



Powering up food

Augmenting foods with nutrients can improve overall health, but it must be regulated

Since a diversified diet that meets all nutritional requirements is difficult to provide, fortification of food is relied upon by many countries to prevent malnutrition. The World Health Organisation estimates that deficiency of key micronutrients such as iron, vitamin A and iodine together affects a third of the world's population; in general, insufficient consumption of vitamins and minerals remains problematic. Viewed against the nutrition challenge India faces, processed foods with standards-based fortification can help advance overall health goals, starting with maternal health. It is imperative, for a start, to make iron-fortified food widely available, since iron deficiency contributes to 20% of maternal deaths and is associated with nearly half of all maternal deaths. The shadow of malnutrition extends to the children that women with anaemia give birth to. They often have low birth weight, are pre-term, and suffer from poor development and lower cognitive abilities. Low intake of vitamins, zinc and folate also causes a variety of health issues, particularly when growing children are deprived. Fortification is a low-cost solution. The benefit is maximised when there is a focus also on adequate intake of oils and fats, which are necessary for the absorption of micronutrients and something poorer households often miss in their diet.

The efficacy of the fortification standards introduced by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) will depend on enforcement. It is important to ensure that all sections of producers meet the norms, since the FSSAI plans to get local flour mills to add pre-mixed nutrients. Making affordable, good quality fortified foods widely available is the key. Only such standardised processes can provide micronutrients to women, and in turn to breastfed children in the first six months after birth. A well-functioning public distribution system is the best channel to reach precisely those sections that need fortified food the most. In the case of children, recent studies show that adding zinc to food during the six months to 12 years growth period reduced the risk of death from infectious diseases and all causes put together. Fortified food, therefore, provides near to medium-term gains, and addresses micronutrient malnutrition concerns at the population level. Yet, as the WHO points out, in the long term, public health goals on prevention and elimination of nutritional deficiencies should aim at encouraging people to adopt a diversified and wholesome diet. Children, including those in school, should get a wholesome cooked meal that is naturally rich, and augmented with vegetables, fruits, dairy and other foods of choice. Fortified foods can help fill the gaps, particularly in areas that are in need of speedy remedial nutrition. It is also vital that food regulation views the issue of affordability as a central concern, because unaffordable fortified food would defeat the very purpose of fortification.

Turkish detour

Recep Tayyip Erdogan's visit highlights the need to refresh bilateral ties

There is usually a heightened exchange of diplomatic niceties between two countries just before a high-level bilateral visit. However, the optics and the statements issued by India and Turkey just ahead of President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's visit were distinctly undiplomatic. Just ahead of his trip to India, his first bilateral visit since 2008 when he was Prime Minister, Mr. Erdogan chose to make comments guaranteed to strike a discordant note in New Delhi. He said the Kashmir issue could be resolved through "multilateral negotiations", and offered himself as an intermediary with Pakistan. Mr. Erdogan knows the region well, and is aware of India's consistent position on resolving the Kashmir dispute bilaterally. That his comments came on the heels of his visit to Pakistan last year where he pledged Turkey's support to the host's position on Kashmir made them more pointed. New Delhi also made what could well be considered as a provocative gesture by inviting Cyprus President Nicos Anastasiades just days before Mr. Erdogan was due, while Vice President Hamid Ansari made a previously announced visit to Armenia. The decision on the visits related to two countries that Turkey doesn't maintain diplomatic ties with was described by India as a "coincidence".

Given this backdrop, Mr. Erdogan's visit did manage to meet the somewhat lowered expectations. His rapport with Narendra Modi is strong, and much bonhomie was on display. Both countries pledged to revive bilateral trade, which has been declining, besides improving air connectivity and increasing tourist arrivals. Mr. Erdogan's comments on supporting India's bid for the UN Security Council membership came with the rider on other countries being included, and for the Nuclear Suppliers Group with the caveat of support for Pakistan. But it is certainly a start that could lead to deeper engagement on the two issues. Significantly, while condemning terrorism he mentioned only Naxal violence and did not refer to terrorism emanating from Pakistan. India-Turkey ties date back centuries: Mughal rulers and the Sultans of the Ottoman Empire exchanged diplomatic missions. The poet Rumi and the Sufi movement there found easy synergy with the Bhakti and Sufi movements here. In the 20th century India's freedom fighters supported the Turkish independence movement. Turkey under Mr. Erdogan has in recent years turned away from the old equation, as he sought to bolster his image as a leader of the Islamic world. It is to New Delhi's credit that it chose to persist in its diplomacy with this important West Asian country, with the hope that sustained contact will refresh the relationship in a way that reflects shared concerns and is not hyphenated with ties with Pakistan — as India has been able to do with the UAE and Saudi Arabia.

