
AP[®] Research Academic Paper

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Sample B

- ☒ **Scoring Guideline**
- ☒ **Student Samples**
- ☒ **Scoring Commentary**

AP® Research — Academic Paper 2021 Scoring Guidelines

The Response...				
Score of 1 Report on Existing Knowledge	Score of 2 Report on Existing Knowledge with Simplistic Use of a Research Method	Score of 3 Ineffectual Argument for a New Understanding	Score of 4 Well-Supported, Articulate Argument Conveying a New Understanding	Score of 5 Rich Analysis of a New Understanding Addressing a Gap in the Research Base
Presents an overly broad topic of inquiry.	Presents a topic of inquiry with narrowing scope or focus, that is NOT carried through either in the method or in the overall line of reasoning.	Carries the focus or scope of a topic of inquiry through the method AND overall line of reasoning, even though the focus or scope might still be narrowing.	Focuses a topic of inquiry with clear and narrow parameters, which are addressed through the method and the conclusion.	Focuses a topic of inquiry with clear and narrow parameters, which are addressed through the method and the conclusion.
Situates a topic of inquiry within a single perspective derived from scholarly works OR through a variety of perspectives derived from mostly non-scholarly works.	Situates a topic of inquiry within a single perspective derived from scholarly works OR through a variety of perspectives derived from mostly non-scholarly works.	Situates a topic of inquiry within relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives, although connections to some works may be unclear.	Explicitly connects a topic of inquiry to relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives AND logically explains how the topic of inquiry addresses a gap.	Explicitly connects a topic of inquiry to relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives AND logically explains how the topic of inquiry addresses a gap.
Describes a search and report process.	Describes a nonreplicable research method OR provides an oversimplified description of a method, with questionable alignment to the purpose of the inquiry.	Describes a reasonably replicable research method, with questionable alignment to the purpose of the inquiry.	Logically defends the alignment of a detailed, replicable research method to the purpose of the inquiry.	Logically defends the alignment of a detailed, replicable research method to the purpose of the inquiry.
Summarizes or reports existing knowledge in the field of understanding pertaining to the topic of inquiry.	Summarizes or reports existing knowledge in the field of understanding pertaining to the topic of inquiry.	Conveys a new understanding or conclusion, with an underdeveloped line of reasoning OR insufficient evidence.	Supports a new understanding or conclusion through a logically organized line of reasoning AND sufficient evidence. The limitations and/or implications, if present, of the new understanding or conclusion are oversimplified.	Justifies a new understanding or conclusion through a logical progression of inquiry choices, sufficient evidence, explanation of the limitations of the conclusion, and an explanation of the implications to the community of practice.
Generally communicates the student's ideas, although errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization distract or confuse the reader.	Generally communicates the student's ideas, although errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization distract or confuse the reader.	Competently communicates the student's ideas, although there may be some errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization.	Competently communicates the student's ideas, although there may be some errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization.	Enhances the communication of the student's ideas through organization, use of design elements, conventions of grammar, style, mechanics, and word precision, with few to no errors.
Cites AND/OR attributes sources (in bibliography/ works cited and/or in-text), with multiple errors and/or an inconsistent use of a discipline-specific style.	Cites AND/OR attributes sources (in bibliography/ works cited and/or in-text), with multiple errors and/or an inconsistent use of a discipline-specific style.	Cites AND attributes sources, using a discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND in-text), with few errors or inconsistencies.	Cites AND attributes sources, with a consistent use of an appropriate discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND in-text), with few to no errors.	Cites AND attributes sources, with a consistent use of an appropriate discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND in-text), with few to no errors.

Academic Paper

Overview

This performance task was intended to assess students' ability to conduct scholarly and responsible research and articulate an evidence-based argument that clearly communicates the conclusion, solution, or answer to their stated research question. More specifically, this performance task was intended to assess students' ability to:

- Generate a focused research question that is situated within or connected to a larger scholarly context or community;
- Explore relationships between and among multiple works representing multiple perspectives within the scholarly literature related to the topic of inquiry;
Articulate what approach, method, or process they have chosen to use to address their research question, why they have chosen that approach to answering their question, and how they employed it;
- Develop and present their own argument, conclusion, or new understanding while acknowledging its limitations and discussing implications;
- Support their conclusion through the compilation, use, and synthesis of relevant and significant evidence generated by their research;
- Use organizational and design elements to effectively convey the paper's message;
- Consistently and accurately cite, attribute, and integrate the knowledge and work of others, while distinguishing between the student's voice and that of others;
- Generate a paper in which word choice and syntax enhance communication by adhering to established conventions of grammar, usage, and mechanics.

The Perceptions of Pakistani Immigrants in the Zurich Canton on the India-Pakistan Conflict

April 29th, 2021

Word Count: 5303

Introduction

Beginning with the 1947 Partition, the India-Pakistan conflict has always been fiercely debated. The Partition, ensuing with Indian independence in 1947, resulted in the displacement of an estimated 14 million people as Hindus and Sikhs were forced to migrate India and Muslims to Pakistan (UNHCR, 2000). As the states of India began to decide whether they would join India or Pakistan, Hindu Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir believed he could delay a decision in order to realize an independent Kashmir. Under pressure, he eventually acceded to India despite the wishes of the state's Muslim majority population (Mir, 2014). Pakistan refused to recognize the accession because of the state's Muslim majority population. Therefore, after independence, Pakistan initiated the Indo-Pakistani War of 1947-48. Following further conflict, such as the Indo-Pakistani War of 1965 and the Bangladesh Liberation War of 1971, the ceasefire line of 1971 was established as the Line of Control through the Simla Agreement, dividing Indian administered and Pakistani administered Kashmir (Mir, 2014). However, neither country truly recognized this division and clashes such as the Kargil War of 1999 and smaller border skirmishes continued.

Prime Minister Modi, elected in 2014 and a member of the right wing, Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), has pursued an aggressive Kashmir strategy. One of the most recent clashes between both sides included the February 2019 Pulwama attack, classified as the deadliest militant attack on Indian forces in Kashmir since the insurgency against Indian rule since 1989 (Siyech, 2019). The Pakistani based Jaish-e-Mohammad group orchestrated the bomb attack, killing 40 Indian paramilitary police. In response, India launched airstrikes in Pakistani territory later that month (Siyech, 2019). Furthermore, one of Modi's most prominent foreign policy decisions was the abrogation of Article 370, revoking Kashmir's autonomous status. While the government justified this decision with the supposed advantages of national laws extending to Kashmir, their deployment of troops to the region, shutdown of the internet, and detention of political leaders suggests otherwise (Medha, 2019). Importantly, though these issues impact and are influenced by governments, these issues also impact and are influenced by Indian and Pakistani civilians. For this reason, it is of relevance to study their perceptions.

Literature Review

Before discussing the perceptions of civilians, it is pertinent to analyze the policy issues regarding the India-Pakistan conflict itself. The South Asian political climate is what ultimately led to the revocation of article 370. For one, The BJP had "long sought to revoke [Jammu and Kashmir's] special status" (Lalwani et al, 2020) Furthermore, closer US-Pakistan relations and "repeated US offers to mediate the Kashmir dispute" could have instilled fear of a shifting environment and caused India to act

on its political goals (Lalwani et al, 2020). Additionally, growing global nationalism provided ideal conditions for this politically aggressive move.

Predictably, this step, representing India's increasing offense towards Kashmir, was of heightened concern to Pakistan as it represents everything the country has long been weary about: an aggressive India (Dwivedi, 2008). Pakistan's foreign policy is centered around India and Kashmir, so this increasingly "aggressive" and militarized India is seen as a threat, exacerbating Pakistan's national security concerns (Dwivedi, 2008). Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan, cricketer turned politician and elected in 2018, condemned India for this move and called for the subject to be raised at the United Nations. Recognizing it would allow India to respond with force and risk its own already economically vulnerable position, Pakistan did not respond militarily. Afraid to jeopardize bilateral relationships, the abrogation of article 370 was not met with much international condemnation.

Moreover, India's policy around Kashmir even before the rise of the BJP party has been focused on counterinsurgency strategy (Lalwani et al, 2020). While these efforts were perceived to be successful, they did not halt violence, and actually appeared to increase militant recruitment (Lalwani et al, 2020). Centering India and Kashmir in its foreign policy like Dwivedi has argued, Pakistan continually supports terrorist groups through the creation of safe havens, hoping to curb India's influence in Afghanistan by augmenting the country's instability and promoting its own interests, a policy named "strategic depth" (Constantino, 2020). This policy reinforces the idea that Pakistan's actions almost always are motivated by its goals regarding India and Kashmir (Dwivedi, 2008).

While there is a large body of literature regarding the political analysis of the India-Pakistan conflict, it is also important to consider the viewpoints of Indian and Pakistani citizens. Cultural contexts, schooling being a part, plays a fundamental role in how people from both countries view current affairs. This is exhibited in how discussion on the 1947 India-Pakistan Partition is different in Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and British textbooks, each praising their nation's actions while criticizing others' positions (Chhabra, 2017). For example, the Pakistani textbook glorifies Muhammad Ali Jinnah, leader of the Muslim League, while the Indian textbook asserts that the League prevented the unification of India (Chhabra, 2017). These educational biases could have influenced the perceptions recorded by Aziz, asking Indian citizens about topics including the "Partition and the Two Nation Theory", "Pakistan's military capability", and "Indian self-image" (Aziz, 1982). Results exhibited that most Indians possessed neutral feelings towards the Pakistani people: not villainizing them, but not being overly understanding either. Similarly to Aziz, Tikekar analyzed perceptions through interviews while spending five months in Pakistan as an Indian. Although she states she "was received with warmth and cooperation", she also observed that many Pakistanis employed anti-Indian rhetoric and found that there was a "crisis of identity" among Pakistani people in deciding if they relate more to South Asian or West Asian Islamic

culture (Tikekar, 2002). Although her tone seems exaggerated, especially through her use of the word “culturally insecure,” this research is one representation of Pakistani perceptions on India.

Bannerji also studied perceptions through analyzing how press coverage of the “Indo-Pak People’s Conference” (1995) influenced the perspectives of Indian and Pakistani citizens. First, Bannerji discusses the Indian press, and how they focused on “hostile” Pakistani officials and political rhetoric, allowing readers to continue to believe that major anti-Indian sentiment exists among the people of Pakistan. Subsequently, Bannerji writes about the Pakistani press, which originally did not support Pakistani delegates attending the conference in India (Bannerji, 1995). He then discusses how the press did move from hostility towards “cautious optimism”, shown by writing criticizing both governments and unifying language (Bannerji, 1995). Bannerji’s work reinforces Aziz’s and Tikekar’s research because the perceptions they studied were shaped by the polarized media their participants consume.

Because only a minimal amount of research has been done to study the perceptions on the India-Pakistan conflict, more of an effort needs to be made in understanding the view of citizens. Are Indians and Pakistanis as divided as perceived? Furthermore, no work specific to Zurich, Switzerland has been published. Therefore, this paper will examine the perceptions of Pakistani immigrants in the Zurich canton on the India-Pakistan conflict. This research has been limited to Pakistanis to obtain a more detailed, focused analysis (Punch, 2014). Additionally, being a person of Indian heritage, the researcher is more exposed to the Indian perspective and therefore eager to understand the Pakistani one. Furthermore, research was limited to the Zurich canton not only for the purposes of convenience sampling, but because it is the most diverse canton in Switzerland in that it has the greatest number of foreign nationals (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2020). As opposed to in Pakistan, the Zurich canton is home to a wide range of nationalities, which could perhaps play a role in influencing Pakistani immigrants’ perceptions of the topic.

Moreover, it is of interest to understand how the perceptions of Pakistani immigrants might be different to the views of people living in the subcontinent, which were observed through the aforementioned works. The perspective of an immigrant is an important one because their identity has been influenced by two starkly different locations, cultures, and communities (Foner et al, 2018). A major shift like this one is likely to change one’s perceptions, therefore it is of value to understand this change as well as the specific circumstances that led to it. Despite much research being focused on how immigrants are viewed, there is some to show that immigrants are still connected to their home countries (Nguyen et al, 2017). Therefore, the question guiding the researcher’s work was: What are the perceptions of Pakistani immigrants in the Zurich canton on the India-Pakistan conflict?

Hypothesis

The researcher hypothesizes that Pakistani immigrants will favor Pakistan's government and policies when speaking about the India-Pakistan conflict. However, their views will not be as polarized as those who live in Pakistan. Though they will express neutrality towards Indians, similarly to how Indian individuals did in Aziz's study (1982), they will also have a certain amount of anxiety when discussing this topic due to its controversial nature.

Method

In order to answer the research question effectively, unstructured interviews were conducted with Pakistani immigrants living in the Zurich canton as a means of gathering qualitative data. An unstructured interview is a "non-standardised, open-ended, in-depth interview" and can be used "to explore people's interpretations and meanings of events and situations, and their symbolic and cultural significance" (Punch, 2014). As this study focuses on perceptions, unstructured interviews were ideal to obtain a clear understanding as they allowed for the personalization of each interview. This methodology was based on Raja Ehsan Aziz's "India Pakistan Relations: A Field Trip Report on Indian Perception", which studied Indian perceptions on the conflict. However, this research is different in that it has a smaller sample size and the questions asked were less focused on specific political events and more on general understanding, such as how one views Pakistan and what one would like to see happen in the South Asian subcontinent.

Contacts for interviews were made through Indian stores, several Pakistani-owned restaurants, a mosque, and the researcher's community network. Through the initial interviews, snowball sampling was used to expand, which is the technique of "using the social networks of one or two initial informants." (Silverman, 2013). There were eleven interviews conducted in total, with nine men and two women, spanning from thirty to fifty two years old. Furthermore, the number of years participants lived in Pakistan ranged from ten to thirty two years. Prior to each interview, consent was obtained from the participants, which informed them of their right to withdraw. Additionally, before asking the questions, it was established that the researcher is open to listening to all perspectives, and that interviewees should not hesitate in sharing their unfiltered beliefs. This was in effort to combat bias due to the researcher's background, which is further discussed in the limitations section.

Interview Questions

While the questions asked varied depending on the responses received and how interviewees led the discussion, the interview always began with the interviewee's views of Pakistan's state of affairs. This open ended question served as a starting point, from which follow up questions were asked. Further

interview questions are given in Appendix 3. While these questions provided a baseline for interviewing, they were modified by the researcher throughout each interview depending on responses in effort to gain an understanding of their perceptions. For example, follow up questions were asked to allow interviewees to open up about a specific topic they felt strongly about, or to encourage more specificity. This technique was used because with unstructured interviews, it is imperative for interviewees to direct the conversation (Punch, 2014). Questions were also modified based on a person's knowledge of the subject. For example, from the first two questions, the researcher was able to gauge how informed interviewees were about the India-Pakistan relationship. If they seemed to know little, more focus was placed on personal experience instead of their thoughts on specific events (questions 5 and 6). The general structure of each interview went from discussing the conflict as whole (1-6), to solutions (7-9), to influences on their perceptions (10). These modifications and additions can be seen in the interview transcripts (Appendices 5 - 15).

The length of the interviews ranged from 20 minutes to 1.5 hours, depending on how much the interviewee chose to elaborate. Four interviews were conducted in a mixture of Hindi and English. One was conducted in Hindi, English, and German. Using multiple languages in interviews was needed to overcome language barriers, and is not anomalous in qualitative research when operating internationally (Welch et al, 2006). Five were online through video chat and six were in person. Eleven interviews were conducted in total. All but one of the interviews was recorded because permission was not given. For this interview, the researcher took notes instead, which are shown in "Appendix 7. Individual 3 Interview Notes".

Thematic Analysis

The next step in the methodology was to perform a thematic analysis of the data obtained through interviews. A thematic analysis is a technique used to identify and analyze prominent themes found in data (Braun et al, 2006). In this case, a thematic analysis allowed for the development of themes in the participants responses, answering the research question. Transcription of the recorded interviewees was completed in sets of three or four in order to allow for a more focused analysis (Silverman, 2013). The notes taken during the unrecorded interview were typed. Each set was then analyzed and codified. This process was repeated three times. The codes were then sorted into five categories (Punch, 2014), which were then titled and therefore formed the themes of this study.

Findings

Table 1: Definition of Themes	
Theme	Definition
Distrust in Politics	Throughout interviews, individuals made clear their lack of trust in political systems. Codes included were corruption, political strategy, education, importance of democracy, blame on Pakistan, Dissatisfaction with Modi, Media polarization, and political use for other countries.
Pakistan on the Right Track	Individuals stated that politics in Pakistan are moving in the right direction because of a shift in governance. Codes included were Pakistan on the right track, Imran Khan, and dialogue.
Choice for Kashmir	All individuals stated there must be some degree of autonomy for Kashmir, whether that be through independence or a system for voting and self determination. Codes included were autonomy for Kashmir, sympathy towards Kashmir/Kashmiri people, self determination, and human rights
Collaboration	Individuals stated that India and Pakistan must work together and gave their views on what they want to see happen moving forward. Codes included were dialogue, people close/similar, open borders, international arbitration, increase interaction, hope and humanity.
Changing Perceptions	Individuals' perceptions on the India-Pakistan conflict have changed through moving abroad, meeting different people, observing Swiss systems, and democracy. Codes included were moving abroad, media polarization, meeting new people, increase interaction, influences of education, and Swiss systems

Table 2: A Summary of the Eleven Interviews		
Individual #	Summary of Interview	Themes Present
1	Politicians use the Indian and Pakistani people. Other countries also use India and Pakistan	Distrust in politics
	Believes Pakistan is on the right path due	Pakistan on the right track

	to new governance.	
	Believes Kashmir should be left alone by India and Pakistan	Choice for Kashmir
	Wants India and Pakistan to come together in the future and is against international arbitration as a means of finding a solution. Emphasizes how close the people of the two countries are.	Collaboration
	Realized that politicians are the problem, not the people.	Changing Perceptions
2	People are used by politicians due to a lack of education.	Distrust in politics
	Supports Imran Khan because of his education and willingness for dialogue. Sees this as a shift from past politics.	Pakistan on the right track
	States that Kashmir should be a separate country. They should naturally have a choice, but believes most want to be independent	Choice for Kashmir
	Believes in the importance of dialogue. In favor of international arbitration. Ideal situation in the future would be for there to be open borders.	Collaboration
	Perceptions on the India-Pakistan conflict since leaving Pakistan, does not want to fight anymore and is in favor of dialogue.	Changing perceptions
3	Expressed that other countries have an interest in the continuity of the conflict for the benefit of their weapon sales. Aggressive decisions are made by India and Pakistan to obtain votes.	Distrust in politics
	Supports Imran Khan because he is educated and because there have been improvements in corruption, economy, and education.	Pakistan on the right track
	In favor of self determination for Kashmir.	Choice for Kashmir
	India and Pakistan should become a bloc and work together. Wants there to be	Collaboration

	peace so they can spend money on poor people instead of fighting.	
	It's different coming to Switzerland and seeing people live in harmony. Back home everyone is fighting.	Changing perceptions
4	Expressed that true democracy will not be achieved until the electorate is well educated. Believes the political system in Pakistan is corrupt.	Distrust in politics
	Supports the prime minister, but that is very hard to improve in a system that is this corrupt.	Pakistan on the right track
	Supports self-determination for Kashmir. However, also discussed the political implications of this decision.	Choice for Kashmir
	International arbitration would not help the situation. Dialogue between India and Pakistan should continue. Discussed similarity of cultures.	Collaboration
	Believes that if he had continued living in Pakistan, he would be much more nationalistic due to the atmosphere.	Changing Perceptions
5	Politicians act differently to what they state	Distrust in politics
	Kashmir should have a choice in which country they want to join, or to be independent.	Choice for Kashmir
	India and Pakistan should work together, but politicians don't have their heart in it.	Collaboration
6	Expresses how both countries are stubborn. Need more maturity for diplomacy.	Distrust in politics
	Pakistan is going in the right direction due to a change in governance.	Pakistan on the right track
	Kashmir should have self determination, but recognized political barriers to this.	Choice for Kashmir
	International arbitration could work, but only under certain circumstances. India	Collaboration

	and Pakistan should continue working together. Emphasized similarities of Indians and Pakistanis. Pakistan should focus inward, on institution building and education.	
	Perceptions changed when moving abroad and meeting new people. In Pakistan, the atmosphere breeds negativity towards India.	Changing Perceptions
7	The largest motive for politicians is to get elected. Raise points to convince constituencies to vote for them. Distrust of the media.	Distrust in politics
	There have been major improvements in Pakistan. Support for Imran Khan.	Pakistan on the right track
	Kashmir should be left alone. Does not believe Kashmir existing as an independent country is a realistic view.	Choice for Kashmir
	International arbitration is only useful when India and Pakistan themselves have the will. Both should continue working together.	Collaboration
	Perceptions changed when met Indian people, realizing biases in the Pakistani educational system.	Changing Perceptions
8	Politics is bad for humanity. Strong disbelief in the media.	Distrust in politics
	Politics is going well in Pakistan. Relationships with other countries are also better.	Pakistan on the right track
	Kashmir should have a voting system. They should be independent but they don't have the resources.	Choice for Kashmir
	Does not know how useful talks between India and Pakistan are. The US will only mediate if it sees a benefit for itself.	Collaboration
	Democracy coming in Pakistan allowed views to change because they were not closed off to the world. In addition, moving abroad and meeting international	Changing Perceptions

	people caused more openness.	
9	Political parties working against Imran Khan. Distrust in the media.	Distrust in politics
	Pakistan is much better under Imran Khan's government. The economy is doing well.	Pakistan on the right track
	Kashmir should be independent. They should make their own decision. Demonstrated sympathy for the Kashmiri people.	Choice for Kashmir
	Supportive of dialogue. No international arbitration unless the United Nations is the mediator.	Collaboration
	Learned more when moved abroad. Could sympathize with the Kashmiris even more.	Changing Perceptions
10	There is instability in politics currently. Kashmir is a matter of political interest, everyone just wants to benefit. Politicians take aggressive steps around election time to garner more votes. The West has an interest in the continuation of the conflict.	Distrust in politics
	Kashmir should have the right to self determination.	Choice for Kashmir
	Pakistan had taken the first step, it is now India's turn. Against international arbitration. Ideal situation in the future would be for South Asia to have open borders.	Collaboration
	Perceptions changed through travelling to India with his boxing team. Relationships with Indian friends caused him to stop seeing India as the enemy.	Changing Perceptions
11	More education is needed for democracy to improve. With education, people will know not to misuse power and people will be less easily manipulated.	Distrust in politics
	Supportive of Imran Khan, unfavorable opinions of previous politicians. Development needs time, and with time	Pakistan on the right track

	he will be able to improve the country.	
	Ideally, Kashmir should have a choice, but expressed political barriers to this. If India agrees to give Kashmir independence, other groups will also want independence.	Choice for Kashmir
	India and Pakistan should continue working together. Not in favor of international arbitration if the mediator is the US, the United Nations should work. Or the mediator should be someone who knows the region. In the future, wants to see easy movement between India and Pakistan. Maybe not open borders, but peaceful living.	Collaboration
	Perceptions have changed since moving abroad because made Indian friends. The fear of the unknown goes away.	Changing Perceptions

Discussion

Recurring Theme 1: Distrust in Politics

All interviewees spoke about their distrust of South Asian politics, specifically regarding corruption. For example, individual 4 stated, “the trouble is that he [Imran Khan] has inherited a system that is inherently extremely corrupt. And so the biggest challenge that Pakistan has today is trying to deal with the corruption that we have that is taking over all aspects of the country.” Similarly to corruption, many feel that politicians are more focused on political strategy than taking actions for resolution or for the country’s betterment. For example, individual 8 stated, “[...] in politics, people lie. Politics is not right. I studied law. But otherwise, I don’t like politics. Because politics, very bad for humanity.” The sentiment that politicians can be manipulative was echoed multiple times. Several stated that people in Pakistan are vulnerable to this manipulation because of a lack of education, discussing how an increase in education would result in a healthier democracy as voters would be more informed.

Interviewees generally expressed dissatisfaction with Narendra Modi, the Indian Prime Minister. None of the interviewees met the removal of Article 370 with approval, except for interviewee 10, who viewed it more from a political rather than personal perspective, believing the autonomous status had allowed China to gain ground in the region. Individual 6 and 2 discussed how there has been a shift in India, with individual 6 stating that for most of the time he has been away from Pakistan, he has felt India is on the right track with its education and secular constitution. However, currently, “Pakistan has started

moving towards a better direction, and India the situation is going the other way”, with many Muslims being afraid to voice their opinions.

When speaking about the Pulwama attack, individuals 7, 8, 9, and 10 expressed distrust in its reporting. While individuals 7, 8, and 9 only vaguely alluded to this, individual 10 explicitly stated, “It was like planted, by the Indian government, or the establishment.” These responses reveal clear media biases in Pakistani news outlets, which are crucial to political strategy. Furthermore, media polarization fills the Indian and Pakistani people with hostility for one another, relating to Theme 5 “changing perceptions”, and how one’s opinions are more subject to change after exposure to independent news sources.

