



SENATE OF PAKISTAN  
PAKISTAN WORLDVIEW

Report - 11

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Dialogue with the  
Dutch  
AND  
Pakistan - Russia  
Relations

August, 2006

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



SENATE OF PAKISTAN  
PAKISTAN WORLDVIEW

Report - 11

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Dialogue with the  
Dutch  
AND  
Pakistan - Russia  
Relations

August, 2006

## List of Contents

1.	Meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee with Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands on Contemporary International Issues (May 2, 2006)	07
	■ Executive Summary of the Meeting	11 - 12
	■ Proceedings of the Meeting (Verbatim Record)	15 - 29
2.	Meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee with the International Affairs Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation on Pakistan – Russia Relations in a Changing Regional Scenario (May 4, 2006)	33
	■ Executive Summary of the Meeting	37 - 40
	■ Proceedings of the Meeting (Verbatim Record)	43 - 53
3.	Senator Mushahid Hussain's Article on 'Pakistan-Soviet Relations' published in Daily 'The Muslim, Islamabad (Sept. 13-15, 1981)	
	PAKISTAN – SOVIET RELATIONS: Providing the historical context	57 - 63
	■ Missed opportunities	
	■ Breaking the ice	
	■ After Afghanistan	
	<b>PROFILES</b>	
	■ Profile of Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot Foreign Minister of the Netherlands	67
	■ Profile of Mr. Konstatin KOSACHEV Chairman, International Affairs Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation	68
	■ Profiles of the Chairman and Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee	71 - 78
	■ Profiles of the Committee Officials	81 - 82



# Contemporary International Issues

---

Meeting of the Senate  
Foreign Relations Committee  
with  
Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot,  
Foreign Minister of the Netherlands

(May 2, 2006)





## CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

### Meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands

May 2, 2006

Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot, Dutch Foreign Minister visited Pakistan in May 2006 and besides other important engagements had a detailed meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 2, 2006 at 2:45 p.m. in Committee Room No.1 of the Parliament House wherein a host of contemporary international issues were discussed.

The following members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee attended the meeting:-

1.	Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed	Chairman
2.	Senator Wasim Sajjad	Member
3.	Senator Babar Khan Ghauri	Member
4.	Senator S. M. Zafar	Member
5.	Senator Nisar Ahmad Memon	Member
6.	Senator Mrs. Gulshan Saeed	Member
7.	Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq	Member
8.	Senator Sardar Mahtab Ahmed	Member
9.	Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed	Member

The Dutch side was represented by the following:

1.	Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot	Foreign Minister
2.	Mr. Willem Andrae	Ambassador of the Netherlands
3.	Mr. Hugo H. Siblesz	DG Political Affairs
4.	Mr. Joop W. Scheffers	Director Asia & Oceania
5.	Mrs. Louise Huijbens-Jellema	Policy Advisor
6.	Mrs. Heleen Saaf van der Beek	First Secretary
7.	Mr. Karel Hartogh	Spokesman of Minister
8.	Mr. Herman van Gelderen	Secretary to Minister

The verbatim proceeding of the meeting is given following the Executive Summary of this Report.



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY





## Executive Summary

The Dutch Foreign Minister was in Pakistan in May, 2006 and besides other engagements had a meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Islamabad. The discussion which lasted about an hour focused on many contemporary international issues of particular interest to Pakistan. The Netherlands is Pakistan's fourth most important export destination in Europe. Bilateral trade of around US \$ 600 million depicts Pakistan's historical trading relations with this important EU country. The Netherlands also hosts a large Pakistani community of about 35,000 which contributes significantly to the workers as well as remittances to Pakistan.

After the usual exchange of pleasantries and introductions of both sides Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed raised a number of issues in the meeting with the Dutch Foreign Minister which include: the recent agreement between India and the US on nuclear cooperation which has disturbed the existing balance of power in the Sub Continent. The issue of Indian Consulates established in Qandahar and Jalalabad in Afghanistan which work to the detriment of Pakistan's security and stability. Thirdly, that under no circumstances, should policy makers in Europe and the United States consider force as a factor against Iran as use of force would destabilize an already volatile region and will send a message to the Muslim people around the world that there are double standards operating in nuclear policy: North Korean nuclear issue is being settled through multilateral negotiations while Iran is under threat. Fourthly, that Netherlands should play a positive and proactive role in promoting dialogue among civilizations, which is the need of the hour.

Prof. Khurshid Ahmed was of the view that after 5 years of the war against terrorism it is time that

the nations of the world pause and reflect whether this approach has led to increase in terrorism or has contained it. He expressed importance of inter cultural dialogue where issues like one civilization dominating the rest of the world according to its values predominates or opt for recognizing many civilizations. On the Afghan problem, he said that Afghanistan has never accepted foreign occupation in its history and the Afghan issue should not be simplified by projecting it as a resistance of Taliban. He said that Indo-US agreement on nuclear cooperation will lead to arms race in the region, which Pakistan is endeavoring to avoid. It also involves some very important conceptual issues concerning nuclear Non Proliferation. He appreciated the role of the Netherlands in particular and the European countries in general for handling the Iran issue in a hope inspiring manner.

Senator Nisar A. Memon stressed the need for a dialogue between different civilizations but was of the view that this dialogue will be successful if it takes place between democratic countries. Since Pakistan is well entrenched on the path of democracy it can play that role effectively. Different communities in Pakistan live in harmony and the limited number of disputes that have occurred in the past 5 or 6 years have been between Muslims rather than Muslims versus other religions or cultures. He urged the Netherlands to exercise its influence on other EU countries concerning the sensitivity about the blasphemous caricatures published in Europe so as to supplement the efforts of the people working for interfaith harmony.

Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq forcefully denied any linkage between Islam with terrorism and extremism and argued that Islam came for the elimination and eradication of extremism. All the



terrorists are a product of the Western universities and not Madrassahs. He said that we in Pakistan feel that after the Afghan war countries like India, Afghanistan and the United States are responsible for acts of violence and terrorism in Pakistan, especially in the province of Balochistan and parts of Waziristan. On the blasphemy issue, he said that the Muslim population would show the same kind of anguish and anger if there was any blasphemy against Prophet Jesus (PBUH).

Senator Mehtab Ahmed Khan was of the view that results of the war on terrorism are still not achieved because the main reason pertaining to terrorism has been neglected which is the absence of universally recognized democratic system in Islamic countries and also religious indoctrination. He showed dismay over United States support to Pakistan for projecting a particular brand of democracy.

Senator S. M. Zafar was of the view that in Islamic jurisprudence the central point for the Muslim ethos is justice which is their primary value and when the reverse happens it gives rise to terrorism. There is this conflict of justice or of no justice. Be it in Kashmir, Palestine or any other region of the world.

The Dutch Foreign Minister expressed sorrow for the victims of the earthquake. He informed that the Dutch government would be sending 1400 to 1600 troops to Afghanistan which will help in reconstruction of the social sector facilities in the region. He suggested that Pakistan and Holland should collaborate in the political and intelligence field in Afghanistan so as to root out terrorists in the region. On the Iran nuclear issue, he said that Iran is pursuing a programme which is hidden and lacks transparency. The worry is that Iran's

pronouncements and deeds do not converge, thus camouflaging their real intentions. There is desire in the EU to solve this issue through diplomacy but for that it is important that Iran is willing to talk, otherwise the dialogue becomes difficult. Europe is also insisting that Iran should observe and submit to the regular IAEA framework. Now it is for Iran to choose the path of cooperation or otherwise. Quoting US Secretary of State Ms. Condoleezza Rice, he said that United States has no intention of using force against Iran.

On the terrorism issue he believed that it is not a clash between religions but a clash between extremists and it is important to initiate the dialogue to remove misunderstandings between different extremists groups. He agreed that interfaith dialogue is the need of the hour so as to comprehend views and opinions of different faiths and cultures. He suggested that International TV Channels should start a regular programme where scholars and ordinary people could discuss issues pertaining to different cultures and faiths which will help in the situation. Referring to the Indo-US nuclear agreement the Dutch Foreign Minister was of the view that the United States Congress has yet not decided on the issue so it is premature to know the outcome of this deal. The Netherlands being an important member of the nuclear suppliers group will look into the issue in an objective and neutral way once this agreement is brought to their notice. On the question of delivery of justice he said that the Netherlands can open its borders and introduce tribunals but people have to be willing to obey the verdicts. Moreover, justice should be delivered in our countries, in our tribal groups and in our families.



# PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

(Verbatim Record)



## Proceedings of the Meeting

(Verbatim Record)

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** First of all, allow me to introduce our team. On my right is Senator Wasim Sajjad, He is Leader of the House and former Chairman of the Senate. On my left is Senator Nisar Ahmad Memon, he is Chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on Defence and Defence Production and a former Minister for Information. On his left, is Maulana Sami-ul-Haq. He is from the religious right but is on my left. He heads the biggest and the most prominent seminary(Madrassah) in Pakistan namely, Darul Uloom Haqqania. He is a leading religious scholar as well and Chairman of the Standing Committee on Religious Affairs. On his left is Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed. He is also from the MMA and is a former Minister for Planning and Development and a very eminent economist

and intellectual in his own right. On the right is Senator Gulshan Saeed, a leader of the Pakistan Muslim League and Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Ports and Shipping.

Senator Mahtab Ahmed Khan is from the Opposition's PML (N), which is a component of the Association for the Restoration of Democracy (ARD). He is former Chief Minister of the Frontier Province which borders Afghanistan and also a former Minister for Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas. Senator S. M. Zafar is Chairman of the Human Rights Committee of the Senate. He is a former Federal Minister for Law & Justice. Let me also welcome Senator Babar Khan Ghauri. He is Minister for Ports and Shipping in the Federal Government and represents the coalition partner of the PML - the MQM which has a very strong power base



Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed, Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee welcoming Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bott, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands.



in Karachi and in other parts of Sindh and Pakistan. So, this is the composition of the Committee and it gives me great pleasure to welcome you, Dr. Bot and we are looking forward to this interaction. I believe that you have to go at 3.30 pm to meet the Prime Minister, so I will start right away with a few opening remarks.

We thank you, especially the Dutch people for support during the earthquake. You rushed 200 tons of supplies, 130 troops from the NATO Relief Contingent and you also have given 70 million dollars for relief and reconstruction, which was a great help to Pakistan. This shows the depth and extent of our relationship which has been reinforced with your visit and the visit of your Defence Minister last month and the visit in September 2004 of President Pervez Musharraf to the Netherlands. Your country is the 7th largest investor in Pakistan and companies like Shell, Unilever, Phillips and ABN AMRO are household names in our country. From our side, apart from welcoming you, we feel that your country has a very important role to play in the EU and I will focus on just two-three brief issues for your interest.

Firstly, we feel that this area remains tense and volatile and that tension has been perhaps aggravated after the recent Indo-US nuclear agreement which has undermined the existing balance of power in the region because that agreement is a violation in letter and spirit of the NPT and also of existing US laws, particularly the 1954 US Nuclear Energy Act and the 1978 Non-Proliferation Act. We hope that the nuclear suppliers group would not support this agreement because it goes against the spirit of Non-Proliferation.

The other area, I would like to briefly mention,

is Afghanistan. NATO has a strong presence in eastern Afghanistan and we feel that the responsibility for settling Afghanistan rests largely with the United States, the NATO forces and the Karzai Administration. Our main concern is that the territory of Afghanistan is being used to destabilize parts of Pakistan. There are Indian Consulates functioning in certain parts of Afghanistan namely, Qandahar and Jalalabad, which work sometimes to the detriment of Pakistan's security and stability. Pakistan, for its part, has been hosting the Afghan refugees and has cooperated in the re-election of Mr. Karzai by facilitating the Afghan refugees settled in Pakistan to vote. It needs to be understood that Pakistan has a strategic stake in the stability, unity and territorial integrity of Afghanistan. Apart from the Afghan people, Pakistan is the only country which has paid the highest price in human, political and financial terms for the cause of Afghan people.

The third area, I would just like to briefly mention, is the Iranian nuclear issue. We feel that under no circumstances should policy makers in Europe and the United States consider force as a factor against Iran as that is not the answer. Threats of force and use of force would destabilize an already volatile region and it will send a message to the Muslim people and the Muslim communities that there are double standards operating in nuclear policy because Iran is the target while North Korea which admits it has the bomb, is settled through negotiations in a multilateral framework while the Israel's nuclear programme is completely exempt. The fall out of any aggression against Iran will particularly be felt in Pakistan. And there are double standards pertaining to human rights issue about Hamas in Palestine as well. We feel that such double standards should be shunned.

So, I think that these are important areas for our consideration. Finally, you have a very strong tradition of having a dialogue among civilizations. In Leiden where you studied, there is a famous centre for learning which was headed by Dr. Khalid Masood who is now Chairman of the Council of Islamic Ideology of Pakistan. Dutch NGOs, Dutch scholars and the Dutch business people have been very active in the Muslim world - not just in Indonesia but in the Middle East as well. We feel that your country can play a positive role and a pro-active role in promoting this kind of dialogue among civilizations and we are aware of the problems in your country. What happened to Mr. Pym Fonteyn? What happened to Mr. Van Gogh? The Muslim community in Netherlands and of course we in Pakistan hope to see Europe as a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-religious society based on tolerance, harmony and co-existence which is the essence of our great faith Islam and which is also the essence of all other major religions including Judaism and Christianity. Thank you sir for coming and we hope you have a good stay here.

**Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot** (Dutch Foreign Minister): Thank you very much, on behalf of the Ambassador, my personal Secretary, my spokesman and my Director, for welcoming us. We have had today very constructive talks with Mr. President and I am very grateful for your kind words and the brief introduction covering the essential subjects, which we should cover today. I have to express once again our sorrow for the victims of the earthquake. However, we were happy to be able to give you assistance. We have discussed today extensively the bilateral relationship. I must say that all signal are more than green. They are on go ahead intensify these relations and intensify political dialogue and we have just signed an MoU to facilitate trade, commerce and investment. People told me that the Netherlands is the fifth largest investor in Pakistan and the fourth biggest trading partner of Afghanistan. I think the subjects that are really important at the moment are Afghanistan and the fight against terrorism. Perhaps you could tell us something about the coming elections here and the way you see them and also something about human



The Foreign Relations Committee in discussion with Dr. Bernard Rudolf, Dutch Foreign Minister and his delegation.



rights and the role of women and the Hadood Ordinance and the blasphemy law. We read about these but I would like to be enlightened further. As far as Afghanistan is concerned, perhaps it has a background. We have been there since 2001. We were one of the first countries to have presence. First in ISEF headquarters in Kabul and then in Bagram. At the moment, we are sending 1400 to 1600 troops to Uruzgan to the south of Afghanistan. So, I am particularly pleased to have here in this group somebody who knows the region because that is, of course, of vital interest also to our troops. I cannot over emphasize that in the context of ISEF. We are not in Afghanistan with the 1600 troops to fight. We are there to try to stabilize that region together with the British, the Canadians and the Australians, in the hope to reconstruct because it is an area where much has to be done in terms of construction of infrastructure, public health, education. In other words, really basic services that can be provided if there is a degree of stabilization. That is the purpose of sending these troops. We have experience in the north, in Bagram, where the situation worked out well so far. That does not mean that we have not been fighting. We have also been participating in the operation enduring freedom in the south-east of Afghanistan. We are willing to heed the call of NATO to join the forces there with a number of other allies to try to bring peace and stability to the region.

I mentioned all these things because an intensified collaboration and cooperation between Pakistan and the Netherlands, as far as intelligence and the fight against terrorism is concerned, is important. How do we identify

those terrorist cells and organizations? What do we do against the enrolment of young people into these organizations? We have presently in the Netherlands the problem that increasingly people are alerted and drawn into the nets of these organizations. I think that we can help each other by exchanging information and I am also thinking about intelligence services on both sides of the border, once we are established in the Uruzgan region. We know that it is a porous border and lots of Taliban are coming back and forth and presently there is increasing activity of suicide bombers. Thanks, of course, to the season. We know that in spring there is an upsurge and an increase of these suicide bombers and of attacks. Our troops are arriving in July. We have, at the moment, already a number of troops there to prepare the field and prepare the scene. I have also talked to the President of Pakistan and my colleague, the Foreign Minister, that we appreciate this kind of information exchange very much and the closer the collaboration in the political field and in the intelligence field, the better. There is also a very close cooperation in commerce. We just discussed a number of issues in food processing, in water management, energy - things where we think we are very proficient and very expert - and we will try to enhance our collaboration in these areas too.

You discussed the Iran nuclear issue and the question of no force. I am in the lucky position that I attended last Thursday and Friday, the NATO Ministerial meeting in Sofia, Bulgaria, where I had discussions also with Condoleezza Rice who once again said that the United States has no intention of using force in Iran. I think that was an important statement, given the fact



that so many rumours are circulating. I think, of course, that United States has all scenarios on the table as any great power needs to do. They probably have developed a number of scenarios and she said the United States has no intention of armed intervention in Iran. She said that twice. So I think, that in itself, is a satisfactory communication. We are worried about Iran because we do not know to what extent we can rely on what they are saying. I myself, during our EU Presidency, had many contacts with my Iranian colleagues and the Iranian Nuclear Chief. They all assured us that Iran only would go to a certain degree if necessary, and that perhaps they would be even willing to compromise. We see that, from week to week, from month to month, what the Iranians are saying is not what they are doing. I think that is the concern because we do not know what their real intentions are and that is why we are insisting so much on IAEA safeguards, on observing those safeguards on submitting to the regular framework of IAEA inspections and of simply opening the laboratories and their installations. That is also the reason why we have said that if they do not comply, we want to submit the whole issue to the Security Council and then to see what can be done and what the outcome will be? That, also, is a question of credibility of the European Union. We have said, over and over again, that we are willing to negotiate to come to a solution and there is a system with many rewards, with many promises of helping Iran - be it in the trade field, be it in other fields, be it helping them in the nuclear field if they would like to build nuclear power plants. All these things were, to a certain way, accepted and then

rejected and I think we have reached a point where Iran itself has to choose and to be clear about her intentions. If not, I think there is no way open for the Europe but to go to the Security Council and then we will see how Russia and China will react. It is a matter of grave concern and I hope that Iran will still come back on its steps and that we will be able to come to an agreement - with reasonable people and with a reasonable outcome. Russia has promised to help. I recently went to Sofia where, once again, it was confirmed that Russia is willing to deliver as well as take back enriched uranium which gives all the guarantees for regular deliveries. So, there is no reason why Iran should opt for this course and in this manner and I am sure that you will see it in the same light.

And the last word about the interfaith relations. I was recently in Saudi Arabia and Qatar after the publication in Denmark of the caricatures and in an interview to Al-Jazeera I said what is very important is that we try to establish what I always call, a respectful dialogue. Dialogue is very important but it usually takes place at a very high level, let us say between top politicians etc. What is lacking is the dialogue at one level below so that we understand each other's views and opinions. There, too, is little knowledge about Islam in the West. I see it in my own country. We have one million Muslims living among us and that makes it also for the Netherlands a very urgent problem. How do we communicate? How do we convey our views to each other and the respect we ought to have for each other and how should we clarify that? Freedom of expression is of course one of the



basic rights which has been enshrined both in Constitutions and in the international treaties. But, on the other hand, there is also respect for other people's rights, religious feelings etc. Let me reiterate that in the Netherlands and elsewhere law is very strict and if you don't agree with what somebody else is saying go to the judge. He will rule whether you are right or wrong and let us proceed along those lines. In the meanwhile let us try to clarify what we think and why we think so, as it is that dialogue which needs to be intensified. I said at Al-Jazeera perhaps that they should start a fortnightly programme where not only scholars but also common people sit together and discuss these issues in a forum which is a little bit interactive so that people like to watch it and not switch off the moment they get a debate and we should be inventive in the way in which we talk to each other and explain things to each other.

Once again, I am very happy that I have this occasion to be here to talk about all these issues with a democratic country and democratic politicians, in an enlightened atmosphere, to listen to your arguments and to take them along in the conviction that our cooperation is very essential also in the coming period because we will be very close. We are at the moment in Afghanistan. You are a neighbour of Afghanistan and so there are many other reasons, why we should not intensify that cooperation. Thank you very much.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Now I invite Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed, he is from the Opposition – MMA.

**Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed:** Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to join the Chairman in welcoming you and your colleagues to Pakistan and to the Senate. This gives us an opportunity to share our thoughts in a frank and democratic atmosphere. You have been meeting government functionaries which is natural in such visits but this meeting with the Committee gives the Opposition an opportunity to share their thoughts with you. I very much welcome the frankness with which you have expressed your views. We were expecting that you would say something about Indo - U.S. nuclear deal about which we all are deeply concerned because it is not only an act of discrimination affecting the balance of power in the region but may lead to a kind of an arms race which Pakistan is deliberately trying to avoid. We do not want that but we can be sucked into it. Again, it involves some very important conceptual issues concerning the whole idea of nuclear non-proliferation, the whole idea of differentiation between nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and weaponization and how indirectly this would help India increase its nuclear weapon power. So it is going to have very serious consequences and I think Europe can play a very important role in that respect. I would like to place on record the fact that the way European countries and your country, in particular, have tried to handle the Iran issue is hope inspiring. Whatever the American delegate might have said in Sofia, it is behind closed doors but what is being said publicly are definitely threats and kind of a bullying approach. That is not doing any good to America and will not do any good to security of the region. So, from that point of view,

European approach is much more positive but I think you are now preferably more assertive and the concerns of Iran also deserve to be considered sympathetically while there has not been any violation of the NPT to which Iran is a signatory. The fact is that Iran is being projected as an axis of evil and as a threat but the genuine concerns for energy and security of Iran have to be taken into consideration. I think equality of sovereign states is the basis for the present global order and if we are not going to respect that principle and as our Chairman of the Committee has rightly said, the attitude towards North Korea, and Israel having an arsenal of over 200 nuclear war heads, is that not a threat to the security of the region? Why is it not the concern of those who are concerned about nuclear non-proliferation?

One more issue I would like to refer to relates

to the whole war against terror and where it is leading us. Is it not time after five years that we pause and reflect whether this approach has led to increase in terrorism or has contained it? Is it correct that we are producing more conditions which lead to deviations which culminate in terrorism? Terrorism can not be fought as a war. It is a complex issue. What is terrorism? What is not terrorism? Yes, use of violence is the heart of it but mere use of violence cannot be ruled out in politics and international affairs. So, from that view point, conceptualization is extremely important. More than that, if we ignore the causes and the factors of terrorism and the way America is trying to tackle it unilaterally will lead us no where. I think the time has come to reflect and evaluate and assess and also, you are very right in expressing, the importance of inter-cultural dialogue. Holland has played an important role



The Senate Foreign Relations Committee meeting with Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bott, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands.



in that respect and Leiden not only had the Institute, Mushahid referred to, it has also churned out major works on Islamic scholarship. I had the occasion to visit your country a number of times. In 1974, I was invited by four universities to speak on interfaith dialogue and I have very sweet impressions of that. So, I think the central issue is; whether we are going towards a global paradigm where one civilization is dominant and tries to fashion the rest of the world according to its values or do we opt for a paradigm where there are many civilizations? Differences are there. Therefore, dialogue, competition and cooperation, not necessarily confrontation, is required. Even if there are situations of confrontation those should not lead to clash of civilizations because differences in civilizations do not lead to clash. I think the basic error made by intellectuals like Mr. Samuel P. Huntington, who clearly says that the threat is not Islamic fundamentalism or terrorism, but Islam. On the other hand for the Islamic world the threat is not CIA or US Department of Defence but the West as such and the difference in values. But the key issue for which I compliment Mr. Huntington is his blunt acceptance that the West is powerful enough to ensure that its values reach all parts of the world. So, if the powerful try to impose their will upon others that leads to clash and not the differences in civilizations. We believe in differences but within the context of coexistence and the law. So, a different paradigm is needed and that is what would ensure equity and peace in the world otherwise the consequences cannot be unwelcomed.

On Afghanistan, if you permit me to say just

one sentence and that is that Afghanistan has never accepted foreign occupation in its history. This has been tried time and again and this is a fact of history and simplifying the issue by projecting all resistance as Taliban and Talibanization, I think it is not correct. My party and many Opposition parties think that Afghan issue is being handled not in the best possible manner and it is not by force or by having favorites and culprits that the situation should be faced. All Afghans would have to participate to resolve their differences and they are capable of doing that. They have done that for centuries and they can do it again. So, I think even Afghan issue has to be dealt with differently not merely through American or NATO muscle. It has to have a political process. With these thoughts I thank you for sharing your thoughts with us and giving us this opportunity to discuss important issues with you. Thank you very much.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you Prof. Khurshid Ahmed. Now I invite Senator Nisar Memon to express his views.

**Senator Nisar Ahmed Memon:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. Allow me to welcome you once again. While you have presented a number of subjects, I will only touch on the points that you mentioned in your presentation regarding the dialogue and what is required to keep the young people away from any of the activities that may be perceived in the West as extremist activities. I think the core is really the defence and security of countries. I represent Defence Committee as its Chairman, and your country is a member of the NATO while we are the non-NATO



Member Allies. This is good since we can work together in the Defence area. I believe the visit of your Defence Minister has been very useful in furthering the cause of working together in terms of training, in terms of cooperation. But I think fundamental to all of these things and the success of international effort for the fight against terror is dialogue which can only take place between democratic countries. In about 60 years of our existence we have reached a level where after various elected and military Governments we now have elected government in place. As Pakistani one is satisfied that this is the first time elected governments (Federal and Provincial) are going to complete their terms of five years tenure. This indicates that President Musharraf being President as well as the Chief of Army Staff has introduced what is called freedom of expression which is the number one element of democracy. In Pakistan, media is free with multiple TV channels and scores of newspapers but government does not own any paper except Pakistan Television. These are the things that have evolved to this stage and democracy is taking roots. Like your country we have a bicameral parliament but we also have the Local Government, which is taking roots. Fundamental rights are exercised, human rights are adhered to and there is great tolerance between the different faiths. The Christians, the Hindus, the Parsis - all live in harmony. If you look at the number of disputes that we may have had in the last 5 or 6 years, they were more between Muslims rather than Muslims versus Christians or the Hindus or the Parsis. So, I think fundamental rights generally are in place. There are incidents where women's rights have been violated but the government,

the people and the Parliament have come in very heavily against such violations. The society recognizes the value of democracy and I would say that the height of democracy today is that the two leaders whose parties exist, one is ex-Prime Minister, Mian Nawaz Sharif, whose party Muslim League (N) is represented by Sardar Mehtab here and the other party which is Peoples Party of Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto, are meeting in London, they are talking, their parties are operating and in my view the entire process of democratic dialogue is going on amongst leader and between the leaders and the government. You could see that there are times when in the Senate and in the National Assembly, after debates, there are unanimous resolutions on various issues. I believe we are moving to the democratic way of life and I would say that there should be dialogue at various levels. For example, your Minister of Defence visited early April, I would say that the Minister of Defence could have met members of the Parliament. He could have met the members of the other society also. The reason being that this is where dialogue will be to further the security needs of the country. After all, security is all about the people and I am very pleased that today we have this dialogue with you so that you have the right perception. Now coming back to the democratic rights and the freedom of speech in Europe, I think we are exercising this but there is a little bit of a sensitivity that needs to be exercised in Europe because the only thing that really affects the people is right approach to bring this interfaith harmony. We are severely impacted by the insensitivity of the cartoons that have been published in a European country or reproduced in Denmark.



I am really not focusing or narrowing on your country alone but I am just saying since you are very active member of the European Union. You could very well exert influence on EU countries regarding sensitivity on these issues so that people, who are working for interfaith harmony, like President's enlightened moderation, could be helped rather than hindered. With these words I would like to thank you very much.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you Senator Memon. Maulana Sami-ul-Haq. Please be very brief because the Minister also has to meet the Prime Minister. I will translate for him.

**Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq:** In the name of the Almighty the most compassionate the most merciful. I warmly welcome the honourable guests. Thanks to the Chairman for arranging this meeting. We really need a dialogue and negotiations on pressing international issues. We Muslims face a number of challenges. We need to clarify that there is no linkage at all of Islam with terrorism and extremism. Islam came for the elimination and eradication of terrorism. In Islamic teachings and curricula and other works there is absolutely no reference to preaching violence, hatred, bigotry or terrorism. All the terrorists about whom you hear internationally are a product of the Western universities not Madrassahs. They are professionals, they are doctors, and they are engineers. We ourselves, unfortunately, are a victim of terrorism. After collapse of the Soviet Union and the collapse of communism following the Afghan jihad the entire burden has fallen on Pakistan. It seems

that some countries like America, India and Afghanistan are focusing entirely negative policies towards Pakistan and we feel that these three countries India, Afghanistan and the United States are responsible for acts of violence and terrorism in Pakistan, especially in the province of Balochistan and also parts of Waziristan which as you know borders with Afghanistan. As Senator Memon rightly said that cartoon controversy is extremely important. Not just Denmark but 170 channels and newspapers and periodicals in Europe unfortunately reproduced these cartoons. This is not freedom of expression. We would have the same kind of anguish and anger, should there be any blasphemy against **Prophet Jesus** (peace be upon him) as there is against **Prophet Muhammad** (peace be upon him) and that is why we cannot respond in kind. Kindly do something to alleviate the concerns of 1.5 billion Muslims on these and other issues and for opening up a dialogue with the Muslims. We do not want violence.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Now Senator Mehtab Ahmed Khan, also from the Opposition.

**Senator Mahtab Ahmed Khan:** Thank you Excellencies, I welcome you and I feel that you are hard pressed for time so I would be very brief. While appreciating your point of view on almost every important subject related not only to Pakistan but also to European Union in general and particularly to Holland,



I would like to mention a very important aspect which is not only discussed but debated in Pakistan and that is the war on terrorism. In fact, we understand that the Muslim world today is particularly under tremendous pressure, somehow or the other, and I would not disagree with the point of view that today terrorism is related mostly to the Muslim world and we understand that the Muslim world has a greater responsibility on their shoulders for responding to this challenge, not only globally but in their own countries as well. But, while the world is on a war against terror for many years now, the results are still not achievable because of reasons which have been neglected so far. To me, the most important reason for this kind of extremism is either religious or the absence of universally recognized democratic system in Islamic countries. In most countries, including Pakistan, I am afraid the United States has been projecting a particular brand of democracy which has been designed for their own ends and unfortunately the entire Europe is also following them. The time has come now that there should be a total review of the situation and instead of continuing a war against an enemy which is nameless, stateless and faceless (I am using the words of our Chairman). It is time that a dialogue be established which, you rightly pointed out, is necessary for the future of this world. It is not only the concern of the West but also of the Muslim world to evolve and support a true democratic system in the Muslim countries so that extremism of any kind may be buried for all times to come. Thank you.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you, now Senator S. M. Zafar. He was the lawyer for Dr. A. Q. Khan and he won the case.

**Senator S. M. Zafar:** I will just make a very small comment, I am sure, by now every one of us is aware that we have also contributed to justice in the sense that Sir Zafar Ullah was once the Member of the International Court of Justice in the Hague and I have some experience of going to Holland and conducting one or two cases there and I won the case from their court. So far as Muslim thought process and jurisprudence is concerned the central point for the Muslim ethos is justice that is their primary value and when the reverse happens or when there is a feeling that there is an unjust world or injustice is being done to them it gets the most violent reaction and this is what is the real reason. Muslim people a feeling that it is an unjust world in many ways and some injustices have been done to them and therefore, I think, the Western world should attend to that. There is no other conflict. There is the conflict of justice or no justice and that is where the whole problem arises whether it happened in Kashmir, Palestine or any other region. I would just like to convey this aspect of the Muslim thought. Thank you very much.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you very much. Yes, Dr. Bot.

**Dr. Bernard R. Bot:** Thank you very much for this very thoughtful and many interesting remarks which would merit a full afternoon discussion, given the width and depths of the remarks that have been made. However, I would touch upon the main issues. First of all,



the Indian nuclear issue. It is not that I did not want to answer that question. The problem is that the United States Congress has yet not decided on the issue so we do not know what the outcome will be in the end. Whether they will approve of this deal or otherwise. Secondly, as I have also told both the President and the Minister of Foreign Affairs that we are an important member of the nuclear suppliers group and we will look at it in an objective and neutral way when it is brought to our attention. But, at the moment, there is nothing. Since the issue is there we will take this neutral approach and look into all the aspects in a very careful and prudent manner. As far as Iran is concerned, that, of course, is a different story. Let us be frank, Iran has been a member of the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty. It has been a member for eighteen years and in the meantime it has pursued a programme, a hidden programme. I think lack of transparency, has created these problems. Let us be frank, we have a feeling at the moment that after the numerous declarations by President Ahmadinejad there is not so much interest in nuclear energy programme or in energy sources, but goes well beyond that and I think that is creating a problem at the moment. I can only reiterate what I have said earlier about the NATO meeting we had last week, where the Netherlands has always underlined that we want to solve this issue by diplomatic means, by continuing the dialogue not only we have had as European Union but also when the Netherlands had the Presidency of the European Union. In the many discussions with our Iranian colleagues we have underlined that we want to solve this issue in a diplomatic

way. But for diplomacy, it needs two to play and if they are not willing to play along or as they say it needs two to shake hands but if one of the part is not willing to shake hands, it becomes a difficult dialogue. We will not give up. We will continue the dialogue. We will continue to insist that this problem be resolved in a diplomatic and peaceful manner but we hope very sincerely that Iran will cooperate and that all neighboring nations also will exert some pressure on that country to make sure that this is not a viable road.

As far as terrorism is concerned and many of you have touched upon this subject, let me again say what I said in the beginning, I do not believe that it is a clash between religions, I think it is a clash between extremists and that is what we should underline and that is why I have said let us try to remove the misunderstanding that it is a question of Muslims against others, that is simply not true. It is a question of extremists in certain groupings, and you find them everywhere fighting for several causes. We have had to deal with terrorism and extremism in Northern Ireland and the Basque provinces that had nothing to do with Muslims but effects were there. So, terrorism is an international scourge at the moment and it is very infectious. In other words, if one groups starts, many other groups follow suit not because they belong to one religion or another but because they think they have a cause and that the only way in which they can realize that cause is by throwing bombs, carry out suicide attacks or whatever. So, if I say that I am in favour of a respectful dialogue, it is just to remove that what several



of you have said, let us be respectful to each other's religion. Let us understand that religion is not a source of terrorism in itself. That it is extremism that is the source of terrorism. But that has to come into the minds of the people and before that, you have to find channels in the minds of the people through which we can communicate and I have the feeling that those channels are lacking at the moment. There are not enough channels and whatever channels there are these are not used in the proper way. It was for that reason that I went to Al-Jazeera and to the Organization of Islamic Conference and I spent an afternoon discussing these issues with them. The representatives of those nations quite rightly said that of the 72 members, upheavals and problems only took place in 6 or 7 countries just demonstrates that there is nothing with religion in the sense that people will react in a violent way. There are some people who use this as pretext to use violence and let us see what we can do against them but let us again try to work together in a most positive manner.

Then I think that I agree very much, of course, with what you have said about justice. I think that should be the tenet, the rule under which all of us live and the Netherlands being the seat of International Court of Justice, that you have to be with the International Court, with International Criminal Court, with the Yugoslavia Tribunal and many other tribunals. We have throughout the centuries been the defenders of justice, the forefathers of justice and we want to continue to do so. But again, we need the help of others. We cannot do it

alone. We can put proposals on the table. We can open our borders and introduce tribunals but people have to be willing to use them and to obey the verdicts and I think that is very important that there is understanding that there is a willingness to live by the rules, the rules of justice and let us see that justice is also done and implemented because often that is lacking. We talk a lot about justice but often in practice we don't implement it either in our own countries or in our tribal groups, families or whatever it is. So, that is something that we have to create, to defend, to stimulate as much as we can. But on the whole, I am extremely pleased that I have the occasion today to discuss these things because it is also very important for me to receive your signals. To hear from you, how you are thinking about problems and how you are seeing the solutions? I have to be alerted and that is also the reason that I am visiting your country and I hope to do so regularly because as we said to the President the many issues that we have in common and Afghanistan, of course, is one of these items and I can only reiterate that we are not there to fight. We are there also for peaceful purposes and for justice because we think, at the moment, injustice is being done there. I also want to reiterate that we are not there as an occupation force. We are there under the UN mandate and President Karzai has invited us and I have had three or four meetings with him and I hope to meet him soon, again. He invited us explicitly to help him, to create that stable environment which permits reconstruction and rebuilding of the country and we should do that altogether in an unselfish spirit because the Netherlands



has absolutely no selfish interest in being there. It is in the spirit of trying to create a stable environment, a form of democracy so that the people can determine their own fate according to their own rules. We are not there to interfere. I can only repeat that it is on the basis of UN mandate and with the full consent and agreement of the Afghan government that we are there and that is the only way in which we will continue to deal with the situation there. The moment President Karzai says I don't need you any more, we will not stay for one day. But for the time being, as he invited us and upon his invitation, we will continue to help and support him. Thank you very much.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:**

Thank you very much and thank you for coming. We would like to present a small memento of your visit, a shield and some of our publications also and then we will have a group photo. By the way our Chairman Mr. Mohammedmian Soomro, who had a very good meeting with you on 10th April, was speaking very highly of you. Thank you.



Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed, Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee exchanging gifts with Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bott, Dutch Foreign Minister.



A group photo of Senate Foreign Relations Committee with Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bott, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands.



# **Pakistan – Russia Relations in a Changing Regional Scenario**

---

Meeting of the  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee

with

The International Affairs Committee of the State  
Duma of the Russian Federation

(May 4, 2006)



## Pakistan – Russia Relations in a Changing Regional Scenario

### Meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with the International Affairs Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation

May 4, 2006

A six member delegation of the International Affairs Committee of the State Duma (National Assembly) of the Russian Federation visited Pakistan from 4th to 7th May, 2006. The first engagement of the visiting delegation was a meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee headed by Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed on May 4, 2006 at 1130 hours, which discussed Pakistan-Russia relations in a changing regional scenario. It was the first ever contact between Parliamentary Committees from Pakistan and Russia and the two sides, which met for about two hours in a cordial atmosphere, discussed a number of international, regional and bilateral foreign policy issues.

The following members of the Committee attended the meeting:

1.	Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed	Chairman
2.	Senator Nisar Ahmad Memon	Member
3.	Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq	Member
4.	Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed	Member
5.	Senator Muhammad Latif Khan Khosa	Member
6.	Senator Muhammad Talha Mahmood	Member

The Russian Delegation comprised of the following:

1.	Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev	Leader of the Delegation
2.	Mr. Igor V. Barinov	Member
3.	Mr. Nikolay A. Benediktov	Member
4.	Mr. Boris V. Plokhotnuk	Member
5.	Mr. Andrew D. Zhukov	Member
6.	Mrs. Elena A. Chistyakova	Secretary Committee/Director
7.	H. E. Mr. Sergey N. Peskov	Ambassador of the Russian Federation in Pakistan

The verbatim proceeding of the meeting is given following the Executive Summary of this report.



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY





## Executive Summary

Russian Federation, with a population of 143.73 million and an area of 17.08 million sq. kilometers, shares boundaries with 14 countries of the world. Previously USSR was separated from Pakistan by a 10 mile wide strip of Afghan territory by the name of Wakhan corridor but after the emergence of Central Asian States in the early 90s, three countries in the north of Pakistan, namely, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan lie between Pakistan and Russia.

Russia has a bicameral Federal Assembly which consists of the Federation Council with 178 seats. Members to this Council are appointed by the top Executive and legislative officials in each of the 89 Federal Administrative Units. The State Duma (National Assembly) consists of 225 seats elected by proportional representation from party lists winning at least 5% of the vote and 225 seats from single-member constituencies wherein members are elected by direct, popular vote to serve a term of 4 years.

A delegation of the International Affairs Committee of the State Duma led by Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev visited Pakistan from 4 to 7th May, 2006 as guests of the Senate of Pakistan. On 4th May the visiting delegation met the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed, in the Parliament House, Islamabad.

After the customary exchange of pleasantries and welcoming remarks the two sides settled down for substantive discussion on some very important issues both regional and international. Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed, at the outset, thanked the Russian delegation for their country's much needed material support during the devastating earthquake which hit northern Pakistan in October, 2005. He also thanked

Russia for supporting Pakistan's entry to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). He hailed Russian gesture of inviting a delegation of Hamas to Moscow, demonstrating solidarity with the new democracy in Palestine.

Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed highlighted four important issues in his opening statement which set a meaningful course for the deliberations, namely the US-India nuclear agreement, the Iranian nuclear stalemate, the Afghanistan issue and the dwindling Russian influence in Central Asian States due to the enhanced Indian clout. He described the US-India nuclear deal violating the NPT and the American laws, leading to destabilization of the region by fuelling a new arms race in the Sub-Continent. Secondly, he termed the Iranian nuclear question of immense concern to Pakistan and complimented Moscow for taking a judicious stand on the issue, advocating its resolution through political dialogue, suggesting that the yardstick applied to North Korea or Israel should apply to Iran too. Thirdly, he advocated initiation of dialogue between different warring groups in Afghanistan, including those resisting foreign occupation, as the unrest in Afghanistan does not augur well for both Pakistan and Russia. Referring to foreign intervention in Afghanistan, he said that Indian consulates in Qandahar and Jalalabad are a security concern for Pakistan and a destabilizing factor in Afghanistan. The Indian intervention is also being targeted from Tajikistan - where, according to a Moscow daily, Delhi has squeezed out Moscow from a Tajik military base in that country.

Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev was of the view that although Russia and Pakistan do not share a common border they can be called neighbours as they have a number of coinciding interests



and share identical declared positions on a number of issues. He thanked Pakistan for supporting Russia for an observer's status in the OIC.

Referring to the invitation extended to Hamas he said that Russia considers only those groups as terrorists which carry out its activities on the Russian soil and Hamas does not belong to that category of organizations. Russia invited Hamas delegation to Moscow because it believes that further isolation of the Hamas government could lead to radicalization of Palestinian streets, which will be counter productive to the Middle East peace process.

On the Indo-US nuclear deal, he said Russia closely monitored the visit of President Bush to the region and they believe no formal document was signed between the two countries on this subject. By reaching an understanding with India the United States is in the process of recognizing the efforts made by New Delhi to the cause of Non-Proliferation. Moscow hopes that Pakistan will continue to adhere to the principles of Non-Proliferation. Russia and India are partners in strategic relationship but that will not hamper the development of relations between Russia and Pakistan.

