

DR. SHASHI THAROOR: Mrs. Margaret Alva, Members of the Government,
Members of Parliament, Mr. Vijay Krishnan, Officers of the Lok Sabha Secretariat,
Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends,

I am deeply honoured by the hon. Speaker's invitation to address this prestigious forum at this crucial time in our nation's history. I think it is a reflection of the importance of the very subject we are addressing this evening that the Speaker himself is presiding over a far more important forum at which this issue is receiving the sustained attention of our democracy's elected representatives. I am very pleased nonetheless that a dear friend, an old friend, Mrs. Alva has been kind enough to preside over this occasion. And she has shown her kindness by an excessively generous introduction at which I shall simply say that it is a sort of introduction that my late father would have been proud of but only my mother would have believed.

Let me say that the horrors that began in Mumbai two weeks ago have left an abiding impact on all of us. Today India picks itself up, counting the cost in lives lost, property destroyed and most of all in the scarred psyche of a ravaged nation. Deep and sustained anger across the country - certainly, above all, at those who did what they did to us, but also at our country's demonstrated vulnerability to terror and at the multiple institutional or organizational failures that allowed such loss of lives - has already prompted the resignation of the Home Minister in Delhi and the Chief Minister and his Deputy in the State of Maharashtra. But there are other consequences yet to be measured that the world will be coming to terms with in the coming days and weeks -- consequences whose impact could extend well beyond India's borders with implications for the peace and security of the region and of the world.

If I may be allowed a personal note, Madam Chairman, I grew up in Bombay, as it was then called, and I watched the unfolding horror there with profound empathy. There is a savage irony to the fact that the attacks in Mumbai began with terrorists docking near the Gateway of India. That magnificent arch, built in 1911 to welcome the King Emperor, has ever since stood as a symbol of the openness of the city of Bombay or Mumbai.

I remember my childhood and well thereafter going back frequently and seeing the crowds flocking around the Gateway of India -- crowds made up of foreign tourists and local yokels, touts hawking their wares, boats bobbing in the waters, offering cruises out to the open sea. The teeming throngs around the Gateway of India daily reflects India's diversity; on a typical moment, you could see Parsi gentlemen out for their evening constitutionals; Muslim women in burqas taking the sea air, Goan Catholic waiters from the nearby Taj Mahal Hotel enjoying a break from their

duties; Hindus from every corner of the country chatting in a multitude of tongues. Two weeks ago, watching that same area, the same Gateway of India, on Television, barred and empty, ringed by police barricades, that Gateway -- the Gateway not just of India but to India and to India's soul -- seemed to me to stand as a mute testimony to the latest assault on our country's pluralist democracy.

The terrorists, who heaved their bags laden with weapons up the steps of the wharf to begin their assault on the Taj, into the Oberoi, Nariman House and so many other places, like their cohorts at a dozen other locations around the city, particularly the Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus -- the point of entry for so many people from all over India into Mumbai -- knew exactly what they were doing. Theirs was an attack on India's financial nerve-centre and commercial capital, a city emblematic of the country's energetic thrust into the 21st Century. They struck at symbols of the prosperity that was making the Indian model so attractive to the globalising world -- luxury hotels, a swish café, a building occupied by foreigners. The terrorists also sought to polarise Indian society by claiming to be acting to redress the grievances, real and imagined, of India's Muslims. And by singling out Britons, Americans and Israelis for special attention, they demonstrated that their brand of Islamist fanaticism is anchored less in the absolutism of pure faith than in the geopolitics of hatred.

The attack on the Lubavitch-Chabad Centre, the Jewish Centre, and its residence may seem, in some way, a side show, but in fact it was quite central and it was particularly sad. Since India is justifiably proud of the fact that it is the only country in the world with a Jewish Diaspora going back 2,500 years where there has never been a single instance of anti-Semitism, except when the Portuguese came to inflict it in the Sixteenth Century. The fact is, in my home State of Kerala, the Jews landed, if oral legend is right, after the destruction of their first temple by the Babylonians well before the birth of Christ, certainly after the destruction of the second temple by the Romans. Again, another oral legend is that when St. Thomas, the Doubting Thomas, the Apostle, landed on the shores of Kerala, he was greeted on shore by a flute playing Jewish girl. We have the Jewish community of the Bene Israel, we have seen the Jewish communities of Maharashtra and the urban Jewish communities of the later era; all of them have lived in India in peace, in peace with their neighbours, in peace with Hindus and in peace with Muslims. This is the first time that it became unsafe to be Jewish in India. One more proof to me, even before the proof was conclusively established, that the terrorists were not Indians because the Indian Muslims have no conflict with Indian Jews and it was clear these were foreigners pursuing a foreign agenda.