Winning back the Valley

Delhi must make an open appeal for peace in Kashmir accompanied by consultations with all segments



M.K. NARAYANAN

The deteriorating situation in Jammu and Kashmir, together with strained relations among the Agenda for Alliance partners in the State, obviously prompted the meeting between Chief Minister Mehbooba Mufti and Prime Minister Narendra Modi. The April 24 meeting covered various measures to deal with the violent protests that have rocked the Valley lately, but the main outcome seemed to have been that the Bharatiya Janata Party-People's Democratic Party alliance would continue.

The BJP-PDP 'soft alliance' may have survived another rough patch. Kashmir, however, does not seem to be going anywhere. This may be par for the course as far as J&K is concerned, for in the evaluation of sceptics the future of Kashmir is almost always more of the same. The argument is that Delhi is, by and large, uninterested in changing its course, and is content with providing puerile explanations for the lives lost and the recurring crises that afflict the State. For alliance partner PDP, having lost its way as far as governance is concerned, it is currently more intent on clinging to the Alliance and the Srinagar gaddi. The future of Kashmir, hence, is nobody's concern.

More complex yet

If, during the latter part of 2016, Kashmir was portrayed as confronting one of its gravest crises ever, the situation in the Valley today is to all intents and purposes far more complex. The violent protests, with a high number of killed and injured, have hardly come down; the patterns set following the death of Burhan Wani in an encounter in July 2016 also continue.

No one in the Establishment, either in Srinagar or in Delhi, seems to know why the violence is continuing. The unchanging nature of the Kashmir scene since late 2016 and extending into 2017 is beginning to worry even those who

have for long been injured to violence and ideas of a change in plan, their sole concern having been ensuring that Kashmir remains an integral part of India.

Today it is not so much the dreaded foreign militants as the 'unattached militants' who are responsible for the bulk of the current wave of violence. They do not appear to have a direct link to pro-Pakistan militant outfits such as the Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammad, though some linkages with the local Hizbul Mujahideen may exist.

The leaders are unrecognisable, and specific causes undecipherable. Pakistan has not moved away and continues to instigate violence, the latest attack being on an Army camp in Kupwara (in which three Army men were killed), patterned on earlier attacks in Uri and Pathankot. The new threat comes from an entirely different source.

Consequently, the refrain of external instigation and Pakistan's role is inadequate to explain the current imbroglio. Urging the security forces to exercise restraint and avoid collateral damage during operations also makes little sense. The issues are far deeper than urging all stakeholders to allay the apprehensions and misgivings of the Kashmir youth. Something very different has occurred and something new needs to be attempted.

The unorganised - and even divided - nature of the protest movement carries the danger that it could turn into an Intifada, a kind of people's uprising with no known leaders, and increasing numbers of trouble-makers, all portraying themselves as leaders of the movement. It carries deep risks for both domestic and international reasons. It is something that India must prevent before it actually takes shape, and 'martyrdom' becomes the new normal.

The moot question is whether India can, and is willing, to handle the truth - bite the bullet in other words. India could continue to acknowledge that those responsible for the past violence have not abandoned the scene, but will need to admit at the same time that a change is taking place behind the scene. New faces of militancy had emerged. Amongst these are a large number who were previously



seen as India's hope in the battle for normalcy in Kashmir, and were willing to stake their future in India.

Since 2008, the Valley has witnessed several waves of unrest. In 2008 and 2010 Kashmir went through a particularly difficult period, but the main instigators then were those who were trained by Pakistan, and the bulk of those involved were inspired by Pakistan. Since 2016, however, it is the 'unattached militant' who has been in the forefront of the struggle. What could be the explanation for this?