Stating his country's position, Mr. Kosachev said Russia believes that Iranian nuclear issue can be resolved only through political means and not by use of force. Moscow is of the view that sanctions on Iran should only be imposed after IAEA experts submit detailed report proving that Iran has violated the NPT.

The leader of the Russian delegation termed Afghanistan a headache for both Pakistan and

Russia where the situation is deteriorating day by day. He talked of continued presence and influence of the remnants of Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Pakistan, which is a reminder that Afghan problem is not restricted to that country only but is a problem encompassing the entire region and the world. The American initiatives on Afghanistan are not producing the desired results and there is no alternative but to initiate an intra Afghan dialogue for settling that country. Refuting the dwindling Russian influence in Tajikistan Mr. Kosachev said that Russia and Tajikistan are members of the Organization of the Treaty on Common Security. Except for the new initiative by Tajikistan whereby it has taken steps to guard its borders with China and Afghanistan without the assistance of Russia Frontier Guards, the Tajik side has never expressed any doubts over the necessity of continued cooperation with Russia in the security field.

Mr. Igor V. Barinov stated that Tajikistan is aware that New Delhi or Washington cannot help secure its borders. Tajikistan asked for the continued presence of Russian Frontier Guards in Tajikistan. The Russian guards provide a shield against the flow of drugs, illegal arms and militants into Tajikistan. Mr. Boris V. Plokhotnuk also refuted the alleged growing Indian influence in Tajikistan at the cost of Russia. He was more interested in discussing the import of gas plants into Pakistan and the prospect of its marketing there.

Mr. Andrew D. Zhukov stated that Russian academia and experts had declared nuclear programmes and the situation in the Middle East as far from ordinary. It is a regional problem having global implications requiring



a composite approach. The nuclear issue needs resolution through political means and by consensus assuming that there is no super power, which will make the final judgment. The NPT has played a significant role but it envisages non parity between parties and creates obstacles for countries which struggle to obtain modern technology. At times, it imposes a ban on both military research and research in energy resources which constrains countries to adopt clandestine methods to obtain new sources of energy. One of the post Cold War scenarios is to create nuclear free zones which would mean freezing nuclear energy resources as well. This is impossible and unacceptable. The other scenario is a complete ban on nuclear research but this is not viable as the matter of Israeli nuclear programme is raised in Vienna every year but not discussed while the nuclear arsenals of other countries are discussed in the press very frequently. He proposed the establishment of a permanent conference dealing with nuclear programmes in the region. He also referred to an idea floated for creating a new document called NPT-II, which would place all the countries of the region at par with each other.

Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq appreciated Russia's good relations with the Muslim world during the Cold War period. He was of the view that in the bipolar world the oppressed nations and the Muslim countries were at an advantageous position because of rivalry between USSR and USA. He advised Russia to forget the bitter history of the Afghan War and keep the Muslim countries on its side. After the end of the Afghan War in the late

80s terrorism had ceased but the powerful nations nurtured terrorism for their own ends. If the Muslims or Al-Qaeda or Taliban were involved in any terrorist activities, Russia would be in the know of it. The Iranian nuclear issue should be resolved through dialogue otherwise America will strengthen its power base in Iran and the biggest loser will be Russia. He also warned Moscow of the possible alliance between India-America and Japan against China in which case, too, Russia and the other Asian nations will be at a loss. If Russia is not in a position to take revenge from America for the results of the Afghan War, it should also not side with it.

Senator Nisar A. Memon expressed the hope that Pakistan Steel Mills, built with Soviet assistance, has changed hands and is now in Russian control, which will benefit the two countries and assure the best interest of workers. He termed the 2002 and 2005 meetings between President Musharraf and President Putin as melting of the ice and breaking of the ice respectively in the strained Cold War era relations between Pakistan and Russia. He asked the Russian delegation about their perception of Pakistan's security needs and the level and prospects of future partnership between Pakistan and Russia.

Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed suggested establishing inter parliamentary group between Pakistan and Russia for institutionalizing contacts between the two countries on a regular basis. He showed regret over Pakistan's missed opportunity of establishing good relations with Russia immediately after



independence when Pakistan's Prime Minister preferred a visit to the US, ignoring Russia. He also advocated a futuristic approach in world relations where the objective should be to evolve a multi-polar world and to perceive a paradigm of global society with many civilizations, economic systems, sense of coexistence and one gearing up for dialogue and shunning confrontation. He suggested that Russia should play a positive role in facilitating the new democratically elected Palestinian Government to become part of the global system and not lead it into isolation. Secondly, Russia and China should declare unequivocally that they will veto any resolution against Iran in case America continues with its present bullying tactics against that country. Moreover, no state should have the right to ignore the UN and be allowed to take action against another sovereign country unilaterally. Thirdly, he suggested review of the entire situation pertaining to terrorism, to examine its causes and a strategy to fight it domestically and internationally. Fourthly, there is a need for increased economic cooperation and trade and investment between Russia and Pakistan.

Senator Muhammad Latif Khan Khosa was of the view that in an era of globalization and a uni-polar world the poor and the downtrodden have been forgotten and the world has become a slave to the capitalist system. The issue of terrorism can be addressed if justice is established in the world but if injustices continue whether in Palestine or Afghanistan or Iraq, it will fuel terrorism. He urged the enforcement of social justice in the world and if the world has to fight a war it should be

against poverty, against illiteracy and against those usurping the resources of the world.

The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to both sides and exchange of mementos. This was followed by lunch.



# PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

(Verbatim Record)





## Proceedings of the Meeting

(Verbatim Record)

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** It is a great pleasure to welcome our friends from neighbouring country Russia. The format of this morning's discussion, which will go into the early afternoon, would be that I will first introduce the members of our Committee. Then I will request your Excellency to introduce members of your Committee. Thereafter, I will give a few opening remarks followed by remarks from your Excellency and then the floor will be opened for discussion and dialogue.

**Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your hospitality. This visit was arranged in a short period of time and we do understand that some practical complications could have appeared. Our interest in establishing these types of contacts, in receiving information about Pakistan, gauging potential in our bilateral relations and cooperation in different international areas is quite obvious and this is why we are here. We look forward to listen to you and to give you our understanding of different views prevailing in our country. Thank you.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Allow me first to introduce members of our distinguished Committee. On my left is Senator Nisar Memon from the ruling Pakistan Muslim League. He is former Minister for Information and is currently Chairman of the Senate Committee on Defence and Defence Production. On my right is Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq. He is from the Opposition religious grouping - the MMA, and he heads a very important seminary (Madrassah) in the

Frontier Province which was known for training and educating lots of people during the earlier Afghan War years. He is also Chairman of the Committee on Religious Affairs and I call him a friendly fundamentalist. On the left here is Prof. Khurshid Ahmed. He is Vice President of the Opposition religious alliance - the MMA, and deputy leader of Jamaat-i-Islami. He is a distinguished thinker, intellectual and economist and former Minister for Planning. He also heads a think tank by the name of Institute of Policy Studies, in Islamabad. On his left, and this is the liberal left if I may say so, is Senator Latif Khosa from Benazir Bhutto's Pakistan Peoples Party. He is a very distinguished lawyer and is also the lawyer for Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto. Senator Talha Mehmood is from the Opposition religious alliance - the MMA, and he has made contributions in the field of humanitarian work and charity especially in the recent earthquake. Mr. Iftikharullah Babar is the Secretary of the Committee and Additional Secretary of the Senate. He received you at the airport this morning. Now I will request your Excellency to briefly introduce members of your delegation and then we will have the opening remarks from my side.

**Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev:** There are currently 28 Standing Committees in the lower chamber of Russian Parliament, the State Duma and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which I am leading, is one of the biggest in the State Duma. It has 23 members, which indicates the degree of importance attached to international affairs. There are currently five different factions represented in the State



Duma which are also represented in this Committee. The gentleman to my right is Mr. Igor V. Barinov. He represents the largest party in the State Duma namely “United Russia” and within the framework of our Committee he heads the Sub Committee on “International Cooperation in the Fight Against Terrorism and Transnational Crime”. He was elected to the State Duma from the city of Sverdlovsk, one of the biggest cities of our country situated in the Ural region. On my left is Mr. Nikolay A. Benediktov, who holds a PhD degree and is a professor. He represents the Communist Party and is a Communist fundamentalist. Next is Mr. Boris V. Plokhotnuk, who is member of United Russia. He is from Addio Brook region and before his election to the State Duma, he was first Vice Governor of that region. Within the framework of the Committee he looks after the inter-religious dialogue. He is also a member of the International Association of Orthodox Christianity. Mr. Andrew D. Zhukov, who belongs to the Mother Land Party, was a distinguished academic before he entered politics. He has been involved in research on strategic stability and nuclear non-proliferation, etc. To the right is Mrs. Elena A. Chistyakova, who is the Secretary of the Committee and I don’t think Ambassador Sergey Peskov needs any introduction. Thank you.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you Excellencies. It is a very distinguished and diverse group like our own group here and I think that is one of the strengths of any democratic pluralistic system. It has been quite a while that any Parliamentary

delegation came from Russia and we are very happy that this group has come after a long period and I am glad that in a very short time we were able to organize this visit. I am particularly impressed by the fact that the leader is a distinguished person with diplomatic and international relations background and who has served Mr. Primakov, whom I interviewed as a journalist when he was the head of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow. I went to Moscow in 1985 and 1988 and Mr. Primakov and I took a flight together from Moscow to Vladivostok, which was a very long flight, when Vladivostok, was opened up in 1988 to the international community. I attended an international conference where Eduard Shevardnadze had given the keynote speech. Mr. Primakov is also a respected journalist and intellectual and an Arab Specialist from Russia.

**Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev:** Later on during the last years of the Soviet Union, Mr. Primakov became the Speaker of the Supreme Soviet Chamber of the Union and once his chair was situated such that during the whole proceedings when anybody took the floor Mr. Primakov was shown by the camera and he could not relax and had to sit alert. He told me later that it was like traveling to and from Vladivostok every day.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** I can understand because the Vladivostok flight took 8 or 9 hours and we had to cross five or six times zones. So, it was a very historic journey. First of all Excellency, I would like to express our very profound gratitude and thanks for



your help in the earthquake. Your country gave tremendous help and your Ambassador played a leading role. You gave us hospital equipment. You sent special medical teams which showed your humanitarian commitment to the people of Pakistan. We are very grateful to you for that. We are also very grateful to Russia for her support in Pakistan's entry into the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) as an Observer, last year. And we also warmly welcome you into the OIC, the Organization of Islamic Conference as an Observer, which you joined last year with Pakistan's support. Our President and Prime Minister have visited Russia. I was also present in the meeting between President Musharraf and President Putin in New York in September 2005 at the United Nations General Assembly session. Our Prime Minister Mr. Shaukat Aziz attended the SCO Summit in October 2005 and had cordial and productive meeting with Russian Prime Minister Mr. Mikhail Fradkov. We want to just mention a couple of issues before we start the general discussion.

Russia has historically played a very pro-active and positive role in the Middle East and you are also a member of the Quartet on Palestine and we were very heartened by the fact that Russia was amongst the first countries to extend an invitation to the delegation of Hamas to visit Moscow and that was a very positive gesture and it was also a gesture of solidarity with a new democracy in Palestine.

The area which we are located in and which is very close to Russia is very unstable, very volatile and quite tense of late. There are a

number of issues which are a cause of concern to us. I would like to mention three, very briefly. Following the visit in March of President Bush of United States to this part of the world and the signing of a nuclear deal between India and the United States, there is a concern that the area would be destabilized and it will lead to a new arms race in the region. This deal violates both the NPT and the American laws.

The second area which is of concern to us is the Iranian nuclear question and in that I would like to compliment the Government of Russia for taking a positive position and we feel, like your government and like most of the international community, that such issues should be resolved politically through dialogue and that there should not be any double standards on that issue. The standards applied to North Korea or Israel should apply to Iran as well.

The third area of concern is Afghanistan, which is of interest to you also for a number of reasons and in that also, unfortunately the situation is unstable and is not improving and the reason for the situation not improving and becoming worse than before is the policies inside Afghanistan. I think no country has sacrificed more for peace and stability in Afghanistan than Pakistan. And we also have helped President Karzai to get elected as President because there are two million Afghan refugees in Pakistan and we ensured that they exercise the right to vote and that vote helped Karzai. We feel that there should be a dialogue between different groups in Afghanistan. If the President of Iraq, Jalal Talabani can talk to



the insurgents in Iraq, as he did two days ago, why the Afghan administration or its sponsors not talk to those who are resisting the foreign occupation there? Soon after eviction of the Taliban regime in December 2001, President Karzai called for general amnesty in Afghanistan but unfortunately Mr. Rumsfeld, the US Defense Secretary scuttled that proposal, scorched that proposal, vetoed that proposal and the result is that instead of national reconciliation there is conflict. And finally I would say that external intervention is also there - the Indian factor. I was reading an article in the Moscow daily 'Nezavisimoya Gazetta' of April 25, 2006, titled "Delhi squeezes Moscow out of Indian Military base in Tajikistan". According to this story in the Moscow daily, there is an Indian Military

presence now in Tajikistan at the Aini Airbase and the Indians also have a political, military and security presence close to the Pakistani border in their Consulates in Qandahar and Jalalabad. We have our own concerns but we would also like to have your Excellency's views on this particular issue and this particular story in the Russian newspaper. Thank you very much and it is a pleasure to welcome our friends and I can see the leader of your team is a youthful dynamic person who is still looking very fresh after all night's travel, so Masha-Allah he is very hale and hearty and healthy and I hope that you will have a pleasant stay in Pakistan. Thank you.

**Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev:** I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your warm



Meeting with the International Affairs Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation.



welcome and for your extensive coverage of different points which we will discuss today. I would like to begin with the words that you mentioned in the beginning of your speech that Russia is a neighbouring country. Although we do not share common border but I think, we can be called neighbours because we have a number of coinciding interests and there are so many things that can happen or exist between neighbouring countries. In the Soviet era relations between Russia and Pakistan were not easy and we still face the consequences of those problems that existed in our bilateral relations say in the 70s and 80s but we do not see any problem that would separate our two countries in today's reality. I must say that on a number of issues, our position is sometimes common or even identical. I can mention such important topics as counter terrorism, strategic stability, countering separatism and the matters of non-proliferation including that of the weapons of mass destruction. I think it was natural development that Russia supported Pakistan in becoming an Observer in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and Pakistan itself extended its support in granting an Observer's status to Russia in the OIC. We do highly appreciate this support extended by Pakistan. You might know that there are more than 20 million Muslims living in today's Russia, thus it makes our interaction with this Organization an important and productive one. As far as the political dialogue is concerned it is developing and it needs further development. There is a mechanism in place, which helped this interaction both at the level of Foreign Ministries as well as at the counter terrorism

agencies and trade and economic agencies level and we are very glad that we can also contribute to the further promotion of this context - in the field of inter-parliamentary interaction. Judging by the first moments of our stay in Pakistan we saw that the relations between our two countries carry a huge potential and being parliamentarians we can ourselves further contribute to the promotion of our bilateral ties so that they can be further expanded at the level of relevant ministries and agencies.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the things you have mentioned in your address and I think my colleagues will also join me in expressing their views on those topics. We thank you for the correct understanding over the steps taken by Russia aimed at establishing contacts with the new Palestinian Government. We do not have any kind of illusions about the true natures of the new democratically elected government of the Palestinian Authority. It is our firm belief that further isolation of the Hamas Government could lead to further radicalization of the streets of Palestine and that will run counterproductive to the efforts in the Middle East peace process. Although that meeting did not bring any substantial results, as we were not over optimistic, but none can say that the first contact with the new administration was not established. It is our understanding that in its capacity as the new government of Palestine, Hamas will be more responsible from the political point of view.

As far as the situation in the region, which is



common to us, is concerned, there are also a number of challenges which seem alarming. You are well aware of the fact that Russia and India have relations of strategic partnership but we are confident that these relations should not hamper the development of relations between Russia and other countries of the region of which Pakistan is one of them. We were closely monitoring the visit by President Bush both to India and Pakistan and we will also closely monitor further developments over this nuclear deal but as far as I know, no formal document was signed during President Bush's visit to India. But that does not really signify, in concrete terms, developments in the region and our understanding is that by reaching an understanding with India the United States is recognizing the efforts made by New Delhi towards Non-Proliferation. Pakistan is also in the middle of discussions on this issue and our opinion rather our firm belief in the matter is that Pakistan should continuously adhere to non-proliferation. All this makes renewed discussion on the NPT all the more necessary because in its present form the Treaty does not meet the challenges of the present times. It has been rightly mentioned that there should be no double standards in dealing with nuclear non-proliferation regimes. We think that the real problem began when the United States, Great Britain and some other countries started toying with Israel's nuclear programme and now the world community is talking about the Iran nuclear programme as well. It is our firm belief that the Iranian nuclear problem can be resolved only through political means and not through force. It is also our firm belief that any talks, theoretically speaking, about imposing

of sanctions on Iran can begin only after IAEA experts provide detailed reports, which prove that Iran has violated the NPT. But up till now, no such report has been presented.

Afghanistan is a great headache both for Pakistan and Russia and we do agree with the fact that the situation there is not improving but deteriorating and one of the proofs is that a large number of trucks still come from Afghanistan via the Central Asian States to Russia. It is also a fact that in Pakistan continuing presence and influence of the remnants of Taliban and Al-Qaeda still continues, which proves that the Afghan problem is not that of the country itself but of the whole region and the world. In my view, the actions taken by the United States to settle Afghanistan seems to be incorrect and there is no alternative to the Afghanistan settlement but to initiate an intra Afghanistan dialogue and to engage the Opposition forces in those talks.

As far as this article that you referred to, which appeared in the American magazine, is concerned I have not read it myself but judging by its title, that India is squeezing Russia out of Tajikistan seems incorrect. Russia and Tajikistan are members of the Organization of the Treaty on Common Security. It is however, true that during the recent times, Tajikistan has come up with the initiative to guard its borders first with China and then with Afghanistan without the assistance of the Russia Frontier guards. We do respect this intention. This is the only change in the format of our cooperation with Tajikistan, otherwise the Tajik side has



never expressed any doubts over the necessity of continued cooperation with Russia because of security. We feel there is no Indian influence or Indian factor in the situation.

**Mr. Igor V. Barinov:** I must say that it is not New Delhi or Washington who can help Tajikistan in securing its border and I think the Tajik side is well aware of this fact. That is why they asked the Russian Frontier Guards (one Infantry division) and anti-aircraft system present in Tajikistan to stay. They constitute a shield in the way of penetrating drugs, illegal arms and militant troops.

**Mr. Boris V. Plokhonuk:** Well, I have not read the article myself but I don't think we can say that India is influencing Russia in that way but I must say that I take great pride in that. I represent the region which is now represented in Pakistan by the largest steel mills and Mr. Benediktov represents the region where the trucks are now being assembled and these are the matters which we would like to discuss and may be we can find solution to the problem of gas plants coming into Pakistan market and in that case there will be less questions for us to ask.

**Mr. Andrey D. Zhukov:** I would like to say a few words about the Iran nuclear problem. This is indeed one of the important topics of the day and I was very much impressed by the statement of our Pakistani colleagues that there should be a positive dialogue on this topic and that one should dramatically abstain from the politics of double standards. Being an independent expert, unlike the Chairman of our Committee, I can express my own point

of view. Please take it into account. Actually, at one time, the Russian Academia and professional experts dealing with these affairs came to the conclusion that the nuclear programme, in addition to the situation in the Middle East, is far from an ordinary issue. Although it is a regional problem, it has global implications and requires a composite approach. There should be several components of the settlement of this issue and the settlement should be multilateral. It can be solved only by political means and by consensus. This approach assumes that presently there is no super power, no highest authority in the world that can make the final judgment. It is obvious that a contradiction has been created between the NPT and the situation in the region. There is an idea floating for creating a new document which might be called NPT-II which would place all the countries of the region at par with each other. Although the NPT-I played a significant role but I may mention that it envisages non-parity between parties and creates obstacles for those countries which try to obtain modern technologies. At times, it results in a situation that puts a ban on both military research and research in energy resources, which constrains countries to adopt other ways of obtaining new resources of energy. One of the post Cold War scenarios is that of creating nuclear free zones which means that this will not only freeze nuclear weapons but nuclear energy resources as well. This scenario is unacceptable and impossible. Another option would be that of a complete ban on nuclear research but this is not viable because, for instance, every year, the matter of Israeli nuclear programme is raised in Vienna but it is not discussed while



the nuclear arsenals of other countries are under discussion in everyday press. The world does not have a unified standard of defining the status of these countries. Naming a particular country, a nuclear threshold state with complete nuclear programme. Under these circumstances, the world community should create a permanent conference or permanent mechanism for dealing with the nuclear programme in the region. It seems that the discussion whether a state adheres to the NPT or it does not resort to the double standards, is for the experts to start implementation of these ideas.

**Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev:** Mr. Zhukov has expressed his personal opinion but I must sign on every word he said.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you very much. Now, Maulana Sami-ul-Haq and I will request him to please be very brief.

**Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq:** We welcome you from the core of our hearts. Some years ago, when the whole world was divided under the sphere of two super powers your relations with the oppressed nations and Muslim states, except Afghanistan, were very positive. During the Suez Canal crisis, the Muslim world looked up to Russia for resolving the issue. In the tussle between the US and the USSR, the two super powers, the Muslim countries were the main beneficiaries. If it was possible we would make Russia a super power once again because it is an admitted fact that the Cold War between America and Russia

benefited the Muslim countries. Now if America, the lone super power, becomes stronger it will not auger well for nations like Russia and Pakistan. Russia should forget whatever happened in Afghanistan and keep the Muslims on its side. Secondly, I may add that after the earlier Afghan War, terrorism had ceased but the powerful nations nurtured terrorism for their own ends. If the Muslims or Al-Qaeda or Taliban were involved in any terrorist activities, keeping Chechnya aside as it is not our subject today, Russia would have got some proof about it. Regarding Iran, as our Chairman mentioned, I think we should sit together and resolve this issue as Pakistan and Russia are both Iran's neighbours. If America fortifies its power base in Iran the biggest loser will be Russia and the Central Asian states. Although Russia and China have difficulties in their relations but India – America and Japan are uniting against China and if they succeed the loser again will be Russia and the Asian nations. Whatever happened to Russia in Afghanistan was due mainly to US involvement and if Russia cannot take revenge I would request that it should not side with America as well. Pakistan and generally the Muslim countries have to live with Russia as we belong in Asia, therefore, Russia should help protect the Muslim countries against the onslaught of America in the garb of fight against terrorism.

**Senator Nisar Ahmad Memon:** Thank you and I welcome you on my behalf. It was a pleasure to hear the fresh views of the head of the delegation and the other members. We are very happy that the Steel Mills which was set up by Soviet Union is in Russian hands



and we hope that you will benefit Pakistan and Russia as well as take care of the interest of the workers, a point that our members will understand better. As you know in the post World War II, Cold War era, there was an important meeting held between President Musharraf and President Putin in 2002, which I view as melting of the ice in the strained relations between Pakistan and Russia. Subsequently, another meeting between the two leaders which I view as breaking of the ice, took place in September 2005 on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly session, which I had the privilege to attend as part of the President's delegation from Pakistan. Now, in this positive relationship between the two countries I would like to ask you what is your perception of Pakistan's security needs and how can your country be a partner of Pakistan in the future?

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** Thank you, finally Prof. Khurshid Ahmed.

**Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmed:** First of all, I would join my colleagues in welcoming you, particularly on behalf of the Opposition parties and place on record my deep appreciation of the frankness with which all your colleagues, particularly your good self, have expressed your views. As time is very limited I would start with a suggestion. I feel that there is a need to have a common Inter-Parliamentary Group between Pakistan and Russia so that instead of a one off meeting we should institutionalize this contact and may be one year, you visit Pakistan and in the next year, Committee on Foreign Affairs from

Pakistan visit your country and we have more time for in depth discussion.

I want to show my regret that when Pakistan was established, Russia was one of the first countries that invited the then Prime Minister of Pakistan. This was followed by an America invitation. But our Prime Minister went to America not Russia, which set things in a certain direction. I want to rectify that by suggesting a beginning in the direction of establishing a Parliamentary Commission between Pakistan and Russia.

I want to say that our attitude should be futuristic. Yes, in the past there have been both cooperations as well as irritants but instead of that, we should have a futuristic approach. And in that context I think that two main objectives should be adhered to (i) the movement of global system from uni-polar to not bipolar but multi-polar in which Pakistan, Russia and other countries can play a positive role at the political, cultural, and economic level. (ii) Our second target should be to perceive a paradigm of a global society with many civilizations, many economic systems, plurality, co-existence and dialogue, not necessarily leading to clash and confrontation. So, in our futuristic approach, Russia has a very unique position being the only country in the world having common borders with 14 countries thus positioned to play an important role in plurality and multiplicity of contacts.

Now, I would make four suggestions. Firstly, we appreciate your initiative in Palestine with both PLO as well as Hamas and we expect



Russia will play a positive role in letting the new democratically elected Palestinian Authority be part of the global system and avoid the isolation towards which America wants it to be driven.

Secondly, regarding Iran, there is so much commonality between your approach and our approach but I suggest that Russia and China should make it very clear that if America continues with its present bullying line then hopefully you would be prepared to veto any resolution against Iran. Moreover, no country should have the right to take law into its own hands, ignore UN and take any action against any other sovereign country unilaterally. My third suggestion is about terrorism. Let us try to review the entire situation and instead of becoming a slave to what America has tried to project, re-examine what is terrorism, what is not terrorism, how it can be fought internally and externally and what new strategy is needed? My fourth suggestion relates to need for increased economic co-operation, trade and investment between Russia and Pakistan. At present, the terms of our trade and balance of trade with Russia is adverse. Unless we build compatibilities, the balance will not take place. At the moment our imports from Russia are almost 10 times of our exports. So, I think there is a need to examine this issue and then find out ways of strengthening economic relationship. Thank you very much.

**Senator Muhammad Latif Khan Khosa:** Excellencies, I represent the Pakistan People's Party which polled the highest number of votes in Pakistan in the general elections. Let me

welcome you on my own behalf and on behalf of my party. I have two submissions to make. In an era of globalization, unfortunately, after it has become a uni-polar world, we have forgotten about the issues of the poor and the down trodden and with the resources of the world squeezing, we have become slaves to the capitalist system and now the hegemony of the powerful has taken over the down trodden people of the world.

We will never get over terrorism unless we address the core issue of injustice prevalent in the world. Wherever you squeeze the people and you commit injustice, whether it is Palestine, whether it is trampling over Afghanistan or whether it is conquering Iraq, it will erupt in one form or the other. So, I think we have to see what the core issue is? It will be no service to humanity if we bring in some other people and then Security Council or other hegemonistic powers take over the smaller nations and deny them their rights. I think, let us enforce social justice in the world through consensus and if we have to fight a war, let us fight a war against poverty, let us fight a war against illiteracy, let us fight a war against those who are usurping the resources of the world. Thank you.

**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed:** We are very short of time; other guests are waiting for lunch. We will continue our discussion there. Thank you.



Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed, Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee presenting a gift to Mr. Konstantin I. Kosachev, Chairman, International Affairs Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation.



## **Pakistan - Soviet Relations:** Providing the historical context

- **Missed opportunities**
- **Breaking the ice**
- **After Afghanistan**

---

Article by  
**Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed**

published in  
Daily 'The Muslim', Islamabad  
on September 13-15, 1981





## PAKISTAN - SOVIET RELATIONS

### MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

The recent visit of Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, Nikolai Firubin, to Pakistan on the government's invitation and inauguration of the Soviet-aided Steel Mill at Karachi (with a reasonably high-level USSR delegation present) has raised hopes of some sort of a thaw in Pakistan-Soviet relations. These ties, alternately, cool and correct but rarely cordial, have of late been marred by the Soviet military intervention in neighbouring Afghanistan, which has been condemned by Pakistan and broad sections of international opinion.

These visits and the resultant professions of friendship from both sides are a good opportunity to examine Pakistan-Soviet relations in their historical dimension with a view to providing some insight into their future direction.

In this book "Sphinx & Commissar – The Rise and Fall of Soviet Influence in the Middle East" (1978), Mohamed Heikal, the eminent Arab journalist and political writer, says that in their treatment of the outside world, the "Russians grade countries, as they grade party members, because it is alien to their nature to do otherwise".