In addition to distrust of their own politicians, there was also the idea that other countries capitalize off of the India-Pakistan conflict. Like individual 10 stated, “Because they [the West] have an interest in our fights. In border instability. So they don’t want us to be stable and for peace to come. If there is peace, then there will be cooperation and engagement, and trade. So after that, we won’t need to migrate.” Therefore, it was put forth that the conflict and innocent people’s lives are being used for political gain.

Overall, all the individuals that were interviewed expressed a strong distrust, almost dislike of politics. There was the sentiment that they, as well as Indians and Kashmiris, are being manipulated.

Recurring Theme 2: Pakistan on the Right Track

A second emerging theme was the idea that Pakistan is on the right path in both its internal and foreign policies, which was communicated by nine individuals. More significantly, six out of these nine individuals explicitly stated that there has been a positive shift in Pakistani politics because of Imran Khan’s government, expressing dissatisfaction with previous politicians because of corruption. For example, individual 2 said, “But first time, I think [...], one party who makes something different, something better for human” after praising Imran Khan. This stands out to the researcher as individuals recognized that previous politicians were not beneficial to the country, implying that they were not speaking highly of Imran Khan simply due to nationalism. This was also echoed with regards to Khan’s policy agenda, with individual six stating, “I think Pakistan after a very long time is headed in the right direction” and citing how the priorities the “government has people centric, power decentric, healthcare centric, environment centric.” Multiple participants also stated that he understands the importance of dialogue in solving the India-Pakistan conflict, which was not fully grasped by previous politicians.

While most individuals praised the current state of Pakistan, there were two outliers: individuals 5 and 10. The specifics of their answers are exhibited in “Table 2: A Summary of the Eleven Interviews”.

Individual 5 repeated that he did not know much about politics, which could indicate a reason for his diverging response.

Overall, the most heavily held opinion was that Pakistan is moving on the right track because of a change in government, which focuses on improvement.

Recurring Theme 3: Choice for Kashmir

All eleven individuals asserted that Kashmir should have some degree of autonomy, if not independence. Individuals 1 and 7 expressed how Kashmir should just be left alone, stating, “And just to leave them alone, like we leave other states of our countries alone, to self govern” (Individual 7). Individuals 2, 3, and 9 explicitly stated that Kashmir should be independent. For example, although expressing that it should be the Kashmiri people's decision, individual 2 said, “My personal opinion that Kashmir make own separate country, not with India, not with Pakistan. And asking the Kashmir people what they want, I think, 99% they want like that. That is reality.” Individuals 4, 5 and 10 shared a similar sentiment, but instead of stating outright that Kashmir should be another country, that they should have the right to vote on what they want. While this sentiment was also expressed by individuals 6, 7, 8, and 11 they were different in that they were hesitant to vocalize it without recognizing political implications. For example, individual 6 stated, “Of course they should also be able to self determine. But that is also a very tricky one, because you know, do you say 51% of the population says go one way, then the 49% should also oblige?”

Interviewees also showed sympathy for the Kashmiri people. For example, individual 11 stated, “I think this in the modern world, to be doing it to a whole host of people, a region, which is being treated not good at all. It is very painful. Very, very painful. To hear how they [Kashmiris] are being treated.” Like in this excerpt, genuine concern for the Kashmiri people's rights was shown, which perhaps influenced their beliefs on Kashmir's autonomy.

Recurring Theme 4: Collaboration

Supporting collaboration, amongst Indians and Pakistanis as well as among politicians, was a prominent theme across all individuals' responses. All interviewees discussed the importance of dialogue and peace. For example, after praising Imran Khan, individual 2 stated, “Because we don't afford again one fight with India. [...] Why cannot they sit two countries together, and make a decision?”

When asked about international arbitration as a means of solving the issue, the responses from the individuals diverged the most. Individuals 1 and 10 were against the idea, seeing the conflict as a matter for only India and Pakistan to resolve. Individual 2 was the most in favor, stating, “If they go two brothers sit and make a solution, then that is fine, but now we need some country, who strong, who have respect

India, who have respect Pakistan, then between together. First, Kashmir. Second, India. Third, Pakistan. And fourth, America, or England, or maybe international movement.” Individuals 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 could see international arbitration being useful only under some circumstances. These circumstances are listed in “Table 2: A Summary of the Eleven Interviews”, in the boxes next to the “collaboration” theme (Column 3). While there were varying opinions when it came to this topic, one common thread observed is that all had some hesitation when it came to other countries being involved in the India-Pakistan Conflict, stemming from their distrust in politics (Theme 1), which is further amplified when it comes to international arbitration because of the past colonization of the subcontinent.

All but one of the interviewees asserted that India and Pakistan should continue working together. For example, individual 3 said that they should become a bloc, and individual 6 stated that “the door for diplomacy should never be closed”. Individual 8, when asked about the use of dialogue between India and Pakistan said, “Maybe they [negotiations] do [help], maybe not.” While this could be interpreted as the individual stating India and Pakistan should stop with dialogue, the researcher finds it more indicative of his distrust in the political system (Theme 1) when observed within the context of his interview, not necessarily that India and Pakistan should halt dialogue.

Two individuals, interviewees 2 and 10, also advocated for open borders between India and Pakistan, with individual 10 stating, “I think that until we make Asia, South Asia, like the Eurozone, border free, it won’t work.” Many others also advocated for increased interaction between Indians and Pakistanis as a means to reduce nationalism between the two countries. Because many feel as though politicians solely attempt to please their base (Theme 1) instead of taking steps to end the conflict, the interests of the base must change for the politicians to follow. The idea of increased interaction was especially emphasized by those stating how close or similar the people are in cultural practices. For example, individual 7 stated, “[...] the people are very close, because Indian and Pakistani people have similar languages, same language, same food, same culture, similar religions.” Living abroad, many have realized what Indians and Pakistanis still in South Asia might not, that, “All Indian people that I know, and I’m sure maybe 99 or maybe 100% of them want the same things. They want the same things any Pakistani wants, security, access to good food and water, the things we just talked about. So when you start understanding people from that perspective, you know the ‘other’ mentality, or boxing people into, or compartmentalizing people into the other boxes, is harder to do” (Individual 6). Therefore, stemming from their changing perceptions moving abroad (Theme 5), many want to see Indians and Pakistanis come together.

Recurring Theme 5: Changing Perceptions

The final theme observed was the changing perceptions of Pakistani immigrants on the India-Pakistan conflict. Out of the 11 interviews conducted, individuals 1-4 and 6-11 expressed that their views have changed since leaving Pakistan. Primarily, they have become less nationalistic. For example, individual 2 states, “I don’t want to fight one thing.” As individual 4 stated, the reasons for this change were leaving an environment plagued with polarized media, which portrayed India as the “enemy”. For example, individual 6 said, “ [...] I think it’s just the general atmosphere. Similarly in India, you turn on the news and it’s just India bashing or Pakistan bashing, and then we all had grandfathers or great grandfathers who had a very, very bad experience of the Partition.” However, when moving abroad, these sentiments change, “it comes from seeing the world, you know the more you travel the more you associate with people, it expands your mind, that’s why if India and Pakistan were to normalize their ties, I think within two years most of hostility would be gone.”

Besides participant 6, the explanation that their views have changed due to meeting Indian and other international people was shared by participants 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11. Out of these six, four participants emphasized that people needed to interact with each other in order for animosity between the two countries to lessen.

Biases in Pakistani and Indian textbooks also promote hostility, as they are overly biased towards and in favor of the country they were published in (Chhabra, 2017). This was communicated by individual 7, who stated that his perceptions began to change when he moved to Switzerland for schooling. As he talked to Indian people, he realized, “So both of our beliefs were totally opposite, so what we saw as the Partition, the reason for the Partition and the conflict, and the ‘48 war and the ‘68 war and the ‘71 war, was totally different to what she saw. It was the opposite.” While the other interviewees did not report such biases in their textbooks and individual 7 could be seen as an outlier, it is likely that biases are hard to identify if one did not have a realization of them like individual 7. Furthermore, some of the participants completed schooling in systems other than the Pakistani one. Thus, the idea of educational biases has relevance and cannot be eliminated.

Admiration for Swiss systems and comparison of them to political systems in the South Asian subcontinent was cited as a reason for changing perceptions by participants 2, 3, 7, 8, 9. For example, speaking about the Swiss government, individual 7 also stated, “So it’s not one president who’s all powerful, one prime minister, who’s all powerful, so the group of seven have their own focus on their expertise. Whether that’s finance or it’s interior, or the ministries that they manage. So it doesn’t give supreme power to anybody, which is crucial.” In reference to bordering countries, individual 8 explicitly said, “But when I came here, look at Europe, Switzerland has four, Italy, Austria, Germany, France. It has

four borders, and very good communication. Why can't we do that? So because of this, my mind was changed.”

Individual 5 was the only interviewee who stated his perceptions have not changed since leaving Pakistan, and is therefore classified as an outlier. The researcher suggests this is due to his lack of knowledge surrounding the India-Pakistan conflict, both before and after migrating to Switzerland.

Overall, when analyzing interviews, changing perceptions was undoubtedly a prominent theme, as individuals identified moving abroad, meeting new people, and observing Swiss systems as reasons for a change in their opinions on this topic.

Limitations

Before concluding, it is important to address possible limitations of this study, which acting as confounding variables, could skew results. First, the researcher's background could have led to potentially biased responses to the questions posed. Because of the researcher's Indian background, interviewees could have felt a hesitation in expressing their pro-Pakistani views. At the beginning of each interview, it was made clear that though the researcher is of Indian descent, she is willing to hear all perspectives as part of the research process. While the researcher does feel as though individuals generally felt comfortable speaking with her, especially because they have lived abroad for a number of years, it would be naive to not include the researcher's Indian background as a source of bias. Furthermore, as an 18-year-old Indian-American female who has never resided in South Asia, many individuals may view it as frivolous to have a discussion with the researcher, viewing her as an outsider. Although the researcher once again attempted to combat this by explaining the project in depth and communicating in Hindi, this part of the researcher's background could also be a source of bias.

Another limitation could be the interviewees' shared experiences. Due to the use of snowball sampling, many of the interviewees knew each other, which could lead to bias if questions were shared prior to interviews. Furthermore, the diversity of the sample could also be a limiting factor. While a range of socioeconomic backgrounds and ages were represented, the sample was not very diverse by gender. Out of the eleven interviewees, only two were women. Therefore, to obtain more balanced results, more women would need to be interviewed. Additionally, this study only employed a sample size of eleven individuals. Because there are 3000 Pakistani immigrants living in Zurich (Year Book, 2005), a larger sample size would be ideal in order to analyze results that are more representative of the entire population. Further, Pakistan itself is home to many different ethnic groups who could have diverging perspectives, an aspect this research does not take into account.

Finally, many of the interviews were conducted in Hindi, and one in German. Therefore, some of the responses could have been interpreted incorrectly by the researcher due to English being her first

language. Importantly, interview 3 was not able to be recorded, therefore some of the information could have been omitted from the researcher's notes and therefore not included in analysis.

Conclusion

The research question, "What are the perceptions of Pakistani immigrants in the Zurich canton on the India-Pakistan Conflict?" can be answered by the five developed themes: distrust in politics, Pakistan is on the right track, choice for Kashmir, collaboration, and changing perceptions. This research found that while there are significant commonalities in the ways in which the Zurich Pakistani community views issues, diverging opinions are present within each theme and were significantly shaped by participants' personal experiences.

While the researcher's hypothesis, formed in reference to Aziz's study (1982), was shown to be correct, it is far too vague to capture the nuanced results of this study. The interviewees did support Pakistan's policies, but many stated that they have not always done so in the past, and that their favorable view of the country is due to a shift in governance. Furthermore, individuals discussed how they believed Indians and Pakistanis to be culturally similar, hoping that hostility would end and the two populations would come together. This strong positive sentiment was not anticipated by the researcher, who hypothesized that the interviewees would be more neutral towards Indians. Finally, while participants did experience a little discomfort with the topic, it seems as though they opened up gradually as the interview progressed, to a greater degree than the researcher hypothesized.

This study has multiple implications for the role of civilians, especially immigrants, in politics. This study presents the idea that since leaving home, immigrants' perceptions have changed due to associating with groups of people they would not have interacted with in Pakistan. Because this interaction can lead to different political perceptions, this research opens up avenues for Non-Governmental Organizations to initiate projects bringing Indians and Pakistanis together, which if successfully change perceptions, could make a difference at the polls. Furthermore, this research suggests immigrants still have strong emotional ties to their home countries, perhaps opening up mechanisms for collaboration between political groups in the South Asian subcontinent and abroad. Moreover, further research should be conducted on different immigrant communities abroad, and how they can possibly play a role in reaching out to those back in their home countries. Such communication, driven by grassroots organizations, could lead to meaningful interaction between Indians and Pakistanis.

References

- Aziz, R. E. (1982). India Pakistan Relations: A Field Trip Report on Indian Perception. *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad*, 5(4), 45-55. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.com/stable/45181943>.
- Bannerji, S. (1995). Pakistan-India Relations: Changing Perceptions.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, 30(16), 859-861. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4402653>.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bundesamt für Statistik. (2020). Swiss Federal Office of Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home.html>.
- Chhabra, M. (2017). A human rights and history education model for teaching about historical events of mass violence: the 1947 British India Partition. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, 47(1-2), 149-162. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11125-018-9424-2>.
- Constantino, Z. (2020). The India-Pakistan Rivalry in Afghanistan. *US Institute of Peace*. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep24909>.
- Dwivedi, S. (2008). India as Dominant Security Concern to Pakistan. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 69(4), 889-896. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41856479>.
- Foner, N., Deaux, K., & Donato K. M. (2018). Introduction and Changing Identities. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 4(5), 1-25. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/rsf.2018.4.5.01>.
- Lalwani S. P. & Gayner, G. (2020). India’s Kashmir Conundrum: Before and After the Abrogation of Article 370. *US Institute of Peace*. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep25405>.
- Medha. (2019). The Revocation of Kashmir’s Autonomy: High-Risk Hindutva Politics at Play. *German Institute of Global and Area Studies*. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep24808>.

- Mir, M. (2014). India-Pakistan; the History of Unsolved Conflicts. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 19(4), 101-110. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol19-issue4/Version-2/O01942101110.pdf>.
- Nguyen, H. T. & Connelly, L. B. (2017). Out of sight but not out of mind: Home countries' macroeconomic volatilities and immigrants' mental health. *Health Economics*, 27(1), 189-208. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3532>.
- Punch, K. (2014). Introduction to Social Research: quantitative and qualitative approaches (ed. 3). London: SAGE.
- Silverman, David. (2013). Doing Qualitative Research (ed. 4). London; Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE.
- Siyech, M. (2019). The Pulwama Attack. *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses*, 11(4), 6-20. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26631532>.
- Tikekar, M. (2002). An Indian in Pakistan. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(17), 1593-1594. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4412036>.
- UNHCR. (2000). The State of The World's Refugees. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/3ebf9bab0.pdf>.
- Welch, W. & Piekkari, R. (2006). Crossing Language Boundaries: Qualitative Interviewing in International Business. *Mir: Management International Review*, 46(4), 417-437. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.com/stable/40836096>.
- Year Book 2004-2005*. (2005) Government of Pakistan Ministry of Labor, Manpower & Overseas Pakistanis. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20100524170403/http://www.opf.org.pk/download/annual/YEARBK.pdf>.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Institutional Review Board Form



Institutional Review Board Application for Approval of AP Research Project

Name	Ishika Gupta
Research Question	How does the expat Pakistani community in the greater Zurich area perceive Indian-Pakistani tensions?
Give a brief overview of your research. Include data collection and data analysis methods.	My research will involve interviewing Pakistani expats in the greater Zurich area on a variety of Indo-Pak issues. This could include the revocation of Article 370, Human Rights abuses in Kashmir, border clashes involving China, the role of the US in the Indian-Pakistani conflict, historical perspectives, and more. I also want to interview officials from the Indian and Pakistani embassies to understand their perceptions on the topic. I will then analyze my interview data through a thematic analysis for presentation into my final research paper.

	Yes	No
Does this research involve the collection of data that identifies individuals? (e.g. surveys that request names, interviews that include a student number)	X	
Will data identifiable by individuals be shared with anyone? (e.g. published articles, conference presentations, funding applications).		X
Are participants being offered incentives to take part in the research? (e.g. money, extra credit) If so please list them here:		X
Is participation in the research voluntary for the individuals?	X	
Will participants be fully informed of any benefits or risks? Please state how this will be done: There are no real benefits or risks to the group interview beyond the possible exposure to points of view the students had yet to consider, this will be explained in the consent form	X	
Will participants be videotaped during the research?		X

Will participants have their voices recorded during the research?	X	
Will participants' privacy and personal information be protected? If so, please state how: The research paper may quote interviewees however they will not be personally identified.	X	
Will participants be debriefed following the completion of the research?	X	
Will participants, prior to their involvement, indicate informed consent to participate by completing and signing a written form?	X	

Appendix 2. Consent Form

Please read this consent document carefully for participation in the interview.

Purpose of the interview: The purpose of this interview is to learn about the perceptions of Pakistani immigrants in Zurich on the India-Pakistan conflict.

What you will be asked to do:

In this interview you will be asked to respond to questions surrounding the topic for the purpose of collecting qualitative data. If you feel like you have something important to say or an idea you would like to share, you are more than welcome to do so as you may add a new dimension to the discussion.

Time Required: 30 minutes - 1 hour

Confidentiality: All responses are completely anonymous; no emails or names will be recorded. To protect confidentiality, the final paper will not contain information that will personally identify you. Should direct quotations be employed you will be referred to as Individual (A-G).

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. There is neither a reward nor penalty for choosing not to participate.

Agreement: If you wish to participate in this interview, please sign the form below. A signature will indicate agreement to participate and not share the content of the interview in any way.

Participant's Name: _____

Signature: _____ (Date) _____

The following information is solely for research purposes and will not be attached with your name in the final paper. Should the information be employed you will be referred to as Individual (A-G).

Sex: Male____ Female____

Age: _____ Years lived in Zurich: _____

Education Level: _____

Occupation: _____

Appendix 3. Baseline Interview Questions

1. What do you think of the current state of affairs in Pakistan? Is Pakistan pursuing an agenda of productivity?
2. What do you think about democracy in Pakistan and its role in the world? Is it where you want it to be?
3. Do you think the situation is more tense than it was, say five years ago? What do you think the reason for this is?
4. What do you think of the Kashmiri people?
5. What was your reaction to the revocation of Article 370, Kashmir's autonomous status?
6. What was your reaction to the 2019 Pulwama attack?
7. What do you want to see happen in the region?
8. Do you think India is a reliable partner for peace? Should Pakistan work with Narendra Modi or are we past that point?
9. Do you think further solutions need to be homegrown or is there room for arbitration?
10. How has your upbringing in Pakistan influenced your views on this topic? How have they changed since leaving?

Appendix 4. Interviewee Data

Table 3: Interviewee Data			
Individual #	Sex	Age	Years Lived in Switzerland
1	Female	33	25
2	Male	50	14
3	Male	50+	unknown
4	Male	52	18
5	Male	37	10
6	Male	41	11
7	Male	50+	34+
8	Male	46	21
9	Male	52	30
10	Male	30	10
11	Female	67	30

Appendix 5. Individual 1 Interview Transcription

What do you think about the current state of affairs in Pakistan? What is your reaction and how do you think the country is doing?

I think it's a bad politics. Because they want to I am the big one, or I am the good one. And they making the communication, they making it because actually the people love each other, the Indian and Pakistani people, but they're influenced by the politicians.

What do you think about democracy in Pakistan and Pakistan's role in the world?

I think Pakistan is on the right way because the leaders before, I didn't like them, the people are looking out for the country. He's looking for the country.

What do you think about Pakistan's relationships with different countries?

I think it's good because the last I can remember he also gave to Modi to make friendship. So he's trying to be. I think it's a good country. I haven't heard anything that it's going bad. I think it's a good sign that he's the Prime Minister of Pakistan. Before Imran Khan came, I read a lot in the news that this is happening, this is happening, like that. And since he is the Prime Minister, Imran Khan, the news is also better.

Do you think the situation is more tense than it was before or is it calmer?

I think it's calm, but the separation between Pakistan and India, I hope it'll be better, and calmer. But, as I said, it's a political game for both sides.

What do you think of Kashmir and the Kashmiri people?

I think India and Pakistan should leave the Kashmiri. If, like Bangladesh, if they separate from India and Pakistan, they will be like Afghanistan, and let them be as they are. Kashmir is part of Pakistan, it's a part of India, it's a part of Kashmir. Let them be and see what will happen when Kashmir will be on their own. No dependent on Pakistan, and not dependent on India.

So you think Kashmir should be left alone, not independent, but left alone?

Yes.

Did you hear about the revocation of Kashmir's autonomous status by Prime Minister Modi? What was your reaction?

No.

So basically Kashmir has this autonomous status, which I'm sure you know about, and that's in India's constitution through article 370. And it basically gives Kashmir some autonomy and some independence in deciding their own laws that are separate from India. But about a year ago, Prime Minister Modi revoked this status. Did you hear about this in the news and what was your reaction to that?

I didn't hear about this in the news. I'm not hearing too much news from India or Pakistan like that or any country, and also not news from Swiss, because it's better to talk to the people, and also emergency news is okay like with COVID.

What do you think about the Kashmiri people? Are they being treated fairly?

I think Kashmiri people say leave us alone. I know that from some Kashmiri colleagues. They say leave us alone, this is our country. Not from Pakistan, not from India. And I think the last I can remember, when the army attack Kashmir, I don't know if it was last year or earlier, many people died.

Was it the Pulwama attack?

Yes, I think it was that.

What was your reaction to that attack? Are you talking about when the Indian officers were killed in the bomb attack?

On one side they are saying Kashmir belongs to India, and the other side is saying kill them, you know. And that's they have double mind. Not one mind. It belongs to India, then it shows also save them, but also kill them, and that's sad. If you want to make freedom with other countries, you have to share love. Killing people don't win the heart of the people. Love can do anything.

Do you think the solutions, you say they should be rooted in love, do you think India and Pakistan should work together or are we past that point?

Yes. I think, because before Pakistan and India were separated, they were one country. And after the law, the American law, when the Americans go back, then Pakistan separated from India. And then when all Muslims came to Pakistan, and the Hindus and Sikhs went to India. They created the country. Also with the current situation, about the Sikhism, the people are fighting for their rights. And when we ask them together as India and Pakistan, no one can put them down. The other countries use India and Pakistan. Because they know the situation between India and Pakistan is not good. And other countries like America, they use this.

So you think any solutions need to come from India and Pakistan, the shouldn't come internationally.

They come internationally like, because the situation between India and Pakistan, they use the situation so they hate each other more and don't come together. That's the problem, that other countries using India and Pakistan.

So to eventually help the conflict, India and Pakistan need to work together.

Yes.

Because there's always talks about if the United States should help them negotiate, you think that would not be a good idea.

Yes.

As you were growing up, you went to school in Pakistan till you were 6 years old. So do you remember learning anything in school about the Partition or anything that would influence your views on this topic?

No, we didn't learn anything about that. My parents also don't talk too much about the situation, but yeah they told me that before they separated the country my parents had their house in India. In north India, in Punjab. There are so many people, also Muslim there. And my parents told me that they had house there. And I heard only that, not about the fighting or how it began.

India has been accusing Pakistan of backing the farmers protesting in India. What do you think about that claim and the protests in India in general?

I think that's the problem because the people also in India put everything on to Pakistan. Also from the farmer, but people know now, slowly, slowly people know that it's not Pakistan behind that. Because you can put the finger to other people but not put finger on herself. They put in the fault Pakistan. I think the farmers are doing great, they don't have anything to do with Pakistan. Because they're fighting for their rights, and every people have rights to fight for them.

What do you want to see happen in the region? In Pakistan, in Kashmir, what do you want to see happen in the future?

I hope in the future they will be together. Like brother sister, we are like brother sister, India Pakistan, Kashmir. In future I hope they will come together again, like many years ago.

Like become one country?

Yes. Because we are same people. Only religion is the different. We are the same, we understand the language, yeah. Why not?

Did you hear about the clashes with China? Because they are also coming in on Kashmir.

I don't know. I think other countries are using this situation. I think India and Pakistan should work together. Other countries don't have the rights to come between them.

You said you want India and Pakistan to work together more. Do you think Imran Khan is doing a good job of that, or do you want to see him do more?

I think when the plane crashed in Pakistan he did a good job. That was a great step. It shows he has done his first step. Now, it should come from Modi also, one step. Because you can't say, we are together you know, one step by step. And when other president there was, before Imran, I think they kill him. But I was surprised that Imran Khan saved him and said okay go back to your country, you don't have any problem from our side. That was a great step.

Do you think Modi is doing the same thing? Do you want to see him take more steps and what do you think about his policies in Kashmir?

I would like to say that he shows more, do more things. Also the people, I hear from my Indian friends, yeah Modi is not doing good things, but why you people voted him again? When he is doing again these things. Why you don't choose another Prime Minister. I hope he will understand and do some good things and not put everything to other countries, Kashmir or Pakistan or other countries because if you want that his country should be with him, he should spit love. Because if he spits love, then people will be with him. The current situation in India I don't think, the Sikhs now are fighting for their rights, because they know what he is doing. And that's why I'm telling even he spits love. He should change and spread love. Because it's not good for his country. India's also like my mother country, and if he's doing this, I start to think what's wrong with our country. I'm sitting here, what's wrong with our country. What's wrong? Because you want to hear nice things from your country. And when I hear bad things from India, its oh no, some good news you know. We are waiting for good news. It's like my mother country.

