

SENATE SECRETARIAT

**REPORT OF THE MEETING BETWEEN THE STANDING
COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE AND DEFENCE PRODUCTION
AND THE U.K. HOUSE OF COMMONS DEFENCE COMMITTEE**

ON

PAKISTAN – U.K. DEFENCE RELATIONS

PRESENTED BY

SENATOR NISAR A. MEMON

CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 2008

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS 10

SENATE SECRETARIAT

**REPORT OF THE MEETING BETWEEN SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE
ON DEFENCE AND DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND THE UNITED KINGDOM
HOUSE OF COMMONS DEFENCE COMMITTEE HELD ON 7TH JULY, 2008**

The Senate Standing Committee on Defence and Defence Production, headed by Senator Nisar A. Memon and an eight member delegation of the UK House of Commons Defence Committee led by Rt. Hon. James Arbuthnot, MP met on 7th July, 2008 at 1000 hrs in Committee Room No.1, Parliament House, Islamabad. The two sides met for one and half hours to discuss:

“Pakistan – U.K. Defence Relations”

The following members attended the meeting:

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|----------|
| 1. | Senator Nisar A. Memon | Chairman |
| 2. | Prof. Khurshid Ahmed | Member |
| 3. | Senator Saadia Abbasi | Member |
| 4. | Senator Mrs. Rukhsana Zuberi | Member |
| 5. | Senator Asif Mustafa Jatoi | Member |

The UK delegation comprised the following:

i)	Rt. Hon. James Arbuthnot, MP	Leader of the Delegation
ii)	Rt. Hon. David Borrow, MP	Member
iii)	Rt. Hon. David Crausby, MP	Member
iv)	Rt. Hon. David Havard, MP	Member
v)	Rt. Hon. Adam Holloway, MP	Member
vi)	Rt. Hon. Bernard Jenkin, MP	Member
vii)	Rt. Hon. Kevan Jones, MP	Member
viii)	Rt. Hon. Richard Younger-Ross, MP	Member
ix)	H.E. Mr. Robert Edward Brinkley,	High Commissioner of U.K.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An eight member UK House of Commons Committee delegation led by its Chairman Mr. James Arbuthnot, MP had a meeting with the Senate Standing Committee on Defence and Defence production in the Parliament House on 7th July, 2008.

2. Senator Nisar A. Memon welcomed the visiting delegation and introduced the Members of the Senate Standing Committee on Defence and Defence Production. He thanked the Government and people of UK for extending their support to Pakistan in restoring its Commonwealth Membership. The delegation was comprehensively briefed about the steps taken in the recent past for restoration of democracy in Pakistan. He categorically stated that last time when two committees met, President of Islamic Republic of Pakistan was in uniform but now he is an elected civilian President and the National Assembly and four provincial assembly's had also been elected. There is a coalition government at the national level, represented by PPPP, PML (N), ANP and JUI. While referring to meeting of the delegation with Prime Minister, he reiterated the Prime Minister's priority areas such as; war against terrorism and efforts to improve economy. The economy of Pakistan was growing at 7% during the last 3-4 years but there was a decline in the growth rate, which was normal in an election year and subsequent political changes. The economy had also suffered due to rising oil prices in the international market. The visiting delegates were informed that irrespective of political affiliations and political parties, people of Pakistan are fully united to counter menace of terrorism.

3. Senator Nisar A. Memon informed the delegates that Senate Committee on Defence and Defence Production had asked the Government to provide details of Defence Budget to the Committee. For the first time in Pakistan's history details of budget, allocated for Defence Ministry were provided to this Committee last year. Now in this year's budget

document this government presented it before the Parliament. He also informed the meeting that Strategic Plans Division (SPD) gave presentation to the Committee on Pakistan's Nuclear Programme while a similar presentation was arranged for the local and international media during the caretaker regime of which Senator Nisar A. Memon was the Information Minister. He assured the UK delegation that the Nuclear Command and Control Authority put in place by the Government of Pakistan was of international standard. He reiterated Pakistan's resolve about unquestionable commitment towards non-proliferation and non-transfer of sensitive technology.

4. While explaining efforts to improve Pak-India relations, Senator Nisar A. Memon stated that despite three wars between the two countries during the last 60 years Pakistan initiated a comprehensive dialogue process with India to normalize relations with that country. During the talks the core issue of Kashmir, Baglihar Dam, Siachen and Sir Creek have been identified. The new government have further accelerated the comprehensive dialogue with India. During the previous decades Pakistan was concerned about its Eastern Border but due to the war on terrorism it is now engaged on the Western Border with Afghanistan. Our relations with Iran are cordial and relation with China are time tested based on mutual respect and cooperation.

5. While deliberating on Pak –Afghan relations, Senator Nisar A. Memon stated that in 2002, we were not enjoying good relations but now after the visit of the International Affairs Committee of Meshrano Jirga led by Syed Hamid Gailani, First Deputy Speaker of the Afghan Parliament, which held a meeting with Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs in June, 2008 and similar visits from Pakistani side would further help in strengthening our relationship and in understanding each others' point of view. We believe that Afghanistan should emerge as a strong and independent country and the ISAF forces engaged in Afghanistan should also realize that politically stable and democratic Afghanistan should be the ultimate goal. Senator Nisar Memon showed satisfaction regarding sharing intelligence information between Pakistan and ISAF forces but emphasized that Pakistan would rather appreciate technology transfer as in the past. He informed the visiting delegation that Pakistan had carried out many infrastructure development projects in FATA.

6. Senator Nisar A. Memon categorically stated that it is a matter of satisfaction that regular meetings of Pak-UK Defence Committee Forum (DCF) has helped significantly in opening new chapters in military and defence cooperation between the two countries. He suggested that similar exchange of visits should also be arranged on frequent basis between Senate Committee on Defence and Defence Production and UK House of Commons Committee on Defence. The leader of the delegation of UK agreed with the proposal and extended invitation to the Defence Committee of Senate to visit UK. The invitation was accepted by the Chairman Standing Committee and informed that the visit will be planned accordingly.

7. Mr. James Arbuthnot, MP after introducing the members of the delegation thanked the Chairman and members of the Senate Committee for the comprehensive introductory remarks. He offered condolences on the death of law enforcing agencies personnel in a

suicide attack and stated that Pakistan does understand terrorism. In fact, Pakistan is caught up in the centre of the problem and whole world is looking at this. While acknowledging Pakistan's efforts to normalize relations with India he stated that he is delighted that Pak-India relations are improving, however, they were particularly interested in dynamics of strategic changes taking place on Pak-Afghan border.

8. Mr. Bernard Jenkin, MP member of the British delegation enquired as to what type of military assistance was required by Pakistan because the Defence Committee was ready to assist and cooperate in this regard. Senator Nisar A. Memon stated that Pakistan looked forward to greater military training opportunities, particularly training in the Hard Core Professional Courses such as NBCW courses and EW courses. The detailed requirements of Pakistan Army, Pakistan Navy and Pakistan Air Force pertaining to equipment and technology can be provided or can be found in DCF documents presented in the 10th June 2008 meeting. Senator Nisar A. Memon suggested that since the Government of UK responds to its Defence Committee reports, therefore, they should put Senate Committee recommendations in their report for further follow up.

9. Senator Sadia Abbasi dealt comprehensively with Afghanistan issue and more specifically with issue of war on terrorism. She stated that Pakistan had engaged one hundred thousand troops on its western border, actively involved in combating terrorism. There is a dire need to adopt a comprehensive strategy for sharing of intelligence information to make these efforts a success. She stressed the need for analyzing the root causes of terrorism. In her opinion, economic deprivation of the people had forced them to engage in terrorism. Unstable Afghanistan is directly affecting Pakistan, she said.

