

Chaophraya Dialogue 11

Report of Proceedings



A Jinnah Institute
Conference Report



Australia India
Institute

JINNAH
INSTITUTE

This material may not be copied, reproduced or transmitted in whole or in part without attribution to the Jinnah Institute (JI). Unless noted otherwise, all material is property of the Institute.

Copyright © Jinnah Institute 2013
R0613-11

This publication has been produced with the support of British High Commission.

Chaophraya Dialogue 11

Report of Proceedings



Australia India
Institute

J JINNAH
INSTITUTE

About Jinnah Institute



Jinnah Institute (JI) is a non-profit public policy organisation based in Pakistan. It functions as a think tank, advocacy group, and public outreach organisation independent of the government. JI seeks to promote knowledge-based policy making for strengthening democratic institutions and to build public stakes in human and national security discourse. It remains committed to investing in policies that promote fundamental rights, tolerance and pluralism.

Jinnah Institute's Strategic Security Initiative (SSI)

Jl actively seeks to articulate independent national security strategies for Pakistan that incorporate the country's stated policy imperatives while making room for voices from civil society, parliament, academia and media experts. Jinnah Institute's SSI also encourages constructive engagement between the international community and local policy and opinion makers on key national security interests, with the goal of seeking broad strategic convergences in multilateral and bilateral forums.

Jinnah Institute runs leading peace initiatives with India through sustained Track II engagement. It has been at the forefront of bringing together stakeholders from India and Pakistan to develop bilateral strategies for regional security and stability.

Jl is committed to broadening Pakistan's stake in pursuing informed and inclusive policies on regional and global relationships with India, Afghanistan, other South Asian countries, China, the European Union, the United Kingdom and the United States.

About Australia India Institute



The Australia India Institute (All) is a leading centre for the study of India. Through its teaching, research, public policy and outreach programmes, it is building Australia's capacity to understand India. All is also a hub for dialogue, research and partnerships between India and Australia. Based at the University of Melbourne, the Institute hosts a growing range of programmes that are deepening and enriching the relationship between the two countries.

The University of Melbourne established the Australia India Institute in October 2008. In 2009, funding for the Institute was provided by the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. The University of New South Wales and La Trobe University were also founding partners. In 2012 the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research, and Tertiary Education and the State Government of Victoria provided additional core funding. The Ministry of Culture, Government of India, is funding a Tagore Centre for Global Thought at All – one of three Centres globally that are being funded by the Government of India. All will host a Chair in Indian Studies, funded by the State Government of Victoria and the University of Melbourne and a Visiting Chair in Indian Studies sponsored by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations.

Contents

Introduction	5
Session I: Bilateral Relations	6
Sessions II & III: Afghanistan	8
Nuclear	10
Session IV: Crisis Stability	12
Session V: Trade	14
Session VI: People-to-People Contacts	16
Joint Statement	18
Conference Delegates India	20
Conference Delegates Pakistan	24

Introduction

The Chaophraya Dialogue is a joint India-Pakistan Track II initiative undertaken by the Melbourne-based Australia India Institute (AII) and the Islamabad-based Jinnah Institute (JI), to encourage informed dialogue on Indo-Pak relations. The process has so far led to eleven rounds of dialogue and is now entering its sixth year.

The Chaophraya Dialogue is primarily meant to give informed members of the strategic community in India and Pakistan an opportunity to interact with each other on a sustained basis. Past participants in the Chaophraya Dialogue have included senior former officials (including Ambassadors, Foreign Secretaries, Intelligence Chiefs and top-ranking members of the Armed Forces), academics, journalists and political leaders from India and Pakistan. Initiated before the Mumbai attacks of 26/11, the process played a critical role in bringing together senior interlocutors from the two countries when the official dialogue process was suspended. The Chaophraya Dialogue has since encouraged participants to share the conclusions of each round with their respective governments.

There have been many efforts in recent years to establish greater Indo-Pak peace and understanding through Track II dialogues. The Chaophraya Dialogue draws from a growing international community of stakeholders committed to Indo-Pak peace and has attempted to innovate its conference agendas by addressing the rapidly changing bilateral dynamic on the ground. The liberalised visa and trade regimes are the result of sustained efforts at the Track II level, but new avenues of cooperation and mutual learning need to be explored to make these gains permanent.

The 11th round of the Chaophraya Dialogue held in Bangkok from 18-20 December, 2012, addressed crisis prevention measures and the issue of Afghanistan in a regional context. Both sides were represented by senior experts who deliberated upon opportunities and challenges in the Indo-Pak relationship and devised a set of policy recommendations addressing them.

Session I

Bilateral Relations

The 11th Chaophraya Dialogue was held at a time when despite setbacks and slow movement on some fronts, steady progress was being made in bilateral discussions between India and Pakistan. Several previously unaddressed issues were on the agenda, on which the dialogue hoped to achieve progress. During the discussions, it was agreed that sustainable, if slow and incremental, progress on issues, especially political and economic, was preferable to dramatic shifts in policy on both sides. The importance of the dialogue process itself, suspended after the 26/11 Mumbai attacks and resumed in 2011, was highlighted.

In the discussions on India-Pakistan trade across the Line of Control in Kashmir, participants agreed that this was beneficial to the two countries, in particular for the people of Kashmir. In order to further strengthen trade, it was recommended that branches of Indian and Pakistani banks be opened on both sides of the LoC as that would facilitate people, improve access to goods and services, and thus promote an overall increase in cross-LoC trade. Further opportunities for joint ventures were also discussed.

