

LAHORE DECLARATION

TERJUMAN-UL-QURAN

April 1999

PROF. KHURSHID AHMAD



LAHORE DECLARATION

By Professor Khurshid Ahmad

It was Lahore where on March 23, 1940 the Muslims of the sub-continent had resolved to establish Pakistan, which with the blessings of Allah came into being on August 14, 1947 under the able leadership of Quaid-e-Azam and after immense sacrifices by the Muslims. It is unfortunate that it was the same Lahore where on February 21, 1999 the ideological and political identity of Pakistan was undermined through Lahore Declaration. This Declaration not only hurt Pakistan's jugular vein - Kashmir - but poses a threat to its political freedom, economic stability, military strength and ideological and civilization identity.

The Pakistan Resolution was presented by Fazlul Haq, the Lion of Bengal, and Quaid-e-Azam had got it approved from the Muslims. This was a declaration of war against British imperialism as well as Hindu leadership of the Congress and guaranteed freedom and ideological identity to Muslims. While the anti-Islam forces of India were mercilessly shedding Muslim blood, the imperialist British representative Lord Mountbatten was forced to hand over the decree of freedom of Muslims to their representatives - Quaid-e-Azam and the legislative assembly - and on August 14, 1947 the flag of free Pakistan was hoisted not merely on the assembly building but all over the country. On the other hand, Lahore Declaration neither reflects the aspirations of the Pakistani nation, nor it is accepted by the people. This is a declaration of Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee belonging to BJP, the advocate of Akhand Bharat. By signing the Declaration, Nawaz Sharif has only tried to please the US and India, at the cost of disappointing, rather infuriating, his own nation. By doing so, he has exposed the nation and the state to new threats.

It is a matter of satisfaction that there are people who for the sake of their faith, for the freedom of their country and for the honor of their nation, are ready to endure all hardships and difficulties in the way of truth. These brave people exposed the conspiracy that is being hatched against the country and spoiled the dirty game of dividing the nation by creating rift and distrust between Pakistan and the movement in Kashmir. The role of the press was also commendable. It gave expression to national aspirations and warned against the policy of befriending India. Moreover, Jamaat-e-Islami Pakistan, All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC), and all political parties of Azad Kashmir, other religious parties and former military leadership played a pivotal role to frustrate this machination which was aimed at liquidating the Kashmir issue and demolishing of the very boundary that guarantees Pakistan's free political, ideological and economic identity and which has in its foundation the blood of millions of Muslims of the sub-continent.

Though the conspiracy currently facing the nation has been designed in Washington, it is being staged in Wahga and Lahore. Allah knows, and probably history will also reveal, who has participated in the conspiracy knowingly and who got dragged unconsciously. However, only the one who has pre-decided neither to see nor understand can deny the dangerous repercussions.

Allah may bless those leaders, freedom-lovers and writers who risked their lives to expose the conspiracy. Praise be to Allah that the veil of lie and deceit was torn within days by the very Indian leaders and their companions who were singing love songs with mischievous pretension.

While in Lahore on February 20, Vajpayee had said: "We wish to curtail defense expenditure and establish good relations with Pakistan". Back in Delhi on February 21, he declared: "I have told the Pakistani Premier that intervention in Kashmir and incidences like killings in Rajori are not tolerable. Innocent men and women are being killed in Kashmir. If this goes on, normalization of relations will be difficult". Then two days later, while inaugurating Mahavir Cadre, Vajpayee said: "India will not surrender even an inch of its land." He clarified that he did not say anything about plebiscite during his meeting with Nawaz Sharif and that his (Sharif's) statement was wrong.