10. Mr. James Arbuthnot, Leader of the delegation agreed with the view point of Senator Saadia Abbasi and stated that problem should be understood in its true perspective. In this regard, he referred to the recent visit of the British Secretary for International Development to Pakistan, who had offered more assistance in the field of socio-economic development.

11. Mr. David Crausby, MP of UK delegation raised the issue of unrest among young Pakistani community in UK. Senator Sadia Abbasi responded that real cause of dissatisfaction is the aftermath of 9/11 incidence, invasion of Iraq and engagement of Allied Forces in Afghanistan, fuelled by socio-economic deprivations of people in the region. Muslims are being targeted on the basis of religion and religion is being linked with terrorism. This phenomenon requires careful understanding and handling. She conveyed to the visiting delegates that Muslims are doing well in Britain and showing highest tolerance even being humiliated on the basis of religion. Such handling of the situation requires careful analysis at the policy level.

12. Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed welcomed the members of the delegation and stated that Pakistan and U.K. had a long history of relationships involving both conflict and cooperation and he was happy that the two countries were now moving from conflict to cooperation. However, he pointed out that the core and central issue was terrorism. What was new was the way in which terrorism was tackled by USA and to a certain extent by

Britain and other European countries post 9/11. Terrorism he said was a form of violence and it had always been looked upon as a tactic to achieve a political end and not seen as an objective or ideology. Subsequent to 9/11 the definition of terrorism had been so expanded that a totally new paradigm had come into existence. Previously criminal justice was invoked to tackle terrorism whether it was the World Trade Centre bombing of 1993 or the Oklahoma incident of 1997 but after the paradigm shift it had become a war, justifying the unleashing of war on terror and turning the whole world into a war theatre. Terrorism was painted as a war on America and the response was not only a war on unknown terrorists but also on two sovereign countries Afghanistan and Iraq. This had led to escalation and not containment of terrorism. He suggested that a careful analysis was needed to know what had been achieved and what had been lost. How far terrorism had been used to promote preset political objectives and how the world had been subjected to global brinkmanship, unilateralism, regime change in the name of self defence, invasion of sovereign countries and making war plans on the basis of concocted reports and patent lies. Radicalism was never a dirty word as it had become today. There was radical economics, radical philosophy, radical sociology and radical theology and they represented phases in the development of thought of policy.

13. Prof. Khurshid Ahmed said that there was wealth of literature from top economists, who have come to the conclusion that while poverty and underdevelopment had a role to play, attributing this articulation to the present wave of terrorism is not correct. Whether it is Afghanistan, Iraq or the impending crisis of Iran they are all linked to the strategic thinking of those who matter in America and the European countries. He stated that the issue of anti American was more serious and fundamental, and was structurally related to U.S. policies and behaviour. He asked the members of the UK delegation that they would do a great service to the region and the world if they could play a role in holding America from any madness or Israel from any adventure in Iran. He further stated that the issue of Kashmir is legacy of British rule therefore it was their moral responsibility to play some role in its resolution. About the particular trend appearing in the Muslim youth in UK, who were born and educated there, he said it was for the government and parliament of UK to find out what had gone wrong. The Muslim community had been in the U.K. for almost fifty years but why these particular trends were appearing now. Spending a week in Pakistan or Palestine was not enough to transform them into terrorists.

14. Prof. Khurshid Ahmed enquired from the members of the UK delegation about Defence Committee's role in formulation, approval and oversight of the defence budget. Mr. David Crausby, MP stated that in his view Kashmir is an easy subject to argue and difficult situation to resolve. Mr. James Arbuthnot, MP responded to the queries of Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed and stated that he will send a copy of the enquiry report prepared by the Defence Committee, which answers all questions regarding formulation, approval and oversight mechanism of the defence budget. He said that the query of Prof. Khurshid Ahmed reinforce their invitation to the Senate Committee to visit UK and see the proceedings of the Defence Committee on the defence Budget.

15. Senator Mrs. Rukhsana Zuberi welcomed the member of the UK delegation and stated that compared to last time we are in a much worse situation other than having a

democratically elected political government. Food and energy security have become very pressing issues but in the case of Pakistan it had multiplied due to the policies of unrepresentative government. A government headed by a Chief Executive, who had no stakes in Pakistan and the policies formulated were random leading to shortages. We would be very interested to go for Nuclear Energy and also explore possibilities of producing Energy from Coal. She desired that if the defence Committee of House of Commons could assist in providing some research reports on the subjects for reference and consultation that would be helpful. Talking about terrorism she said that due to political expediencies countries like the UK had been condoning military dictators in Pakistan. She asked the members of the delegation to give an opportunity to the members of the Senate Defence Committee to observe how the UK Defence Committee formulated, oversaw and discussed the defence budget.

16. Mr. David Havard, MP Stated that practical measures had to be taken to resolve complex situation on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. He proposed that Border Control Centres should be established on both sides of the borders. Such arrangements would strengthen the information sharing mechanism. This aspect of joint efforts needs to be addressed and a comprehensive strategy was needed to implement the proposal. Senator Nisar A. Memon, however, stated that threadbare discussions should be held in the DCF meetings to work out details of operational mechanism. However, people of Pakistan were sensitive about joint deployment mechanism on both sides of the border. Mr. David Havard, MP stated that supply of information was one aspect and practical implementation was another, therefore there was still need to resolve this complex situation.

17. Senator Nisar A. Memon informed the delegation that due to rapid socioeconomic development in FATA, the percentage of poppy cultivation has drastically decreased. On the other hand a vast area of Afghanistan is under poppy cultivation and money earned from this source was being used for terrorist activities. He appreciated the efforts of International Development Agency, but Afghanistan had failed to establish good governance and could not accelerate socio-economic development in the country.

18. Mr. David Borrow, MP was of the view that after 9/11 attack, Afghanistan government failed to take swift action against terrorists. One would have expected the Government of Pakistan to take action against the terrorist groups based in Pakistan that carried out operations similar to 9/11. He was of the view that the difficulty in terms of relationship between the West and Muslim world was the perception within many of the Pakistani communities in the UK that 9/11 was not an attack on the United States by a terrorist group but was a US conspiracy, which was used as an excuse to take action against Afghanistan and this fundamental difference of opinion lay behind much of the misunderstandings and difficulties. He argued that UK would certainly not spend millions of Pounds and spill the blood of soldiers from UK unless it was felt that there was a long term threat from terrorist groups that could be based in Afghanistan.

19. Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed stated that we need to examine the factual position under which incidence of 9/11 occurred because we don't believe in the conspiracy theories and Taliban were ready to hold judicial enquiry. Moreover, we should not be emotional

because people who were involved in 9/11 terrorist act were not from Afghan origin, in fact those terrorists operated from American soil and despite of 9/11 commission report, it would remain a riddle.

20. Mr. Richard Younger-Ross stated that one of the problems with Afghanistan was that it was one of the poorest in the world. We are all duty bound to deal with the deprivation prevailing in Afghanistan. Afghanistan was a land locked country and they found it hard to export their produce especially soft foods, which rotted due to train delays in Pakistan. Senator Nisar A. Memon while commenting on the statement of Mr. Richard Younger-Ross said that there was a need to understand the sentiments of people of Pakistan because after the end of Afghan war, Allied Forces left Afghan unsettled and that is why today we are facing the consequences. We have \$ 1 billion trade with Afghanistan; we have even provided wheat to Afghanistan at the cost of our own people, which are clear indications of our sincere efforts to see Afghanistan an independent and democratic country.