What do you think about the role of religion in the India-Pakistan conflict?

I think the problem is not the religion, problem is 'I want to be the strongest' you know. That's the main 'I am the strongest, I am bigger'. It's more political.

I think I've asked everything I wanted. Do you have anything else to add?

Actually before I thought for interview, I don't know how to answer this question because first of all my English, and I hope that in the future the country comes together. The people are actually loving each other, from India and Pakistan and that's great. When I live here, some Indian people, they're spreading love. And that's all great that they don't say 'oh you're Pakistani go away from us'. No, they're really very good people. Because we are sisters and brothers. Because I saw so many videos of people's reactions on YouTube, when a Pakistani goes to India what happens. First I was scared, then I thought no let's see what's happening, and then when I saw the videos I saw that the people are not the problem. The problem is the politics. It's all about politics.

Appendix 6. Individual 2 Interview Transcription

You've been here for 14 years now?

Yes

Since 2007. I've been running this shop for 5 years. Before I made my job at many places. I have three children, born here, and my wife is from Pakistan.

So did you come here to find work?

Yes. We came as immigrants, not for work, but because we had problems in Pakistan. Personal. We are a love marriage, you know there is cultural difference, they don't accept people, government accepts the law, India Pakistan I think different. People have stronger law, the political system is not good. Here we have been here since 2007 and I have had different places to make my job.

I wanted to make clear to you from the start that I am Indian, just because I know this issue can create tension. But, I am here because I am open to understanding and listening to all perspectives. So, please don't hesitate to be open.

I think for me, in my country, the intelligent people of both countries understand. I am 50 years old, I think education doesn't matter for India or Pakistan the same. But the uneducated people, they believe the lies. They don't look at reality. They believe the politicians. That's why they have different. There, in my experience, I've lived in Switzerland for 14 years, from everywhere they don't have a problem to live and work together. But why not there [India and Pakistan]? Because they are used by the politicians. Two, Three countries, Kashmir valley. My opinion like that. I'm not allowed to go to India. One time I go to embassy in India, they don't give me visa. They say why you want to go to India? Like Europe, the borders are open. India, Pakistan, very nice place, by the people don't interact. 60% people are without education.

Are you happy with how Pakistan is acting in the conflict right now? What do you think of Imran Khan?

He is very educated man. In my opinion he's the best for Pakistan, the best for India, the best for all world politicians. Because he wants to talk, he doesn't want to attack. Last year, he gave back the pilot from India. That means he doesn't want to fight. I don't wish to come more casualties from the people. Because I don't want to see again a fight between India and Pakistan. We are the same family. It doesn't matter if Hindu, Muslim, or Sikh. Because Pakistan and India everybody have. Not a different culture, not a different people. If India make intelligent, India is very strong economy, then he want to help neighbor, because you can change everywhere, but you cannot change neighbor. And Pakistan as well give handshake, I think we can make open border. People can go without visa and without permission to have work. Then they have potential economy and then make strong the people. Then the immigrant they don't go out of country. It's a big place and too many things to do. We also have 70 year ago not have a good politician. But first time, I think so, I am not politician, but I think so, one party who make something different, something better for human. This for me is right. It doesn't matter if one Hindu, Muslim. Sikh,

Christian, it's same. Humanity, not believed to, God is not person, God is one for all. And I think if Imran Khan, like 20 year again, then Pakistan don't have a problem.

So you want another person like Imran Khan.

Yeah. Because he vision very clearly, he make more poor people, he make education, he want to give construction. But now, is not impossible. Because poor people, poor countries, 40%, 30% people uneducated. My opinion, solution only, to educate the population. If know how to do my vote, then I can do. If I don't know, then how can I.

So you think there needs to be an increase in education.

Yes

Okay, so you also mentioned the 2019 Pulwama attack. What what your reaction to that? When you first heard about the pilot and everything?

I think he have a good decision to give back. Because he's not against Pakistan, he also make a duty. He must be go there. Because military regulation is very different. I think Imran Khan, I appreciate my prime minister. He makes a super decision, I'm happy with this decision. Because we don't afford again one fight with India. We don't want. And India also, if India like that, then we don't have a problem. Because 70, 73 year ago they had a problem with Kashmir. Why cannot they sit two countries together, and make decision? India also go back, Pakistan also go back. Kashmir makes Parliament, and then have one country more.

You think Kashmir should be another country?

Yes. Because I don't want they take Pakistan because this reason they have a fight together. If Kashmir go alone, they want to go. If they want to go with India, then they go with India. If they want to go with Pakistan, then they go with Pakistan. But in my opinion, they should go alone one country. Because small country, we have one city, like Swiss. But we don't have to live there. Because it's criminal, they don't have electric, they don't have bread. Poor people. Investment only for fight. I don't what that. I want to make sure the people live. We want to make bread for people. Together. We want both countries -- the people living, no one dying. Because with fight, nobody have a win. 20 year ago, America, strong country, big technology, they have a fight with Afghanistan. What to do? Only in table. Talk. Talk is best. Don't solution to any problem is fight. Have to talk together. We are brothers. I think so it's not reason to fight. The whole world is laughing when India and Pakistan make a fight. It's not a solution to fight, only talking.

For the solution, do you think we should only talk to each other, is there room for international arbitration? Do you think the US should help India or Pakistan, or only India and Pakistan?

I think the problem is between two countries, and we live in the world. If they go two brothers sits and make a solution, then that is fine, but now we need some country, who strong, who have respect India,

who have respect Pakistan, then between together talk. First, Kashmir. Second, India. Third, Pakistan. And fourth, America, or England, or maybe international movement. Because without international movement, we can't do that. Because 70, 73 year ago every time like that. Now, we have a solution only to make a decision Kashmiri people. They can say what they want. My personal opinion that Kashmir make own separate country, not with India, not with Pakistan. And asking the Kashmir people what they want, I think, 99% they want like that. That is reality. If you go one village, you can ask. Everybody will say, we don't want India, we don't want Pakistan, we want alone. I think between two big countries, to have a fight, and these people they won't live. Because this side, Pakistan make a fire, India make a fire, this is not solution. They sit in table, and then America or international community, they make solution for that.

You were saying how you think Kashmir should be its own country. Did you hear about a year ago, Prime Minister Modi revoked Kashmir's autonomous status. What was your reaction to that?

I think he not deserve to be Prime Minister. Sorry my opinion. I speak a little bit true. He don't deserve this job. Because he like Hitler, he like a sting. Politician not like that. India has many educated people, many, many intelligent people. Why they don't make another person, who make a good solution for this. Because that is not true, you have 80 thousand, 80 million, doesn't matter how many people. You want to cut electric, you want to cut internet, that is not true. That is not solution. If they don't accept ground reality. The Kashmir people don't want a lockdown, they don't want with India, they don't want with Pakistan. My opinion like that, and I think Modi have made a big mistake. For India, India have a loss economy. They have lost all world respect, because that is not humanity. Because we want to help people, we don't go against people. I don't against India. Because my father country. My father from Kashmir also. He immigrated to Pakistan in 1947. When I look back, what he says, that is tragedy, people die, many women, men, and children. Many, many people not together. 73 years ago, people family in separate places. It's not true. Fight is not a solution. Both countries go in international community, and I think, America, or London, or Europe also sit and talk. This is only solution to make decision. India go back, Pakistan go back, and they make one country alone.

You said your father immigrated to Pakistan from Kashmir in 1947. So with his family or did he get separated?

No with family, but this time my father was 10 years old. He come in Pakistan with family. All family die, and two sisters and my father. And then slowly, slowly survive. And he cannot want to say something this happens. When I ask sometime, he says no. I don't want my mind to go there this time. Because it's not a good time. It's a tragedy. And I think many people think lost family. I think many people lost family, from India and Pakistan. And I don't understand why they make decision for fight. I think now my opinion is only one solution, they have to talk with Kashmir, and they make free. India go back from Kashmir, because people don't want India. Pakistan also go back because they don't want Pakistan. The Kashmiri people want one separate country. And I think they deserve. Because enough is enough. It's like 100 year ago. They have many people die, many women. You are too small, like my child. I don't want to tell you who leave the people there, in Kashmir valley. Military. Like one million military from India. They cut electric, they take women out, and raped. And Indian army had to make many, many fight with Kashmir people. Also Indian army has loss there. For what they make fight? This is only one solution. It's a

politician. Political solution, you have to talk. I think Imran Khan make a good decision to not want to fight with India. Because he knows that both countries have atomic. If they make a fight, they not only disturbing in Asia, they come in Europe also. It's not solution to fight. You lose economically, you lose people. I think India and Pakistan have to sit and table and they have to talk. Only one solution.

India has often said that Pakistan harbors terrorists and that makes the conflict worse. What do you think of that?

No I think India has one lobby against Pakistan. India make sure to against Pakistan. They want to say everywhere that Pakistan has terrorists. Pakistan have 20 years ago, fight with a terrorist. And we have one border with Afghanistan. And then India have 25 military concern in Afghanistan. And there, they invest money, and make against Pakistan something. And that lobby, and India want to more everywhere they go against Pakistan. Pakistan don't have terrorists. Pakistan's innocent people. Because I go sometimes Karachi, Islamabad, Lahore, and we don't have anyone to do that. What I can say is how many people that have educated that don't against from India. Both countries have not many people, not all population educated. Non educated people, India also, India also has terrorist like RSS. Modi party. Big terrorist of the world. Not only with Pakistan. They are world terrorists. Not Pakistan have terror problem because Pakistan also fight with terror. We make sure to clean up. My country. And I think we are done. Because I think 26,000 kilometres border line with Afghanistan, we make sure one safeguard to anybody don't come inside, and I think Pakistan done this job. That is only propaganda from india, Pakistan have a terrorist. India don't allow to go into any country and make fight against terrorist. Country can do. Pakistan also have police, Pakistan also have military, why make India there. Because they are RSS, bigger terrorist in India. They make against, you look at videos, and history from Modi, he's local minister from Gujarat, he make 2000 people kill in Gujarat, when he local minister. And now India make him prime minister, then Indians have a loss. Because I think last two years, India economy, 90% India loss. Too many bank corrupt. Because only he make lockdown in Kashmir, and again, and again, why he make so decision, who don't accept the people. Now he against Punjab. The farmers. Any country, if they don't have farmers how can they eat? Where.. I don't understand why India make him Prime Minister. He don't deserve that. That job not for him. India have many intelligent people, and I appreciate India has big education, better than Pakistan, and many more, and rich people, but I don't understand why they make like that Prime Minister. We are 10 gram, India 1 kilo. We don't want to fight. But if the India go, scare me, then we have to back. Not like India and Pakistan not like same. India is big, big country, big military, and everything more than Pakistan, and Pakistan don't want fight. That's why Prime Minister Imran Khan has decided, if India want to talk, we can talk. But if the India come with gun, then we have to back. Then you know if I go your home and you are scared, then you can fight back not only I am allowed to fight with you. You also. Like that between both countries. I think India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, not look better Bangladesh, also like same. Politicians very very bad, we have first time, after the Pakistan, after 1947, we have first time, one Prime Minister educated Prime Minister we have select. And I am happy. I fully respect, Imran Khan is very nice person, and super people. Super education, and he knows what to do. I think if they want to talk India with Pakistan, then India decide any other person, not like the Modi, because he don't want to talk, because he don't know! He's like a farmer, like a tea seller, like me job! He deserve that job, what I do! He don't deserve Prime Minister. India is 1.4 population, is big country, is super economy, why, the India, make cars, make tractor, many, many things. But Pakistan not allow to buy. Why everytime like that? Because Imran Khan had opened Wagah border for the Sikh community

because the Sikh community have to go there for a temple, and Pakistan have to make sure for security, and everytime to come people without problem. Have to visit everytime. You can ask Canada, America, England, who people go there. We have cleaned up. Everywhere. Super. They don't have problem with security, don't have problem anywhere. Like same people. It don't matter from India or where. But India, make sure, first the Modi go away, anybody educated Prime Minister, and then we have to talk together. Modi don't understand. Modi take vote from this fight. If they don't against, he don't talk against Pakistan, then anyone can, he like child! Sometimes I'm scared. I say why India make a decision like that, he don't deserve. He cannot Prime Minister. One tea stall or kitchen work for him, not Prime Minister position. Because 1.4 billion people they want to do everything. India not a poor country, Pakistan not a poor country, one way together, and both working for the economy. Potential. We don't have hungry people. We have big money. We are not poor place. But we have corrupt politicians. They taken money. Before one or two months, he buy fighter plane from France, India. For what? We don't want. With who you want to fight? Pakistan don't want to fight with you. If you come extra, then Pakistan has to retaliate back. That is Pakistan true. Pakistan don't go anyway to fight with me. Because Pakistan already fights against terrorists, against Afghanistan. We have a partnership with America 20 years ago. We already have a fight with one border, we don't want to again. Pakistan have a loss. Many people, 60,000 people. India have involvement in Balochistan, India have involvement in Kashmir, India have involvement in Afghanistan. And India don't want to dialogue Kashmir between America. India don't want! Because India want they cannot dialogue, and then fight with Pakistan. And then, Indian population make sure, they change politicians, first thing is RSS completely terrorist organization. They have one special cloth, one special, I think two, three year ago, one big jail in Maharashtra, they have many people inside, who against Modi, he go die. That is not solution. If you make population, RSS murderer. They make 80 thousand young people in Kashmir. That is not true. I don't understand why the international community no response. Why they cannot ask India, because everywhere they have a business. India has big business with every country. But I think, slowly, slowly, the Modi make finish off. Because he is not deserving of this job. I can say. We have many friends from India. Sometimes customers and something like that. I speak with many people why you make decision like that. You have too many people educated, and good people. Why this person you have to give Prime Minister. He not deserve. Like India, not like Europe. Europe don't have any place to buy something. Farmers, and like that. But, India and Pakistan have more place for farming, for meat, for oil, for everything. But only solution they have to talk and make finish fight first. If they fight finish today, 10 year after, it's greenery and not a problem. Because rich countries, not poor countries, I think so.

Do you think the situation has become more tense because of Modi? Do you think it's more tense than it was before?

I think Manmohan Singh's time it's okay. Not a fight or not a too good relation. But India and between Pakistan, I think Modi's a terrorist and will finish India. Because he cannot done finish in Pakistan. Pakistan have 230 million population, and we are all arm. Not one person without. And Modi make a not true decision. He make a decision for a Kashmir, what he buy. He have a loss there. Second decision he make against farmers. Have a loss. Economy shut down. And India don't deserve this person quickly go away. Population make good decision, some people that will do better for India. Pakistan have super decision. I think Prime Minister Imran Khan absolutely right. He is educated, not corrupt, he's innocent. He don't want fight. I like him. And I think he have everywhere people like him. He have a good

relationship between America, between Europe, between Asian countries. Sri Lanka. We want to help neighbor. We don't want to fight with neighbor. That's not true. In my opinion, if I want to live, I give the right to another also live. Not die another and I live. Alone is not good. We can everything make a change, but not make neighbor change. We must accept my neighbor. It don't matter if they have some not good. We can speak together and make it good. If India goes to America to help me, and Pakistan goes to England to help me, I think that is not true. I think India go to Pakistan to help me, Pakistan goes to India to help me. Between both countries together, they make a decision, and then is. But I don't know how long we have to wait that. Because people don't want fight between India and Pakistan. They don't want. Only they want terrorist people. You know, you are not one child, you also understand. If I have 5 fingers, not same. Everywhere, they have good people, they have bad people. I think India have more education like Pakistan. Pakistan have more innocent people like India. Indian people who educated, they also scare. Pakistan, who people educated, they also scare. Because two countries, they both are atom. We don't deserve fight. We deserve border open, and economy. My opinion, India before, super. Before Modi. Modi only go away, RSS ban completely. India make decision to ban RSS, because they are terrorist. If the RSS ban, then India have to chance to come out and make a good decision for population. Without that, Modi and RSS in parliament, India don't go up. They go everytime down. Because Indian parliamentarian, all who make against Modi decision, he go away. But because Modi party is too strong, the mindset like Hitler. They don't want humanity, they want fight. And fight is not solution. Solution is talk. Between both countries, they can sit, and they can talk. And international community also make a decision for that. I think America and UN make a decision for that. Enough is enough. The both countries go back, army go back from Kashmir. And Kashmiri people, they make a decision what they want.

And do you think China should also be involved? Because they've been coming in..

No. China don't interest to make something bad. Because China have one things. He help for construction, for road, China make good decisions and help everywhere. China don't want to help anybody between both fighting. China have, Pakistan also, tell, and India also. But I think China don't interest to make something between...because China is not a person between Pakistan and India.

Because they've been coming into Kashmir, you know..

No, no, no...that we give permission, Pakistan gave permission to inside, we make in Balochistan, we make like an international port, and we give a place because Pakistan don't have the money to make that project. And China make that, and two, three years after China go back. Like a worker. Ladakh, India have a loss in Modi do not go away. Pakistan also. Because we don't have to fight with China. Between two countries, Pakistan and India, if they make fight, China take this place, without fight. They fighting, then China deserve that, without fight. My opinion like that. That's the reality. If the both countries, they talking about this solution, only talking, Kashmir free. Then they don't have fight between Pakistan and India. If Pakistan and India fighting, then China can take also, Kashmir. Because Kashmiri people want help, any people help him. I don't think so, but Kashmiri people, somebody, they thinking so, not Pakistan, not India, better China. China come in and take all. If we are fighting, then China will come. If I take credit for you, if my brother also take credit for you, you have to security some place. China want place, because China has big population. My opinion, they cannot fight, they can talk, and free Kashmir.

Kashmir want new country, finished. That is only solution. And China don't interest in come to take Kashmir. No, that's not true.

Do you think your education has influenced your opinions on this topic?

I think we can more make education. And I think, I hope, if this government, make a job, then after 10 years, we have all population, minimum educated. Not like fingerprint, like a signature. It's very important to do that. Because non educated people cannot survive again. Because now you have big technology all the world. You can make sure your country to go with world. Not go back 100 year ago. If you don't make good decision, your country and politician cannot give education, and then you have loss. My opinion so, that if 10 year after, Pakistan don't make universities, then we have loss. But 1.4 billion Pakistan have decide for university everywhere. Every city. Because we also population, we have to control population, because population big, everytime, and is not good for country. Population enough. You cannot make sure stop, but you have to control.

Since coming to Switzerland, do you think your views have changed? How?

Yes, yes. Of course. I don't want to fight one thing. There, politician system not good. Both countries, people only believe in politicians. And politicians make everything rubbish. And my mind is not changed in Switzerland, but I think to better. Because if I compare with my country, in Switzerland, we are too back. And there is everything is alright. Only expensive. But everything alright.

So you think seeing the Swiss political system has changed your views, or what..

No, I think my country the political system we have to change. We don't deserve many people in Parliament. I think maximum 10 people enough, not 10 thousand, because the poor country, don't deserve to pay much more money for politicians. And one thing I want to change system for school. Many things, system for school, system for health ministry, and system for politicians. This must be changed. Because if we adopt this system, I like this. This is super system. It's true democracy. In Pakistan, Asian countries, not only India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, but Sri Lanka, Iran, Turkey. Turkey more better. Sorry I have visit many countries, and I know much more history from countries. And I think England make a fight 200 year everywhere, and 1.4 they have take on the world. But they don't win, they have a loss again. Because the population, against population, what to do, is not good. If the people accept it, that is okay. I think we can adopt the taxes system, both countries, from Switzerland. All completely system for taxes, we want to adopt. We must adopt, without that, we cannot survive. If we want to come with foot to foot in Europe, then we have to adopt. Because we have a bogus system between education, between health, between taxes. This three and more much, we want politician change. We have corrupt politician. It's a big problem country, and also India. Because India more corrupt politician like Pakistan. And here, I think here if you have a salary 2000, you pay tax for 2000, if I have 10,000, you pay for 10,000. In Pakistan and India, they don't have taxes, the people live. Because here, not rich, not poor, we have middle standard. Pakistan and India don't have middle standard, rich and poor. We don't want to make more poor people. We can take from rich people and give poor people the help and then we have one standard middle. Middle population. And that means we can change politicians first, second health, third education, and much more. Like system from transport, like system from.. Because Pakistan and India the both countries

they don't want to line. Everybody say I am best. You can respect anybody, then you have to deserve respect. If I bad word to say India people, India people also tell me like that. I cannot do that. If I want my respect, I give respect anybody, and then I have deserve. If I don't give respect anybody, then they don't respect me. We can must be changed if we want to live. There, many things not true. If I have permission, I can tell you India some things.

Yeah of course

India has a big problem to cost. It's a big cost and a low cost. One raja sab, it's poor people not a raja sab. If we don't make a same, we have not a finished problem. And this problem, in Pakistan we don't have. If my Prime Minister go in mosque, he can stay in there, I can also with him stay there. We don't have, in Muslim, the Muslim people don't have caste difference. They are same. But India have a caste big problem. It's big Hindu, small Hindu, middle Hindu, it's Jains, its vegetarian, it's Sikh. I think 900 different castes. So many. And the people don't make to mix, cannot survive. Because this reason, for example, one girl from Hindu caste, she cannot go in Muslim. One Muslim cannot go in Hindu. It's not true. People, if you make same, then you have equality. Islam, Muslim, we make equal, we don't have different. That is big problem in India. Plus, who, I have many time tell you, big problem only education. If you make education, you have to win. If you cannot make education, you must educate people. India have 60% non educated people, they cannot write him name, don't understand, one village born, there die, they don't understand which city who he can survive. This country, we must have to help these people, and we can make, and Pakistan in Punjab we have one community, the educated youngest, they make a free study, for poor people. I think India can now also, the people the community, can much more help, and also government, and then after 20 year you can survive. How long, they don't have education complete. You look Romania, Bulgaria, Turkey, like Serbia, Croatia, these countries also Europe. But 98% or 55 much more educated people, like Azerbaijan, like Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Armenia, why Pakistan and India Bangladesh 60% people don't go to school. Then it's human rights. Why they don't make decision against the government. Human rights make a decision, and make sure they don't child allowed to work. Many, many children, like you, like my child, they have a work. And it's crime. It's crime! If we don't, if we are not stop that, we are loss. That is both. Not only India or Pakistan. They are both, India Pakistan Bangladesh. Three countries all same. Not different. India, much more people without house. Pakistan have also without house, but not like India. Because India have big population, India cannot make a stop population. India also work like that. Not work for by expensive plane from France and make a fight. We don't deserve that, we don't want. So my opinion like that. I think Indian people make sure, they first go away Modi, and RSS ban. Because RSS is terrorist organization. And then they make sure one educated person, who deserve this position, Modi don't deserve this position, Modi is killer. He have 2000 people in Gujarat. 2000. And nobody responds back. And today he is Prime Minister, what is this! People without mind. We have Nawaaz Sharif three time Prime Minister, we have caught him and jail. Because he make a corruption, and that's why we have to vote Prime Minister Imran Khan. India now give money against Imran Khan, to lose Imran. But if they want population, we also same population, we are also not better, but I think if Imran Khan 10 years in this position, we have much better like India. Not same. Because everyday, every month, every year, Pakistan going up. Only Imran Khan have super mind, and he make good decision, for country, for relationship with outside, with inside he make good decision.

Do you think that the news channels and the media make it all worse? Or how do you think they contribute?

Sorry?

Do you think that the news media, like the Indian news channels and the Pakistani news channels, do you think they make more people more scared of the situation? Or make people more angry, or how do you think they contribute?

I think both media also corrupt. Because if I make a decision, I don't want to many channel to have permission to news. I think both channels take money from outside, and they make news. And not true all. I think it's news channel, they make sure that everyday, one hour, to give education from people, not against India, or not against Pakistan. It's not lobby. They make sure the people together brother. If the media make a good presentation, then they both have to survive. But media in India, media have Modi channels, then they against Pakistan they talking, then Pakistan also against India talking, because they have money. All for money, all for business. I think, India make also stop this channel, and Pakistan make also stop. Better than, they make educated people, like a pampers, like a water, like a nature, like animals, like cooking. They make educated people. Not between news channels, what they saying? You cannot accept this. Because Indian channels lie, Pakistan also. I don't want too many channels make news. I think maybe little bit news it's okay. But not only fight. India can tell we have this industry, we need so many workers, they make like that work, they make education, not a fight education. That is theme they can change. Channel is okay, news channel. But not same theme. They make something better.

Well that's all the questions I had. So is there anything else you want to add?

No, thank you.

Thank you so so much that was so helpful.

