

THE KARGIL BATTLE: INDIAN  
OFFENSIVE AND PAKISTAN

---

TERJUMAN-UL-QURAN

July 1999

PROF. KHURSHID AHMAD



## **THE KARGIL BATTLE: INDIAN OFFENSIVE AND PAKISTAN**

By Professor Khurshid Ahmad

Kargil has been aflame since the beginning of May. Indian air force has deployed its MIG 21, 23 and 2 Mirage 2000 aircraft and M.I.17 gunship helicopters and since May 24 they have been carrying out 50 to 100 sorties daily to blast out the positions of the Mujahideen with the help of Indian ground forces. Not only Cluster bombs but even chemical bombs are being used with their devastating effect upon the population of Azad Kashmir. The fighting is no longer confined to Kargil, Daras, Batalik and Mushko sectors and Indians are intruding into Neelum valley and Bhimber areas as well. The political and military leadership of India is going beyond the state of a sort of war, and is now talking of an open war. On the eve of Vajpai's visit to Kargil and thereafter, an atmosphere of full-scale war is being created. Retired military men and the analysts are openly saying that it is not possible to oust the Mujahideen from their deeply entrenched positions without crossing the Line of Control. India is, therefore, eager to open a war front of its choice elsewhere in Azad Kashmir or on the international border with Pakistan. It is a crucial moment for Pakistan. The most vital need of the hour is that keeping in view of the experience of the events of 1965, 1971 and 1984 and brushing aside all wistfulness and complacency, comprehensive military, political and diplomatic strategy is devised with realism and sagacity of a Momin to counter the impending threat. The whole nation must be galvanized and motivated to meet the challenge of the hour by creating a national accord.

The foremost need is to analyze the situation correctly to avoid any set back due to misunderstanding and false expectations.

There is no reason for entertaining fond hopes about real intentions of India. By carrying out the tests of AGNI II and the military exercises at Pokhran shortly after the proclamation of the Lahore Declaration; India had conveyed a clear message, but the leadership in Pakistan had been dreaming of friendship and wishful plans for developing trade and economic ties with it. Thanks to the Mujahideen, however, that they have turned the tide of events with their force of faith, spirit of Jihad and invaluable sacrifices. Just as they had enlivened the dead issue of Kashmir through their heroic Jihad in 1989 which was unfortunately blocked by the leadership of India and Pakistan through Tashkent and Simla Agreements, they have once again challenged the Indian aggression in Kashmir by capturing the high mountain peaks of Kargil and by controlling their supply line from Srinagar to Leh, Laddkah and Siachin. They have thus brought their Jihad for freedom to a decisive point. This achievement of Mujahideen has exposed India's military and political weakness and it has clearly demonstrated to the world at large that the people of Jammu and Kashmir are at war against the illegal occupation of its territory by India. The Indian army, which is said to be the fourth largest army of the world and whose 700,000 troops have remained entangled with a few thousand Mujahideen for the last ten years, had been routed on every occasion at the hands of the

freedom fighters despite Indian claims, repeated scores of times that "resistance movement has breathed its last" and that "all is normal in Kashmir".

The position of battle at Kargil is that a few hundred Mujahideen have demoralized and beaten back India's 30,000 troops. Interestingly, India has thrown in on this front as many as 20,000 fresh reservists, the entire batch of Dehradun cadet officers, their artillery as well as their air force, and yet the situation is that the Indian Defence Minister, who boasted in the beginning of May that the "intruders" would be flushed out within 48 hours, is now eating his words and looking for excuses. Despite the innumerable daily sorties by 100 fighter planes and their continuous and indiscriminate shelling since May 24, there has been no mentionable advancement. This military leadership is now talking of operations extending over several months and, in spite of the preponderance of their striking power; they have failed to make any headway. Resultantly, Indians are now making plans to violate the line of control, and also open a new front against Azad Kashmir, besides carrying out army exercises in Jammu and concentrating their troops on the borders of the Punjab and Sind. Like an injured serpent they are vicious in their attacks. A prudent review of these events and consequential circumstances lead to certain conclusions that need to be comprehended:

