

The Resurgent India

A Monthly National Review

June 2018



“Let us all work for the Greatness of India.”

- The Mother

Year 9

Issue 3

The Resurgent India English monthly published and printed by Smt. Suman Sharma on behalf of The Resurgent India Trust Published at C/o J. N. Socketed Cement Pipes Pvt. Ltd., Village Bhamraula Post Bagwara, Kichha Road, Rudrapur (U.S Nagar)
email: sadlecjnn@gmail.com, info@resurgentindia.org, URL :
www.resurgentindia.org

Printed at : Priyanka Printing Press, Hotel Krish Building, Janta Inter College Road, Udham Nagar, Rudrapur, Uttarakhand

Editor : Ms. Garima Sharma, B-45, Batra Colony, Village Bharatpur, P.O. Kaushal Ganj, Bilaspur Distt. Rampur (U.P)

THE RESURGENT INDIA

A Monthly National Review

June 2018



SUCCESSFUL FUTURE

(Full of Promise and Joyful Surprises)

Botanical name: Gaillardia Pulchella

Common name: Indian blanket, Blanket flower, Fire-wheels

Year 9

Issue 3

A Declaration

We do not fight against any creed, any religion.

We do not fight against any form of government.

We do not fight against any social class.

We do not fight against any nation or civilisation.

We are fighting division, unconsciousness, ignorance, inertia and falsehood.

We are endeavouring to establish upon earth union, knowledge, consciousness, Truth, and we fight whatever opposes the advent of this new creation of Light, Peace, Truth and Love.

— The Mother

(Collected works of the Mother 13, p. 124-25)

THE KASHMIR ISSUE: A 'MUSCULAR POLICY' ALONE CAN DELIVER

The toppling of the PDP-BJP government in Jammu & Kashmir, with the BJP pulling the plug on the alliance, has provided an ideal opportunity to the central government to intensify anti-terror operations in the valley. In the recent past, these operations – which had been going strong since 2016, following the surgical strikes and the fallout from Burhan Wani's death, killing more than 200 militants – had suffered. After taking a strong stand, the government went on a backfoot, in the wake of allegations about rise in local recruitment, alienation and Kashmir situation being touted to be worse than what it was in the 1990s.

All of these contentions were ill-motivated and the government, unfortunately, partially heeded them. The result was the appointment of an interlocutor along the same lines as was done by the UPA-II government in 2011. While it won a few relief points for starting the 'dialogue' process, the Kashmir situation has rendered all such attempts farcical. During the same period, Operation All-Out – the Army's successful operation of weeding out and destroying the terrorists – had also taken a hit. Operations were suspended in the month of Ramzan and the 2003 ceasefire was re-invoked along the border with Pakistan, even though neither the terrorists nor Pakistan ceased their offensive.

To make matters worse, the government, particularly the J&K's BJP's leadership, had been on a serious backfoot over the Kathua rape and murder case. For Jammu, the BJP leadership has proven ineffective in tackling Ms. Mufti's exercise of soft power to allegedly instigate demographic changes in Jammu and Ladakh. It was apparent that Ms. Mufti was being indulged by the BJP for a while, but has now been dropped. Governor's rule has been welcomed in

both Jammu and Kashmir and by the Army. The Army has already resumed Operation All-Out with greater intensity, while cracking down on funding networks of terrorists by NIA – which had succeeded in wiping out the terror networks of terrorist veterans like Geelani and others of Hurriyat.

All the counts on which the government had neutralized itself in recent months can now be re-implemented with greater intensity. It is clear that things have reached such a point that reconciliation is no longer an option. ***When civilians are actively collaborating with the militants, providing them information to kill security personnel and openly supporting terrorists, there is a clear message that no code of honour will be respected and no one will be spared. Yet, there is a popular perception that we should broker a dialogue with such a population.***

There are three important things to be noted here – all of which relate to the Kashmiri people's support for the imposition of Islamic rule in Kashmir:

- * The farcical and superficial perception that 'dialogue' works in Kashmir.