Looking at trade beyond the LoC was also the main area of convergence between the participants. There was a unanimous consensus regarding the transformative potential of trade in the region, as well as on the commitment that trade should be strengthened to such a level that any incidents cannot be used as an excuse to detail it. Participants suggested following the model used by India and China to facilitate such a situation, describing how Beijing and New Delhi have severe political disagreements and issues, but despite that bilateral relations such as trade continue unhindered. In this context, the continuing impasse over the Most Favoured Nation (MFN) status was also brought up. Pakistan is yet to award India the status despite having committed to do so. While the movement on this matter has been slower than what many had hoped for, participants believed that Pakistan granting MFN status to India would assist economic development on both sides, through the improvement of access to and exchange of previously restricted items easier. The ultimate aim, according to participants from both sides, would be to ensure that a 'nexus' of economic linkages emerges that remains resilient in the face of changing political situations. As some proposed, the entire endeavour of bilateral negotiations should have an economic slant, and both countries should practice a policy of self-enlightened coexistence.

As mentioned earlier, the formal Indo-Pak dialogue was suspended after the Mumbai attacks, and resumed in 2011. Given the shadow cast by the Mumbai attacks on bilateral relations, one objective of the Chaophraya Dialogue was to find a way to rebuild the trust levels that were damaged.

This was also perhaps the area with the most divergence amongst the participants. By and large, the Indian participants felt that if another attack like 26/11 were to take place, progress on bilateral relations may become impossible given the Indian public's perception of Pakistan as an untrustworthy country. In contrast, the Pakistani side pointed out that both countries were victims of terrorism, and that Pakistan neither condoned nor supported terrorism.

Despite their differences, both sides agreed that if another such attack were to happen and caused a suspension of dialogue, any gains made on other fronts like trade would be futile. A contingency plan was proposed to deal with such an event, so that there are options for both countries to discuss and resolve problems.

The session on bilateral relations also looked at pending disputes like Kashmir, Siachen and Sir Creek. On Siachen and Sir Creek, participants said that these were issues that at one point were considered close to resolution, but are now considered among the more complicated bilateral problems.

The final bilateral issue discussed during the session was people-to-people contact and visa regimes. All agreed that there was a need to increase such contacts and bridge the gap that seems to have been widening in recent years between the two peoples. Increasing such contacts would spur cultural exchange, economic development and trade. Most importantly, it would ensure that both sides have a stake in each other's stability. The panel argued that a liberalised visa regime was required, and both New Delhi and Islamabad needed to focus on coming up with strategies that facilitate cross-border interaction. Several topics in this session were the subject of detailed panel discussions of their own during the dialogue.

Sessions II & III

Afghanistan

Afghanistan was a core issue on the agenda for the Chaophraya Dialogue 2012, with both sides highlighting their concerns about the situation. With 2014 approaching - when U.S.-led NATO troops are scheduled to withdraw most combat troops from Afghanistan - the question of Afghan leadership was discussed, especially with reference to how external actors can facilitate this transition. Both sides acknowledged the sovereignty of Afghanistan, stressing that it is the Afghan people that must decide how their country should be governed. However, the importance of peace in Afghanistan to the region - Pakistan and India especially - was highlighted as well.

The participants agreed that the voice of Afghans was being disregarded in discussing the future of the country. There was also a consensus that any one voice, such as those of the Pashtun majority, must not be given precedence. The participants also agreed that Pakistan's restrictive role in Afghanistan and support for the Taliban might not be conducive to a strong and stable Afghanistan. However, the participants disagreed on whether Pakistan is justified in its concerns of Indian encirclement in the region. There were also differing views of whether Afghan stability could be best brought about by building the economy or through securitization. However, all the participants agreed that there was very little time for dialogue given that the US withdrawal was by 2014. Furthermore, this challenge is exacerbated by the fact that Afghan economy and domestic security is so closely intertwined with the US.

In the first session, participants debated the issue of trade and negotiations for Afghanistan's future. Indian speakers pointed out that Pakistan had been hampering Indian efforts to invest in the infrastructural development of Afghanistan. They also responded to Pakistani concerns regarding Indian consulates in Afghanistan by noting that such practices were established diplomatic norms for gathering information in their respective countries, and that they were a natural and necessary presence. In response, Pakistani participants quoted from studies extolling the virtues of greater economic engagement with the Pakistani Pashtun areas of Quetta and Peshawar, and how these could lead to greater Afghan prosperity. They also noted that any future negotiation of the country's politics would require the absence of foreign forces, and greater participation of tribal and female voices.

In the second session, participants focused on greater economic goals for the country and the role of the regional powers in facilitating this. It was pointed out that Afghanistan could serve as a major

energy corridor between Central and South Asia, and such potential could lead to the operationalisation of SAFTA (South Asian Free Trade Agreement) and move towards a regional economic union. The participants also proposed that both India and Pakistan adopt a dual approach towards dealing with Afghanistan – one focused on the three countries themselves, and another that takes in a larger, regional perspective.

Several participants deplored the fact that Afghanistan's economy was still inextricably dependent on foreign aid, and any future plans for prosperity were contingent upon the country's stability. The failure of Afghan President Hamid Karzai's government in maintaining control through out the country was noted as an obstacle towards lasting economic stability.

The participants also looked at who could take responsibility for Afghanistan's affairs after the 2014 withdrawal, and there was considerable debate over the role of Pakistan's armed forces in the country, and whether they could be relied upon to deliver a lasting peace in their manoeuvrings. The discussants concluded that while there were currently no clear indications of where the country's leadership was going to come from, if the Taliban and the Afghan people were to reach an agreement on how to settle the conflict, there should be no interference from another country. It was also recommended that the United Nations dispatch peacekeepers from countries considered neutral, such as South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Burma and Vietnam.

Nuclear

States pursuing nuclear weapons cite various reasons for their programmes - the most important being vulnerability and threat - and consider nuclear weapons to be a deterrent against any conventional aggression. In South Asia, in addition to the many regional complexities, Pakistan and India have an imbalance of conventional forces in the latter's favour, inducing further insecurity in the military establishment of Pakistan.

