

Conference Report – 2016



One Day International Conference on

Promoting Global Peace: Drivers for Transnational Cooperation

April 5, 2016

Compiled by:

Fawad
Sadaf Sultana
Saman Choudary
Waqas Waheed Malik

Pakistan House, Islamabad

Contents

Inaugural Session

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Welcome Remarks by Rana Athar Javed, DG Pakistan House | 1 |
| Keynote Address by Ambassador Masood Khan | 1 |
| Keynote Address by Chief Guest Lt. Gen(R) Naseer Khan Janjua, National Security Advisor | 3 |

Session-I

Chair: Rana Athar Javed, DG Pakistan House

Speakers:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Lt. Gen (R) Khalid Rabbani | 6 |
| “Operation Zarb-e Azb: A Case Study on Counter Terrorism”. | |
| Dr. Khurshid Ahmed | 8 |
| “Kashmir Dispute & Peace in South Asia” | |
| Ghulam Muhammad Safi | 8 |
| “Democracy, Conflict and Stability in South Asia” | |

Session-II

Chair: Dr. Pervez I. Cheema, Dean Faculty of Contemporary Studies, NDU, Islamabad

Speakers:

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Mr. Stefano Gatto, Deputy Head of EU Mission to Pakistan | 10 |
| “EU Migration Crisis” | |
| Mr. Kamal Hyder | 13 |
| Mr. Saleem Safi | 15 |
| “Reporting of Conflict in Middle East & Afghanistan” | |
| Dr. Simbal Khan, Security Expert | 17 |
| “CPEC, Regional Connectivity & Peace” | |
| Ms. Najma Minhas | 18 |
| “National Identity & Peace: Nature of Conflict in Afghanistan” | |
| Ambassador M. Asif Ezdi | 20 |
| “Future of Peace and UN Security Reforms” | |
| H.E. Dr. Omar Zakhiwal, Afghan Ambassador to Pakistan | 22 |
| “Peace & Stability in Afghanistan: A Way Forward” | |

One Day International Conference on “Promoting Global Peace: Drivers for Transnational Cooperation”

The Pakistan House in collaboration with Global Affairs, Islamabad, organized a One Day international Conference titled “Promoting Global Peace: Drivers for Transnational Cooperation” on April 5th, 2016 at the Marriott Hotel Islamabad.



The main aim of the conference was to identify the changing geo-political realities and drivers for transnational cooperation for promoting regional peace and long-term prosperity. Mehr Sher, news anchor at PTV World, brilliantly hosted the whole conference. The conference started off with the recitation of the Holy Quran by Waqas Waheed Malik.

Inaugural Session

Welcome Remarks by Rana Athar Javed, DG Pakistan House



Director General Pakistan House, Rana Athar Javed, presented his welcome remarks. He welcomed and thanked the Honorable Chief Guest, Lt. Gen(R) Nasir Khan Janjua, distinguished chairs and speakers and worthy participants, for affording valuable time out of their busy schedule and gracing the occasion with their presence. He said that organizing such kind of events are the need of the hour and we must join hands for the sake of global peace. The conference was well attended by members of the academia, diplomats, policy-making civil and military establishments, and students in the field of strategic studies and international politics.

Opening Remarks by Mrs. Farah Azeem Shah, Executive Editor, Global Affairs



population.

Mrs. Farah Azeem Shah presented introductory remarks and objectives of the conference and thanked all the worthy guests and participants. She said that it is not enough to talk about peace, one must believe it. And it is not enough to believe it, one must work for it. Now it is time to join hands and implement the suggestions and ideas. We as peace lovers, must define our core values, common objectives and global pursuit of security and progress. It is the need of time to have the interfaith dialogue regularly and immediate action towards promoting peace, mutual acceptance and tolerance to diminish radical elements causing hatred toward minorities, and vulnerable segments of



Keynote Address by Ambassador Masood Khan

Ambassador Masood Khan thanked Rana Athar Javed for inviting him to speak on a subject of promoting global peace. He opined that human civilizations and major religions and belief systems are in search of peace. The overwhelming majority of Muslims all around the world want peace and basic rights, social justice, and human dignity. He provided citations from the Holy Quran, Bible, Torah, Buddhist, and Hindu scriptures which reveal that all religions preach for peace and that war has to be averted and prevented at all costs.

Mr. Khan believes that future wars are going to be religious wars for the most part. The Western world perceives Islam as a religion. The wars that are fought within the Muslim countries are based on Sectarian and denominational grounds. Two third of the conflicts raged around the world are fueled by sectarian clashes, violent extremism, terrorism and civil strikes. These conflicts have geostrategic overhang and stem from territorial and political disputes. Instead of conflicts being spawned across borders, there should be an interflow of peace and cooperation. And thus, instead of transporting terrorism, drugs and arms, borders should become stronger arteries for peace, commerce and connectivity.



Masood Khan suggested that now some people believe that world war III has already been started in a different form and it is being prosecuted by overlapping coalitions of the willing. He believes that the enemy is nebulous and amorphous on the one hand and a concrete and menacing threat on the other. The strongest and the richest nations of the world form blocks to defeat this enemy and to wage wars against some of the weakest nations on earth. Peace making is recessive whereas peace keeping is a growth industry while peace building is something that gets scant attention. Approximately 2 billion people live in the countries driven by war, conflict, terrorism

and extreme violence. War's cumulative impact on the global economy is estimated at 14 trillion dollars per year. Looking for drivers of cooperation, we should not re-invent the wheel. The UN is there and it is evolving despite its weak performances and weak form. We must remember that the UN has been able to prevent deadly wars since 1945. The reality is that the Security Council has been marginalized in dealing with most of the serious crises and has been misused when dealing with peace and security.

He submitted that the Security Council needs reform that makes it more representative, more accountable, more efficient and more effective. We need to beef up regional building blocks. The drivers for transnational cooperation would include an overlap of national interests, market access, a culture of shared prosperity and connectivity as well as national and regional institution building. Weak institutions create vacuums that in turn breed conflict. We need to take serious steps to invest in stability and foster resilience to make regional forums and institutions viable.

To break the vicious cycle of conflicts and to create and sustain virtuous cycles of peace, reconciliation and cooperation, we need to promote international rule of law and respect for the United Nations Charter. Considering that most of the wars are religious, inter-faith and inter-civilizational dialogues are a must. These dialogues at the moment are anemic and suffer from inattention. Similarly, peace building is the weakest link of the United Nations peace agenda and should thus be upgraded to avert relapses. Middle East and North African countries must move to peace tables and sincerely and earnestly delegitimize and demobilize their proxies.

He added that the solution lies in building regional wise economic communities in the Sahel region, Great Lakes region, West Africa and Horn of Africa. Africa is rising and therefore it is necessary for Pakistan to deepen its ties with this continent. It is in the interest of US and China and the emerging regional order to avoid and avert escalation in Asia and especially in the South China Sea. CPEC offers huge new opportunities for win-win cooperation. Afghanistan and Pakistan must fight terrorism together and both must create conditions for an Afghan led peace and reconciliation process. The Afghans must find a formula that brings peace to their tormented land and both countries should build mutual trust. Nuclear standoff between India and Pakistan is frightening.