And I can tell you, some word, my English is not too good. And I have my opinion to say. I don't have mindset against any people, because I don't know who is Modi. I look only news. But that I know, RSS, have much more allegation. Not I say, this says India. That I know. Modi make 2000 people kill in Gujarat. Why he come in Prime Minister stool? He don't deserve that position. That I can say. And India, we love India, I love Pakistan, India, Bangladesh. That is my place, my mother place, my father place. I don't forget. I want to help there. I want to change there. I want like here, there is everything okay. But for this, we have to much more study and much more education in population. When, the population understand, I make road, I make decision for this person, who make a good decision for my country. And one thing must be changed both countries, it's like new law. If government, parliament want new law, they have to ask population, not make decision in Parliament. Like here. For example, last week, he want to make new law, Burka verbot. They send paper every house. The people make decision, not parliament. Because if they take parliamentary decision, it's not true. It's not for population, only for blah, blah, blah, it's not like that. I think like you are youngster, we make today decision to do some, who come after they have better life. Not better fight. I don't want this fight, I want open border, the people together, they have a family, they have same culture, they have same eating, they have same religion, why to make

different places. I want minimum the border make open, you can give there ID, and you can go. Don't visa. Free. From India come in Pakistan, they have work. Pakistani people go in India, they have a work, they have many relatives, many friends, and much more. Not like a fight. And this way, first, we have to stop media against between both countries. If the media positive, then slowly, slowly the population going positive. If the media negative every time, then the population also negative. If the population negative every time, you have to survive. You cannot survive if negativity. If positive, then you have to survive.

Appendix 7. Individual 3 Interview Notes

Note: Permission was not given for the recording of the interview. Therefore, notes were taken instead.

This interview was conducted in a mixture of Hindi and English, however notes were taken in English.

1. What do you think of the current state of affairs in Pakistan? Is Pakistan pursuing an agenda of productivity?
 - Very good, Imran Khan is educated.
 - Improvements in corruption, economy, and education
2. What do you think about democracy in Pakistan and its role in the world? Is it where you want it to be?
 - Democracy is very important
3. Do you think the situation is more tense now than it was, say 5 years ago?
 - It should be good. Very bad right now. Right now politicians are not good.
4. What do you think of the Kashmiri people?
 - Kashmir should be its own country - they should be independent
5. What was your reaction to the revocation of Article 370, Kashmir's autonomous status?
 - Bad decision. Let Kashmiris determine their own fate. All problems in politics. Use these decisions to get votes.
6. What was your reaction to the 2019 Pulwama attack?
 - Modi wants control
7. What do you want to see happen in the region?
 - For there to be peace. Spend on poor people rather than fighting. Become a bloc and work together. Right now both are losing something. They should talk.
 - Other countries want us to fight, because who will buy the weapons otherwise? They don't care. Fighting for so long despite having a very similar culture.
 - There are so many poor people, but just want bombs. Frustration.

8. How has your upbringing in Pakistan influenced your views on this topic? How have they changed since leaving?

- Seeing that everyone here is living in harmony. Back home everyone is fighting.
- No educational biases.

Other:

- China is a big power and should be involved in talks.
- All just want to sell weapons.

Appendix 8. Individual 4 Interview Transcription

So just to start off, how many years have you lived in Zurich?

About eighteen years

And before that you were in Pakistan?

No, we lived in the UK, Germany. We left Pakistan in 97. We left Pakistan 24 years ago.

Did you leave for work I'm assuming?

Yes

What's your current occupation?

I'm retired.

What do you think of the current state of affairs in Pakistan and do you think Pakistan is pursuing an agenda of productivity?

I think we have a prime minister who is trying to do some good, the trouble is that he has inherited a system that is inherently extremely corrupt. And so the biggest challenge that Pakistan has today is trying to deal with the corruption that we have that is taking over all aspects of the country. I'm not terribly hopeful for it, I think what may help is the gradual emergence of a middle class, who are more educated, who have the ability to ask the right questions, and then who have some power at the polls. But as long as we still have a feudalistic society, which we have in Pakistan compared to India, I think the situation is going to stay difficult.

What do you think of Imran Khan and his rise to political power?

I think he's someone who is honest, I've known for some time personally, and he is honest as the day is long. So at least that's one good thing. He's trying to do the right sort of thing, the trouble is that one man alone will never achieve a lot in Pakistan when you have a whole system that is already compromised.

What do you think about democracy in Pakistan and then its role in the greater world?

Well in my opinion, it's difficult to have a true democracy without a decent level of education and rule of law. Given that, you know, if you look at even say the US, you could say this is the oldest, continuous democracy, but if you look the recent elections, look what happened with Trump, look at what happened when half the country rejected the results of a democratic election. Without a decent level of belief in the rule of law and education, true democracy is very difficult. The US is going to be paralyzed for a while. Similarly in Pakistan, without the rule of law, without an educated electorate, you can have so called one

person one vote elections, but those elections will be continued to be dominated by groups, such as the MQA, or by the feudal bot. So, I don't think we have true democracy in Pakistan.

Do you think the situation in India is more tense than it was, let's say 5 years ago, or how do you think that's escalated?

I think it comes and goes, the tension. It all depends on how much the politicians want to deflect from internal problems. So, it's probably tense now. It was tense 10 years ago, tense 20 years ago.

What do you think of the Kashmiri people?

I've never met them, I have no views on them, I haven't done much research, so I know very little about them. It's difficult for me to have a view. My only view is that if there is a conflict over it, then they should have the right of self determination, to see if they want to join India, join Pakistan, or be independent.

Did you hear about the 2019 Pulwama attack and what was your reaction to that?

No.

It was the Indian Parliamentary police that were killed by militants in Kashmir, and then people were saying that it was a Pakistani based terrorist group. And then there was also the situation with the pilot, and how Pakistan returned the pilot.

I don't know anything about the attack so I have difficulty commenting on it.

Did you hear about Modi's revocation of Article 370, which was Kashmir's autonomous status?

Yes, I did.

What did you think about that? What was your reaction when you first read that?

I think it was a move to appeal to his base. I'm not sure it was done in any way to attend to the problem in Kashmir. But, he's a populist, and he does things that will appeal to the populist base, and I think that's why he did it.

Do you think Imran Khan's reaction to that was what you would have wanted, or what do you think?

I don't know what Imran's reaction was, maybe you can enlighten me.

It was just, calling upon the UN, because there wasn't that much international outrage, you know, because everyone's trying to keep their allies. He called upon the UN because they don't want to get into a military conflict with India because that would be disastrous.

In my view it's a wise response. You don't want to get into a conflict situation, it's better to try and escalate it to an international body.

Do you think solutions for the India-Pakistan conflict should be homegrown, or do you think that there is room for international arbitration in negotiations?

I don't think they can be homegrown, because the positions are too deeply entrenched, and it's a matter now of national pride on both sides. And unfortunately I don't think international moderation will work because neither side will accept the results that went against them. So I think it's a non-resolvable matter.

Oh okay. So you think it can't be resolved. What do you think the next steps should be? What do you think would be a step in the right direction?

For me, it would be to let the Kashmiris have a free vote on what they want to do. Stay, go, or be independent. The trouble is that I don't think India will allow that to happen cause if the Kashmiris voted for independence there's a lot of other people in India, and other groups, who would want the same. So India can't afford a break up, can't afford to have Kashmir breaking away, because it could trigger other dominos in India. So I think this issue will unfortunately stay as it is.

And what do you think of the United Nations' role in the conflict? Do you think they can do anything more?

I don't think they will be able to have a role. I don't think India will accept it.

And then, what do you think about China's role? Because they've been coming into Kashmir, especially over the summer with Galwan valley. So what do you think of their role and do you think they should be involved in future negotiations?

I wasn't aware of that. You may have noted, I don't follow the situation all that well, you know. I grew up outside of Pakistan, and I went back for 10 years, and then I left again. So, I am not deeply into all the politics and all the issues around Pakistan. So do I think China should have a role? No, no. I don't think having one more country involved will make anything better.

And then you said that you lived outside of Pakistan? So were you born in Pakistan?

I was born there, and then I went to school, university in the UK.

So when did you move to the UK?

When I was 10 years old.

Do you still have family in Pakistan?

No, no

So you're not as connected with the political side.

No, not at all.

Do you remember learning anything about the Partition in school, that you think might have influenced your perceptions?

Not so much in school, I mean of course I've done some reading out of interest. So I'm aware of what happened, and why it happened. So, what do you want to ask about it?

I was reading research about different textbooks in India, Pakistan, the UK can be very biased towards their side. So I was wondering if you think anything like that has influenced your views. Because obviously you're very international, so I'm assuming you would be able to spot that now.

I haven't read any Pakistani textbooks on the Partition. But, you know, talking to friends and family in Pakistan, I think there's two views. The populist view is that it had to happen, Muslims had to have their own country, and therefore Partition was good. And during the Partition, Muslims were treated very badly. That's the sort of populist view. The view amongst the sort of more educated people, more well read people, the general consensus still is that partition was good, and I think that is reinforced by what has been happening for the past 10 years in India. Modi has been making statements that have been interpreted as negative for Muslims. That strengthened the belief in people that the Partition was good, Muslims needed their own land. But then again, the better read people feel that there were atrocities committed on both sides, and that it was a terrible time for everyone.

What do you think?

That's what I believe, that it was a terrible time for everyone.

And then what do you think about Modi? Do you think him being prime minister has made the situation more tense? What do you think of his relationship with Imran Khan?

Modi has made it worse in my view. He's like all the populists that got elected. It's like all the populists that got elected, Modi, Trump, Poland, Turkey. Wherever you have people that have simplistic solutions, believe the problems are caused by a certain group of people, and believe they can increase their popularity by fermenting hatred. So I'm not a fan of his.

So, just to clarify, you believe that Imran Khan has handled the situation well, and with a better leader in India, you think we can move forward?

I think if there was a more culminating leader in India, then Imran would be a good partner to lower tensions and increase friendship. The trouble is that Imran himself is hemmed in, he leads a more or less minority government. And again, Pakistan is as subject to populism as India is. So if Imran appears as though he is pandering to India, there will be a bunch of people waiting to condemn Imran. You've also

got the army that doesn't want to have any proof conditions with India, because the army wants to justify its budget because of the tension with India. If Pakistan and India became best friends, there is no need to spend 50% of our budget on the army. So between the army and between other populist groups, Imran does not have any room to maneuver. But, if there was a part on the other side, they could both take very small steps, incremental steps, to improve conditions to build trust. And this could become a virtuous circle. They can start with cricket diplomacy, for example.

You also talked about the budgets, and how they spend a lot of their budget on the military. So because of that, how do you think the people of India and Pakistan perceive this conflict?

The people of Pakistan have been like the MAGA crowd in America. They have been brainwashed into believing what they're told. And currently they're brainwashed into believing that India is the enemy, and that Kashmir is the right of Pakistan, and that we must never give up. And this is what's making it difficult. Therefore, it would be a process of slow, incremental movements that would take us somewhere. And you know, this has worsened, because of populism on both sides. When I was a kid in Pakistan, there was no real animosity towards Indians as such. There was political animosity because there were a couple of wars. But, Indians were very welcome in Pakistani society. And the other way around, when I visited India also, we share the same culture, the same food, the same background. So, there was, on a personal level, much less difficult relations between us. And now what's been caused by many years of increasing populism stirred up TV channels, by the internet is personal animosity. And what's made it worse, is a lack of contact. Both countries have made it very difficult to travel back and forth. And the less contact you have with someone, the more likely you are to believe that they are a bad person. If you look at areas of the US that are anti-immigrant, most anti-immigrant areas are the places that have the least amount of immigrants. So the more familiarity people have with immigrants, the more open they are, and therefore the more familiarity, the more familiarity Pakistanis and Indians have with each other, the more friendly they would become. And therefore we need in my view, incremental measures which help improve contacts between both sides. Open up sports, open up diplomacy, open up visits, open up shopping trips, open up tourism, get the people talking to each other and get them to understand they are brothers rather than enemies.

So you think on a personal level, the animosity has increased whereas on a political level it has not.

Yes, absolutely, caused by populism, TV, Pakistan has 50, 60 TV channels, and each of them try to reach an audience through extreme statements. The Internet is also a hub for populism. So, it's populism enhanced by social media, TV, that has increased up the antagonism.

So it's been exacerbated by the media. Because it is shown that in both countries the news channels are extremely biased. Do you think that has increased since you were little?

Yes, Absolutely.

Okay so the media polarization has increased. Also, for the war in 1965, do you remember your perceptions of it at the time? Or what your parents thought about it?

I was 7 years old at the time. I remember the war, bombs falling, sirens, and having to do blackouts and stuff. Maybe not bombs ---- But yes I remember the war, and my father preparing to be called up, because he had been in the army many years ago, he never was called up. But yes, I remember the time of the war, and I think that no one initially wanted the war. When it started of course, everyone immediately becomes patriotic at that time. So yes, there was an increase in patriotism at that time.

So you think that also increased polarization.

Yeah. I think 71 more than 65.

What were your parents' reactions to both of the wars? Because they lived in Pakistan for a longer time, must have a deeper connection to the politics.

I honestly don't remember discussing it with them, but my parents were what I call more enlightened people. And their whole attitude was that this whole thing between Pakistan and India should have never escalated into wars and fights.

And your father, how did he feel when he was preparing to be called up?

My father loved the military. He was in the British army. When my parents were born, they were Indian, they were born pre Partition, there was no India, no Pakistan. My father was born in the Punjab, the only army you could join at that time was the British army. And after Partition, by 52, he left the army. My mother's family came from Bombay and Karachi.

Do you think that has an impact on their perceptions or your perceptions in any way?

My mother's family was never really part of this big migration. They were a well off family, with bases both in Bombay and Karachi. Gradually, over the years, my grandfather moved the bulk of his business to Karachi. But they never had to get into trains and go through the terrible trains.

Do you think your perceptions have changed since you left Pakistan?

I was 10 years old, I had no perceptions. As long as I could go play cricket in the streets I was happy.

Did you see a difference in how your parents viewed their home? In how they viewed issues in Pakistan?

No. Their attitude was the same. My father's Punjabi, and the biggest change was that Punjab had to be partitioned because he had so much fun talking to his Sardar ji friends. My mother -- half her family were in Mumbai, half were in Pune. They were very international people, and didn't feel any animosity towards India.

Do you think the fact that you've lived in so many different places has influenced your political beliefs?

Yes absolutely. In fact, lived in Pakistan, and grown up in that society and being subject only to that media and that talk and that internet, I'd be probably a very different person. I'd be more nationalistic. I would be less friendly - believing India was in the wrong and Pakistan was in the right.

I'm sure you've heard about the farmer protests in India. So, a couple of weeks ago there was an article saying that the farmers were backed by Pakistan. What do you think of that?

Whenever anything bad happens, you just blame the other country. I don't know about India, but Pakistan just doesn't have the resources, the capabilities, the ability to organize something across the border in India.

Oh since you lived in the UK for a long time, what do you think their role in the conflict could be if any?

Too late. No. No one can have a role, Ishika. Because if someone says, let's say, whoever this independent party is, if they said Kashmir must be reunited and given to India, Pakistan will never accept it. And if they say Kashmir must be reunited and all of it goes to Pakistan, India will never accept it. And if they say Kashmir must be reunited and become fully independent, neither side will accept it. Mediation only works when the parties are willing to accept a decision. And I don't think they can. I don't think Modi can accept a decision where Kashmir goes away. And same for Imran.

Is there anything you would like to add?

No, I think you've picked a very interesting subject. And good luck to you in your work as you go forward.

Appendix 9. Individual 5 Interview Transcription

Note: This interview was conducted in a mixture of Hindi and English, however transcription was completed in English.

When you think about Pakistan and politics, what do you think of? What do you think of current affairs? About Imran Khan or in general?

I'm not that interested in politics. Sometimes when it comes in the news, one time, two times a month, I pay attention, but I don't really have the interest.

But, there is a little, so what do you think about when you think about Pakistan and politics?

I don't really understand politics. They say something, do something else.

So not much trust in them?

No, not a lot.

And what do you think of Imran Khan?

Until now Imran Khan hasn't really done anything. I went to Pakistan after a long time, I haven't seen that many changes. The changes come in the news sometimes, this happened, that happened, but I haven't really seen anything.

What do you think of the democratic system in Pakistan? Do you think Pakistan has democracy?

It's been over 10 years since I went to Pakistan. In this subject, I don't know much about what people will do, what they will not do. But we were just living with our own family, mother and father, peacefully, and we would follow their way. Democracy means that everyone is independent. According to Islamic traditions, whatever our parents or community say we would be independent to do it, and if a girl wants to get married to this person, and if her parents agree, she's free to do it.

Do you think the situation with India is more tense? Is there more conflict or less?

I don't know about the government. The people, in between India and Pakistan, it's not that bad. I have so many friends, never said a bad thing about India.

Do you think your view is similar to the people that live in Pakistan?

No, not really. It's not really similar.

And what do you think about Kashmir? The people who live in Kashmir, what do you think of them?

The government there, India's there, can't say because I've never been there, without having seen it, how the people are and what they do, sometimes I hear in the news. If India said this, Pakistan did that, if Pakistan did something, India did this.

Do you think Kashmir should be independent? Or it should be with India? Or it should be with Pakistan?

First they need to be asked what they want. If they want to be with India, then they go with India, if they want to be with Pakistan, then they go with Pakistan. If they want to be independent, then they should. Their choice.

Do you think India and Pakistan, do you think they should work together? How could this happen, in your opinion?

I think they should work together, the people also want to work together, but the politicians from both sides don't have their heart in it.

Why do you think their heart is not in it? Because the people have the heart..

Yes, the people have the heart, but the politicians are getting their food and getting their money by playing the politics.

Do you think the US, or England, or a European country should come in this conflict? And negotiate with India and Pakistan? Or India and Pakistan should talk alone?

Firstly both should sit relaxed together and work, but if not they should come, they should say.

So if the US wants to mediate then that would be fine?

No, no problem. If they have the right they should do it.

What do you think of Modi?

Not a lot. Only sometimes in the news I see that Modi spoke against Pakistan, then the Pakistan government spoke against India. The people that are interested in politics, they would know more about their leaders, I don't have much interest in politics.

Do you think that he is good for the India-Pakistan conflict? Is he doing well or badly?

I don't really have a view on this.

What do your parents think about this topic? When you were little, because they all lived in Pakistan.

When I was little I didn't know about these things. Politics. I didn't really hear anything, how India and Pakistan fought. Now when I'm older I've just heard it in the news.

Did you hear about the Pulwama attack, which was in February 2019, which involved a pilot, and a terrorist attack on military bases?

No, I didn't hear about this. I'm not that interested in watching the news.

When did you last hear the news?

Five, six months.

What did you listen to? Do you remember?

I don't remember much, Imran Khan is catching the thieves.

Do your relatives still live in Pakistan? What do they think about this? How are you different?

We don't have a TV in Pakistan. If someone has a TV, then they listen to news. No TV, what news can you listen to?

What do you think, do you want to improve something? What do you think, what improvements can Pakistan have? Education, or economy, corruption

Education

Why education?

If a person has education, then he knows the difference between good and bad.

And politically, there are a lot of tensions between India and Pakistan. But the people, Indians and Pakistanis, do you think there is tension between them?

I don't understand.

Modi and Imran Khan, there is a lot of tension between them. But the people, who live in India and Pakistan, do you think there is tension between them.

No, I don't think there is tension. The politicians make a fool out of us.

What do you think about China's role in the conflict?

I haven't heard about that.

Have your views changed since you came to Zurich from Pakistan?

The culture has changed, but the other, I don't really know.

So how has the culture change affected you?

I didn't feel that much.

Appendix 10. Individual 6 Interview Transcription

What do you think about the current state of affairs in Pakistan? Do you think they are pursuing an agenda of productivity, and what do you think of Imran Khan?

I think Pakistan after a very long time is headed in the right direction. Of course, it has got its own set of problems, but directionally I feel Pakistan is headed in the right direction. From a democracy perspective, they're evolving, they're a bit half pregnant at times with the army being too involved with local politics. But I think democracy has to evolve, and not just have shots or jabs of democracy, you have got to let it evolve. And the army there has sort of been tweaking with the politics for such a long time, you can't just snap a finger and they're out. And if they were out, that would be chaotic as well. So Pakistan is headed in the right direction, from an institution building perspective, it's trying to do the right things. Just overall, the themes, the priorities that the government has, people centric, power decentric, healthcare centric, environment centric, are all very promising. Let's see where it goes, but I do feel that after a very long time Pakistan is headed in the right direction.

What do you think has changed? Like you say after a very long time it's headed in the right direction, so what do you think facilitated that change?

I think number one, they had three or four terms of civilian government now, as it's got its goods and bads, but it's, that is the way to go, you can't have military dictatorships intervening every few years, or have that sort of uncertainty. Number two, I personally think. Imran Khan, with all his shortcomings, is from a priority perspective, headed on the right track. There is a huge amount of promise that he brings, and it's also his, he's trying to change to status quo, which is not easy, and all the hue and cry that we generally hear, is because he is threatening that status quo and people who are an admitted part of that nation or the institutions are fighting back, and it's not going to be an easy fight but he's still trying to change things. Also I think morally and ethically, you know it's becoming a much more tolerant nation, then what it perhaps was 20, 30 years ago. I think it's been through a lot of, it has had its share of troubles, and a lot of innocent people have died because of the war on terror, and the association Pakistan had with its border countries and the US. So you know no more fighting proxy wars is the absolute right thing to do, and I think one turning point was when there was the army public school, I think in Peshawar or somewhere, where 150 kids were like mowed down or literally just shot. And that was just not carnage, that was just extremely tragic. I think the nation then had to wake up and sort of stake stock of where it is headed, you know, there are turning points in a nation's history, and it was a turning point. People thought of all this sort of militancy, or fundamentalism differently, when it's too far away, you can look at it from an idealistic perspective. But when it comes very close to home, and when you see flesh and blood actually being lost, then people, the emotional impact is different. So I think that was a turning point.

You talked about the war on terror and the association Pakistan had with that whole situation. What do you think about the associations that were made with Pakistan during that time and how do you think that has influenced it today?

Well I mean it was the association that Pakistan had during the war on terror was something convenient to, and something which had maybe short term gains, to kind of, while the temperature was hot, on

Afghanistan and Al Qaeda and all that stuff, they, it was marriage of convenience with the US. I think at the same time, Pakistan has way too much, way too much intervention going on in Pakistan also. They look at it from, if you talk to the policy makers, they will talk from a geo-political perspective, but if you look at the humanitarian perspective, in Afghanistan, the Pakistani meddling has not helped. Maybe it would be worse if they hadn't been meddling around there, but it hasn't helped. So I think that nation needs to, Pakistan needs to at some point, are realizing now, that having influencing in that country comes at a price, and that price to Pakistan was a lot of militancy inside the country and a lot of weaponry that was not easy to control. And having sympathy with certain elements, fringe elements, who are extremists, if it's not tackled head on, what we've seen has happened.

What do you think about Pakistan's greater role in the world?

My personal view is that it needs to focus on the welfare of its own people before thinking outside. Pakistan needs to focus on the welfare of its own people and its own development before it starts looking out. And that's my personal view. The less people in the world talk about Pakistan the better. They just need to do their own thing and we don't need a pat on the shoulder or a hug from the neighbor, just focus on the betterment of your own people, try and keep good relationships in the region, and I don't see any reason why Pakistan does not have all the ingredients to be successful nation.

How do you think that feeds into the conflict with India?

I mean that conflict with India, historically is the Kashmir issue. As long as people keep the Kashmir issue burning or relevant, both nations will sacrifice a lot, in terms of human lives or resource allocation, the amount of resources that are going towards defense or weaponry, or building up military institutions is just tremendous, on both sides. And who can afford it more? I can't really answer that question. I've traveled in India many times to see that the poverty in that country is also profound. Can that country afford it? I feel it cannot. And if you look at Pakistan, the other side, I've not seen that level of poverty in Pakistan anywhere but from a macro perspective, it's maybe a poorer country than India. As long as the Kashmir issue is alive and people keep relevant, then Pakistan's geopolitical sort of policy all revolves around the Kashmir issue. Is it the beacon of the Islamic world and does it have to be the flag bearer of protecting Islam around the world, I mean you can do those things if first your own house is in order. So I feel that you need to get your own house in order first.

And do you think the conflict with India including Kashmir and everything, do you think that's more tense now than it has been before, or do you think that it's just ongoing?

Hard to say. I think the dynamics have changed because Modi is more of a strongman leader, and before whatever militancy was happening, you can call it militancy or freedom movements, or whatever you want to call them, which I'm sure has some backing of Pakistan as well, I'm sure of it. Does that change because Modi takes a different style and he is a strongman leader, he's trying to be, just the way he's done with China, he's taking a more aggressive approach to dealing with those things there. I feel the ground realities haven't changed. I mean yes, you may have, the temperature may keep going up and down, but the ground reality hasn't changed, you know, Kashmir is still a disputed area, and it's not disputed I feel because it's Pakistan or India, Pakistan says it's disputed, or someone else says it's disputed, I think it's

disputed, historically, I don't know all the history, so I refrain from making very black and white statements here, but you know there's a lot of, why does India need to have a million armed forces in the region? There is, at least from what I have read, independent organizations, when they talk about human rights violations, and other rights violations, the local population does have a distrust towards the Indian government, now how can that sentiment be validated, I mean could they have sort of a referendum of some sort, which says you know we want to go this way or that way, but that will never be allowed, the independence that they were promised, whatever that article was in India, that's also been taken away. So, it's a tough one. I don't know what the resolution for that would be. But it will stay relevant as long as the armed forces want to stay relevant in both countries. Because all conflicts can be resolved, yeah, that's my view.

