual Guide’.

Next, Emperor Nuruddin Jahangir for 22 years spread his gracious shade on the head of the world and its dwellers, gave his heart to his friends and his hand to his work, and gained his desires. The Emperor Shah Jahan for 32 years cast his blessed shade on the head of the world and gathered in fruit of eternal life – which is only another name for goodness and fair fame – as the result of his happy time on earth.

.....They, too, had the power of levying Jizya; but they did not give place to bigotry in their hearts, as they considered all men, high and low, created by God to be examples of the nature of diverse creed and temperaments. Their kindness and benevolence endure on the page of Time as their memorial....most men lack bread (now) at night and in the day inflame their cheeks by slapping them. How can the royal spirit permit you to add the hardship of the Jizya to this grievous state of things?” (Mountstuart, 2008)

As a matter of fact, the Muslim majority territories now constituting Pakistan also had resentment against the rule of Muslim kings of Agra and Delhi and local leaders like Dulla Bhatti and Khushhal Khan Khattak etc. rebelled against the Mughals. Conversion to Islam, as hinted earlier, was the result Sufis like Ali Hajveri (Data Ganj Bakhsh), Baba Farid Shakarganj etc. and not Muslim rulers of Agra or Delhi. It is interesting to note that mystic poets from these areas like Bulleh Shah, Sachat Sarmast, Shah Latif Bhitai, and Shah Hussein etc. all asserted that they were neither Hindus nor Muslims nor Shias nor Sunnis (Academy, 1995).

In Hindus also there were Bhaktis who, according to Percival Spear, had gurus like Kabir of Beares, Chaitanya, a devotee of Shri Krishna or perhaps Guru Nanak etc. Their path to salvation was through heart and soul. They believed that religion was a personal affair and it was a matter of heart and soul and not ceremonies and traditions (Academy, 1995). They denounced caste and were close to Sufis in Islam and it was not easy to distinguish from them “A sufi was a Muslim bhakti, a bhakti a Hindu sufi” (Academy, 1995)

The Impact of British on Hindu – Muslim Relations

Towards the end of Muslim rule in India, East India Company, which had initially come here as a trading enterprise, soon developed territorial ambitions that led to the British Rule in India. The Company developed a security set up to safeguard its interests and started fishing in the troubled waters of India in the 18th century. The Company’s forces were defeated by Nawab Sirajuddaula of Bengal in 1756 and in 1757 the Company managed to defeat him with the help of treachery of Mir Jaffer. The foundations of the Company’s Rule were thus laid down with the policy of divide and rule and exploiting treacherous elements amongst Indians. As the Company started enjoying the expropriation of revenues of land, its appetite for more territories increased. In the century following this victory, the Company managed to defeat most

Democratic Peace in South Asia

of the important local forces. The Nawab of Mysore, Marathas, tribal chiefs, Nawab of Awadh and Sikhs were defeated by the Company one after the other till the First War of Independence, according to the local population, or Mutiny, according to the British.

During this widespread uprising, Hindus and Muslims fought side by side against the British Rule. The greased cartages, rumoured to be coated with pig and cow fat, sparked the revolt as Hindus and Muslims both considered this to be a plot to pollute them before forcibly converting them to Christianity. The war started at Meerut in May 1857 and the rebels marched to Delhi and installed the last Mughal emperor, Bahadar Shah Zaffar, as head of the uprising. The Marathas and Rani of Jhansi and other Hindus along with Muslims fought against British. In fact, Maulvi of Faizabad proclaiming Jihad against the Farangis also emphasized the common threat posed by to both Hindus and Muslims by them. Hindu-Muslim unity against British was underlined by others also. Percival Spear had this to say about life and communal relations in Delhi immediately before 1857 “Official garden parties at Metcalfe House were attended by Mughul Princes and Hindu bankers equally with British officials and their wives. The Court celebrated Hindu festivals of Divali and Holi as well as the Muslim Ids; Hindus regarded the Mohurram ceremonies as almost as much their own as the Muslim”. (Academy, 1995)

In any case, after the 1857 uprising was suppressed, the senior leadership in the Company, including Governor General Earl Canning, started examining deeply the causes of the rebellion. It was found that a number of peaceful rulers had been turned hostile because of the policy of territorial expansion. In fact, Lord Stanley, President Board of Control of the Company, in a speech to the Parliament in March 1860, asserted that this was a major cause of the revolt.²⁰ At the same time it was recognized that steady support of some of the princely states helped turn the tide in favour of the British. Referring to this support by these princely states, Lord Canning, therefore, wrote to the Secretary of State for India that they “served as breakwaters in the storm which would otherwise have swept over us in one great waive”. (Viceroy, 1860)

British policy was, therefore, changed in respect of relationship with Indian Princes. In the proclamation of 1858, Queen Victoria assured that the Treaties with Indian Princes would be honoured in future. The lapse of dynasties for want of natural heirs was discontinued then. As a matter of fact, this ensured that till 1947, when the British left the sub-continent, not a single princely state was annexed on this ground.

