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ABSTRACT

According to former secretary general of United Nations Kofi Anan the event of 9/11 was a seismic shift in international politics. Pakistan as an intrinsic part of the global war on terror is facing repercussions on its politics, economy, and social fabric and on foreign policy. The United States of America contemplated Pakistan as frontline state against international war on terror due to its long border with Afghanistan, ethnic composition across the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan and close proximity with Taliban who supported Osama bin laden a major culprit of the crucial events of the 21st century. The paper discusses the consequences of the US-led war on terror and the direct effects on Pakistan.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 9/11 after Iraq and Afghanistan; Pakistan is the only country that got more damage of war on terror than any other country in the world. The U-turn in the foreign policy of Pakistan after the event has taken by a single individual (Pervez Musharraf) who didn’t have the strong domestic support. Pakistan since has been facing grim security, political, economic, and geo-strategic challenges. Thousands of innocent people including political leaders have been killed in suicide bombing. Suicide bombing, attacks on mosques, on an army Head Quarter and the offices of the intelligence agencies has become the order of the day in Pakistan.

Critics of the war strongly believe that political leadership in Pakistan due to American influence has made war on terror into war of terror; they have brought war inside Pakistan. And the military of Pakistan is playing the role of mercenary of America. Critics are also of the view that on the one hand accentuating Pakistan to do more on the other hand Obama administration is inviting the Taliban for talks in Afghanistan. “Pakistan’s post 9/11 alliance with the U.S was, however, the beginning of another painful chapter in Pakistan’s turbulent political history. In the blinking of an eye, Pakistan’s become a battleground of the U.S war on terror and is paying a heavy price in terms of human and material losses.”¹

The policy of aggressive defence was adopted by America and Pakistan has inflicted more vulnerabilities rather than making peace in Afghanistan and Pakistan. America is losing grip in Iraq and Afghanistan due to its aggressive policy. “9/11 attack on the prestige of America’s military and economic power have diametrically changed international political scenario and seismic change in the international arena. The spillover implications are so vulnerable and wide spread. Indeed, the event has unleashed that including Iraq, Afghanistan and even U.S; Pakistan is the only country that has been in deep trouble due to the event of 9/11.
“Since the event Pakistan has been facing its desperate dilemma of its foreign policy. Within the blink of moments after the horrific event of 9/11; Pakistan’s Geo-strategic put Pakistan into America’s threat of seven point ultimatum, saying Pakistan to accept all the demands. These demands were: Abandon the Taliban, abandon Islamic Jihad give passage to flight, provide access to the all types of operations, and providing intelligence about Taliban.”

2. U.S POLICY TOWARDS PAKISTAN AFTER 9/11

Before 9/11 the relationship between Pakistan and America were very low. Pakistan’s nuclear explosions, Kargil issue and military coup of Musharaf in 1999 alienated Americans. Furthermore President Clinton’s visit to the India and Pakistan in 2000 showed America’s tilt towards India. “At the time of 9/11, the U.S.-Pakistan relationship was its lowest ebb. The relations of both the countries were constrained over facets of issues as Pakistan’s support of the Taliban in Afghanistan. Pakistan was facing a great deal of economic and military sanctions as Pressler, Glenn and Symington Amendments and also sanctions due to lack of democratization in the country. And the worst situation in Pakistan was that America was making amicable diplomatic relations with Pakistan’s rival in the region- India.”

The event of 9/11 put Pakistan at the place America’s strategic ally and front line state in the U.S led war on terror. Pakistan provided logistic, military, and intelligence support to America in Afghanistan. America in pretext of war has long geo-strategic objective in Afghanistan. First it wants is to eradicate extremism and terrorism from the region which is a serious security threat to American security in the world. Second U.S wants to check china’s increasing influence in the Asian and Far Eastern region. Third Russia is still a threat to American interest in the central Asian region to American; so to contenting this objective American presence is crucial to secure its interests. “As Afghanistan was landlocked country, America was in need of airspace, bases and strategic support of neighbouring countries to occupy Afghanistan. America was contemplating on different options as Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan for support but America was really in need of Pakistan.