He further elaborated that the quest for peace with India and resolution of the outstanding disputes, particularly the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, would remain elusive, if India does not wind up its network of espionage and proxy war in Pakistan. India must come clean. Pakistan must project a self-assured confident persona vis-a-vis India and transact with that country on an equal footing. Pakistan should forge closer ties with Iran to develop its own corridor to West Asia. Pakistan's core prism should be geo economic and we should harness regional energies for a virtuous cycle. He concluded that we should not abandon the ideals of peace and amity distilled over the centuries by the collective wisdom of human civilization. We should side with the positive and good and we could not find peace by relying solely on western dual frameworks and constructs dating back to the concept of Europe and the treaties of Westphalia. We need bigger and more intrusive tools to find solutions to our problems.

Keynote Address by Chief Guest Lt. Gen(R) Nasir Khan Janjua, National Security Advisor



Lt. Gen(R) Nasir Khan Janjua in his keynote address stated that while the world is plagued with verity of downtrodden issues, it is actually the peace which has been worst hit. None of us are safe irrespective of time and place. An immorally haunting enemy has lost all the ethics and values and has scooped so insultingly low that by way of its heinous thinking it can slit throats, burn alive fellow humans and manifest a deep rooted hatred through tearing us, chewing our organs oozing of fresh and hot blood. Shocked, traumatized and terrified we look at each other. Our eyes filled with pain, anguish, and more, so the questions of our helplessness, our shoulders bearing the heaviest coffins of our own. We ask, is this the world we wished for? Is this what we want to pass on to our children and the next generations? Why are we and our loved ones dying? What have we done to be killed in this way? Who is killing us and why? With no clear cut answers our questions hit us back in our faces and at the end of the day; we point our fingers at each other in the name of whatever comes to our mind. That is our world of today.

He believed that instead of pointing fingers at each other and crafting designs against each other, if we collectively participate in pursuits and endeavors to seek, promote and preserve peace, we could do it. Before I delve further on seeking, promoting and preserving peace, let me say a few words about Pakistan, its people and the role that we have already played in serving global peace. I'll begin by saying that irrespective of the vitiated environment and sufferings at hand, Pakistan has always been a symbol of global peace and stability. Unfortunately we are only misunderstood by those who think of us otherwise. Pakistan along with its people and armed forces has made massive and un-parallel contributions by the way of their achievements and sacrifices to serve global peace and continue to do so while many of the trusted allies have returned home leaving the situation in the middle. Afghanistan along with its people has suffered the most, our hearts cry out for them. Their children have seen nothing but war and the next worst hit has been Pakistan. The dirty war beyond a doctrine and with an insane rationale has permeated into our streets and homes where our children are not safe. Pakistani people along with their armed forces make up the most resilient nation. While, for no fault of their own, they can carry the heaviest of coffins, mourn the death of over 50 thousand near and dear ones and suffer losses beyond 100 billion dollars. But they can still dance on drumbeats, light the bonfire, and cheer up and maintain their progressive outlook. Thus their resolve remains undaunted.

According to him, irrespective of its sacrifices and sufferings, the world today is least interested to know why a segment of Pakistani population from within has picked up arms against the state and caused miseries to society. The world does not know that we are blamed and fought against by our own people for supporting the 'infidels' against our Muslim brethren. Did the world acknowledge even once by the blink of an eye that Pakistan has risen far beyond religious bounds for the sake of right versus wrong, peace versus terrorism? Does the world ever thankfully

recognize that the spilled Pakistani blood is for global peace? Despite all the question marks on Pakistan's performance, Pakistan must continue to pragmatically engage both regional and international powers in order to assert its legitimate place in the comity of nations. Pakistan can look the other way but that would severely daunt the world's peace. Instead holding the threat at bay and using its own resources along with 180,000 troops goes in the service of global peace. We know the value of peace more than anyone else and will surely go on to contribute for global peace, whatever it may take.

Having said all this about the role of Pakistan, its people, and armed forces, he elaborated why he made this assertion about Pakistan as a symbol of peace and stability. To that, I will take you through some hypothetical but essential questions. My lead question would be, did Pakistan have anything to do with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan? Was it of Pakistan's making? Did Pakistan ask the USSR to invade Afghanistan? Surely no. when USSR invaded Afghanistan, what if Pakistan minded its own business? Could people of Afghanistan alone succeed in defeating the USSR on their own? Could the US, West, and the rest, succeeds in defeating the USSR without the support of Pakistan? What if Pakistan declined to be the frontline state in the fight against the USSR and instead offered a trade corridor to USSR for much needed warm waters? What would have been the fate of the world today? Though the USSR predominantly had its own internal reasons for breakdown, but access to warm waters would have given it a new soul and life. Could the world still have been a unipolar world? Nobody sent their armies to fight the USSR. Who fought the USSR? Islamic concept of Jihad was exploited, tones of money was trolled out to establish thousands of madrassas. Clergy with its extreme thoughts was put in the lead; people of Afghanistan and Pakistan were made to fight, making Pakistan as a base of entire offensive. What if Pakistan declined to do so? Could we still have been part of a perpetual cold war? Does the world acknowledge our role at all? Having played such a gigantic role in the service of peace, what did Pakistan get in return? Extreme thought, which is hurting us today, comprised of fractured social fabric, bombs, explosions and millions of refugees. The world washed its hands off at the cost of Pakistan and Afghanistan and left since the USSR had been buried in Afghanistan. What all has been said has no other purpose than to reiterate that Pakistan's commitment to peace is by the way of its character and more so, it's strategic choice. All its endeavors, commitments and sacrifices are to seek, promote and preserve global peace

Briefly talking about what is haunting global peace and what else is evolving which can further spoil it; he said that the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan and the way it is becoming perpetual is of concern to all of us. Turmoil in the Muslim world configured on its sectarian based fault lines is another greater conflict in the making. This conflict has its seeds in the invasion of Iraq in the search of weapons of mass destruction. Subsequently, deliberately altering the demographic realities, regime changing phenomena by way of force, arming and equipping rebel forces, initiating religious and regional proxies, these seeds will continue to haunt the world for a very long time if the Muslim world does not realize from within and reconciles. Pakistan, like always will play a role to inject balance, peace and stability to harmonize the Muslim world and serve global peace. Another rather devastatingly evolving conflict resides in the containment of China. On the global chessboard, this is clearly a power contest which would severely impinge the emerging strategic environment and strategic power equilibrium, particularly in the Asia Pacific

region. From within this greater design, India and Pakistan need a special mention. India's strategic location, her phony rhetoric against China overlaps the interest of the US, West and the rest, for the containment of China. Such a stance has started serving India very well. All the roads have now started to go to India. Preparing India against china and providing her massive support in nuclear and conventional spheres under the umbrella of strategic partnership is an outright neglect with a clear lack of vision about the complexities of South Asian security, political, economic, and diplomatic architectures. This is maximizing India's stature as a military power, making nuclear Pakistan vulnerable.

The world before 9/11 was a better place. As a popular quote, it is said that all wars are to win peace, but where is the peace? Why is war becoming a perpetual phenomenon? Why is war spreading all over? Why are we becoming increasingly vulnerable and insecure? Why is the world more injured and aggrieved today? As an answer to all these questions, all those who are contesting the need to sit down should reconsider their strategies particularly military thinking which has led and injured the world. Strategies like de-confliction, dispute resolution, reconciliation, reintegration, de-radicalization, tranquility and immediately following on the heels, economic facilitation ad incentives are needed to reverse the situation if you want to serve global peace.