As the Company’s rule was replaced by the Crown rule, the most important policy changes in the light of experience of the Mutiny were, however, made by British in the reorganization of the armed forces. It was decided that in future the Indian troops would not number more than twice the British troops and British officers alone would be in charge of artillery. A new strategy was adopted to recruit troops from new social groups and to mix the regiments in such a way that different groups may have

no hesitation in firing on each other, if the need arose. The policy of divide and rule was thus adopted in the British Indian army also. The loyalty shown by the Punjabi and Gurkhas during the Mutiny also led to a change in the policy of recruitment to the British Indian army and by 1875 about half of the British Indian army was recruited from Punjab.

Different communities in the princely states, however, lived in harmony with each other, while the rivalries between the Hindus and Muslims grew in the British India. Talented individuals from one community prospered in states with rulers from other community. For instance, Nawab Liaquat Hayat Khan served as Minister and Prime Minister under Maharaja of Patiala, who was a Sikh ruler. In fact, he was nominated to represent Patiala state in the Round Table Conferences held in London in 1930 and 1931 by the Maharaja. Similarly, K.M. Panikkar, who distinguished himself at Oxford, was a Hindu who also served Maharaja of Patiala, a Sikh ruler. Sir Mirza Ismail served as Chief Minister of Mysore, Jaipur and Hyderabad in succession. About him the American Ambassador in New Delhi wrote, in 1945, to the US State Department "I have not ... met anyone else in India ... either Indian or European, who is in this class." (Viceroy, 1860)

Crystallization of Communal Identities

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and others had started emphasizing the distinction between the two communities during nineteenth century but the Muslims of India really became apprehensive when Hindus agitated against the 1905 partition of Bengal. The Kanpur Mosque episode and annulment of partition of Bengal produced resentment amongst Muslims and in 1913 Moulana Muhammad Ali wrote that there were "events like the Durbar announcement revising the partition of Bengal that have dealt a heavy blow to the confidence the Musalmans have always reposed in the pledges and sense of fair play of their rulers".

Political rapprochement between Hindus and Muslims still emerged in the wake of First World War. In seeking rapprochement with Congress, the Muslim Leaders considered it the representative organization of Hindus. Muhammad Ali, however, wrote in 1912 that some self-advertising folks had gone about proclaiming that the Muslims should join the Congress because the government had revoked the partition of Bengal or because Persia and Turkey are in trouble. Hence Prabha Dixit observed, "The contents of Lucknow Pact make it absolutely clear that it was mere modification of tactics and not of strategy as conceived by Syed Ahmed Khan". (Dixit, 1985)

Even then at the end of First World War both Hindus and Muslims of India turned against the British Raj in India. The Muslims launched Khilafat Movement under the leadership of Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali and Gandhi joined forces with them in the aftermath of the First World War to effectively challenge the colonial rule. Gandhi, in fact, urged his Hindu followers to support the "just cause of the Muslims"

Democratic Peace in South Asia

and continued, “for the Hindu not to support them (Muslims) to the utmost would be a cowardly breach of brotherhood”. (Mahatma, 1965)

In fact, a leading Muslim Alim, Abdul Bari supported Gandhi during the Rowlatt Sityagraha and in 1919 he wrote to Gandhi, “Thanks are due to your kind special attention for the success of the Day of Prayer and Hindu Muslim unity. ... A group of ulama have written to me specially to pay their homage to you”. (Bari, 1919) Some ulama of the Bahr al-ulum of Firangi Mahal were opposed to non-cooperation policy of Gandhi and his domination of the Khilafat Movement but they were few and had limited influence. Most of the Ulama supported accommodation with Congress and cooperation with Hindus in the campaign for Khilafat. In March 1921 Jamiyat-i-Ulama-i-Hind, however, declared that it was haram (sinful) for a Muslim to serve in the army. The Khilafat Conference held in Karachi on 8-10 July 1921 endorsed this resolution. Gandhi too supported this resolution but he was opposed to the militant posture adopted by some ulama because he thought that it may lead to violence and undermine his policy of non-violent non-cooperation.