Transparency, trust building and control were the highlights of the discussion during the session on crisis stability. Both sides agreed that referral to nuclear weapons as an extension of conventional military capability in the media has created a certain level of apathy in both societies. The nuclear conundrum represents a significant existential crisis in South Asia, but the participants noted that its significant dangers and challenges were not being reflected in the discourse on the topic in the respective countries. It was observed that both countries used their nuclear arsenals as a source of national pride – a misguided and ultimately destructive sentiment that needed to be curbed. To this end, the participants were united in their support for public education campaigns about the dangers of nuclear weapons. They pointed out that the public rhetoric was unaware and unable to properly support the needed CBMs (Confidence Building Measures) urgently needed in each respective country. They also agreed on the need to tone down the overall casual nature of the nuclear threat and really understand the severity of these weapons if used. The participants also converged on the need for increased CBMs going forward, particularly those that would survive any potential miscommunications or momentary shocks to the system.

However, there was an intriguing debate on how the two sides could develop further CBMs. Some participants argued that trust was a pre-requisite to any CBMs being planned and implemented. But others contended that the build-up of trust between the two sides would be a consequence, rather than a cause, of institutions and infrastructures devoted to maintaining peace and stability. It was argued that CBMs should be constructed on the basis of self-interest, and once established they would encourage further trust between the two countries, and allow for more comprehensive CBMs to be employed.

There was also a divergence between the participants on the roles of the two countries as nuclear power. The Indian participants noted that while New Delhi's nuclear arsenal served deterrence purposes on several fronts, Pakistan's nuclear weapons and program were completely India-centric.

Similarly, Indian participants expressed their concerns over the fact that the Pakistani army had considerably lower thresholds for deploying nuclear weapons, did not have a clearly defined doctrine or a no first use policy. Moreover, they bemoaned the fact that any progress on trying to implement CBMs in the nuclear standoff was being scuppered by Pakistan's insistence that they be linked with conventional arms reduction.

The Pakistani participants noted that a lack of trust and goodwill had serious implications on any potential progress. Moreover, they recommended that both countries have different levels of nuclear threshold, and that these should be calibrated with respect to each country's strategic needs. There was also an appreciation of the fact that the presence of non-state actors in the security paradigm had considerably worsened any likelihood of progress on the nuclear issue.

Session IV

Crisis Stability

States pursuing nuclear weapons cite various reasons for their programmes, the most important being vulnerability and threat, and consider nuclear weapons to be a deterrent against any conventional aggression. In South Asia, in addition to the many regional complexities, Pakistan and India have an imbalance of conventional forces in the latter's favour, inducing further insecurity in the military establishment of Pakistan.

As all the participants agreed, India and Pakistan both understand that their nuclear arsenals are for deterrence only. At the doctrinal level, however there are differences between the two countries. Discussants concurred that for Pakistan, its nuclear capability is an extension of conventional military capability, whereas for India, nuclear weapons are only deterrents. In that regard, Pakistan's nuclear threshold is considered low. In this scenario, the introduction of tactical nuclear weapons complicates the way nuclear weapons can be used. A tactical nuclear weapon further lowers the threshold, potentially affecting crisis stability. The participants noted that remaining engaged in a nuclear arms race with increasing number of both strategic and tactical nuclear weapons places the whole region in a position where the only beneficiaries are non-state actors and terrorists.

Transparency, trust building and control were the highlights of the discussion during the session on crisis stability. Both sides agreed that referral to nuclear weapons as an extension of conventional military capability in the media has created a certain level of apathy in both societies. Participants from both sides noted that the narrative in India and Pakistan keeps promoting nuclear weapons as a source of national pride, without giving due consideration to their destructive capability. National education programmes are needed to create awareness about the gravity of nuclear war, and why Pakistan and India do not need to resort to this weapon to resolve conflicts. Both sides are well aware of each other's capability, doctrine, and threshold, hence the need for trust building and timely communications. Issues such as the continued production of fissile material or the number of weapons both sides need, should be transparent and communicated to each other.

Safekeeping of fissile material and the storage of nuclear material have remained serious issues in both countries. The authorities in Pakistan and India realise that fissile material in the hands of non-state actors and terrorists bent on causing mass destruction will be catastrophic for the whole region, and have invested in infrastructures sturdy enough to withstand natural disasters or sabotage. Pakistan's Strategic Plans Division along with Pakistan's Nuclear Regulatory Authority and India's Atomic Energy Regulatory Board along with the Nuclear Command Authority have been entrusted with keeping the civilian and military nuclear infrastructure robust and safe.

The discussion also conceded that over the years, the leaders and decision makers in India and Pakistan have consistently shown maturity and level-headedness even in times of crisis. Discussants agreed that Confidence Building Measures are the best way to create the environment necessary for keeping lines of communication open, especially after events like 26/11, when public anger can place the national leaders in difficult positions.

Ultimately, various people observed that both governments may work on eliminating terrorists or start negotiating with them, but there will always be the possibility of terrorist attacks. Bilateral relations cannot remain hostage to terrorist activities. The two governments attempted to alleviate each other's legitimate concerns with a declaration at the end of a SAARC Summit in 2004 in Lahore, and agreed that to sustain the dialogue it is important to prevent terrorism, hostility and violence. A step further in the same direction, India and Pakistan set up a nuclear hotline on Sunday, June 20, 2004. The hotline was set up with the assistance of United States military officers, with the aim of keeping a line of communication open at all times. At the end, the participants agreed on the need for both sides to invest in Confidence Building Measures which can address the contingencies that may potentially lead to nuclear escalation in the future.