Despite Liaquat's pandering to American whims, the Soviet Union continued to be critical of India and supportive of Kashmiri self determination, at least till Stalin's death in March, 1953. A Pravda commentator wrote on May 31, 1950, that the "Indian government's policy is a reactionary one India is one of the weakest links in the imperialist chain. That is why the leaders of the Indian National Congress are having to camouflage their compact with the imperialists. But it is hard to hide the fact that they are surrendering increasingly to the extortionist demands of the Anglo-American imperialists".

On Kashmir, the Soviet representative at the United Nations outlined his government's position in a December 23, 1952, Security Council Speech: "The USSR Government maintaining the right of peoples large and small to national independence and national sovereignty, holds that the only correct method by which the problem of Kashmir can and must be solved is to enable the people of Kashmir to freely decide its own fate, the Security Council should be guided by the principles of the right of self determination and of the equality of the peoples as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations."

The Soviet Union made some overtures towards Pakistan in 1956 to which we never responded. In March 1956, Foreign Minister Molotov attending a National Day reception at the Pakistan Embassy in Moscow stressed the USSR's desire for friendship and offered Pakistan Steel Mill, similar to the one at Bhilai (India) capable of producing 2 million tons of steel annually. Ironically enough twenty five years later, the Karachi Steel Mill, aided by the USSR, has a similar capacity.

### 'PART OF INDIA'

At celebration marking Pakistan's proclamation of a Sepulie in March 23, 1956, the Soviet Union sent its senior Deputy Premier Mikoyan to represent on March 26, Mikoyan stated that "the future of Kashmir is not for us to decide. This is for the people of Kashmir to decide". However a week later during a visit to India Mikoyan retracted on this statement by referring to Kashmir as a "part of India."

Broadly speaking, Heikal view's Soviet ties with Third World nations in roughly four categories- A, B, C, and D. Category A carries with it a sort of "most-favoured nation status": generous political and economic support, arms sold at two-

---

This Article provides the historical context of Pakistan's chequered ties with Moscow. The impact of which continues to linger on even today and its conclusions remain relevant.



thirds cost-price, with Soviet support going as far as threatening to intervene on the country's behalf. In cultural exchanges, category A is treated to visits from the Bolshoi ballet company, while state transactions are carried out at the highest level. Currently, India, Afghanistan, Angola, Vietnam, Cuba, South Yemen etc, can be said to enjoy category A status, Category B includes official warmth and cordiality, sale of arms at cost price and provision of reasonable aid., Libya, Syria, Algeria, Nicaragua, Mozambique, Grenada etc, presently enjoy inclusion in category B, Category C countries find themselves dealing entirely with Moscow bureaucrats, who ensure any official communication is subjected to a rather lengthy red-tape. In cultural relations, the best that Category C can expect is a 'third-class ballet' from Baku (Azerbaijan)! Most of the ASEAN countries, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Kuwait, Jordan, etc., roughly qualify for category C status, The lowest rating category D, "is a stage of cold formality and scarcely concealed hostility".

Pakistan, Bangladesh, Egypt, Sudan, Guinea, etc., presently seem to have category D relations. If one traces Pakistan-Soviet relations from 1947 onwards, it will be seen that the highest we ever got to was category B and that too for a very short period, i.e. 1965-69. this was the time of two Presidential visits to Moscow, the aftermath of the "Spirit of Tashkent", two visits from Premier Kosygin, and the sale of Soviet arms to Pakistan. Barring these four years, Pakistan Soviet relations have barely managed to rise beyond category C and D. this need not have been the norm, had not Pakistan missed opportunities for better ties in 1949, 1956 and 1961 and the Soviet Union developed a better understanding

of the "India factor" in Pakistan's foreign policy. When partition resulted in two sovereign states in the Sub-Continent, the Soviet Union viewed both India and Pakistan with suspicion. However, in the early years (1947-1952), the Soviet Union was less critical of Pakistan as compared to India. One reason perhaps was that the Communist Party of India (CPI) unlike the Congress, had endorsed the Muslim League's demand for Pakistan as early as 1944, After Partition, in 1948, the CPI with Moscow's concurrence was, following the line of armed revolution which pitched it in direct confrontation with the Congress,. Although Pandit Nehru appointed his sister Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, as India's first Ambassador in Moscow, through out her tenure she was never received by Stalin.

#### **'RIGHT NOISES'**

Conversely, Pakistan which did not have an envoy in Moscow till 1949 was honoured with an invitation to Liaquat Ali Khan for a state visit. The invitation conveyed on June 2, 1949, was promptly accepted five days later by Pakistan. While the Moscow trip was effectively sabotaged by the pro-Western bureaucratic cabal at the Foreign Office led by Zaffarullah Khan, Liaquat Ali Khan chose to go to Washington instead in May 1950. While in the United States, Liaquat Ali Khan made the "right noises".

In November 1953, the Soviet Union sought "clarification from Pakistan regarding its impending military alliance with the United States". Pakistan assured Moscow that it would never allow the use of Pakistani territory for anti-Soviet activities – an assurance violated in 1960 when the American U-2 spy plane flew from Peshawar towards the Soviet Union



where it was shot down. In 1954, Pakistan signed a bilateral defence agreement with the United States, joined SEATO, and quickly followed by the Baghdad Pact. With Pakistan firmly in the American Camp, the Soviet Union quickly reversed itself on Kashmir. Khrushchov even went to the extent of supporting “Self-determination for Pushtunistan” and questioning the validity of Pakistan itself by criticizing the 1947 partition.

In a December 10, 1955 speech the Soviet Union was “grieved that the imperialist forces succeeded in dividing India into two parts. It was not in the interests of the peoples of India that India was divided.” Realizing perhaps that it should not foreclose the option of a better relationship with Pakistan,

The only tangible result of the Mikoyan visit was the signing in June 1956 of the first Pakistan Soviet trade agreement. Pakistan seemed to be so allergic to any form of contact with the Soviet Union that it even refused to accept Soviet medical assistance offered to help combat cholera spreading in East Pakistan in 1958. The reason for such shortsightedness was the ideological orientation of Pakistan policymakers and overwhelming American influence in our highly unstable domestic politics. Given this context every potential candidate for high office, in order to reach it or retain it, had to curry favour with the Americans. Policies during a large part of the fifties were made by the bureaucratic “Gang of 4” in Pakistan’s politics: Ghulam Mohammad, Chaudhri Mohammad Ali, Iskander Mirza and general Ayub Khan. Only three examples will suffice to underline the degree of U.S. involvement in Pakistani internal affairs:

- Prime Minister Suhrawardy’s political adviser was an American Prof. Charles Burton Marshal;
- President Iskander Mirza’s son was married to the American Ambassador’s daughter.
- Every official communication from Soviet Union was routinely sent to the American Embassy in Pakistan “for information”.

## **BREAKING THE ICE**

The U-2 incident was an important factor in Pakistan’s gradual shift away from a total commitment to the American camp. The other reason for Pakistan’s reassessment in foreign policy was America’s own change in its South Asian strategy. While Pakistan managed to keep itself out of the Afro Asian mainstream through the fifties, India became the recipient of U.S. generosity. The Pakistanis were taken for granted as “good boys” who could be relied upon to defend American interests even in a manifestly one-sided relationship.

The then Soviet Ambassador in Pakistan, Mikhail Kapitsa, drove home this point to the jilted Pakistanis quite aptly: “We support India and Afghanistan against you because they are our friends, even when they are in the wrong. But your friends do not support you, even when they know you are in the right”.

## **FIRST ACCEPTANCE**

On March 4, 1961, Pakistan signed an oil exploration agreement with the Soviet Union, which was our first acceptance of Soviet economic and technical assistance. In November 1963, Pakistan took the initiative in inviting Khrushchov to visit Pakistan as part of his proposed journey to Nepal and Ceylon. Although Khrushchov couldn’t undertake his South Asian journey he did respond by inviting Ayub Khan for a Moscow visit in June 1964. By the time Ayub managed to visit the Soviet



Union in April 1965, Pakistan-Soviet relations were well on the way to normalization with a slight air of cordiality creeping in. Agreements in the fields of aviation, barter trade and culture had already been signed. The turning-point in Pakistan-Soviet relations came during the September 1965 war, when the Soviet Union, contrary to its past posture, adopted a policy of strict neutrality in the Pakistan-India conflict. This neutrality enabled the USSR to host the Tashkent Conference, a major coup for Soviet diplomacy. Tashkent was held with tacit US concurrence, both Super Powers agreeing on the need to neutralize Chinese influence in South Asia, particularly Pakistan. Although Tashkent failed to achieve its objective of laying the basis for a durable, tension-free Pakistan-India relationship it did serve as a big plus in developing our ties with Moscow. By 1968, the Soviet Union had even initiated a modest arms sales programme to Pakistan, much to the chagrin of India. The emerging cordiality in Pakistan-Soviet relations was not liked by India, which rejected Kosygin's offer to mediate on the Farakka dispute and also was mildly critical of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. Pakistan on the other hand, maintained silence on this issue.

The Sino-Soviet Schism had now developed into a state of mutual paranoia and Pakistan's policy of "bilateralism", came under crude pressure, particularly from the Soviet Union. In February 1969 the Soviet Defence Minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko, came to Pakistan and bluntly told his hosts that "You cannot have simultaneous friendship with the Soviet Union and China" when asked how come the USSR was cultivating goodwill in both Islamabad and New Delhi, Marshal Grechko's reply was classic: "What is permissible for a Super Power is not possible for a country like Pakistan!" Additionally, Moscow was exercising pressure on Pakistan to accept its proposals

which had an unmistakable anti-China undercurrent. In May 1969, Kosygin visiting Pakistan for the second time within thirteen months, tried to sell his scheme for "regional economic cooperation" among Pakistan, India, Iran, Afghanistan and Soviet Union. This was closely followed by Brezhnev's June 7, 1969, Speech to an International Communist Conference at Moscow which called for establishment a "Collective Security System in Asia."

Both these proposals had been preceded by the March 1969 armed border clashes between the two communist giants and Peking had started referring to the USSR not simply as "Modern revisionists" (ideological deviants) but as "New Czars" following a "Social-imperialist" policy. Pakistan could not possibly participate in any scheme that clearly aimed at the containment or encirclement of China. When Yahya Khan, during his June 1970 Moscow visit, raised the question of continued Soviet arms supplies, Kosygin responded that there was a 'linkage', between Soviet arms and Pakistani acquiescence to Moscow's regional designs: "You cannot expect Soviet arms while you are unwilling to endorse our Asian Security System." He added that the system would be "The best guarantee for Pakistan's territorial integrity."

### **REGIONAL BETS**

Pakistan's refusal to go along with the Soviet Union on these issues, plus its key role in the Sino-American rapprochement, convinced the Kremlin that it should place all its regional bets on India, especially with reference to the East Pakistan crisis. Soon after the military action of March 25, 1971, Soviet President Podgorny sent a message to Yahya Khan urging him to "stop the bloodshed and repression against the population in East Pakistan" Yahya Khan responded by emphasizing that "all efforts



should be made to ensure that no interference takes place in a matter which is strictly Pakistan's own internal affair" and calling upon the Soviet Union to use her undeniable influence with India to prevent her from meddling in Pakistan's internal affairs." In anticipation of the coming war between Pakistan and India, The Soviet Union and India signed a 'Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation' whose Article IX explicitly was meant to ward off any potential Chinese intervention on Pakistan's behalf:

"In the event of either party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries". While Bangladesh marked the end of one phase in South Asia with the establishment of a new status quo favourable to India, Pakistan-Soviet relations till that point were marked by missed opportunities, and short sightedness on our side, although Moscow is not blameless either.

If Pakistan's policy was opportunistic and conditioned by internal political constraints, particularly the overwhelming American influence, the Soviet Union too has also not been so consistent to its professed principles. Political expediency has been important in guiding Kremlin policies, Some examples of Soviet contradictions:

The Soviet Union first supported Kashmiri self-determination then opposed it while simultaneously supporting "self-determination for Pakhtunistan": Moscow supported the Bangladesh movement but in the late sixties it fully endorsed the Nigerian military government's brutal suppression of Biafra's secessionist struggle;

The Soviet Union had always opposed security pacts like CENTO and SEATO but in 1969 it put forward its own anti-China "Asian Collective Security System";

While condemning the U.S, for acting like an imperialist Super Power, the Soviet Union itself, in putting pressures on Pakistan, has exhibited a typical Super Power's arrogant attitude.

## **AFTER AFGHANISTAN**

Pakistan – Soviet relations have entered a new phase after the USSR's military intervention in Afghanistan. With the presence of nearly 100,000 Soviet troops in Pakistan's neighbourhood a qualitative change has occurred in the region.

The Afghanistan issue is currently the main point of friction in Pakistan-Soviet relations. However, this was not the case after April 1978 when a Khalqi coup ousted Prince Daud Khan and installed a firmly pro-Moscow regime in Power.

Pakistan recognized the Tarakki regime a few days after the coup and General Zia was the first foreign leader to visit the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in September 1978. A year later they met again at Havana where the Pakistan President referred to his Afghan counterpart as a "good Muslim".

## **SOVIET CREDIT**

Before that, in July 1978, the Finance Minister, Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan, visited Moscow and managed to seek continued Soviet credits for the Karachi Steel Mills while effusive in his praise for Soviet assistance, he also termed friendship with the USSR as a "basic principle" of our foreign policy – the first time it had been



elevated to this level. Press reports at the time also mentioned that Premier Kosygin had accepted an invitation to visit Pakistan “in the near future”.

By the end of 1978, the refugee inflow from Afghanistan had begun and in March 1979, the Soviet media began the first in a series of attacks on Pakistan alleging its “interference in Afghanistan’s internal affairs”. Afghanistan was now an issue in Pakistan-Soviet relations.

Interestingly enough, on the eve of the Soviet invasion, Foreign Minister Shahi had been scheduled to visit Afghanistan, but after the Soviet action this visit was cancelled.

Following the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, certain consequences flowed from this needless blunder of the Kremlin.

All of a sudden Afghanistan was transformed into an international question affecting Super Power relations and the Muslim world.

The first few months after the Soviet intervention were spent by both sides in expending energies towards opposing objectives – a sort of political tug-of-war where both sides failed to realize their objectives.

The Islamic Conference and a Third World majority at the United Nations, with Western backing, strongly condemned the Soviet Union and demanded the unconditional withdrawal of its occupation army from Afghanistan. The Soviet Union, in what it erroneously presumed to be a limited, surgical operation, sought to legitimize its role in Afghanistan and the regime of Babrak Karmel installed via the Red Army’s courtesy. Containing the guerrilla insurgency

and healing the Khalq-Parcham conflict were central to Soviet strategy in Afghanistan.