21. While concluding the meeting Senator Nisar A. Memon stated that Pakistan was committed to fighting terrorism and looked forward to greater military cooperation in terms of training and support of military hardware for Pakistan Armed Forces. He wished there would be more frequent meetings between the two committees to discuss bilateral issues pertaining to Pak-UK defence relations. He thanked the members of both sides for their participation in the meeting.

IFTIKHAR ULLAH BABAR

Secretary Committee

SENATOR NISAR AHMED

MEMON

Chairman Committee

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

Senator Nisar A. Memon: It is a pleasure for us to receive you here in the Senate. I will first of all introduce my colleagues, who have joined us already. On my right is Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed from Jamaat-e-Islami. He is one of the most outstanding politicians and a senior parliamentarian. He runs a lot of institutions and I think he himself is an institution. He sits on various committees and greatly contributes in the meetings, the last one being the finance committee, where we discuss the budget. On my left is Senator Saadia Abbasi, she is in the parliament and Senate for the first time. She is a barrister from Lincolns Inn. So you can have a lot of commonalities in terms of the country that you come from and the country where she acquired her education. She not only practices corporate law in Pakistan but in the United States. Therefore, we sometime miss her in early morning meetings because of the time difference between Pakistan and the U.S. Senator Rukhsana Zuberi is from the Pakistan People's Party. She is a first time member of parliament too. She has been very close to Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto, a leader lost as a result of terrorism. She has been very close to her and she is also a great contributor to the committee system and I would say that right from the beginning she contributed greatly in the Defence Committee meetings. Senator Asif Jatoi of the National Peoples Party is the youngest member of the Senate. He is the son of the former Prime Minister Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi so; he comes from an important political family of Sindh. On the right is Secretary Senate Raja Muhammad Amin. He is the most senior officer of the Senate and was moved to the present position a couple of years ago. He contributes immensely to the running of the Senate Secretariat especially when Chairman Senate is out of the Country. Then we have the Director General of the Foreign Office, Mr. Nafees and also Mr. Jamil Ahmed Qureshi, who is the Acting Secretary Committees because Secretary Committee is travelling abroad with another Committee. I myself was on that tour but I interrupted that schedule to come and receive you here.

After the introduction I would like to briefly state some of the points. I believe that yesterday the delegation called on the Prime Minister and I was in that meeting too. I therefore, will try not to repeat anything. I will only say that relationship between the two countries is historic in nature. Despite the fact that there is acrimony when one is fighting for independence, civilized negotiations were conducted and in 1947 that accorded independence to Pakistan. And there are a lot of memories of good contribution that your country made. Now these historic relationships have been further strengthened by frequent visits from both sides. Recently U. K. Secretary Foreign Affairs, Secretary Defence and Secretary Home visited Pakistan and similarly our Prime Minister, our President, our Ministers and Secretaries have been meeting your people. So, apart from close bilateral linkages Pakistan and the U.K. participate closely at the international level and in Commonwealth. We want to thank you for your efforts to get Pakistan's membership of Commonwealth restored. I recall your first historic visit to Pakistan of 2006, when half of the members present today were there. I welcome you again. It was the first ever meeting between the two defence committees. One would hope that these visits should be more frequent. I am saying this because things are moving so fast in the international arena and in the region that our meetings at the level of government the level of the people should

continue and meetings between the people's representatives should be more regular. I am sure that if you feel that way, we could also have at the end of the day some kind of understanding on what should be the frequency of visits and meetings.

After your last visit two important things happened. One is the complete transition to democracy. When you last visited there was a Senate, a National Assembly and the President as part of the Parliament was in uniform but now we have a President, who is not in uniform. So, 2007 was an election year and after the election we have new National Assembly, you will be meeting the Speaker of the National Assembly this afternoon. In addition to that the four Provincial Assemblies were also elected. The election, which was earlier, planned for 8th of January 2008 but due to the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, leader of Pakistan Peoples Party, it was postponed to 18th of February. So, the four provincial assemblies and the National Assembly are newly elected now under the parliamentary system inherited and adopted from Britain. So, democracy has marched forward and there was transition of power. Pakistan was subjected to a lot of propaganda and it was said that for some reason probably there will be no elections or delayed elections or no transfer power. I am very pleased to report that complete transfer of power has taken place. In the centre there is a coalition government led by Prime Minister from Pakistan Peoples Party. Our party Pakistan Muslim League (Q) was defeated.

You may have read in the newspapers and seen on television also yesterday the Prime Minister clearly identified two priorities of his government which are number one, Law and Order and second to improve the economic situation. These are very clear priorities and Law and Order is one of the major issues including terrorism. I am sure you heard on television last night that there has been yet another attack of suicide bomber and that caused casualties in Pakistan. Terrorism remains a challenge and the government is ceased with this matter. People of Pakistan irrespective of party consideration, irrespective of the fact that they come from different provinces remain united on the issues that this is our war now and we will fight it. Certainly this subject will come up for discussion in this meeting.

Now the challenges the economy is facing, as you know growth rate of the economy of the last three years of more than 7%. But last year there was a decline, which is normal in the election year plus the political changes that took place. The growth rate has now been reported at around 6% for the year ending June 2008. The government has just given the budget and growth rate has been fixed at 5%. You will be happy to learn that the Defence Committee for the first time asked the government last year after the budget that we will not be satisfied with one line of the Defence Budget we need to have details of the Defence Budget because it is the right of the parliamentarians. I am very happy to share with you that the then governments accepted the demand and presented to the Defence Committee several lines of the Defence Budget including Navy, Army, Air Force and the Special Plans Divisions. You will be happy to hear that this year there was an evolution of the entire thing and the new government decided that details provided to the committee in camera last time will be presented with some more details in the budget document. So, it was made public. I think, we are evolving and working to even open up Defence matters before the

Committee. For the first time the Defence Committee visited China. In addition to that we also are opening up the defence information as last year a comprehensive three hours presentation was made to this committee on our request by the Special Plans Division on the nuclear programme of Pakistan. In addition to that a similar presentation was made to the international, as well as local media also.

Coming to relations with India, as you know the traditional challenge to Pakistan was from the eastern border with India because of the Kashmir problem which remains unresolved till today. But what has happened during the last eight years is that a comprehensive dialogue process has been initiated with India. This process has been further accelerated by the new government. The issues that have been identified in the discussions between India and Pakistan are the core issues of Kashmir and other important issues of Baglihar Dam, Siachin and Sir Creek. So, all of these issues are on the table but in the meantime Pakistan has opened up with India and delegations are being exchanged and political leaders have visited India. Pakistan and India have fought three wars but we want to resolve issues through negotiations. I may point out that in 2001-2002 about a million Indian forces were on the boarder of India and Pakistan but a confrontation was contained, as both are responsible nuclear powers. In the meantime Pakistan has setup a very comprehensive Command and Control System of International standard, which ensures that leakage of nuclear technology and assets do not take place.

With Iran which is on our western border we have no border dispute but we had some difficulties in the past but right now issues have been discussed and there is no tension between the two countries. China as you know is one country, which Pakistan was instrumental in opening to the world or the world to China. China is our neighbour and Karakoram highway was constructed jointly by Pakistan and China. With China we enjoy good relations based on mutual respect.