As in many other areas, truth tends to be sporadic here, and reality obscure. It would seem that after the dangerous 1990s, militancy has once again regained social acceptance. To an ever increasing number of youth, the profile of violence stands in contrast to the hypocritical utterances of the authorities in Srinagar and Delhi.

As of today, the Agenda for Alliance, the PDP, Hurriyat leaders like Syed Ali Shah Geelani and Mirwaiz Umar Farooq, the erstwhile secessionist leaders like Yasin Malik all stand marginalised. Anger is the dominant sentiment, as epitomised by the violent protests and the near total boycott of the recent Srinagar poll. The message sent out is clear. Peace cannot be enforced by authoritarian means or by fiat.

Episode upon episode, Kashmir is steadily unravelling. Normalcy is tending to be episodic. Over and above this is the emergence of what can only be termed as 'strategic falsehood'.

Social media tweets and retweets are altering ground realities. Hyperbole is making a mockery of truth and providing scope for still more lies. The only realities are: the dead, the wounded, the martyr and, of course, the authorities who are the villains.

The authorities are losing the propaganda war. Social media is putting out its own account of events and encounters, aided and abetted by several thousands of social media accounts operating from across the border. This is what is providing oxygen to the 'unattached militant', and more significantly, leading to a 'rainbow coalition' between the 'unattached militant' and the 'Deep State' in Pakistan.

Counsels of despair are not of any use. Putting the blame on the ruling coalition for the present morass in Kashmir, as former Chief Minister Farooq Abdullah has done recently, hardly helps. His assertion that India is heading towards disaster is again of little use. The suggestions that he has to offer are a repeat of what has previously been said and tried.

Restraining and restricting Pakistan's ability to fish in troubled waters will not be easy. Any expectation that the U.S. would lean sufficiently on Pakistan to impel the latter to avoid meddling in Kashmir needs to be given up. Pakistan is crucial for the U.S. to sort out its Afghan imbroglio. Within Kashmir, the Hurriyat has, today, lost much of its relevance. The PDP-BJP alliance is floundering and has few

real insights into what is taking place. Delhi seems far removed from the reality of the grim scenario unfolding in the Valley. Leaving matters to intelligence and security agencies, and the Army would be the least viable option.

Where do we go from here? To begin with, policymakers must ponder deeply as to why ordinary citizens are prepared to gravitate to areas where actual encounters are taking place risking death and injury even though they are not involved in the protests.

Resorting to pyrotechnics such as the novel idea of tying a protester to the bonnet of a security vehicle and driving it through a crowd of agitators are best avoided. Today's agitators are angry and reckless, but it is they who are redefining the nature of protests and reshaping the contours of the movement.

Back to the drawing board

The situation thus demands a complete makeover. There is a need to go back to the drawing board and effect changes in Kashmir's Constitution that were introduced post the 1960s. This would help establish a measure of credibility to India's claims that it is not seeking to undermine the autonomy that Kashmir prizes so much. What these are will need to be carefully worked out by teams of constitutional and other experts.

Immediately, however, what is most crucial is to make an open and impassioned appeal for peace in the Valley accompanied by meetings and consultations at several levels. No segment should be excluded, including separatists and the Hurriyat. Some of the ideas set out in the 'backchannel' proposals (2005-2008) should be revived. Jobs for Kashmiri youth must be a priority and a massive job-oriented programme launched. India could consider swallowing its pride and reopen talks with Pakistan, not so much hoping that Pakistan would cooperate but to assuage the 'hardliners' in Kashmir. Detaching from a muscular policy to a more reasoned one has become essential.

M.K. Narayanan is a former National Security Adviser and a former Governor of West Bengal

Refuge from the sinking islands

We need an international forum to help small island nations threatened by rising sea levels

ARMIN ROSENCRANZ
PRATHEEK REDDY

Tuvalu is a small island nation in the South Pacific and home to about 10,000 people. It is likely to be under water in less than 70 years. Due to the rising sea level caused by global warming, other low-lying island nations such as Kiribati, Fiji, Marshall Islands, Vanuatu, Micronesia and Nauru are destined to suffer the same fate.

The 52 low-lying vulnerable island nations sustain 62 million people and emit less than 1% of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), yet are among the first victims of climate disruption. High sea levels have already resulted in displacement of people in several small island nations. These island nations require immediate remedies, including migration, compensation and reduction in GHG emissions.