1. Kashmir issue is the core of Indo-Pak relations. Any strategy for normalizing relations without resolving this issue is neither practicable nor rational. Unless and until Kashmir issue is settled according to the wishes of the people of Kashmir and in the light of the UN resolutions on the subject, no step towards friendship can succeed.
2. The so-called confidence Building Measures (CBMs) are a ruse and cannot lead to any success. They have been mentioned in every Agreement, including Tashkent Agreement and Lahore Declaration, but they are merely cosmetic in nature and lack substance. Confidence and friendship can emerge only when the forcible occupation of Kashmir by India comes to an end and India gives up its stance of hegemony over the region and agrees to negotiate on the equality basis. Otherwise the reference to these CBMs would be nothing but pretentious double-talk.
3. Kashmir issue is not a conflict between Pakistan and India only. It involves four parties and it can be settled with the participation of all these four parties to it, viz.: India, Pakistan, the people of Jammu and Kashmir and the UN and the world community at large. At Tashkent, Simla and then at Lahore unrealistic attempts were made to convert this four-party issue into a bilateral one between India and Pakistan. It was bound to fail. Neither Tashkent Agreement led to any solution of the Kashmir issue nor did the Simla Agreement pave way to it, while the Lahore Declaration failed to take off. On the contrary, as Mr. Vajpai himself has admitted, the road to Lahore has led to Kargil. **(The Asian Age, London, June 15, 1999, p.20)**

Kashmir issue cannot be settled in this cul-de-sac. It shall be settled either through force or through international intervention and pressure - the possibility of the latter is apparently remote, although efforts should continue in this direction. But nothing can be achieved solely through bilateral negotiations, bypassing the people of Kashmir and ignoring their wishes and sentiments. India would not be prepared; it seems, for any kind of talks unless it is under real pressure from the people and the freedom fighters. Bilateral diplomacy has been a failure in the past and it is bound to be so even today. Pakistan's Foreign Minister, during his recent sojourn in Delhi, has seen for himself what India is upto. According to Peter Pufom, correspondent of the daily Independent, London, the meeting between the two foreign Ministers was one of the frostiest encounters in diplomatic history. Neither any joint communiqué was issued, nor any dialogue ensued - not even a ceremonial handshake! Like pretenders they sat for a while and dispersed, and that was the end of it. The Indian Foreign Minister himself admitted that it was no more than that.

Nobody knows what our Prime Minister intended to gain through this diplomatic fiasco. Even Chaudhry Sarwar, the Chairman of the Kashmir Committee of the National Assembly which is dominated by his own party, was constrained to remark "Sartaj Aziz's visit to Delhi shall bring disgrace to us and hurt our national honor."

**(Jung, London, June 4, 1999, p.2.)**

4. There is no place for personal relations and personal chemistry in Indo-Pak relations. They are governed by national interests and facts on the ground with little reference to exchange of pleasantries, poetic exuberance or bus rendezvous. A leadership, which is under the illusion that it has succeeded in winning over somebody and in developing abiding friendship with him would soon become disillusioned, irrespective of the fact whether the person is a cunning statesman like Vajpai or a playboy politician like Clinton. Unless hard facts on the ground are kept in view, one cannot face the challenge of time.

Another aspect of the issue that has come under sharp focus is the fact that the dispute is not related merely to a piece of land but to the freedom and political future of four million people. It will not be even one step towards the solution of Kashmir if the feelings, ambitions, sacrifices and aspirations of the people of Kashmir are disregarded. India's pleas that Kashmir issue is merely a mischief sponsored by Pakistan and that Kashmir Jihad is the baby of ISI, is a brazen lie of this century and a great travesty of facts. The people of Kashmir have never accepted the occupation of the state by India. The farce of an 'assembly' that was put up in 1953-73, comprising 75 members elected unopposed, carried no credibility in the masses. Sheikh Abdullah, the person who enacted the farce himself confessed later in his biography that it was indeed a political hoax. And before