But also with this tragedy and this extra dimension to the tragedy, it became conclusively clear that India had become the theatre of action for a global battle,

one which threatens Indian lives, it is true, but one whose world-wide objectives also mean that we are not alone in this fight.

After the killings, the platitudes flowed like blood. Terrorism is unacceptable; terrorists are cowards; the world stands united in unreserved condemnation of this latest atrocity – we heard all of these platitudes immediately. Commentators in America tripped over themselves to pronounce this night and day of carnage the moment of India's 9/11. But India has endured many attempted 9/11s, notably the ferocious assault on this very Parliament in December 2001 that nearly led to a larger war against the assailants' sponsors in Pakistan. This year alone, terrorist bombs have taken lives in Jaipur, in Ahmedabad, in Delhi and – in an eerie dress-rehearsal for the effectiveness of synchronicity – they have also taken lives in several different places on one searing day in the State of Assam.

Jaipur is the lodestar of Indian tourism to Rajasthan. Ahmedabad is the primary city of the Gujarat, the State that is a poster child for India's development, with a local GDP growth rate of 14 per cent last year. Delhi, of course, is our nation's political capital and India's window to the world. Assam was logistically convenient for the terrorists from across the porous border.

Mumbai combined all the four elements of its precursors; by attacking it, the terrorists hit India's economy, its tourism and its internationalism. And logistically they took advantage of the city's openness to the world. It was a terrorist grand slam.

So the terrorists hit multiple targets in Mumbai both literally and figuratively. They caused death and destruction in our country, searing India's psyche, showing up the limitations of our security apparatus and humiliating our governance system. They dented the world-wide image of India as an emerging economic giant, a success story of the era of globalisation and an increasing magnet for investors and tourists. Instead the world was made to see, in those days of continuous television coverage, an insecure and vulnerable India; to use the words that appeared in the cover of Newsweek magazine, a 'soft State' bedevilled by enemies who could strike it at will.

We Indians have learned to endure the unspeakable horrors of terrorist violence ever since malign men in Pakistan concluded that it was cheaper and more effective to bleed India to death than to attempt to defeat it in conventional war. Attack after attack has proven to have been financed, equipped and guided from across the border - the most recent being the suicide bombing of the Indian Embassy in Kabul, an action publicly traced not just by us but by American intelligence to Islamabad's dreaded military special-ops agency, the Inter-Services Intelligence

(ISI).

The laughable attempt to claim credit for the Mumbai killings in the name of something called the 'Deccan Mujahideen' merely confirms that – confirmed already on that very day – wherever the killers are from, it is not the Deccan. After all the Deccan lies inland from Mumbai. One does not need to sail the waters of the Arabian Sea to the Gateway of India to get to the city from there. In its meticulous planning, its sophisticated coordination, and military precision, as well as its choice of targets, the assault on Mumbai bore no trace of what its promoters tried to suggest that it was - a spontaneous eruption by angry young Indian Muslims. It was very clear from the very beginning that this horror was not homegrown.

As evidence has now emerged that the terrorists, certainly the ten that we have found, came across the Arabian Sea from Pakistan to wreak their mayhem on Mumbai, the geo-political reverberations of the carnage are beginning to resonate. The interrogation of the one surviving terrorist, and evidence from satellite telephone intercepts and other intelligence, has led to an emerging international consensus that the attacks were masterminded by the Wahhabi-inspired Lashkar-e-Taiba, a terrorist group once patronised, protected and trained – some would even say founded – by the Pakistani ISI as a useful instrument in Islamabad's proxy war against India. We realise that this tragedy was imposed upon us even if it is true that some of India's internal problems have provided an opportunity for outsiders to exploit.