Afghanistan on the west has borders with our two provinces namely Balochistan and North West Frontier and as Prime Minister told you that we have 900 posts on that border. The cold war has come to an end with the defeat of Russia and America emerged as major super power. NATO also expanded but Pakistan got this problem of terrorism with Al-Qaeda and Taliban governing. I recall in 2002 as Federal Minister I was part of President Musharraf's delegation which visited Afghanistan and met President Karzai and his Government. Since then the relationship has been there but you will notice the occasional utterances by President Karzai, which I think are not conducive to good friendly and brotherly and neighbourly relationship. But I would say that we have agreed to have better relationship where we discuss issues and as the Prime Minister yesterday mentioned that we have people to people contact. In June 2008 the Foreign Affairs Committee of Pakistan which is headed by Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed, who is also a member of this committee signed a memorandum of understanding that there will be biannual meetings between the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee of Pakistan and International Affairs Committee of Meshrano Jirga of Afghanistan. So, I think these contacts are there but certainly one would expect that Afghanistan has good governance and good control of the territory. NATO, ISAF, and U.S. forces are there but it is important that Afghanistan must

have governance of their own region because a strong, stable Afghanistan is what we will desire as a neighbour so they could not be used and they could drive out all the foreign elements from there and we could then drive them out from here.

As we all know that Pakistan shares information with NATO forces but we would like to have stronger relationship in defence so that in addition to the sharing of the information, technology is also shared among the NATO, ISAF and of course UK. Your country will like to see that there is more of the relationship where technology is also transferred as in the past. I remember in 2006 the Committee said that licenses should be issued which has come about in the last two years and we want to thank your Government and your people for this. I think ultimately we need to go on to Open General License where, there is free trade between the two countries so that technology is transferred. All these issues are being discussed in various forums, I only mention the Defence Coordination Forum (DCF) that we have between the two countries. In fact 10th DCF has taken place in London in June this year so every six months there is a meeting. I would suggest, if you feel appropriate, there should be a similar arrangement between our two committees because I was looking at the list of things that the Prime Minister mentioned. I have the detail which after introduction I will be presenting. I think it would be very valuable if the two committees could meet at least once a year, if not twice. In terms of defence, I would say, Pakistan's challenge today is really to continue to face terrorism, economy built up and security in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of Pakistan (FATA) region. In fact we did not discuss to that extent yesterday but I would say this should be mentioned that in FATA in the last several years Pakistan has developed infrastructure. We still need more educational and health facilities so as to provide an opportunity to FATA people to come in to the main stream of Pakistan's life and this is where we come in. I think, with this very comprehensive introduction I will now like to again welcome you and pass it on to you and subsequently we will open the floor for discussion, comment and questions, so over to you Rt. Honourable James Arbuthnot.

Mr. James Arbuthnot, MP: Thank you very much indeed Mr. Chairman for your welcome and even before I begin to introduce my colleagues, may I give you the condolences of our Committee and of Britain as a whole for the event which happened yesterday in Islamabad. It was serious reminder of the fact that you in Pakistan have suffered terrible things from terrorism and are continuing to suffer terrible things from terrorism and you are taking very tough and very difficult actions to cope with it. We in the UK must never suggest that you do not understand terrorism because you are on the front line and so please, accept our condolences for the incident of yesterday and for the many police men who died in the incident.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: They died in the line of duty. You know there was this congregation and they had to ensure that everything goes well. Thank you very much for this.

Mr. James Arbuthnot, MP: Yes. Mr. Chairman may I start by introducing my committee. We as you know are an all parties committee and the Labour Government in the United

Kingdom has a fairly large majority on our committee and so I begin by introducing the Labour members of our committee but in fact we do not really think ourselves dividing very much., David Crausby, the Vice Chairman of our committee and the long standing Labour member, Mr. Kevin Jones also another long standing Labour member, David Borrow is just on the right of the High Commissioner, he is the member, who has been a member of the committee for I think as long as I have. Mr. David Havard is a Labour member as well, Mr. Richard Younger-Ross is a member of the Liberal Democratic Party the 3rd Party in the United Kingdom and then Mr. Bernard Jenkin, is a Conservative member of Parliament and Mr. Adam Holloway Conservative member of Parliament and I am also another Conservative Member of Parliament.

Can I say thank you very much indeed for the comprehensive words of introduction. You reminded us quite how important Pakistan is at the centre of where the eyes of the world are and you have a border with Iran, which is a country in which everybody is absolutely very interested at the moment. You have a border with India and I must say that as a patron of the Pakistan-India friendship forum in United Kingdom, I am delighted that your relations with India have improved so much over the last five years but still there is much work to be done in improving the relations between your two countries. You have a border with China where again all the eyes of the world are and we are particularly interested in your other neighbouring country in Afghanistan where you in the FATA territory particularly have had so much to do yourself. So, if during the course of the morning we could discuss perhaps all the issues then we would find that very interesting. Indeed I am delighted to find a fellow member of Lincolns Inn here. I am unaware of whether you still practice in Lincolns Inn. Well, it is a great pleasure to see a fellow member.

May I particularly welcome what you said about the increase of information about the defence budget which is given to this committee because we always find that every year we ask for a little bit more information about the defence budget and its always a gradual process and gradually we bring the budget into the open and the more that we can do that the better it is for democracy and the better it is for the people's control of the way their own money is spent. Having said that in very brief introductory remarks, I wonder whether it would be a good idea now for us simply to go into the discussion where colleagues can ask questions and make comments and I wonder if I could begin.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: I have information that you will be meeting the Speaker of the National Assembly at 12 O' clock. So, we will close this meeting in an hour's time which I suppose, is good enough in order for many of your questions to be answered. So, you could start and then our members will also be asking questions.

Mr. James Arbuthnot MP: Yes Bernard Jenkin would like to begin.

Mr. Bernard Jenkin: We were very honoured to meet the Prime Minister yesterday and I am very interested in how it has been reported in the papers this morning where it seems to be calling for more military assistance from the United Kingdom and I think, everyone

on our committee would be very keen to provide any assistance that we can. What sort of assistance do you think this actually is that the Pakistan's Armed Forces require?

Senator Nisar A. Memon: May I respond to this. As you know media is free and they report freely and we also invite the media in the committee. This committee meeting is open to the media and some of my friends from the media are here and they will be reporting openly whatever we said here. So, let me now mention that the Government and the country feels there is more cooperation in training, Training that is imparted to Pakistani officers in the UK is satisfactory. Officers from the UK also participate in Command and Staff College Courses for which seats have been reserved at the college. We believe that slots should be allocated to Pakistani Officers in NBCW courses and EW courses. These are some of the hard core professional training courses that we would like to avail in United Kingdom.

Secondly, Pakistan's Armed Forces armament dependence has been on the West, it has been United Kingdom in the first place followed by United States because we were members of the SEATO and CENTO which was established against communism. The details of the requirements of Pakistan Army, Pakistan Navy and Pakistan Air Force can be seen in documents presented in the DCF meeting of 10th June 2008.

Yesterday the Prime Minister very clearly and vividly pointed out to you that technology used by terrorists today is so advanced that we are facing the challenge of keeping up with it. I think, the NATO and ISAF Forces have done well because of technology and information provided by Pakistan. Pakistan has the cultural background and has people to people contact with them because of close proximity. If technology is there, our advantage over the terrorist will increase. Irrespective of the government in power in Pakistan national interest warrants diversification of our sources of weaponry and that is why we acquired the knowledge of the European as well as Americans technology. If you require the details of the 10th June 2008 meeting than I will ask the Defence Ministry to provide you the detailed paper on it, so, that you could take it up in the report that you will submit and I have observed that whenever you submit any report to the House of Commons, the government does respond to the Committee's findings. In addition to that I will now ask, if my members would like to comment on this particular question and any thing else. Yes Senator Saadia Abbasi.