Session V

Trade

The importance of collaborative economic activity between India and Pakistan cannot be underestimated. It can potentially help restructure their economies and increase trade. Over the years, trade is one of the most important factors that can, and has, lead to the normalisation of relations between India and Pakistan. Both countries agree that this needs to increase substantially. The economic managers in Pakistan, more than in India, need to capitalise on the regional dynamics of South Asia. Over a billion people stand to benefit from intra-regional trade, either as buyers or sellers, making the growth potential 8 percent for Pakistan.

The participants undertook an exhaustive review of the current situation, and noted that at present the number of items on the trade list was limited, and restricted buyers and sellers from both sides. Participants felt that any potential increase in trade was directly linked to facilitation of the banking sector, by allowing banks to open branches in multiple cities of India and Pakistan. Expanding banking infrastructure was also given as the solution to the problems associated with intra-region trade, such as currency exchange and barter.

The issue of the MFN came up once more, and the debate acknowledged the fact that India had granted MFN status to Pakistan several years ago, but despite that trade remained below potential. There was a general agreement that if Pakistan were to finally decide upon returning the favour, it could dramatically transform the economic relationship between the neighbours. Such gains could be further enhanced with the exchange of skills, human resources, services like healthcare and tourism, and investment in other sectors. The participants from Pakistan did point out though that their country expected that once it were to grant the MFN status to India, New Delhi would reciprocate with the removal of para-tariff and non-tariff barriers.

There were few divergences amongst the participants on these matters, but several concerns were brought up. On the Indian side, for example, there are concerns about losing comparative advantage in some sectors, and for some goods, once prices are lowered. Similarly, Pakistani businesses could fear being swamped by cheaper Indian products, leading to further resentment against trade relations. While the panellists acknowledged the legitimacy of concerns on both sides, they arrived at a consensus to let trade progress regardless of the current balance of trade. It was argued that if trade between the two would be initially in India's favour, as it is the bigger exporter, it will eventually benefit Pakistan in terms of skills-transfer and improved variety of goods available to its consumers.

It was also proposed that optimistically speaking, intra-region trade regulated by the MFN status could lead to a free trade zone agreement at some point in the future. For that to happen, the participants admitted India and Pakistan would have to work on improving the level of trust between them, since misgivings exist on both sides about each other's intentions.

Another aspect of intra-region trade that requires special attention is the opening of multiple trade routes. Many participants observed that there was tremendous potential for development for countries involved in intra-region trade, as their geographical proximity provides certain benefits, and helps achieve economies of scale. Indian goods reaching Afghanistan through Pakistan is a possibility, and this could help to improve Afghanistan's economic situation by providing transport and banking facilities, which go hand in hand with increased trade. In the textile sector, India has a comparative advantage in cotton craft, while Pakistan has an advantage in yarn and Bangladesh in textiles. Participants were therefore confident that well-managed trade policies would lead to mutual benefit for all concerned.

The participants further stressed that eventually, liberalised intra-region trade was bound to alleviate poverty in South Asia. They pointed to the example of China's trade-led model, which helped pull many people out of poverty. Pakistan and India could hope for the same as it would help increase people-to-people contact and reduce mistrust.

That being said, the panellists agreed that several hurdles might impede progress. Bureaucratic inertia and red-tape confusions exist at almost all levels in India and Pakistan. Moreover, several participants pointed out the existence of certain lobbies which continue to benefit from preventing liberalised trade. It was proposed that such industries are included in the process so that their interests can be dealt with as well.

Eventually, the participants conceded that all issues of trade were currently enmeshed into the security and political paradigms. Pakistani participants exhorted that the governments, especially India, will have to look beyond 26/11, and let it not cloud the judgement of their policy makers. Their Indian counterparts also noted that any progress on the issue of trade now lay in Pakistan's court, which had the potential and need to move forward both on the issue of trade, as well as the security and political factors that ended up determining its health.

Session VI

People-to-People Contacts

In recent years, the initiative for increased people-to-people contact has gained national as well as international recognition. It is one of the ways to reduce, and ultimately eliminate, the trust deficit that exists between India and Pakistan. The reality is that people on both sides of the border want to know more about each other. This genuine interest has made it possible for the civil society in both countries to overcome existing hurdles and create more opportunities to invite and visit both countries. This fact was highlighted in the eleventh round of the Chaophraya Dialogue, which has enabled the two sides to meet face-to-face and formulate solutions to bilateral issues.

The first observation made by all the participants, particularly in light of their attendance at the dialogues, was to acknowledge that the role played by the civil society, in creating peace and stability in the region was significant. Panellists praised civil society efforts in influencing their respective governments, urging them to set aside rhetoric, and getting them to look at issues like visa regimes and trade from the perspective of people on both sides of the border. There was a broad consensus that the success of Track II diplomacy can also be attributed to the robust and enthusiastic civil society in India and Pakistan, which stayed on track even when formal channels of diplomacy were shut down during crises.

Other participants noted that the impact of civil society could also be gauged from the fact that the jingoistic rhetoric of politicians on both sides, which had existed during the election campaigns during the 80s and 90s, had now been replaced by more realistic approaches in India and Pakistan. Today, as some pointed out, no Pakistani leader can hope to have a large vote bank solely based on India-centric rhetoric.

Other areas of convergence for the participants included many of the topics that were previously discussed as being essential to facilitating and furthering people-to-people contact. These included stronger trade relations, simpler visa processes, and improvement of access and travel across the LoC, particularly for Kashmiris on both sides of the border.

With regards to travel, panellists from both sides recognised that the hurdles in place for acquiring visas to visit India and Pakistan were at times ineffective and absurd. They also observed that many of the requirements expected of travelers after acquiring visas, such as police reporting and applications, had not been effective when it comes to the prevention of terrorism. Keeping in view

that some perceptions may not be baseless, there were several suggestions from the participants to at least soften visa regulations for students, accredited journalists, accredited tour operators from both sides, and people who have family members in both countries.