Almost all the strategic supply including aircrafts, troops, and other supply were coming across via Arabian Sea where Iran was considered not a viable option Pakistan’s Geo-strategic location both provide proximity to the Arabian sea and the Afghan border. Even if Pakistan’s close relations with Taliban Bush administration decided to gain Pakistan’s support.”

Pakistan’s role in the scenario is significant in many counts. Pakistan’s Geo-strategic location provides a safe route for U.S and NATO supply in Afghanistan. Pakistan had remained a close ally of America in war against U.S.S.R the country provided Military and economic assistance to Mujahdeen; against Russia in Afghanistan. Pakistan military had close relations with Taliban infect Pakistan was one of the countries who recognized the Taliban government in Afghanistan. With the help of Pakistan America can get its desired goals easily.

As Pakistan is the only Countries that have had capture more terrorist than any other country in the war against terror. In response to Pakistan cooperation America has lifted all economic and military sanctions from Pakistan. U.S helps Pakistan through economic assistance in the war against terror. “President Bush provided economic aid to Pakistan remove all sanctions related to democracy and debt in 2003. Including those sanctions that hinder U.S accede 600 million dollars in economic aid to Islamabad. In 2002, Pakistan got an estimated $ 624.5 million in for amelioration assistance, where India got $ 164.3 in the development aid, and food aid grain.”

Analyzing the long term geo-strategic goals America has adopted three prong strategies in the region. First as it is losing its grip in the war on terror in Afghanistan U.S has engaged Pakistan to fight the war on behalf of U.S. second checking chains influence in the region America has made India its strategic partner in the region. America is ready to support Indian
demand of permanent member security council in the United Nations and done controversial civil nuclear deal with India. Third America’s presence in Afghanistan is a close watch to the preparation of Iran’s nuclear capability. “The United States of America has a widespread strategy on the war on terror not only for Pakistan but also regarding the whole South Asian region. American objectives in the war on terror towards Pakistan are: enhancing regional states to stabilize the situation in the region; assisting Pakistan by ensuring its economic growth, social integration, political stability, and enhancing democratic order in the country and making the people of both the states to close to each other and consolidating bilateral relations.”

Despite Pakistan’s significant performance the U.S and its Allies pushing Pakistan to do more, it is a matter of fact that Pakistan got more damaged and sacrifices in the war on terror than any other country including America in Afghanistan. America has adopted coercive diplomacy in Pakistan since the event of 9/11. Many analysts believe that Pakistan lost its fundamentals of foreign policy due to the individual decision of General Pervez Musharrarf.

They are of the view that had there been elected governments the scenario would have been changed. Pakistan has got great set back to its Kashmir policy, lost the policy of strategic depth in Afghanistan and more importantly in the region U.S possesses double standard give priority to India, make civil nuclear deal with India. “Thought out by the coercing power and then clearly transmitted to the coerced power. In this case the demand was fairly simple: the U.S. demanded Pakistan’s support the war in Afghanistan. America impaled Pakistan not to deal its options including nuclear weapons or Kashmir. The U.S successfully manipulates the situation and project “either you are with us are with terrorists”.

3. PAKISTAN’S CONCERNS ON WAR AGAINST TERROR

Pakistan despite giving a great deal of sacrifices and got economic, political infrastructural and Geo-strategic setbacks are considered as playing double standards with the U.S. America tries to pressurize Pakistan to do more and to stop infiltration in Afghanistan. Another concern of Pakistan is “drone attacks” U.S many times breached the sovereignty of Pakistan and sends the fighter jets without a pilot that targeted inside the territory of Pakistan and killed many innocent civilians. Pakistan in the war on terror also lost its cause of Kashmir India has rightly exploited the situation and pressurize not to support Kashmiries, including Afghanistan India also complaining for the cross border infiltration inside the Indian territory.

4. THE KASHMIR CONNECTIONS AND THE WAR ON TERROR

The definition of war on terror is quite controversial every country is trying to interpret it for their connivance. The Taliban or enemies of today were Mujahdeen; friends of U.S who fought a proxy war of U.S against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Another dilemma of war on terror is the double standards of American policy it gives license to India, Israel and Russia to get their perfidious advantages to nip in the bud to the freedom struggle in Kashmir, Palestine and Chechnya. In the war on terror Pakistan being a close ally to America fails to pursue its principle stand on Kashmir issue.