Senator Saadia Abbasi: With regard to your question, I would say that, what Senator Memon has said relates to the purchase of Military hardware. The real question today is the issue of security and terrorism. Your Country is engaged in a situation in Afghanistan in which very precious lives and a lot of your resources are committed and there is a loss of somebody's life everyday. Every life is precious and similarly is the case in Pakistan. We have committed almost one hundred thousand troops in the North West region of Pakistan simply to combat terrorism that is in Afghanistan and that has spilled over into Pakistan and that is in fact now a serious challenge to the stability and to the security of Pakistan. So, there should be a greater exchange on this issue between the two countries. There should be exchange of information. There should be exchange of intelligence

information and there should be a serious effort to address this issue through a comprehensive strategy which involves not only Military Planning but it also involves investment in the social sectors of those areas and to address the issues of economic deprivation there. Which are the root causes of all this. But, if it requires you know hitting at those elements, which are a threat to the stability of both countries than we have to take very bold initiatives and we have to hit at the root cause of terrorism. We can not hide behind political expediency and say that appeasement is only one way of addressing it and we can not address this issue through removing the root causes. So, these are tough decisions that have to be taken but there has to be a commitment from both sides to address these issues. Your country is committed, your tax payers have paid for so much but at the end of the day, that problem has now come into Pakistan. It is not just in Afghanistan any more. Afghanistan is not stabilized but Pakistan is being destabilized now, even with the commitment of one hundred thousand troops there. So, there has to be more effort, I think from your government and with our government to address these root causes. I mean you can buy any amount of equipment but if you do not address the root causes, what good is that equipment. Thank you.

Mr. James Arbuthnot: May, I say, before I correct a serious omission which I have made. May, I say in immediate answer to that point that the Senator must be absolutely right that we have to address the root causes and so I think it was very pleasing to us from the Defence Committee that the British Secretary of State for International Development was here last week and announced that there would be a doubling of the amount of aid that would come to particularly the tribal areas in the next 5 years or so. So, if you have not heard the news that he had been here and had made that offer of important more help I am pleased to be able to say that we heard it ourselves earlier this week and it is very important error indeed. Mr. Chairman, you said at the beginning that these meetings ought to be more frequent. I have no doubt at all that we would like to come here much more frequently than we can. We are constrained by the requirements about having to be in our own Parliament. We try to persuade our Parliamentary Whip that we would prefer to be here but my suggestion would be that if you thought that more frequent meetings will be a good idea, perhaps you might like to come to the United Kingdom where you would be most welcome and a visit could enable you to meet, I think we have 800,000 people in the United Kingdom from Pakistan and so it would be very worthwhile visit but the next member on our side who got my eye was Kevin Jones.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: Before you start let me accept your invitation on behalf of the Committee and we certainly will put it in our programme of this Committee's future visit outside the country because that will enable us to do exactly the way Afghanistan and Pakistan are doing meeting alternatively in Kabul and Islamabad. We certainly accept your invitation and we will take it up.

Mr. Kevin Jones: Thank you Senator. Can I just follow on what Senator said about the root causes of some of these problems and I could totally agree that the solution is not just military in the end. It is something going to be both economic and touch some of these issues which she ably talked about but very interesting now what we can do to not just

attack poverty and economic issues but some of the root causes of radicalism in not just communities in Pakistan but also some amongst the Pakistani community living in thousands in the United Kingdom. Have the members of the committee got any idea how we can actually try to persuade especially young disaffected Pakistani citizens both in the UK and here away from the idea of radicalism, terrorism and towards obviously the peacefulness in both majority of the Pakistan community in the United Kingdom and here.

Senator Saadia Abbasi: I think this is a question that requires almost a debate but I would just like to say one thing that what are the root causes of dissatisfaction amongst Muslim Communities in Britain and I think one of them is the impact of 9/11 and it has hurt the Muslim community throughout the world and the invasion of Iraq and after that the situation in Afghanistan. There is a perception amongst the Muslim Communities and it may be fueled by social and economic causes also but there is a perception that Muslims all over the world are the target of the policies of the West. Rightly or wrongly, one can debate it for ever and ever and go around in circles and I as a Pakistani, holding a Pakistani Passport, if I travel anywhere in the world the way I am treated is I think, a unique case even though the highest tolerance we have seen is in Great Britain and you know the Pakistanis there, they are so many there and people have done exceptionally well. They are contributing to the economy of Pakistan and they have been for the last almost 45 years but still you know there is this feeling today that if you land in a Western country you are treated differently than others and you are basically humiliated and you know that feeling of humiliation is at the root cause of every thing and that is because somehow we are identified with our religion and our religion is now identified with terrorism and a small problem has now snow balled into a issue in which our religion is linked with terrorism. I think there needs to be greater understanding and greater openness and sharing of ideas about not only religion but it should be openly discussed and openly debated. No doubt every time there is a bomb attack, every time somebody is killed and there is a report that there were suicide bombers. Suicide bombing and suicides are unknown to our religion not permitted under our religion and even then these events are taking place, the events taking place in Palestine and these are festering problems. You know the world has now changed and these problems have become larger than what they really are. I think it is lack of understanding between our cultures, our peoples and our politics more than any thing else. I think at the people to people level there might be a different kind of interaction than at the level of governments and the polices I think do not reflect the realities of the sentiments of the people.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: Prof. Khurshid Ahmed also to comment on this, so that if there is a response from you.

Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed: Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to join the Chairman of the Committee to welcome all of you to Pakistan. We have a long history of relationships involving both conflict and cooperation. I am happy that from conflict, we are moving towards cooperation. That is what we expect the future to be. We appreciate that there is increasing cooperation between Pakistan and the U.K. in areas of

defence and economy and greater interaction on global issues. It is in this context that I would like to share some thought with you.

First of all I want to make submissions about the central issue of terrorism, which is worrying all of us. Let us be clear that terrorism is not something very new, it is as old as history. What is new, however, is the way particularly after 9/11, the issue has been handled by the USA and I am sorry to say, also by the Britain and some other European countries. The fundamental issue relates to the use of violence in politics. Terrorism, as you know, is a form of violence resorted to achieve political objectives. That is why it had always been looked upon as a tactic and not as an objective in itself. In legal terms it was looked upon as a criminal act, to be taken care of through mechanism of criminal justice. But somehow after 9/11 terrorism has been so metamorphosed as to become an act of war, justifying the unleashing of war on terror, so much so as turning the whole world into a theatre of war. The earlier paradigm regarded terrorism as an aberration, a tactic and a crime that should be punished as a criminal act. That is why whether it was the Trade Centre attack of 1993 or the issue of Oklahoma incident of 1997, it was criminal justice which was invoked to tackle terrorism. 9/11 is paradigm shift. Now terrorism is turned from a crime into an act of war. Consequently, terrorism was painted as war on America and responded to by waging war not only on terrorists of unknown identity but on at least two sovereign countries Afghanistan and Iraq. Unfortunately for the last seven years, we are suffering because of this paradigm shift and consequent policy changes and redrawing of the strategies to fight it. This has led to escalation of terrorism and not its containment. It has made the world more insecure. In fact it has become a recipe for promotion of lawlessness and harassment of innocent civilians the world over.

