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PAKISTAN STUDIES

1. A critical Analysis of Pakistan’s Foreign policy post 9/11

Answer: **In the aftermath of 9/11, Pakistan is once again a frontline state, and a pivotal partner of the United States in its war on terror. As a battleground of this war, Pakistan could not escape the fallout of the crisis in the form of a heavy toll on its already volatile socio-economic environment as a result of protracted violence, instability, displacement, trade and production slowdown, export stagnation, investor hesitation, and concomitant law and order situation.**

**This was the beginning of another painful chapter in Pakistan’s turbulent political history. In the blinking of an eye, Pakistan was abandoning its decades old policy and orientation. It had become the centre of world attention after the 9/11 as a major player in the war on terror and was seen both as a source of the problem as well as the key to its solution.**

**Although “by allying himself with America’s war on terror,” General Musharraf had managed to secure “de facto international acceptance for his 1999 coup,”** **he faced the “dilemma” of his life in having to maintain a delicate balance between the US demands and an expected backlash from internal militant and religious organizations.  It was a difficult task but he did manage to ride over the storm by making it very clear that Pakistan will not get involved in any military operations beyond its geographical boundaries.**

**US military action in Afghanistan started almost within a month after the 11 September attacks as the Taliban Government refused to meet American demands of closing alleged terrorist training camps, handing over the leaders of the Al-Qaida network, and return of all foreign nationals, including American citizens detained in Afghanistan. Pakistan’s religious as well as other political parties made noises against US military action against the Taliban regime and use of Pakistani soil. They were not only against attacking Afghanistan from Pakistan soil, but were also against offending a “brotherly” neighbour, whom Pakistan had supported against the Soviet Union at the cost of burdening itself with a large number of refugees.**

**General Musharraf made efforts to persuade the country’s political and religious leadership to support an alliance with the United States but was only partially successful in his efforts. Liberal-minded politicians agreed to fully back the government while leaders of some hard-line Islamic parties were not happy. Several groups threatened to start a countrywide uprising in protest against any US attack on the Taliban. Given the intensity of the US pressure and his perception of Pakistan’s long-term security interests, President Musharraf took the decision to comply with the US demands, and agreed not only to abandon Afghanistan’s ruling Taliban but also to cooperate with the US in its military strikes against Osama bin Laden. The US was allowed the use of Pakistan’s airspace for missile and aerial strikes against targets in Afghanistan.**

**There were fears that this situation might provoke Muslim sentiment in Pakistan to topple the Musharraf regime. It didn’t happen that way. He remained unscathed and managed the crisis authoritatively. Meanwhile, the Americans and their coalition partners continued their military attacks in Afghanistan with relentless intensity. The Taliban regime crumbled and a transitional government   was installed in its place under the Bonn Accords.**

**Pakistan’s dilemma did not end there. On the one hand, it is being continuously blamed by the Karzai government for allegedly harbouring Taliban “insurgents,” while on the other, it faces unending criticism from the US “for not doing enough” to secure its borders and arrest Taliban leaders, including the elusive Mullah Omar.**

**President Musharraf rejects these accusations as “humbug and nonsense;” and claims Pakistan’s security forces have killed a number of high-ranking Taliban and al-Qaida leaders. His foreign minister maintains that the anti-terrorism drive inside the country has been a “great success.” According to him, over 700 suspected al-Quaida operatives and affiliates including some of its top leaders like Abu Zubaydah, Ramzi bin Al-Shibh and Khalid Shaikh Mohammad have been either arrested or killed.**

**Pakistan became engaged in a full scale war within its own territory. It   deployed roughly 80,000 troops since last autumn along its Afghan border, most of them in the desolate mountains of North and South Waziristan where al-Quaida militants had reportedly been operating alongside Taliban sympathizers. It also pledged to work more closely with NATO-led forces in southern Afghanistan.**

**The government and the militants in the restive North Waziristan agency subsequently concluded a peace agreement. In the preceding weeks, the two sides had been observing a ceasefire while the tribal Jirga worked on a settlement.**[**[**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ca%5CDesktop%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc#_edn34)**If this agreement endures, it will be a big relief for the government and its beleaguered troops in the rugged terrains of Waziristan.**