Pakistan was after all hacked off the stooped shoulders of India by the departing British in 1947 as a homeland, it was said, for India's Muslims. But more Muslims have remained in India than live in Pakistan. (Perhaps the numbers have begun to change now with Pakistan's population growth, but certainly till very recently it was true). And Pakistan's relations with India have ever since partition been bedevilled by this festering dispute over the now divided territory of Kashmir, India's only Muslim majority State. Pakistan has tried other means, and they have had the worse of four wars: in 1947-48, in 1965, in 1971 (which, of course, led to the secession of Bangladesh and should have ended the two-nation theory once and for all), and in 1999, the undeclared war that followed a Pakistani attempt by soldiers wearing civilian clothes to seize strategic heights in the Kargil area.

India, I keep explaining to my international interlocutors, is a status quo power. Pakistan has nothing that we want, but we have something Pakistan wants, and has tried repeatedly to get, and that is the territory of Kashmir. For two decades now, a succession of Pakistani military rulers has made it a point to support, finance, equip and train Islamic militants to conduct terrorist operations in our country.

Their logic has been clear. It was more cost effective to bleed India from within than to challenge it by more conventional military means.

The newly elected civilian Government in Islamabad, of course, has shown every sign of wanting to move away from this narrative of hatred and hostility. But Pakistan is a deeply divided nation. As the Kargil bombing showed, the disconnect between the statements of the Government and the actions of the ISI suggest that the Government in Islamabad is too weak to control its own security apparatus. In India, our State has an Army but in Pakistan the Army has a State. And an attempt to place the ISI under the Interior Ministry this summer, even though it was publicly announced, had to be humiliatingly rescinded when the Army refused to accept the order - even though it was officially announced on the eve of the Pakistan Prime Minister's visit to Washington.

When, in the wake of the Mumbai bombings, the Pakistan President and Prime Minister acceded to the request of our Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, to send the Head of the ISI to India to assist the Indian authorities in their investigation, the Pakistan military again forced the civilian Government into a humiliating climb down saying that a lower level official might be sent instead. They said that perhaps there was a misunderstanding by the Indians. The only problem was that there was a publicly issued Press release from the Secretariat of the Prime Minister of Pakistan saying that the Director-General of the ISI was supposed to come: slightly difficult to blame that on a misunderstanding in India. The fact is that the ISI is not exactly keen to cooperate with an investigation into the massacres' Pakistani links.

The Mumbai attacks bore many of the trademarks of the extremist fidayeen groups based in Pakistan, notably, of course, the Lashkar, which has enjoyed the patronage of the ISI, but also others. We have to say from the very start that whether the Pakistani military or elements in the Pakistani military are orchestrating the violence or merely shielding its perpetrators, inevitably, there has to be an accounting.

The Islamist extremism nurtured by a succession of military rulers of Pakistan has now come to haunt its well-intentioned but lamentably weak elected civilian Government. The bombing of Islamabad's Marriot Hotel this summer proved that Frankenstein's monster is now well and truly out of that government's control. The militancy that was once sponsored by its predecessors now threatens to abort Pakistan's sputtering democracy and, of course, it seeks to engulf our country in its flames.

There has never been a stronger case for firm and united action by the

Governments of both India and Pakistan to cauterize the cancer in their midst. President Zardari, after all, is Benazir Bhutto's widower, and he surely realizes that India's enemies in Pakistan are also his own. The very forces of Islamist extremism responsible for his wife's assassination last December were directly or indirectly also behind what happened in the Marriot Hotel and, therefore, by extension behind what happened in Mumbai.

So, this militancy simply has to be dealt with in the interests of Pakistan's own future. And it is true that rarely have we had a Pakistani Government that has been more inclined to pursue peace with India. Whereas Gen. Musharaf, as we all know, had mastered the art of saying one thing and doing another, President Zardari had been pushing genuinely for greatly expanded trade and commercial links and for the liberalization of the restrictive visa regime between the two countries. Indeed, his Foreign Minister was in Delhi for talks on these very issues when the Mumbai terrorist assault occurred. I think, our Marxist friends would probably say that it does represent, if you like, a bourgeois class in Pakistan that sees advantages in increased trade and commercial relations across the borders, and direct advantages to them. And, this is an accurate analysis.