The participants also discussed the plight of fishermen and people languishing in the jails of India and Pakistan for overstaying their visas. They stressed that this issue needed to be taken up by the respective governments on a humanitarian basis. Although, as some participants observed, both governments release imprisoned fishermen on a somewhat regular basis, they stressed that the practice of arresting these people and keeping them imprisoned for long periods of time needs to be reviewed.

Education exchange was another sector pointed out by the panellists where Pakistan and India could have a mutually beneficial and long-term relationship, leading to sustained peace and stability. It was noted that both countries have an untapped majority of young people that aspire to see their region economically and socially developed, and are willing to work for this goal. It was also pointed out that the South Asian University was an excellent opportunity for both sides to exchange students and teachers. It was further proposed that India and Pakistan could have campuses in different cities, and could sponsor students who would act as peace-builders in future.

The main area of divergence in this, as in several other sessions, was on the fallout of any potential future terrorist attacks. While both sides were adamant that a terrorist incident like 26/11 was condemnable, there were some who argued that such incidents should not become a basis for creating hurdles for genuine visitors. It was argued that Pakistan had suffered from terrorism too and there was no popular support for militants in the country. However, others responded that the responsibility for creating the awareness that Ajmal Kasab and his like do not enjoy broad based support from the people of Pakistan fell on the media and the civil society, and such perceptions of militant support in Pakistan had not been assuaged in Indian minds.

Building on this discussion, the participants also debated the role of media. It was pointed out that by and large, the flow and control of information, and the formulation and propagation of narratives in both countries was in the hands of the media, which in turn was controlled by the establishment. The panellists suggested the need for an open-minded media which has the capacity and motivation to reach out within the country and across the border, and change the perception of masses. They also stressed that it was important to provide an enabling environment to journalists, allowing them to reach out to those who are in inaccessible areas, such as Kashmir.

Joint Statement

Chaophraya Dialogue 11
Bangkok, Thailand

Afghanistan

- They expressed solidarity and sympathy with the long suffering Afghan people and recommended that any solution should respect the territorial integrity of Afghanistan;
- They asserted that the conflict in Afghanistan does not have a military solution and has to be resolved politically;
- They recommended that any resolution of the conflict should satisfy the aspirations of all the segments of the population in the country and that it should be led by Afghans themselves;
- They reiterated that all countries should commit themselves to non-interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and that Afghanistan's soil should not be used for actions prejudicial to peace and security in any country;
- They recommended that conditions be created inside Afghanistan that enable all Afghan refugees living outside Afghanistan to return to their home country;
- They recommended that pledges made by the international community at various fora need to be fulfilled to support Afghanistan's rehabilitation and economic development;
- They recommended that India and Pakistan engage in a frank bilateral discussion on their roles in the stability and progress of Afghanistan;
- They recommended that India and Pakistan should explore the possibility of undertaking joint projects in Afghanistan on Information Technology, training and education, telecommunication, healthcare, agriculture, capacity building, etc.;
- They emphasised the vision of Afghanistan being a the gateway for trade and commerce between South and Central Asia and strongly urged India and Pakistan to work towards realising this vision;

Conflict Prevention : Crisis Stability

- They encouraged transparency in strategic nuclear matters;
- They urged that India and Pakistan should discuss the structure and growth of their nuclear arsenals;
- They recommended that nuclear arms control as a means of enhancing understanding, security, stability and the consequent need for verification should be taken up;
- They felt there was a need to define credible minimum nuclear deterrence;
- They identified the need to discuss measures that prevent the pre-delegation of nuclear launch authority;
- They urged that contingencies that potentially lead to nuclear escalation should be addressed;
- They urged that India and Pakistan should refrain from missile testing during periods of tension;
- They emphasised that measures be taken that can prevent radioactive material from falling into the wrong hands.

Conflict Prevention : Trade

- They noted the headway India and Pakistan have recently made on bilateral trade and economic relations and recommended that Pakistan should grant and operationalise the MFN status to India;
- They recommended that a mechanism for resolution of bilateral trade disputes/grievances be created that includes private sector participation from Pakistan and India. Further, both countries should develop the capacity for evidence based dispute resolution;
- They recommended an improvement in trade related infrastructure through opening up of more trade routes such as Khokrapar-Munnabao, greater facilities at Wagha-Attari Integrated Check Posts with an increased capacity to handle more trucks at Wagha. Moreover, cross-LoC trade should be enhanced;
- They recommended that bilateral trade should be facilitated by availability of banking services and the existing agreement on opening bank branches should be expeditiously operationalised;
- In the area of services, they recommended the following:
 1. Group tourism through accredited travel agents should be facilitated immediately;
 2. Students from India and Pakistan should be encouraged to study in each other's educational institutions;

Conference Delegates India



Prof. Amitabh Mattoo

Professor Mattoo is Director of the Australia India Institute and a Professor of International Relations at the University of Melbourne. He concurrently serves as Professor of Disarmament Studies at the Centre for International Politics, Organisation and Disarmament at New Delhi's Jawaharlal Nehru University. Professor Mattoo has been a Member of the National Knowledge Commission, a high-level advisory group to the Prime Minister of India and the National Jammu Security Council's Advisory Board. He was the Vice-Chancellor of the University from 2002-2008. He received his Doctorate from the University of Oxford and has been a visiting Professor at Stanford University, the University of Notre Dame, the University of Illinois and the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme in Paris. He was awarded the *Padma Shri*, one of India's highest civilian awards, for his contribution to education and public life.