Pakistan is a great country which symbolizes peace and stability while dealing with complex conflict in the region. However, it faces a colossal challenge in seeking its closure through reconciliation and conflict resolution. This perplexed and ambiguous situation at hand carries a large number of questions and counter questions but still carries a strong hope that collectively, we will find a solution to it. Pakistan assures the world that it is there not for today but for the last 40 years paying through the blood of its people and will continue to do so as it is in the ethos and guiding beliefs of its people.

He concluded that, in the Muslim world, conflict must not be allowed to grow further as this fire has a full-blown potential to engulf and burn global peace in its entirety. Let's not choose the sides and contest through them as that will fuel the conflict. Let's be impartial and put a thaw to it and somehow manage to stop it through political and reconciliatory processes. In the context of India and Pakistan, the regional strategic equilibrium should not be fiddled with, as it will disturb strategic stability making it a recipe of disaster and Pakistan must not be discriminated against. India and Pakistan both need to invest in peace as the conflict between two nuclear states does not lead them anywhere. We need to engage and resolve our disputes as these not only kept us frozen in the past but also exist as flash points today. Let's resolve them by ourselves rather than leaving them for the next generations. Since two nuclear states cannot be enemies forever, together we need to belong to the future. No sooner Pakistan is over with terrorism. It is the country of the future, a country to reckon with in serving global peace better than ever before while connecting the world to Central Asia and serving as a gateway to china. It will be a stable and progressive country helping the world to become a better place to live in.

Session-I



The session-I was chaired by DG Pakistan House, Rana Athar Javed. He introduced the distinguished speakers of the session and conducted the discussion. He also shared his valuable views on the topic while concluding the session.

The first speaker **Lt. Gen (R) Khalid Rabbani** talked about “Operation Zarb-e-Azb: A Case Study on Counter Terrorism”. He said that terrorism has a long history and it established its roots in the 1980s after the Russian infiltration in Afghanistan and its occupation. Pakistan played a significant role in that period but still sanctions were imposed on Pakistan. Within this timeframe, Taliban rose to power in Afghanistan, followed by establishment of Al-Qaida in various places including Afghanistan. After 9/11, the conflict spread immediately to Afghanistan and spilled over to Pakistan and the US left Afghanistan in a lurch. The War on terror greatly marginalized the menace of terrorism but yet, we can see the monster and now non-state actors have taken root in the form of ISIS and are coming up in Iraq and Syria and some of its footprints are emerging in Afghanistan.



According to Gen. Rabbani, three factors resulted in terrorism and they include the failure of Pakistan to re-integrate the Mujahidin, failure to provide socio-economic resources to FATA, and failure to initiate reforms both at political and administrative level in FATA. There is a need for persistent regional and global coordination and cooperation. Forces of order must be preferred and preserved against forces of disorder even at the expense of narrow state interest. The war on terror resulted in terrorism in Pakistan which has created a fragmented society with a strong fault line. There is a serious need for sustained support from the international community which would be needed in order to create peace in the region. The threat dimension is ideological, ethnic, and political in nature that

altogether constitutes a plethora of various parties joined together under the umbrella of TTP. Within that, there are Pakistani militants, foreign fighters and Afghan Taliban, all inter-mingled with each other and are present in various parts of Pakistan. In the north, we have threats across the border, in between near Khyber, the threat resides across the border and down below in Waziristan, there are still a few traces left between North and South Waziristan. The national strategy encompassed political, socio-economic and military means.

He declared that from 2001 to 2008, after Rah-e-Nijat operation, Swat, deer, Bajaur, and Mohmand agencies were cleared. In 2011, North Waziristan became the epicenter of terrorism and up to 2014, various terrorist entities (Al-Qaida, PTIM, PPT, IMU, and Haqqanis) all were addressed after the launch of operation Zarb-e-Azb. At the moment, except for some traces next to the border, rest of FATA has been cleared and the operation has resulted in the clearance of the entire area. Over 2000 terrorists were apprehended at the cost of 118 officers and soldiers, who laid down their life during the operation. Operation Khyber was also conducted in the Khyber agency and over 900 terrorists were taken to task. Now both North Waziristan and Khyber agency are under control and re-adjustment of IDPs has already begun. Revival of national counter terrorism authority, crack down on hate speech, and special anti-terrorism force should be raised. Madrassas should be regularized and media should not give any space to terrorists. Karachi operations and Baluchistan operations were part of the National Action Plan. More than 13000 intelligence led operations have been planned and executed across Pakistan. Various weapons and equipment were recovered from the operation. More than \$800 million were spent to develop areas in FATA. He suggested that the reconciliation process in Afghanistan should be Afghan led and Afghan brewed. The civil government of Pakistan should manage the affairs while the essential components of the regular army will stay in those areas to dampen the temperature of the affected areas.



Dr. Khurshid Ahmed discussed the topic “Kashmir Dispute & Peace in South Asia”. Talking on the subject of Operation Zarb-e-Azb, he said that the level of contribution and sacrifice by Pakistani nation in extremism and terrorism is unforgettable. He said that we are all affected by terrorist attacks in Peshawar, Lahore, Brussels and Paris in which thousands of people lost their lives. On addressing the Kashmir dispute and peace in South Asia, he suggested that peace in South Asia is linked to solution of the Kashmir dispute and the Kashmir issue has to be resolved in accordance with UNSC Resolutions. Enduring peace in South Asia is deeply linked with the peaceful settlement of

the longstanding Kashmir dispute. He called upon the international community to play its due role in resolving Kashmir issue to establish durable peace in South Asia.

Dr. Khurshid argued that India could not suppress the Kashmiris’ struggle for right to self-determination through force of guns and the day is not too far when it will be freed from Indian yoke. The peace initiative is looking at the universal declaration of Human rights and religious

freedom and aims to provide it with further strength because at the moment, it is a fairly toothless instrument and is not implemented robustly in member states. We are trying to collaborate with more than 20 neutral members and a resolution in the UN General Assembly will be presented next year and six regional conferences will be held in six different parts of the world.



Ghulam Muhammad Safi deliberately talked about the “Democracy, Conflict and Stability in South Asia”. He said that, democracy is not as someone has said, “Democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for lunch”. Democracy is also not merely conducting periodic elections in a territory. Democracy in fact as we have all been listening to is “government of the people, by the people, for the people”, but in fact it is an attitude and behavior and mindset and in our territory, occupied Jammu and Kashmir, we have been confined to our houses by a so called largest democracy of the world. Just imagine a territory whose inhabitants have been enslaved by saying that, the people of the state of Jammu

and Kashmir have no right to choose, though the country speaks about the freedom of expression, freedom of choice and right of self-determination. So in our case, especially in this territory of Indian occupied Jammu and Kashmir, both India and Pakistan promised that the people of Jammu and Kashmir will be given their democratic rights, to choose their future and fate. However, after the lapse of six decades, the people are still awaiting for that promise to be fulfilled. We are the victim of the largest democracy of the world in a disputed territory recognized by the United Nations. So there is a conflict, an issue and a problem in Jammu and Kashmir and as Martin Luther King once said, the best solution to a problem is to remove the root cause and because of that problem South Asia does not have peace.