- * If at all, who can the government conduct a dialogue with? The entire landscape of militant leadership has been taken over by Pak-based foreign terrorists and their sympathizers among the locals. The existence of an indigenous separatist leadership fighting for the supposed freedom of Kashmir is a myth.

- * Kashmir is not a political issue. Under the guise of human rights and political freedom, the real agenda of all foreign and indigenous militants has been to facilitate Islamization of the Valley and establish the rule of Sharia. To pretend to engage with such elements under the guise of political outreach would be, and has been, most harmful.

In further elaboration:

First, in Kashmir, dialogue has never been more than a farce. The very idea of a dialogue undermines India's basic position that Kashmir is an integral part of India and is not a disputed territory – Pakistan and terrorists are part of problem, not the solution. Previous governments have only supported this position through parroted words, but undermined it through their actions.

The Modi government has faithfully implemented its Kashmir policy in line with the basic Indian principle on Kashmir, unlike other governments who have undercut their own interests. There is a tendency – especially among circles of retired Indian diplomats and ex-servicemen who served at top positions – to fondly remember 'moderate' eras like those of Vajpayee and Manmohan Singh, when, they claim that local recruitment was at an all-time low and a dialogue was underway with the separatist leadership of Hurriyat Conference.

What we miss is that fact that such periods of farcical peace never solved the basic Kashmir problem – a population, vested with special status, fundamentally wanting to break free of India and preferring the imposition of Sharia rule in the state. Our wise men say that development and material welfare will end the alienation of Kashmiris. What they fail to realise is that this alienation is self-imposed.

Therefore, all the social engineering and dialogues were bound to result in a situation wherein people would obviously utilize the material incentives dangled before them, without any fundamental change in their mindset. As a part of these material incentives, the local recruitment to terrorist ranks would fall as people would be in a more complacent mode – complacent but always with a fundamentally anti-India psyche – and there would be a lull in civilian killings and terror operations. But this is no proof of success. Because

at the next opportunity, they would again start demanding ‘azaadi’. ***It is like pushing a problem under the carpet – never solving it – and then calling it successful diplomacy.***

So, the arguments of Kashmir being better-off during the Vajpayee and Manmohan era fall flat in the face of reason. It was always a compromise and evasion of reality. ***As soon as the present government took the initiative of permanently resolving the Kashmir issue by attempting its irreversible integration with the Indian Union – that should always have been the objective towards which previous governments should have strived – the revolt was quick to rise. The previous approach was covering the Kashmir issue with pleasant diplomatic platitudes, broking a ceasefire with Pakistan and assuming these temporary measures to be constitutive of a permanent solution.*** But for how long? Even now there is an unhealthy clinging to the perception that the Kashmir issue has to be resolved only through dialogue and peaceful means – an impossibility, given that nobody there wants any solution except the rule of Sharia. The issue is no longer about Kashmiri right to self-determination but of their popular support of integrating with Pakistan and Islamization.

Second, advocates of dialogue do not realise that the entity they want to conduct a dialogue with, no longer exists. Kashmir is no longer what it was a few years ago. Kashmir was a political issue only during the time when Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah jointly mismanaged it. After that, and especially now, the entire scenario of militant activity and engagement of civilians as over-ground workers is being spearheaded from Pakistan. ***The Kashmir of 1960s no longer exists. To view it fondly as a political and not a security issue has been suicidal for our Kashmir policy. The so-called indigenous terror networks – who claimed to be against both India and Pakistan and insisted they were only fighting for self-***

determination, like JKLF – are no longer there. Even this was a farce. Geelani's Tehreek-i-Hurriyat was openly allied to Pakistan. Hurriyat and JKLF – who many idolize and view as moderates – had presided over the massacre of Kashmiri Hindus during the late 1980s – at the same time when Pakistan had actively sought to provide material support to Kashmiri insurgents.