**Officially, Pakistan remains committed to “close and friendly relations” with Afghanistan as a foreign policy priority. It supports the Bonn process and the Karzai regime in its efforts for “national reconciliation and development.” In the past two years, despite occasional mutual recriminations, the relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan have improved in diverse sectors. Pakistan has also pledged $100 million aid to Afghanistan for its reconstruction and institution building.**

**The Image.**

**The sum-total of Pakistan’s post-9/11 foreign policy is its new identity on the global radar screen as the “hotbed” of religious extremism and terrorism, and its frontline role as the “ground zero” of the war on terror, which has not only made it the focus of world attention and anxiety but also forced it to make difficult choices in its perennial struggle for security and survival as an independent state.**

**President Musharraf has himself acknowledged publicly on several occasions that Pakistan now has a serious image problem which needs to be addressed by “moderating” its national culture and behaviour.**

**According to him, while the domestic environment was as it was and the US coalition forces were battling al Qaida/Taliban in the Afghan countryside, Pakistan was facing accusations of being a source of terrorist activity in Afghanistan and in occupied Kashmir, as well as nuclear proliferation, and also being “an intolerant militant extremist society.” He admitted that his “single-handed” efforts to project Pakistan as a progressive, moderate Islamic state had not succeeded sufficiently.”**

**Woefully, wherever and whenever there is an act of “violence or terrorism” in any part of the world, howsoever remote it might be, Pakistan finds itself  linked in one way or the other. Last year’s London bombings and again the latest security alerts in London and elsewhere in the world are stark reminders of this reality.**

**No matter how much Pakistan now tries to wear the mask of “enlightened moderation,” continuous sectarian violence and terrorism-related problems have tainted its image on the global radar screen as the breeding ground of violence and militancy. This perception impacts adversely on Pakistan and its nationals living or travelling abroad.**

**There could not have been a gloomier depiction of a country today than what the Economist in a recent Pakistan-focused survey wrote: “Think about Pakistan, and you might get terrified. Few countries have so much potential to cause trouble regionally and worldwide. One-third of its 165 million people live in poverty, and only half of them are literate. The country’s politics yo-yo between weak civilian governments and unrepresentative military ones currently on offer under Pervez Musharraf, the president and army chief, albeit with some democratic wallpapering.”**

**Yet another comment is: “The state is weak. Islamabad and the better bits of Karachi are orderly and, for the moment, booming. Most of the rest is a mess. In the western province of Baluchistan, which takes up almost half of Pakistan’s land mass, an insurgency is simmering. In the never-tamed tribal areas bordering Afghanistan, the army is waging war against Islamic fanatics.”**

**Assessments such as these may be biased but they are not entirely inaccurate. It is ironic that Pakistan, which has played so formidable a role in the fight against global terror, should be pilloried for extremism. A lot has to do with its tarnished image. This can be 000000000altered through far-reaching reforms to ensure a return to genuine and inclusive democracy rooted in the will of the people, constitutional supremacy, rule of law, institutional integrity, a culture of political consistency and a civilianized body politic.**

**The Scourge.**

**“Terrorism poses the most urgent threat to many countries, including the most powerful states. For many of us, the terrorist threat is close and personal. Terrorism threatens Pakistan’s vital national interests and objectives. We have thus participated actively in the unprecedented campaign against it. Pakistan has led the way in this campaign. Our counter-terrorist campaign is ongoing.” President General Pervez Musharraf; Address to UN General Assembly, September 22, 2004**

**Terrorism is the new scourge afflicting our world and a phenomenon that transcends all boundaries which, in recent years, has affected the political, economic and security environment of all regions, countries and societies. Unfortunately, the war on terror has not gone beyond retribution and retaliation.**