But it went, of course, even beyond that from our point of view. President Zardari rhetorically started winding down his Government support for Kashmiri militancy. If you remember the interview in which he called the Kashmiri militants terrorists, it was the first time any Pakistani leader had used that kind of a vocabulary. He even announced the disbanding of the ISI's political wing. The ISI is not supposed to have a political wing, but nonetheless, it has been publicly disbanded by its Government. And then, he even went so far as to propose a No First Strike Nuclear Policy, which matches India's stance, but violates its own military's stated nuclear doctrine because the Pakistani argument is that they must have the right to use nuclear weapons first because if we are about to prevail in the conventional war, they want the right to use nuclear weapons to prevent outright defeat. So, to say that Pakistan will not use nuclear weapons first would be tantamount to a strategic concession of some significance.

But all of these statements put together would have suggested to us that at long last we have a Pakistani leader, who appears to understand that normalising relations with India would be of great benefit to Pakistan itself. But what we have learnt from the Mumbai horror is that the peacemakers in Islamabad are not the ones who call the shots in that tragic country.

So when President Zardari initially agreed and then withdrew the agreement to our request for the ISI Chief to visit New Delhi, he stated, and I quote: "Pakistan will cooperate with India in exposing and apprehending the culprits and masterminds behind the attacks." Now, we have to know that this is not an objective that is unanimously shared in Islamabad. The terrorists and their patrons clearly wish to thwart any moves in the direction of rapprochement between the two countries, which would obviously disrupt their destructive agenda. And, these people enjoy the sympathy and some would say perhaps the sponsorship of senior, well-placed elements in the military, whose disproportionate share of Pakistan's national budget would be threatened by a genuine peace with India under the country's civilian Government. But after all, our official interlocutors can only be a Government -- New Delhi can only talk officially to a Government. Unfortunately the civilian government does not dare to cross the red-lines drawn by the military for fear of being toppled. Again, let us not forget that every single Pakistani Government without exception has been overthrown before the end of its elective term of office.

Pakistan has first predictably denied any connection to the events, even though each passing revelation rendered its denials less and less plausible. "Our hands are clean", the Pakistani Foreign Minister Shah Mahmood Quereshi said at a news conference in India, in Delhi, and I quote: "Any entity or group involved in the ghastly act, the Pakistani Government will proceed against it."

But did they actually proceed against anyone initially? No. All that was suggested was that Pakistan needed to look at their meticulous planning, the sophisticated coordination, GPS equipment, cell phones, calls to handlers in Pakistan, and they all kept saying: "No, no, no, we need more proof from India." There were no investigations being conducted there. In fact, we thought President Zardari had a decent instinct towards India, but he actually said that he doubted that the sole surviving terrorist, whom we had arrested was even a Pakistani. It took a British journalist of Pakistani descent, by the way, a brave young man, who personally travelled on Sunday to all the four villages in Punjab called Faridkot - because that was the name the boy claimed his family was from - he found the right Faridkot, and found the boy's parents. He even got their national identity card numbers and published them. Immediately, of course, the Pakistani authorities descended on Faridkot and spirited away this young Ajmal Kasaab's parents from the village.

So, the instinct of denial and self-protection still triumphs in Pakistan over the alleged promise to cooperate with investigating and proceeding against these wrongdoers. Of course, the next journalist who tried to follow the British journalist was an American journalist and this journalist was beaten up when he tried to enter the village of Faridkot.

Fortunately, this time the terrorists have gone too far. The killing of Indians essentially outrages Indians. But in Mumbai, the murderers also killed a lot of foreigners. They killed Americans and Israelis. These are not people who forgive and these are not people who, in their domestic constituencies, are prepared to sit back and say we have to somehow absorb these losses. What is more, the fact that it was not just an attack on India -- the fact that the terrorists were clearly desirous of killing the so-called "Jews, Crusaders and infidels," which is a famous Al Qaeda expression -- this, I think, has very interesting implications. In terms of our own response, it will give us allies around the world.

As the terrorists dominated the media for three gruesome days, in the short term they achieved this startling success for their cause. It has shaken the anti-terrorist experts around the world, who now realise how easy it would be for 10 men unafraid of death to hold any city in the world hostage. After all, how many hotels, schools, airports, markets, cinema theatres, can you turn into fortifications everywhere in the world? So, what happened has certainly woken up the anti-terrorist experts around the world. But it has also, I think, enhanced the determination beyond India to deal with the people that we think of as India's enemies. They now have acquired a very large number of very powerful enemies elsewhere as well.

