

MEND TIES-LOVE NOT HATE THY NEIGHBOUR CHANGING PERSPECTIVE ON INDO PAKISTAN RELATIONS

NEELAM BHARDWAJ

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, D.A.V. College Malout

ABSTRACT

It is stark reality that the aftermath of partition has forced India to manage relations with its troublesome neighbor, Pakistan that has constantly weighed its tacit power to sponsor and deepen animosity, hostility and confrontation towards India on one pretext or another. This paper will reveal the present scenario of mutual mistrust between two countries that can further harm the mutual agreeable interests of both.

Kashmir remains a casus belli although General Musharraf remarked that Kashmir solution is no guarantee of peace with India which may have to face many more Kashmirs. On the contrary, Mr. Jinnah even after the partition hoped that India and Pakistan cannot remain permanent enemies and envisioned that both the countries must enter into an association similar to USA and Canada that will permit the two neighbors to work upon shared defense, free trade, unguarded borders and freedom of movement through several crossing points. As far as Gandhiji is concerned he mooted on different premises and negated the malevolent idea that of religion as the lynchpin of nationality because perpetual antagonism can end in permanent enmity. He had cautioned these two nations born out of agreed separation between brothers had to live as friends or die as such. This vision of permanent enmity or friendship at both ends has mired the holistic development thereby failing to sustain an expansive vision of peaceful coexistence of our forefathers.

Keywords: Partition, Hostility Kashmir, soft Borders.

INTRODUCTION

In International relations neighborly peace is a prerequisite as war like strategy cannot pave the path of progress. Tranquility outside is more important than peace at home. Until 1951 when Pakistan formalized its citizenship law Muslims from India travel back and forth in search of better future. But the military coup and capturing power by Ayyub Khan transformed the nature of ties between these two countries. This political event exalted the role of army as the institution to fix and place India and promoted Pakistan's national interest thwarting the folly of war.

Nehru in his speech at Aligarh Muslim University in Jan. 1948 reassured Pakistan that **India will never question the Pakistan right to exist as a separate country**, if today by any chance I were

offered the reunion of India and Pakistan he said he would decline this arrangement due to certain obvious reasons. He further steered that any closer association must come out of a normal process and in a friendly manner which does not end Pakistan as a state but makes it an equal part of alarmed union in which several countries might be associated. **"Jinnah also envisaged that both the countries can develop closer ties while maintaining separate identity."**

But the reference of shared culture and history is colored with suspicion, mistrust of years by Pakistan as if it will sound the death knell of Pakistan as a different state. It started the blame story against India of declaring partition as temporary solution and this would result into a disfigured Pakistan. And their apprehension proved true after the formation of Bangladesh and this exacerbated the issue why both these countries cannot be just friends as remarked by Hussain Haqqani in his book India Pakistan why can't we just be friends

Nehru said, "What ever happened, the two countries would have to time together." This was Nehru's vision that the two would live in amity but terror tactics has become the most insidious threat for the theory of existentialism.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:

- 1) To reexamine the thought process after partition.
- 2) To analyze the role of army in disruption of normal ties.
- 3) To critically observe the role of political establishment in promotion of peace.
- 4) To underline Kashmir imbroglio in this hostility.
- 5) To expose the framed myth of decimating identity of Pakistan.
- 6) To examine psyche of Pakistani civil society in establishing permanent peace in the area.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

As India and Pakistan relations have undergone vicissitudes and touched its nadir due to policy of tacit provocation of terrorism in India. The unresolved tinderbox like situation has ended the relationship in animosity but positive bilateral cooperation is in the interest of both sides. Restoration of peace remained cloaked in dishonesty as after Mumbai attack it was suggested to sever ties that is constantly conspiring against us but still Indian establishment pursued the policy of talk because "not talking is not much of a policy because India cannot change its geography though Pakistan can deny its shared history. V.P. Singh Former Indian Prime Minister affirmed after the dismissal of Bhutto govt. that it will continue to build a relationship of cooperation with Pakistan despite severe provocations."

Full-fledged armed conflict with India was never a part of its strategy it only wanted to weaken India by waging low intensity Conflict. But from Indian perspective "It was a proxy war."