By the end of 1921, the more militant of ulama led by Hasrat Mohani precipitated a showdown by calling for complete independence and in case of martial law being imposed urging Muslims to give up non-violent non-cooperation. Gandhi opposed this move and Congress rallied behind him. The Subjects Committee of the Muslim League too rejected Hasrat Mohani’s resolution on 30th December 1921. The ulama were upset and gradually Khilafat Movement started slipping from Gandhi’s hands. Gandhi, in fact, suspended the civil disobedience on 5th February 1922. He informed Congress that he could not be a party to a movement of violent and half non-violent. This took the sting out of the agitation. In March 1922 Gandhi was, therefore, condemned for betrayal at the meetings of Jamiyat-i-Ulama-i-Hind and the Central Khilafat Committee. Gandhi was arrested on 10th March 1922 and when he was released nearly two years later he had lost all interest in Khilafat Movement. When he was asked to nominate a Hindu to join a Khilafat deputation to Angora, he said that it would be out of place for any Hindu to be a part of the deputation. (Viceroy, 1860)

The collapse of Khilafat Movement had a strong impact on different sections of Muslim population, including ulema. The resulting confusion for over a decade and a half was described by Khaliquzzaman in the following words:

“The disruption of the Khilafat organization was like a breach in the embankment of the flowing stream of Muslim mass emotion, which diverted it into several petty streams, some leading to desert lands there to dry up, some flowing by a zigzag routes to meet the original bed in their head long march and some others rushing towards the mighty ocean to drown themselves. To try to find any consistency, sound reasoning or logical method in Muslim politics during that period would be utterly futile.”

Jinnah and Hindu – Muslim Unity

It is interesting to note that Mr. Jinnah had, in the meantime, become member of Congress only and for a number of years did not join All India Muslim League established at Dacca in 1906. Even after joining Muslim League in 1913, he tried his best for Hindu-Muslim unity and their combined struggle for liberation of India from the British colonial rule. The Hindu leaders, in fact, called him the Ambassador of Hindu – Muslim unity. He did not join the delegation of Muslim leaders who called on the Viceroy at Simla. The delegation consisted of 35 leaders of Muslim community, who met the viceroy, under the leadership of Sir Aga Khan, in Simla on 1st October 1906. The delegation included the members from Bengal, Punjab, U.P., Bombay, Madras, Sindh, C.P., Deccan, and Delhi. They were mostly drawn from the Muslim elite class and were connected with the Aligarh movement through the AIMEC. Their demands, included right of separate electorates for Muslims, three more seats in central legislature and quota for the Muslims in civil services etc.

Actually, Quaid-e-Azam had opposed Aga Khan, who led the delegation of 35 prominent Muslims that called on the Viceroy of India at Simla in 1906. The Aga Khan in his memoirs noted that Jinnah had shown “bitter hostility towards all that I and my friends had done and were trying to do”.²⁸ According to Quaid-e-Azam the principle of separate electorate was dividing the nation itself and he continued to work for Hindu-Muslim unity. At the Allahabad session of Congress held in 1910, he seconded a resolution that strongly opposed “the expansion or application of the principle of Separate Communal Electorate to Municipalities, District Boards, or other Local Bodies.”²⁹ As a matter of fact, Quaid-e-Azam formally joined Muslim League in 1913. When he was asked to speak at the Council meeting of the Muslim League at Bankipur in December 1912, he supported a resolution that aimed at “promoting national unity and fostering public spirit among people of India, and by cooperating with other communities” (Pirzada, 2007)

Quaid-e-Azam attended the Karachi Congress in September 1913, where he was chosen to chair a Congress deputation to London in the spring of 1914. He seconded a resolution expressing full accord “with the belief that the League has so emphatically declared at its last session that the political future of the country depends on the harmonious working and cooperation of the various communities....” At the meeting of Muslim League at Agra in December 1913, Jinnah proposed postponing reaffirmation of the principle of communal representation, as “demanding special would get only two watertight compartments”. (Sinj. J, 2009) He worked very hard for the next two years for Hindu-Muslim Unity and concluded his address to the Bombay Provincial Conference in October 1916, on the question, in the following words “I believe all thinking men are thoroughly convinced that the keynote of our real progress lies in the goodwill, concord, harmony and cooperation between the two great sister communities.” (Saiyid, 1945)

Democratic Peace in South Asia

He was able to convince the President of Congress, A.C. Mazumdar, to accept a formula developed by him and this resulted in Lucknow Pact under which percentages, for each of the legislative councils, of Muslim members were reserved i.e. 1/3 at the centre and in Bombay, 1/3 in the Punjab, 40% in Bengal, 30% in United Provinces, 25% in Bihar and Orissa and 15% in the Central Provinces and in Madras. A further safeguard against a future Hindu Raj resulting in loss of Muslim identity was provided in the Pact was that any legislation or resolution “affecting one or the other community, which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the Legislative Council concerned, shall be proceeded with, if three-fourths of the members of that community in the particular Council, Imperial or Provincial, oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.” (Saiyid, 1945)

In December 1916 Jinnah, as President of the Muslim League said “The Musalmans of India would be false to themselves and the traditions of the past, had they not shared to the full the new hope that is moving India’s patriotic sons today, or had they failed to respond to the call of the country. Their gaze, like that of their Hindu fellow-countrymen, is fixed on the future”. (Pirzada, 2007) A few days later, Mazumdar, while addressing Lucknow Congress stated that Hindu-Muslim question had been settled. On June 16, 1918, a mass rally was held by the League led by Jinnah to celebrate Home Rule Day. A month later, Ghandi wrote to Jinnah to make a declaration relating to recruitment in the Indian Army in order to ensure passing of Congress-League scheme. (Pirzada, 2007) Congress and Muslim League both held their annual meetings in Amritsar in 1919 and it was felt that the Congress–League Pact of 1916 had removed political hurdle in the way of Hindu-Muslim unity.