You talked about Modi, do you think he's escalated the situation, what do you think of his role?

Like I said, he's taking more of an aggressive approach whatever he thinks is the Kashmir issue. I don't feel it changes the ground reality. If we take the assumption that the local population wants independence, or wants to go another way, and not be a part of India, that sentiment isn't going to go away if you have more hardline approaches. So these are, you can strongarm people against their will, but you don't change the actual dynamics or sentiments that the people have. So one day it's Modi, someday it might be somebody else, but the way I see it personally, right now, it's India's problem. Let them figure it out. I always say to my friends and family, and my personal position is, that the 7, 8 million people in Kashmir have taken, I don't know, what, 220 million people in Pakistan hostage. I mean, I don't know, 30, 40 percent of the budget or maybe more of Pakistan goes toward the armed forces. There is so much poverty in that country also so you need to build institutions, how are you going to do that when you allocate so much resource to this particular conflict. I have no problem with having militaries and armed forces for defense purposes, and just the way Switzerland doesn't have any threats but it keeps its armed forces and it's well trained as a deterrence, absolutely no problem there, every nation should have that. But I feel as though the Kashmir is holding about 200 million people hostage, and it's deterrent to Pakistan growing, because at the end of the day, compared to India it's a very small nation, compared to India maybe a tenth of its size or a fifth of its size whatever, and if it wants to be an integral part of the world economy, through exports or attracting foreign investments, building a platform of stability and trust so that people can come and do business there, or exports can happen. As long as they keep fighting with India, India will keep maligning the country, and it will be harder and harder and harder to improve the perception of the rest of the world about the country itself. So yeah, I feel that both countries need to sit down and figure that out, but I don't see a way out to be honest. Not the way things are. If you let the education increase, at the same time, I think under Modi, India has started going... for as long as I've been away from Pakistan I've felt India was on the right track. It has its set of problems, I mean if I start counting those, I probably couldn't count those, but you know India placed a lot of value on its education, its quality of education has been very good, I feel India was always been, since it has a secular constitution I believe, it was very secular, I could go around Mumbai, in Pune, in Goa whatever and I saw all sorts of faiths, people living there for hundreds of years maybe, living with each other peacefully by in large, when I was in Pakistan, they were still fighting over Shia-Sunni issues and other sects like that. I feel as though Pakistan has started moving towards a better direction, and India the situation is going the other way I know a lot of Indian Muslims who are, when they voice their opinions, A they feel as though they cannot voice their opinions as vocally as they could do in the past, and number two they are very afraid of

the direction the country is going in. And you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out the way the news the media is being manipulated there, these are all, it's almost sort of what's happening in places like Poland, or Brazil, wherever people have strongarm leaders. And you know it's the nation's Psyche, when you start moving toward and deriving your power not through achievement, but division, that's when your country starts going the wrong direction. In Pakistan they were doing that for a very long time, Shia versus Sunni, Punjabi versus Sindhi, all sorts of these things, but there I feel they have taken a different turn, maybe they'll fall off the track, but at this particular juncture, I feel India wrong direction, morally perhaps as a country, if not otherwise.

How do you think this increased division has impacted the India-Pakistan conflict? Is the population more vulnerable to that aggressive stance because of increased divisions?

Look, both countries are stubborn. If you look at world history, but you also look at lesser developed nations many many times, I'm not talking just purely on population but also individuals, the ability to agree to disagree, that element, there is an immaturity in people. I mean you're here in Switzerland, wherever else you grew up, or if you grew up in the West whatever. If two people have differences, they might not stop talking, they might just say, okay, we disagree, life moves on. In these countries, sometimes, even at the individual level, they become very emotionally involved in these discussions, and then they take very embedded positions, and they will never move away for them. I think what's happened now is that, India's taken a strong position, good for them, now Pakistan's also taken a strong position now, Imran Khan is, forget the army now, if you look at his life, he is a very stubborn person. When Imran Khan says I'm going in this direction, the whole world can change the whole world can change but he will keep going in that direction. And it's the same thing with his politics, people wrote him off for 20 years, people used to laugh at him all the time, and so I think with Imran Khan they're dealing with a different creature. Now that we have Corona I hope both governments focus on people's welfare and developing those institutions that allow for the poverty levels to improve. But right now the environment or the temperature is hot, and both sides are not going to give in. Whenever one sees a vacuum, one is going to go in. Maybe Corona from a geopolitical perspective is not a bad thing because people are more focused on Corona eradication, more focused on the important things instead of those issues. But I don't think a resolution is happening on this anytime soon. My personal view, if you ask me in a nutshell, is that Pakistan says, we got our own problems, we'll take our stance and say, okay, we have a moral obligation towards the Kashmiris, because the formula by which the Partition happened, they rightfully belong here, they can have a principal stand, and you keep talking about it, but allocate more resources towards institution building, focus on education, focus on job creation, focus on development, focus on GDP growth, all the things which are important for the country to develop. And once you have a better standing in the world, meaning you have a lot more influence, then your diplomatic muscle is a lot more also. Because it's either diplomacy, or you let it be, or it's going to be another war, or some conflict again. And that should be the last thing for everybody. So that's my view, that Pakistan should focus on its own people.

And before you talked a little about the revocation of the article, 370, that revoked Kashmir's autonomous status, what was your reaction to that, when you heard about the situation?

Honestly I didn't even know that there was an article that gave them some autonomy. And that's a political move, does it change anything from a Pakistani perspective, probably not, if anything, it reinforces people's view that India was never serious about giving them any autonomy. It was always their intention to sort of bring into their fold, and not respect any promises that they made them. Honestly, it's an internal India issue, does it change anything from a Pakistani perspective, no. I don't think so.

Because Imran Khan did obviously commend it

Which they have to, as a government whose foreign policy depends on the Kashmir issue, they've got to keep saying these things, and erase the human cry. Which Imran Khan will continue doing, because if he has now said, or if he believes that this is an issue that needs to be relevant, he will keep it a relevant issue. He will go to every platform that he is given and talk about this issue, so make no mistake, that he will say, other priorities, other priorities, other priorities. The angle that I was offering is my personal angle, that I don't think that it should make any difference.

Did you also hear about the Pulwama attack in 2019? What was your reaction to that?

Yes of course. The default Pakistani position is that it's just a reaction to all of the atrocities that may be happening on the local population, because of so many armed forces being in the region. Being in a very policed environment, could have there been Pakistani involvement in that attack, I mean of course, no one can rule it out. Of course, anytime any innocent civilian dies, that's the tragic part. However, when it comes to military attacking military personnel, military institutions, who are, and it could be on both sides, Pakistan has a similar issue in the travel areas, and our military is over there against the people's wishes perhaps. When they are fighting the Pakistani military over there, they are fighting what they consider to be an enemy. Right or wrong that's not for me to judge. So, whenever military institutions are attacked that's a conflict between the population and the military. If the same attack had happened on civilians, I would condemn it a lot, even these people who worked in the armed forces, at the individual level thought they were there for peacekeeping purposes, and they died. It's an extremely tragic thing, because every human life matters. At the end of the day it is human cost, every human life is of paramount importance, just go ask their families and that's why this conflict just cannot go on forever. I mean there's a human cost, an economic cost, the economic cost then translates into a human cost at times, so absolutely. And the Kashmiris should have their rights. And if there are other people who may be oppressed, they should also have the right to speak up, they should have the right to free speech, they should have the right to protest, to criticize the government. If they want to have a peaceful pro independence movement, then there should not be obstacles in the way. Peacefully. If they pick up arms, then you start going on a dangerous path. Because one man's militant is the other person's freedom fighter. There's a very fine line, and it depends on who you talk to.

Going off of the human cost in Kashmir, what do you think of their role, like not the politicians, but just like ordinary people, and how do you feel about them being yanked in two different directions?

It's hugely important for them. They're unfortunately on the chess board as the pawns, and not the kingmakers, or not the influential people. I honestly don't know, to what degree do they have the autonomy to live their lives and do their thing, to what degree is there intervention from whichever party.

I am unaware of those ground realities. I think we're in this day and age, land and territory is of lesser importance than human capital. Whereas in the past, territorial gains were linked with economic gains, because you got more population, you got more natural resources perhaps. That's no longer the case, both countries should focus on human capital and economic development, and keep their deterrents in terms of having armed forces to protect the countries.

A lot of the other people I interviewed said that they want self determination for the Kashmiri people, in that they should decide whether they want to go to India or Pakistan or be independent, do you think that's a viable solution, or do you think we're past that point?

Of course, they should also be able to self determine. But that is also a very tricky one, because you know, do you say 51% of the population says go one way, then the 49% should also oblige? I mean you saw what happened with the referendum in the UK with Brexit, Scottish referendum, how justly are these referendums even done? Plus any sovereign nation will hardly ever allow it. I don't recall in the recent past, any such self determination referendums happening anywhere in the world, i just haven't seen it. But yes, as an idea, that is the right idea.

Moving forward, do you think India is a reliable partner for peace in Pakistan currently, or are we part that point, do you think Imran Khan and Modi should try and work together or at this point is it kind of fruitless?

The door for diplomacy should never be closed. Of course, there's a huge amount of distrust, if you just look at the Palestinian, Israeli conflict also, it's been going on for God knows how long. But you know people will never find a solution unless they talk to each other. And it's good for India and Pakistan, maybe better for Pakistan because it's smaller, it's got a smaller economy, and it's diverting more percentage of its resources towards things to do with defense and spending on armed forces. But for both parties, I think it's imperative, it needs to be resolved, or one party needs to take a step back and like I was saying, I'm just repeating myself, diplomacy also requires a certain level of maturity, and it also requires a certain amount of guts. Somebody has to take some very unpopular steps in order for peace to happen, not everybody will get everything. If you remember Rabin, the guy who, the Israeli Prime Minister, who struck the peace accord with the PLO leader, Yasser Arafat, I mean Rabin was murdered, he was assassinated, after doing what was a very admirable thing that he did. But it was at the same time very unpopular in certain elements. So yes, over the course of the years, I don't know how it would happen, both countries need to water down, lower the temperature, slowly, slowly, slowly, and keep talking and keep talking, and it may not seem possible today, but there's always a solution.

Do you think in negotiations, in developing the solution, that there is room for international arbitration in that? Perhaps from the US, UK, or European union, or do you think those solutions need to be purely homegrown.

I don't have a strong view on it to be honest. But, the question is what would the US or any other party bring to the table. If you have a moral higher ground, or if you are in a position of strength, or a lot of strength, you can literally bend arms, those are two ways you can sort of bring parties to the table. But in the case of the US, or the UK, or whoever else, there's a huge amount of mistrust. And the things they've

been doing around the world, you know, what qualifies them to actually sort of be the arbitrators for these types of negotiations. It will always be in Pakistan's benefit to bring these to the table, it just gives them their viewpoint more credibility, perhaps, maybe the United Nations would be the right place to go and have these debates in the open. But somebody, somewhere will have to make some very tough decisions in order for things to improve, on both sides.

And what do you think of China's role, do you think they should be involved?

Look they have their own views, on what they consider their own territory, and I don't know the history, and I wouldn't, I don't really have a view. I don't know. I would slot in China in the same place as the US, UK, and any other country you named, I mean at the end of the day all these people can come in and try to influence the process. But, for example if it's two people, and let's say it's maybe a marriage, and it's headed towards a divorce or whatever, and they're having differences, the realization to make things better has to come from within, it cannot be your mother in law, your father who says this and that, I mean you'll listen to these people, but the realization has to come from within. Until that realization comes, I don't see how things are going to get better. The world has its own sets of problems to deal with right now, we've got a pandemic, this thing is going to last forever, or for years to come, the impact of this. People yes, they can talk diplomacy, diplomacy, diplomacy, but the US has a very erratic track record, the UK even more so because of its past. The United Nations perhaps would be the only institution, but that too is not a true democracy, it's got a few permanent members, who got veto power, so it's never a full democratic decision making institution anyway. So I would slot China in the same place. However it's unfortunate that it often takes a big bang for people to talk. My personal view is that the West can claim all the moral superiority these days, rightly so in many ways, but let's forget the US for a second, if you talk about Europe, if you talk about 60, 70 years ago, all European were at war from time beginning. What, it took 60, 70 million people to die in World War 2 for people to realize that you know now we need to live peacefully? Unfortunately for that part of the world 60 million people have never died, I hope it never happens. So sometimes there is an enormous amount of sacrifice before people realize what should be done. With the immaturity of the leadership on both sides, and the fact that they've got access to such destructive weaponry, they better realize themselves sooner rather than later that they need to talk peace and come up with a resolution. Or one side backs down and says, you know we can't afford it, let it me, we need to focus on our own problems.

How much schooling did you do in Pakistan?

Till high school, A levels.

Do you think your schooling in Pakistan has influenced your views on this topic?

I don't think it's schooling per say, I think it's just the general atmosphere. Similarly in India, you turn on the news and it's just India bashing or Pakistan bashing, and then we all had grandfathers or great grandfathers who had a very, very bad experience of the Partition. So some of those sentiments came down to the first, second generation. So, my question always now that I ask, I wish my grandparents were alive, so I could ask them, why you were part of the same area as people in India, my grandparents migrated from Amritsar, so the same people you live with and the generations before lived them, why do

you have so much hostility towards them? That is the question to ask. Because A, you were neighbors, centuries, and the next day you're different countries, so you think of the other country through a certain lens. How, what happened back then? Why such divisions? On both sides. Of course there was a lot of loss of human life, because of the migration, but then the other question is that, why did that also happen? Why such extreme actions? Why did millions of people die because of that Partition? What motivated people to kill these other people? They may be different things, but I personally think it's the emotional maturity at times. To be able to go and pick up a knife and pick up a gun whenever you have a small disagreement or argument. And those emotions need to mature overtime, either through education or becoming more knowledgeable about the world, or whatever things frustrate you need to be watered down a little bit.

Did you also experience that hostility that you were talking about when you lived in Pakistan, when you were growing up? Or did you diverge from your parents or grandparents?

No, no, when I was growing up in Pakistan I mean I shared the same very, very partisan views on India. And my friends that are still there, they would not agree with 90% of the things I just said.

So your views really started changing after you left?

Look, when people, when it's just the other, and you've never met people from that side, then it's easy to point fingers and you know make judgments. But when you start mingling with people from India, when you start actually getting more of an independent, start forming more of an independent view, instead of the mainstream view that some of the media on both sides offer, you start forming a different view I think. It has to come from tolerance. It also comes from seeing the world, you know the more you travel the more you associate with people, it expands your mind, that's why if India and Pakistan were to normalize their ties, I think within two years most of hostility would be gone, if you ask me. Because the nature of the two countries, or the peoples, is such that if the bandwagon of nationalism and the anti-Pakistan bandwagon or the anti-India bandwagon isn't just banging all the time, I think if the nations were able to truly find peace, within two years of very quickly the sentiments that people hold inside of them will change drastically. If you are living in Pakistan right now, growing up, as a teenager, you could be 50, 60 years old or 80 years old, or 10 years old. Your sentiment towards India is extremely negative. Extremely negative. When I look at the other side, up until, 10, 20 years ago, that maybe the sentiment wasn't as extreme. I felt that there was less anti-Pakistanism than anti-Indianism on the other side. I felt, like when I talked to people. And I think it's because of the secular nature of the country, over the years people have lived together and learned to be tolerant, learned to accept differences between different types of religions or backgrounds. I can't really say that anymore, I feel the temperature is different now, I feel they're maybe both as partisan towards each other, if India not being more, now under Modi.

Do you think the hostility is more towards the politicians, or the people, or both?

I think it's just the other, when you have zero interaction, 99.99 percent of the Indian population, 99.99 percent of the population, will never meet a Pakistani or Indian. Only the people outside will mingle, were fortunate enough to travel outside will mingle with a person from the other nation. So for them, it's just the other. I don't think they make a distinction between the army, the politicians, the people. For them it's

just the other. When they go abroad, when they start meeting people from India, you'll hear things like 'Yeah, but he's a nice Indian', you know as if the rest of the country is not nice. So whenever you create that hostility about the other, the other is just the other, people don't start thinking 'Oh I'm going to segment the population based on these criteria, it's just the other.

And for you that really started shifting when you went abroad?

Yeah it took me many years for sure, and it's not just that I met more people from India, that wasn't really the fact. But it's just you meet people from all over the world, and I do travel a lot for my work as well. Because the other issue at times is that a lot of people from our part of the world end up going to the UK, the US, English speaking countries. Each of those countries works in a different way. I mean America has had a great success story, and it works in a certain way, and people start thinking that this model is the model that needs to work in their country. Which is very, very unfair and it cannot happen, so what I'm trying to say is that you're a product of your surroundings and the people you associate with, and your circumstances, so the best education is when you travel the world. You meet people from all over the world, you start understanding that there are different ways to do the same thing. Not one size fits all formula applies everywhere, no one template can be applied everywhere. Every country is different, people are different, traditions are different, culture is different, religions are different, thought processes are different. Nevertheless, the huge majority of the world all want the same thing. They want good for their family, they want security, they want healthcare, they want to provide for their family, they want a roof over their head, you know what they are. They want to have hope for the next generation, so on and so forth. And when somebody starts realizing that me versus somebody else, we might have differences in culture, language, we might not be able to communicate with each other, whatever our differences are, which are healthy differences, otherwise the world would be very boring, but what he wants or what I want are the same things, and we need to respect them. All Indian people that I know, and I'm sure maybe 99 or maybe 100% of them want the same things. They want the same things any Pakistani wants, security, access to good food and water, the things we just talked about. So when you start understanding people from that perspective, you know the 'other' mentality, or boxing people into, or compartmentalizing people into the other boxes, is harder to do.

Appendix 11. Individual 7 Interview Transcription

What do you think the current state of affairs in Pakistan is and do you think they are pursuing an agenda of productivity?

Yes they are. They have a very good government there, who are fighting corruption, they are concentrating on productivity, concentrating on increasing manufacturing industry, creating jobs, increasing jobs. And they are very pro business.

So you think there's been an improvement in the current state of affairs in Pakistan then in the past. Personally yes, I think there has been major improvement, and it interacts a lot with the population. They want to improve thing in general, they've introduced agricultural schemes, they've introduced housing schemes, you know for the general masses. They want to improve the standard of living for everyone. They are pro business I would say.

And what do you think of Imran Khan?

So Imran Khan I think is a very straight person, he's been a very philanthropic person, in the past, after playing cricket of course, when you're a sportsman you understand team spirit, you understand comradery. And cricket is always a fair game, that's why people say when you play cricket you're a fair person. So I think cricket must have taught him a lot of things. And then he was already a celebrity when he became the captain of the cricket team, when he won the world cup, and when he got married to Jemina, he was already a big personality. And of course he went to Oxford, so he's been used to the high life and so being Prime Minister didn't dazzle him too much. And I think he's a sincere person, he works hard at his job, and wants to improve the quality of life and he's not corrupt.

And what do you think about the democratic system, and then comparing that to the world, where do you think Pakistan stands more broadly?

So I think, look, it's taken a long time for Pakistan to gain democracy in a proper way, but the last three governments were elected on a democratic system. So the last 15 years the process has worked really well. With proper elections, with all the people who were elected finishing their terms in office. And if the public did not like the incumbent they would outvote him. The last 15 years we had three different governments, three different parties that won the elections. And the process is working. And overtime, it just takes time to improve, but it will improve.

What do you think about Pakistan's role in the world? Where do you think they should stand and where do you think they should go from here?

So Pakistan is a very large country. I think it's the sixth or seventh largest country in population. It's got a very young population, and it should play a much bigger role in the world than it is playing today. Right now I think the role is quite small compared to what it can offer. It's a rich country, there's a lot of agriculture, land, minerals, they're improving the infrastructure now. So I think it's going to be getting more and more important as time goes on.

Then talking about the conflict with India, do you think that situation is more tense than it was say five years ago? How do you think has escalated, or stayed the same, what are your perceptions on that?

So I Think the situation hasn't improved. I'm not sure whether it has worsened or not, but it has definitely not improved. In my opinion, the conflict is totally senseless. It is very old, I mean the partition happened now 70 plus years ago both the countries live side by side. There's no reason for conflict, I think the people get along with each other quite well, they play sports together, they've traded together. Like you and me are talking, we don't feel anything. Like I told you, I go to India every year, I've great friends, and they come to Pakistan also, a lot of my friends came to my son's wedding. In Dubai I think about 100 of them came. So you know the people are the same, the languages are common, there's no reason for conflict. It's all just created for political reasons.

So if it's all just created for political reasons do you feel a sense of resentment towards politicians in both India or Pakistan?

I think politicians around the world have a lot of different motives and for them to get elected is number one motive. So they do use platforms and they do bring up issues, especially conflicts to be able to raise their points through which they can convince their constituencies to vote for them. If there's no conflict, there's no issue, then who's going to talk to the politicians. So a lot of the conflicts are created intentionally, a lot of the real issues are ignored, and the superfluous issues are created. I'm not a big fan of politicians.

Moving on to Kashmir, what do you think of the Kashmiri people's role in the conflict?

I think the Kashmiris got the raw end of the stick, since this Partition has happened, and they've suffered the most. I don't know if it's possible for them to have a state of their own, because there are many other political issues that arise from that. But I think it would be good to let them have some kind of autonomy, by which they have a certain level of self rule, like they had before. And just to leave them alone, like we leave other states of our countries alone, to self govern and autonomy. So I think they should be left alone. Kashmiris have had a very hard time since the Partition.

Politically, do you think Pakistan needs to focus more on Kashmir, or do you think they should focus on their own issues, and the same goes for India.

I think India and Pakistan should both resolve the Kashmir issue, it's something that can be resolved if they're sincere, if they come on the table, if the intention is to resolve it. I think they should basically resolve the issue, it's been too long.

What was your reaction to the 2019 Pulwama attack?

Which attack sorry?

The Pulwama attack in February of 2019.

I don't remember, can you remind me?

It was an attack on Indian military bases from what was assumed to be driven by a Pakistani state sponsored terrorist group and then in response India launched airstrikes, and then Pakistan had captured a pilot which was then returned.

Ahh okay. So that disrupted my birthday, actually. So I was very unhappy about all of that action, because it disrupted my birthday. I was having my 60th birthday in Abu Dhabi, I was having some friends come over and due to the airstrikes, there was no airstrike, or what airstrike I don't know, I don't believe in a lot of fake news around from everywhere, so we don't really know what is the truth, what's not the truth. But I know one thing that the airspace was closed during that time, and I had friends who were about to take off from Emirates airline to come to celebrate my birthday with me. And some family members, about 8, 10 of them who were stuck on the aircraft, couldn't come. So that was not so much fun for me, I was very upset about it. But again it's unnecessary, all these conflicts. It's just created by people

You said that you think that there is a lot of fake news circulating around. Do you think that a part of how the Pulwama attack was reported was influenced by fake news?

Definitely. Of course. Look, when I go to India, the Indian news media is always, they're kind of obsessed with Pakistan. And you hear anti Pakistan rhetoric all the time in India, all the time, on every news, and all of it can't be true. It's possible, in Pakistan there must be anti-rhetoric going on. Most of these news are baseless, and they're fake, they're just there to create sensation, and hatred amongst their own people. And that's how politicians are able to get votes and to rule. Again, forget these two countries, lot of countries where there is conflict, there's fake news all the time. And I know you are smart enough now, also, sometimes, look at the fake news that comes on the vaccines, and Fauci, and Microsoft, all these conspiracy theories, that they were being injected with chips in the vaccine's early days. You must have heard all those, right? And even today you hear so much fake news on what kinds of reactions will happen, people get genetically dismembered. So fake news is everywhere, especially with these Whatsapp messages going across the world, you don't know what is real, what is fake, unless you really read a lot and use your mind. I think you young people are much more aware of these things. When I talk to my kids, they know what is fake, because their mind logically thinks, quite clearly. So fake news is everywhere.

Then moving on, did you hear about the revocation of Article 370 from India's constitution? What was your reaction?

What I know is that there was a deal made with the Kashmiri people in 1947, and this article goes against that deal. It's not my position to agree or disagree, it's just the breaking of a deal. If I make a deal with you I must honor it always. I cannot unilaterally break a deal. So I think the Kashmiri people should be allowed what was agreed at the time of the Partition. Whatever was agreed, it should be honored. Whether it was a good deal or a bad deal that's not for me to judge. I'm just saying that it was a deal that was made, and deals should be honored. If I make a deal with you, if it's a good or a bad deal, it's a deal, right?

What do you think of Modi, the Indian Prime Minister?

Oh that's a tough one. I don't think that he's as open and as neutral as the previous prime ministers of India have been. I think he has very strong views, which are less friendly to certain types of people or certain castes of people. So, I feel the previous prime ministers of India have been more secular. I think other leaders of India have been more secular, and have a higher tolerance of, now I don't know if it's his personal issue or not, but I think India's become less secular, or less tolerant as a society than it was say two or three years ago, five years ago. This is what I'm getting from the people I know in India, that's the feedback. I've not been to India for the last couple years so I don't know directly, but this is the feedback I'm getting from Indians themselves, who live in India.

How do you think that lesser degree of tolerance has influenced his policies towards the India-Pakistan issue?