He further stated that, in South Asia we don’t find stability and prosperity only because of the two nuclear capable neighbors having a conflict and problem and this problem persists for more than six decades. So what needs to be done? Some people say let there be peace between India and Pakistan. Who can oppose peace but we don’t want peace of the graveyard, we want peace with justice. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are not against peace. Who else could desire for peace than the Kashmiris who have lost more than hundred thousand men, women and children. People have disappeared and are buried in un-named and unmarked graves about which the European Parliament also spoke. We want the people of the entire world to know that we want peace but peace with justice. There are voices being raised from many quarters that the conflict management is the only way out. No...not conflict management but conflict resolution is the way out. And in the issue of Jammu and Kashmir, people also talk about confidence building measures to reduce tension between India and Pakistan. We, as Kashmiris would say that the biggest possible confidence building measure is to address the root cause of the tension that is the issue of Jammu and Kashmir thus ushering in an era of peace, prosperity and goodwill amongst the neighbors of the sub-continent, especially the SAARC countries.

To conclude, he said that peace, prosperity and stability of South Asia hinges on a just solution of the Kashmir issue and for that just solution, a roadmap has already been provided by the UNSC through its resolutions. And when people say that people of Jammu and Kashmir have participated in so many elections and that is the right of self-determination that they were promised by the international community, by India and by Pakistan. I would like to tell all those people that the issue of those elections and that constituent assembly was raised by Pakistan in the UNSC and therefore, the UNSC in 1957 through its resolution 122, categorically stated that any such election cannot be treated as a disposition of the state or any part thereof so elections in the presence of occupation troops is not the answer. A right of self-determination, a vote conducted by United Nations to ascertain the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is the only answer.

Session-II



The second and final session-II was chaired by **Dr. Pervez I. Cheema, Dean Faculty of Contemporary Studies, NDU, Islamabad**. He thanked DG Pakistan House and Global Affairs for inviting him to chair the session. He said that speakers' and audience' participation throughout the conference has been outstanding. Dr. Pervez introduced the distinguished speakers of the second session and conducted the discussion.

Speaking on “EU Migrant Crisis”, **Mr. Stefano Gatto (Deputy Head of EU Mission to Pakistan)** briefly stressed as a starting point that EU is itself born exactly after WWII to change history of the European continent from conflict to peace, from war to cooperation. Since its inception, the EU not only contributed brilliantly to peace and stability of the region but the economic performance of its member countries increased dramatically and it became probably the most efficient region in the world. So it was a virtual project of cooperation where the countries which have been facing each other for centuries decided to turn their history in another direction and very successfully put together political and economic instruments to build a new world. So by giving

this example, the driver for peace is through cooperation, getting the same objective, going beyond the national boundaries and building a huge level of trust, even eliminating national borders. Imagine any other part of the world where there are no borders, well there is none. It happened only in Europe and this came after two world wars which Europe itself created. This is just to explain how Europeans frame in the subject of this conference.



Mr. Gatto addressed the most striking problem which Europe is facing right now and that is the huge inflow of migrants that arrived in the continent during the last 2 years. Europe itself is based on free movement of people. The two drivers of European process are peace and freedom. We have established the free movement of people within European borders since many years and this free movement is also granted to the citizens of other countries who are legally in Europe. Europe has a tradition of opening its borders for people in need, we have a strong humanitarian tradition and on the basis of this we created a policy called asylum policy in the 90s which is quite developed and has worked on previous occasions, essentially during the period of Balkan wars, civil war in former Yugoslavia, and number of other

wars in Europe which displaced a huge number of people within the European Union. At that time, a common system of asylum was built because till the 90s, Europe had only national systems of asylum; every country had a different policy for asylum.

He further elaborated that in the 90s, it was realized that when the national borders have been eliminated, how could national policies for asylum work? So a community based European Union asylum policy was formulated. It worked quite well in the 90s. The Principle of this policy was that each case for asylum had to be taken care of individually. There was a general criteria and each case had to be accessed on merit. This system called Dublin Protocol, quite effectively managed the people displaced by Balkan wars and more or less worked reasonably well till 2014. Just to the problem on the table, in 2014 Europe received 270,000 people illegally meaning they entered Europe without visa or they came on tourist visa and let it expire which is very common for economic migrants whereas asylum seekers usually try to enter directly from physical borders. Just to give the comparison in 2015, Europe received double that of 2014, and this year so far Europe has received 1.5 million migrants. This is not a new phenomenon but the numbers increased dramatically in the last 12 months. Before 2014 they were essentially coming from some Asian countries like Afghanistan, Bangladesh or Pakistan but many from Africa. So the route they mainly used to enter Europe was maritime border of Italy and Malta.

He argued that in 2014-15, this situation led to a humanitarian crisis because these people were essentially coming by boats. These boats very often were sinking and the arrivers were in extremely dangerous condition. So the Italian government at that time built up a mission not to control the border and to rescue people at sea. This mission now has been replaced by a European mission. So there was tension on the southern border but in 2014-15, this (inflow) was moved to the terrestrial borders on the eastern side because people started coming from Turkey, originally

from Syria and Iraq, essentially from the zone controlled by Daesh. They came through Turkey and last summer they started coming massively to Europe. This summer, there was a commotion in Europe and thus the EU had to find a way to help the border countries to cope with the massive inflow.

He said that according to the rules established in 90s, since the EU is a unified territory, the country which physically receives the migrant was to deal with the legal situation of that person, and this meant Italy from the sea and Greece and Hungary from the land were facing huge tension because all the pressure was on them. So this means for a country like Greece which is already under terrible economic stress, has an obligation to deal with thousands of incoming migrants i.e. providing them medical treatment, education and job opportunities etc. The system surely worked for many years but with the explosion in numbers due to the Syrian crisis, it became extremely difficult to cope with the same standards since it was taking on millions more people. Obviously, the four to five countries at the borders cannot be burdened to deal with all this, and on top of this, most of the people looking for economic opportunities wanted to go to the main economy which is the German economy.

He added that Germany has also declared that it is ready to accept a very high number of people but this meant 2 things. First is that the priority was given to only those who are coming from Syria and Iraq which meant all others were not the priority anymore but they still consisted of thousands of people because the EU was receiving people from Africa and Asia every day. So the EU had a legal obligation to treat their cases individually and with the already set standards which were designed to receive only a few arrivals every day and not thousands. In order to keep the systems working, the EU had to look for the possibility of sharing all these asylum seekers among the 28 in fact 26 countries because UK and Denmark are not part of the asylum policy. It was decided to share the number of people who were arriving because a few countries would not be able to cope with all of them so an agreement was made that 160,000 asylum seekers will be shared among the member states, taking them essentially from Italy Hungary and Greece where they were arriving and were blocked. Remember within the European Union, there is a free movement policy. Once you have entered and are admitted by authorities, you can move freely. So what happened with the announcement that the EU would take so many people actually led to a dramatic increase in the number of arrivals even during the winters instead of reducing them?

He explained that this phenomenon created a lot of commotion within Europe. It must be admitted that people in Europe are divided. One portion of population says yes we are Europe we should open our territory to all those people who are looking for a better life, this is our history and our duty. On the other hand, you have a very strong populist extremist view which says no way, we are fed up, we have our own economic crises with millions of people unemployed, why should we use our resources for the people coming from somewhere else. So European people are very divided and the governments and EU institutions have to find a policy which is balanced, which does not betray European values, which is not in conflict with international and humanitarian law, gives opportunity to the asylum seeker to be assessed fairly but at the same time, also guarantees a certain control of the borders.