Nirupama Subramanian

Nirupama Subramanian was the correspondent of The Hindu in Pakistan from May 2006 to February 2010, winning two prestigious awards in Indian journalism for her coverage. She is now Associate Editor at the newspaper, based at its main office in Chennai, India. In a career spanning 25 years in print journalism, Nirupama worked at the Times of India, The Indian Express, Sunday Observer and India Today before joining The Hindu in 2000. From 2000-2002, she was based in Colombo as the newspaper's Sri Lanka correspondent. As Nieman Fellow (2003) at Harvard University, she wrote *Sri Lanka: Voices from a War Zone* (Penguin 2005), a book based on her reportage of the conflict in that country from 1996. Nirupama is an alumna of the Delhi School of Economics, Delhi University, and St. Xavier's College, Mumbai.



Amb. Gopaldaswami Parthasarathy

Ambassador Gopaldaswami Parthasarathy is a career Foreign Service Officer who retired from Service on May 31, 2000. He has served as Ambassador of India to Myanmar (1992-1995), High Commissioner of India to Australia (1995-1998), High Commissioner of India to Pakistan (1998-2000) and High Commissioner of India to Cyprus (1990-1992). He has also served additional positions in the Ministry of External Affairs and the Prime Minister's Office,

India. Mr. Parthasarathy is presently Visiting Professor in the Centre for Policy Research in New Delhi, a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies and a member of the Executive Committee of the Centre for Air Power Studies in New Delhi. He is also a member of the Indian Delegation to the high level Indo-U.S. Strategic Dialogue organized by the Confederation of Indian Industries and the Aspen Institute in the USA. He was a member of the high level Task Force set up by the Government in 2011 to Review National Security Structures in India.



Dr. Ajay Darshan Behera

Dr. Ajay Darshan Behera is Associate Professor at the Academy of International Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi. He is also the Coordinator of the Pakistan Studies Programme at the Academy. His main areas of research interest are foreign policy and security issues in South Asia, Political Violence, Insurgency and Terrorism, Conflicts and Conflict Management, India's Foreign

Policy, Political Development and Foreign Policy of Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Prior to joining the Academy of International Studies, he was the Officiating Director of the Centre for Strategic and Regional Studies, University of Jammu, Jammu. He was the recipient of the 1996 Kodikara Award instituted by the Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Colombo. Mr. Ajay Darshan Behera has also been a visiting fellow at the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. (October 2001-June 2002) and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA (September 1997-January 1998).



Dr. Happymon Jacob

Dr. Happymon Jacob is Assistant Professor of Diplomacy and Disarmament at the Centre for International Politics, Disarmament and Organisation, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi where he teaches courses on 'India & Disarmament', 'National Security & International Relations' and, 'Foreign Policy Decision Making'. His current research is focused

on South Asian nuclear order and India's foreign policy. Prior to joining JNU in 2008, he held teaching positions at the University of Jammu in J&K and the Jamia Millia Islamia University in New Delhi and research positions at the Centre for Air Power Studies, Delhi Policy Group and Observer Research Foundation, all based in New Delhi. He is the author and editor of four books.



Dr. Mallika Joseph

Dr. Mallika Joseph is presently Executive Director at the Regional Centre for Strategic Studies. Prior to her appointment at RCSS in 2012, she was the Director of the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies. She holds a PhD from Jawaharlal Nehru University on international relations and specializes on security sector reform, human security, left extremism, small arms, landmines

and small arms and improvised explosive devices. In 2011, she was based in Geneva with the International Security Sector Advisory Team. In 2009, she was inducted into the UN roster of SSR experts and also received the Chevening Fellowship to undergo three months training on tackling transnational organised crime. In 2006 and in 2007, she was part of the high-level DFID technical team that offered consultancy for broad based security sector engagement in Guyana.

Mr. Baijayant "Jay" Panda



Baijayant "Jay" Panda was elected to the Parliament of India, Lower House (Lok Sabha) from Kendrapara Constituency, Odisha in May 2009. Earlier, he had twice been elected to Parliament, Upper House (Rajya Sabha) in 2000 and 2006, also from the State of Odisha. He is a member of the Biju Janata Dal (BJD) party. Panda graduated from the Michigan Technological University and, with a

background in Engineering and Management, worked in the corporate sector before joining politics. Panda had helped to form the Young Parliamentarians Forum (YPF) and was its Convener; he has also been associated with the India-USA Forum of Parliamentarians and is its Chairman. He was awarded the 'Bharat Asmita National Award' for best parliamentary practices by the Hon'ble Chief Justice of India in 2008. He frequently participates in national television discussions and writes op-ed pieces in newspapers.



Mr. M. K. Venu

Mr. M.K. Venu is currently working as Managing Editor of The Financial Express with over 10 editions across the country. He is in-charge of the overall editorial management and other administrative aspects of the newspaper. Previously he worked as Opinion Editor, The Economic Times. Prior to this he worked as Chief Editor, News with The Economic Times. Earlier, he also worked for other prestigious national newspapers such as Hindustan Times and Times of India Group, Business Standard, The Statesman and Patriot and has completed 28 years in journalism. He has written a lot on India's dynamic role at the WTO as also its quest to become part of regional trade blocs such as ASEAN and East Asian Summit. He attended a specially designed workshop by the WTO headquarters at Geneva and does regular economic policy related discussions on national television channels. Mr. Venu was part of an Indian delegation to China in 2005 to discuss larger energy cooperation between the two most populous countries. He has traveled to Japan, East Asia, China, Europe and Australia.



Amb. Vivek Katju

Ambassador Vivek Katju joined the Indian Foreign Service in 1975. He served in Indian Missions in Cairo, Abu Dhabi, Washington DC, Suva, and Kuala Lumpur. Amb. Katju was the ambassador of India to Myanmar, Afghanistan and Thailand. During his long and distinguished career, he served in various positions in the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, as Joint Secretary (Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan), Additional Secretary, Special Secretary (Political and International Organisations) and as Secretary (West). Mr. Katju retired from service in August 2011.