“The dimensions of the Kashmir issue diametrically went upside down owing to the event of 9/11 that brought round U.S agenda of the war on terror in the region. America considerably accentuate in the war on terror issues like, extremism, Islamic fundamentalism all is inversely proportional to Pakistan’s policy on Kashmir. The United States dealing with the issue without differentiating between the freedom struggles and international terrorism the world community seem to have adopted a reluctant attitude. India has manipulated the situation proving Pakistan as country supporting cross-border terrorism in the Kashmir.”
Since Pakistan could not peruse America on its principle stand on Kashmir because the decision taken on the eve of 9/11 was by single individual General Musharaf for saving his power in the politics of Pakistan. Many analysts believe that Pakistan could have bargain form the American some crucial issues like Kashmir and its nuclear programme.

5. DRONE ATTACKS

Yet another cause of concern for Pakistan is the drone attacks by the U.S inside the territory. The issue has not only alienated Pakistani authorities but also it enhance more terrorists innocent civilian killed in these attacks adapted the way to kill other people in Pakistan to get their revenge. Pakistan considered drone attacks as deteriorating factor that is enhancing more terrorism. The discordant reaction of Pakistan was strong protest to the US Embassy, and denunciation of missile attacks that Islamabad considers it will innervate the support of the people for the government’s efforts” and should be “stopped immediately.” Gen. Petraeus during his visit to Pakistan got a strong message from the Pakistani authorities complaining on U.S military strikes inside the border areas of Pakistan. The defence minister of Pakistan gave warnings to General Petraeus that the strikes surly are projecting a great setback to the war on terror by creating sense of restlessness among the common people of Pakistan.

Fig.1: DRONE STRIKES BY THE UNITED STATES

The fig. 1 shows monthly drone attacks in Pakistan in 2008 and 2009. In 2008 January 4 attacks have been done. In February in the same year 1 attack has been done; in March 3 attacks, in April 5 attacks, in May 4 attacks, in June 6 attacks, in the July 8 attacks, in the August 4 attacks and in the September 7 attacks have been done (Source: LAN S. Livingston and Micheal O’Hanlon: Brookings Pakistan Index Tracking Variables of Reconstruction & Security, Oct 30, 2009).

The fig 2 shows drone strikes by districts in 2006 to 2009. In North Waziristan 42 percent, Bajur 3.3 percent, in Bannu 2.2 percent Kurram 2.2 percent, in Orakzai 1.1 percent and in South Waziristan 42 to 49 percent (Source: Lan S. Livingston and Micheal O’Hanlon: Brookings Pakistan Index Tracking Variables of Reconstruction & Security, Oct 30, 2009)

In 2009 all 324 low, 538 high and militant 246 low, 406 high. In 2008 all 291 low, 310 high and militant 121 low, 130 high. In 2006-7 all 142 low, 164 high and militant 138 low, 160

Fig. 2: DRONE STRIKES BY DISTRICTS 2006-2009

Table 1: DEATHS FROM DRONE STRIKES

Table 1 shows that the estimated total death from US drone strikes during 2006-2009

6. U.S SUPPORT DICTATORS IN WAR ON TERROR

There is growing criticism on the U.S. policy that America around the Muslim world has been supporting the dictators in its war led against terrorism. Many critics in the Muslim world of the US foreign policy contend that America holds up to governments particularly those of Muslim countries which are dictatorial and posse’s most terrible human rights records. There are facets of views that if U.S actually dedicated to dissipate democracy and human rights that America must not endow with political, economic and military prop up to those regimes. If America does that then it should not get on the policy of “assertiveness realism” dissipating democracy by force”. In Pakistan U.S has history to support dictators. Since 9/11 American support to General Musharaf has affected Pakistan’s internal politics, its geo-strategic concerns and most importantly the institutional development. A deficit of democracy causes a sheer breach of law and human rights.