Emergence of Difference between Jinnah and Gandhi

Although he purported to speak for all Indians, the Hindu leaning of Gandhi was evident by the fact that on arriving back from South Africa, a few years earlier and travelling across India, he founded Sabamarti Ashram to settle down - the funds were provided by Hindu capitalists, though he claimed to be a leader of all Indians³⁷. Jinnah, on the other hand, had a secular leaning and had supported Hindu-Muslim unity in India for a long time.

In 1920, however, differences appeared between Gandhi and Jinnah after Gandhi launched his first nationwide Satyagraha in August 1920. These differences widened at the regular session of Congress and Muslim League near the end of December at Nagpur. Jinnah opposed dissolving of the British connection, without greater preparation for independence, but Gandhi argued that they probably had to go through a sea of blood but it would not be somebody else’s blood. Although Jinnah tried to argue against Gandhi’s resolution at the session of Congress, he was howled down with cries of “shame, shame”. Jinnah left Congress and realized the futility of opposing Gandhi-Khilafat axis. He did not even attend the Muslim League Session at Nagpur, as Muslim League also supported the Congress Resolution, and left Nagpur the same day (Sinj. J, 2009).

Ross Masud

It was when 22 Indian policemen were immolated in the police station by a mob in the town of Chauri Chaura that Gandhi called a halt to Satyagraha in February 1922. A few months later, Jinnah tried to organize a moderate party without Gandhi and invited Jayakar and Motilal Nehru to join in the venture but they refused and he was thus isolated from his partner Hindu colleagues from Congress. He, however, continued to believe in Hindu-Muslim unity and, while addressing a special session of the Muslim League in Lahore, in May 1924, he said "one essential requisite condition to achieve Swaraj is political unity between the Hindus and Mohammedans." (Mahatma, 1965)

In 1928, Jinnah attended All-Parties Conference Chaired by Congress President that was held in Delhi, which ended without agreement on the Muslim question. Jinnah, however, convinced a number of his independent colleagues in the Delhi assembly budget session to sign a communal unity appeal, which had been drafted by him. Earlier in 1927, Jinnah had formulated proposals that involved constitutional changes to compensate the Muslim community for agreeing to eliminate separate electorate. They were accepted by the Muslim League and were substantially agreed to by Congress in May 1927. The pressure of Hindu Mahasabha, however, made Congress back off in early 1928.

It was under these circumstances that Jinnah wrote to Ramsay MacDonald on June 1929 that there was "a very serious deadlock and if allowed to continue it will, in my judgment, prove disastrous both to the interest of India and Great Britain." (Saiyid, 1945) He suggested that representatives of India, who could deliver, be invited to London to meet with British officials till they could reach a constitutional solution that would carry assent of political India. A few months later Lord Irwin wrote to Jinnah that His Majesty's Government proposed to "invite representatives of different interests in British India and of the Indian States to meet them, separately or together as circumstances may demand, in regard both to British India and all India problems. They hope thus to be able to submit eventually to Parliament proposals commanding a wide measure of general assent." (Saiyid, 1945) This led to 3 Round Table Conferences in London that, however, proved futile as Congress wanted transfer of power from Great Britain to India, without settling the communal issue. The Congress was not prepared to accept that a Muslim problem even existed.

The Congress resolution for complete independence in 1930, without addressing the question of safeguarding of Muslim interest, prompted Jinnah to call it an outburst of political hysteria and Sapru wrote to Jinnah "I entirely agree with you. The Congress has gone mad, but the worst of it is that in its madness it is going to involve the country in disaster."

Emergence of the Demand for Pakistan

It was under these circumstances that, while presiding over the Allahabad Meeting of Muslim League on 29th December 1930, Allama Iqbal said, "I would like to see the

Democratic Peace in South Asia

Punjab, North-Western Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-Western India.” (Pirzada, 2007) It is interesting to note that a few years earlier he had composed his famous poem ‘Sarey Jahan se acha Hindustan hamara’ (better than the whole world is our India). The idea of partition of British India and creation of Pakistan was thus set rolling. In January 1937, Nehru said at Ambala that there were “only two forces in the country, Congress and Government.” He further said, “The opponents of Congress are bound with each other by a community of interest. Their demands have nothing to do with the masses.” (Gopal, S., 1976) Jinnah refuted the claim and asserted that Muslims represented by Muslim League was the third force. Jinnah was proved right by history. (Sinj. J, 2009) Failure of Congress to accommodate Muslim League led by Jinnah in any power sharing formula thus led to the adoption of Pakistan Resolution by Muslim League in 1940. Jinnah still accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan of united India in 1946 initially but the die had been cast and he retracted when the Congress asserted that the scheme of grouping of Provinces and their rights could be undone by the Parliament of independent India.