He brought to attention that the atmospherics in Europe change very much during the year unfortunately after a stream of sympathy for Pakistan in the aftermath of the Peshawar attack in December 2014. Europeans understood that if this happens in a country like Pakistan then terror is really a common problem. Then comes Charlie Hebdo, the Paris attacks, the Brussels attacks, and all this moved a lot of Europeans to the other position which is, ok we open our borders for everyone but then we are attacked by the people of the same touch. He said, “This is very delicate and difficult to understand, for a person like me or others, we totally agree that Islam is purely a religion of peace but quite hard to argue with many of the Europeans”.

He suggested that in order to cope with this situation, first it was decided to share the number of migrants which didn't work properly because due to this new atmosphere, some of the European countries said that ok this is the EU's decision to take this many people but we don't accept it or some governments said that they only want people with certain specific characteristics so it became very difficult to manage. Since the migrants kept coming, the EU had to conclude a bilateral agreement with Turkey because since last year most of the migrants were coming through Turkey. This is a very practical agreement as EU had to control the border, it cannot afford thousands of people coming to Europe every day. It had to find a reasonable solution to the problem as well as discourage people from coming to Europe. This agreement implies cooperation between the border forces of Turkey and Europe. Moreover essentially it means that the migrants will return to Turkey because they are illegal and are not the asylum seekers. EU will take only genuine asylum seekers in return. It has just started and we'll see how it works as it is an extremely difficult task. In exchange for that, the EU has reached an agreement with Turkey on other issues in bilateral relations. EU also pays 6 billion Euros to Turkey to implement this agreement. But obviously this could only work if a reasonable prospect of peace in Syria comes out.

He concluded that this entire crisis is extremely complex to manage; facing such a difficult and huge crisis puts pressure on the European fabric. So it's clear that irrespective of what will happen to Syria, Europe would have to work a lot on this very difficult debate reflecting on the future of Europe, which Europe we want? The Muslim they mention in Europe what does it imply. It is impossible to hide that this has become very difficult debate in Europe. Fact is that there are a growing number of other citizens in Europe, majority of them are very good, well integrated in society but still, all the attention goes to the tiny minority which are not law abiding and have different agendas. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to discuss it with European citizens due to the stress of terrorist attacks shown everyday on TV. This implies that Europe has to reflect and strengthen a common agenda with the Islamic world. Many people in the west do not believe that there is a genuine will for peace in the Islamic world, I believe so and many people working with Muslims also know but it becomes difficult to sustain that. We need to make an effort to understand more and we need to work together with the Islamic world and an effort on both sides is required.

Mr. Kamal Hyder deliberated upon the “Reporting of Conflict in Middle East & Afghanistan”. He started his discussion with a dilemma that in Aljazeera we call these (people at the European doorsteps) immigrants, refugees or migrants. You have to understand that a vast area of Middle East and Afghanistan is a conflict zone and people there are suffering on daily basis and their lives have been uprooted. So you have to be very careful to classify, when these people go out and leave

their country in desperation, we in Aljazeera decided to call them refugees because they were fleeing a conflict zone. Pakistan as you know has been host to above 3 million refugees for over four decades. A poor country like Pakistan has still not complained to the international community about the problems that emanate from these Afghan refugees. If you really look at this there is no doubt that Afghanistan and Pakistan have a common history and the people who came here during the war found a safe refuge. We didn't see the kind of discrimination that you see with some of the refugees when they go to other countries.

He argued that we know Europe has problems, the rest of the world has problems and we know



that there are forces which are trying to perpetuate the climax of civilization. This term Islamophobia has become a common word and we can unfortunately see in United States' writings now the republicans are all talking about Islam-o-phobia as if the Muslims are the main threat to world peace. You have to understand that the region per say has problems and those problems are not necessarily of their own making. It is the global powers and their race to get the pipeline through certain countries that has pitted these countries against each other. If 10 years ago, I had told someone that there are so many countries that would cease to exist nobody would have believed me but now you have Libya, Iraq, Syria, crisis in Bahrain, Yemen, Egypt is on the edge where a democratically elected

government was set aside by a military coup, Algeria is on the verge where there is a very old leader and it is said that when he will die there will be crisis in Algeria and I was told while visiting the Middle East that the largest number of recruits for ISIS are coming from Tunisia. This is a new phenomenon that ISIS is trying to reassert itself in Afghanistan as well and the Afghan Taliban are also misunderstood because on the one hand they are fighting ISIS and on the other hand they are pitted against the Afghan Regime. So the whole area has a lot of challenges to put up with and I believe that with the emergence of a multi polar world, there will be more problems.

He further added that after the demise of USSR, you had a unipolar world and you saw the consequences of that unipolar world. It was called a new world order; unfortunately this new world order did not take into account the ground realities. I'll give you an example, I have spent 6 years with Taliban in Afghanistan when they were in power. When 9/11 happened my 1st question was: did the afghan Taliban do that or was it someone else. Afghan Taliban had nothing to do with that, they were not involved in planning and execution of what happened on 9/11. But by not talking to them and considering them a pariah we isolated them just like Americans isolated the Bathists in Syria. They wanted to kill every Bathist there was, they wanted to kill every Talib there was and eventually they realized that the only way to deal was to talk to these people. Today at least we know that the Americans tried to talk to the Bathists because they realized that this was not achievable, today they want to talk to Taliban but Taliban don't want to talk to them because now the Taliban are gaining the upper ground, they have gained the territory. For Pakistan, it's a dilemma because for Pakistan to get involved in the afghan quagmire where the United States and all the international community with all their sophisticated weapons could not defeat Taliban, I think nobody should expect that Pakistanis would be able to do that. On the other hand you have

to realize that with the emergence of a multi polar world you have got a recipe for disaster because each power is trying to assert itself. You see the friction with China, you see the friction with Russia, the reemergence or rebirth of the cold war something nobody could imagine, the conflict in Nagorno Karabagh, and these are all signs for us to see. Even though our endeavor is to ensure and guarantee global peace and order, it's proving to be an uphill task. Peace seems to be an elusive aim. What needs to be done at the moment is that to understand that the ground realities are something which cannot be disregarded. In order to have peace in Afghanistan, I have heard many speakers here today that it has to be afghan owned and afghan led. It would be unrealistic for us to draw scenarios for this and that. The mistrust between Afghanistan and Pakistan is something which is alarming. The situation between India and Pakistan is equally alarming. You look at the region it's on the edge. There is a fear that it will result in a major conflict if not handled amicably and in time.

He opined that it is going to be an uphill task for all those people who are endeavoring and staving to promote peace. We should always try to understand that there are always two sides of a conflict and for us (Aljazeera) the most difficult task is to balance these two sides. It's not about what we think about them but it's about what they are trying to say. To better understand these people you need to give them space. I think we won't be able to achieve peace unless we realize our blunders and mistakes. When Americans were coming to Afghanistan I remembered George Santayana who said if you forget history you are going to repeat it. When Aljazeera was launching everybody wanted to talk to British commanders of forces and I told them not to talk to them but talk to the Russians. We talked to general Gromof and he said you will be beaten like we were beaten because people don't understand that the Afghans are freedom loving people which will not allow any foreign dictation. I think Pakistan learnt its lesson and backed out.