Of course, the important point that is no longer seriously questioned by independent analysts in the West or East or anywhere else is that the massacre in Bombay was planned and directed from Pakistani territory and that the inability or unwillingness, whichever it is, of the Pakistani Government to prevent its soil from being used to mount attacks on another State even makes a mockery of Pakistan's pretensions to sovereignty. It is, therefore, right that the consequences for Pakistan should be severe.

On the first day in his speech our Prime Minister said there will be a cost to our neighbours if it turned out to be that the attack originated from Pakistan. I think

India will find sympathy and practical support from the countries of the other victims. We know President Zardari was adept at going on Indian television and saying what his viewers across the border wish to hear. But it is an understatement to point out that President Zardari does not enjoy the unstinting support of his own security establishment.

What about the US in all of this? Before the attack on Mumbai, the US had been promoting a reduction of Indo-Pakistan tension in the hope, openly voiced by President-elect Barack Obama, that this, the reduction of Indo-Pakistan tension, would free Pakistan to conduct more effective counter-insurgency operations against the Taliban and Al Qaeda in its North-Western Tribal areas bordering Afghanistan. Washington, of course, has begun to fear that Indo-Pakistan rivalry will make its own task in Afghanistan more difficult. President-elect Obama, therefore, called for a rapprochement between India and Pakistan as a key objective of US foreign policy in the region. Today, though, he will find few takers in India for continuing a peace process with a Government that does not appear to control significant elements of its own military. Any Government in New Delhi will be wary of being exhorted to talk with a Government that is at best ineffective and at worst duplicitous about the real threats emanating from Pakistani territory and institutions.

Now, ironically, still talking about the US, President Zardari has proved a very useful ally for the US because in addition to lowering the temperature with India through the statements that I quoted earlier, he was cooperating tacitly with the American Predator aircraft strikes against the Islamic extremists in the Afghan borderlands, much to the resentment of the pro Islamist elements in his own military. This cooperation has now been jeopardised by the assault on Mumbai and the seething anger throughout our country against Pakistan. As tensions rose, there was a fear that India would mobilise the military, which of course we have not done in these last two weeks. But the hardliners in Islamabad's Army Headquarters are looking for a justification that they need to jettison a policy they dislike (the policy of assisting America on the border lands) and they will, of course, love nothing more than to turn their weapons back towards their preferred enemy – us.

Mr. Obama had pointed out during the campaign that American military assistance to Pakistan was being diverted to the purchase of jet aircraft and battle tanks rather than on the tools needed to combat the militants in its tribal belt. Now, after Mumbai, the Pakistani Military may well seek to move its forces away from the

western borders of Afghanistan, where the US wants them, in order to reinforce as they would claim, their eastern border with India instead. This is why it is genuinely important for India not to give them the excuse to do this. Washington, of course, has been deeply frustrated by this whole turn of events.

While Pakistan was initially denying all responsibility for the murders and rampage that was planned on its soil, it did seem that India had no good options. There was the typical Pakistani conundrum that the Military was not willing and the civilian Government was not able. The fear remained, of course, that expecting Zardari to fulfil even India's minimal demands might be tantamount to asking him to sign his own death warrant.

What we needed had to be done in a way that did not undermine the civilian Government. So, it was a tough challenge. For the first few days after the attacks India seethed with rage, Pakistan belligerently asserted its innocence and Washington, of course, despaired that their position in Afghanistan had just got harder. And in the meanwhile in Mumbai hundreds of funeral pyres shot their flames up into a glowering sky.

But then things started getting better. India had to act. Anything that smacked of temporising or appeasement will further inflame the public just a few months before national elections are due. But we also knew that though some hotheads in India on television and even elsewhere were calling for military action, suggesting strikes on terrorist facilities in Pakistani territory, missiles on the training camps and so on. We knew that this will certainly lead to a war that neither side could win. If anything such an Indian reaction would play into the hands of the terrorists by strengthening anti-Indian nationalism in Pakistan. Remember that there are forces in Pakistani society who are not with the hardliners and Islamists; who are in favour of an elected civilian Government; who are in favour of closer relations and trade with India; but if a foreign country, India, were to attack them they will have no choice but to make common cause with the Islamists, with the killers, with the likes of Lashkar-E-Toiba.