this so-called Assembly could start functioning, the Shaikh was unceremoniously sacked and sent to jail. The Security Council of the U.N., through a formal resolution, declared it to be irrelevant and ineffective for the purpose of a plebiscite and for a decision about the future of Kashmir. As a matter of fact, all elections held in Kashmir have been non-representative and, after the fraudulent elections of 1987, the people of Kashmir totally rejected course of the ballot box and took to political resistance and Jihad, which continues till today. This resistance movement and Jihad has assumed a new diversity in the shape of the battle of Kargil. The All Parties Hurriyat conference (APHC) and all the political forces of Occupied Kashmir have openly declared that Mujahideen of Kargil are the heroes of the freedom movement and sons of Kashmir. India may call them 'intruders', 'infiltrators', 'Taliban' or Pakistan army personnel, but the fact remains that they are the standard bearers of the freedom movement. Political and militant struggle is indigenous to the soil of Jammu and Kashmir. Whatever the Indian propaganda, the facts are otherwise and their veracity has been universally accepted. Regrettably the diplomatic and propaganda effort of Pakistan has been so weak and inept that even these incontrovertible facts have not been projected by them in an effective manner. On the other hand, India is flashing its lies with fanfare, following the dictum: "Tell the lies so persistently that people may come to accept them as true."

India claims that Kashmir is its 'integral part' whereas the people of Jammu and Kashmir regard it as an illegal occupation through an act of aggression by India. The UN and all fair-minded persons consider it as a disputed territory and not part of India. The resistance movement in Kashmir is a national movement, and there is no way out but to admit this fact. In the recent past, India tried its best to raise a smoke screen on the issue, but the battle of Kargil has dispelled it once for all.

In the first phase of the movement during 1990 itself, this fact was recognized by all as is evident from the report of Mr. Derck Brown, correspondent of the Guardian, London, appearing in its issue of January 28, 1990. The report said:

"I think the Indians were very embarrassed by the way the foreign press in particular tended to discount the official line namely, that the trouble is the work of handful of malcontents largely supported and inspired by Pakistan. The much more widespread view among foreign correspondents is that it is something more like a popular uprising and it does indeed have a broad base of mass support."

Christopher Thomas wrote in London Times, of 1st February, 1990:

"India's portrayal of Pakistan as instigator of the Kashmir troubles ignores the fact that the separatist movement has mass indigenous support."

Similarly Financial Times wrote:

"India's claim that Pakistan has fomented the trouble and sent armed and trained insurgents across the border, is unproven and unlikely to be true."

London Economist remarked in the beginning of this movement:

"Given choice, the Kashmiris would probably opt for independence or for Pakistan".

During all this while India turned the whole of Kashmir into a 'no go' area for the international information media and even today it is hard to make the world know of the correct situation inside Kashmir. There is a ban on Pakistan T.V. and the international representatives, TV camera men and NGOs do not have any access. Whatever happenings are being reported in consequence of the on-going battle, presents a picture that is enough to expose India's propaganda.

The representative of The Guardian, London writes from Srinagar in its issue of June 7, 1999:

"In the Kashmir valley, some 125 miles from the mountain ranges, where India is installing its heaviest concentration of troops and equipment since 1971 war against Pakistan, there is no sympathy for the Indian soldiers whose corpses lie unclaimed on the heights because it would be too dangerous to retrieve them."

"People are taking pleasure in the discomfiture of Indian soldiers - and that is putting it mildly", said one of the Kashmiri senior police officers. "They say the Indian army has been killing us for so long, now let them get killed."

"Within the officer corps there are growing fears for the morale of the men - fed by their distrust of a local population which wants revenge for the 25,000 people killed by security forces since the Kashmiri uprising began. In Srinagar, separatist groups have ordered protest strikes and demonstrations against the use of India's air force along the line of control."

The representative of The Independent, London, Peter Popham, writes from Delhi in its issue of May 27, 1999:

"But its population is 90 percent Muslim, and since the beginning of 1990, and the adoption by the Indian authorities of brutal methods to suppress it, they have become deeply disaffected. Pakistan has always insisted that Kashmir belonged to it. India has struggled to maintain the status quo, but since the start of insurgency it has been a losing battle. This celebrated beauty spot has become an armed camp."