I'm sure it has affected his policies, to the detriment of peace, I guess. Because when you have a view, which is less secular, you take a side which is more hard, a hardliner side rather than a flexible side.

Do you think Imran Khan is best prepared to work with Modi? Or do you think there needs to be a change in leadership, on either side, for them to truly work together?

I think Imran Khan is a peaceful guy, and he'd be willing to work with anybody who has a long term prospect of peace, which is good for both the nations. Because there's so much senseless expenditure and wastage in building up armies and weapons, which are useless, they get obsolete after a while. They keep on buying stuff. Both countries have very, very poor people, who live below the poverty line and that money was used to help support employment and food, and health and school, and education programs and to support humanity in general.

So you think there needs to be a shift, in that they should focus on internal affairs rather than continuing this conflict?

I think there should just be peace now, and that they should concentrate on improving the standard of living of their people. That should be the number one priority.

Then, going back to Kashmir, you were talking about how there needs to be peace. There have been increased rates of militancy in Kashmir. What is your view on that?

So, if you were a Kashmiri people, whatever that article was revoked, how would you feel about it. Would you be peaceful about it? Or would you like to protest and say, look, I'm not happy about this. So I think, that's where your answer is.

Do you think we're past the point of the two countries working together? Do you think negotiations are fruitless or do you think there is value in continuing them?

No, we're nowhere past that point, nobody ever is. So, there's never a point when you can't return back and sit on the table and agree to be friends. Look you saw World War 2, you saw the biggest enemies in Europe and Germany and Italy and France and UK, and then they came back and made the European Union. And millions of people lost lives, but they put that behind them, because the intent was to have peace. So once you have an intent that you want to have peace, especially the people are very close, because Indian and Pakistani people have similar languages, same language, same food, same culture, similar religions. They're even closer than the European Union people are. Culturally, ethically, genetically. So I think it won't be impossible, as long as the leadership decides 'yes we want peace'. They can do it. If they want to do it. I think the people want peace, they don't want war, no sane person in this world wants war.

Then, do you think in developing solutions, in negotiations, is there room for international arbitration in that? Or should all solutions be solely homegrown?

Well if people are not willing to listen to each other, then international arbitration doesn't help. But if people are willing to sit down and solve their issues themselves, then I think that's the key. But international arbitration can work as a country that can moderate between the two, and bring some reason between the two, so yes international arbitration definitely helps.

So do you think it could help if the US was a mediator or some European country.

I would say if it were a European country, it should be like Norway or Sweden, who are known to be, you know Scandinavian countries have very peaceful history, they've known to be good mediators, countries like that would come up and get involved, and it would happen. If there's a will on both sides.

Do you think there is a will on both sides?

At the moment I don't think there is a will on both sides, but that would be necessary to have an arbitrator to succeed.

At what point do we go past the point of homegrown and shift to international arbitration?

Once there's a will. I don't think it makes sense before that. And I think the will needs to be eventually driven by the people.

You said you wanted to see peace in the region. A lot of the other people I interviewed had a clear view, like 'Kashmir should have self determination' or 'they should vote whether they want to join India or Pakistan. Do you have such a clear view? Or do you think negotiations should lead to peace but are unsure on how that would happen?

I don't think it's a realistic view that Kashmir can exist as an independent country. I don't think that's realistic. And if they have a status that they had before, and being part of India, being part of Pakistan, what they had before, I think that is more of a possibility. It depends on what expectations are possible

and what are not. I mean ideal situations are there, but normally to achieve an ideal situation it's not practical or not possible, because there's a lot of history behind. So to roll back a lock 70 years is not easy.

So what do you think the most practical way forward is?

I think to have peace, and then to have Kashmir have whatever their agreement was. So roll back at least the last two, three years and leave them alone.

How large of a role do you think religion plays in the conflict?

I think religion plays no real role. I think it's projected to play a role, a very important role, but in reality it plays no role. That's my opinion.

You lived in Pakistan for 16 years. So how did that atmosphere, living in Pakistan, how did that influence your perceptions of the conflict? Like your schooling, parents, friends..

So I went after 16, I went to school in Geneva, College du Lemman International School, and so my best friends were people from Bombay. I had a very close friend, and she was very smart, especially in the subject of political science. And when we discussed the India-Pakistan Conflict, I was shocked to know that she had a total opposite view to what I knew. So the histories were written differently. So when I read my history as I grew up in Pakistan, I read the Pakistan side of the story, and she grew up in India, and she read the Indian side of the story, so she used to fight on what she had learnt all her life, and I used to fight with her on a debate, I'm talking about a school debate, on what I had learned. So both of our beliefs were totally opposite, so what we saw as the Partition, the reason for the Partition and the conflict, and the '48 war and the '68 war, and the '71 war, was totally different to what she saw. It was the opposite. So then if you have this kind of knowledge and thinking, which is totally different, it becomes difficult for the people to then understand the other's view, and I think that's also the issue. So people have to close the past, okay there was a conflict, whatever it was, doesn't matter whose fault it is. We now need to go forward and fix it.

So what was the greatest difference? Like what was one example of a difference?

One would be who started the war, who won the war, what was the reason for the war. Stuff like that. They're written differently, right. So the Pakistan side would say India started the war, and Pakistan won the war, and India would say Pakistan started the war, and India won the war. So those are basic stuff, right, so all my life I've heard this part, that my books when I grew up, in India they said Pakistan is the bad guy, in Pakistan they say India is the bad guy. So that indoctrination plays a role in one's life as they grow up.

And those things that you learned in your Pakistani textbooks and your schooling, did that change when you came to Switzerland? Did you start questioning that knowledge, or do you still believe those things? How has that changed?

So you do more research. You talk to people who were there. You read other historians. So if one is interested, one can do that. And try to find the truth. And the truth is always something in the middle, it's not on one side.

What was one example of something that changed for you when you moved to Switzerland?

I learned to respect other people's viewpoints and at least be open to listen to other people's viewpoint. So the acceptability part is what you learn, when you meet people from other countries, other cultures, and you have to accept that people are different, and that their beliefs are different. And then it's not necessarily wrong for people to have different viewpoints, you have your viewpoint and that could be correct, it doesn't mean that your viewpoint is always wrong and my viewpoint is always right. You learn to then listen to another person's point of view, and to ponder what the other person is saying. So that's what you learn when you come to Switzerland, or you come to a country where you are exposed to other nationalities and other points of view. So that's the advantage, which I think people in Pakistan or people in India, who are contained in that environment don't get. Of course now these days you are exposed to global media, through the internet or through social media. And you as students today in universities learn to express your points of views, and also listen to other points of views. Which in my generation, was less open, that's a huge advantage your generation has.

Along with schooling, did your family also influence your views? Did you find that the atmosphere you were growing up in was very pro-Pakistan, or did they not care as much about politics. What was your upbringing like?

No so my family was not a political family, they're a business family, right. My parents were very careful to teach me the right values, they always taught me to tolerate other viewpoints, other beliefs, other religions, and to be nice human beings, and to contribute to society, to do philanthropy, to take care of the less fortunate. Irrespective of which religion they're from, irrespective of which country they belong to. So my parents, I was quite fortunate, they're fantastic people. And they were worldly people, they'd traveled the world much before, and they were exposed to many points of view, and don't forget they grew up in India and migrated from India, and they still had family in India. They had seen the world. When you migrated in 1947, that was a very harsh time, and a lot of hatred was created at that time too, in the Partition, people were split up, their homes were destroyed, people were killed on trains, and conflicts across the border. When you lose family members at the end, of course many people have deep rooted hatred. A lot of that happened in those days.

Do you think that happened with your parents? Like how did the Partition influence their views?

They were of course sad to leave their home, but they understood the move to Pakistan, their father made that decision. And then they supported Pakistan, very strongly, they wanted to build the nation. They participated in building the nation. They were very patriotic. Then they fully supported Pakistan.

Did you agree with a lot of their support?

Yes, I did. Because you belong to a nation and you're patriotic to that nation, and you support that nation, you build the people, build businesses, build industries, so they had philanthropic institutions. In India before, my great grandfather had started schools and hospitals in Bombay. And then when my grandfather moved to Pakistan he did the same, he built institutions, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and also businesses and banks. They built industry, they created employment, they partook and played a major role in the progress of the country, of the country they belong to and the country they love.

Do you also have that sentiment for Pakistan and its growth? Has that shifted the longer you've stayed in Switzerland?

No, no. I still have. Because that's the country of my birth, that's the country of my growing up. I have really strong emotions towards Pakistan for sure. But on the positive side, to see it grow, to see it progress, to see the people grow. To educate them, to provide them good healthcare. And my family supports all schemes that are toward the betterment of humanity. In Pakistan and outside of Pakistan as well.

You were saying before how your views shifted when you came to Switzerland. Since you've lived here for so long now, have you seen a greater gradual shift? Has the initial shift stayed, or how has the Switzerland environment affected you living here for so long?

So Switzerland is the best democracy in the world I think. And the way they have tolerance for other people, and the way they vote, even on the smallest things now, whether their vote is correct or incorrect that is a different point. But it's the vote of the people. And I think that is the best system in the whole world. I haven't seen a better system that operates like that. And if they make a mistake they do a new referendum and change the vote. If things don't work out. They vote on everything, they vote on building a street, building a school, they vote on taxes, they vote on pretty much everything. I love the system here, really. I think it's where the people decide, other countries, other democracies are a little less people driven, and some are more autocratic in the world.

So do you think this system of Swiss democracy has influenced your perceptions of the India-Pakistan conflict?

Well I don't think on the conflict per say, because this has nothing to do with the India-Pakistan conflict, it's just a system of governance. And a system of public's participation in government. And not having one president, or one prime minister who is very powerful, it's a cabinet of 7 people who decide, and they rotate the presidency every year, you know that. So it's not one president who's all powerful, one prime minister, who's all powerful, so the group of 7 have their own focuses on their expertises. Whether that's finance or its interior, or the ministries that they manage. So it doesn't give supreme power to anybody, which is crucial.

How do you think your perceptions would be different today if you still lived in Pakistan and worked in Pakistan?

Again I would promote what I believe in. The upliftment of the people, their standard of living, their well being, and whatever made that happen. So I would probably try to create more businesses, create more employment, build more charitable institutions and schools. We just launched our own university in 2014, so we have the best liberal arts university in Pakistan today. That's amazing. And all our graduate kids go to good colleges, we had 5 Fulbright scholars last year, from our university. So again we want to improve the quality of life for people. So we build schools, we create opportunities, we contributed two floors to build hospitals for cancer, and for children's hospitals, and then for physiotherapy, and we continue to do stuff. We still have a lot of people, a lot of family who live in Pakistan.

Do you think you would be more pro-Pakistan if you stayed?

So I liked, let me come back to my main theme which I mentioned earlier, my main theme is humanity and people, and the progress of people across the world. I feel more for Pakistan than I feel for other countries, because that's my country of birth and I spent my youth there. And then I feel for Switzerland because that's my present country of Switzerland, which is where I live and where I belong. So of course, countries where you spend time you have more emotions and are connected to, and that's what I favor.

Between the Indian and Pakistani people, do you think there is hostility between those populations, in those countries, not abroad? Or do you think that it's all just exaggerated by politics and the media.

Okay so I'll tell you a fact right. It's grossly exaggerated. So I'll give you some examples. So I was at a wedding in Lahore, two, maybe two and half years ago. My employee's son was getting married. And he lived in London and grew up in Switzerland. And he had some of his Indian friends, his British Indian friends who came and one was a Sikh gentleman, and he came into Pakistan and people loved him. He became like a celebrity, he got free gifts, free rides in taxis. He went to his village because he wanted to see where his grandparents were born, and he came on television. And similarly when there are cricket matches played between India and Pakistan, in Lahore and Karachi, and a lot of my Indian friends who came to watch cricket at that time, they were really welcomed. And another thing I'll tell you, there was a religious event in Pakistan last year. Are you familiar with the Bora community?

Yes, I am.

The Bora religious head had lectures in Karachi, he opened it up for Boras across the world to come. So, 40, 50 thousand came to Karachi about three years ago. And Pakistan opened up the Wagah border, from India, so the Boras in India could all come. They walked through the border. And there were a few thousand of them that came from India across the border. And they were treated like royalty. So the people are the same. I'm telling you people welcome people from other countries, especially from India into Pakistan. So amongst the people I think there is animosity. I think it's just with these politicians.

Do you have anything else to add about your perceptions on the India-Pakistan conflict?

No, I think it's a senseless conflict, they should sit down on a table and solve their issues. And once the major issues are solved, the smaller issues should be ignored. It can be done, it's not impossible. You saw the Berlin Wall fall, you saw that the United States and Russia have become friends, you seen so many

world conflicts in the past, like I mentioned to you, World War 1 and World War 2, the biggest enemies they made a union, so anything is possible if people put their mind to it.

Appendix 12. Individual 8 Interview Transcription

Note: This interview was conducted in a mixture of German, Hindi, and English, however transcription was completed in English.

[Describing the topic]

The media doesn't say everything right. The media says anything, Real, you have to see for yourself. If I tell you that, it's also in Islam, that you can't trust only through hearing. The thing that you haven't seen, you can't trust only through hearing. This is my opinion. When I see something in real, then I can say that yes it is true. But otherwise, with India or Pakistan, not with only hearing.

Okay don't hesitate in saying anything when talking with me.

No, no, I don't have that in me. I mean what is true.

What do you think about Pakistan? About politics or anything else?

Pakistan's politics is going well. But from '96 to 2018, Pakistan's politics were broke. No good. But now, I think politics is going well. Industry, and military, things like that are going better, because they are becoming strong. Before these things were weak. Now they are becoming stronger. Because of this Pakistani politics are going well. Because the dollar in Pakistan, before it was very weak, but now, for the last two months, it's getting stronger. But I don't know about India. Because I listen to Indian politics very little.

So what do you think the reason for this is? You were saying that it has become stronger.

The reason is that politics is going well now. Politics is better than before.

And why is it better?

Better because the man who has come into politics, Imran Khan, credit goes to him. He wants to make it better, he has brought it in the right line. Because the people before were corrupt, for a short time the people were satisfied, but for the future, that was bad. That was a problem for the party before, for politics. Before politics was not right, they were very corrupt.

What do you think about democracy and Pakistan?

Democracy in Pakistan is free. Voluntary. There is a lot. But there are also a lot of negatives to it, people take advantage of it incorrectly. Because there is not enough education. The people are not educated. Because when the people are not educated, and you have democracy, then it is misused.

What should be the solution to this?

The people should be educated, so democracy would fare well. Otherwise democracy, democracy only works for those who are educated. Educated people are good for democracy. But when people are not educated, then the people have a problem. Because where people are educated, they misuse the uneducated people. That's a problem. Because you know educated people thinking too much like that, and yes that's the problem.

And is Imran Khan good for this problem?

Imran Khan is not alone because other people will help, and that is good. He can't do anything alone, we need to help him. When we help each other, then it works well. Before, he had less support, but now it is growing.

And what do you think about Pakistan's relations with different countries?

Pakistan's relationship is better than before with different countries. The countries that are away from us, the ones that preferred corruption, are away from us now. But which country need our business, these people are happy with us. But which people like the corruption, for example need only dollar, give take give take, they are unhappy now.

The conflict with India, is that more tense now, or more 5 years ago? Or is it the same?

I think with India it is okay. But it will take time. It will not get fixed quickly, this needs the time. Because maybe I think, when I see the television, the India people are not happy with us, like before. Before the politics people, from the top were very good, but from the inside the public, they used to put them in fights. That fight is little by little finished. Our fight with the public has finished. Now the political fights have started. I see the TV, and the media, but our politics is good, and the people are happy together. It's coming in the right direction.

The people that live in Kashmir, what do you think of them?

About Kashmir, maybe Pakistan, or maybe India. But through a voting system, they should have a solution.

Because of the military, that is not good.

What do you think of Modi and his policies towards his Kashmir?

I don't know. I haven't read his politics at all.

Do you think he's better than other Indian politicians?

I listen sometimes that his politics is not good. That is real. Then how much it should be. He's politics should be strong, and he should have made good decisions. But that is not happening. Because I'm seeing

that he's giving a lot of trouble to the farmers. This is a very big problem, not a small problem. Big problem for the farmer Sikh people. Because India people, Pakistani people, 70,80 years ago equal. This has come up recently. 1947 wasn't that long ago. The politics has put animosity in our heart. We shouldn't talk on religion, but on humanity. We should talk on humanity. Modi should stop his cruelty in India. Good politicians are not cruel to their people. They do good things.

Do you think he has harmed the Kashmiri people?

No, the Kashmir problem is old. Long time. But he should solve this now. The world has become very fast, it doesn't need problems like this. The old problem should not be kept old, it should be solved somehow. And the cruelty Modi is giving to the farmers, that is not good. That should be solved. It should not last so long. These days, no one watches the film, they watch the clip. Now it's time for the clip. Even for a minute, people don't have time for a minute. Not one hour, two hour. It's what politics is notorious for.

Did you hear about the Pulwama attack in February of 2019?

Yes I did. It was a huge problem in Kashmir. But what I heard, Indian politics has accused Pakistan, and Indian politics, of the part that was outside, it attacked that part and made a name, that this was cruel to us. That's why I heard on TV.

What was your reaction?

That it shouldn't be like this. There is a solution to everything, but this is not the solution. Because this is the wrong solution. Because you hit Kashmir one way, the other way you hit your own military, you're doing bad to yourself.

Do you think Pakistan had a role in this talk?

I don't know about this.

Did you hear about how Modi took out Article 370 from India's constitution?

I heard about this, but I don't understand it. When I came to Switzerland, I was finished with politics. Because in politics, people lie. Politics is not right. I studied law. But otherwise, I don't like politics. Because politics, very bad for humanity. I studied law, and then when I got older I lived a military life. Because when I was in Pakistan in school time, Pakistan had a military government.

How did that influence your view? The military government.

Strong. You can't do anything yourself. Military and democracy don't go together. In the military you can only do what you are ordered. You can only stay in one place. Military is a strong life, the strongest life. But we were happy. Life is happy. No money. The people have no money. The people are poor. But

people are sincere. There was no development happening. But no one went to sleep hungry. That is a completely different life. Now, less people live it.

When you were growing up like that, what did you think about India and Kashmir?

That time, we only heard. Heard that bombs here and there, because in the military the media is closed. You don't get the right news. It's like a blackboard, you can't see the other side. When democracy came, then you could see the other side. When democracy came, then we could start seeing.

Back then, did you trust the military government and what they said?

Our whole life was in the military. Our mind was not like today, it wasn't an open life.

How did your views change?

When the military government ended, democracy came. In '96 I came here. Because there was so much change, and I couldn't adjust. Because the cheap school was now at a high level and we couldn't afford it.

So how did you make the decision?

I was a student. I wanted to leave Pakistan because my life there, I saw it as black. Because of the corruption. You could go to the military with merit, but with democracy, corruption started, so my chance was over. I didn't decide Switzerland, but my friend was with me, and he decided. And then when I came here, I felt good, because in school I had learnt how it is in Europe. So it was easy for me. It was easy to adjust. Because at that time, we only learnt about what happened in Europe, a European school taught us.

How did your views change when you came here? About democracy, politics, Pakistan, India-Pakistan.

Because I was with international people. So I thought over there they are teaching us something, what is happening here is something else. Because I was with Indian people, so from that we took ideas, and realized that politics are making us fight. It's not bad between us. Because we used to live together, eat together, go out together, we didn't fight. So politicians are bad. We are not bad. Politics are bad. We accepted it. This is not good.

And you felt hostility more in Pakistan.

A lot. Because they put cruelty in our hearts. India is no good for us, India is everytime the enemy. Enemy, enemy, enemy. So our minds were ruined. But when I came here, look at Europe, Switzerland, has four, Italy, Austria, Germany, France. It has four borders, and very good communication. Why can't we do that? So because of this, my mind was changed. I think if I was still in Pakistan my mind wouldn't have changed. But when I moved, it changed, that this is not good. Because with war, people die, they do not live. There should be a solution. In a good way. Good politicians find good solutions.

What do you think this solution should be?

The solution should have been a year after the problem occurred. Because with a solution, people are happy. Because people over there are not happy. They eat one time, they don't get food another.

For a solution to come, India and Pakistan talk. But do you think these talks are useful or are they useless?

Maybe. Maybe they are, maybe they aren't. Because I was very little, there was no TV. There was a radio, and I used to listen on the radio, about Kashmir and Pakistan's problem. Hearing it I became old.

Do you think other countries should help. They were saying the US should mediate, do you think that will help?

The US will help, but only if it sees a benefit for itself. It has its own choice, to help India, or to help Pakistan. When it knows that it is getting a benefit. When there is no benefit, the US will not be anything.

Do you think that should happen?

For human rights, they should. They should not stop. Otherwise the US is US.

And you were saying before that a voting system should come in Kashmir.....

It should be there! For it to be free. Look at Switzerland, before it was small, and then it got freedom. So it should happen. These days everything is possible.

Do you think they should be independent?

It should be independent, but it doesn't have the sources. Independence needs the sources. Money, craft, force, that's very difficult. And no one will agree. But there should be a solution. Everyone is there for their own benefit. It's like a shop, people go to do there work, politics, reporters, media, military, everyone is doing work. Some people are doing it at the dark, some in the light.

Does your family or relatives still live in Pakistan?

My brother is in Pakistan.

Are your views different to him?

He has changed a lot. Because Pakistan has changed a lot. Democracy, new government. People have changed. If you don't ask for change, it will not come.

Appendix 13. Individual 9 Interview Transcription

Note: This interview was conducted in a mixture of Hindi and English, however transcription was completed in English.

So what do you think about Pakistan and about Pakistani politics, how do you think Pakistan is doing?

It's on the right track. With Imran Khan's government, it's on the right track.

What do you think about the economy, education?

Economy, is going well on the government level from what I've heard. The previous government would make everything very expensive, the mafia that they had for 30 years, they are involved.

What do you think about India and about Modi?

Modi is very dangerous for India. And he's not too dangerous for Pakistan, but he only thinks of one side. The RSS organization he made, and the Hindu religion, he's only focusing on that. Not on his people, not all the religions that he has with him, like the Sikhs and the Muslims. His focus is not on that, he's only focused on the RSS' agenda. This is not good for anyone, not India, and not Pakistan. Because he will bring a civil war in India as he makes people fight. He can change anytime to a civil war.

And what do you think about Pakistan's role in the world and its relationships with other countries?

It's much better. Under Imran Khan's government, it has worked on everything, to fix relations with other countries, and a lot of compliments are coming, that I hear on international media. I don't live in Pakistan, but here when I see or hear the news, they give him compliments.

Do you think the situation with India is worse than it was before, or is it going well?

I think Imran Khan, since his government has come, the talks that he invited people to, to come sit on the table, like now the delegation came from Pakistan.

And everyone says that every problem's solution only comes through war, and only when you sit on the table can it be. I think the last 2, 3 years, when our Prime Minister got Corona, I heard for the first time a good thing out of Narendra Modi's mouth. So the feeling was, he is coming in line. It should get better. He also tried for war, in which India failed, so he knows that this doesn't have another solution, like Imran Khan is saying, that we can come on the table and talk about this. There's no other solution. And this is Imran Khan's approach with the Kashmir situation too. He wants us to sit on the table and find a solution, that we do not fight. Our people are poor, so nothing will happen with war.

So Imran Khan is better than other prime ministers?

Yes, he is right. Because he is not a businessman, he doesn't have another list, he is retired, you probably know about his life, he used to be a cricketer. And he came to Pakistan, leaving England, only so he could fix, what is Pakistan's deteriorating...both of the parties, the People Party, and right now there are 8 or nine parties against him, against Imran Khan. So in 30 years he made a very big. That they are all working against him. If they were not there, his government would be much more successful. But the opposition is working hard so that he is not successful.

So what do you think about the people of Kashmir?

It's the people's decision if they should be free, or stay with Pakistan. And Pakistan's view as well, that if India let them go, then they can make their own decision if they want to stay with Pakistan or make their own state.

So you think they should make their own decision?

Yes.

And do you think that Kashmir should be independent?

In the whole world, every human being should be independent. If you came here, and we closed all the doors, how would you feel? So that's what I want, that the force is taken off and they get the right to say. I don't even say that they must leave India. That is their choice. and under the UN give them rights. They should make their own decision. Military will go. If they make the decision that they want to stay independent, that is also their right. The decision you make for yourself, that closing the doors will not make you feel good, you can apply the same thinking to the Kashmiri people.

Do you think the policy India and Pakistan have towards Kashmir is good?

Pakistan's policy is what has been coming from before, Imran Khan also talked about this at the UN. Right now, the policy has become aggressive, on the international level. Before they just used to say a little so that the people didn't resist. Now, it is on the international level. Pakistan's is clean. You can early understand, the whole international community, they can easily understand, India's is not clear.

So Pakistan has become more aggressive?

Pakistan hasn't become more aggressive, India has made Pakistan more aggressive. Because before they wanted to chit chat to Pakistan, they didn't listen, so Imran Khan brought this to an international level, and explained to people that these poor people should get their rights. It's their choice if they want to stay with India, with Pakistan, or alone. That's their choice. People should leave them, like you do what you want to do. But India is not leaving them, it is occupied, they are oppressed, there is a curfew, people are dying in their homes, there is no food, they are not giving them medicine.