While India has enhanced its defense budget, already of Rs. 5 trillion, by 11 percent (and last year, it had increased it by 8 percent), Pakistan has since slashed its defense budget by 7 to 9 percent. Indian Air Force have recently conducted war-games at Pokhran close to Pakistan's borders without any pre-exercise intimation. Seventeen thousand tons of live ammunition was used in this biggest exercise in the history of India. It warned Pakistan to stop what it calls the 'proxy war' in Kashmir. In spite of the nuclear deterrence, the Indian Chief of Staff talked about the possibility of a conventional war and roared that if 'proxy war' continues in Kashmir then war will not only be possible but inevitable. Interior Minister and Vajpayee's right-hand man L.K. Advani came to Wahga right on the spot where Vajpayee's bus had stopped and repeated that Kashmir was an integral part of India. He also resolved to eliminate the partition line and establish a federation of India and Pakistan. Thus the sugar-coat over the bitter pill of Lahore Declaration was washed away by the signatories themselves and the real face of the conspiracy stood exposed to all - except to those who, in the words of Qur'an, have heart (and mind) but do not understand, have ears but do not listen, and have eyes but do not see.

The present government of Pakistan and, more particularly, the Prime Minister suffer from an intense longing to befriend India. They are following a path that leads only to destruction. To work for preventing such a catastrophe is the duty of every patriotic citizen. An objective analysis of the situation reveals that Nawaz Sharif and his brother Shahbaz Sharif think that if they are to stay in power they have to ensure:

1. Complete subjugation of all constitutional organs, political forces and administrative machinery to establish a centralized rule so that they may enjoy exclusive decision-making authority;
2. Running of state affairs on the criteria of personal loyalty considering it the secret for perpetuating their rule;
3. Full compliance with American agenda. See salvation and progress in being part of its global order and work according to its scheme;
4. Friendship with India, at all cost;

5. Decrease in defense budget, downsizing the army and engaging it in civil affairs to make its interest subservient to that of the political leadership; or else the army loses popular respect and credibility along with the political leadership.

This is their actual 5-point manifesto. The points are inter-related and mutually reinforcing. These trends are manifest through the policies and deeds of the government over the past two years.

The eagerness for friendship with India was expressed in the PML manifesto for 1997 elections for the first time in a manner never done before by either Muslim League itself or any other right-wing political party. Not only the Jamaat-e-Islami took serious notice but even Nawa-i-Waqt had to take strong exception to it in its editorial notes. All know how after coming to power, intimacy was first sought with Mr. Gujral and then with Mr. Vajpayee in spite of the Indian back outs and clever schemes. A well considered policy after taking the nation into confidence has never chalked out. Political parties, parliament, intellectuals, journalists and even the cabinet and foreign office have never been properly consulted on the issue. All steps are taken on personal whims with the assistance of a very limited circle whose knowledge, experience and political understanding carries no weight. These individuals insist to push the nation towards a particular path and if not stopped they would confront the nation with a big catastrophe. In fact, the situation suggests that the country is about to enter a decisive phase within a short time.

September 1999 marks the deadline for a decision on CTBT. The rulers are ready to sign it. All arrangements are in this direction. Till that time comes, the drama of Pak-India friendship will be staged. This would dissolve the Kashmir issue. Moreover, signing of CTBT would practically amount to rolling back of the nuclear program. President Clinton and Madeleine Albright have openly stated the Pakistani Premier has promised in September and December 1998 to do this and what is being done now is like taming of the nation for that eventuality. US is also dealing with India, but separately. The drama of Pak-India friendship is being staged under the US direction. The frequent visits of Shahbaz Sharif are part of the same game. Matters are being settled without being brought into the knowledge of and advice from the foreign office, defense establishment, cabinet, parliament and the nation. Vajpayee's bus trip was part of this game-plan and Lahore Declaration is its logical outcome. Except that Indian leadership stings every now and then, impelled by its scorpion-like nature, the rest is going exactly according to the plan.

How far does the friendship with US and India and the anxiety for it conform to the national interests and the freedom and honor of the nation? Our rulers are simply blind to this dimension. There is no argument, nor any evidence to indicate that US and India have made any basic changes in their stance. We have been paying for the US friendship since 1965. US betrayed us at every moment of trial and used Pakistan only to further its own interests, yet our leadership is running after illusions. Our experience of India and its leadership is even older. Muslims are confronted with the hegemonic designs of Hindu leadership for almost 1400 years.