In view of this experience, I submit, there is an urgent need for some careful analysis and fresh thinking to assess what has been achieved and what has been lost. How far '*terrorism*' has been used to promote pre-set political objectives, and the world has been subjected to global brinkmanship, unilateralism, regime change in the name of self defence, invasion of sovereign countries and making war plans on the basis of concocted reports and patent lies. Similarly, we have to face the issue of extremism in its real historical and socio-political context. Radicalism was never such a dirty word as it has become today. Extremes have also played a role in the development of human thought and policy. As students of history and social sciences we all know how proud we were of affiliation with movements. We were talking of Radical Economics, Radical Sociology, Radical Philosophy even Radical Theology. These movements were not looked upon as aberrations and roads to disaster. They represented phases in the development of thought and policy. Hegel or Marx looked upon history as arena for the conflict of the extremes of thesis and antithesis, leading to the emergence of synthesis. This is how human thought in society have progressed.

May I submit that there is an urgent need to liberate ourselves from the tyranny of those intellectual constructs that have been clamped upon us under flag of war on terrorism. Let us try to address the root causes, and come out of the spell of the cliché? Let us be prepared to understand the meaning and significance of the reactions to the policies of Western powers particularly America?

Anti-Americanism too is not a new phenomena. The literature of the 60's and 70's was rife with characters of "ugly American". In the post cold war period even before 9/11, there were dozens of studies analyzing the phenomenon of anti-Americanism not merely in the third world but also in France and Europe. Now the lava that was seething beneath the surface for long has burst out. Let us try to assess these trends and factors that are beneath it.

To trace the causes of terrorism exclusively in poverty and under-development is not realistic. They may have a role, yet they are not the most important factors as shown by some of the latest studies by top economists and data-analysts. The latest study of Prof. John Esposito based on Gallop Survey from 2002 to 2007 (*Who Speaks for Islam?*) is a very timely piece of research. The policy formulations based on differences between the moderates and the liberals on the one hand and the radicals and the so-called extremists on the other, is very deceptive. The issue of Anti-Americanism is much more serious and fundamental, and is structurally related to US policies and behaviour. It is not simply a product of religious fanaticism. If that is so, some fundamental rethinking is necessary and unless that is done and done with greater depth and objectivity we cannot face the challenge that beset us. The issue of political and economic designs of the West to remake the world and particularly redraw the map of the Middle East is very relevant. It is not a figment of imagination. Whether it is war in Afghanistan and Iraq, or the threatened invasion of Iran, all of these issues are interlinked. They are also linked to the strategic thinking of the establishment in America and in some other European countries.

You have touched upon the issue of Muslim Community in the U.K. I would like to request you to reflect on the fact that the Muslim community is there for almost half a century. Why is it that these particular trends are appearing now amongst the Muslim Community, particularly the youth who were born and educated in the U.K. The redherring of a weak spent in Pakistan or a few days in Palestine as enough to transform them into terrorists is a non-starter. You cannot understand the psyche of these youngsters you fathom their inner feelings and understand their anxieties and concerns. Then only you can find out what has gone wrong and how it can be corrected. I don't want to take more of your time but I would definitely like to say that while you are here, I would invite you to kindly reflect on three or four other important issues.

First and foremost — if any military action is contemplated against Iran, its consequences for the region and for the world would be disastrous. If you can play some role in holding America from this madness or restraining Israel from any such adventure you will do a great service to the region and the future of peace in the world.

Secondly, I would also like to suggest that the issue of Kashmir is a legacy of the British Rule. It is one of the problems which you left unresolved. As such you have a moral responsibility to play a more effective role in the resolution of this issue on the basis of justice and rights of the people, particularly, their right to self-determination. What is happening in Jammu and Kashmir today is important and you must see how an issue that related to the question of land is being turned into a communal issue and a new scenario of

conflict on communal and religious basis is being forged by none other than the communal forces in India. This is a very serious situation. It is a flashpoint.

Finally a piece of information I would like to have from you. Senator Memon has already referred to it and the Leader of the British delegation has also referred to that. Believe me we are fighting a very difficult struggle to make the defence establishment reveal their budget and their priorities to the Parliament. So far there had been no Parliamentary oversight on defence budget. For the first time in Pakistan's history from one line defence budget we have moved to a one page one! That gives us information about allocation to the three major services and defence production and defence establishment. This is the be-all and end-all of it. I want to find out (a) what is the role of British Parliament and Parliamentary Committees in the formulation of the defence budget, (b) Role in its approval, and (c) Role in regular oversight. We want to know as to what is the role of the Parliament and its relevant Committees in these three aspects? We want to know how you operate in the U.K. and whether we can learn from your experience. We would be grateful if you can share with us this information. Thank you very much.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: Thank you, Prof. Khurshid Sahib.

Mr. James Arbuthnot: I think we are over whelmed; it reinforces our invitation to you to come to the United Kingdom, perhaps you could see us in session when we are asking the Ministry of Defence about the budget and accounts but that you knew is one of the many things the Professor has raised. I think I had best call on our Vice Chairman to answer these difficult questions.

Mr. David Crausby, Vice Chairman: Thank you, I am not sure to answer questions but I am posing some more. I represent the constituency in the North of England that has a substantial population that either come their parents come from Pakistan their grand parents come from Pakistan and I completely accept Senator Abbasi's point that the widely held view is that the West wishes to be completely opposed to the western world. I accept that is a widely held view. My view is that it is completely wrong and it's certainly wrong as far as Britain is concerned. In my opinion I just want to make the point because I represent the people, who made complaints to me when they land in the UK. The manner people were treated in the U.K. I think the Britain government is working on that and I think the reality is we are humiliated when we land in America anyway. This is not where you come from but we all get it the same way. So, I think we got you argue very strongly that this is not an issue until with the Muslim World. This is joint issue against terrorism and it is absolutely right that the British and the Western World is very keen to defend itself against terrorism. We would all want to do that is what responsible governments are elected to do and we are prepared to do that in anyway possible but I would make the point, that most in my constituency for many years and there has always be a very strong anti-American feeling in particular long before 9/11. There are many of these troops in Palestine and to some extent in, if your argument about Kashmir, as well difficult arguments about Kashmir you might well say that the British have a moral responsibility to take action as far as Kashmir is concerned. I think we have no more wisdom than anyone else on this issue and

it's a very easy subject to argue about a very difficult situation to resolve. I was going to say that this was the first time I met a group of Pakistanis that Kashmir was not mentioned until Professor Khurshid Ahmed mentioned it. Now, I like to think that there is an indication of your improving relations with India, because it is absolutely vital in my opinion. That if we are going to defend ourselves internationally against terrorism then we got to do that together and Pakistan and India have got to do that together. So, I rather think that the reason why Kashmir is not mentioned as much is because you have got even more pressing problems as far as terrorism is concerned. I think we will ignore Kashmir at our peril and I absolutely accept the Professor's view, there must be doubt without this time as much as anytime. So, I wondered if you said anything about progress that has been made as far as Kashmir is concerned with India.