Prof. Ila Patnaik

Ila Patnaik is a Professor at the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy. She studied Economics in Delhi University and JNU, and holds a PhD from the University of Surrey, UK. Her research papers focus on subjects in open economy macroeconomics, especially issues related to capital flows and emerging economy business cycles. At NIPFP her work is related to policy issues faced by the Indian economy as the economy globalises. She is presently working on providing research support to GOI's Financial Sector Legislative Reforms Commission. Prof. Patnaik is also a regular columnist with the Indian Express and has hosted a policy oriented TV show on NDTV Profit.



Vice Admiral (Retd.) Vijay Shankar

Vice Admiral (Retd.) Vijay Shankar PVSM, AVSM, holds an MSc. in Defence Studies and is a graduate of the Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, USA. He is the former Commander-in-Chief of the Andaman & Nicobar Command, Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Forces Command and Flag Officer Commanding Western Fleet. His command and operational experience are comprehensive and include command of INS Viraat, the aircraft carrier, and

active service during the 1971 war against Pakistan, Op Pawan (the IPKF operations in Sri Lanka) and Op Vijay (operations to vacate the Kargil intrusion.)

The Admiral retired on 30 September 2009, after nearly 45 years in uniform. He contributes to various professional journals and continues to support his Alma Mater in Kochi through his writings. He has lectured at the Staff College, Higher Command College, the United Services Institute and the National Maritime Foundation. He is a member of the adjunct faculty of the National Institute of Advanced Studies and has tenanted the Admiral Katari Chair of Excellence at the United Services Institute. Internationally, his participation in the Track II Ottawa Dialogue, the Bellagio Carnegie Endowment discussions, the Indo-Sino-Pak trilateral dialogue and the papers he has presented seek to provide a new paradigm for nuclear security in the sub-continent.



Mr. Raashid Alvi

Raashid Alvi was a member of Rajya Sabha from the Congress Party. His term of membership from Andhra Pradesh was completed in 2012. He is also an official spokesperson of the Congress Party. Mr. Alvi is renowned public speaker and studied B.Sc., LL.B. and educated at KGK College, Moradabad (Uttar Pradesh). He practiced Law and was an Advocate of the Supreme Court. Before joining the Congress Party, Rashid Alvi was an important leader of Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP). During his term as an MP of Rajya Sabha, he served in various Parliamentary Committees including the House Committee, Official Language Committee, Joint Parliamentary Committee on Stock Market Scam, Committee on Installation of Portraits/Statues of National Leaders and Parliamentarians in Parliament House Complex, Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS), etc. He is also a member of the Supreme Court Bar Association.

Conference Delegates Pakistan



Amb. Aziz Ahmad Khan

Ambassador Aziz Ahmad Khan has had a long and distinguished career in the Pakistan Foreign Service with which he has been affiliated since 1969. He has served in various professional capacities in Pakistani Missions abroad, such as Buenos Aires, Brasillia, Maputo, Vienna and Lisbon. He has also served as the deputy Chief of Mission at New Delhi and as the Consul General at Los Angeles.

In addition, he has served as High Commissioner to Malaysia (1995-1996), as Ambassador to Afghanistan (1996-2000), as Additional Foreign Secretary (2000-2002), as Spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2001-2003), and as Director General of Foreign Service Academy (2002-2003). More recently, he held the position of High Commissioner to India (2003-2006) and as a consultant at the National Defence University, Islamabad (2007-2008). He is also the Hon. Vice President of Jinnah Institute.



Lt. Gen (retd.) Talat Masood

Lt. General (retired) Talat Masood served in the Pakistani Army for 39 years retiring in 1990 as Secretary for Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence. Prior to this, Lt. Gen. Masood was Chairman and Chief Executive of the Pakistan Ordinance Factories Board. He is a graduate of the Pakistan Command and Staff College and the National Defence College of the Armed Forces. He holds a

Bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering and a Master's degree in Defence and Strategic Studies. He is a frequent participant and speaker in international conferences and writes regularly on security and political issues in national news papers and foreign magazines.



Dr. Ijaz Nabi

Dr. Ijaz Nabi is Sector Manager, Economic Policy, for the World Bank's South Asia Region. He joined the Bank in 1986 in the research complex, and later moved to operation as Senior Country Economist for Mexico and later Malaysia. During 1994-1997, while on leave from the Bank, Dr. Nabi was a Visiting Professor at Lahore University of Management Sciences, and later, Advisor to the Government of Pakistan on trade policy. He returned to the Bank in 1997 at the

height of East Asia's financial crisis, and as Lead Economist, led the Bank's team that helped stabilize and restructure Thailand's Economy. Dr. Nabi has published extensively on finance, trade policy, competitiveness, growth and rural development. Dr. Nabi was educated at the London School of

Economics, received his PhD from Warwick University, UK and was a post-doctoral fellow at Yale University.



Marvi Sirmed

Marvi Sirmed is a leading human rights activist and has written extensively on the rights of persecuted minorities, governance, distortion of history in Pakistan's text-books, counter-terrorism and de-radicalization. She has been part of powerful movements for women's rights and for the restoration of democracy in Pakistan since last twenty years. As part of Pakistan-India People's Forum and Women's Initiative for Peace in South Asia, she has actively taken part in struggle for peace between the two countries. She is an MPhil candidate in International Relations with dissertation on countering globalisation of terrorism. Currently, she is heading a parliamentary support program, which seeks to institutionally strengthen the Parliament of Pakistan and build the capacity of its officials and members.

She is a member of Women's Action Forum (WAF), Insaani Haqooq Ittehad (Coalition for Human Rights), Pakistan Coalition for Education and is on the Board of several non-profit organizations working for human rights, social development and democratic governance. Recognizing her services for democracy and human rights, the President of Pakistan conferred upon her National Human Rights Award in 2010.