They would to go to Pakistan for training, wanted Sharia imposed in Kashmir and received all their material support from Pakistan. Yet we bought into the lip-service they paid to 'political self-determination' in Kashmir. What has now changed is that these local outfits like Hurriyat and Geelani's – with their corrupt monetary roots attacked by the NIA – are a new spent force. People also no longer support Hurriyat. **The people of Kashmir no longer support Hurriyat because they have found better alternatives directly in hardcore Pakistani terror outfits who have become popular in the valley – like LeT, JeM, Al-Badr, Hizbul Mujahideen etc. They no longer support indirect Pakistan proxies or the self-certified 'indigenous' militants, but are now openly in favour of 'foreign' terror groups who owe allegiance to Pakistan and promise radical Islamization.**

And yet, look at the irony – some of us – retired personnel with their outdated attachments – still advocate a meaningless dialogue with the failed Hurriyat. That the Modi government even issued a statement saying it is amenable to dialogue – only to be snubbed by the insignificant Hurriyat – was a negative strike against India. **What 'healing touch' shall we give to a population which is openly supportive of Pakistani terrorists? It is flabbergasting that a dialogue is being advocated with Pakistani proxies.** There are no indigenous networks in Kashmir – only Pakistani terror groups and civilians who overwhelmingly support them. No dialogue is possible with either of these foreign elements and any attempt in this direction would now undermine India.

Third, we must recognize that the militant networks operating in the valley – including the so-called somewhat ‘legitimate’ indigenous ones like Hurriyat Conference – have only the imposition of Sharia as their principal aim. They only claim that they treat Kashmir as a political issue and one of self-determination. But the words of terrorists and militants cannot be taken at face value. They derive support from groups like Dukhtaran-i-Millat, whose only aim is the rule of Sharia in Kashmir. And the Pakistani terror networks are openly advocating for Sharia law. Indians ignore this situation and stubbornly continue to want to treat Kashmir as a political issue. Instead of countering militants at their own level, by recognizing the reality, we seem to want to ground our approach in baseless intellectual theorizations of the past.

The Modi government has followed a ruthless approach to Kashmir. It recognized the reality and responded as such. Nobody liked it. All vested interests wanted the status-quo of NDA-I and UPA to continue. But the present government’s Operation All-Out had been such a success that it had struck at the very roots of militancy. Even local recruitment had fallen in 2017.

In fact, a lot of allegations are being brandished about today, with everyone harping on the idea that for one terrorist killed, 100 more are born. This is a myth. It is not happening but not because of some imaginary change of heart among the ranks of terrorist sympathizers.

During the previous years, the control in local recruitment could happen because the Army had much superior intelligence and covert operations capabilities. In 2010, after 26/11 terror attacks the year before, the Army had formed a strong Technical Support Division, under the then General V K Singh. This division was meant to provide foolproof intelligence to the Army and gave it an edge in Kashmir (Sharma 2018). It led to a reduction in local recruitment to

terrorist ranks. It was mercilessly dissolved in 2012, after allegations of political snooping and paying money to topple the state government, after which the Kashmir situation deteriorated rapidly. Its dissolution – having fallen prey to political ambitions – struck a blow at Army’s covert operations and intelligence capabilities, making it heavily reliant on the J & K police, as is the case now, and leaving it dependent on overt operations – like surgical strikes – only.

Even then it has done well with its Operation All-Out.

Since 1989, the number of civilians killed has fallen from 8640 between 1989 to 1998 to 312 between 2009 to 2018. The number of security personnel who lost their lives has also fallen from 2326 between 1989 to 1998 to 558 between 2009 and 2018. Despite all allegations, terror incidents have gone down dramatically, while the targeting of terrorists has become much better during the last 4.5 years of Modi government, with 701 terrorists being killed. The Army, for the last 4.5 years, has had some undeniable signature successes like Operation All-Out and cracking down on funding networks of terror veterans, as well as targeting top terrorist commanders to strike at their roots. Hence, the desperation of terrorists and their random killing of civilians has become clear as day.