In one of its editorials dated May 28, 1999, New York Times, published by "The International Herald Tribune", writes:

"The Muslim-dominated state of Kashmir has long been the scene of rebellion of guerrillas seeking independence from India."

The Economist, London in its editorial column under the caption "Kashmir Again", published on June 12, 1999 writes:

"India has long contended that peace would return to Kashmir if only Pakistan would stop interfering. That is at best, a half-truth. India has tamed a decade-long insurgency against its rule. There seems to be fewer home-grown insurgents and more foreign infiltrators. But that does not mean Kashmir has returned to normal, or that its people are content to remain under Indian rule. Most Muslims there seem to want independence, rather than ruled by India or Pakistan. India adamantly refuses to offer them their choice."

The truth speaks itself. Praveen Swami, the representative of an Indian daily The Hindu Group in the latest edition of its magazine Front Line, published on June 18, 1999, writes from Sringar:

"If after the Kargil conflict, the resistance movements remain in possession there, then Pakistan along with pro-Pakistan groups in the rest of Jammu and Kashmir, will be able to claim that anti-India insurgency has spread to all Muslim-dominated areas of the state." **(p.22)**

Swami further writes:

"A special session of the APHC's executive committee, held in Srinagar on May 27, attacked India's defensive operations in Kargil claiming that its "unwarranted use of air and ground power has amplified the prospects that peace in the region will be put in peril." Interestingly it suggested that insurgents are of Kashmiri origin, rather than Pakistan irregulars and troops were holding ground in Kargil. "Now that the air force too has been called in to supplement ground troops in order to crush Kashmiri militants", the APHC statement read, "The Kashmir issue has assumed an ominous dimension in the context of peace and security of South Asia region." **(p.24)**

Swami expresses his surprise on the point that no leader of Kashmir other than Farooq Abdullah, not even the leaders of National Congress have 'condemned the Pakistani offensive'. All of them deliberately preferred to be silent. He writes:

"Mainstream political figures appear to have had nothing to say about the fighting in Kargil. Abdullah has, true to form, attacked Pakistan's aggression, but other N.C. figures have maintained a studied silence on recent events. No major political figure, but the Chief Minister has even sought to visit the combat zone, and there has been

no effort to bring about a coherent political debate on what meaning this summer's events will have for the state."

General Krishan Pal, the Commander of 15 Corps of India, in a recent interview has admitted that the Army is engaged in crushing this uprising but it does not enjoy the support of local population. **(Reference: Ummat, Karachi, May 27, 1999 - Article by Irshad Mahmood, on "India cannot win this War")**

Real external interventionists and aggressors in Kashmir are - India and its armed forces. They are being encountered by the entire Kashmiri population and its armed groups with their jihad movements. India cannot belie these facts by implicating Pakistan. The real issue is Kashmir's freedom from the illegal domination and forcible occupation of India. Their struggle for achieving their right of freedom is not subversion - it is jihad for freedom. It should be upheld and supported by all freedom-loving forces and individuals who cherish the ideals of liberty and democracy. All the supporters and upholders of jihad for freedom are in fact benefactors of humanity and helpers of the oppressed and are certainly not terrorists or miscreants.

This is the philosophy as well as the message of the French Revolution and of the democratic movements worldwide. The democratic process of European nations, the freedom movements of America and their Bill of Rights stand on this base. This very principle is the spirit behind the UN Charter and the Human Rights Convention. The charter of Non-Aligned Movement Countries is the standard bearer of this principle. So far as Muslims are concerned, this principle is a part of their faith. Islam's concept of 'Jehad' advocates it. The holy Qur'an proclaims in clear terms:

"And how is that you do not fight in the way of Allah and in support of the helpless - men, women and children - who pray: 'Our Lord, bring us out of this land whose people are oppressors and appoint for us from Yourself, a protector, and appoint for us from Yourself a helper? Those who have faith fight in the way of Allah, while those who disbelieve fight in the way of taught (Satan). Fight, then, against the fellows of Satan. Surely Satan's strategy is weak."  
**(Al-Nisa: 75 -76)**

The main plank of Indian propaganda rests on three points: first that Kashmir is a part of India and Jihad activities in Kashmir are tantamount to an attack on India; second, that whatever is happening in Kargil and Kashmir is the doing of Pakistani people, Pakistan Army or Afghan Taliban and third, that Pakistan has violated Simla Agreement, particularly in Kargil and has started military action on the other side of the line of control.