As Narsimha Rao Former Indian Prime Ministersaid in meeting of National Integration council, "I would say there is nothing like a foreign hand. It is a whole government, whole state involved in creating disturbances in the two border states." ShyamSaran in his book how India sees the world ,India is an opportunity and not a threat.As it is in India interest not to volatile both the borders Sham saran said.

In 2002 AR Siddiqi in his article Conflict resolution in South Asia expressed, "I remain firmly of the opinion that while staying within their international borders India and Pakistan, would one day make two ideal neighbors and excellent friends. ".

Benazir Bhutto also wrote in US daily Miami Herald regretted her policy of Kashmir that held intoPakistan relations hostage and actually fed the tensions She conceded that the Indian stand that Kashmir need not come in the way of normalization of relations was correct. For fifty years we in Pakistan thought that Kashmir had to be resolved before any normalization could occur between the two great powers on the subcontinent added that that approach may have been self-defeating. She highlighted the plan that Kashmir should have open and porous borders.

At Davis on February 2,1992 the PM reiterated their resolve to find a solution to their outstanding problems through dialogue so that they could direct their energy towards economic development. "But Pakistan considered it India's Pavlovian response"

Pakistan Air force chief Air Marshal Zadar Chaudhary explained, 'while we may not be able to touch India, s far west but we would be undergoing much greater destruction than our neighbors because of lack of depth. ".....Will it be a consolation for us that we have killed while risking our own existence?"

Leadership of Pakistan should consider the long-term interests of the two neighbors and shunted unfriendly moves. We need to chalk out a way to determine the right force levels at the borders consistent with the defense needs of either country. The positive bilateral approach should not be violated by constant vituperative denunciation

As Pakistan foreign secretary Shahryar khan when said, "normalization of relations couldn't be achieved overnight but there was need to make a positive movement forward." Kashmir is a factor in Pakistan domestic politics and Sharif had charged Bhutto for selling the Kashmir cause."

Nur Khan another former Air chief speaking at a forum organized by newspaper Nation on 17th August 1994 said, "Our armed forces are not in a position to sustain a war with India even for a short period owing to the defense gap between the two states which has widened substantially definitely in favor of India. "He pleaded for concentration on economic development."

Sir Syed Ahmad khan in January 1883 delivered a speech in Patna "To be a Hindu or Muslim is a matter of internal faith which has nothing to do with mutual relationship."

Shashi Tharoor in his Pax Indica, “talking can help in identifying and narrowing the differences between our countries which are less complicated while keeping the spirit of dialogue alive.” Indo Pakistan relations are facing the wrath of time. For the past seven decades India and Pakistan haven't been the best of neighbor. Instead, we have fought three wars and Pakistan constantly indulged in proxy wars to weaken India. Different issues have been unearthed such as identity crisis, Kashmir imbroglio pampering terrorism, nuclear strength, army overreach and nominal recognition of civil establishment have denied the infrequent overtures of normal ties.

It has been argued that India nourishes harsh perception against Pakistan. USA President Eisenhower remarked, “There was no problem between Pakistan and India which could not be solved if both countries approached it with reason and good will. “But all it appears as a chimera when relations are betrayed and buttressed by unfounded misconception, mutual mistrust, jingoism and fear. According to well-known Pakistani journalist Khaled Ahmed, a founder member of Track2Neemrana Dialogue. Pakistan is “failing because it is a warrior state and is not supposed to learn. It is wedded to the idea of war.

For Pakistan Kashmir is not dead rather a living dead for them, if Kashmir is receded into history, then identity crisis will resurface or resurrect and Pakistan will slip its importance in the world map as potential rival in South Asian region.

Sh. Veda Marwaha former advisor to Governor of J.& K. attributed the tension between India and Pakistan to the internal compulsions of Pakistan politics. Although it was sensed that misadventure can cost Pakistan heavily both politically and militarily even then the return of normalcy in Kashmir was not to Pakistan advantage. Pakistan opined that it has never shied away from talks but an enabling environment is needed instead of outrightly rejecting he said, “States have their means and ways to communicate which remain available even during wars and dialogue shouldn't stop. Therefore whether any talks are taking place between both the countries is not important. Pakistan power structure poohpooched the argument that only army was responsible.

