

507 Sharif 6th March
5th Punjab Jals.

Detailed summary of issues discussed:

1. PML-N alliance with ASWJ and other right wing groups.

ASWJ: supporting PML-N. They are a new face of SSP and have allied with LJ. Were involved in Gojra against Christians too.

PML-N has always had a connection with right wing groups like LJ and SSP. Shahbaz Sharif has agreed to their support even though mainstream media anchors have criticized it.

Quest: why is this alliance being discussed and not other alliances?

Response: difference must be made between those political forces who accept the constitution and are in electoral politics and those who are merely a front for non state actors who want to change the very basis of Pakistani society. WAF must emphasize this distinction and caution the government and civil society against it. It is also about challenging PML-N assertions that they are not associated with Right wing groups. CM Sharif has not denied newspaper articles about this affiliation.

WAF needs to make a strong statement against PML-N alliance with ASWJ.:many options were discussed:

- A women's group should go to Nawaz Sharif and voice their discomfort about these PMLN alliances with banned parties.
- WAF should take a position and go public on it: through letters to the editor, or opinion piece in the paper or through social media?

2. Sectarian killings re Hazaras and Shia community: Civilian lives are threatened all the time, no one feels safe, when perpetrators confess to their crimes e.g. Hazara killings. Killers have a safe passage and the security agencies do not touch them. Why is it so? A lot is justified in the name of national security and people's mobility and lives are compromised

The possible link between sectarian violence and coming elections. There was a discussion on this and while it was felt that this could be an tactic to bring in the army it was felt that the matter was more complex.

3. Members agreed that Elections are necessary and must be held on time although conflicts and ethnic strife could be tactics to stop elections. Violence may increase during the caretaker government to delay elections.
It was agreed that WAF must demand that elections be held on time.
4. No new decisions should be made now by the present governments. All decisions should now be made by the new government in power.
5. APC/Grand Jirga is an election stunt but it is a matter of concern that women and communities who have been hit by the Taliban and who will be impacted by talks with Taliban were not represented at these meetings and their issues were not discussed.
WAF needs to highlight this absence of representation of affected communities.
6. Talks with Taliban: WAF rejects talks with Taliban but has also not supported killing them. Regarding the Army's concern/recognition of the 'enemy within' - is it the Taliban they were referring to or the

Baloch. How will the army define who the enemy within is? Esp since many elements of the enemy within is also the creation of the military. There is no concrete picture and discussion is needed on what is the game?

7. WAF's position on 2001 bombing of Taliban recalled viz untenable and would not end the issue or resolve it. Waf and other groups made the point then that the Taliban and al Qaeda would then come into Pakistan. Military is involved in creating conflict and goes to war against communities. It should play a role in curbing the Taliban. Talks will not be required if that happens.

Problem raised by Nighat: if the military has created them and keeps them for its own interests then why would the military curb what they want to keep?

Conclusions/decisions:

1. WAF should move towards a position on the APC and other developments and a range of other policies and WAF positions. A comprehensive policy paper needed as WAF did in the past.
2. On talks with Taliban: it can only be under the constitutional provisions with groups who accept the constitution, accept and include rights within the const and be legal. Needs more discussion and positioning. Do states negotiate with non state actors? Foreign militants?
3. On NCSW role in CEDAW and representing the govt or leading govt delegations. NCSW has an independent oversight mandate/role and is meant to assist, check, direct, facilitate, critique the govt not to represent it: it should also be in the position to raise questions on CSOs