It is pitiable that the Government of Pakistan and its diplomatic force have failed to effectively counteract the propaganda onslaught of India at the international level and, as a result, our strong case has been going by default due to their ineptitude.



In the first place Kashmir is not a part of India nor the Line of Control of Kashmir is an international boundary either. The future of Jammu and Kashmir has to be decided by its people. This whole issue is disputed one not only for India and Pakistan but also in accordance with the cannons of international law and the UN charter. In its very genesis it is an international issue and no agreement can convert it into a bilateral matter between Pakistan and India. M.J.Akbar, the editor of an Indian paper Asian Age, in his article "The Blind Hawks of BJP", published on June 5, 1999 writes:

"Pakistan does not have to take Kashmir to the United Nations; it is already there. Its job is only to activate forcefully."

Brahma Chelleney, the columnist of another Indian daily Hindustan Times, writes in its issue of June 2, 1999, under the caption "Blundering on Kashmir" as under:

"From Nehru to Vajpayee a short-sightedness has sired mistake after mistake on Kashmir. It was not Pakistan that internationalized Kashmir but Nehru.....If the international attention on Kashmir after the sub-continent's overt mechanization was a diplomatic bonanza to Islamabad, Kargil is a diplomatic coup for it. It puts Kashmir on the front burner."

Scanning through the world press, one finds a universal acceptance of the fact that the Kashmir issue has become the focus of world attention due to Kargil. In view of the principle enunciated recently in regard to Kosovo by the U.S., NATO and the U.N. itself, Kashmir has become a very apt issue for international intervention. Despite all this, however, it is distressing to see that India is firing volleys of its propaganda all around so as to isolate Pakistan in the diplomatic field. Pakistan's diplomatic corps is in deep slumber so much so that Pakistani Ambassador in United States while appearing in the Q & A Program of CNN, did not at all rebut the false claims of Indian Ambassador made in the same program and did not utter a single word in regard to the UN Resolutions and the right of self-determination of the Kashmiri people. We have failed even to make use of what has been said by most of world newspapers and magazines on the Kargil issue.

The British daily financial Times in its issue of May 28, 1999 write under the heading "War in Kashmir":

"It is impossible to know how far India is justified in claiming that the territory on its side of the cease-fire line has been infiltrated by Afghan mercenary guerrillas, but it is clear that the outgoing Hindu nationalist government stands to gain electorally from a crisis in Kashmir.....The nuclear dimension means the outside world has much at stake too. India has always sought to avoid internationalization of the conflict but the world has a common interest in keeping it in check. This is precisely the kind of problem for what the multilateral approach of a strong UN is needed."

The daily Times, London, in its editorial of May 27, 1999 write:

"While other actors have been absorbed by events in Kosovo, India and Pakistan have edged towards another armed struggle in Kashmir."

The Guardian in its editorial of May 29, 1999 wrote:

"The war in Kosovo may be on Europe's doorstep, but no one should under-estimate the damages of another conflict which is now threatening to run out of control half a world away.....Britain and other leading powers must bear their share of responsibility for the nuclear threat over the sub-continent."

The Independent in its editorial of May 29, 1999, after mentioning the UN intervention in Kosovo and Iraq, its peace keeping efforts and the accountability of crimes against humanity, wrote:

"And this is a doctrine that could be applied to the Kashmir conflict, which was never a simple border dispute between the UN member states, or even an argument about to which of them a province belonged.... The UN has some standing in Kashmir, too, as the guarantor of the referendum once promised by the Indian government..... In the case of Kashmir, however, the UN is probably the only hope of peaceful resolution."