METHODOLOGY

This research paper has mainly relied upon secondary data to validate its findings. During the analysis of this paper material was culled from books interviews journals, articles and original resolutions and letters. The researcher adopted both descriptive and analytical method to emphasize the dire need of peace in the immediate neighbor to delink the region from further growing as a war zone.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

With the change in leadership when Ayyub assumed power army was installed as an institution that can properly define and protect the national interest of Pakistan thereby denying the argument of Feroz Khan Noon as pm of Pakistan who had spoken of the folly of war with India.

Nehru opined that due to our close contacts we can't be indifferent to each other. We can either be more than friends or become more than enemies. "Yet Kashmir has become the permanent contentious issue that strengthened the Pakistan army role in policy making. Infact Kashmir was made a laboratory and a testing ground for all forces. Kautilya has also remarked "Peace is to be preferred to war and it should be hallmark of a nation 'foreign policy.' "India thereby embraced the ideology of mutual peaceful coexistence nourished the argument that domestic unrest and balkanization of Pakistan will be unhealthy for regional development and all the mutual differences need to be resolved by peaceful means only. The need is to reset the constantly worsening relations. Even fragile state can pose danger to neighbor peace. It is imperative for both the countries to start thinking as friendly neighbors and shed the shibboleth of acting as only enemy neighbors. Terror tactic will leave the country in limbo and instead both should come together to defeat their biggest enemy surging in the form of poverty, unemployment illiteracy. Climate crisis. The best policy will be to address the problems collectively and open the trade transit and shared borders as envisaged by our forefathers to realize the goal of development syndrome of our civil societies.

If Conflict of interest between two neighbors is a natural phenomenon, then Conflict resolution can be another reality.

And As Maharaja Rasgotra in his book 'A life in diplomacy' remarked Pakistan is a specific problem for India n foreign policy. I am all for continual dialogue with Pakistan on all issues. "

SIGNIFICANCE OF PAPER:

It is apparent that Pakistan's malignant role through its state actor and non state actor undermine vital Indian interests and imaginary Indian threat cynically portrayed globally by Pakistan can disturb Indian market. The purpose is to expose the hidden designs of these dark forces who see their future resting upon weakening and ultimately failing India.

Violence has its own reasons and genesis. You have to see what your focus is. Either you want to keep the pot boiling or you want to douse the fire.

When Nehru talked of Pakistan., he viewed no decimation of Pakistan because survival of Pakistan is in India' interest. We should adopt the soft power such like common culture and put more emphasis on cultural heritage. Every policy has to be calibrated whether we want to push Pakistan totally in the China 'laptop is presently alluring every South Asian country to further their economic dependency model and Pakistan civil society should be made to understand the Full reality of proximity with India. It should be convinced how peace can save the cause of civil societies of both the countries. The negative mindset and approach has floundered our relationship. As Kerry said. The present stalemate again focused on Kashmir will block economic progress.

Conflict of interest is a natural phenomenon but to turn it into permanent rivalry will make it perennial symptom of decimation of the country and the nation. As JaswantSingh said India and Pakistan are borne out of the same womb. Only through dialogue process can prevent disruption of good neighboring relations." If both the countries have to be successful, it can only be by friendship and agreement. Economic development will not be possible by threatening or failing each other, the greater the enmity and animosity the greater will be their loss Instead of considering our borders as walls behind which we can protect ourselves against our enemies, We need to see our borders as connectors.

Now the two countries are sovereign and should bury the past and step forward with this notion that India can never be a threat to any country rather an opportunity due to its policy of mutual peaceful co-existence. Pakistan needs to fix its attention for economic growth of all the stakeholders around.

J.N DixitPakistan long term objective is to ensure that India doesn't emerge as the most influential power in the South Asian region."

Relations troubled by terror, hostility, fierce animosity will pull both of us down. There is no alternative to peace,even the end of any waged war is also peace. and to achieve peace we have to mend our ties and become friendly neighbors for the ultimate mission of holistic regional development.