7. ECONOMIC LOSES OF PAKISTAN IN WAR ON TERROR

During 2007 and 2008 the “Since 2007 and 08, the “fight against terrorism” is increasing towards various stages, with the Pakistan Army has widespread military action in
the country’s North West (in Malakand/Swat, and the Agencies of South Waziristan, Bajuar, Mohmand, Khyber, and lately, Kurram and Orakzai). Consequently over 3 million people have been displaced but their spillover impact on the economy is great cause of concerns. It is officially estimated that Pakistan’s economy has been impacted to the extent of over US $3 billion between 2001 and 2010.”¹¹ A brief list of the areas that have been impacted includes the Following:

- Turn down in the increase of GDP
- Decrease in external internal investment
- Failure of increasing export
- Destroy the physical infrastructure
- Desperate lack of employment opportunities
- Distraction of allocation of the budget related to defence and security
- Cut off in the expenditures of public good
- Assets, and Human Capital, Flight
- Decrease in resources
- Sheer reduction in the exchange price
- Great set back to the tourism industry.
- Enormous lose of social and environmental conditions.

“Since 2007 the security situation in Pakistan has gotten greater challenge from the war on terror; it unleashed the fact 3 million people have been displaced due to war, great burden on the budget that is US $600 million, the consequences of war has left spill over implications on the economic growth 1.2 percent in 2008/2009, with widespread manufacturing 8.2 percent per year.”¹² The export sector, with a contribution of 12 percent to GDP, and a Substantial employment base has faced the brunt of the fallout. The adverse impact on the export sector has manifested itself in the following ways:

- Thrashing of export orders / trade diversion to competitors
- “Eternal” removal of Pakistan from global manufacture and marketing series of global brands/large trade houses
- Downgrading to low value supplementary goods, products
- A considerable turn down in value/element worth for yield
- Augment in charge of doing trade;
- Failure of plan and scientific reassign
- Thrashing of commercial assets due to investment escape and intellect deplete
- Privileged consignment, indemnity and safety outlay
- Loss of income, new, investment and jobs.”¹³

8. THE EFFECTS OF AFGHAN POLICY

Pakistan has got great set back to its Afghan policy. After the occupation of Afghanistan a new set up of government was established by U.S and its allies is opposite to Pakistan’s interests. Pakistan has lost its policy of strategic depth”. On the other hand the Indian influence has been increasing in Afghanistan that innervates the interests of Pakistan in the region. Including this there has been increasing concerns of border infiltration, drug tracking. Pakistan has shown great apprehensions over the on six Indian positions of consulates in proximity to the Pakistani border, and of Indian military backing to the Afghanistan establishment for the establishment of the Afghanistan national military. India has sent 3000 commandos to Afghanistan.
India was of the view that these troops were for the protection of their workers in Afghanistan. India asserts their troops in Afghanistan are available to provide security to the Indian workers; Pakistan has rejected that alibi by saying Afghan government has not permitted the security forces of other countries. Furthermore the presence of Afghanistan’s member of the provincial assembly and their personals of intelligence agency has confirmed the concerns of Pakistan. Pakistan now believes that some groups from the cross border are explicitly involved in the Baluchistan and NWFP.

9. PAKISTAN’S SECURITY CONCERNS

The war on terror has created security issues in Pakistan. The internal security seems fragile against the human bomb. So far many civilian and military targets have been by the terrorists including the Army Head Quarter in Rawalpindi in 2009. Pakistan’s operations against the Taliban in NWFP; and the red Mosque incidents have given an opportunity to the terrorists to attack every nook and cranny of Pakistan. Since so many civilians and military personnel have lost their lives. The areas of frontier of Pakistan are fragile and Pakistan is facing tremendous armed aggression in Waziristan, which is part of the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), and Baluchistan.

In 2003 the army launched operation in the FATA, where the Afghan Taliban and al-Qaeda were active to operate. “Musharaf launched military operation and the process of peace talks with the local tribal leaders to innervate the position of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. There is a desperate lack of peace talks in Baluchistan. International crisis group and the other organization have unleashed the fact that disappointment is going to increase in FATA and Gilgit Baltistan. The consequence of red mosque operation has given birth to the new wave of suicide bombing in the country.”14 “Incidents of missile/rocket firing, Improvised Explosive Device (IED) explosions and land mine explosions went down to 417, lesser than 528 such acts of terrorism in 2006. There are increases of attacks on the security forces security; 100 percent with 234 personnel losing lives in about465 attacks throughout the country, including the offices and the vehicles of the intelligence services.