When the British came to the sub-continent, Hindus and more particularly their Brahman leadership collaborated with them in intrigues to undermine Muslims' political strength and interests. In the war of freedom in 1857, their acts of deceit, treachery and betrayal were of such magnitude that Muslims had to set their separate course of action. Since the creation of Pakistan, India has never spared any opportunity to harm Pakistan. What basic change has, then, occurred which compelled PML leadership to go mad for befriending India? Instead of presenting argument, there is only a mischievous propaganda on the electronic and print media that government is striving for peace and good relations and only a few extremists are fueling the flames of war by opposing dialogue and friendly relations between the two neighbors. The prime minister is himself issuing provocative statements:

- I can take advice from the elders of Pakistan Movement, but why should I seek guidance of those who opposed the idea of Pakistan;
- I am being opposed because I decided for nuclear explosion and made Pakistan a nuclear power;
- I want economic progress in the country and am building the motorway but these people do not want to see the country making progress.

All this is a bundle of lies and nonsense and merely aims at deceiving the masses. When he says that he is ready to consult the elders of Pakistan Movement, he should name those whom he has consulted? The daily Nawa-i-Waqt wrote more than 20 editorials only in two months (February and March 1999), against his attempts to befriend India. Did he pay any heed? Mr. Nizami refused to open the gate of Ewan-e-Iqbal for Vajpayee and threatened to resign if compelled. Who the PM looked for advice, then? He says that he will not consult those who opposed the Pakistan Movement. Where he places Awami National Party (ANP) then? Its leadership has given him a real tough time yet his cronies are desperate in seeking its support even today!

Let us talk clear. If Prime Minister's allusion is to the Jamaat-e-Islami, the biggest opponent of pro-India policies, then when he came to know that Jamaat had opposed the idea of Pakistan? For five years from 1988 to 1993, Nawaz Sharif was passionate in seeking support from Jamaat-e-Islami and its Ameer Qazi Hussain Ahmad. Why he remained unaware of Jamaat's anti-Pakistan stance? Did he get the news of it only when Jamaat called for on-board accountability? Is he really unaware of the services rendered by Syed Maududi and Jamaat-e-Islami during the pre-partition era when they came up with irrefutable arguments in support of the two-nation theory and thus defeated the view of one-nation of the Congress and Jamiah Ulama Hind?

If the PM does not know the history of the Muslims of the sub-continent, he should at least go through Dr. Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi's Ulema in Politics and Sharifuddin Pirzada's Evolution of Pakistan. He would then know that Syed Maududi and Jamaat never opposed Pakistan Movement, rather they strengthened it despite differing on approach. Syed Maududi also advised his party workers to vote for Pakistan during the plebiscite in NWFP. On the other hand, PM's lauded people

were opposing Pakistan and talking about Pukhtoonistan. It seems the PM does not care to find out realities. Jamaat-e-Islami has in its folds thousands who took active part in the Pakistan Movement (and the writer feels great pride for being one of them). Whereas Nawaz Sharif has nothing to his credit. He started his political career from Tehrik-e-Istiqlal of Asghar Khan and his brother Shahbaz Sharif from Bhutto's Peoples Party. All know the role of Nawaz Sharif in dividing the Muslim League when Junejo was its president. It was Qazi Hussain Ahmad who made every effort to ensure that Junejo and Nawaz Sharif go together. Will the PM deny this too?

Let the Prime Minister get the credit for nuclear detonation, as much as he wishes. We have never been niggardly in admitting his share along with that of Z.A. Bhutto, Zia-ul Haq, the army and the scientists. It should be remembered, however, that the premier had told Bill Clinton that he was ready to do what he (Clinton) says, but the situation in the country has taken such a turn that if nuclear explosion is not conducted, "the nation will throw me out." This whole episode has been duly documented by the US journals and its recorded tape lies in the White House. This was because Jamaat-e-Islami and Qazi Hussain Ahmad were in the forefront for nuclear test and had created such an environment where there was no choice for rulers but to conduct the nuclear explosion. The same was the stance of all institutions and organizations now opposing friendship with India. Still the prime minister has the audacity to say that Jamaat-e-Islami and others are criticizing him because he made Pakistan a nuclear power! In fact, Nawaz Sharif is being criticized because, despite being a nuclear power, Pakistan is made to surrender before India and his government is showing weakness on Kashmir issue and rendering the nuclear capability ineffective by getting entangled into the US trap.