Broad but urgent remedies
More people are likely to migrate due to slow-onset processes of en-

vironmental degradation such as inundation, desertification, soil erosion and changing coastlines than sudden-onset events like storms and cyclones.

The total population in the South Sea region is projected to reach in excess of 18 million by mid-century, which could result in between 665,000 and 1,750,000 people migrating to other regions of the world. A sea level rise of 0.5 to 2 m could leave between 1.2 and 2.2 million people displaced from the Caribbean Sea and the Indian and Pacific Oceans. This will set off domestic as well as cross-border migration.

The international community does not yet realise its responsibility to enable such migration. For example, on request from Tuvalu's Prime Minister, New Zealand agreed to allow a meagre 75 Tuvaluans to relocate annually to their country, a migration that should stretch over 140 years. Australia refused to make any offers when approached similarly.

While these are broad remedies that the sinking island nations im-

mediately require, they are hardly exhaustive. There is a need for a wide range of varied remedies, mostly adaptive, such as coastal protection, rainwater harvesting and storage, alternative methods of growing fruits and vegetables, human resource development and research and observation. However, in any remedial adaptive mechanism employed, high costs are unavoidable.

A single-purpose forum
The only practical way to attain

these remedies seems to be to reinvoke political pressure and negotiate globally to arrive at a forum that could deal with the issue.

The primary focus of the forum so created must be to ensure adequate and appropriate remedies as discussed above. The forum must enable negotiations regarding the legal status of migrants and develop adaptive strategies in the destination country to guarantee and to protect dignity and cultural iden-

tity of the displaced in the destination country. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) obligates countries to provide finance to resist global warming. By extending such existing obligations through political pressure and diplomacy, the forum could ensure compensation to the island nations in the form of contributions from party countries by managing a fund created in this regard.

Lastly, the forum would require a tribunal to assess the case presented by each island nation and to decide whether help from the international community is required. The tribunal could then invoke appropriate measures such as multilateral negotiations or directions that enable migration, compensation and other remedies that could save the people of the sinking small island nations.

Armin Rosencranz is professor of law at Jindal Global University, Sonipat, where Pratheek Reddy is a law student

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Letters emailed to letters@thehindu.co.in must carry the full postal address and the full name or initials.

Soldier deaths

The gruesome act of killing of our jawans, committed allegedly by Pakistani troops, was an act of extreme savagery and barbarism ("Pakistani troops kill, mutilate two jawans," May 2). Having come out of its 'silence mode', India now believes in retaliatory action. That its condemnation is not empty rhetoric was demonstrated last year through surgical strikes across the Line of Control. We hope the sacrifice of these soldiers, who died in service of the nation, does not go in vain and that our forces show determination in avenging the deaths.

N. VISVESWARAN,
Chennai

It looks like the Pakistan Army's barbarity knows no bounds. While India's response should be

proportionate, that by itself will neither restore normality along the LoC nor deter the rogue Pakistan Army from repeating such acts. Unfortunately, Prime Minister Narendra Modi does not seem to have a credible action plan to either rein in Pakistan or calm the Valley. The footage of young girls in school and college uniforms hurling stones at our security personnel should be a wake-up call for our leaders. Mr. Modi must listen to saner voices and resume meaningful political initiatives to defuse the situation.

S.K. CHOWDHURY,
Bengaluru

Such incidents are always followed by a demand that India sever all diplomatic relations with Pakistan and use pressure to isolate the neighbour internationally.

We should ponder over whether this would actually result in a solution to the hostility between the two nations. Keeping away from the discussion table has only intensified the mistrust and hence avenues for dialogue need to be kept open at all times. China stands firmly with Pakistan and recently even Russia has sent signals that it is not averse to a good relationship. The U.S., though it reprimands the country time and again, continues its financial aid. Under the circumstances, isolating Pakistan is not going to be an easy task. Only uninterrupted diplomatic efforts will bring in sanity in its behaviour.

