

"KEYING PAKISTAN'S DILEMMA"

BY

SYED MUHAMMAD WAQAS

Director General

Bab-ul-Ilm Research Foundation, Pakistan

(All Rights Reserved)

‘War is a necessary evil’; no man of reason can deny this assertion. The historical role of War as one of the driving forces of society is undeniable, also admitted by high profile skeptics and peace-loving statesmen, such as Bertrand Russell and Arnold Toynbee. Their conclusion, too, supports the thesis that War is unavoidable in the flow of human history. Moreover, the reports of both ancient and modern chroniclers justify the phenomenon of War as a living organ of human civilization. We can, therefore, suggest it in the light of our historical knowledge that War, too, has a positive side in addition to its bleak face. Objectively speaking, War is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. However, War oftentimes contradicts its original character and proves an end in addition to a means. And this happens when nations desire deliverance from domestic disunity and polarization. Modern instance of War’s adoption as an end being United States’ invasion of Afghanistan in 2001.

The solution of Pakistan's internal problem lies in the fact of the necessity of battling a "common" national enemy. That common enemy of Pakistan is, in fact, neither USA nor Taliban, but the conventional archrival, India. Pakistan's story of rivalry and struggle for existence has its seeds in the bowls of the Partition factor; therefore, the anguish and enmity of Pakistanis are solely directed towards the Hindu India. It is a natural outcome of the millennial hostility of two mutually distinct—in fact diametrically opposed—nations, the Muslims and the Hindus, who shared about a thousand years the same piece of land to develop an internally dichotomous culture. The present proposition also forms the nucleus of the thesis of many Pakistani intellectuals who are well-versed in the Hindu-Muslim history of struggle. And every sane student of history knows that there is no other solution of Pakistani problem than uniting ourselves to fight a "common national enemy". If you cast even a cursory look into human past, you will come to know that mankind has almost always sought solution for their domestic problems in fighting a national enemy—whatever the definition of the word ‘nation’ in a given age. The call to fight a national enemy always makes people forget minor differences in order to get united on national front. *Ibn Khaldoon* terms this psychological behavior of human race as "**Asbiyyah**", the Affiliation of the Self!

The verdict of Time itself says that nothing other than a major war against a historico-ideological enemy, namely India, can salvage Pakistani nation in the wake of current uncertainty and chaos. Whatever good you have to offer today, nothing is going to deliver and galvanize the

disorganized and frustrated people of Pakistan. War with India is not a doctrine of destruction or annihilation, as many may put it, but a dynamic path to revival and survival. Critics have a huge choice of precedents to quote against the thesis of the present writer, such as the two World Wars, Gulf Wars, Soviet-Afghan War and the collapse of USSR. However, equally potent examples in the favor of the present thesis can be cited from the same ancient and modern history. USSR collapsed because there was yet another, mightier international power to claim the suzerainty of the world politics. Presently, it is only the United States of America, the strongest country on earth, that is free from the fear of being attacked on its soil. However, they still spend on defense a big share of their national budget, namely more than any other nation on the globe. I do not think their think tanks are fools sitting in comfortable offices to chatter and waste national money.

Pacifist statesmen pick and choose any events of their like from the national history of Pakistan to annul the thesis of the inevitability of war with India. The Fall of Dhakka, for instance, is their favorite subject to scare the people of Pakistan with a warning of similar future results in case of another adventurism. However, they always forget that the Fall of Dhakka was not a purely military tragedy, nor a failure of Pakistan's military might. 16 December 1971 was indeed a day of national tragedy deeply rooted into the very bowels of Pakistan's politico-economic system. This politico-economic system was in fact framed by a dictator, Ayyub Khan, to cater his own vested interests. Moreover, it was the failure of a longstanding government doctrine, namely "Defense of East from West", which never proved redemptive.

The good news is that Pakistan is still intact and Two-Nation Theory is still alive and relevant. Pakistan is blessed with a strong, extremely disciplined army that has never been found reluctant to protect and guarantee the ideological boundaries of the Motherland. What we require at present is a better working political system with better individuals in it. Better individuals with superior leadership qualities can only—and only—pop up in the system of an anti-Indian atmosphere, for such patriotism is the product of the psychological factor of "Asbiyyah". Mr. Bhutto, for instance, rose to highest national standing in the post-dismemberment politics from the very anti-Indian sentiment. The other efficacious ground for the unity of the nation can be sought in religion. But, it is beyond doubt that the very idea of a uniformed, pragmatic religion has been frustrated by clerics and religious extremists in recent times. Therefore, I strongly commend that the solution of our domestic problems can be sought in fighting a national-historical enemy to harvest the after-produce of such a purifying campaign!