As far as the economy is concerned, Nawaz Sharif is in power for the last 15 years. What has he delivered? What is his contribution in making the economy healthy? The fact that he made fortunes for himself is well established. The country is crushed under the enormous burden of indebtedness which has reached the extent of jeopardizing its political and ideological freedom. Let the PM construct roads, but why snatch the last morsel of bread from the poor who are forced to commit suicide.

The rulers have looted the country mercilessly. The Premier is one of the biggest defaulters and the Ittefaq group is defaulter to the tune of Rs. 10 billion. Chairman WAPDA has released the news that 44 assembly members (mostly belonging to the treasury) are involved in electricity theft. The thousands of 'ghost' schools recently unearthed by the army have all along been plundering the resources of PM's own province and under his own rule. In fact, by attacking others he is trying to cover up his own faults and crimes. Would this ploy work, and for how long?

Dialogue is an important part of diplomacy. No one is denying this. It is also granted that Pakistan's foreign policy should be designed to establish friendly relations with all nations of the world. There is no point of difference to this extent. The difference is on not differentiating between a friend and a foe. Every one wishes peace and security, but not at the cost of justice and national honor.

Otherwise, mere 'living' is possible even under slavery and subjugation and a sort of peace can be had in graveyard. But nobody wants such a life and peace. So, friendship with India will be possible only when it is ready to shun inimical designs and postures against Pakistan, to pay our due rights, to stop killings and pillage in Kashmir and allow the Kashmiris their right to self-determination as guaranteed under the UN resolutions.

If Indian hands are stained with the blood of our brethren, then shaking hands and embracing is not friendship but wanton shamelessness. This is not a mere sentimental avowal, but a principle of global politics that dialogues without due resolve and strength prove useless and even harmful. "Diplomacy without force is like music without instruments" is a proverbial statement of Frederick the Great which finds place in every authentic book on international politics.

The epitome of our prime minister's political acumen is that after becoming a nuclear power the country has been pushed through the Lahore Declaration back to the disgrace of 1972 when the Simla Agreement was signed under duress. Having been defeated in East Pakistan, with 90,000 POWs in Indian prison, and thousands of miles of area captured by it, we were forced to accept Simla Agreement. However, Indian invasion in Siachin had rendered the Agreement ineffective. Because of this Agreement, Pakistan could not make any headway on Kashmir for 27 years. With the exception of PPP and ANP, no other party ever accepted it as legitimate. It did not figure in the manifestoes of IJI or PML, either. Also, on Feb. 21, 1999, the Foreign Minister stated that it was not a proper model for resolving problems. Yet, alas! Pakistan has been pushed back in the degrading depths of the same Agreement.

We are not objecting to the concept of dialogue per se. Our objection is to the framework, targets and priorities that our PM has set to unilaterally change Pakistan's policies on Kashmir and India. Doing this, he has committed two blunders:

- Delinking CTBT and nuclear policy from Indian signatures on the Treaty and the just solution of the Kashmir issue; and
- Delinking the Kashmir issue from the normalization of relations with India that covers trade, communication facilities, cultural exchanges, sports and exchange of parliamentarians.

The 50-year history shows that India always wished to delink all matters from Kashmir issue, whereas our only leverage was, and still is, that first the Kashmir issue be solved and only then relations could be normalized. Lahore Declaration is a deviation from this policy and a retrogressive step which the Pakistani nation will never accept and which the Prime Minister will have to take steps to revoke it. Without making reasonable progress on Kashmir issue, any cooperation with India is against the interests of Pakistan and amounts to following the Indian agenda. More than anything, its two outcomes are highly dangerous to Pakistan's vital interests:

1. The Kashmiri people and their resistance movement will get the signal that Pakistan is about to stab them in the back and leave them at the mercy of India. This would obviously weaken the freedom struggle and Kashmiris would stop expecting anything from Pakistan. Feeling betrayed, they would get frustrated. While the feelings for accession to Pakistan would cool down, the exponents of the Third Option would get strength. Certainly Kashmiris would never opt for joining India, but because of Pakistan's short-sighted policies they would be forced to quit their pro-Pakistan stance and fall prey to the slogan of independent Kashmir - and that is part of the US agenda;
2. The consensus that we have been having to date in Pakistan on Kashmir and India will be destroyed. This has been the single issue on which the entire nation is unanimous. What Nawaz Sharif now has to his 'credit' is the division of the nation on this issue.