While making concluding points, he said that today we have to understand that in order to achieve sustainable peace in Afghanistan, the regime and its entrapments as I was told today Mr. Abdullah Abdullah is fighting Mr. Ashraf Ghani and Mr. Ghani is Fighting Mr. Abdullah Abdullah. It's a power struggle and unless you are able to address that power struggle and have a viable afghan military that can deal with the situation which apparently is not able to do so, peace will remain an elusive dream. It will make it that much harder for us, who are trying to be the proponents of peace, to work towards achieving that end.



Mr. Saleem Safi also talked about the “Reporting of Conflict in Middle East & Afghanistan” and divided the media into three groups Western Media, Arab Media and Pakistani Media. First if we have to see how Arab Media is behaving in the context of conflict in the Middle East. Generally the Arab Media is under the influence of the respective Arab regimes and does not enjoy as much freedom as the media in the rest of the world particularly Pakistani media. They report the conflict, be it in Iraq, Syria or even in Afghanistan and Pakistan, according to the preferences of their respective governments. The attitude of Western media is also more

or less synchronized with the policies and interests of their respective establishments.

Now the question is how Pakistani Media reports the situation in the Middle East? While reporting on Middle East, Pakistani media cannot avoid the sectarian color. This mostly is an outcome of the personal religious/sectarian affiliation of the people who are reporting on the ground or the owners of the media organizations. Focusing on conflict reporting of Pakistani and Afghani Media, Mr. Safi said that first of all, the tragedy with both the Media is that on both sides, myths prevail and generally dominate the facts which are already scarce. Unfortunately, Pakistani media is well connected with most of the international media but it shows less interest in Afghanistan especially in the area of fact finding and ground reporting and that's why myths and perceptions dominate. Same is the case with Afghan media. They have very limited and mostly ceremonial interaction with Pakistan. Let's take an example; it is a myth in afghan media that whatever happens in Afghanistan or Pakistan, ISI is responsible for it. On the other hand, in Pakistani media, the phrase Northern Alliance is overwhelmingly used and blamed for every thing happening in Afghanistan, but the fact is that the organization called Northern Alliance has ceased to exist since 2001. It is a major problem that both Pakistani and Afghan Media report on the basis of prevailing myths rather than facts. In the case of domestic reporting just like Pakistani Media, Afghan media is very much independent even independent from the rules and regulations, flooded with untrained work force. It gives a very tough time to the Afghan government at the domestic front.

Another important factor here is that Afghan media lacks indigenization. Initially it was believed that the whole Afghan media was sponsored by America which was true to some extent but now this is not the case. Few of the Afghan media outlets are still sponsored by America but most are now being sponsored either by Iran or by India. So when they report about Pakistan, they cannot report independently. On the other hand, the problem with Pakistani media is that on this matter, it is being controlled by the Pakistani establishment. So unfortunately media on both sides is not independent when it comes to reporting about Pakistan or Afghanistan. Moreover, the Afghan media is not even under Afghan government's control, rather it is being used by Indian, Iranian, American, British and other foreign sponsors for their own interests. In addition to this, in Afghanistan, most of the influential political figures own their own media channels which reflect their personal viewpoint about Pakistan.

Another issue with both Pakistani and Indian media is that it thrives on the basis of popularity, so instead of looking for right or wrong, the media on both sides tend to report according to popular trends for which they can get appreciation and business. Unfortunately, nowadays Pakistan bashing is a popular trend in Afghanistan so most of the media owners, anchor persons, and analysts do Pakistan bashing for the sake of popularity and ratings. The Pakhtun belt of Afghanistan is suffering the most because it has been embroiled in conflict since the Soviet invasion and they could not develop as much as the other Afghans did. The same happened to the Pakhtuns on the Pakistani side of the border as they were and still are the primary sufferers of the Global War on Terror. In this backdrop, the Afghan media is being led by non-Pashtun people who are the least interested in Pakistan. Similar is the case with Pakistan where most of the media houses are situated in the southern or central parts of Pakistan and are relatively less interested in Afghanistan. So when we try to interact with Afghans, usually Pashtuns come forward but the

Uzbeks, Tajiks and Hazara who actually own the media do not come forward whereas Pakistani media owners are more interested in India than in Afghanistan. Due to this gap, media on both sides has almost negligible role in improving Pak-Afghan bilateral relations.

Now the question is what to do? It must be ensured at the level of governments, media organizations and civil society that media on both sides must start merit-based factual reporting about each other's country. We both need to come out of cold war style propaganda type reporting. The second thing is that we, the media on both sides, need to acknowledge, present and promote the positive aspect of each other's country on one another. Third is that we both need to be self-accountable instead of blaming each other for each and every wrong thing. We need to respect each other's integrity rather than exploiting each other's weaknesses.



Dr. Simbal Khan (Security Expert) discussed about the “CPEC, Regional Connectivity & Peace”. According to her, Pakistan and China have enjoyed long and deep strategic relationships based on common geo-political objectives. Plans for Pakistan-China economic cooperation and strategic affairs appear to have developed for the first time in the mid-2000s with a proposal to create an economic corridor from Gwadar in Baluchistan to Kashgar in western the Chinese province of Xinjiang. China in the last ten years successfully rolled out its one belt-one road strategy which is an integrated land and sea based transport system which links mainland China to Europe and African markets. It has also shown an increasing interest in integrating sea pacts within its global network of trade corridors.

In this backdrop, PM's visit to China in July 2013, marks a new phase in the development of the relationship by putting economic cooperation and connectivity at the center of this bilateral agenda. The timeframe of this corridor project is 2030, which constitutes the first phase and the total estimated cost of this first phase of the project is about 46 billion US dollars. In the first phase, the project seeks to develop a multi-modal transport corridor and to enhance Pakistan's capacity for energy production which will take it to the second phase of the project, which looks at economic zones which lie at the heart of this idea of connectivity.

The speaker said that Pakistan and China have been strategic partners for a long time. This fact has played an important role in both Pakistan's regional geo-politics and global alignments. However, sea pacts since their inception have created intense interest and scrutiny globally as well as regionally. Even now, the strategic aspects of this corridor are highlighted rather than its geo-economical basis. Competitive advantages to China via its access to Gwadar port and the possibility of its dual military use by China in the near future are mainly highlighted. This element has been discussed both at regional as well as global forums. New possibilities of cooperative alignments are entirely negated. Although, the South Central Asia region is home to almost half of the world's population, it remains one of the least connected regions of the world. Two contemporary trends are changing these traces which include patterns in global trade and technological advancements. Patterns in global trade show that despite globalization, 60% of global trade is within regions and regional markets. Eastern China and Asian tigers of South East

Asia have all deeply webbed economies and eastern China has shown its momentous growth which is due to accelerated trade with its immediate neighbors and bordering countries. This was made possible by investment in integrated infrastructure grids which makes such volumes of trade across regions plausible.

Secondly, the south central Asian region along with China has become a growth hub because it has future markets for global goods. For instance, China has diversified its growth model from export center model to an internal consumption model. This will happen in most of South Asia as incomes go up and urbanization increases. It is happening in India and this trend will also continue with growing urbanization in Pakistan. Potential for increasing prosperity through regional trade and connectivity are colossal in the region. Technological innovations are making connectivity more complex from multi-model transport which is overlaid with digital linkages and common energy and power grids. Sea pact once rolled out, can function as a major first archery and hub for a cross-regional system of connectivity with possible tributaries connecting all important regional nodes. Yet despite such obvious potential, reactions from regional countries have been guarded and sea pact is only looked at from a competitive lens rather than the cooperative one.