And did you hear about the Pulwama attack?

Yes.

What was your reaction?

Like I said before, Modi tried for war, to do something about the situation and Pakistan, for the detriment of Pakistan. That was a whole drama. Modi came in line because Imran Khan invited him to come on the table, saying that the problem can be solved there, not through war.

So what came into your mind when you read about the attack?

I was thinking that it is a drama, it was also proven that it was an attempt to start drama but it didn't work.

The media was saying that the attack was connected to a Pakistani terrorist group? Do you think this?

No, no. If there is an independent Kashmiri group that is fighting for this, they call them terrorists. Like I told you before, if I closed all doors and had a pistol, if they have closed them out, and you don't even come on the table, and if you have used a pistol to keep them out, then they will also use a pistol. But one person calls them terrorists, others call them separatists, they have the right to their own state.

Did you hear that Modi took out article 370 out of the constitution? What was your reaction?

This was against Muslims and against Kashmir. In some states, he has started operations against Muslims, destroyed Masjids. If you do this anywhere, you will see people's reaction. If you do it anywhere, even if people do it here, in our Masjids, or churchs, or your temples, they will try to close it, then we will also have a reaction.

So what were you thinking?

I had a lot of difficulty, a lot of difficulty. Why did this happen. There were many reactions, you also saw on international media. They shouldn't have done this, he just wants Kashmir to have the name, for them to be occupied, and take the rights away from the poor people.

So do you think when Modi and Imran Khan discuss, that they other countries, like US, should mediate? Or just India and Pakistan.

Just India or Pakistan. It's okay if the UN is free, if one person from the UN sits there. But it's better if the two countries whose situation it is, solve it on their own.

China is also coming into Kashmir in Galwan valley.....

That India messed with on the border, so now they started.

So what do you think about China?

China is doing its own thing, from its own side. For us, since Kashmir has been occupied we are fighting for it, we are with it, we are with the poor people. Trying to uplift their voice. We are knocking on every door to see if someone will listen to them. You might have heard on TV how much cruelty is going on with it.

So do you think Imran Khan supports the Kashmiri people?

Yes. Of course.

You've been living here for 30 years. Have your views changed? When you were in Pakistan were your views different?

No, no, the same. I learnt more. Like the environment, sometimes fire, fly, shoot a bullet, what was a different thing. But when I came here, then we learnt more about humanity. I understood the pain of the Kashmiris even more. Even though we were still with their pain back in Pakistan. And with Muslims. Wherever Muslims are, where there are problems and war, I am with everyone.

How did your mindset change?

I saw the system, I saw a person's, that these rights, why don't Kashmir, or anywhere were people are suffering cruelty, why don't they have these? Or in Pakistan, why don't we have a system. Or in India, a system which people are happy with and make the country better.

And do you think your education system has influenced your views on this topic? How?

Yes, but in the student federation

16: 55

And your views, do they match with your parents or differ?

Yes, they were in the same line. Whoever is a good person, they have the same views, that why doesn't this person have the same rights I have? If you were yourself a Kashmiri, then you would know, you can't say anything, food, medicine. Here are five men, and from all four sides we block you, that's how you feel in Kashmir.

Do you want to say anything else about this topic?

No, no. That we together think about those, especially Kashmir. And give them the chance to make their own decision, to be with India, or Pakistan, or to be separate. If you weren't given this right, then you would be against them. So why is that not given to them?

Do you think Pakistan should focus on Kashmir, or just Pakistani....

They are, they are doing that. They are focusing on people, but also on Pakistan.

Appendix 14. Individual 10 Interview Transcription

Note: This interview was conducted in a mixture of Hindi and English, however transcription was completed in English.

What do you think of the current state of affairs in Pakistan. Do you think Pakistan is pursuing the correct agenda?

The current situation is like specially you know very well we have an establishment, and there is not a stability of the politics. The establishment sometimes wants to be engaged, as like about what they have interest about. If it's trade, or border. Sometimes they need to be engaged, sometimes they need to be conflict, it's about the interest. Like Kashmir is the interest. So it's like a big business, like a big shop, everybody can earn, I'm talking about both sides, everyone can earn too much things. And this is the problem, and they want the problem to stay. They don't want to finish it. I'm talking about both sides, not one side. Because there's also billionaires, millionaires, they don't want to solve it. There was three conflicts about it, especially, the Kashmir, 1948, '65, indirectly, '62 indirectly, and then in the Kargil War. Like '99 I think. About politics, they want to engage with the Indians now. Like they opened the corridor, like the Baba Guru Nanak, they already did it. They give the way to in come, and without visa, without anything, and then you can go. Or you can stay one night too actually. And the government, without instability, the both sides, there is a stability about, like you can say there is no military dictatorship or anything, but you can say like until there is stability, it keeps going up and down. And for stability you need to make an environment. And that takes both sides, not just one. So, for the environment, conferences and meetings, like when he came when Nawaz Sharif was president, he came and visited Lahore. These types of things need to happen. I think that until we make Asia, South Asia, like the Eurozone, border free, it won't work. If you make a single currency, then you can make it. But the West doesn't let this happen. Because they have an interest in our fights. In border instability. So they don't want us to be stable and for peace to come. If there is peace, then there will be cooperation and engagement, and trade. So after that, we won't need to migrate. Pakistanis, Indians, everything. India's very good, good future, Pakistan too, but despite that we are here. We come West. So we have a lack of something.

What do you think about democracy in Pakistan?

Without democracy, the country doesn't work. Democracy should stay, and should stay forever. And the solution to everything is in democracy, the grassroots level allows you to give facilities to people, you can bring it up. And Pakistan's biggest issue is that democracy hasn't fully come to Pakistan. 8 years, 10 years, and then dictatorship. Then 12 years, and then dictatorship. 1956, 55, 56, dictatorship, then 60s, '61, then '71 war, that time was Yahya Khan, and then '79, General Zia-ul-Huq. After that, 2000, 2001, 2000, 1999 Kargil Conflict, just after the Kargil Conflict there was General Ashraf, eight years, 2008, he was there, and then till 2018, there was stability. After that, now, the mini mashallah.

Why do you think it keeps going back and forth like that?

You look at corruption from the back, if you go deeply into this, then you can really see where the problem starts from. Like India and Pakistan became free. I think there are 24 states in India. When India became free, there were a total 14 provinces. After in 1955, '56, they made four more cantons, and after that they broke the big provinces, and gave its own parliament, it's own capital, like the Zurich canton's capital in Zurich. They gave them facilities, and you wish want you want you make your own self law and everything, budget, chief minister, minister, everything. This kept happening in India. In Pakistan, the one unit system came. After the partition in '47, Pakistan had one unit. '55, '56 one unit system, like one unit Pakistan, we will make a Parliament, and one unit system. You can say parliament or present, or dictator. There was Ayub Khan, and he became a government general, there was only one. The bad thing about the one unit system, the loss was that the facilities that should have been given at the grassroots level did not happen. You didn't get the facilities, not the budget, education is not reaching you. Information is not getting to you, jobs are not coming to you. Nothing is happening. Here, you are stopped. You are not going forward. So in 1971, Bangladesh broke off. Because Bangladesh's revenue, it would come from East Pakistan to West Pakistan. The causes was because it was at one time enough for Bengalis. Because when they gave revenue it would come to Karachi, or Lahore, or Islamabad to be spent. Nothing would happen over there. So they started asking for freedom. It's a different story that at that time, they had funding from India, because they were enemies, but besides that, political stability should exist, everywhere. And biological and geographical it didn't match because India was in the middle. So, the separation had to happen. But the negative was that political stability did not come. Dictatorship, dictatorship, dictatorship. They never let you for the judicial system. After that there was no political system, Bhutto came, and made the Simla Contract with India. We studied in 6th grade I think in Social Studies in Pakistan, about the Simla Contract and the Indus River, about every contract about India. So Bhutto made the contract at that time and political stability came. After that, now the Simla Agreement is finished. It should have stayed stable, but when you're not strong it finishes. That shouldn't have happened. Every country needs political stability. When there is political stabilities, the facilities will come on the grassroots level, to the people.

And do you think Pakistan is moving in that direction right now with Imran Khan?

Like not in a good direction, but in the best ways they did somethings very good. Like in the last 17 years was not good, no one did it. Like about the money laundering, or like the criminal laws, like if you're corrupt and you do something like this, they make new laws for that. So this is really good about this. But with the relationship neighborhood countries, they're still watching.

Do you like Imran Khan as a prime minister?

Of course. He's a prime minister, but he's our prime minister, we like, we should. He's the prime minister as like Modi, Modi about the people of India, they should love it, because he is the prime minister. We can judge him in 2 or 3 years. Let them 5 years, he will take the tenure, and then the result of the 5 years. We will see where the government goes, and the economic growth, and everything's like that. And this you can see after five years. You need the time.

Do you think Imran Khan's better prime ministers?

I don't think that he's better. Like nowadays you can say, the dollar was 125 before, and in three years, it's come 160. So the growth of the successes, or the economical growth is low nowadays. People don't want to invest. Yes the China corridor came before, like before Imran Khan, like 45 billion dollars it's investment. But the outside investment is stopped already. Because the people are watching, where the water flows, for example. You see the way the river with the water flows, so you will spend the money. You don't know the tenure, you don't know the stability of the politics nowadays, so you can't invest, otherwise you will lose.

Do you think he's been good from a humanitarian standpoint? Or social issues?

Somehow. Like you can say 20 to 30 percent they are doing. But I don't think so like you can't see negativity, but not positivity also. Like it stays how it is. There's a corona came, and you can say everything is destroyed what they did. But started political, the political stability, you can start two years, you can manage, you can start the policies in the start, for economic growth or foreign investment, in start two, three years. And then the end two, three years, your policies go polishing cream. Or the project will be finished in the last tenure. There's a 5 year tenure for politics on both sides. Not like European. So in 5 years, in 2 and a half years you should start your project. You should show the people. You should bring the investment from outside. You make the policies, you make the law and everything to be flexible, for the outsiders to come invest there. And after the 2 and a half years, the project in 3 years, 4 years the project will complete and you can go to the opening ceremony and everything. And then you should see what the trees give you the mango, and the seed, and after 2 years they give you the fruit. So you'll see at the end.

Do you think Imran Khan has had the right approach or policies towards the conflict?

He took the step, the first step I told you about the Singh came from India, the politician, I forgot his name. We met the corridor, at least the Sikh religious people they had space there. We took the step. The second step is from India, we're waiting for this. The first step he took it and he make that access to come, without visa, without anything, you just come sit in the bus, immigration, like very fast track system.

Do you the situation between India and Pakistan is more tense now, then say it was 5 or 10 years ago? Do you think there's been an escalation, or do you think it's remained the same. Or what are your opinions about that?

It depends on the election. Like you can say, in India if it's in Pakistan. Both. When in India the election person come, or the Modi, or any kind of prime minister, or the sitting government, in India or in Pakistan. They make these kind of talks, or media talks, or something, they make intention. Especially what happened in February 2019, the two jets were shot down and everything. That was intense, but they created it. They created it. If it's from here. But that time is the election coming in March or April I think in India, so intense they make it, and they gain the vote because of that. Both sides. They gain the votes against the Kashmiris, like the agenda of the Kashmiris.

So the tensions increase when they try to get the votes around the election time.

Of course, it comes always. In 1971 you see also, there was, the Bangladesh, but '48 yes, of course, and there was no access to Kashmir at that time. If you see in the 2018, 27 February, there was an election coming in India. So it was intense. And 2018 in Pakistan was okay, that time it was not intense, but before it was already gone towards this one.

So what do you think of the Kashmiri people?

About the Kashmiris, if you go really deeply behind, the Britain was there, when the British colony was there, the British rules and regulations. That time also the Kashmir was a state of the complete India. There was a government general of the Kashmir, Raja, like a king, like governor. There was a Kashmir committee, there was a Muslim and Hindu peoples, like the majority. And that time it was also a state. But the majority was Muslim. And if you see according to the United Nations, when United Nations say okay we will be making election there, and who will be voting or somethings, what they will decide, the Kashmiris decided. When they will decide where we can live, which part we will live. They can decide. Let them, if it's Pakistan or India. But I think it will be solved because it's not a too big problem as like you can see the General Ashraf time period, he came to Agra and meet, and the offer about to be solved. That time was also written in the MOUs, but I don't know what happened about the MOUs or something.

So what do you think of the people right now?

And then Pakistan gave them access to India to defense the border. It was in 2003. Pakistan gave the permission, that make the fence here, and the border, what is the line of control. India's fence is also, Pakistan's fence is also. There was no interior or something like that. It's the freedom fighter. They was from here, Kashmiris from both sides. The both sides of Kashmiri, the half families are living here, the half families are living there. So they go to the freedom fighters, so they was here to interfere with border and everything. The Pakistan offering to fencing. You will have no problem, we will have no problem. But still, we fence, and they fence everything, but still they don't give the rights to this state, like the parliament, like a everything, like separated.

So currently, what do you think of them, like of the Kashmiri people?

I'm thinking that we should give them decide, self determination. It's democracy. In the world the best is democracy. So we should let them decide what they want.

What do you think they want?

That I don't know. I really like the culture of the Kashmiris, specially about the marriage system, about the food, about the credations, about the clothes, I really love them. I really like there's also the Hindus families, from their grandfathers they are living here. There is not the new people, now also there are new people living here. They should decide.

Do you think India's a reliable partner for peace for Pakistan right now? Or do you think we're past the point of negotiations and working together?

Right now in two and half years I never see this. Anything like the MOU signatures, no nothing. Something like the peace is already destroyed three, four times on the border, in fence and everything. Someone has not taken a step, especially no meetings at conferences. No South Asian conference, nothing has been made. They should talk, our culture is similar, our eating, drinking, traditions, specially in our Muslim community, weddings, wedding traditions, the red dress of the bride, we get it from Hindus. When we were living before the Partition we were together, Muslims and Hindus. So gain from this. They politicians should continue, because they should see the public of India and Pakistan and they should see and decide what they want. We have the same culture. Nowadays in the media, is the media war and everything, because they will not let you, because they are paid from Western agencies, from Europe. They will not let you to do anything, peace of anything, the both countries.

I'm sure you heard about how Modi revoked article 370? So what was your reaction to that? Like when he took it away?

Reaction is like you can say, I told you about like the last answer, like General Ashraf went in Agra, and he signed the MOU. He offer it. He was thinking about it as a politics, thinking of the public from Pakistan, and he took this step to solve it. Still we are waiting, because what is gone, is gone. It's the border, you are here, and we are here, it's okay.

So you think it was a good decision?

Yes of course, we need a solution.

He took the article away.

He should took. He should took because it's a wrong decision, and I don't think it will apply. Because it's not applicable in Kashmir. If it is applicable in Kashmir, not in Ladakh now. Because the Chinese will not let you, 1000 kilometer they come inside the Ladakh. And they gain it, and they make the bunkers there, and they come in more and more because of this wrong article. I think the India lose, like the peace, like the neighborhood relations. Like the foreign policy goes really wrong nowadays. He's alone in South Asia. Like the Bangladesh, cut. It got engaged with China, with Pakistan also, and Russia especially, and you can see like the Nepal is gone already. They make the intention of the problems, like the camp, so they make a new military and army, and China give them access from the military, the two tunnels, and then the way, you are free, not only with India, you need access for trade. So they go now, like the Myanmar, they have a deal with the Pakistan, I've seen 17, with the defense. So India with the 3 articles, so with article 370, they became alone, with neighborhood policy and with foreign policy.

So they're like separate from the rest of the subcontinent.

Of course. Like starting from Modi was really right, and he really good about the trade, about the MOUs, about the investment, he bring the investment, Google and Apple, a lot. But I think now I think he lose

after 2 and a half years. He will lose election next election, of course he will not come. The nominating of the Modi, it was not good, because they bring the RSS, he is a member of the RSS, and they hate. And for the politics or for the prime minister, you do not select a member of the RSS. So he's hated. He was already nominated in the case when in Ahmedabad when there was a case of Muslim and Hindu conflicts, like local.

So you think it was wrong that he was nominated, but you're supportive of the decision to take the article out.

I'm not supportive of it, because India lose everything through the article 370. It's bad for India, because they lose the 1000 kilometer from China. They apply this article in the whole of the region, but practically only in Kashmir, not Ladakh. If it's the Chinese, they became a superpower nowadays. Now they show to US. The US lose in Afghanistan, now they want to go give us the way from the Taliban. And they want to go out.

Do you think revoking the article was good for Kashmir?

It's not good actually. If they put the article 370, now Pakistan will also put the article about Gilgit-Baltistan and the free Kashmir also. So then what you do? Because this is also occupied. There's no lockdown there. There's peace. When they let it there, then Pakistan say that is mine. What you have, you should take it. What I have, I should take it, and make the solution.

So you think it's good for India but not for Kashmir?

It's not good for India also, because in foreign policy is going wrong and they are alone. Even now America is now helping them, because they want to be in South Asia some place, showing to China. Because the Americans have a policy, they will not fight directly, they will not go in battle. Because they have an experience in the Vietnam War, they went there 17 years practically, and they lose after 17 years. Now we can see from 2001 they came to Afghanistan, they lose it and they went away. They say they withdraw the militaries from outside. So they lose. And they will not go directly against China because China is very strong nowadays. They go there, the Chinese specific ocean, China make their artificial island, and everything, in South China Sea, and they say that Vietnam is mine, this is mine, this is always mine, the South China Sea is mine. No one can say against. But Americans bring the India and the Australia and the England, and the two, three ships come there, they just show the eyes but they don't fight. They want to break the export or transport way of China. Nowadays economic superpower in the world is China you can say. But the Chinese make a new way for the China-Pakistan corridor also, and through Afghanistan and Iran also. Before there was India, now Chinese already got it. The contract they got it. They take the oil from Iran and say okay we can help you in 20 million dollars we can invest.

What was your reaction to the Pulwama attack?

It was like planted, by the Indian government, or the establishment. No one can attack your military camp and they come inside and it was like they kill 200 military. You can't blame anyone. Pulwama is in Kashmir, but this is headquarters of the military there. But this is the headquarters of the military, you

can't blame some neighbor countries that they send the military and something like this. In 2003 you fence the border and we fence the border, so how can someone enter? You didn't give us the proof, you don't want to investigate it. Joint investigation or something. We offer, we don't want it.

A lot of the international media they were saying that it was from the terrorist group in Pakistan..

No they didn't give us the proof about it, it was just the blame. International media never blamed this. Only Indian media has blamed this.

BBC said it was the Jaish-e-Mohammad group.

Jaish-e-Mohammad, you can say that there was a Jaish-e-Mohammad group before, but it was also Kashmiris, they are the freedom fighters, you can't say they are Pakistanis. Like Afghanistan, the Taliban is the freedom fighters, there, their own land, you go from Europe, America, you go from everywhere, NATO goes there and they are bombing there, so they want to free them from NATO and from America, so they are the freedom fighters. You can't say they are terrorists. The Kashmiris are freedom fighters. The Jaish-e-Mohammad leaders are in Kashmir, and they are Kashmiris, and who was it dead, or something like that, the fingerprints were not matching and everything. They didn't even give any proof to Pakistan. The Pulwama attack was planted by the Indian establishment for the politics. So I told you, when the elections come, they do this for the vote gaining. And they got it.

What did you think of India's decision to send air strikes back?

It was only just in the media of India. No one give proof of anything. We called international media, and Pakistan brought the international media there and showed them, show us which place is destroyed. Because there is fence. There is a military sitting. There is everything. And even you can't say like this that any kind of birds come inside. They come by the plane and the did operation one hour, two hour, and then they come back. How is possible? Pakistan have 1.4 military. We have strongest military, and we show you revenge of this on 27th February? The one plane jet, and the pilot, Abinandhan, his plane came for 2 seconds and it was shot down. So how is it possible?

Do you think solutions need to be homegrown or is there room for international arbitration?

We don't need anyone, we have our culture is same, our tradition is same, we don't need anyone. We sit on the table and we discuss it. We don't need anyone.

What do you want to see? Like what should the next step be?

We're still waiting for the next step.

You came here from Pakistan 10 years ago, right, so how do you think your perceptions have changed since then?

I visit Pakistan every year.

But you moved 10 years ago, so do you think your opinions have changed on the conflict?

Yeah of course. Before I was never meet like, I was on the boxing team, I visited India, Ahmedabad also. And then I have the relation with the Indian friends and then perceptions changed. Before it was another, we watched India that time as the enemy, before. Like in the video, what you hear. But when we came here, the both countries like this and the foreign policies or something and the engagement and the peace or something, and when we meet, like as I meet you here now, it was not possible in Pakistan. So, I think we are the same, and we are okay. Like the public of Pakistan and India they don't want, the public don't want a conflict, the both sides.

Okay so because you met more people and you read more, then your perceptions changed?

Of course.

Do you still have family in Pakistan?

My parents are there.

Do you see a stark difference in what they think and what you think?

No my father is really open minded and he don't care about anything, but he don't cross about the politics.

Do you think your education in Pakistan has influenced your views?

Education is really better than last 20 years. Especially with the modern world, the internet, the media. Like 20 years ago there were only two channels in Pakistan, like the national TV channels. But now there are 60 or 70. They bring the program.

You were saying you were reading about the Simla Agreement in your textbooks. Do you think it was biased in any way?

Of course it's really different, like they show us their success or their policies or something. Again, according to the Simla Agreement, but India break the Simla Agreement, Especially I think they make 73 dams, and on the Indus River. So they break the Simla Agreement.

Appendix 15. Individual 11 Interview Transcription

What do you think about the current state of affairs in Pakistan and is Pakistan pursuing an agenda of productivity?

Do you mean about politics? About the president, the prime minister, who is trying to build relationships, in that sense?

Yes, in that sense.

Yes I think he's doing a great job because the previously, unfortunately, prime minister was completely useless and I don't know him personally, but what I hear, what I read, he was just being very creepy. And not looking for the country, and it is fine to make money here and there, but to be so greedy not to do anything for the country is horrendous. And he did not have any foreign policy, or a foreign minister because he wanted to keep everything at hand. The new prime minister is honest, but he is coming into a set up where the other, older people who were still there around them. So he cannot make a clean sweep of the government. People are still there. So he's struggling. But what I like about him is that one, he's honest, two, he's trying to improve the country. Not improve himself, his bank balance, like any good prime minister he is trying to help his country and the countrymen, and I think they are making some advances with relationships. I really look forward to him improving the country which will take some time. We do not have the patience, we human beings do not have the patience. We want it quickly, and that can never be.

So you think with time he'll be able to improve the country.

Yes, look at Switzerland. In 700 years, they have become a wonderful country, but if we look back, they were fighting amongst each other. Little, little cantons, fighting with each other. Not agreeing on things. So it takes time for countries to improve. But there should be this desire to improve. There should be more education in our countries, so that people know what they are getting, what they are not getting. And I think if this man is given more chance, he will improve it. He won't change it like magic wand, but things will get better.

What do you think about democracy in Pakistan?

Since there is not too much democracy in our countries, we do not know how to use democracy well. We are people who have to be directed, who have to be shown a path, and each country, we cannot give the same democracy, the American democracy, or the British democracy to Pakistan yet. But yes, democracy is important. We do have it. And we will have to improve ourselves. We will have to get rid of this, like we have it in our head, we own the world, this is what I do, that we will have to improve ourselves, and that comes with education. Only when our people are educated and we are educated will we know not to misuse power. Power is used everywhere in the world, believe me, but in our parts, a little more, because the people you are dealing with are poorer and not educated. So you can manipulate them. We have a democracy, which is not the Western democracy, but we are on that path, we are.

What do you think about Pakistan's broader role in the world?

Broader role? I think Pakistan has a very big, in fact Pakistan has shown a lot of, since the new prime minister, by catching up, by bringing different countries closer. There are countries that are not willing to come closer, like our relationship with India is still not good. There is still hostility, there isn't trust between them. But look, the Afghans were brought together with other countries, especially America, by Pakistan's efforts. So Pakistan is trying to have a peaceful dialogue with different countries, a peaceful country with good relationships around the borders, but then two countries have to be willing for it. We created good relationships with the Afghans because they had some good relations with us. All of Pakistan had 2.5 million Afghans in Pakistan, imagine. 2.5 million Afghanis in Pakistan, when they had war with Russia. These people fled. And who gave them. We were feeding these people but again, it was like an extreme group of people that thought this is right, this is wrong, there's not a middle way, but now they are looking at the world with a balance. Remember, the Afghan's they were called, for one country it's a freedom fighter, the same people are called jihadists. If I defend my country, is that wrong? The Afghanis were called jihadists. But they're protecting their country, they have every right to. How can anyone come to their country, and land with their big aeroplanes and helicopters and tell them this is how you run your country. No. You have to let people with dialogue. Then of course, there was no other resort but to protect themselves. So not that I call everything that they did right, I think when they were telling women to sit in the house, and not work, that was wrong! Our religion, Afghani religion, which is also Islam, does not say that. Nothing. People then go to extremes. They either become modern, or too conservative. We have to find a balance. And now the Afghans are finding that balance, and people are listening to them, this is our country get out. But then they had to take extreme measures, then again it becomes a cycle, extreme measures, bad people, so it becomes a very vicious kind of a circle. But definitely Pakistan is played a role with China, with Iran, with Afghanistan, because even Pakistan wants to live in peace, who wants war all time, who wants worry all the time. So I think it has a very important role to play, with the borders of Pakistan, and as a whole. Because we are now, this world has become, this world has shrunk so much. One country is affected, a lot of other countries are affected. So it has an important role, and I think Imran Khan at the moment, Indian educated man, is trying his best. We have to give him that time to go further, definitely.