The Prime Minister should not think that it is only some people who are challenging his policies. The overwhelming majority of the nation and even the workers and voters of the Muslim League are not with him. This is because he has divided the nation and his own party. If the government does not stop deviating from the Pakistan's principled policy, these two outcomes would assume much dangerous and alarming proportions.

A matter of great anxiety is the immature and childish perception of friendship presently advocated. Though talks are held even between fighting groups and adversaries, they proceed only when certain rules and limitations are observed. History bears witness to this fact. The danger of deceit, whose model Shivajee presented by staging the farce of talks during the battle between Aurangzeb and Marhattas, cannot be neglected. Even a cursory glance at the history of diplomacy would serve to highlight that there are certain rules and conditions, in short etiquette, for holding meaningful negotiations. It is accepted that Russia and the US discussed issues during cold war; Israel and Arabs first held indirect talks, then met face to face and finally, though coldly, shook hands; Kosovo and Serbia held parleys only recently; and the US and China, who did not recognize each others for many years, have begun negotiations on sundry issues. Yet, talks are one thing and according a hero's welcome to the enemy is another.

Indian cruelties in Kashmir escalated during January, 1999. Indian Army Chief threatened about a break out of conventional war. Only two days prior to the February 20 visit, the Indian Foreign Minister repeated ad nauseam that Kashmir is an integral part of India. The Cricket match at Eden Garden, Calcutta, was started by decorating a banner reading 'intimacy had to be established' (piyar to hona hi tha), but when defeat became imminent the game was turned upside down and the stadium was evacuated and it was probably the only match in the history which had no spectator! When Vajpayee's bus reached Wahga, the Indian Border Security Forces' band was playing Sadey nal rahogay Te aish karoga (if you - Pakistanis - join us, you will relish life) And we, on

the other side of the border, were standing as if to receive a conqueror. As if a reception at the Governor's House was not enough, a grand welcome was arranged in the Shahi Fort. Songs played on the occasion reflected utter shamelessness:

Aayga Aayga Aaney wala (the comer would come); Ghar aya mera pardesi (welcome back!); and Janey waley thero zara ruk jao (O traveler, stay a little longer).

It seems that our leaders have no regard for diplomatic etiquette, nation's honor and implications for movement in Kashmir. Mr. Abdus Sattar, a former diplomat, has rightly said that observance of dignity and decorum is particularly important in case of dealing with Pak-India relations. "Neither enmity nor friendship, but a middle approach is to be maintained."

There is a stage between love and hate. Its realization assumes even more importance when it is about establishing relations against the backdrop of enmity. But, before some kind of friendship could be established, our rulers began expressing not only the signs of intimacy but of love and passion. Would not the people be infuriated by these extreme acts of abominable fondness?

Newspapers have carried it through authentic sources that diplomats and the foreign office had advised for refraining from showing much warmth; that the reception should not be given at the Shahi Fort; and that some assurance on Kashmir be sought first. The Prime Minister, however, did not heed and created a situation which was simply intolerable for being against the national pride, honor and interests.

