

to allow the negotiations to be held with war criminals, and also under a completely changed position of negotiating on the basis of "ethnic divisions" and abandoning the already established position of the "civic state" principle.)

3. Agreeing to an inferior position in negotiation.

Before going out to negotiate, Bosnian diplomacy could have made a number of completely legitimate requests and could have gained a number of "life-saving" little advantages, that would provide for stronger negotiating positions in diplomacy and on the battlefield. The informational, traffic, and political deblockade of Sarajevo, government of Bosnia, and Tuzla airport could have been preconditions for the negotiations. Subservience did not help at all.

After all, the delegation of Bosnia, during the negotiations, went further and further away from the mandate received from the "Expanded Presidency" in the capital, Sarajevo, and thus committed an unauthorized acceptance of the "basic principles" and later of "the military agreement," also. Therefore:

The delegation of Bosnia committed the "sellout" of the continuity of the statehood and the constitution of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. In return, they received "guarantees" of the human rights and religious rights that are usually included in the higher categories (statehood and constitution) which they have lost and/or abandoned.

The delegation of Bosnia (President Mr. Alija Izetbegovic and Foreign Minister Mr. Haris Silajdzic as well as other members) traded away the principle of the sovereignty of Bosnia and the principle of the firmness of the borders, for the humiliating *protectorate over Bosnia*, which is the only method for a "legal" destruction of the sovereignty of a member of the United Nations.

Having done that, the delegation of Bosnia has caused a severe loss of morale in the Bosnian population, with a total collapse in certain areas. Army commanders, very discouraged by such treason, were also criticized for "politicking," meaning that the delegation does not care for the opinion of the Army of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which fights valiantly for the freedom of the entire country and not the slavery and slaughter that the Vance-Owen plan basically imposes. Furthermore, the "negotiating skills" of Mr. Alija Izetbegovic have given a morale boost for a renewed Serbian offensive in eastern Bosnia, stemming from the Serbian (correct) perception that the Vance-Owen plan gives them a total *carte blanche* to kill, even 12 months after the commencement of the slaughter of the innocent Bosnian civilians.

Finally, nobody has the right to negotiate, let alone accept, the destruction of the continuity of the statehood and the constitution of Bosnia, especially not the leaders who were sworn to defend those sacred principles.

How will "the West" solve the Bosnian-Muslim refugee problem? It accepts the refugees. The exit from Sarajevo is cynically granted "to the signers of the Vance-Owen documents."

Is India losing its grip on Kashmir?

by Ramtanu Maitra

As the winter snow melts and makes accessible the rugged terrain of Kashmir, the Indian Army is facing a new wave of well-trained and well-armed intruders from the Pakistan side of the border. On the ground in the Kashmir Valley, it is evident that India's 38-month effort to eradicate violence and militancy has failed, and it is to be seen whether the Indian Army, battling an elusive army backed by the locals, can contain the situation through the coming summer.

Such a question is no longer rhetorical, as is evident from the growing urgency expressed by New Delhi. Newly appointed Minister of State for Home Affairs Rajesh Pilot, who is in charge of internal security, has made a quick foray to Kashmir and is now busy pushing for a political solution. The 33-month tenure of the Jammu and Kashmir governor and former chief of Indian intelligence, Girish Chandra Saxena, has been abruptly ended. Gen. Krishna Rao (ret.), who had already had a short stint as governor in 1989 before the valley erupted with violence and militancy, has been asked to take over. Such old hands as the former chief minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Dr. Farooq Abdullah, and the scion of the Kashmir royal house, Dr. Karan Singh, have already indicated that Delhi should hold talks with both Pakistan and the Kashmiri militants of all hues to resolve the problem. Dr. Abdullah, in fact, has gone further, to indicate that India should discuss the autonomy of the Kashmir Valley with the militants and define the autonomy quantitatively so that the "boys" do not feel that they have not gained anything.

Threat of war

The increasing evidence that Pakistan is directly involved through its military intelligence wing, Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), in training and arming Kashmiri militants, including the jihad-seeking Afghan mujahideen and even, reportedly, Sudanese fundamentalists, as documented by India, has endangered peace in the subcontinent. In the coming summer, if the Indian Army fails to prevent a reported 4,000 trained guerrillas from entering the valley and loses a number of personnel in the process, a war-like situation is bound to emerge. Moreover, Indian intelligence is alluding to an ISI hand in the recent bombings that rocked Bombay's

commercial brain center. If this were to be established, the possibility of a war between India and Pakistan cannot be ruled out.