Thus, during this period (most of 1980), no serious political initiative was undertaken by either side and any peace feelers were meant more to score debating points than to seek a genuine political settlement. There is a Chinese saying that the “journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step”. The first step in the “thousand-mile journey” towards an Afghan political settlement was taken in January 1981, when Pakistan called for talks under U.N. auspices. Unlike previous moves on our part, Mr. Shahi’s initiative was without any preconditions.

Although that initiative was stalled on account of Kabul’s intransigence, the flexibility in position was significant. Mr. Firyubin’s visit to Pakistan coincided with a new initiative from Kabul which indicated a shift in its professed policy, Kabul finally has agreed to trilateral (Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan) talks under U.N. auspices.

After its invasion of Afghanistan, bilateral political friction notwithstanding, the Soviet Union has demonstrated a rather “business-as-usual” approach towards Pakistan.

In line with this approach, the Soviet Union sent delegations for the inauguration of their funded projects like the Guddu Thermal Power Station and the Karachi Steel Mills (these projects remained unaffected by the political pinpricks over Afghanistan), bilateral trade increased by 25 per cent and the Soviet Ambassador has been going around offering Pakistan nuclear power plants! When Mr. Gromyko last met Mr. Shahi at the U.N. in



September 1980, although he chided his Pakistani counterpart that “you seem to want to fight a war with us”, he did invite Mr. Shahi to visit Moscow for talks.

Obviously the key to normalization of Pakistan-Soviet relations lies in a political settlement in Afghanistan.

### **COMPULSIONS**

There are compulsions for both countries to seek such a settlement, speedily with no sell-out but a balanced ‘give-and-take approach. For Pakistan there are two basic compulsions. The refugees, touching 2.5 million, a major socio-economic burden in the areas they occupy. This is almost invariably the case with refugees who come in such large numbers.

Then there is always the danger of a “new Yalta”, a grand settlement by the two Super Powers over Afghanistan over the head of Pakistan. The two Super Powers respective spheres of influence of arms of vital interest are Afghanistan for Moscow and the Gulf for Washington. An article in the July 1981, issue of the Soviet journalist “International Affairs” stated that the Soviet government “confirmed that it did not object to discussing the problems related to Afghanistan together with the problems of security in the Persian Gulf”. The American’s are already known to have made “secret offers” to the Soviet Union for a “face-saving formula over Afghanistan.

The Soviet Union also has its compulsions to seek a political compromise on Afghanistan. Militarily, it is in a “No win” situation, politically, it is propping a narrow, based regime and diplomatically it is losing face all over for invading a small Third World Country. Then

there are some hard facts of geo-politics which Kremlin’s old guard should understand. Turkey is firmly in NATO, revolutionary Iran rejects both Super Powers, Afghanistan is in a civil war situation, and China is aligning closer towards Washington with an extended handshake across the Himalayas towards India. This leaves Pakistan which is essential to the Soviet interest of seeing it non-aligned and not serving as a base for anti-Sovietism. Of course, there are unanswered questions on both sides. Even if we reject the warm waters theory as a collector’s item for conspiracy-theorists, we would like to know more about Soviet intentions in Afghanistan.

The Soviets are probably interested in knowing more about our American connection and what role, if any, we intend to play in this region. Afghanistan apart, extraneous factors also affect the future development of Pakistan-Soviet relations – our ties with Beijing and China’s growing links with India. Given this context, we cannot have an “either or” approach, i.e. either we are sworn enemies or we are bosom friends. This is neither feasible nor desirable. Years of mistrust can only be wiped out if there is better understanding of each other’s interest so that a realistic relationship can be forged based on equality and mutually beneficial cooperation.

*Courtesy: Daily ‘The Muslim’, Islamabad  
Sept. 13 - 15, 1981*



# Profiles

---

- **Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot**  
Foreign Minister of the Netherlands
  
- **Mr. Konstantin KOSACHEV**  
Chairman, International Affairs Committee,  
State Duma of the Russian Federation





**Dr. Bernard Bot**

Foreign Minister of the Netherlands

Dr. Bernard Rudolf Bot was born in Batavia, Indonesia (formerly the Dutch East Indies) on November 21, 1937.

After completing his secondary education, he studied law at Leiden University, the Hague Academy of International Law and Harvard Law School in Cambridge, Mass., where he obtained a Master of Laws (LL.M.) degree. In 1968 he was awarded a doctorate in law by Leiden University for his thesis entitled 'Non-recognition and treaty relations'.

He worked for the Foreign Services of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 1963 to 2002, with postings at the Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the European Communities from 1964 to 1970, at the embassy in Buenos Aires to 1973, and the embassy in East Berlin (DDR). In 1976 he returned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague where he remained until 1982. He then became Deputy Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to NATO in Brussels, a post he held until 1986, when he became Ambassador to Turkey.

From 1986 to 1992 he was Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and rounded off his civil service career as Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the European Union in Brussels.

On January 1, 2003 Dr. Bot became a partner in the Praaning Meines Consultancy Group.

He has been Chairman of the Foreign Service Association (1978-1982), a member of the Executive Board of the Fondation Journalists en Europe and the Supervisory Board of the Hotel School in The Netherlands, the Board of Trustees of the European Centre for Work and Society and the Board of Trustees of the University of Tilburg.

Since December 3, 2003 Dr. Bot has been Minister for Foreign Affairs in the second Balkenede Government, succeeding Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, who will take up the post of Secretary General of NATO on January 1, 2004. Dr. Bot is also a member of the Christian Democratic Alliance.

**Mr. Konstantin KOSACHEV**

Member of the State Duma (2004-3-2)  
European Democrat Group

**Chairman**

International Affairs Committee  
State Duma of the Russian Federation



Konstantin Kosachev was elected to the state Duma for the first time in 1999 and currently serves as chairman of the Duma Committee on International Affairs. A respected diplomat prior to his service in the Duma, Kosachev worked in various Russian diplomatic missions as well as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He represented Russia in negotiations with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe as well as the Parliament of Sweden, and is the recipient of the Russian Order of Friendship and the Swedish Royal Order of the North Star. Kosachev received his Ph.D. from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO).

**Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly**

Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly: Bureau of the Assembly

Member: Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe (Monitoring Committee)

First Vice-Chairperson: Political Affairs Committee

Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly: Standing Committee

Chairperson of national delegation: Standing Committee

Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly: Enlarged Joint Committee / Joint Committee

Address:

State Duma, Okhotny Ryad 1, Moscow RU - 103265



# Profiles

---

- **Chairman**  
and
- **Members of the Senate  
Foreign Relations Committee**





## Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed

(PML - Federal Capital)  
Chairman

Mushahid Hussain Sayed is currently a Senator and Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He is also Secretary General of the ruling party, Pakistan Muslim League. He has been a Cabinet Minister, Journalist, university teacher and political analyst. As Information Minister from 1997 to 1999, Mushahid Hussain was the country's principal spokesman and appeared frequently on international television and radio channels to present Pakistan's position on issues ranging from nuclear weapons to Islam and foreign policy. He was also Leader of Pakistan's Delegation to the UN Human Rights Commission at Geneva in 1993. After October 12, 1999, Mushahid Hussain was held without any charges as a political prisoner for four-hundred and forty (440) days, including a period in solitary imprisonment. The world's leading human rights organization, Amnesty International, declared him a 'Prisoner of Conscience' making him the first such Pakistani to be so honoured for the year 2000.

Mushahid Hussain has a Master's degree from the School of Foreign Services in Georgetown University at Washington. While studying in the US, he was President of the Pakistan Students Association and was awarded a Congressional Internship to work in the United States Congress. In Pakistan, he studied at the F.C. College in Lahore, from where he received a BA.

After completion of studies in the United States, he returned to Pakistan and became Member, Directing Staff of the country's prestigious training institution for civil servants, the Pakistan Administrative Staff College. He then joined Pakistan's oldest seat of learning, the Punjab University, as Lecturer on International Relations in the Political Science Department, from where he along with three other teachers was removed on political grounds during Martial Law.

In 1982, at age 29, he became the youngest Editor of national English daily, The Muslim, published from capital Islamabad, which was respected for its independent positions.

As a specialist on international political and strategic issues, he has lectured widely and his articles have been published in various national and international publications including The New York Times, The Washington Post, International Herald Tribune, and Middle East International. He was elected Co-Chairman of the NAM Media Conference of 100 countries, held in New Delhi in December 1983 and he is the first Pakistani journalist to have a syndicated column in the Indian media, writing regularly in the 'Time of India' and the 'Hindustan Times'.

Mr. Mushahid Hussain is the author of three books. He is also Chairman of the Board of Governors of Islamabad Policy Research Institute (IPRI), a leading Think Tank.

He is also the Vice President of the Centrist Democrat International (CDI) Asia – Pacific Chapter. On January 27, 2006, he was awarded Congressional Medal of Achievement by the House of Representatives of the Republic of the Philippines.

### Membership of the Senate & Parliamentary Committees:

- Committee on Foreign Relations, Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas (**Chairman**)
- Committee on Defence and Defence Production.
- Functional Committee on Government Assurances.
- Functional Committee on Human Rights.
- Finance Committee
- Parliamentary Committee on Kashmir.
- Joint Parliamentary Committee on Balochistan.

### Contact Information:

Tele (Off.) 051-922 3974, 051-111-00-1947, Fax: 051-282 7870

Tele (Res.) 051-920 6531, Cell: 0300-500 6056

Email: mushahid.hussain@gmail.com

Address: (Home) 175, Street 15, E-7, Islamabad.

(Office) Secretary General, Pakistan Muslim League,  
4, Margalla Road, F-7/3, Islamabad.



**Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri**  
Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs  
Ex-Officio Member

Mian Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri is a member of the National Assembly from NA-140 (Kasur-III) constituency. He is currently Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Mian Khursheed Mahmud Kasuri graduated with a B.A (Hons.) degree from University of the Punjab in 1961, followed by a tripos degree from Cambridge University and qualified as Barrister-at-Law at Gray's Inn London. During his political career, Mr. Khurshid Mahmud Kasuri was elected as First Secretary General of Peoples Democratic Alliance and was appointed Federal Minister for Parliamentary Affairs in the interim government of Prime Minister Mir Balakh Sher Mazari.

Mr. Kasuri is an ex-officio member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

**Contact Information**

Tele (Off): 051-9210335, 9203824

Tele (Res): 051-9222227-8

Fax (Off): 051-9207600

Address (Off):

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Constitution Avenue, Islamabad.

Address (Res):

House No. 13-A, Street No. 8, F-7/3, Islamabad.



## Senator Wasim Sajjad

(PML - Federal Capital)  
Member

Mr. Wasim Sajjad was born on 30th March, 1941. He went to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar in 1964 from where he obtained the Degrees of M.A. (Jurisprudence) and B.C.L. He is a Barrister-at-Law from the Inner Temple London and an Honorary Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

He has a highly distinguished career in politics and public service and has held the office of :-

**President of Pakistan** (July to November, 1993 and December, 1997 to January, 1998).

**Chairman Senate of Pakistan** (24th December, 1988 to 12th October, 1999). Elected in 1988 and re-elected in 1991, 1994 and 1997.

**Federal Minister for Law, Justice & Parliamentary Affairs** (September, 1986 to December 1988). Has also held the portfolio of the **Federal Minister for Interior & Narcotics Control**.

**Leader of the Opposition in the Senate of Pakistan, 1988.**

Elected as **Senator** from Punjab on a technocrat seat in 1985. Re-elected in 1991, 1994, 1997 and 2003. Presently he is the **Leader of the House in the Senate of Pakistan** and is a Member of the Pakistan Muslim League.

As a **Lawyer** by profession, he is presently heading his own law firm (**Sajjad Law Associates**) having its Head Office in Islamabad.

He is the **President** of the **Foundation for Advancement of Science & Technology** and **Chancellor of the National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences**.

He has travelled extensively and visited over fifty countries. He is married and has three children.

### Contact information:

Tele (Off): 051-922 3503, 922 3504

Tele (Res): 051- 224 0903

Mobile: 0333- 575 3205

Fax: 051-922 3505(Off.) 224 3856(Res.)

Address: H. No.12-A, P&V Scheme No.2, Park Road,  
Chak Shahzad, Islamabad.

**Senator S. M. Zafar**  
(PML - Punjab)  
Member



Senator S. M. Zafar is a prominent lawyer and former Federal Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs, Pakistan. He is involved with various aworks and is Chairman of the Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency - PILDAT's Board of Advisors, Chairman of the Human Rights Society of Pakistan as well as of the Senate Committee on Human Rights. He was President of the High Court Bar Association Lahore (1975) and President of the Supreme Court Bar Association (1979). He is also Chairman of the Cultural Association of Pakistan. Senator Zafar has visited the US, Canada, UK, France and Germany. He enjoys farming and has three sons and a daughter.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-9223969, 042-7570257, 042-7570258

Tele (Res): 051-9223825, 042-5420828, 042-5421668

Mobile: 0300-8455377

Fax: 042-7570256, 042-5715483

Email: mnz@nexlinx.net.pk

Address: Zafar House, 300 West Canal Bank, Hanjarwal, Lahore

**Senator Prof. Khurshid Ahmad**  
(MMA - NWFP)  
Member



A world renowned research scholar, an educationist, an economist, a versatile writer and a preacher of Islam, Prof. Khurshid Ahmad was born on March 23, 1932 at Delhi, India. He holds a Bachelors degree in Law and Jurisprudence, Masters degrees in Economics and Islamic Studies and an Honorary Doctorate (Ph.D) in Education. Prof. Khurshid Ahmad has held the portfolio of the Federal Minister of Planning and Development and has been Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission in the Government of Pakistan from 1978 to 1979. He has written around 30 books in English, over 20 in Urdu and contributed to a large number of magazines. Senator Ahmed was elected as member of the Senate in February, 2003, and is a member of the Senate's Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Kashmir Affairs and Northern Affairs. He previously served as member of the Senate from March 1985 till March 1997. During that tenure he was also Chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs from 1991 till March, 1997. He is Vice President (Naib Ameer) of Jama'at-e-Islami Pakistan and Founder and Chairman of both Institute of Policy Studies, Islamabad and the Islamic Foundation, Leicestershire, UK.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-2650971-3

Tele (Re): 051-2103137

Mobile: 0300-8542211 Fax: 051-2650704

Email: khurshid@ips.net.pk

Address: Institute of Policy Studies, Block-19, Markaz F-7, Islamabad



**Senator Sardar Mahtab Ahmed Abbasi**  
(PML-N - NWFP)  
Member

Senator Sardar Mahtab Ahmed Abbasi is former Chief Minister of the NWFP and a Federal Minister. He is an experienced politician and one of the prominent leaders of the PML-N.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-4102122

Tele (Res): 0992-382323

Mobile: 0300-8548638, 0300-5006061

Fax: 051-2876405

Email: sardarmahtab@hotmail.com

Address: Pines Cliff Mirpur Abbotabad



**Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq**  
(MMA - NWFP)  
Member

Senator Sami-ul-Haq completed education from Jamia Darul Uloom Haqqania Akora Khattak, and received a degree in Tafseer from spiritual leader Maulana Ahmad Ali Lahori. He was awarded an honorary degree from Darululoom Deoband India and Jamia Makka Muazzama, serving as Chancellor and Teacher of Hadith. Senator Maulana Sami-ul-Haq is a central leader of MMA and runs Dar ul Uloom Haqqania, a religious seminary at Akora Khattak, NWFP. He is also the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Religious Affairs and Minorities Affairs, and has been serving in the Senate of Pakistan since 1985. Senator Sami-ul-Haq is the Secretary General of the JUI-S, and Senior Vice President of the Islamic Democratic Alliance. He is Founder and Secretary General of the National Uniformity council (A common council of all religious political parties). He is the also the founder of the monthly Jamia Haqqania Al-Haq, and has authored several religio-political books in Urdu.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-9223957

Tele (Res): 051-9222829

Tele (Res): 0923-630340

Mobile: 0333-5196486

Fax: 0923-630922

Email: haqqania@nsr.pol.com.pk, haqqania@hotmail.com

Address: Jamia Darul Uloom Haqqania Akora Khatak, Distt. Nowshera, NWFP, Pakistan.