She further explained that the most well-known objections have come from India and Iran as Iran is seen as a competitor in the field with the partially Indian funded Chabahar port. The less widely talked about negative view of sea pact is among the Gulf countries and the main objection is that the full operationalization of Gwadar port will result in diversification of regional trade and business away from Dubai port and its impact on net revenues for the Emirates. These fears are unfounded as empirical analyses of other regional examples especially in South East Asia suggest that multiple ports in the region's counties have led to trade volume expansion rather than contraction. These new ports in other parts of the world actually became new nodes of activity, opening up those regions for international trade.

Dr. Simbal pointed out that Gwadar port will likely serve as a trade hub for Pakistan, China, Afghanistan, Central Asia and South Asia including India. If Pak-India trade relations are normalized, it can offer several opportunities to the Gulf States, to access, expand and invest a new infrastructure for regional trade. Dubai and Gulf states have emerged as very sophisticated transshipment and capital markets. The transshipment business is only very marginally impacted by Gwadar while the opportunities in investing in the trade forwarding and transshipment opportunities in Gwadar for Gulf countries remain substantial. The gulf countries in the Middle East moreover, remain the primary energy supplier for the growing Chinese economy. China will continue to access Middle Eastern and gulf ports to access oil and energy resources and China's investment in Gwadar is not likely to change or radically transform its energy sourcing or diminish this aspect of China's relationship with the Middle Eastern countries. A major portion of Iranian trade is handled out of Dubai port.

She suggested that with the lifting of sanctions on Iran, it is the construction of Chabahar port which is likely to impact Dubai port business not Gwadar. Pakistani missions in the Gulf and the Middle East must actively promote and showcase investment portfolios specially designed for Gulf, public and private companies and attract gulf investment in Gwadar and Baluchistan. The aim of such an investment, promotion and communication strategy should be to increase

cooperative synergies in the region over Gwadar and mitigate competitive regional trends. For Iran, Gwadar port and CPEC are likely to create opportunities for expansion of trade, both energy and commodity trade with China.

Talking on “National Identity & Peace: Nature of Conflict in Afghanistan” **Ms. Najma Minhas** covered major historical fault lines that exist within Afghanistan. She discussed four major arguments in this regard. First one is centralization: Afghans always lived in either of the autonomous zones where power has been exercised by local war lords. The first king, Ameer Abdul Rehman in 1880 dealt with three things, the British, the local power lords, and the religious clergy. He signed the Durand line with the British because he wanted to make it very clear that your sphere of influence is outside this region, and this sphere of influence is mine. The second was the local war lords and he dealt with them by a series of masterful strokes. He established bureaucracy to control them. With the clergy, he put them on his pay rolls to control them and order them to teach what he wanted them to teach. We see the same thing happening again and again since 1880, and we see the same thing happening under Zahir Shah, under People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, even the Taliban did the same and now the current government is also practicing the same thing. Why does it fail? It fails because you are basing all this on the construct of a nation state which in itself is western philosophy based on the social contract.

John Locke and Rousseau came up with a contract “people that were ruling verses the people that were ruled” and the thing they had to deliver was life, liberty, or the pursuit of wealth for happiness. To the individuals living in Afghanistan or Pakistan for this matter, do they feel that this contract is being secured for them? No they don’t have the life, liberty and economic well-being, they don’t have health facilities, and education etc. so if they think that the king or the government is not delivering on his front, how is the contract going to hold. The second is the ethnicity issue. Some of elements of ethnicity existed in Afghanistan such as Pashtuns, Tajiks, Hazaras, and Uzbeks. But the cleavage among ethnicities came into the fore when previously individuals living their own lives suddenly felt the force of the king or state, telling them to deliver in their lives.



If you move people around you create a homogenous society, they lose their traditional power basis and elegance.

According to her, Pakistan is facing the problem by losing one important part of its country due to ethnicity and wanting to centralize Bangladesh but with the recent 18th amendment we see a good move on that front which is keeping the provinces and the ethnicity to some extent happy with what happened. Another factor is cleavages, in particular the cleavage between the drive towards modernity in a traditional society like Afghanistan and some of the factors are very common in Pakistan as well. The traditional society in Afghanistan still gives huge amount of credit to Pashtun Wali and upholds their code of honor. The issue of modernity and traditionalism to the extent that how fast to move is a very core fault line both in Pakistan and Afghanistan. As far as Pakistan was concerned, this was a defacto line since 1947 when Pakistan came into being and in 1949

Afghanistan was the only nation in the United Nations to say that they did not want Pakistan to enter into UN. This along with doubts created by sending military forces into Bajaur Agency has worsened relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan as both are mistrustful of each other.

The speaker concluded that as a result of these events, Pakistan has acted in ways to support certain parties that they thought are amenable to what they were desire in the long run, which is the acceptance of the Durand Line and it created a mistrustful relationship between the two countries. If we want us to become a growth hub, we need to work for a better relationship and overcome this discord and the Durand line is something that we should be thinking about resolving.



Focusing on the “Future of Peace and UN Security Reforms” **Ambassador M. Asif Ezdi** claimed that with the most important responsibility of the New World organization is the maintenance of international peace and security and it was one of the most powerful organs. It was the only organ of UN which was given the enforcement function and whose decisions were to be legally binding on all member states. Seventy years after the UN was founded, the Security Council remains at the front and center of the international structure of cooperation in peace and security. Since its existence, the UN has served as a center of mankind’s effort for a better, more peaceful and more just world, one in which human rights are universally respected and in which the material, scientific and technological resources of the nations of the world are pooled

together to combat poverty, hunger and disease. The UN can no doubt claim sub-credit for the advances mainly in this period in the social and economic fields but its record in the maintenance of international peace and security and in resolving international conflicts which is its most important responsibility leaves a lot to be desired. Kashmir and Palestine have been on its agenda for almost the entire period since the existence of the UN. But the resolution of these problems is nowhere in sight. These are the oldest but of course not the only issues of UN failure in fulfilling its responsibility.

He argued that the UN also remained ineffective in face of the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan in the period from 1979-89. Two more failures of UNSC are; genocide in Rwanda in 1994 in which close to a million or 20% of the country’s population were killed when the UN failed to react despite clear warnings of an impending disaster. Second is the ethnic cleansing during the Bosnian War between 1992 & 1995 and in particular, the massacre of Srebrenica in 1995 in which 8000 Bosnian Muslims were killed by Serbian forces. Today Syria has become another victim of UN’s ineffectiveness. Also, in South Sudan, the number of people killed are as much as in Syria. The failings of the UN that are mentioned are actually the fault of its more powerful organ which is the Security Council and specifically of its five permanent members, the so called P-5, which are the veto powers over the council decisions. It is these five which take all the important decisions or vote action if any that UN will take in any particular crisis. Each one of them can block action by exercising its veto power and they do so whenever it suits their national

interest. It is no secret that all decisions of the Security Council are taken first by the P-5 in private meetings from which not only the public but also the non-permanent members are excluded.