Notice that unlike the past times, these new breed of terrorists no longer try to gain local sympathy through propaganda or by talking about false theories like azaadi. Instead, they are clear about their Islamic agenda and the intention to topple the Indian state. All their sympathy comes from these bases. Those civilians who don’t toe their line are killed or threatened. This desperation has made it easier for the Army to go after them. The success is undeniable. ***For the first time in decades, one can actually hope that there will be a change in status-quo and the Kashmir issue can reach some solution, instead of suspended in mid-air, thanks to past political ambitions and expediencies.***

Not many like this strategy – as is obvious. As soon as the Modi government gave an inch of space in trying to appear ‘moderate’, the enemies were quick to pounce, hoping to weaken and corner the government completely. The outrageous UN OHCHR (United Nations Office of High Commissioner on Human Rights) report on human rights – penned by a sympathetic fellow Muslim High Commissioner, who has had a controversial tenure of support to Rohingya militants and Pakistan – along with wisdom of Congress’s Saifuddin Soz and Ghulam Nabi Azad came in quick succession. The UN’s temerity to issue the report is the first instance of its kind, and this shows that Modi’s ‘muscular’ Kashmir policy had been giving sleepless nights to many, unlike the complacency displayed by the previous governments.

Under no circumstances can the government afford to make the mistake of lapsing into the false political lull of the last few months. The Governor’s rule provides an opportunity till 2019 to make some permanent headway in Kashmir. The opportunity cannot be squandered away to accommodate voices that insist on false policies of engagement with terrorists.

Bibliography

Sharma, Madhur. 2018. *Swarajya*. June 19. Accessed June 27, 2018. <https://swarajyamag.com/politics/a-lost-opportunity-for-kashmir-why-scrapping-the-armys-intelligence-unit-was-a-blunder>.

TWO CONTRASTING SUMMITS – G-7 AND SCO

The succession of rapid international organizational meetings – ASEAN’s Shangri-La Dialogue, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) summit and the G-7 summit – shed light on the rapidly changing international fortunes of the West and the East. Today, we can marvel that nearly 70 years after the rise of the newly decolonized Asian, African and Latin American countries in the midst of the Cold War, when the world was a plaything of Western powers and their rivals, fortunes have reversed.

Russia – the successor of the mighty Soviet Union – is now conceding China’s authority in all the territories that were earlier under the Soviet influence in Eurasia, while the North-Atlantic powers are wooing India to secure their strategic interests and economic opportunities.

Most recently, this reversal has been underlined by the abject failure of the G-7 summit and the success and unity displayed at the SCO summit. The trade conflicts leading up to the G-7 summit and the aftermath of the summit were marked by deep divisions and acrimony among the industrialized countries. The US President is determined to dismantle all the multilateral bodies that have formed the crux of the West’s dominance of the global order. The immediate casualties will be the NATO military alliance, any further free trade deals with Europe similar to the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), the WTO (which the US has said it will follow only when it suits them) and the already weakened IMF and World Bank. The list basically includes all the liberal mainstays of the ‘first world’ through which it has exercised its dominance for the last 60 years.

It is very likely that Trump’s immediate actions are further endearing him to the US electorate, irrespective of what the media

says, since the US's economic figures have rarely been better than now. While the US unemployment is at record low, the economic growth is at an all-time high and corporate tax savings are also high. Seeing these domestic results, Trump will be further emboldened to carry the trade war with the US's western allies to its fullest extent. While Obama was obviously pursuing ideological interests, Trump's policies are based solely on the US's narrowly defined national interest and immediate gains and his own immediate domestic interests. That is why the fiasco at the G-7 summit, which started with Trump's call to re-induct Russia into the group and ended with him calling Canada's Trudeau 'very weak and dishonest' while refusing to sign the G-7 joint statement and leaving the summit early for Singapore, thereby skipping and dismissing the importance of the sessions on gender and climate change.