**According to  UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, terrorism is the product of what he once described as “a broader mix of problems caused by bad governments, opportunistic politicians and militant leaders who exploit grievances”.**[**[**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ca%5CDesktop%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc#_edn39) **He may have changed his mind now but at one time, he also believed that “when there are no legitimate means of addressing the massive and systemic political, economic and social inequalities, an environment is created in which peaceful solutions often lose out against extreme and violent alternatives.”**

**President Musharraf also subscribes to this view and believes that terrorism in essence stems from unresolved disputes and unaddressed issues that give rise to forces of hatred and violence. However, one cannot deny that in recent years, most of the perpetrators of violence were trained “militants” and dissident runaways from their own countries and had a political agenda of their own in pursuing their terrorist activities.**

**Unfortunately, in the aftermath of 9/11, the detractors of Islam found an opportunity to contrive stereotypes to malign Islam and to mobilize an attitudinal climate of antipathy against its adherents by focusing obsessively on the religion of the individuals and organizations allegedly involved in terrorist activities.**

**The enthusiasm with which Islam was maligned obscured the truth that those responsible for the acts of violence were dissident fugitives from their respective countries with misguided, obscurantist political agendas which they were          determined to pursue through terrorist activities.**

**Terrorism will not disappear through retaliation and retribution alone. To address the underlying causes of this menace, the world community needs to build global harmony through mutual understanding and tolerance, promote peace and stability, pursue poverty eradication and sustainable development and ensure socio-economic justice, political freedom, genuine democracy and respect for fundamental rights of people, particularly the inalienable right of self-determination.**

**War on terror should not remain confined to nabbing or killing the perpetrators or changing a government in one country or the other. It should be waged at all levels – national, regional and global – against oppression, injustice and instability which fuel hatred and violence.**

 **In combating terrorism, the foremost responsibility lies with national governments which must re-order their priorities and focus on the socio-economic uplift of their societies. People-centred development, not military arsenals, should be their priority. Education must become a strategic need and priority of every developing nation.**[**[**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ca%5CDesktop%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc#_edn43)

**In the context of Pakistan, a special effort is needed to purge the society of extremism and obscurantism which have crept into its ranks over the decades of instability and poverty in its region. This is not an easy task. A sustained and persuasive effort will have to be made not only by the government but also all influential segments of Pakistan’s society.**

**Pakistan continues to pay a heavy price for being the “ground zero” in the war on terror. It has suffered in terms of human lives and huge economic losses. Its leaders have been targets of suicide assassination attempts. The government in Pakistan has repeatedly admitted that terrorism cannot be fought by force alone. “The ultimate battle in this war will be fought in the hearts and minds of the people.”**[**[**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ca%5CDesktop%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc#_edn45)

**Pakistan has consistently stressed the need to identify and actively address the root causes of violence such as the long outstanding issues of Palestine and Kashmir. But charity must begin at home. While maintaining the pressure on global players for resolving disputes and redressing injustice, it must also focus on its home-grown problems that have spurred extremist violence.**

**Here again a dispassionate appraisal is required into the causes of violence and extremism so that prescriptive measures can be determined. Instead of using military force against its own people, the government must engage them politically through the country’s political and tribal influentials. It must seek to build bridges of peace and harmony within its society, and promote an environment of mutual tolerance and accommodation through better education, national confidence building and reconciliation.**

**The Hinge.**

**Despite the chequered history of their relationship, Pakistan and the US have been “hinged” together as friends and allies for more than 50 years. For much of its history, this relationship has lacked continuity, a larger conceptual framework, and a shared vision beyond the “narrowly based and vaguely defined” priorities.**

**From the early days of its independence, Pakistan had a direction clearly charted for its future relationship with the US by the value system that it cherished, and indeed by the Quaid-e-Azam himself. Speaking to the first US ambassador to Pakistan on 22 February 1948, he described Pakistan and the US as equal partners in defence of democracy and freedom.**

**Emerging from the trauma of sub-continental turmoil, the young state of Pakistan, imbued with Islamic values and a moderate and progressive outlook, gravitated naturally to the pole that stood for freedom and democracy in that intensely bi-polar world.**