Preferential Treatment of India by British and Resulting Grievance of Pakistan

In February 1947 Lord Mountbatten was appointed the last Viceroy of India. He originally favoured united India but quickly realized that unity of India was not feasible after the British left. Initially, he worked on the Cabinet Mission Plan of 1946 and prepared a plan that was taken to London by his Chief-of-Staff, Lord Ismay, and it was appreciated by the Attlee Cabinet but it had not been shown to Jinnah or Nehru. On 10th May 1947, the plan was shown to Nehru by Mountbatten. Nehru, however, rejected the plan on the ground that it involved Balkanization and needed to be wholly redrafted. (Lamb, 1994) The British Government in London was, therefore, informed that the plan was being revised and a revised plan would be submitted shortly. The revised plan of 17th May 1947 provided for two Constituent Assemblies to be set up in the Subcontinent, one for India and the other for Pakistan – consisting of Baluchistan, North-Western Province, Punjab and Sindh plus Eastern Bengal and Sylhet. The plan, however, did not provide for the future dispensation of Princely States.

It is interesting to note how the British and Indian National Congress took diametrically opposite positions in respect of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and Hyderabad. The former with a Hindu ruler and a Muslims majority and the later with a Muslim ruler with a Hindu majority were treated differently. For example, the Government of India leased from the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, in 1935, the Gilgit Agency and dependent territories that were comparable in area to Berar leased from the State of Hyderabad by the British in 1903. In both cases the sovereignty of the rulers was recognized. In the former case, the British returned Gilgit Agency and

dependent territories to the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir two weeks before the transfer of power on 14/15 August 1947, on the pretext that the lease had lapsed with Paramountcy but in the case of Berar, about 17,000 sq. miles in area, the same logic was not followed and the territory was retained as a part of British India. The Prime Minister designate of the Dominion of India, in fact, slightly toyed with the idea of holding a plebiscite to determine the will of Beraris but gave it up. In fact, both Nehru and Mountbatten had “the slightest wish to strengthen the Nizam of Hyderabad’s pretensions to independence after the British departure, and to give him back Berar would do just this.” (Lamb, 1994)

The seeds of injustice and discontentment thus sown by selling the Muslim majority territory of Kashmir to a Hindu Ruler were further nourished through manipulation of the boundary award of Radcliff allowing for a land link between the State and India, in violation of the principle of Partition. This clandestine manipulation of the boundary between East Punjab and West Punjab, enabled India to capture the State after obtaining a conditional instrument of accession signed by the Maharaja, who had fled his capital in the face of uprising of Muslims majority population of the state. In fact, the original Award reportedly proposed to include the whole of Gurdaspur District in Pakistan as over 51% of the population of the District was Muslim. Lord Mountbatten, however, announced that the whole of the District was not likely to be included in Pakistan. There was a protest against this announcement as it was likely to affect the Final Award but the die had been cast. Even the Tehsils of Gurdaspur and Batala allocated to India had Muslims majority.

Of the four Tehsils of Gurdaspur District, only Pathankot had Hindu majority and the rest of the Tehsils, namely Shakargarh, Gurdaspur and Batala had Muslim majority. Unfortunately, the two Muslim majority Tehsils of Gurdaspur and Batala were allocated clandestinely to India and only Shakargarh was allocated to Pakistan in the Final Radcliffe Award. Radcliffe tried to justify the allocation of Gurdaspur to India on the ground that this was necessary as the canal feeding Amritsar should be with India but on this logic too it should have gone to Lahore as headwork of canal feeding most of the District was in Gurdaspur. (Victoria, 2003)

In fact, initially Radcliff proposed to allocate the Tehsils of Ferozepur and Zira to Pakistan to balance and Ch. Muhammad Ali claimed to have seen a map in the Viceroy’s office showing the new boundary according to which these two Tehsils of Ferozepur District were shown in Pakistan. (Chaudhri, 1967) In fact, Liaquat Ali directed Chaudhry Muhammad Ali on 11th August 1947 to call on Lord Ismay to protest against the proposed award in respect of Gurdaspur as he considered it unjust breach of faith on the part of British Government. In his written reply, Ismay asserted “the final report of Sir Cyril Radcliffe is not ready, and therefore, I do not know what grounds you have for saying that Gurdaspur has been allocated to the East Punjab” he continued, “I am well aware that some uninformed sections of public opinion imagine that the award will not be Sir Cyril Radcliffe’s but the Viceroy’s.”