Besides pointing to the obvious divisions within the so-called 'first world', the fiasco also highlights the rapidly growing irrelevance of G-7, with Russia expressing no desire to join it. Moreover, the presence of weaker economies like Italy and ageing ones like Japan and Germany included in the grouping contrasts sharply with their actual role in global economic leadership, which is rapidly diminishing. Europe is heavily tilting towards trade with China after suffering rude shocks from the US, Japan is opening up its economy to immigrant labour, while UK badly wants to court India in the post-Brexit era. When the idea of G-7 was conceived during the heyday of the West in 1970s, these countries were the global economic leaders, while those like China and India were stuck in a socialist mire. But now China and India together constitute more than half the increase in global GDP, while G-7 languishes.

When G-7 was conceived the world had started moving towards globalization based on financialization. Today, we are at a stage where trade deals have been corrupted, financialization has resulted

in complex markets full of self-destructive bubbles and globalization became the handmaiden for fulfilling the West's imperialist extractions across Africa. One of the main contentions of the war between US, Canada and Mexico over NAFTA is the sunset clause – as witnessed during heated G-7 debates also – which Trump wants introduced, since he does not want to bestow any permanence on a trade deal conceived more than two decades ago. NAFTA – like may other bilateral disputes dragged to the WTO – is being misused by foreign companies, who have been given the power – under investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms – to drag sovereign countries to court in the name of protecting the rights of foreign investors, thereby spawning a whole new industry of clever, cheating lawyers whose actions have ended up binding the hands of the state and compounding their environmental problems.

Countries cannot take the initiative of banning environmentally harmful activities within their own territories, since reprisals result in them being dragged to court by vested interests of some investor or the other, resulting in them having to revoke their policies and pay millions of dollars in compensation. That Canada would want to bestow permanence on this system by denying the sunset clause or renegotiate any new makeovers but without the sunset clause explains one of the reasons of why Trump is enraged.

Such flashpoints – heightened during the G-7 – show the true selfishness and utilitarian spirit underlying the global governance system at present. It is now seen that this West-dominated system is falling apart under the burden of its own selfishness and greed, and is being replaced by an Asia-led world order. The SCO meeting at Qingdao, which occurred parallel to the G-7, provided a clear contrast to the acrimony at the latter summit. Its success is reflective of the consolidation of Asian superpowers. Led by China and jointly managed by China and Russia, the strategic grouping is focused on

counter-terrorism and regional connectivity. Both issues are extremely important for India as well, which finally became a full member of SCO last year.

This year's SCO summit further consolidated the spirit of cooperation between India, China and Russia. Most notably, it is clear that ***the recent informal Wuhan summit has now set a new tone for the Indo-China relationship which will be reflected in all future cooperative meetings and ventures***, including Xi Jinping's visit to India next year for another informal summit. Even though India kept out of signing an endorsement for the Belt and Road Initiative of China, this poise has come to be expected of India and did not generate any surprises.

SCO offers a good opportunity for India to further its connectivity interests in the region by bypassing Pakistan. The International North South Corridor, the Chabahar port etc. are all a part of India's connectivity priorities. Counter-terrorism measures will also strengthen India's hand. Through the SCO summit and the previous Shangri-La Dialogue, it is clear that India is maintaining a consistent position of developing its relationships with all countries, but especially with China.