**In making that deliberate choice, Pakistan was guided not only by the Quaid’s vision but also by its over-riding security and economic interests. On its part, the US looked at Pakistan and its special geo-political importance as a strategic asset in its “containment” policy against Soviet expansionism.**

**It has been a curious relationship which never had any conflict of interest and yet experienced interruptions in its intensity as well as integrity. The “hinge” was purely one of mutual expediency as both sides were always aiming at different goals and objectives to be derived from their relationship.**

**For Pakistan, the issues of security and survival in a turbulent and hostile regional environment and its problems with India were the overriding policy goals in its relations with Washington. The US policy interests in Pakistan, on the other hand, have traditionally encompassed a wide range of regional and global issues, especially nuclear and missile proliferation, India-Pakistan hostility, drugs trafficking, democracy, human rights, and economic reform.**

**According to a US Congressional report, “a stable, democratic, economically thriving Pakistan is vital to US interests in Asia.” But the report also acknowledged that the US-Pakistan relationship had been marked by “periods of cooperation and discord” and “was transformed by the September 2001 attacks on the United States and the ensuing enlistment of Pakistan as a pivotal ally in US-led counter-terrorism efforts.”**[**[**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ca%5CDesktop%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc#_edn47)

**No matter how much praise is showered upon Islamabad by the top US officials for its role in this campaign, “serious doubts exist in Washington about Islamabad’s commitment to some core US interests in the region.” The US does not hide its perception of Pakistan “as a base for terrorist groups and their supporters operating in Kashmir, India, and Afghanistan.**

**There are also concerns in the US about Pakistan’s serious domestic problems, including the democratic and institutional logjam, terrorism and violence and human rights violations. Similarly, congressional circles are also aware of Pakistan’s difficulties as a result of its “unprecedented counterterrorism military operations” in the traditionally autonomous tribal area These concerns are, however, overshadowed by Washington’s expectations from Pakistan “to continue to do more in fighting terrorists.”**

**In June 2004, President Bush designated Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally of the United States under Section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, a move that may be more symbolic than practical. On the other hand, allegations that Pakistan had been a source of “onward nuclear proliferation” to North Korea, Iran, and Libya will continue to complicate the future of U.S-Pakistan relations.**

**This unusual relationship has, no doubt, seen ups and downs with rotating phases of “engagement and estrangement” depending on the nature of regional and global dynamics. This tradition has generated its own anti-Americanism, which is triggered by a perception that the United States has not been a reliable ally and has not helped Pakistan in its problems with India.**

**The first of the three major U.S. “engagements” with Pakistan occurred during the height of the Cold War, from the mid-1950s to mid-1960s; the second was during the Afghan Jihad in the 1980s, again lasting about a decade; and the third engagement dates to 11 September 2001 and relates to the ongoing war on terrorism.**

**And every US “engagement” with Pakistan was issue-specific and not based on shared perspectives. The spells of close ties between the two countries have been, and may continue to be, single-issue engagements of limited or uncertain duration. (Cold war, Afghanistan and now terrorism)**[**[**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ca%5CDesktop%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc#_edn51)

**Interestingly, during each engagement or “honeymoon” period, Pakistan had either a military or military-controlled government, whereas in Washington, the policy direction on Pakistan was in the hands of a Republican White House with the Pentagon and the CIA playing a central role. Most of the “estrangement” phases of the US-Pakistan relationship happened when the US had a Democrat Administration and Pakistan an elected civilian government.**

**Unpredictability has been another consistent feature of this relationship. The US would lose interest in remaining engaged in any cooperation once it achieved its objectives vis-à-vis Pakistan. “Pakistan was either consigned to benign neglect or hit with a succession of punitive sanctions that left in their trail resentment and a sense of betrayal.”**

**History seems to be repeating itself again. As Pakistan was faithfully engaged in fulfilling its post-9/11 obligations, the US entered into a long-term defence pact with India last year as part of its evolving multi-dimensional “strategic partnership” which it values for various reasons, including India’s phenomenal market size and its great unrivalled potential as a “counterweight” against China.**