**Senator Muhammad Ali Durrani**  
(PML - Punjab)  
Member



Senator Muhammad Ali Durrani, Minister for Information and Broadcasting, is a leading political activist and grass roots organizer of his party who founded the youth movement "Pasban". He was Secretary General of the National Alliance, a coalition partner of the ruling party. He is also the President of the Wise Education Society and Women Welfare Society. He is the Founder of the Institute of Afghan Affairs (1985) and Education for All (EFA). He has launched campaigns for the Kashmir cause, free employment (1997), Shaukat Khanum Memorial Trust Hospital, collective marriage ceremony, true freedom (2000), and for relief on foreign debt (2001). He played a leading role in the establishment of IJI (1988), Millat Party, National Alliance and the Grand National Alliance. Senator Durrani has visited Europe, Asia and Africa and is married with three sons and a daughter.

**Contact information:**

Tele: (Office) 9211800, 9213649

Tele: (Res) 042-5885593, 042-9230082, 051-9202895

Mobile: 0300-8453883

Email: durrani@interface.net.pk

Address 1 : Islamabad: 09-H Parliament Lodges

Address 2: Lahore: H.82-B Garden Block, Garden Town

**Senator Nisar A. Memon**  
(PML - Sindh)  
Member



Senator Nisar A. Memon is the former Minister for Information and the former Chief Executive of the IBM Pakistan. He is also Chairman of the Standing Committee on Defence & Defence Production. He previously served as Federal Minister for Information and Broadcasting twice (1993 and 2002); as President of the Overseas investors chamber of Commerce & Industry Pakistan (1994); and as Chairman Board of Directors, Engro Chemicals Limited, Pakistan (2001-2002). He is a Syndicate member of Karachi University and President of The Reformers. Senator Memon has visited Europe, USA, Canada, Middle East, Africa and Central Asia. He is married with two daughters and enjoys reading and playing Golf.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-9223956

Tele (Res): 051-9223853

Mobile: 0300-8222836, 0300-8556632

Fax: 021-5840642

Email: namemon@attglobal.net

Address: 78, Khayaban-e-Sehar, DHA, Phase VI, Karachi



**Senator Sardar M. Latif Khan Khosa**  
(PPPP - Punjab)  
Member

Senator Sardar Muhammad Latif Khan Khosa is one of the country's leading lawyers who has actively defended constitutional and political cases of his party leadership. He was President of the High Court Bar Association thrice (1981-82, 1987-88, 1995-96), Member Pakistan Bar Council since 1995, Chairman Executive Committee P.B.C. (1995-96), Chairman Appeal Committee Punjab-1 (1996-2000) and Member Tribunal P.B.C. (1995-2000). He is a Life Member of the High Court Bars of Lahore, Multan and Rawalpindi. He is also Life Member of the Supreme Court Bar Association, and Chairman of Khosa Law Chambers. Senator Khosa has visited the USA, Canada, France, UK, China, Ireland, Dubai and Saudi Arabia. He is married with four sons and two daughters and enjoys cricket, debating and music.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Res): 042-7351695

Tele (Mob): 0300-8410477

Fax: 042-7351695

Email: slk@magic.net.pk

Address 1: Lahore: Khosa Law Chamber, No. 1 Turner Road

Address 2: Multan: 2522, Bhawalpur Road

Address 3: Rawalpindi: Flat No.3, 1st Floor, Satellite Plaza,  
Six Road Chowk, Satellite Town



**Senator Muhammad Talha Mahmood Aryan**  
(MMA - NWFP)  
Member

**Membership of the Senate Committees**

- Standing Committee on Petroleum and Natural Resources.
- Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas.
- Functional Committee on Government Assurances.

**Contact Information:**

Office Phone: 051-227879

Mobile Phone: 0333-5116995, 0303-7371408

Fax: 051-2270465

**Address:**

i. 202-G, Parliament Lodges, Islamabad.

ii. Bandi Gulu Kot Najeeb ullah Haripur NWFP.

**Senator Babar Khan Ghori**  
(MQM - Sindh)  
Member



Senator Babar Khan Ghori is currently the Minister for Ports and Shipping. He has served as Member of the Sindh Assembly from 1993-1996, and as Member National Assembly from 1997-1999. He has visited the UK, USA, Holland, UAE, Saudi Arabia and France. Senator Ghori is married with two sons and three daughters.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-9210344, 9203244

Mobile: 0300-8420949

Fax: 021-4125466

Email: babarghauri@hotmail.com

Address: C-170, KDA Scheme, 1-A, Karachi, Pakistan

**Senator Gulshan Saeed**  
(PML - Punjab)  
Member



Senator Gulshan Saeed, Chairperson, Senate Standing Committee on Ports and Shipping, is a long-standing political activist and she runs an NGO called Roshan Pakistan. She was a member of the Punjab Social Welfare Board from 1998-2002. She has visited the UK, Thailand, Saudi Arabia, France, Holland and USA. Senator Gulshan Saeed is married with two sons and two daughters.

She is currently the Vice President of the Women's Wing of Pakistan Muslim League, and member of its General Council. She has held assignments of Punjab Social Welfare Board, Bait-ul-Mal Punjab and Chairman Zakat Committee Lahore.

**Contact information:**

Tele (Off): 051-9207477, 9223818

Tele (Res): 042-6664652, 042-6650482

Mobile: 0300-8420783

Address: 77, Bridge Colony, Lahore, Cantt.



# Profiles of the Committee Officials





**Mr. Iftikhar Ullah Babar**  
Secretary Committee

Mr. Iftikhar Ullah Babar is Additional Secretary at the Senate of Pakistan and is currently working with the Parliamentary Committees of the Senate.

Mr. Babar completed his Secondary School and Higher Secondary School from Burn Hall School Abbottabad and Abbottabad Public School respectively. He attended Edwardes College Peshawar for his Bachelor's Degree and University of Peshawar for a Master's Degree in Economics. He also holds a Master's Degree in Development Studies from the Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague, The Netherlands.

Mr. Babar attended the 13th Advance Management and Development course at the National Institute of Public Administration (NIPA) Peshawar and the 76th National Management Course at the Pakistan Administrative Staff College (PASC) Lahore.

Mr. Babar has authored a number of research articles on wide ranging topics namely, the Eighth Constitutional Amendment, Research support to Parliamentarians, the Parliamentary Committee System in Pakistan and Parliament and Financial Control. He has written numerous reports for the Committees, which were presented in the Senate.

**Contact Information**

Tele (Off): 051-9209790

Tele (Res): 051-9266966

Mobile:0333-5107274

Email: [iftikharullahbabar@hotmail.com](mailto:iftikharullahbabar@hotmail.com)

Address: Senate Secretariat, Parliament House, Islamabad.



**Mr. Tayyab Siddiqui**  
Consultant  
Ambassador (R)

Mr. Tayyab Siddiqui joined the Foreign Service of Pakistan in 1967 and served as Ambassador of Pakistan to Zimbabwe (1986-1990), with concurrent accreditation to Zambia, Botswana and Namibia; to Indonesia (1992-1996), with concurrent accreditation to Papua New Guinea; to Egypt (1997-1999); and to Switzerland (1999-2003), and also to the Holy See and Liechtenstein.

In a 35 - year career as a diplomat, he also served in Pakistan missions in Amman, Beirut, Colombo, Berlin (GDR), Athens, Dhaka and Washington D.C. He was a member of Pakistan delegation to the UNGA for four years (1977-1980).

Ambassador Siddiqui is currently a regular analyst on international affairs with Radio Pakistan and PTV and other private channels. He is a regular contributor to English dailies - 'Dawn', 'The Nation' and 'The Post' on current international issues. He also contributes a regular column entitled "Harf-e-Haq" to the Urdu daily, 'Ausaf'. The selection of his columns was published in March, 2005.

**Contact Information**

Mobile: 0300-5005358

Tele (Res): 051-2816011

E-mail: amb\_tayyabsiddiqi@yahoo.com

Address: House 13, St. # 43, F-8/1, Islamabad.

## About the Hanns Seidel Foundation

The Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSF) is a non-profit organization established in 1967 with its headquarters in Munich. Its activities, financed by the Federal Republic of Germany, by the Free State of Bavaria, and by private donations, are organized through four main departments, the Academy for Politics and Current Affairs, the Institute for Adult Civic Education, the Scholarship organization and the Institute for International Contact and Cooperation.

In accordance with the overall mission statement of the HSF, the Institute for International Contact and Cooperation is working in the service of peace, democracy and development with projects in currently 60 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe. In Pakistan the HSF has established and supported Technical Training Centers in the province of Balochistan from 1983 to 1999. Since 1993, when an office of the HSF was opened in Islamabad, its activities have included technical support and staff training for the Secretariats of both houses of the Parliament and cooperation with a number of Institutes, Think Tanks and University Departments, all of which are doing research mainly on issues of current international and regional politics. HSF has assisted in the organization of hundreds of public seminars with its partners in Pakistan, as well as non-public dialogue forums on foreign policy and security matters with experts from neighbouring and European countries.

The HSF is pleased to be associated with the production of **Report No.11: "Dialogue with the Dutch and Pakistan - Russia Relations"**, under the auspices of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Hanns Seidel Foundation  
House 2, Margalla Road, F-6/3, Islamabad.  
Tel: (051) 227-5568/69, Fax: (051) 227-5569  
E-mail: [hss@isb.paknet.com.pk](mailto:hss@isb.paknet.com.pk)

Reports published by the  
SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE  
2004 - 2006

**Report No. 1 (July 2004)**

**The Global & Regional Scenario in the aftermath of 9/11:** Deals with the visit of the members of British House Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, to Islamabad in May 2004. The major issue was "to discuss matters of mutual interest, particularly the global and regional scenario in the aftermath of 9/11 incident".

The Report covers the proceedings of the meeting and explains the viewpoint of the two countries.

**Report No. 2 (August, 2004)**

**General Elections in India - its impact and the regional implications:** It relates to the meeting held on May 28, 2004 on the subject of General Elections in India, its impact on Pakistan and their regional implications. Recognized experts on South Asia were invited to present their assessment and perspective; including former Foreign Minister Abdul Sattar and Foreign Secretary Riaz Khokhar.

**Report No. 3 (October, 2004)**

**Special Report on Enlightened Moderation – The Post 9/11 Scenario:** This Report is a well-documented treatise on post 9/11 issue of terrorism and the counter strategy – "Enlightened Moderation" advocated by President Musharraf.

The US point of view, both official and nonofficial, is also reflected in the articles and statements by renowned US experts to provide a broader view of the problem, as also perspectives from Pakistan.

**Report No. 4 (March, 2005)**

**Occupied Kashmir and Relations with India:** The report is a unique document as it contains the eye-witness account of the visit of Pakistani journalists to Occupied Indian Kashmir – the first ever by any Pakistani in last 57 years.

**Report No. 5 (April – May, 2005)**

**Visit to Germany, Belgium and the UK:** It is an account of the visit of Foreign Relations Committee to Europe, in particular, Belgium, Germany and the UK. The Report covers meetings with the counterparts in these countries and interaction with the resident Pakistan community in the containment.

**Report No. 6 (September, 2005)**

**Pakistan and the OIC:** The Report titled "Pakistan and the OIC" records the developments of Organization of Islamic Conference since its birth in 1969 and is a record of last 35 years of OIC.

**Report No. 7 (November, 2005)**

**Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Balochistan:** Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Balochistan" is the first informative and detailed account of problems facing Balochistan and the proposals to overcome them, as reflected in the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee on Balochistan established by Chaudhry Shujat Hussain, then Prime Minister of Pakistan and its Sub-Committee on Current Issues headed by Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed.

**Report No. 8 (December, 2005)**

**Pak – Africa Relations:** Report on the state of relations between Pakistan and African countries based on informal dialogue of the Committee members with African envoys based in Islamabad.

**Report No. 9 (December, 2005)**

**Pakistan – UK Relations:** This Report is an account of the interaction with Sir Michael Jay, Permanent Under Secretary, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office which covers viewpoints of both countries on issues of terrorism, Afghanistan and Iraq Wars, Iran's nuclear issue, and the difference between struggle for the legitimate right of self-determination and terrorist activities.

**Report No. 10 (January, 2006)**

**Visit to Japan and South Korea:** This is an account of the visit of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to these two east Asian countries.



SENATE OF PAKISTAN

Foreign Relations Committee

*f*or Reports of the Committee please visit  
<http://www.foreignaffairscommittee.org>