India and Pakistan have already fought three futile wars over Kashmir, and came close again in 1991, when a timely intervention by the Bush administration defused the crisis. In Washington, a number of individuals belonging to the Clinton administration and outside of it, have expressed the fear that India and Pakistan will engage in an all-out nuclear exchange over the Kashmir dispute. Newly selected CIA chief James Woolsey, testifying before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee on nuclear proliferation on Feb. 24, talked about the possibility of a nuclear exchange. Although the CIA chief's warning is slanted with the Clinton administration's expressed goal of getting both India and Pakistan to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT), there is no question that Washington is conscious of the possibility of a war breaking out over the Kashmir issue.

Weakening of the Indian position

The latest uprising in the valley, which began in the early 1990s, has a lot to do with the retreat of the erstwhile Soviet Army from Afghanistan in 1988 and Pakistan's efforts to arm and train the Kashmiri militants. However, Kashmir has been a troubled spot for the last four decades and more. The Kashmiris, unlike the Sikhs in Punjab, have little loyalty toward either India or Pakistan. This sense of independence was allowed to be bred not only by outside forces in Britain or elsewhere, but even within India itself.

Jammu and Kashmir's first chief minister, Sheikh Abdullah, who was also prime minister when Kashmir was a principality, had openly talked of a "Switzerland-type independent Kashmir" and yet has wielded power for almost three decades. Close to the Nehru-Gandhi family and having achieved both profit and power through Nehru's generous support, Sheikh Abdullah, whose son Dr. Farooq Abdullah is a much weaker man, had all along worked, with the help of New Delhi, toward carving out an independent Kashmir.

The Kashmir situation is different from Punjab in every possible way. Except for a brief period following the Indian Army's incursion into the holy Sikh shrine, the Golden Temple of Amritsar, in 1984, the Sikh militants in Punjab never had the support of the Sikh population in general. In Punjab, even when the Indian Army was killing many, the Sikh population never turned on the Army itself. However, in Kashmir, the only difference between an ordinary Kashmiri and a militant Kashmiri is the way they are armed: Both hate India with a passion and consider the Army as a tyrant.

It is also widely acknowledged that Pakistan, having lost its eastern wing and militarily kowtowed to the Indian Army in 1971, will not give up this opportunity to "teach India a lesson." India's efforts to pressure Washington to label Pakistan a terrorist state will not succeed, because Pakistan has developed its nuclear weapons programs and the United

States fears that isolating Pakistan would only propel Islamabad to pass on nuclear weapons technology to hostile nations.

The 'human rights' chorus

In addition, "human rights violations" in Kashmir are becoming an issue in the West. New Delhi is well aware that it cannot exert more pressure in Kashmir. It is no surprise that those in Britain and the United States who had been lamenting India's deliberate attempt to suppress the "aspirations of the Kashmiri people," are now tuned in to the human rights chorus. It is the same in Pakistan. Those who had been vocal about India's deliberate attempt to "weaken Islam" have also started to sing the human rights tune.

It is also evident that Britain would like to see an independent Kashmir. This has become particularly important for the British in the light of the growing economic strength of both India and China and the emergence of at least a half-dozen nations (former Soviet republics) in Central Asia. Britain, and its promoters in the United States, had long been cultivating the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front, the main proponent of an independent Kashmir, and have even provided succor to the pro-Pakistani militant group, Kizbul Mujahideen. With the backing of Pakistan, Britain, and some in the United States, the militant movement has garnered further strength.

Split four ways

The softening of the Indian position—if one considers that Dr. Abdullah is speaking on behalf of the new set of policymakers—raises a question as to what kind of solution can be worked out which will bring peace, satisfying the Kashmiris, Pakistanis, and the Indians. Kashmir is now split four ways. Almost two-thirds of Kashmir belongs to India. Within the Indian part of Kashmir, there exist three distinct parts. One is the valley, where the militancy is at its peak and which is inhabited mostly by the Muslims. The other two parts are Jammu, a Hindu majority area, and Ladakh, with a large Buddhist community bordering China.

The Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir has itself been split into three parts. A small portion has been given to China, the northern part has been assimilated within Pakistan as a northern territory (although a Pakistani court recently announced that such annexation was illegal), and the rest is Azad Kashmir.

Since the demand for autonomy exists only in the valley, it is expected that India will not even discuss Jammu and Ladakh. On the other hand, an autonomous Kashmir Valley must also contain that part of the valley which is now part of Azad Kashmir. Also to be considered is the level of autonomy to be given to the valley. Both India and Pakistan must make sure that this autonomous state does not become the dreamed-for Switzerland of Sheikh Abdullah, where foreign powers will vie for control over a highly sensitive region.