This is why the columnist of Front Line, V.R.Raghavan concludes his analysis in its issue of June 18, 1999, by saying:

"Kargil has brought India and Pakistan to a turning point. It is time to look beyond Kargil to the long term security implications of the Kashmir issue for the well-being of the two countries" **(p.28)**

Similar views were expressed by The Economist, Washington Post, Al-Ahram and other world papers and magazines, but our diplomatic circles did not take any advantage of all this, whereas it was an opportune moment for cornering India and blasting its propaganda balloon.

While dealing with the second point, we have already concluded that the real struggle is being waged by Kashmiri people while Pakistan is also not unconcerned with; rather it is a party to the Kashmir issue. Freedom struggle is the right of the people of Occupied Kashmir and Azad Kashmir. It is the duty of Pakistan, the Muslim Ummah and all anti-imperialist people to support the people of Kashmir in their freedom movement. India and not the Mujahideen is the aggressive and tyrannical force in Kashmir.

The third point concerns the line of control and here also all the facts go against India. It is correct that the line of control was agreed upto a specified place (NJ 9842) on paper, but it is a hard fact that at many points there had been no demarcation on the ground, particularly in Kargil sector. In the recent issue of Front Line (June 18, 1999) - whose major portion covered the Kashmir issue¾ one of the columnist, Praful Bidwai, in his article captioned "Playing with Fire in Kargil" admits:

"Given the fact that the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir is undemarcated on the ground....., and that there is wide scope for ambiguities about airspace violations, air strikes greatly increase the probability of retaliation and counter-retaliation." (p.19)

So far as Kargil is concerned, there is clear manifestation that the law of natural retribution is working there. The whole area of Kargil had been with Pakistan. India had occupied it in the war of 1965, but it was restored to Pakistan under Tashkent Agreement. In the war of 1971, India again occupied it. Under the Simla Agreement of 1972, which was negotiated by Pakistan under duress, Kargil was retained by India by dint of force and the cease-fire line was re-named as the Line of Control. In 1984, India violated even the LoC and, when it saw a good chance, it grabbed the Siachin glacier. In the same way in which India occupied a position of Siachin, the Mujahideen of Kashmir found an opportunity in 1999 and occupied some strategic posts in Kargil. Now India is enraged and has started a relentless military operation using its ground and air forces. The heavy losses India is suffering on this front, it is feared, may not enrage it to the extent that it crosses the LoC and commits the folly of opening other fronts against Pakistan. India intruded in Siachin and committed several hundred violations of LoC, the whole record of which has been maintained by the Government of Pakistan and the UN Observers' Group in Pakistan.

India has all along opposed the deployment of UN Peace Force and the monitoring of LoC by UN representatives and this is a clear proof of India's mala fide. India's case on Kargil is flimsy and full of contradictions. But here again Pakistan has failed to bring round the world opinion and even our close allies, like China and the Arab countries, to fully support its view point. Pakistan and China have common security concerns as well, but it is apparent that our diplomatic corps has not done well.

In Kargil, Mujahideen have proved that they are in a dominating position. The first priority should, therefore, be to maintain this position and all the Jehadi forces should hold on to their positions on this point firmly with resolve and unity. At the same time, the Government and the people of Pakistan and their armed forces should also discharge their respective obligations in this regard.

The real danger is, however, that existing semi-war situation may not flare up into a full scale conflagration. In this connection world political circles are debating different strategies. Some American and Jewish circles wish to take advantage of India's imbroglio and drag it into a war so as to secretly target the nuclear installations of Pakistan. The organization of Muslim Scientists and Engineers in America has openly expressed its apprehension on this grave possibility which should

not be ignored by Pakistan's leadership and its armed forces. They should plan for preservation of their capabilities and at the same time make advance preparations to face the situation. Possibilities of a conventional war are also increasing and while these lines are being penned, all of the sensitive information coming from India is indicative of the chances of a limited war in Kashmir and a full scale war against Pakistan. Mr. BAL Thakray has announced his intention to teach a lesson to Pakistan, while Vajpai and Jaswant Singh are also talking of an open war. Military and ex-Military circles are also expressing their views on the same lines. Therefore, the risk of a war is very real and preparations should be made with all seriousness to meet the challenge.