**This was an ominous development which would not only destabilize the critical balance of power in the region but also reinforces the prevalent public perception in Pakistan of traditional US insensitivity towards Pakistan’s genuine security concerns. The deepening Indo-US strategic partnership with all its ramifications has raised serious fears in Pakistan about its impact on the overall regional security environment, including prospects of durable peace in South Asia.**

**There is a general feeling all over the world that the US was not a “steadfast and reliable” friend and that over the decades, the US neglect and “self-serving” exploitation of its friends had contributed to most of the current problems in the region.**

**In the aftermath of 9/11, Pakistan is once again a pivotal “front-line” state fighting terrorism as a key US ally and partner. The effectiveness of its role and capability in this process will, however, be predicated on the overall political, socio-economic and security environment of South Asia and on how the US engages itself in helping the region to overcome its problems.**

**The Region**

**“With nuclear weapons now in the possession of both countries, it is small wonder    that people describe South Asia as “the most dangerous place on Earth.” Today, peace in South Asia is hostage to one accident, one act of terrorism, one strategic miscalculation….” President General Pervez Musharraf: Address to UN General Assembly, September 2002)**

**There could not be a more poignant reminder of South Asia’s critical**

**importance in today’s world as a factor of global stability.**

**Today’s world is in turmoil. South Asia is at the root of most of its problems ranging from inter-state and civil conflicts to unresolved disputes, human tragedies, violence, extremism and terrorism. This region was globally important during the Cold War era and remains relevant to world’s peace and security in today’s changed environment.**

**With overt nuclearization of the sub-continent, South Asia’s problems are no longer an exclusive concern of the region itself. They now have a worrisome global dimension which raises the major powers’ stakes in the issues of peace and security in this region. No other region in the world today is as volatile and unstable as South Asia with its legacy of India-Pakistan hostility and conflicts and its new crucial role in the post-9/11 scenario.**

**In recent years, policy makers in world’s major capitals, especially Washington, have been exploring policy options in terms of their regional and global strategic and economic stakes. This brings in the crucial factor of US “engagement” or “re-engagement” in South Asia’s future and its role in the changing geo-political landscape of the region.**

**President George W. Bush’s visit to the region[[](file:///C%3A%5C%5CUsers%5C%5Ca%5C%5CDesktop%5C%5CQuarterly%20Criterion%5C%5CVOL%201%20No%201%5C%5CV1CRN1%20Shamshad.doc%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn54). was a landmark event representing the new direction of US policy towards South Asia. In New Delhi, he  bestowed upon India all that it needed to be acknowledged as a “de facto” nuclear power and to be able eventually to claim a permanent seat in the enlarged UN Security Council. He signed a nuclear deal lifting the decades-long US moratorium on nuclear cooperation with India allowing it access to fuel and technology for its civilian nuclear facilities.**

**The inevitability of the US-India strategic nexus had long been foreseen and was publicly articulated during Present Clinton’s five-day visit to India in March, 2000. In fact, he laid the foundation of  the new relationship by signing a historic document “India-US Vision for the 21st Century” charting a new and purposeful direction for their future relationship in the new century. The Bush administration has now added a strategic dimension to this relationship.**

**Where does Islamabad stand in this new geo-strategic scenario? The last few years have been a fateful period for Pakistan. A dispassionate though painful soul-searching would reveal that its current relevance to the international community is only as a “breeding ground” for religious extremism and militancy and as a country afflicted with a culture of violence and sectarianism.**

**This perception not only impairs Pakistan’s global image but also complicates matters for its government in its dealings with friends and foes alike. The US, in particular, sees Pakistan as the “ground zero” and a pivotal linchpin in its fight against terrorism, and for all purposes, now brackets Pakistan with Afghanistan. This is an unenviable distinction which circumscribes Islamabad’s role both within and beyond the region.**

**To make things even worse, Pakistan’s image in recent years as a “responsible nuclear state” has been marred by alleged proliferation scandals. US Secretary of State and other senior officials have publicly made it clear that no nuclear deal was possible with Pakistan as, according to them, there were serious “concerns” over its “proliferation” record.**