It is necessary to know as to how far Vajpayee's visit and its agenda were designed in Delhi and Islamabad and to what extent it was the fraudulent conjuring of Washington. The sequence of events reveals astounding facts. The way Lahore Declaration has been lauded in the West and particularly welcomed by President Clinton as well as the State Department, and the manner in which nuclear non-proliferation is taken care of in the Declaration and the Memorandum suggest that we are at the losing end. What the informed circles say merits immediate and deep consideration. For instance, Indian daily The Asian Age analyses the situation in its editorial of March 10:

"It seems that the American administration is taking care of each and every item of the agenda of bilateral relations between India and Pakistan along with details. After the visit of US under-Secretary Talbots, Premier Atal Bihari Vajpayee's Lahore voyage is not a simple coincidence. Washington's back-up in this matter was more than pronounced. For those who still doubt, the statement of Assistant Secretary of State Carl Interfresh should be sufficient that Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's visit to Delhi in June or July (next) is decided. It is a visit that the (two) concerned countries have not announced and the officials are not aware what the other side has

planned. Mr. Interfresh's statement clearly indicates that dates are now fixed by others - not necessarily India or Pakistan."

Indian monthly Afkar-e-Milli comments in the editorial of March:

"Premier Atal Bihari Vajpayee's 37 kilometer long bus travel from Amritsar to Wahga on February 20 has made him fully successful in his veiled objectives. Decision of the bus voyage was in fact reached during the two premiers' meeting in Washington in February 1998. A deeper study of the situation reveals that the journey of the BJP leader was a result of internal and external pressures. The US was trying since long that relation between the two countries be normalized and ban on nuclear tests gets a final shape. Also the cordiality of relations should provide to the US a chance of mediation on Kashmir. That is why, when Indian premier showed willingness to visit Pakistan, the World Bank with American consent approved long withheld \$ 210 million for the electricity project in Andhra Pardesh. Similarly, it is now possible that a green signal will be given to release \$1.7 billion loan to Indian government."

Another reputed Indian magazine Frontline writes in its issue of March 12, 1999.

"To show that US is not concerned with the steps for peace in South Asia may be a display of splendor, but is absolutely far from reality"

It is also worth noting that at the occasion of Vajpayee's visit to Lahore, not only the US ambassador to Pakistan but its current and former ambassadors to India Richard Celaste, and Frank Weizner were also present.

The question is what is the real American agenda? An article by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbotte in the famous US journal Foreign Affairs (March-April) and comments in London Times, New York Times, Washington Post, etc. make the US plans abundantly clear:

1. The ultimate American objective is to eliminate nuclear programs of the two countries - particularly that of Pakistan. For this US insists on first signing the CTBT (a treaty not yet ratified by Russia, China and US). Then comes its demand to stop enriching nuclear material under FMCT, although even the preliminaries of this proposed treaty are yet to be decided. It would probably take two years to take some final shape, but the demand is that Pakistan and India immediately stop enrichment, open their installations and test-sites for inspection (something which the US and the other four nuclear powers are not ready to comply with, under NPT protection). In case of India, there are indications that US will accept the principle of 'critical minimum deterrence', which India is not ready to define, rather wants to keep ambiguous. US is not prepared to give this option to Pakistan. In short, the US

demand is embodied in four points: nuclear program i) be practically capped; ii) be reversed to old status; iii) delivery system be controlled; and (iv) be opened for inspection by the West - under persuasion or under compulsion.

2. Initiation of Pak-India dialogue and ensuring Indian agenda that all matters be discussed and agreed upon without linking them to Kashmir issue. The strategy is to start cooperating in various fields without making anything public so that these become 'accepted facts' later on.
3. As far as Kashmir issue is concerned, arrangements are made to ensure:
 - face-saving for both parties;
 - Pakistan gets neither more territory nor a better military position;
 - India may leave some area but it should not come to Pakistan. This is to help Indian army to get out of the mire without any advantage to Pakistan;
 - Certain areas be merged either with Pakistan or with India, while others be given semi-autonomy - administered either jointly by the two countries or by India alone or by the United Nations.

In other words the purport is to prevent India from getting weak and Pakistan from getting strong; to have ways for pressurizing and monitoring China while allowing India get out of its present troubles. Though details are being hammered out and various possible scenarios are being examined, yet the targets are the ones as mentioned above.