So, we will actually undermine our own allies in Pakistan --such as we have in that society -- if we were to take such a step. Obviously, it would also be seen as playing into the broader objectives of the terrorists on the western frontier as I mentioned earlier, on the border lands with Afghanistan. In any case, with two

countries both possessing nuclear weapons, the risk of military action escalating and then spiralling out of control, is simply too grave for any responsible Government to contemplate.

So, by showing restraint, by ignoring the calls of the hotheads for air strikes and by pressuring the US diplomatically to work on its near bankrupt clients in Islamabad who have received some eleven billion dollars in American military assistance since 9/11, since 2001, ostensibly of course to fight Islamist terror but not spent on those who have fomented such terror -- by doing all of this, India has achieved real results.

My logic in saying this is very clear. The people we can talk to are the civilian Government and talking to them is useless. They do not call the shots. They do not pull the trigger. The people who have to be talked to in Pakistan are the Military and Intelligence. But we cannot talk to them because anything we say will not have an impact on them. By getting, therefore, the US through all levels, State Department level but also the Defence department, Military Intelligence, the CIA, to talk to their counterparts in Pakistan with whom they have built up decades of close and intimate relations, we have been able to put pressure where it is most needed, and that is why I believe we are seeing the results that we are seeing in recent days.

We have seen the arrest of some 20 militants including Zaki-ur-Rehman Lakhvi, the reputed operational mastermind of the Mumbai horror, after the frantic meetings between the Government, the military, the ISI day after day in Pakistan. Now, we have the house arrest of JeM leader Maulana Masood Azhar, and these are all important first steps. Interestingly, we have seen no opposition from Pakistan to the Indian proposal to the United Nations Security Council to ban the Jamaat-ud-Daawa (JuD) and a few others, and I will come back to it in a minute. But house arrests and nominal bannings are not enough any more. As the Americans like to say: "We have seen this movie before." The LeT was banned in 2001 by General Musharraf under duress, only to re-emerge as an ostensibly humanitarian group because that is what JuD is. It is supposed to be a humanitarian organisation, and in that guise it has been even more powerful than before. Its head Hafiz Muhammad Saeed remains free to preach vitriolic hatred against India in his Friday sermons, and to serve as a catalyst for murder and mayhem in our country. Therefore, when we insist that the Government in Islamabad crack down completely on these groups, we are talking of serious action. We want them not to

have the kind of house arrest that enables them to lead normal lives and go outside and preach and talk to whoever they want to, but genuine arrest. We want the training camps to be dismantled, and we want the bank accounts to be frozen and not the way General Musharraf did it. In January 2002, when General Musharraf announced that he was freezing the bank accounts, he gave them so much notice that all these bank accounts of LeT, etc. were completely emptied before they were frozen, and then the money was simply put into other accounts and used again against us.

Of course, we want serious action to investigate and to prosecute these killers or at least their leaders. We know that there is little appetite in Pakistan for such action, but it is interesting that the UN Sanctions Committee, acting under Resolution 1267 of the UN Security Council, has in some ways made it easier for the civilian Government in Islamabad by proscribing the JuD and imposing travel bans and asset freezes on specifically named four individuals including Saeed. This is also very interesting because this is not the first time that this has been attempted. Two years ago, that is, in 2006, the American and British attempted the very same action, to ban JuD and to have specific restrictions on specific named individuals. Pakistan opposed it and General Musharraf opposed it, and he found a valuable ally in the Government of China. As you know, a permanent member can prevent any such action in the Security Council. China blocked this decision in 2006. In December 2008, China did not block the decision.

This is a very interesting development. It seems to me that Pakistan could not block it and hold its face up in front of America any more, but the American pressure had indeed extracted some real results. As far as China was concerned, the evidence was so overwhelming that China feels that it would no longer be compatible with its interest in becoming seen as a responsible player in the international system to block the adoption of such a proscription. It is a very important change in the last couple of years. But what is essential is to sustain the pressure. If, in a few months the villains are all back on the streets and in their mosques planning and mounting fresh attacks and preaching more hatred, then this week's news would have been a false dawn. But our tragedy gives the semi-secular moderates in Pakistan the opportunity to crack down upon the extremists and murderers in their midst, which is in their own interest. The suffering of a few hundred families this month might not be replicated in the lives of other Indians at the hands of these evil men in the months and years to come.