Senator Professor Khurshid Ahmed: Let Kashmir be open for the media, to the international aid agencies, to the NGOs, who want to serve the afflicting humanity there, the human rights issue. I do not find enough mention of that in world media and this is very important force for awakening of the issues world over and also for developing genuine pressure on those who are resisting listening to this problem. So, at least we also try to seek that more coverage, more access, more information about Kashmir in world media. Last couple of years World Watch and Amnesty International have started doing something but if we look upon last thirty years one finds a tragic silence. Let us break this silence and let the world know what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr. David Crausby: I think many problems go back to the economic prosperity and that seems to me when Prime Minister is absolutely right in saying that security comes before economic success. The economic success is absolutely vital to all of these problems and that is very much a part of the issue as far as Pakistani community is concerned in Britain that is why the Muslim Community in Britain feel separate and disenfranchise Not because of their different religion but because they feel they did not have fair opportunity in life and it suffered in some of the most poorest communities that is what we have to resolve in Britain and in the world.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: May I invite Senator Rukhsana Zuberi.

Senator Rukhsana Zuberi: Thank you very much. First of all I would like to welcome the members of the delegation especially those whom we held an opportunity to meet again after your June 3rd meeting. I think the Chairman himself is there Mr. David Borrow, Mr. David Crausby, Mr. Adam Holloway, Kevin Jones welcome again and my apologies for getting late. I think this is my second or third meeting in five years in the Senate that I have been late. I was here at 09:00 A.M. and then I had to rush for something which I could not avoid, so, I am very sorry for that. Compared to last time when we met, I think we are in a much worst situation other than having a politically elected government. The food Security has become a very pressing issue, energy security, these are the things which are being talked in your country also and every time we access media from your country these issues are being discussed. But in our case it is multiplied because of policies of a government which was not representative, when I say not representative means unfortunately we had

head of the government, Chief Executive of the country a person who had no stakes in Pakistan, so they were random policies and the policies which gave day to hoardings? and to other things. We are really in a tough situation. So far energy is concern the Prime Minister Mr. Yousaf Raza Gillani has accepted, I mean in fact is focusing on the alternate energy and renewable energy, but what my suggestion to you would be if he could have some support in getting nuclear energy because right now even we are a nuclear state a nuclear country but we are not being able to use it for the benefit of our people. We are having several nuclear diagnostic centres, which is good. So we will really appreciate if something can go from this Committee and we could move on getting more nuclear energy technology and also coal gasification technology because in your energy pie you are having energy as a major source of your supplies.

So far we talked of terrorism. We need to see how we are facing this today because due to political expediencies countries like yours have been condoning the military dictators. We have been out of Commonwealth but then their acceptance due to certain reasons has definitely caused concern and since these people do not have a constituency they don't have support of people, they find their own constituencies and they find their own people and then today we are facing as a result the kind of terrorism, which you were kind enough to condole to start with. The Chairman has talked about training of our armed forces. I would go one step where I belong to I would say we will appreciate training if you could give an opportunity to the members of this Committee to see how you make inroads in to defence spending and how you do it and it will be very difficult on our part when we say that the whole Committee wants to visit I am sure Mr. Chairman Nisar Memon may be able to do that but if it is possible that one or two members who are visiting U.K. can be facilitated, who can assist them in learning. I was at an orientation programme with CPA where all the Commonwealth countries Parliamentarians and Speakers were there and it was really an opportunity that they learned about the Ombudsman, about your ethics committee and things like that. I have been talking to our secretary about it and definitely we will work it out as we are in the process, so we will appreciate that facilitation. Thank you very much.

Mr. James Arbuthnot: Senator I wonder whether it would be sensible in view of the way the discussion about oversight of the budget goes if we would to send you a copy of a most recent inquiry and report into the M/O Defence budget and accounts: an inquiry and report, which we do every year and we also do inquiries and reports into the supplementary estimates, which are produced twice a year. We will do that.

Professor Khurshid Ahmed: Is it also possible to share with us the process through which defence budget making takes place and what role your ways and means committee and or any other committee plays in that. Is it possible to receive a report?

Mr. James Arbuthnot: Yes I will write a covering letter to explain that. I wonder whether David Havard, who is a Labour Member Parliament like to speak.

Mr. David Havard: but I would like to focus down on something practical if I could. I agree with you about the demonizing of groups and the use of language and so on, and on

and its very important these things can have practical affects but in terms of practical affects one other thing that clearly we have interest because of the activities of our forces currently in Afghanistan on the security of the borders of that country or what is going in and out of that country and you have a similar concern because you are one of the neighbour's who share the border. A practical measure that needs to be taken to deal with the immediate circumstances is what I am really looking out. You talked about how you need more information, assistance with all of those things. My understanding is that there is a practical arrangement being discussed they help with them, which is the establishment of some sort of joint border control centres or coordination centres in order to achieve control. Actually, that's the better way of describing it within, which obviously if there was a joint activity some of the feeds from information would be available to be shared for a shared objective. Now I understand that's an active discussion. So, what I would like to understand where that has got to as a practical idea it may well turn in to political and diplomatic enablers for future relations between the neighbours, but it is immediate task it seems that needs to be addressed. This is one practical way of trying to do that, and I would like your opinion on where we could go in terms of achieving it.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: I think all of these things have been discussed threadbare in the DCF as well as in subsequent visits of your Secretary of Defence and as well as the Secretary of State. I think the details are of course with them because this is an operational requirement that should be there. But in terms of the philosophy it is very clear that Pakistan would ensure within the territory of Pakistan whatever information we are provided from your forces, which are part of the NATO and ISAF, that we pursue on this as well as any technology that is required. It is a question on which Pakistan is very clear and Pakistani people are very sensitive to any joint operation, any operation on the soil of Pakistan because the people of Pakistan believe that as a sovereign state that is not required. And the Pakistani forces not only have the experience of these areas and knowledge of these areas. With this kind of exchange at the operational level what's happening in Afghanistan and what kind of groups or people that you believe are working there in order to provide linkages here that kind of intelligence sharing should be there. In fact, we had very recently visits from your intelligence services people and there these details have been in fact explained at length. I would say that things are mention but certainly the details we would be discussing in the various Forums between the two governments, because we leave the operational issues of the forces to the government.

Mr. David Havard: Its clearly, important for the military task the direct military task, but it has all these other ancillary advantages, not the least of which is part of the money revenue streams to people to carry out extremism is the drugs narcotics trade, which is of no benefit to anyone other than them. The interdiction of that is also important, so the supply of information in order to achieve the interdiction is only one aspect. There has to be the practical coordination of the interdiction of people, goods, pirates, drug runners whatever they are as well as those people who are associated with terrorism.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: I am happy to mention about the aspect of the drugs because Pakistan on its part in its own territory, ensured that alternate be provided to the people, who have been growing poppy, so that they are not encouraged to grow it. At the same time

Pakistan has initiated socio economic development in the FATA areas. This need to be supplemented by the international forums and other countries because I think, the interest of Pakistan, Europe and of your country, is the same, which is to fight terrorism because it is here that they have now focused apart from other places. But where can we work together? In fact if we look at Pakistan today poppy growing is almost negligible. We notice that Afghanistan today emerges as the biggest poppy growing country in the world. Now, it is not poppy, it is the question of the earnings that they have and this is the kind of money which is used for arms distribution and in terms of providing people all the facilities to act as extremists. So their people are encouraged to follow their philosophy while their family is taken care of with the kind of money that they have.

I think we also appreciate that while trade with UK is the highest it has increased further. Over hundred British companies are operating here under the Overseas Investors, Chamber of Commerce and Industry and apart from that the international development fund that you have allocated are highly appreciated and have a positive impact. But I think the quantum of this has to be much bigger than what it has been in the past simply because the government in Afghanistan has not been able to govern their own territory to be able to curb and suppress all the drug cultivation as well as arms purchases by militants. So, I think the answer lies in increasing developing funds though can not only fighting back in terms of the border but also developing this and I think, your Chairman very clearly mentioned your interest and ours in fact mutual that we develop socio economically those areas which Pakistan has come in but it is a horrendous task in view of the drug cultivation which you have mentioned.