Pakistan is being persuaded and cajoled that it cannot get Kashmir by force; that the resistance movement is getting weak; that Pakistan should better stop helping freedom-fighters or else it will be declared a terrorist state. On the other hand, if it acts upon US advice it might get some area, its tussle with India would come to a close and the resources thus saved could then be used for economic welfare. India is told that it can save billions that are now being spent in Kashmir; that Pakistan will not get upper hand; that Kashmiris do not wish to stay with it but under the semi-autonomous status they will be persuaded to live under Indian control. The whole exercise is to enhance US influence in the area and, with the help of India, to work out new monitoring system against China. That is why China has expressed concern over Vajpayee's visit.

4. In this whole game, Pakistan is subjected to two kinds of pressure. First is economic which has become quite serious because of governments' wrong policies, corruption and mis-management. Second is the threat of the rise of regional separatist movements and Pakistan's threatened break up into four or five states in the wake of its rejection of US plans for friendship with India and division of Kashmir.

This is the real US agenda. So far, neither Pakistan nor India has fully agreed with it, yet both are being slowly pushed into the trap.

The real target of the whole scheme is Pakistan, not India; but unfortunately Pakistan's leadership has no clear perception of it. It has practically accepted foreign demands for capping and control of the only leverage i.e. the nuclear capability. If nationwide popular pressure is not built, then there is a great risk of signing CTBT somewhere between July and September. This would be the first step to trap. Pakistan should realize that if it stands the pressure, CTBT will become ineffective after September 1999 and then Pakistan, along with the whole Muslim Ummah and the Third World, would be able to play important role in any fresh parleys. It is also most probable that the Russia, China and US would defer their ratification till September and will do so only when the rest of 44 countries ratify. Therefore, a wisely devised strategy promises great dividends though at the same time demands strong nerves and unflinching commitment to our ideals. Obviously, this is possible only with the help of popular support.

The basic blunder of the government is that in a matter of great national importance it has totally overlooked the principle of formulating the policy after due consultations. Parliament took up CTBT for discussion but it remained inconclusive. While the discussion was merely half way through, the Prime Minister went into talks with President Clinton. Nobody, therefore, knows what is going on behind the doors.

Talks are being held with Mr. Vajpayee and it is claimed that things will be settled within this year (by September!), but neither the cabinet nor Parliament has been taken into confidence. Political parties and leadership are all kept in the dark. There is no open debate on media, print or electronic. Surely, this is not how democracy functions. It is a worst form of dictatorship bound to spell catastrophe for nations.

General Ayub was a military dictator. But, when India invaded Pakistan on September 6, 1965; and even after the Tashkent Agreement, he invited the political leadership and briefed about the situation. It is quite another thing that the leadership supported Ayub Khan on September 6 but refused to extend support in case of the Tashkent Agreement. By the way, it is the Tashkent Agreement which marks the first basic deviation and which laid the foundations of bilateral talks. Simla Agreement was bad, and the Lahore Declaration is worst because it upholds the same deviation from the just path. Again, General Zia-ul Haq too was a military ruler. But on matters of Afghan Jihad, he would consult all and sundry. He had a well-enacted system for the purpose.

Mr. Junejo convened all-parties conference before signing the Geneva Accord and called a joint sitting of the Parliament. On the contrary, both Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif never took into confidence the political forces and Parliament in matters of national importance. We consider it necessary that government is bound constitutionally to get ratification from the Parliament for all important international treaties. In the absence of such constitutional binding, the only way left is to mobilize popular pressure. Those individuals, institutions and parties do merit appreciation, who during the Vajpayee's visit gave expression to national sentiments. Braving state terrorism, Jamaat-i-Islami has done not only its own duty but also performed the duty on behalf of the entire

nation. This voice of protest saved the country from further threats. Had the Jamaat not protested, matters concerning CTBT and Kashmir would have been settled in utter disregard to the supreme national interests. This popular protest worked like temporary breaks. The mass opinion has to be mobilized to the extent that government finds it impossible to act in a manner harmful for the country. For this purpose all patriotic elements and organizations have to get united. The National Conference to discuss the situation arising out of Vajpayee's visits on February 20 and 21 gave expression to national aspirations and served to guide the nation in the face of dangers facing the country. More steps are needed to be taken in this direction to stop government from pursuing any wrong policies in future as well.

PROF KHURSHID AHMAD