Democratic Peace in South Asia

In any case, Jinnah accepted the truncated Pakistan reluctantly but the discriminatory treatment of Pakistan did not end here. In July 1947, the British Parliament had enacted the Indian Independence Act 1947. According to Section 1 of the Act “As from the fifteenth day of August, nineteen hundred and forty-seven, two independent Dominions shall be set up in India, to be known respectively as India and Pakistan.” In sub-section (2) of the section it was provided that “the said Dominions are hereinafter in this Act referred to as ‘the new Dominions’...” Under Section 11 of the Act the Governor General was required to make provision for the “division of the Indian armed forces of His Majesty between the new Dominions”. It thus clearly envisaged equal for the two Dominions.

Subsequently, in order to provide legal justification for discrimination between the two Dominions, it was manoeuvred to grant independence to Pakistan on 14th August rather than 15th August and argue that India retained the international personality of British India when it became independent on 15th August but Pakistan was a new state that seceded from the British India. To support this view an unconvincing reliance was made on the provisions of Section 2 of the 1947 Act to the effect that “the territories of India shall be the territories under the sovereignty of His Majesty which, immediately before the appointed day, were included in British India except the territories which, under sub-section (2) of this section, are to be territories of Pakistan”. The Indian Independence Act 1947 had, in fact, envisaged both India and Pakistan as new Dominions, which were to succeed British India and the Act did not provide anywhere that India would be retaining the international personality of British India, while Pakistan would be a new state.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Jinnah was initially of the view that both India and Pakistan were to be born as a result of the enactment of the British Parliament and it could not be assumed that Pakistan would secede from British India and the Dominion of India could alone be identified with the British India. In fact, Lord Mountbatten reporting the views of Muslim League Leaders’ in the matter to British Government stated “They would strongly resent the insertions in the (Indian Independence) Bill of provisions affirming any terms that the Dominion of India is the successor of the present India.” The Indian Leaders, on the other hand, were of the view that only certain parts of British India were being separated from “the main body which continues the international personality of present India as one entity certain parts of which were being afforded the opportunity to secede from it.” As far as the British Government was concerned, it also supported the Indian view, although it was felt that treating Pakistan as a seceding state would not be appreciated by the British Parliament. In any case, the official view of the British Government was expressed by Lord Mountbatten who explained the reasons for supporting the Indian view in the following words “we shall meet far greater difficulties from Congress if we oppose their view than from the League if we follow the Congress suggestion.” He observed that Pakistan was not likely to have more than 70 million of the entire population of

India and “if the rest of India takes over all the international obligations of the present Government, I feel it will solve many difficulties.”

The British influence was also used to ensure that India was recognized as an original member of the United Nations, while Pakistan had to apply for membership of the United Nations as a new member.

Indian Threat and Insecurity in Pakistan

On 8th August 1947, Patel, while addressing the Constituent Assembly in Delhi, alluded to departure of M.A. Jinnah for Karachi a day earlier, as removal of poison from the body of India. (Singh. J, 2009) He didn't expect Pakistan to last like Nehru and said, “I do not know what they can possibly do in Pakistan. It will not be long before they return...” (Singh. J, 2009) On the other hand, Jinnah had very positive sentiments for both India and Pakistan and, while addressing a press conference on 14 November 1946 in New Delhi, he said, “whatever others might say, I think that these two states of Pakistan and Hindustan, by virtue of contiguity and mutual interests will be friends in this subcontinent... They will go to each other's rescue in case of danger and will be able to say ‘hands off’ to other nations. We shall then have a Monroe Doctrine more solid than in America...” He further added, “Pakistan and Hindustan alone will mean freedom to both Hindus and Muslims.” (Singh. J, 2009)

The mass killing of minorities left on the wrong side of the border by the majorities and continuing hostility of India towards Pakistan compounded the problems faced by the new born state and produced a feeling of insecurity in Pakistan. India added to the difficulties of the new born state of Pakistan by hindering transfer of military stores and monetary assets apportioned to Pakistan. Jaswant Singh, a patriotic Indian, conceded that India “needed to accept with greater generosity (of spirit, too) what had separated from its own body.” (Singh. J, 2009) Though he provides some justification for India's reaction due to trauma of partition and uprooting of millions and large scale killings, he conceded that “Pakistan was starting on its journey of statehood neither with any abundance of options nor with the goodwill of an amicable settlement, a willing partition of assets amongst disputant brothers.” .. “The monetary assets apportioned to Pakistan were held by the Reserve Bank of India, and given the hostile environment, the transfer of these was not taking effect smoothly.” (Singh. J, 2009)

In fact, a few months after partition, India stopped supply of water in the canals flowing from India to Pakistan, on 1st April 1948, precipitating one of the gravest international water disputes of the world. The Prime Minister of Pakistan requested the Indian Prime Minister to take action to restore water supply immediately - in his telegram of 15th April 1948; he added “I regret that before we have had time enough to settle our existing problems, the Government of East Punjab has thought it fit to create new ones.” (Niranjan D, 1973)

Democratic Peace in South Asia

India thus tried to ensure that Pakistan proves to be a still born child of Partition, which resulted in a sense of insecurity pushing Pakistan towards defence alliances with the West. It has also left a deep rooted mistrust of India in Pakistan.