**President Bush also left Pakistan in no doubt on this issue when at his joint press conference with President Musharraf in Islamabad on 4 March 2006, he said bluntly that Pakistan should not expect a “civilian nuclear agreement like the one he had signed with India” because they were “two different countries with different needs and different histories and could not be compared to each other.” He also described India as a “great democracy and a responsible nuclear power” which had earned the right to nuclear technology.**

**The Indo-US defence and strategic alliance will not be without serious implications for the delicate balance of power and stability in the region and might also undermine the ongoing process of nuclear and conventional restraint and stabilization measures which India and Pakistan have been pursuing as part of their “composite dialogue” and mutual confidence building arrangements in recent years.**

**Besides the nuclear deal as the centrepiece of his visit to New Delhi, President Bush also reached additional agreements encompassing “a long list” of areas, including trade, agriculture, science and technology, energy, environment, defence, combating HIV/Aids, counterterrorism and “strengthening” of democratic institutions in Third Worldcountries.
In Pakistan, the only agreements signed were those on the establishment of a US-funded entrepreneurial training centre and Pakistan’s participation in the US-sponsored container security initiative. No progress was reported on the much trumpeted bilateral investment or free trade arrangements. As against a substantive framework of “strategic partnership” with India, only a “strategic dialogue” mechanism was announced for Pakistan.
Even on the four high-profile issues on the Pakistan-US agenda, namely, nuclear technology, democracy, terrorism and Kashmir, the US message was loud and clear. There will be no nuclear cooperation with Pakistan, not even for peaceful purposes, until it re-establishes its non-proliferation credentials.**

**For Washington, democracy is merely a subject for sermonic discussion and not a priority issue. On terrorism, Pakistan was doing great but still needs to do a lot more. On Kashmir, the US will only encourage a bilateral approach as the only “way forward.” No matter what Islamabad now says to keep face, the fact remains that the US has given it a clear reminder of the changing realities and a new geo-strategic landscape in South Asia.
Instead of lamenting  the conspicuous contrast in the substance, ambiance and outcome of his visit to India, Pakistan should be grateful to the US President for bringing it face to face with its real “worth and standing.” Islamabad must also keep in mind that the US is the sole superpower today and also Pakistan’s largest trading partner. It is in Islamabad’s interest to continue to have a strong and enduring relationship with the US.**

**But this will not be possible unless Pakistan re-establishes its own relevance as a partner not in wars and fighting campaigns but in peace and prosperity. This would also require it to restore its global image and standing as a “democratic” country and a “responsible” nuclear state.**

**If the turbulent political history of this region has any lessons, Washington, on its part also needs to understand the real issues of peace and security in this region. Its future engagement must not exacerbate those issues. Any step that fuels an arms race with an escalatory effect on the military budgets and arsenals of India and Pakistan is no service to their peoples.**

**Durable peace between Pakistan and India on the basis of a final and just settlement of the Kashmir issue will not only be a factor of regional and global stability but will also enable the two countries to divert their resources and energies to improving the lives of their peoples, and eradicating poverty and despair from the region.**

1. CPEC: prospects and challenges

Answer: China–Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), a key artery of China’s Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), has attracted the attention of researchers and policymakers within and outside Pakistan. A blend of investment-loan-grant model of over US$ 46 billion, CPEC contains projects aimed at building energy and communication infrastructure and industrial zones. Based on the analysis of primary and secondary data, this study aims to answer two questions: first, what are the main socio-economic or geostrategic prospects of CPEC for Pakistan and China? Second, are there any constraints and challenges in the implementation of CPEC projects and how are these going to be addressed? The paper examines CPEC’s potential in bringing about socio-economic development in Pakistan and its financial and geostrategic significance for China. It also explores key constraints related to the fragile security situation and the potential of CPEC to further exacerbate the geopolitical situation in the region, particularly in South Asia, where it could intensify tension between Pakistan and India as the latter perceives CPEC as a Chinese geopolitical and security project. In addition, the long-term financial implications of CPEC are assessed, with particular focus on its potential to become a debt trap for Pakistan in the long run.