Amb. Rustam Shah Mohmand

Ambassador Mohmand is currently in the Board of Directors of Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency and the Institute of Policy Studies. Prior to this he has been affiliated with the Civil Services of Pakistan and hails from a tribal background. He served as the Commissioner for Afghan Refugees in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa from 1983-1985 and then again from 1992-1996. From 1989-1991, Mr. Mohmand was appointed as Home Secretary KPK, following which he assumed the role of Chief Secretary for the province (1997-1998). He was appointed as the Interior Secretary of Pakistan in 1999 and has also served as Pakistan's Ambassador to Afghanistan (2002-2005). Upon retirement, Amb. Rustam Shah Mohmand gained experience as a consultant to Pak-Afghan peace commission and has worked as a consultant for UNHCR (2008-2010).



Saleem Safi

Mr. Saleem Safi started his career as a reporter for NNI (News Network International) in Mardan and quickly rose to the post of Bureau Chief of NNI in Peshawar. As Bureau Chief he was covering all of Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa, FATA and Afghanistan. Saleem's columns in Daily Mashriq, Daily Aaj and Daily Pakistan were widely read. In 2004, Saleem's first book, *Afghanistan: The Role of US, Taliban and Pakistani Religious Parties*, received widespread acclaim and he became a successful author. He is in the process of writing his second book. Mr. Saleem forayed into electronic media following the media boom in Pakistan. He hosted his own prime time Pushto talk show 'Jirga' from PTV Peshawar (2002 to 2004). Mr. Saleem Safi was also a host of a talk show 'Siyasat' (2007-2008). At the end of 2008, he joined Pakistan's largest media group Jang and Geo TV as an anchor, columnist and analyst and is currently hosting a show by the name of 'Jirga', in addition to writing for The News and Jang.



Mehreen Zahra-Malik

Mehreen Zahra-Malik is a prominent journalist who has worked as Assistant Editor, *The News International* — Pakistan's largest English language daily. Since October 2012, she has joined *Reuters* as a correspondent covering Pakistan and Afghanistan. Previously, Mehreen worked as News Editor for *The Friday Times*. She holds a Masters degree in Political Science and is currently on sabbatical after completing four years of her PhD (University of Wisconsin, Madison). She writes a weekly column for *The News International*, while her work has also been published in *Newsweek*, *Al Jazeera English*, *Express Tribune*, *Indian Express*, *Tehelka*, and several other international newspapers.



Dr. Zafar Iqbal Cheema

Professor Zafar Iqbal Cheema is the founding Faculty member of the Department of Defence & Strategic Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. Dr. Cheema specializes in nuclear proliferation with special reference to South Asia, Indian nuclear strategy, theories of International Relations, arms control and disarmament, strategic analysis of the Afghan conflict, technology and warfare.

Dr. Cheema has written extensively on a wide range of issues related to Pakistani security and has participated in many notable international conferences. His publications include '*Pakistan's Nuclear Use Doctrine & Command and Control*,' in *Planning the Unthinkable: How New Powers Will Use Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Weapons* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), '*Pakistan's Nuclear Policy under Z. A. Bhutto and Zia-ul-Haq: An Assessment*,' *Strategic Studies* 15 (Summer 1992). His most recent publication is titled '*Indian Nuclear Deterrence: Its Evolution, Development and Implications for South Asian Security*'.



Amb. Ayaz Wazir

Ambassador Ayaz Wazir joined the Foreign Service of Pakistan in 1974 and has served as Director General for Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey and Central Asia Republics during his tenure. From 1997 to 2000 he was part of the four member mission engaged in shuttle diplomacy between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance. He has also represented Pakistan in a meeting with the UN Secretary General in New York in October 2000 to present the progress achieved by the

Committee of OIC on Afghanistan.

Amb. Wazir frequently writes for *The News International* and *Express Tribune* in addition to speaking at several national and international conferences.



Dr. Aisha Ghaus Pasha

Dr. Aisha Ghaus Pasha has over 25 years of experience in teaching, undertaking research in macro-economics, social policy and development, governance, public finance and urban & regional economics and in advocacy work on social and economic issues. She has a PhD from the University of Leeds, United Kingdom. She is currently the Director of the Institute of Public Policy (October 2009 to date), Beaconhouse National University, Lahore. Previously she served as the Deputy/ Acting Managing Director of the Social Policy and Development

Centre, Karachi.

Dr. Pasha has undertaken consulting assignments for a number of international multilateral and bilateral agencies like UNDESA, UNDP, The World Bank, The Asian Development Bank, Canadian

International Development Agency (CIDA) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). She has published over 75 publications to her name including books, journal articles and reports. Her most recent publication is The State of the Economy: The Punjab Story, Fifth Annual Report, Institute of Public Policy, Beaconhouse National University, (2012).



Hameedullah Jan Afridi

Hameed Ullah Jan Afridi was born in Khyber Agency. He got his early education in Islamabad while he did graduation from Punjab University and Master Degree in Business Administration. He worked as Executive Officer in Oil Marketing Company for 9 years in different areas of the country. He worked as social worker and remained with National Rural Support Programme (NRSP) for social mobilization, poverty alleviation through community participation in rural areas of Pakistan. He established (FRSP) FATA Rural Support Programme on the pattern of NRSP to improve the living standards of the people of FATA. He was elected as member to the Senate, Upper House of parliament, in February 2003. He was Chairman of Senate Standing Committee on States and Frontier Region Division (SAFRON). He was also a member of the Senate Committees on Interior, Commerce, Human Rights and Population Planning. He contested the general election 2008 and was elected as an MNA from NA- 46 Khyber Agency, FATA as an independent candidate. He served as the Federal Minister for Environment from 2008-2011. Since 2011, he has served as Chairman, Intellectual Property Organization, Cabinet Division, Government of Pakistan and was elected as Convener of Pakistan & Brazil Friendship Committee, National Assembly of Pakistan earlier this year.





Email: info@jinnah-institute.com
www.jinnah-institute.com