Prospect of Peace between India and Pakistan and in South Asia as a whole

Although it appears that in the near future peace between India and Pakistan and in South Asia in general is not likely to be achieved. This does not mean that it is not possible but if we keep on moving in circles and do not think out of box we are not likely to break out of this vicious circle. Who could imagine at the end of World War II that France and Germany, who fought each other for centuries and French resistance against German occupation, during the World War II, having been branded as terrorism by Germany, would join hands to form the bulwark of the European Union (EU)? It speaks of the maturity of the leaders of these two countries apart from other European leaders who joined the Union.

The Major Hurdles in India – Pakistan Peace

Kashmir Dispute, Terrorism, Water Disputes and minor disputes like Siachen and Sir Creek disputes are the hurdles in the way of peace between India and Pakistan. Now, as far as water disputes are concerned, a satisfactory framework for their resolution has already been developed in the shape of Indus Waters Treaty 1960 – a bona fide implementation of the Treaty can take care of them. If the two countries can settle the Kashmir Dispute, by thinking out of box, while taking into account the wishes of the people of Kashmir, the issue of terrorism can be jointly tackled by the two states successfully provided they objectively keep in view the origin and nature of the phenomenon.

The phenomenon of terrorism has been attracting increasing attention and concern of the international community for the last five or six decades. Starting from the brutal suppression of Palestinians by Israel and their forced displacement from their homeland, the armed struggle of Palestinian has been branded as terrorism. Some of their tactics like hijacking of civilian planes were universally condemned as terrorism. The international community has, however, circumvented the question of definition of terrorism but has made significant headway in combating it in specific areas. About a dozen major International Conventions/Protocols, apart from the regional legal instruments, have been adopted to provide legal framework to check the menace of terrorism in specific forms and in specific fields.

Initially, it was Palestinian struggling for regaining their lands, from which they were dispossessed and reduced to the status of the refugees that resorted to hijacking civilian aircraft, which attracted attention of the international community though it was not a new phenomenon. The first three of the Conventions adopted, therefore, dealt with terrorism in the context of Civil Aviation, which are Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft (1963), Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft of 1970, Convention for the

Ross Masud

Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against Safety of Civil Aviation, 1971. The offences which threatened the lives of Innocent people travelling by air was considered to be so clear cut a form of terrorism that the international community did not consider it necessary to go into motives, purposes or causes for which they are committed. Subsequently, another six or seven international Conventions / Protocols of universal nature were adopted. The phenomenon of terrorism has not, however, abated.

In South Asia, the American led intervention in Afghanistan is the primary cause of growth of this menace in Pakistan and elsewhere. To exploit religious sentiments of Muslims, the Americans branded their war against Russia in Afghanistan as Jihad in which a section of population of Pakistan was radicalized to fight in Afghanistan. Jihad subsequently spread to Kashmir where there was already resentment against Indian domination and struggle against about 700,000 Indian forces gained strength. The American and Indian strategy of relying on force to eliminate the local uprising has only led to growth of this phenomenon of radicalization and massive violations of human rights.

The USA has spent over a trillion dollars in Afghanistan and over one billion dollars a year, for a number of years, to support the military efforts against militants/terrorists in the tribal and adjacent areas of Pakistan but in vain. The results are there for everyone to see. More Pakistani troops have died within the tribal and adjoining areas of Pakistan adjacent to Afghanistan than the NATO troops killed in Afghanistan since the post September 11 intervention in that country. In Swat, North Waziristan, South Waziristan etc. there have been attacks on girls schools and colleges, paramilitary and military personnel of the state in which a number of persons have been killed. In spite of claims of NATO and the USA, militancy in Afghanistan seems to be on the increase. Taliban's were, in fact, able to successfully break open one of the most secure jails of Afghanistan in Qandahar a few years back and set hundreds of militants free and insurgency is gaining strength. The USA is now having dialogue with Taliban to get a settlement in Afghanistan. India must also realize that it cannot have a military solution to Kashmir and her branding freedom struggle there as terrorism sponsored by Pakistan would not help – the latest U.N. Report has not accepted the Indian stance.

As a matter of fact, India and Pakistan had come very close to taking a road to peace between the two countries and settling the disputes between them, including Kashmir issue, a few years back, according to former Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri. He considered that after the meeting between Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President Musharraf in New Delhi in 2005 the peace process had become irreversible. After Advani's visit to Islamabad thereafter, Kasuri observed, "now the hardliner leader of the BJP was indicating to me in Islamabad that the peace process was indeed irreversible." (Kasuri, 2015) The present mistrust between the two countries may not, therefore, continue indefinitely and can give way to the rational need of peace between the two countries for their mutual benefit

Democratic Peace in South Asia

provided the leaders of the two countries make a conscious effort to come out of the grove of hostility.