I had a very interesting episode last night. I have been doing a lot of television interviews in our country and very often in programmes where there is somebody from Pakistan calling in by phone. Yesterday, the person at the other end was the former Information Minister of Pakistan Mushahid Hussain. When the question of the U.N. Security Council action came up, he said: "Of course, Pakistan will act because this is in our own interest. These are our own enemies. We are the biggest victims of terror. We have suffered far more than India. It is us, Pakistanis, who are being killed by these people." So, I asked one very innocent question. I said "if you are victims of these people, why do you have to wait for the United Nations Security Council to take an action before you do. If you are the victims, why do you not act now, why do you not do what is necessary without this extra international pressure?" The sad truth is they are not capable of doing so. They need the international pressure, so they can say to those in their own system who do not want to act, "See, we have no choice, we have to act or we will have trouble in Washington, we will have trouble in New York, we will have trouble in Beijing. Therefore, we have to act." It is not the best thing from our point of view. We would prefer it if they acted on the basis of what they already know and have, but it is still better than the alternative of inaction.

What are the remaining actions that we must pursue? I mentioned the sustained pressure, and that is number one. Sustaining it means not just saying today it has been accomplished, the deed is done, but continuing to press tomorrow, next month, six months from now, nine months from now, a year from now to see that there is follow-through. That has to be done by us because we are directly concerned and implicated. It also has to be done by our friends and allies among whom we can now truly count Washington as one. That international sustained pressure is an important and an essential challenge for our Government, for our diplomacy, now and in the future.

The second thing we must remember is there has to be a sensible limit to this pressure because there is a lot that Pakistan can do under pressure; there are some things they would not do. The world needs this Government to survive; we need this Government to survive, and we need to strengthen them while undermining the killers and their sponsors. That is not easy. We talked about America's interest. America has a real interest, of course, in seeing that Pakistan remains an ally in the effort in Afghanistan. There are some people, including on other television shows I have been on, saying we can be a substitute for Pakistan as an ally in Afghanistan. That is nonsense. We cannot be. First of all, our very presence in Afghanistan would be a problem, possibly for United States of America

itself. But second and more important, it is the territory next to Afghanistan that America needs to transport supplies through. There are 34,000 American soldiers whose food, fuel, water, rationing, vacation travel, all happens through Pakistan. They need Pakistan's cooperation and Pakistan knows that. So, let us accept the logistics have also to be born in mind. I remember in my peace-keeping days of the U.N. that Margaret Alva mentioned, senior Generals would tell me, "You know, amateurs discuss strategy; rank amateurs discuss tactics; the true professionals discuss logistics." Logistics is what the military needs to focus on and it is very important for us to realise that Pakistan is essential for the logistical supply of the American forces in Afghanistan.

But equally Pakistan is essential to the logistics of the terrorists who came to us. Without the logistical possibilities made available to them from Pakistani territory and across the waters from Pakistan to us, these killers would not have got to Mumbai. So, that is the other side of the logistics coin that we have to continue pressing on.

China remains an important player. It is Pakistan's most important ally other than the United States. It has not been as generous as the United States. It is very striking that military assistance from China, nuclear assistance from China exists, but has been at a much lower dollar level than Pakistan's. And equally, when President Zardari went to Beijing a few weeks ago to ask for financial assistance for his nearly bankrupt economy, he was told politely to look elsewhere, to go to the IMF and get a loan from there. Maybe, that is a sign that China is beginning to realise that it will not write a blank cheque to a collapsing State with these twisted institutions.

But there are others that can write a blank cheque. Saudi Arabia is an extremely important patron of Pakistan as well. And we have to see the extent to which Saudi Arabia is going to be prepared to withdraw some of the funding from which organisations like Jamat-ud-Dawa, which raises a lot of money in Saudi Arabia, have been able to function.