General Mc Arther was right in saying  $\frac{3}{4}$  "History of the world has given a lesson from the very beginning that cowardliness breeds scuffles and bravery often stops them." Therefore, the people of wisdom and experience have stated the principle that there is only one way to stop war, viz. to remain prepared for a war. Peace cannot be maintained without balance of power. If you possess the strength to face the enemy, you will have peace and you will live with honor and freedom. Weakness is a crime and its punishment is sudden and total death.

The holy Qur'an has also directed the Muslim Ummah to remain always prepared for an encounter with the enemy:

"Make ready for an encounter against them all the forces and well-readied horses you can muster that you may overawe the enemies of Allah and your own enemies and others besides them of whom you are unaware but of whom Allah is aware. Whatever you may spend in the cause of Allah shall be fully repaid to you, and you shall not be wronged. **(Al-Anfal : 8 : 60)**

The risks that the country is beset with cannot be met with armed preparedness alone. No doubt armed alertness and readiness is of paramount importance but the courage, maturity and steadfastness of the political leadership are also equally necessary so as to prepare the nation to meet any formidable challenge and to keep it in readiness for that purpose. The greatest source of strength for the nation is, besides its faith in Allah, its unity of purpose and its readiness to sacrifice it's all for the sake of freedom and honor. Likewise a strong economy is equally essential as, in the absence of economic resources; the highest level of military capability may become ineffective. But the most important of them all is the faith and trust in Allah and the hope for His help and support. -These five elements are the basic requisites for progress and stability both in times of peace and in war. Whereas we have full confidence in the valor and capability of our armed forces, it is hard to express satisfaction over to the existence and effectiveness of the rest of the elements. Nevertheless, the need of the hour is to provide and consolidate all of these elements.

We should bear in mind that while an historic opportunity is available to us, it remains the responsibility of the national leadership to comprehend with objectively and prudence the dimensions of the impending challenge in relation to our circumstances and our resources, and

should neither take the course of cowardice and retreat nor undertake risks for which we are not prepared. Our battle is long drawn and every moment is crucial. To lose an opportunity is a folly and to deal with the matters ignoring our capabilities is also against prudence and wisdom. Where trust in Allah is ordained, it has also been advised to tie the camel with a tether! Despite its entire shortcoming, the nation has its strong points and capabilities, but all of them need to be mobilized. Nothing worthwhile can be achieved without taking risks but there is hell of difference between taking risk and gambling. To meet the risks with full deliberation is real bravery and manliness. In this crucial hour sagacity and valor are our weapons besides our faith in Allah.

The primary responsibility for mobilizing the nation to meet the impending risks and for creating unanimity and single-mindedness among the various sections of the people rests with the political leadership which should come out of its shell and do its duty to fulfill the needs of the hour. They should try to take along with them all the national and patriotic elements inside and outside the Parliament. It would be a great blunder if we continue abiding by the LoC or remain confined only to the hypothesis of a limited strife in Kashmir. All the risks and probabilities shall have to be taken into account in their varying perspectives and a proper strategy shall have to be devised for each of them. For that purpose it is essential that the whole nation is taken into confidence and the potential of the nation is fully mobilized.

Another great need of the hour, besides these domestic preparation, is to take our friends also into confidence and to influence the world opinion and the power blocs with their help. The closest friends of Pakistan have not been as warm in their response as they had been in the past, and this needs immediate attention. An effective diplomatic campaign should be organized and the leverage which we have acquired as an atomic power should be used for this purpose with sagacity and wisdom.

A great deal needs to be done in the field of propaganda. Instead of projections of individuals, we need to focus our attention on issues, problems and the current situation. High priority must be given for developing contacts with the world and achieving their cooperation, particularly on the Kashmir issue. Special diplomatic campaigns be initiated for China, Iran, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, Turkey and the Republics of Central Asia. Our Prime Minister himself should be moving and he should be accompanied by a small team of competent experts instead of a troupe sycophants. Important diplomatic assignments need to be entrusted to only the most capable in the nation, and persons of wisdom and sagacity from Occupied Kashmir and Azad Kashmir should also be included therein. All of them should work like a team, so that the emergency now being faced by the country and by the nation should be dealt with effectively.

---