In fact, some fundamentally erroneous impressions that are shared by even educated people in the two countries ought to be dispelled to generate goodwill and bring peace to the region. For instance, many people in Pakistan think that Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni was amongst their ancestors, although their actual ancestors were largely the victims of his attacks – incidentally, attacks on other countries in his days were not considered illegal as they are considered today. Indians, on the other hand, have the erroneous impression that it was their ancestors who exclusively suffered at his hands. The kings of slave dynasty, Ghauris, Tughlaqs, Lodhis, Mughals etc. who ruled from Agra or Delhi did not come from Lahore, Multan, Peshawar or Quetta etc. as many Indians tend to believe. Indians have no animosity against the lands they actually came from i.e. Afghanistan, Persia or Central Asia but wrongly consider the inhabitants of Pakistan as their descendants and keep a grudge against them. As a matter of fact, Babar, the founder of Mughal Empire in India came from Afghanistan and willed that he should be buried in Kabul, Afghanistan and not in territories that are part of Pakistan – local leaders like Dulla Bhatti and Khushhal Khan Khattack from these areas, actually, opposed Mughals. In this regard, it is quite irrational of Pakistanis not to own Chanakya or Kautaliya, who was born and brought up in Taxila and was a Professor of politics and economics at Taxila University and became an advisor to the ruler of the time. Since he was born before the advent of Islam or even Christianity, he could not possibly be a Muslim and if he were born in the reign of Akbar the Great he would surely be one of his illustrious courtiers, whether he became a Muslim or not.

In any case, to spoil present and jeopardizing the future of generations of people of the two countries is neither wise nor pragmatic. Peace between the two countries can help the entire South Asia to move into an era of peace and prosperity and framework of SAARC can play an effective role in this process. Threads can be picked up from Vajpayee – Musharaff negotiations to reach a solution to Kashmir and tackle the menace of terrorism. Siachen and Sir Creek issues can also be settled with some give and take. The mistrust and hostility amongst the European countries had been deeper and more longstanding than that between India and Pakistan when their leaders rose to the occasion and laid the foundations regional peace and prosperity of their future generation and there is no reason why leaders of these two countries that were the cradle of Indus and Ganges valleys civilizations cannot do so.

References

- Academy, P. (1995). Mystics Poetes of Pakistan. *Paksitan Academy of Letters*, 29-30.
- Ansari,, I. (1989). *The Muslim Situation in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Bari, A. (1919). Firangi Mahal Papers (FM). Lucknow.
- Bush, C. (1985). *World Leadesr Past & Present*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Chaudhri, M. (1967). *The Emergence of Pakistan*. Delhi.
- Court, D. (2015, June 27). The Time of India dated 27th June 2015. p. 26.
- Dixit, P. (1985). *Communal and Pan-Islamic Trends in Colonial India*. India.
- Gopal, S. (1976). *Jawaharlal Nehru - ABiography*. Lahore.
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Hudaybiyyah
- <https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/modern-europe/wars-and-battles/thirty-years-war>
- Kasuri, K. (2015). *Neither a Hawk nor a Dove*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Khan, I. (2016, August 05). Lahore, Lahore: Dawn Publishers.
- Lamb, A. (1994). *Birth of a Tragedy - Kashmir 1947*. Karachi.
- Leo, G. (1948). The Peace of Westphalia 1648. *American Journal of Interanion Law*, 38.
- Mahatma, G. (1965). *Collected works of Vol 17*. India.
- Mountstuart, E. (2008). *Aurangzeb, Edited by Sril sitea Ram Sharma*. Delhi: Oxford University Pres.
- Niranjan D, G. (1973). *Indus waters treaty - an exercise in International Mediation*. New York: Routledge Publication.
- Pirzada, S. (2007). *Foundation of Pakistan*. India.
- Saiyid. (1945). *Mohammad Ali Jinnah*. Lahore: SM Ashraf Publishers.
- Shankar, A. (2015). Unknown. *INAS*, 38.
- Simon, & Schuster. (1954). *The Memoirs of Agha Khan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sinj. J. (2009). *Jinnah India Partation-Independence*. Lahore.
- Spear, P. (1951). A History of Delhi Under later Mughuls. *Pakistan Academy of Letters*, 134.

Democratic Peace in South Asia

Sugata, B., & Jalal, A. (1998). *Modern South Asia*. London: Oxford University Press.

Viceroy. (1860). Viceory to Secretary of state for India 30th April1860. *Foreign Letters* . India.

Victoria, S. (2003). *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan and the Unending war*. Delhi: Sage Publication.