Another important instrument of pressure remains the United Nations. I spoke about the Sanctions Committee and Resolution 1267. There is also, as Margaret Alva mentioned, the thirteen conventions against terrorism. But with the support of the US, India has been pushing for a Comprehensive Convention on Terrorism

which has been held up for many years by the objections essentially of our friends in the Muslim countries. The Islamic countries have taken the position that they will not agree to a Comprehensive Convention on Terror unless there is a specific reference to state terror which Pakistan is pushing in reference to Kashmir, and others are pushing in reference to Israel; and that there is an exemption for national liberation movements, which again is intended by the Arab countries to relate to Palestinians and is intended by Pakistanis to relate to the Kashmiris. Because of these two objections the Comprehensive Convention on Terror has not been adopted.

Terrorism is rather like pornography, in the words of a famous American Supreme Court justice: We may not be able to define it but you can know it when you see it. If that is true of pornography, it is true of terrorism as well. Whether or not there is a Comprehensive Convention, the vast majority of the member-states of the United Nations sympathise with us in the horrors to which we have been subjected by terrorists.

There is a Resolution of the Security Council going back to the 9/11 period, to September of 2001, Resolution 1373, under which there are specific requirements on all member-states under Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, which is a binding Chapter. In that, member-states are required to take action against suspected terrorists on their soil, to freeze financial transfers and bank accounts, to report on the movements of these suspected people, to exchange information, to update their national legislation, to bring it up to conformity with international standards, and to share information with the Counter-Terrorism Committee of the United Nations. We can construct a pretty good case that Pakistan is in breach of this Resolution. We have not yet chosen to do so. But I just mentioned it as an example to suggest that there are other weapons, other UN weapons available to us to continue to sustain the pressure on a state which has allowed this to happen to us.

Let me conclude, Madam Chairman, so we could have at least a few minutes for an exchange amongst us if you have questions or concerns either on what I have said or what I have not said. But let me, before concluding, return to where I began, at the Gateway of India. That is because inevitably, the questions have begun to be asked abroad, is it all over for India? Can this country ever recover from this? Of course, the answer is, "No, it is not all over", and "Yes, the country will recover". But outsiders cannot be blamed for asking existential questions about a nation that

till so recently had been seen as poised for take off, if you remember all the talk of India just a few months ago and how people are speaking of it now.

I was in Trivandrum when this tragedy happened. And yet in a hotel in Kerala I was told they were getting 20 to 25 cancellations a day, a thousand miles away from the horrors of Mumbai, let alone the cancellations in Mumbai where I went immediately thereafter and I saw the situation there. I saw the empty hotels there too, or in Delhi, or anywhere else. We have taken a big beating from tourists. We have taken a big beating from investors, potential investors cancelling their travel to India, cancelling their immediate plans to invest here. This has been a serious blow.

But I believe firmly that India can recover from the physical assaults against it. We are a land of great resilience that has learned over arduous millennia to cope with tragedy. In fact, within 24 hours of an earlier Islamist assault on Mumbai, the Stock Exchange bombing of 1993, Bombay stock market traders were back on the floor within 24 hours, their burned out computers forgotten, doing what they used to do before technology had changed their trading habits. To me, example after example like that shows that bombs and bullets alone cannot destroy India because Indians will pick their way through the rubble and carry on, as we have done throughout history.

But what can destroy India is a change in the spirit of our people, a change away from the pluralism and coexistence that have been our greatest strength. The PM's call for calm and restraint in the face of this murderous rampage is vital. My big fear on those first couple of days was that political opportunism in the charged election season could lead to some people practicing the politics of hatred and division. After all, we have seen in the same Mumbai, people attacking those who did not speak a particular language or come from a particular corner of our country, living in that city. So, we know that there are politicians who will use the politics of division and the politics of hatred, for their own petty ends. Indeed, I wrote while the attacks were still going on, in *The Guardian* in London and *The Los Angeles Times* in the US, that if these tragic events lead to the demonization of the Muslims in India, the terrorists would have won. I am so heartened that instead of this fear of demonization, the Indians have stayed united in the face of this tragedy. The victims included Indians of every community, including 49 Muslims who have died, out of the 188 killed.

There is anger, yes; some of it is directed inwards, yes – against our security and governance failures. But none of it is against any specific community. That was as it should be. For India to be India, its gateway, the real gateway of India, to the multiple Indias within and the heaving seas without, must always remain open.

Thank you very much.