 Islamiyat Marks 20

1. Prophet (PBUH) as an educator ,diplomat, military strategist, and peace Makera

Asnwer: When the atrocities of infidels became intolerable, the Prophet (PBUH) allowed Muslims to migrate to Abyssinia during 5th and 6th year of prophethood in 615 and 616 AD respectively. In 621 AD, he (PBUH) ordered Muslims to secretly migrate to Medina in small bands and in June 622 AD, when the Makkan infidels conspired to murder him, the Prophet (PBUH) also migrated to Medina along with his great companion Hazrat Abu Bakr (RA).

After reaching Medina and establishing the first Islamic city state in 622 AD, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) gave more attention to military organization of Muslims as the infidels were adamant on annihilating them. In 624 AD, a large army of infidels attacked Medina. Both the armies met at the place of “Badr” near Medina. In this first test of his military leadership skills, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) proved the mettle of his most consummate skills at carving out military strategies. He (PBUH) not only sent spies to know the exact military strength of the enemy, but when it came to fighting he (PBUH) reached the battleground well before enemy, got hold of water source, selected better position and organized army in different ranks as well. This strategy played the decisive role in the victory of Muslims who were only 313 in number up against a 1000-strong well-equipped force. In this battle, nearly 70 infidels were killed and as many were made Prisoners of War.

These prisoners were treated kindly and humanely and the Holy Prophet (PBUH) freed the literate prisoners on the condition that each one of them would teach the art of reading and writing to 10 Muslims. This kindness toward POWs was unprecedented in the annals of military history of the whole world.

Only a year later, in 625AD, in order to avenge the Badr defeat, the Quraish again attacked Medina with 3000-strong well-equipped military. They encamped near a hill called Ohud, in the north of Medina. The Holy Prophet (PBUH) positioned his army of nearly 700 Muslims on the western slope of the hill with Mount Ohud behind it on the top of which was a little pass. Though the rear was safe due to the hill, yet there was a possibility that the pass could be crossed or circumvented by the Quraish cavalry. Anticipating this danger, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) posted there a band of 50 archers under the command of Hazrat Abdullah bin Jubayr. He instructed them, “Stick to your place, and don’t leave it even if you see birds snatching us, till I send for you; and if you see that we have defeated the infidels and made them flee, even then you should not leave your place till I send for you.”

Muslims drew first blood in the battle and the infidels started slowly turning on their heels. Sensing a complete Muslim victory, that 50-man band left the position without the approval of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). When that unprotected pass was noticed by fleeing infidels, they reassembled and attacked Muslims who were busy in collecting the spoils of war from that strategic pass. The Muslims were taken aback, and were defeated. Nevertheless, the battle proved the strength and success of military skills of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) as it was the breach of his command that converted the triumph of Muslims into a defeat.

Two years later, in 627 AD, the Quraish and their allies gathered a large army of more than 10,000 men for exterminating the Muslims, once for all. On the other side, the Muslims could muster an army of only 3000 men. The Holy Prophet (PBUH) made consultations with his companions regarding the preparation of war plans. It was decided that Medina could be protected easily on three sides — on its northern side was shelters of steep cliffs whereas on its eastern and western sides were houses — because the only unprotected side was the southern one. Prophet’s Companion Hazrat Salman (RA) put forward a suggestion to dig a trench on that side. It was accepted and executed thereupon. The Holy Prophet (PBUH) himself took part in digging of the trench that was too broad to be passed by men or horses. When the infidels reached Medina, they were unable to enter the city. Stopped by the ditch, they laid a siege to Medina that lasted for many days. With the passage of time, the annoyance among infidels soared and their supplies too began to run short. So, they had to return unsuccessful. On account of hectic consultations by the Holy Prophet (PBUH), which is an integral part of military strategy, the City State of Medina was saved from destruction. It was the Holy Prophet (PBUH) who successfully used trench as a defence strategy for the first time in the military history of Arabia.