He further elaborated the fact that the decisions taken by P-5 are ratified by the council as a whole. There are also some taboo issues such as Kashmir which are not discussed because it does not suit the national interest of the P-5. Even the mentioning of the Kashmir issue is prohibited. The P-5 also decides who the Secretary General would be and always chooses the President who is considered as viable or at least someone who does not act independently. Reports are edited by the permanent members before they are delivered to the Security Council. Permanent membership with veto power is the privilege which the victors of the second-World War gave themselves when they designed the UN. It has enabled them to use the Security Council as an instrument to advance their national interest and impose their will on other member states. If the P-5 got their seats because they were real or putative great powers, putative in the case of France, some of them revel in this status today only because they are permanent members of the Security Council. Deprived of those seats, they would be delegated to the possession of the middle ranking powers that is certainly true of Britain and France. It is therefore no wonder that these countries are determined to claim their Security Council seats at all costs and for as long as they possibly can.

He opined that the claim of the P-5, the veto power, is becoming more important and difficult to defend with the passage of time. The P-5 does consult India which itself aspires to become a veto power one day. With the rise of new emerging powers, they are no longer prepared to adjust in the global system (5:48) by a few self-appointed global policemen. The demand for a review of veto power has acquired further strength. The structure and the composition of the Security Council has remained unchanged since it was founded in 1945 except for the increase in the number of its rotating members from 6 to 10 in 1965. This small extension in the non- permanent category did little to loosen the stranglehold of the P-5 over the Security Council. For the last three decades, there has been an increasing demand from the rest of the membership for the reforms to bring the UN into conformity with present day realities. Reforms of the Security Council were placed on the agenda of the general assembly in 1979 and have been under intensive discussion since 1993, first in the working group of the assembly and since 2009, in inter-governmental negotiations in the informal preliminary.

He said that despite overwhelming support for reforms, little actual headway has been made over all these years. This is mainly because the necessary consensus on an enlarged and restructured Security Council has not been possible. This is so for two reasons: first, no amendment in the UN Charter is possible without the concurrence of the permanent members as these countries are not prepared to contemplate any change that will loosen their tight grip over the Security Council. Second, reform is being obstructed by the ambitions of a handful of countries allied in the group of four, India, Japan, Germany and Brazil, to attain the rights and privileges of the victor powers that had setup the UN. The main arguments advanced by the G-4 countries in support of the claim to permanent seats in the Security Council must reflect current geo-political reality. But the truth is that these realities by no means justify the expansion of permanent membership.

According to him, Security Council reforms required an amendment in the UN Charter with a two-third majority in the General Assembly and ratification by another two-third majority of the

member states. The G-4 countries did not yet have the required majority in the assembly. Security Council reforms today are one of the most important issues facing Pakistan. It is not just a foreign policy matter, the creation of G-4 members also have far-reaching, profound and lasting consequences for our national security. Despite this and several wake-up calls, Pakistan's Political leadership, both in government and opposition, still remain complacent.

He said that the only occasion on which the Pakistani government and political leaders took any stand on the issue was in November 2010, when the foreign ministry, the national assembly and government publically expressed concern and disappointment for the support expressed by US President Obama for India's Security Council membership. But this was something like Pakistan's protest at the US drone strikes because privately Hussian Haqqani at that time conveyed a very different message after which the state department spokesperson said that Pakistan has not expressed any particular concern to the US over its decision to support India. The policy followed by the Nawaz government is not very different. Nawaz has not spoken once on the issue apart from some sentences in his annual speeches in the UN assembly.

He stressed that this is simply not good enough. Pakistan is a leader and the question of the Security Council reforms we must not be glossed over. We must effectively refute the G-4 claim that the creation of new permanent members is justified by the current geo-political realities and it must be cleared that the expansion in the permanent category would be unacceptable. The report adopted by Pakistan is floated also because it is India-centric. We are given the impression that while our reports are opposed to India's permanent membership ambitions; we have no problem with other G-4 countries. Our opposition to India is therefore seen by most observers as being rooted in our mind till we have problems with India. We must dispel this impression by stating unequivocally that we oppose the creation of any new permanent members whatsoever. Lastly, we must also find out that in addition to permanent membership, it will not only be unacceptable to us but to other large number of emerging powers that would also address the UN because some of these countries would choose to leave the UN in which they are reduced in perpetuity to the status of third class countries.



H.E. Dr. Omar Zakhiwal (Afghan Ambassador to Pakistan) talked about "Peace & Stability in Afghanistan: A Way Forward". He said that the topic of this event is global peace, and global peace begins at home. If we don't have peace at home, global peace means nothing. For me, home is both Afghanistan and Pakistan. The reality is that Afghanistan does not have peace and mostly as a result of Afghanistan's ongoing situation, Pakistan does not have peace. Considering the tragic event in Lahore a few days ago or terrorist attacks in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa or in any other part of Pakistan, the situation in Afghanistan will not be unrelated to this event. The consequences somehow are there and therefore without peace in Afghanistan, you cannot have peace in Pakistan and vice versa. It is so interdependent. It is not just the geographic proximity of the two nations; it's the multiplicity

of the dimensions that have tied these two countries together. These are two countries but one with the same people.

He admitted that the government of Afghanistan and Pakistan have mismanaged and mishandled their relationship. Had the governments reflected the wishes and aspirations of their people, we absolutely would have had an entirely different environment and that would have been an environment of peace, prosperity and tranquility. It is submitted that, the instability and war in Afghanistan is not because of Pakistan. We find it convenient to blame this power, that power, Russia, U.S. India, Iran, and Saudi Arabia, from A-Z. Probably there are very few countries that we do not blame but ourselves. The war in Afghanistan, the instability in Pakistan and the image which goes with it, is absolutely of our own making. And that could only be corrected if we acknowledge that it is because of our own making. Pakistan has mishandled Afghanistan and Afghanistan has also mishandled its relation with Pakistan. We cannot expect to be correcting it if we ourselves do not acknowledge that we have mishandled it. And there is the first important step: a half-hearted admission and acknowledgement may not be enough because then we want to discuss how we do not repeat it and how we correct our mistakes. So if we do not even acknowledge them and assert that every fling is due to somebody else, than we cannot have the belief that we are moving forward.

He claimed that in a more constructive, optimistic and encouraging direction, my role as an Ambassador to Pakistan, I do see this relationship as indispensable. In this relationship, we already have a relationship between two brothers that are always with each other. The relation is already there but it's a broken relationship and we need to mend and repair it. Secondly and most importantly is the misperception and misconception that exist between the two nations. There is a need of commitment within ourselves to understand each other better. So base our judgments on facts and not on fiction and therefore, I do believe that we have real issues but if we divide our mistrust based on issues and misperception, a larger percentage of this would be misperception. And that can only be corrected by facilitating and creating more interaction not only President to President, Prime Minister to Prime Minister, and Minister to Minister level, but between other segments of society, particularly the media. And therefore, one of my priorities is to be helpful in facilitating that interaction with the hope that we will understand each other and understand our mistakes better. This will contribute to a change in our behavior and policy towards each other and then we will together want peace for each other and peace for ourselves and I hope with that we will earn a more peaceful and prosperous future together.

At the end of the conference, a vote of thanks was presented by Rana Athar Javed, DG Pakistan House and Mrs. Farah Azeem Shah, Executive Director, Global Affairs to the whole participants for their effective involvement in the conference.