For counter-terrorism Pakistani and US troops near Ghazi Barotha, North Western Frontier Province (NWFP). Most of the attacks on LEP were carried out in FATA and the adjoining settled districts FATA.”15 In the year of 2007 the former Prime Minister of Pakistan was killed in a suicide attempt in Rawalpindi. It created political instability in the country. Targeting civilian as well as military installations the terrorists, are trying to pressurize the government of Pakistan to stop ongoing operations in NWFP. Till then the Jihadists groups conducted successful suicide attacks against the military, air force and established enormous damage to the infrastructure and the intelligence agencies of Pakistan including ISI was also being targeted.

Pakistan President General (r) Pervez Musharaf on record claimed that such activities and the killing of Ms. Benazir Bhutto is linked with the Taliban leaders based in FATA. Her killing aggravated the domestic political instability and insecurity in Pakistan but the threat is still looming as many other top political leaders reportedly are on the hit list of the terrorists. The worsening of political stability in Pakistan is compelling the Americans to re-establish its options as the New York Times suggested in one of its reports on Jan 6, 2008 that the National Security Council was believed to have more aggressive operations in the Pakistani areas of FATA region. Observers say that chaos, weakened government control and the entry of the US military into the conflict all blend into conditions in which al-Qaeda removal. Al-Qaeda believes that Pakistan and Afghanistan are greater opportunities for them exploit their agenda to defeat America.
Table: 4 show that the number of suicide attacks on Pakistan’s provinces from 2002 to 2009. The table shows the highest number of attacks in the province of Khyber- pakhtoonkhawa in 2006, 2007, and 2008, on second number is FATA, and Punjab is on number three. Baluchistan is on number four and Sindh is at number five respectively.

10. POLICIES OF NEW ADMINISTRATION IN WAR ON TERROR

The policies of the new U.S administration and democratic government in Pakistan are not new in long term matters but in the prevalent scenario of Iraq and Afghanistan the Obama administration has taken some drastic steps in the war on terror. For ten years has been past America could not get substantial success in Afghanistan and Iraq. The Obama administration is trying to peruse pragmatic approach. On international level it is bringing Muslims countries on board. In Afghanistan and Iraq in short terms the policy of use of force has been abrogated and U.S is trying to talk with Taliban and give them some kind of concessions to them.

The Obama administration has also given an exit strategy from Afghanistan. The gradual Withdrawal in 2011 and in 2014 has been announced. The Bush administration has got sever criticism regarding human rights in Guatemala jell were suspected Muslims were treated brutally in the prison. President Obama has revealed his new strategy regarding Afghanistan and Pakistan in 27 March 2009: to interrupt, take apart and overcome Al-Qaeda may regrouping in Pakistan and Afghanistan in the future; having a safe heaven for Al-Qaeda in Pakistan is a source of grave concerns, because the “cardinal threat to Pakistan's future comes from Al-Qaeda and its radical partners. “The president also reasonably assures that the America will increase aid to Pakistan to $1.5 billion per year over at least 5 years, that can be extended for another five years; however US will not give any “no blank Cheques”.

As a replacement for, there would be a marvellous act in progress and current calculation. Furthermore to the 17,000 troops sent to Afghanistan, 4,000 more will be delivered to make security arrangements including giving training help the Afghan National Security Forces to assist them to regularly take more responsibility for the Afghan people. Obama said more resources would be dedicated to civilian efforts in both Afghanistan and Pakistan, to donate to safety and society building."
Any policy or strategic framework is only as effective as the tactical measures taken to ensure relevance in the context of the “on the ground” realities. This is particularly true in the case of Pakistan, where the underlying realities are influenced by several complicated contextual currents. “As the US develops its Pakistan policy, it is important to recognize that in the past, large amounts of aid—military, development or otherwise—have simply disappeared into the various bureaucracies involved. Achieving these ambitious and challenging objectives in Pakistan will require going well beyond simply donating aid dollars: it will require active, accountable engagement throughout the development process which will likely last well over a decade. Also critical to recognize is the suspicion with which many Pakistanis view the US; hence, America’s Pakistan strategy cannot be seen—by the Pakistani government, Pakistani citizens, or the rest of the Muslim world—as unilateralist.”