After the truce of Hudaybiyah was broken by the Quraish when they sided with the tribe of Banu Bakr, the Holy Prophet (PBUH), in 630 AD, led an army of 10,000 soldiers towards Makkah. Since it was a surprise attack, so every precaution was taken to keep the infidels unaware of the coming of the Muslim army.

On the eve of the attack, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) used his unique skills and ordered his soldiers to cook their food individually rather than in a collective kitchen. Resultantly, 10000 fires could be seen from a distance. The Quraish surveyed the scene and concluded that an army of 50000 men was poised to attack Makkah, which shattered their morale and they decided not to put resistance and hence surrendered. So, this excellent military strategy of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) enabled the Muslims to conquer Makkah without bloodshed. Another unique display of the Prophet’s (PBUH) military genius was seen during the conquest of Makkah where he showed mercy for those who had opposed him tooth and nail by announcing a general amnesty for all the Makkans. As a result of those merciful and dignified steps, the Makkans entered the fold of Islam in bulk, which buttressed military strength of Muslims and made their defence impregnable.

During his whole life, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) took part in as many as 26 wars, and in all he exhibited excellent military skills. He always led the Muslims from the front and preached that martyrdom was better than turning back in the battlefield. He was careful and cognizant of military preparedness of Muslims and made arrangements for imparting military training to Muslims during peacetime as well. Races of men, horses and camels were organized. Wrestling and archery competitions were held. Some Muslims were sent to Yemen for getting training in the use of weapons for subduing forts.
The Holy Prophet (PBUH) was careful even about trivial matters during wars such as ensuring that the morning sun did not face the soldiers directly and direction of wind did not obstruct the movement of horses and soldiers. Hence, we can easily conclude that the Holy Prophet (PBUH) is the most supreme role model for military strategists of all times.

1. According to Quran and Sunnah define Human Rights

## Answer: Equality.

* We have honored the childrens of Adam, and provided them with rides on land and in the sea. We provided for them good provisions, and we gave them greater advantages than many of our creatures.
* people, we created you from the same male and female, and rendered you distinct peoples and tribes that you may recognize one another. The best among you in the sight of GOD is the most righteous. GOD is Omniscient, Cognizant.

Right to life and peaceful living

* Whosoever kills a human being without (any reason like) man slaughter, or corruption on earth, it is as though he had killed all mankind.
* You shall not kill any person - for God has made life sacred - except in the course of justice. If one is killed unjustly, then we give his heir authority to enforce justice. Thus, he shall not exceed the limits in avenging the murder, he will be helped.

Right to own and protect property

* As soon as he leaves, he roams the earth corruptingly, destroying properties and lives. GOD does not love corruption.
* you who believe, do not consume each others' properties illicitly - only mutually acceptable transactions are permitted. You shall not kill yourselves. GOD is Merciful towards you.

Rights of minorities and other religious groups

* Proclaim: "This is the truth from your Lord," then whoever wills let him believe, and whoever wills let him disbelieve.
* Do you know who really rejects the faith? That is the one who mistreats the orphans. And does not advocate the feeding of the poor. And woe to those who observe the contact prayers (Salat) - who are totally heedless of their prayers. They only show off. And they forbid charity.

Women's rights

* The divorcees also shall be provided for, equitably. This is a duty upon the righteous.
* Do not approach (the bounds of) adultery.

Business and Labor Law Marks 20

1. Negotiable instruments .Draw a cheque,promisory note and bill of exchange

Answer: "**Negotiable instrument**". (l) A **negotiable instrument** means a **promissory note**, **bill of exchange** or **cheque** payable either, to order or to bearer. ... A **promissory note**, **bill of exchange** or **cheque** is payable to bearer which, is expressed to be so payable or on which the only or last endorsement is an endorsement in blank.



1. Functions of labor court

Answer: Industrial and **Labour Courts** deal with the matters such as strikes, lockout, bonus, service conditions, unfair **labour** practices, granting recognition to the **Labour** Union and awarding compensation to the employees on account accident in respect of fatal or non-fatal accidents.