Senator Professor Khurshid Ahmed: If you permit me Mr. Chairman, while I share the concern of the honourable M.P, but we have to realize that it is a long porous border and difficult to monitor. Moreover, movement across this border has been a common practice and many families live on both sides of the border so it is not an easy task. We are perhaps over emphasizing the border between two states and neglecting the fact that states, which do not have a common border with Pakistan are also suffering from the same problem. The insurgency, the resistance, the attacks are not confined to this particular area. So unless you take the whole view, it will be distorted and finally I would say that it is one of the contributions of American and NATO presence in Afghanistan and the Karzai regime that poppy cultivation that was almost 100% wiped out in 2001 is now again a booming trade and those who are benefiting from it, include those sitting in Kabul, the Karzai regime and the economy of Afghanistan. So we should not just try to dish out blame on XYZ and ignore others. We have to promote better steps.

Mr. David Borrow: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the comments of Professor Khurshid Ahmad about the change in terrorism after 9/11. And traditionally terrorism is being focused on overthrowing or changing of governments in a country. And governments outside that country have not really been interested, unless they have asked for support. When 9/11 was different, was that 9/11 was an attack by a terrorist group based in one country, on another country, 9/11 obviously was an on the United States. And after that attack, the government of that country let us say, Afghanistan did not take any action

against that terrorist group where as in most situations one would expect a sovereign government to have taken action against the terrorist group that had attacked another country directly. One would have expected the government of Pakistan to take action against the terrorist group based in Pakistan that carried out operation similar to 9/11. I think part of difficulty we have in terms of relationship between the West and the Muslim world is the perception certainly within many of the Pakistani community in the UK that 9/11 was not an attack on the United States by a terrorist group but 9/11 was a US conspiracy which was used as an excuse to take action against Afghanistan and that fundamental difference of opinion, I think lies behind much of the misunderstandings and difficulties since. We, from the UK perspective, I certainly would not be supporting spending million and hundreds of million of Pounds and spilling the blood of soldiers from the UK unless I felt there was a long term threat from a terrorist group that could be based in Afghanistan. And until we have a government that is secure in Afghanistan, they will not provide a haven for terrorist groups that can attack the west. The west will continue to have an interest in Afghanistan. From my own point of view, if the Taliban government of that time had stopped the terrorist activity in Afghanistan attacking the US and the rest of the west, the West would have no interest whatsoever, in changing or affecting the Taliban government that would be for the people of Afghanistan that would not be for the west to intervene. The west intervened because of the threat of that I think. There is the misunderstanding between many in the Pakistani community and the UK and I think, in parts of the world as to why the west intervened and I think that it to me feed into many of antagonisms that exist within the world because we have not really reached a proper a great understanding of what happened at 9/11 and have other spread into many of the difficulties since 9/11.

Mr. Adam Holloway: I will not take much time. I would only like to talk on headlines or bullet points. What advice, Senators will give to an in coming US President and how to win the war on terror.

Mr. Richard Younger-Ross: It is not directly to deal with your committee but as we talked about ideological differences, we got the culture differences and in fact we talked about social injustice and the need to deal with deprivation. One of the problems of course with Afghanistan, is that it is one of the poorest countries in the world. It has very severe deprivation and I believe that we are all duty bound to try to deal with that deprivation as I believe we are also duty bound to try to help Pakistan and other developing countries. In dealing with the deprivation some problems that even they have as you would wish it to be not enforced as is appropriate. In the case of Afghanistan, what are the problems they have is they are land locked country and they find it very hard to export but their complaint is that they wish to export via Pakistan but if they are exporting soft foods than they find the train delayed by the time they get food. Their crops have been destroyed to the other things perhaps, what you can do I would say that whether that not true until this is a lot of nonsense or to facilitate them and their economic development either that way through energy or through trade.

Senator Nisar A. Memon: Let me submit in response to the various observations that have been made here. First of all, I think we need to clearly understand that the people of

Pakistan and many other people in the world also feel that as a result of end of the cold war the American forces, which were here and the allies that were supporting at that time, left Afghanistan's agenda unfinished moved to another theatre that was Iraq and I think that was a mistake. If you recall 9/11 happened exactly after 1989 when the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan came to an end. So, the forces acted accordingly. Now, of course there are various views as to why 9/11 happened but this is a common view that 9/11 was a result of the deprivation and the void that was created and some of the forces who had earlier worked as agents of CIA operated knowing the system very well. However in response to the trade, let me submit to you that we have one billion dollar worth of trade with Afghanistan today and all of this to a country earlier was at a very low level and all other states are in fact in the interest of Afghanistan which as Professor said, it was not the first time that its land locked but this trade has increased tremendously to a level of one billion and we have in fact seen in the worst times that when we needed wheat, it was provided to Afghanistan and to the extent that it even reached the flour markets of Moscow. This is where they started to trade at the expense of the people of Pakistan and this need to be understood. And I think there is no substitute for any country to stand on its own and we have discussed earlier in some other meeting with NATO here that NATO and the UK need to have an exit strategy. So that, that country runs on its own. But what they will require of you to exit, I think, it is very clearly understood by every one but I think you could certainly see that and send us notes of what observations you have and findings in Afghanistan. We could pursue that kind of things but in the mean time I would say that let us continue this dialogue and exchange of your observations from the other side also.

Senator Professor Khurshid Ahmed: I am very grateful to M.P. David Borrow for raising a very fundamental issue. And I would very humbly submit that we have to examine the real nature of 9/11, response to it and consequence thereof in greater depth. We should not be administered by the conspiracy theory or the official version we are getting from the west. We must note that none of those involved in 9/11 came from Afghanistan, they came from Saudi Arabia, Egypt and they studied in Germany and America so we have to go deeper into that. We can not brush and set aside like that. Secondly I would very humbly submit that as far as Taliban's role is concerned, they made it very clear that let there be an independent judicial tribunal and we will surrender Osama Bin Laden for trial. We are not going to hand him over to America, which Bush was demanding. They said we are prepared for judicial enquiry but you did not respond to that. We also know that there are judgments of International Court of Jurists that those terrorists, who had operated from American soil in Latin American countries, they were responsible for whatever act of terrorism they committed and the American government was equally responsible for that. If that is so looking at the Judgment of 1984, how could they invade Afghanistan on that plea? I think we have to go deeper. So let us not be emotional or just have shortcuts. And unless you do not go really deeper, you will not be able to find out the truth. I conclude that despite all that has been said and the 9/11 Commission Report and the books that have appeared in support and against it, I use a phrase by Churchill that 9/11 remains "a riddle, wrapped in mystery inside an enigma". Unless we reveal it, we will not be able to face reality. Thank you.

Senator Nisar A Memon: I think from this side there could not be a better conclusion than what Professor Sahib has already submitted. I am looking at your next appointment with the Speaker, National Assembly but at 1230 we will get together for lunch. All the people in this room are invited including my friends from the press. Of course, this lunch is being hosted in your honour by the Committee.

Mr. James Arbuthnot: Thank you. After that we look forward to meet you in London.

Senator Nisar A Memon: Certainly.

Senator Professor Khurshid Ahmed: Hopefully, and we would receive the information from you.

IFTIKHAR ULLAH BABAR
Secretary Committee

SENATOR NISAR AHMED MEMON
Chairman Committee