V. SUBRAMANIAN,
Chennai

In the name of cows
India has been witness to several incidents of

communal violence in the name of the cow, beef and cattle since 2014, when the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)-led government came to power ("Two suspected 'cattle thieves' lynched in Assam's Nagaon," May 2). No strong action is taken against the vigilantes, making the common man feel that by normalising the violence of non-state actors, the ruling party is sponsoring an assault on the Indian state itself. It has become very easy for some of the so-called 'cow protectors' to kill Muslims and later justify it, knowing that the law enforcement machinery will back them and will take action not against them but, on the contrary, against the victims.

If this flirtation of the state machinery with vigilantism continues, India, like Israel and Pakistan, could soon

become a democracy that provides unequal treatment to different communities.

IMTIYAZ SHAMIM,
Aligarh

Korean Peninsula boils
Noam Chomsky reminded

recently in an interview that an attack on North Korea would unleash massive artillery bombardment of the South where 28,500 American troops are stationed. The U.S.'s military manoeuvres near the North are highly provocative and have exacerbated an already explosive situation. North Koreans have much to fear. We must keep in mind that U.S. aircraft carpet-bombed North Korea in June 1952 and then proceeded to destroy the Sui-ho Dam, releasing a huge quantity of water that destroyed villages and crops. Destroying a dam is a

serious war crime for which it was never held accountable.

A solution should involve de-escalation from both sides. North Korea should be forced to freeze its nuclear programme and, as a quid pro quo, the U.S. should halt its joint operations with South Korea and gradually withdraw its troops from the Korean Peninsula and Japan. There is universal revulsion for the North Korean leadership but its basic instinct for survival is understandable. It must be having in mind the fate of Muammar Qaddafi of Libya who paid the ultimate price after he gave up his nuclear programme.

TEJINDER UBEROI,
Los Altos, California

MORE LETTERS ONLINE:
www.hindu.com/opinion/letters/

THE WEDNESDAY INTERVIEW: HAMID KARZAI

'India should have its own policy on Afghanistan'

The former Afghan President on U.S. doublespeak on Af-Pak, elusive peace, and why India must stay invested in his country

SUHASINI HAIDAR

For years, former Afghanistan President Hamid Karzai has been outspoken in his criticism of U.S. action in the war on terror. But in the aftermath of American forces dropping a massive 22,000-tonne 'MOAB' – its biggest non-nuclear bomb – in the country on April 13, he has criticised the Ashraf Ghani government too, the first time he has been this vocally critical of his successor. In an interview to *The Hindu* during a visit to Delhi, he explains his comments, as well as his hopes for Indian engagement in Afghanistan in the future. Excerpts:

You have come out very strongly against the U.S. bombing in Nangarhar province. Given that the GBU/43B MOAB (Massive Ordnance Air Blast) was claimed to have been used to target ISIS Khorasan, that everyone seems to agree is a major threat to Afghanistan, why are you objecting?

I am objecting for two reasons. One, that the Americans waited two and a half to three years for Daesh (the Islamic State) to entrench itself in Nangarhar province's Shinwar district, and to use those caves, and to abuse our people, to evacuate villages of their inhabitants, and basically allowed Daesh to do all of this, without stopping them. They had all the means to stop Daesh from infiltrating into Afghanistan across the Durand Line all this time. They monitor this line at all times. So, having allowed them to cross into Afghanistan, to allow them to carry supplies and ammunition in... that is a very mountainous area and those passes could have been easily stopped with just a few people. None of that was done. And then when the local people rose against Daesh, instead of helping local people there, the U.S. Air Force planes targeted their village defence lines against Daesh.

By mistake, they said...

Yes, but we don't know about this. It looks like a mistake, but how do they keep making mistakes like this?

Should they not know who is the enemy? And then, hundreds of thousands of people were driven away from their villages; almost all the tribal chiefs I knew had been driven out of their villages with their people. Then the U.S. comes and hits Afghanistan in the name of Daesh, and that too with the deadliest bomb they have short of a nuclear weapon. This isn't hurting Daesh. The motive for the U.S. is clearly to test its bomb in Afghanistan, and to send tough signals to its rivals at the same time. So I condemn it in the strongest possible terms, and I see it as a violation of Afghan sovereignty and an attack on our soil, on Afghan lives and on Afghan environment.

You've even accused President Ghani's government of "treason" for allowing the bombing. Won't such allegations weaken the National Unity Government at this time?