CONCLUSION

The long time implacable hostility will not end even if India makes true overtures because the other side tries to pull down its soft image and economic growth. The strategy of hitting India by fomenting terrorism will recoil on Pakistan itself. In an interview Maulana Fazlur Rehman spoke about Kashmir and reiterated, "Things have changed so much. Now the concept of winning Kashmir has taken back seat to the urgency of saving Pakistan.

India still believes in buying lemonade by asserting its policy of peace and mutual cooperation It gave clear signal that Talks and Terror "cannot go together and Pakistan will have to take

demonstrable steps against terror groups Earlier also various initiatives and agreements fail to deliver the results. When we come to the remarks of General Musharraf that Kashmir solution is no guarantee of peace with India"Actually, there is a combination of forces acting against peace with India. Ahmad Rashid, a Pakistan journalist viewed that the Pakistan Army seeks to ensure that a balance of power and terror is maintained with respect to India and

the jihadis are seen part of this strategy. The root of the problem is that politics always trumps Economics in Pakistan.

Militants and their leadership have been popular with pro-Islamic populace and the rulers in Pakistan are not ready to risk any political cost domestically by opposing the terrorists. Farhad Hussain, a Pakistan executive also supported this argument saying "The reason we are hawkishly anti India is that we know it sells."

All shibboleths have to be shed so as to look forward to upend Gandhi 'fear of dying as foes confidence and security building measures will remain a process and leaders will meet, talk and disperse and no CBM will disabuse the Indian and Pakistanis minds of mutual fear and hostility. The difficulty of mutual relations has to be settled at the earliest and only working together can serve the national interest of harmonizing prosperity and security.

In the words of Shiv Shanker Menon 'Neither of us can thrive in peace if the other does not.'

It is also true that no one policy can be true for all the time and decisions become difficult but we have to admit that proper communication, free trade, porous borders.

Mutual trust renunciation of terror tactic can restore ultimate existence of the two neighbors in prevalent zero-sum game.

While it seems difficult to judge when all the stakeholders will contribute to establish peace thereby promoting economic growth. The need is to explode the myth of Enemy neighbor's and become friendly neighbors and realize the vision of our forefathers that they can be close while maintaining their separate identity. As Jinnah said nothing was dearer to his heart than close relations between India and Pakistan. As Kerry has said, "Forget Kashmir, Forget Indian obsession and concentrate on economic development." Army activism syndrome has become all the time functional to vindicate their value present in Asian Region. There is no alternative to peace ideology. War can win territories but it cannot win hearts. The need is to win the hearts of countrymen of both sides.

REFERENCES

Muhammad Ali Jinnah's Presidential Address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan at Karachi, 11 August 1947.

Jawaharlal Nehru's Speech at Aligarh University, 24 January 1948. Jawaharlal Nehru Speeches. Sept. 1946-May 1949, Vol. 1, New Delhi: Press Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. pp. 337-39.

Muhammad Ayyub Khan, Friends, Not Masters. A Political Biography, Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1967 p. 172.

Jawaharlal Nehru. Speeches, Vol. 2. p. 446.

J.N. Dixit, India-Pakistan in War & Peace, London: Routledge Publishers, 2002. p. 7. Husain Haqqani, India Pakistan why can't we just be friends? p.3.

Husain Haqqani, India Pakistan why can't we just be friends? p.24-25. Husain Haqqani, India Pakistan why can't we just be friends? p.38.

Husain Haqqani, India Pakistan why can't we just be friends? p.64. Husain Haqqani, India Pakistan why can't we just be friends? p.144. Remarks: - The Hindustan Times November 27, 2020.

Maharaja Krishna Rasgotra, A Life in Diplomacy. Interview with BBC world service Former PM V.P. Singh.

Shyam Saran, How India Sees the World, Kautilya to the 21st Century, p.68-69.

Shiv Shanker Menon, India and Asian Geopolitics, the past, present.

Shiv Shanker Menon, Choices-Inside the Making of India's Foreign Policy. Shashi Tharoor Pax Indica, India and the world of 21st Century.

Articles from the Hindu. <https://prosyn.org/L.KKOHdx>.