Most recently, in terms of concrete actions, this was reflected in the decision by India and China to come together and bargain as one to challenge the power and prices fixed for oil by the OPEC (Organization for Petroleum Exporting Countries), since both the countries together accounted for over 25% of world's oil imports last year. The increasingly united front being displayed by these countries has been strengthened by the SCO summit. The strategic objectives of the organization render the compulsion of geographical connectivity among its members to be of utmost importance. The position India used to adopt, till a few years ago, of always being at loggerheads with China is dissolving and will dissolve due to the

irresistible logic of Xi's vision of unity and of SCO's own logic of regional connectivity for strategic and security purposes.

As it is, India is already looking at rebalancing ties with Pakistan, in yet another attempt, to open up its connectivity to Central Asia through Pakistan and Afghanistan, under the SCO framework. But the extent to which SCO can serve to smoothen India-Pakistan relationship remains a big question. With Iran also soon set to join the SCO, India's Chabahar project – seeking to bypass Pakistan – to deliver goods to Afghanistan, will be influenced by the changing regional environment. Instead of viewing SCO as a product of Chinese domination, it should be viewed as a wider Asian grouping that will counter terrorism and challenging existing fiefdoms, lead to a shared future.

THE TRUMP-KIM SUMMIT: A BREAKTHROUGH IN KOREAN UNIFICATION

The historic summit between Trump and Kim Jong Un heralds the beginning of transformation of Asia and the dismantlement of the control of the 'West', leading towards a spirit of unity and resurgence. Indeed, the first-ever meeting between a US President and a North Korean leader coincided with the first-ever deep disruption of the G-7 unity ever since it was conceived as a grouping of highly industrialized countries in 1973. The inevitable dismantlement of the dominance of the West – despite the best efforts of all its leaders – and the material and cultural rise of Asia has made one thing clear – the immediate future is bringing us closer towards a unification of Asia.

Bringing North Korea onto the international stage should be seen as a part of this movement, in the overcoming of a big obstacle to Asian unity. That the meeting between the two leaders not just went through extremely warmly and smoothly, but in a spirit of friendship, has accorded the kind of legitimacy and recognition to North Korea on the international stage, which the country has never had before in its history. In a similar fashion, the latest third inter-Korean summit in April, resulting in the signing of the Panmunjom Declaration, also went well. The previous meetings between North Korea and the US or the last two inter-Korean summits had backfired, with US's John Bolton sabotaging the 1994 'Agreed Framework' deal during the later George Bush years and resulting in North Korea reneging on its commitments to denuclearization. But never has a US President himself met a North Korean leader bestowing global acceptability on him.

The final statement at the historic Singapore summit itself did not contain much, but the US's security guarantee to North Korea

after denuclearization as well as the removal of US troops from the region has come as a shock to all, leaving both Japan and South Korea rattled and providing the perfect opening for China and Russia to ease up on the economic sanctions on North Korea, irrespective of what US does in the future. What Trump himself broadly wants is evident. He has to be aware that North Korea came to the summit as an almost fully nuclear country and to reverse that process, try to monitor it and ensure that it does not have hidden weapons sites would take more than a decade or two, and would be pointless.

The world will have to accept that North Korea is in the same league as other non-NSG nuclear nations like Israel, India and Pakistan, and should stop treating the nation like a pariah. It would be much better to have a nuclear North Korea on the world stage peacefully rather than risk starting the World War Three. Trump appeared to be more interested in winning the Nobel Peace Prize and boosting his domestic popularity, in addition to the attraction of withdrawal of troops from Seoul that he has always favoured even before his election, than in any global farsighted diplomacy. Despite the motivations of Trump and calculations of other countries, the irresistible momentum of the Trump-Kim summit was in the direction of removing this persistent thorn of an isolated and threatening North Korea from the Asian cooperation efforts.

As long as the situation on the Korean Peninsula remained what it has been for decades, the US would have always maintained its presence and kept the Asians divided and suspicious of each other. It was keeping Korea weak and trampling on its nationalism through the meaningless dead divisions created during the Cold War, it was ostensibly containing China in its own backyard and was already keeping a pacifist Japan, through its foreign and defense policy, firmly under its thumb – all because of the North Korean threat. Despite these hurdles, Asia has been rising. Increasingly,

with China assuming a decisive role in world affairs, US is beginning to look like an illegitimate intruder in the region.