Do you think the situation with India is more tense now than it was say, 5,10 years ago? Or do you think the amount of tension has remained the same, or has it increased?

You know these, they go up and down like the ways. There are good days, when the borders are open, things are nice, then something happens, and suddenly there is this animosity which increases and decreases with time. It's a matter of not trusting each other. We also feel that the Indians have not forgiven the Pakistanis for carving out a land for themselves, that is like, India was a big country, one piece, and it is painful for them, and they call it like a part of their body has been cut off. But you see, there was a reason. The Muslims, when the British were leaving, they realized that they would also like to have a land of their own. Where they can have their own religion. So they had every right. They sat down with Mountbatten, they sat down with other people, and they said we want a separate homeland, where we can practice our religion, just like in India, where people can have their religion. But that has gone on for too long. Look, Bangladesh, separated from Pakistan, that was East Pakistan, none of us say, like nobody, none of us have animosity against Bangladesh. In the beginning, people were very unhappy, sad, angry,

but it's gone, it's done. Now we have to learn to give with them. Now Pakistanis are opening their factories over there, because it's cheaper over there. If there was animosity, they would not trade with them. So we have to let go, what's done is done, that's history. Okay. India was a very big country, and it was called Hindustan, but then they have to learn, okay a certain people wanted to, and this was the right time, because the British are going. Because the father of our nation, Mr. Mohammad Ali-Jinnah, was with the Congress in the beginning. But then he decided that the Muslims wanted a land of their own. He realized their desire. So then he said, okay, then I'll make another party called Muslim league, or probably it was already there, anyway, then he tried it and he helped the people with Pakistan. There were sacrifices on both sides, there were deaths on both sides, my family comes from Amritsar. And my grandfather was a great industrialist from Amritsar, and my grandmother used to cry when she remembered the grey times she had over there. And my grandfather never wanted to leave Amritsar, because his roots were there. You know I'll tell you something very interesting. My grandfather had two houses, one in the old city, that was the tradition, if it was to live in old cities. And they had a big house, everything there. But they also had a very big house in the outskirts. And my grandmother used to take her girls and boys to her house in the outskirts, because they had a big garden, in city areas you don't have gardens. So she used to take them everyday over there, and they used to play and enjoy themselves. And my grandfather used to say, and my grandmother used to say, let's go live over there. And my grandfather used to say, no, my roots are in this area, I'm not going anywhere. But then he had to leave the country, it was his decision, but he had to leave the country, he left his heart over there. So it's the same way. I met a lot of Hindu friends, who say, oh my grandmother was in Lahore, my grandpa was there, and they have this love for that city because their grandparents live there, which I understood because my mother lived there, and she grew up there. So it is, it was very hard for both sides, but now we have to move on. We cannot be angry for something that happened 73 years ago. Pakistan is a reality. It's there now. So why should we try and destroy each other, get angry at each other, send like 'spies to this side, find out how we can weaken this country', let's live in peace. That is our desire living abroad. But obviously when you are in Pakistan you are more nationalistic because that is your country and you want to save it. It's the same with the Indians. They want to hold on to their country. But we can have hold on to both our countries and still live in peace. I mean we have the same, when I went to Delhi, it was so interesting, I could understand everything the people over there were saying. Because I know the language. The clothes are nearly the same, the faces are nearly the same. But what divides us is the religion. But we can look past our religions. I mean I have so many Indian friends, I don't think I worry too much what God they are believing in, for me, my friend is very important. If she's doing wrong, she will answer to God herself. I can't beat her up and say, you are wrong. In the same way, she might think she believes in one God, no. But, our friendship is more important than what we believe. I always hope and pray that, I hope she believes in one God. But that's it. I can't punish her, I can't be angry with her. I can love her as a person. And that is what we have to learn to do to both parts, not to view another person in hatred and think 'oh he's a Hindu!' or 'oh he's a Muslim'. These are things, there is a section of people, who are very rigid. But there is always a section in every country, imagine in Ireland the Protestants and Catholics were fighting, even though they're both Christians. So that element will always be there, but I feel we should not hate each other as a country and try to have peace in both countries. Then we'll have less armies, more money to spend on our people. I feel that way.

You were talking about how religion can divide people. Do you think the Partition was necessary then? Do you think it needed to happen?

It was necessary. Because the Muslims wanted a land. I still remember, mum saying, telling me, they lived in Amritsar, that there were times when one miscreant would throw a piece of meat into a Masjid. Masjid means the mosque. It could be one in ten thousand people, but then everybody would get so annoyed, because they said, oh this is pork meat. They would get upset, because a Muslim will not throw it. In the same way, I'm sure a Muslim would do something to one of the statues for instance. Now what is happening? The animosity. But this can be overcome when the leaders, when the elders stepped in, and said, this is wrong. So I feel it is okay when Pakistan was carved out, because they wanted to live their way. They wanted to have five times prayer announced on the loudspeaker. I mean it is very loud, even we get irritated because you can't have it, it's so loud that even while speaking you are disturbed. Right? Although it's my religio. We say, why do they have to have it so loud. And I heard in India where they are banning the Azan on the loudspeaker. Okay. Fair enough. We would not have had the privilege of hearing the Azan everyday if we had lived on. I don't know how things are in India, because I don't hardly know any Muslims over there. So I don't know exactly, how much exaggeration I'm hearing, how much is the truth, but I think it's okay. We wanted to live, the Muslims wanted to live, in a country where they could pray openly without being questioned, without having to prove themselves. Now I don't have to prove myself to be a good Indian. Because I'm Muslim, I don't have to prove my loyalty to my country. If I was in India, I don't know how much is true or not. But I would have to prove, even if I'm against the government, I would dare not say a word. Because I may be perceived as, this is seditious, she's a Muslim, so she's thinking about it. In Pakistan I can call my government whatever I want, I'm not scared. Nobody is going to judge me. Ah, Samina is a Muslim. Nobody is going to think about it. They'll say yes, this woman does not agree with her. Okay the government does not like it, the people do not like it. I would not have to prove my trustworthiness because of my religion.

Do you think it's a good thing religion is intertwined with the government in Pakistan?

No the religion is not too intertwined, interestingly enough, we are still following the British law in a lot of things, for instance, there's another law that was passed by the President of Pakistan about 20, 30 years ago, that if a man wants to remarry, he has to ask his wife, so that's not a religious law, this is law made by the country just to make it easier for the women because in every religion, people do misuse the laws of God. And he made this law, that a man will have to take permission from his wife, because that's not in Islamic law. According to Islamic law, he could have married the second wife, or the third, but it was made straight. So we do follow some things, but not totally. It's not a country where only the Sharia rules the land. No. We have a mixture.

So what do you think of the conflict of India right now. You were saying it goes in waves, so where do you think it's at right now?

I don't exactly know, because I don't live there. But yeah, definitely there's a tension, because at the border there's always something going on. One person killed, two person killed, a shelling there, a shelling here. It is not so good at the moment. But this has been happening for 73 years, at the borders. It's never quiet, there's always something or the other happening, I think it's trying to irritate each other. Irritants. But yeah, I think there's always a fear of something escalating. Some incident, and then an escalation, and then the whole world must quickly calm both sides down. And I don't know how long it'll

go. We hope that there will be, you know, we don't have to trade with each other too much, we don't have to have open borders, but we should live in peace. You stay in my part, I stay in my part, and we both go on with our lives, that sort of thing. I wish this would happen, but I don't know how long. But like always, there's always tension at the border, there's always armies facing each other, ready to take action if required.

Then what do you think of the Kashmiri people at the moment?

I think that at the moment they are being treated very badly, their facebook, their internet systems have been disrupted. I think this in the modern world, to be doing it to a whole host of people, a region, which is being treated not good at all. It is very painful. Very, very painful. To hear how they are being treated. And especially, when the treaty was made with these people, it has been broken. They have gone back on their words. The government, the BJP, has gone back on his words. A good government doesn't do that. So I think this Kashmiri situation is really sad, very painful, and I hope the present government will do something about it, improve the condition. I think they are suffocating them. You know what, there's one Indian gentleman whom we know, he recently brought shawls from India, from Kashmir, for 200,000 Swiss francs. Do you know why? He said, this trade of embroidery will die. So he thought okay I'll buy a lot of good shawls, then in five, ten years when the trade has died, I'll sell them at ten times the price. Because people can see. And this is an Indian gentleman. People can see the depth of the people, Kashmiri in any case is not a language that is written, it's only spoken. So the language will die, the people will die, the trades will die. It's ethnic minority which will die. So when you see this, it breaks your heart. So in these modern times, when people are trying to make peace, improve, maintain their culture, preserve their culture, a culture is being killed, it's dying, it's dying. And when you come across videos because they have access to sending us, they are cutting trees. I saw one program that showed they were cutting trees. What does that mean? That the fruit that is growing, from which they can feed themselves, or sell, they are being cut. What does that mean? Killing them, starving them, taking away hope. Very painful. And we, Pakistanis do have an affinity to these people, so it hurts even more. But then again, we can't interfere, we can only tell the world, look this is happening, do something about it. That's all we can do. Or hope that that Indian government has better policies. It's a very sad affair.

So what did you think of Modi revoking Article 370? What did you think of that?

See I can't interfere in another country's affairs, but one can have an opinion, and I think that is an absolute, I don't have the right word, like it's against the law of the countries. Okay he did take, like the Parliament passed it, so it wouldn't be against the country's law. But it would be against international law, against the human, like he broke a promise, made a long time ago. I think that's a very wrong thing. But if the Indians go along with it, I think it was the right thing, one can't do anything, except the United Nations maybe, if someone takes the topic and goes to the United Nations and they take some actions. And yes, I think it was very wrong. But history shows us that wrong things are done, people shut their eyes, and then regret it 100 years later. History tells us about it. But yeah, it was not right. But I have one or two good friends that say, no it was time for this to happen. We discussed it, we seldom discuss politics and religion, amongst us friends, because that is something one has to stay out of, otherwise everyone becomes very emotional. No, I think it was time that this was revoked. And I said, okay, if that's what you think, but I don't know if this was the right time to revoke it.

So what was your reaction when you first heard that he revoked it? And then what was your reaction when you heard that your friends..

Very said, and very annoyed, because that was not right. I can be annoyed at so many things that are happening in the world, but I don't take action so my annoyance is not enough. There should be people who take action for it. Yes. It was very upsetting how things happen. How people can vote for it. Friendship doesn't come between what you think about, I mean we all have every right, she was from South of India, and she said I think it was time and I said no, it was not time, but that's it. Friendship doesn't get affected by your opinion. I did tell her, no that was not right. And she said, no, it was time, why should they have a special status. Why not? If they were given a special status, let it be like that. But, I let them have their culture, and their ethnic culture, let it stay that way. But it was her opinion. That's it. But that doesn't affect our friendship. Friendship is something deeper, caring for each other. Her opinion, okay if she went around killing Muslims, okay you stay away from me, but okay if she has an opinion, and she thinks she's right, fine. It's okay, It's her choice. Just like I choose to say, that was not the right thing to happen.

What was your reaction to the Pulwama attack in February of 2019?

I wasn't really, I don't really know the whole story, what happened. But, then again, two countries, two different narratives. Pakistan says it was all planned, and India says Pakistan did it. Now who do you believe and who do you not believe? So the best thing is, I can't give an opinion about that, because I don't really know the whole story. What happened, how many people were killed, where was this place. I sort of missed this whole story. I do know the Pulwama attack, but what happened, I have no clue, truly speaking.

Did you hear about the pilot?

Yes, that I did hear, and see on the TV, and internet and all, and Pakistan returned him within one or two days, I was thinking we should have kept him for a week. I thought, I am a layman, I am not a politician, I think we should have had him for a week, just to tell the Indians that we do have some power over him and we will exchange him for something good. But the government decided to return him quickly because he is a prisoner of war, and I think that is fine. Because we are not about to mistreat the prisoners of war. He's not a criminal, he's fighting for his country. For instance if I'm an army officer, I'll fight for my country. And he was doing what his country had told him to do. He was down by the Pakistanis, and they were going to also, and the crowd was very angry at him, and they would have probably beaten him up. Badly, and killed him. Because in a crowd, the frenzy gets higher and higher. But fortunately for him, an army officer came. In fact, I think they had gotten the news that an aeroplane has fallen. So he'd even took his name and said that gentlemen saved me from the crowd. And then he was returned, within one or two days, which I think is okay if the government decides, fine, they must have a reason for it. And yeah, that's the whole thing, two sides, two stories, two narratives. So you just have to have an open mind and look for middle ground and decide, how much is this exaggerating, how much is this side exaggerating. And you leave it to the country to make decisions. And if the government decided to return him, good, very good.

Do you think at this point, India is a reliable partner for peace? Do you think they should work together or are we past that point?

No you're never past that point, there's always dialogue that can go on, but you know like two days ago you're shooting each other's soldiers and then third day you say that we can live in peace and love each other? It takes time to develop relationships, to trust each other. Only when both sides are committed, and it cannot be an overnight thing. But one can always pursue peace. One can always look for ways of living together. Living peacefully, in each other's countries. I think there was recently an agreement broken by India, so then trust breaks. Or when the politicians of a country say no do this, or smash this, then the people of the country do not trust the other country. I'm not saying both sides don't say such things about each other, but then how can the relationships develop. If we're going to have a narrative which is so negative. We can take a step forward, maybe not buddies but at least we can be good neighbours. At the moment, things are quite hot, and at the moment it's best if we have a dialogue, inviting people at the table. Saying this is your demand this is our demand, okay let's find a middle way. There are sometimes when India even refuses to talk to Pakistan. Because India is a bigger country, and they feel like 'I don't have to negotiate with them, they are small fry' then they will never be pleased. Germany is a big country, Switzerland is a small country. If Germany doesn't take a step forward, Switzerland would be squashed. So you have to live with your neighbors in a good way, you don't have to be friends, you don't have to be buddies, but you have to respect each other. And this will come with time, with good governance, with friendlier governments, with smarter governments, who think far ahead, for their people, for their country, for the good, and for the peace of the world. But at the moment I think it's a very difficult time. They will have to take one step at a time, to improve the relationship. It cannot be open borders, closed borders, this is what happens many times. No. Take is slow and steady, and we can achieve peace. At the moment the relationship is not good.

Do you think Modi's the right person to take that step?

I don't think he's the right person. His government is not at all for peace. They are not looking for peace, they are looking for confrontation. And they are a big aggressive. But god willing, another party might come that has a more balanced view. Only time will see. But I think this government is not looking for friendship at all. They are on a very negative path and rhetoric. Rhetoric is very bad, and rhetoric affects the people. Even if you don't do anything, the rhetoric then it becomes negative, and the people of that country start thinking negatively. Because that is being pounded on you morning, afternoon, evening, the media speaking about it. And you really think the other person is a demon. You can't help doing that. It would be the same with us. If our government keeps on saying this is bad, this is this, obviously Pakistanis would be affected. And they will think the opposite side is a demon. So the governments have to calm down, the politicians have to calm down, and then, but the desire for peace has to be there. You have to decide peace. And if you say, okay, I'm fine on an aggressive path. But with BJP at the moment, I think the party is on the aggressive path. And hopefully the next ones will come will be more calm and balanced, I would say. But, being nationalistic is alright, loving your country is alright. Wanting to half the best is fine, making relationships with different countries for different reasons is fine. But then, beyond that, to go on a aggressive rhetoric, then relationships cannot develop.

And do you think solutions should be homegrown or do you think there should be room for international arbitration? Like with the US, or some European countries...

No, not US. Better to be people in the region, who are going through it, who know it. But yes, United Nations is a good place to go to. In some matters, definitely international arbitration. But, in a lot of matters, just the two countries sitting down together and talking. And of course there are things which both are not agreeing to, then you call in a third party.

But that's a lot of things

I mean it's always best having two people talk. But that is why the United Nations was made, to help. So we can all just go back to them and ask for help, but there are a lot of things that can be discussed by the two, step by step, gently, and solutions can come. I'm a layman, I don't know much about it, I'm just telling you from my heart.

That's what I want!

What do you want to see happen in the region? What would be the ideal next step for you? Or even in the future what would you want to see?

I would like to see that they are just posts at the borders, no armies standing against each other. I would like to see that it is easy for us to come to India and for us to Pakistan. Maybe not a crowd or an onslaught. Because if there's too many than somebody has a bad experience, then 'oh this is not a good country', or the other way around. But we should have, ask for a visa, we should have it conveniently for each other's country. I think Pakistan and India still do some trade with onions and tomatoes and all that. They are still doing all that trade, so it should be a gradual process, but I would be happier if the army was not standing against each other. There was some resolve about Kashmir, something that was resolved about the Kashmir and the Kashmiri people, that they can come to us, we can go over there, and they were given a status where they can live peacefully, and the whole problem is, interestingly enough, Kashmiris don't want to join Pakistan, that's the interesting part, Kashmiris don't want to join, they just want independence. There's a perception that they want to join us, not at all. They're a very different kind of people, who have their own ethnic qualities. They would rather be independent. They don't want to, this perception that we loosen the noose around their neck they would join Pakistan, no way, they have no intentions of doing that. They may have the same religion, but that doesn't mean, I mean I have the same religion as Arabs, but do you think that we think alike? No. We have our own culture, they have their own culture. I may not agree with a lot of things that Arabs do. But, yes, we have the same religion. It's the same with the Kashmiris. They have the same religion, but not the same culture, and they might not want to mingle and mix with us. They will come and see us, but they don't necessarily want to join Pakistan. So I would live to see a more peaceful region, less people being killed at the borders, innocent people, working in the fields, on both sides. Just like with Afghanistan, we don't have troops over there, we have these borders, people standing at the border, and then letting them in or out, with the visas now. Letting them in or out. No lovey-dovey relationships in the sense, that would be pretense. Only time will tell us if we do care or not. But if foreign countries we live so nicely why can't we live in our own countries.

You were talking about how the Kashmiris want independence. Do you think that's a good idea?

If I think from the Kashmiri point of view, that's a good idea, but if I think from the Indian point of view, I think it's not a good idea. Because once Kashmir becomes independent, then the other parts of northern India will ask for independence. And that no country wants to let go of, not just India, any country. Because then other regions will start saying, we want to be independent. And then the fear of the country breaking up, into pieces, comes. So if I think from an Indian perspective I would say well, they have to really consider the idea of letting it become independent. Because then, will be a whole line of people from different states saying we want to be independent too, and then they'll have trouble on their hands. On one hand, you know their problem, but on the other hand, it's sad that some people are being suppressed.

What do you think though? From your point of view.

From my point of view, I would be very happy if Kashmir became independent. Because then I would be able to go to Kashmir. But that's a very selfish approach, I would say. Because actually by descent I am a Kashmiri, I mean my forefathers came 150 years ago, or so. But till now, we have a lot of Kashmiri traditions. We eat a lot of food, like the Kashmiris did. Because as you know, in olden times, people married within their own community. So I don't know the language, I don't know the culture, but I feel Kashmiri. So if you ask my perspective, I would be very happy if they have their independence. But if I think from an Indian point of view, I think look, most Indians would not be happy about it.

Do you think your views have been influenced by your education in Pakistan?

No, when we were growing up, we were going to a convent. And the convent doesn't teach our history at all. We read all about the kings and this and that. No, not really, we were never really taught in school about Kashmir and all that. This was a long time ago. In fact, I think our history when we were growing up was neglected in fact. What we heard was from our parents. We didn't hear anything from our schools, not at all. And even now, I'm not sure, because I don't know the curriculum now. But no, when we were growing up nothing was taught in school.

Do you think your views have changed since you left in Pakistan?

I think so because when you live abroad, you have Indian friends, you're really fond of them, you sit and eat with them. You go out with them. So the fear of the unknown is gone away. Whether you were in Pakistan or India, you have never met a Pakistani. So you think, 'hmm, Pakistanis are very dangerous people', and likewise. But when you are abroad, you're on neutral ground, so it's like a neutral ground for me. Now I made friends, because I liked them, it didn't matter whether it was an Indian or a Pakistani, I had to like that person. And when I liked that person, it didn't matter to be, whether she was a Sikh or a Punjabi or a Gujarati, for me, it was having fun with her, being able to talk to her. So definitely, living abroad opens your eyes to the feeling that this person is with two eyes, two hands, two legs, just like me. So that fear of unknown, or the perspective, of all are bad, or all are good, goes away. When I came to Switzerland I heard, 'oh the Swiss are very bad, they don't make friends', I made friends with Swiss people too. So it was wrong. It was only when I experienced it I knew how it felt. It was the same with

Indian and Pakistani friends. I have some good Pakistani friends but not everyone that I like. And same with Indian friends, out of 25 girls that I met, I'm very fond of 5, for instance. And I'm very close to them. I can talk about everything with them. So definitely living abroad has changed. But I remember always, that was perhaps me and my upbringing, because we were educated in a convent. So we were really used to living with Christians, Muslims. So for me, Christians were just like me, it didn't matter. And then I always thought, so what if somebody else has another religion. And some people thought it very strange on my part, but for me it doesn't matter to be because I thought if I'm wrong, I'll be punished for my behavior for following the wrong God. And if that person is wrong, then she will be punished. But I'm not God, I cannot say right or wrong. So that is why, I mean I was always like that, and then when I came abroad, for me, human beings are more important. And how, what kind of a person is right in front of me. The rest is his or her decision. So, yeah it does change your perspective when you go and live abroad.

You said you also lived in Dubai. Do you think it changed more when left from Pakistan to Dubai or Dubai to Zurich?

No, in Dubai, I had more Pakistani friends, because it was a big bank and we didn't need to know any other people. We didn't even know Arabs. We didn't mingle with Arabs. I did have one or two Indian friends, but mostly I mingled with the Pakistanis, because it was easier. In my own building, I have four, five girls, who I was very fond of. But when I came here, I met all sorts because it's a very small community, and then I met some people, and really liked them, and then it didn't matter to me which country they belonged to.

Do you have anything else to add?

As I told you, I just hope for peace, and a step by step peace, which would be longer lasting than this love hate relationship, which comes and goes. It should be a gradual development of trust and development of relationships, but slowly. But both the parties need to have the desire for it, one side cannot achieve it. That's my prayer and hope. Because then we all will thrive. When I have anger over here, I cannot thrive in my heart, but when this is open, then I thrive and happier and it's the same with the people of both the countries. So that's my hope and my prayer and my desire.

Academic Paper

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

Sample: B

Score: 5

This elegantly communicated paper earned a score of 5. The paper provides an in-depth review of the scholarly conversation found on pages 1-3. This review leads naturally to a clearly-articulated gap, found on page 3. It states, “Because only a minimal amount of research has been done to study the perceptions on the India-Pakistan conflict, more of an effort needs to be made in understanding the view of citizens. Are Indians and Pakistanis as divided as perceived? Furthermore, no work specific to Zurich, Switzerland has been published. Therefore, this paper will examine the perceptions of Pakistani immigrants in the Zurich canton on the India-Pakistan conflict.”

The paper hypothesizes that “Pakistani immigrants will favor Pakistan’s government and policies when speaking about the India-Pakistan conflict” and provides a rationalized, well defended method on pages 4 and 5 to test this hypothesis. The methods include interviewing participants and then using the interview transcripts to conduct a thematic analysis to establish recurring themes. The methods are thoroughly described in clear, replicable steps.

The findings and discussion section provide a nuanced analysis, which includes an eloquent discussion of the boundaries of the conclusions found on page 17, stating, “First, the researcher’s background could have led to potentially biased responses to the questions posed. Because of the researcher’s Indian background, interviewees could have felt a hesitation in expressing their pro-Pakistani views. At the beginning of each interview, it was made clear that though the researcher is of Indian descent, she is willing to hear all perspectives as part of the research process. While the researcher does feel as though individuals generally felt comfortable speaking with her, especially because they have lived abroad for a number of years, it would be naive to not include the researcher’s Indian background as a source of bias. Furthermore, as an 18-year-old Indian-American female who has never resided in South Asia, many individuals may view it as frivolous to have a discussion with the researcher, viewing her as an outsider. Although the researcher once again attempted to combat this by explaining the project in depth and communicating in Hindi, this part of the researcher’s background could also be a source of bias. Another limitation could be the interviewees’ shared experiences.” This section demonstrates a clear limitation on the conclusion and a careful reflection on the research process.

In addition to the evidence mentioned above, this paper did not earn a score of 4 as it offers clear and substantive implications to its findings found on page 18, stating, “Because this interaction can lead to different political perceptions, this research opens up avenues for Non-Governmental Organizations to initiate projects bringing Indians and Pakistanis together, which if successfully change perceptions, could make a difference at the polls.”

This paper is a strong example of a paper that earned a score of 5.