According to Kori Schake of Foreign Policy, there are three major challenges to Obama’s Af-Pak strategy. First, there is a desperate trust deficit between the Afghanistan and the new administration that Afghanistan cannot accomplish the prospect of the Obama administration. Establishing, competent, armed and law enforcement arrangements to consolidate Obama envisions (134,000 troops, 82,000 police) will take years to revolve up, the plane would get is desired target till 2011. “Second, even though public constituent has been accentuated the progressive blurred with “no plan for creating the indispensable US public involvement”. Finally, the approach appears to be a US plan, owing to the nonexistence of associates in the improvement and the declaration of the approach. There was no NATO involvement even if countries are of the view, that coalition hasn’t devoted itself or the assets essential to make it triumphant.”

There is a mark difference between the policies of the previous administration of the President Bush and the administration of Obama towards Pakistan. “In spite of these correspondences, there are the new essentials in the Obama approach, exclusively the amalgamation of Pakistan and the broad strategy to vanquish al Qaeda in both countries. While the Bush Administration acknowledged the significance of Pakistan for Afghan security in the plan to analyse launched at the end of 2008, the new Obama approach accentuates more comprehensively on Pakistan under the notion of “two countries but one challenge. Pakistan also got close to one and the same action with Afghanistan in the fifteen recommendations listed in the White Paper. The new approach advanced, enhanced authority and economic development for both Afghanistan and Pakistan includes with augmented facility for counterinsurgency actions and ask for a supplementary global prop up from allies.”

11. INDO-PAK RELATIONS AND WAR ON TERROR

After the 9/11 India has shrewdly manipulated the situation in South Asia and tried to declare Pakistan as hub of terrorist. In such a way India wanted to get two objectives first blaming Pakistan for the cross border terrorism to halt the ongoing struggle for freedom in Kashmir; second declaring Pakistan as a terrorist country India wanted to divert U.S attention from Pakistan’s strategic importance but India failed to get both these objectives; because of Pakistan’s Geo-strategic importance and proximity with the Taliban leaders. The attacks on the Indian Parliament in 2001 by the terrorists escalated the tension on the border of Indo-Pak. Since then America has played the role of mediator. Under the pressure of America both the countries started CBM (confidence building measures) and composite dialogues to solve their outstanding issues including Kashmir.

The current process of composite dialogue began in January 2004 when Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf and Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee met in Islamabad on the sidelines of the SAARC Summit. At that time, the decision to resume the compound dialogue was hailed as a significant step forward in the India-Pakistan peace process because
the years preceding this decision had witnessed a constant breakdown in bilateral dialogue due to various crises. More importantly, the decision to resume composite dialogue was taken after an assurance from Islamabad that it would not allow any territory under Pakistan’s control to be used for terrorist activities against India. Accordingly, in September 2004, foreign ministers of both the countries launched a composite dialogue encompassing a range of peace and security concerns, including Confidence Building Measures (CBMs), Jammu and Kashmir, Siachen, Sir Creek, Tulbul Navigation Project/Wullar Barrage, terrorism and drug trafficking, economic and commercial cooperation, and the promotion of friendly exchanges in various fields.

Since the Mumbai attacks in 2008 has derailed the process of confidence building measures. India blames Pakistan for the attack while Pakistan claims that it is already facing the domestic terrorism and the ongoing operations has created the chaotic condition in the country. The Mumbai attacks once again grounded Pakistan’s relations with India. Ordinary people, uninterested about state-level solutions a couple of months ago, are suddenly talking about what will happen next; India-Pakistan relations are today as much a part of drawing room and Dhaba discussion as they were a few years ago.”

Since the war on terror is going on the relations between the two countries are in stalemate India is determined not to start any peace talks with Pakistan until it will take action against those responsible for the Mumbai attacks.

12. CONCLUSION

As Americans are getting tangible defeat by Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan; the Obama administration is keeping up pressure on Pakistan to do more. Pakistan is trying to peruse policy on use of force in its Northern part to content terrorists inside Pakistan. The policy on the use of force has been failed to win the war. It’s high time to take cumulative decisions to bring a logical end of this war that is damaging all the nook and cranny of the world and Pakistan at large. Diplomatic means should use to deal the menace of terrorism.
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