For many of the East Asian countries, the summit – no matter how short on substantive outcomes – was welcome news. ***And for both the Koreas – of the same blood, race and culture, but riven asunder by foreign domination for more than a century, first by Japanese, and then by Cold War and US politics – it was indeed an emotional moment. That there are concrete discussions on the reunification scheduled in the near future shows that both the Koreas consciously want that outcome and are moving towards that – none of the previous meetings triggered such a response. Only when the conditions are right does the work occur.*** Japan is clearly the most vulnerable country right now. Left in the cold by the US on the trade issue as well on the Korean issue, it is now planning to hold its own summit with North Korea, to resolve all existing issues and dissolve their mutual enmity. It also realizes that the talk of revising its pacifist Constitution will have to become an inevitable reality in a world where the US is withdrawing into itself and can no longer be trusted.

Other countries – Russia, Syria and India – are following suit in setting up engagements with North Korea, while the Western countries have reserved their judgement. This shows that ***the international recognition gained by North Korea has been a major breakthrough, irrespective of the promises Kim and Trump made to each other.*** Even if Trump – and his complex administration and anti-North Korea NSA, John Bolton – decides to continue with the material status quo, North Korea's economy will be stable. Its major trade relations were with China, in any case, which will now not heed any kind of US sanctions after this summit. The additional advantage is that it can now cultivate its own economic relations with other countries like Russia as well. A summit in Japan – probably within the next two months – will further cement North Korea's global

integration, even as regular contact with South Korea has already been established. India had already starting courting the country few months ago by sending its diplomats and appointing an ambassador to the country.

This is the scenario that we can see panning out irrespective of US's and North Korea's promises or future collapse of the talks. But we must take account of the changed global scenario to see why these talks are not likely to fail and why North Korea will remain consistent to its present position. ***The biggest advantage of the current Trump-Kim equation is its simplicity, which bypassed and surprised many of the seasoned cynics in Washington as well. That Trump went to the summit largely unprepared insisting that the success will depend on the attitude marked a refreshing break from the convoluted cynical machinations of the Washington bureaucrats.*** At every opportunity, the Democrats and the liberal experts would invoke North Korea's past betrayals and are even now insisting that Trump was probably played by the regime's seasoned negotiators.

There is no evidence to back these claims. At that time too, John Bolton sabotaged the deal and an aggravated North Korea did not trust the US administration, which left no stone unturned to take potshots at it, calling it a part of 'axis of evil' and what not, besides the Iraq debacle which left its credibility tattered. ***The failure of the past meetings was in fact the failure of any common carefully crafted selfish understanding – agreements which today are less between nations and more between their soulless machinery of experts and bureaucrats. This summit was different – it was spontaneous and was prefaced by the slight tremors of reemerging emotional connect between the two Koreas – for the first time. It was prefaced by the spirit of nationalism and occurred in a context where Asia is turning towards itself. All these elements were missing in the past mechanical understandings.*** This summit and ***the future of North***

Korea is being shaped on Asian terms and not by an alien West. The role of US would be rather limited in the process, contrary to popular expectations. This makes all the difference and should shape future course of events on the peninsula.

What is Our Ideal?

“Unity for the human race by an inner oneness and not only by an external association of interests; the resurgence of man out of the merely animal and economic life or the merely intellectual and aesthetic into the glories of the spiritual existence; the pouring of the power of the spirit into the physical mould and mental instrument so that man may develop his manhood into that true supermanhood which shall exceed our present state as much as this exceeds the animal state from which science tells us that we have issued. These three are one; for man’s unity and man’s self-transcendence can come only by living in the Spirit.”

– Sri Aurobindo

(Collected Works of Sri Aurobindo 13: 147)