I don't want to weaken the National Unity Government, but at the same time I want the government to defend Afghanistan. The American bomb was a violation of Afghanistan, it was an attack on Afghanistan. And the U.S. is supposed to be our ally. They have signed a bilateral security agreement with us. According to the agreement, they are supposed to strengthen Afghanistan, defeat terrorism, and protect our borders. After the signing of the BSA [U.S.-Afghanistan Bilateral Security Agreement, signed in 2014],

We have heard of the U.S.'s to-and-fro diplomacy since 2002. They come one day and say that terrorists are being kept and trained inside sanctuaries inside Pakistan. And then they provide Pakistan with hundreds of thousands of dollars in aid. You heard, about five years ago, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral [Mike] Mullen called the Haqqani network a "veritable arm of the ISI". They made a statement that was so strong five years ago, and subsequently continued to supply Pakistan with weapons, aircraft and money. Just recently, they have announced another \$350 million to Pakistan [under the Coalition Support Fund]. They can't talk one

S The Americans waited two and a half to three years for Daesh to entrench itself in Nangarhar province's Shinwar district, without stopping them

way and walk another way. So for me, U.S. NSA McMaster's visit is just a repetition of what I saw during my government, and all that has followed with the next government.

You're accusing the U.S. of doublespeak, yet some may say Russia is doing the same thing. Its latest initiative on Afghanistan, bringing together what you have called a "strategic arc" of Iran, China, India and Central

Asia, also includes reaching out to the Taliban and Pakistan. Given that you are visiting Delhi after visits to Beijing and Moscow, what do you see as the purpose of this initiative, and how do you justify its decision to protect the Taliban in particular?

Yes, well, Russia, India, China, even Iran, all supported U.S. presence and its actions in Afghanistan from 2002 onwards.

They were all part of the Bonn Conference [in 2001] and continued to support the U.S. aims in Afghanistan: fight terrorism, bring stability to Afghanistan, and address the issues in Pakistan as well. But look what happened. After all these years, that cooperation has given way to competition

between them. I remember in 2008, for the first time at the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation conference, I complained to Russian President [Vladimir] Putin about American actions in Afghanistan.

Complained?

I said that the way the U.S. forces were implementing their war on terror, carrying out operations – the manner of the operations, the aerial bombardment, arrests, torture, and the lack of action against sanctuaries on the Pakistani side – was causing more extremism and violence in Afghanistan and adding to the ranks of the Taliban. At that time President Putin told me he had many differences with the U.S. conduct in the world, but on Afghanistan they saw

CONCEPTUAL

Imagined communities

POLITICAL SCIENCE

A concept developed by political scientist Benedict Anderson to define nationalism. Rather than looking at a nation as one bound by physical boundaries, Anderson defined it as a community bound by people who imagine themselves to be part of the group. The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is an example of nationalism. These tombs are either empty or hold unidentified remains, but nations with these memorials claim the soldiers as their own, in their own imagined communities.

MORE ON THE WEB

Seventy years of India at Cannes

<http://bit.ly/IndiaCannes>

NOTEBOOK

New homes for Sri Lankan tuskers

The decision last week overturning a ban on elephant adoption came as a surprise

MEERA SRINIVASAN

You don't have a Sri Lanka souvenir until you have one sporting an elephant. The Asian tusker has made it to nearly all memorabilia – from t-shirts to tea packets and stationery. Traders possibly believe that you can't sell a souvenir without the elephant validating its 'Sri Lankan-ness'.


My first encounter with a Sri Lankan elephant was four summers ago at an elephant orphanage – one that had 88 of them – in Pinnawala, some 100 km northeast of Colombo. I went up a raised wooden platform to feed a piece of watermelon to one of them. The elevation was to help us look the beast in the eye. The orphanage-cum-captive breeding centre fascinated me, with its milieu consisting of a big herd of elephants, once abandoned, now living in a shared open space, the centre supported by the tourism it spawned.



at Pinnawala and the consequent pressure on resources, the government said. Elephants in the orphanage are now available to individuals or institutions for adoption. The move came as a surprise, especially at a time when President Maithripala Sirisena has signed a major gazette notification on wildlife conservation.

While temples will get them for free, individuals will have to pay about \$66,000 for each tusker. Elephants were a part of temple traditions and processions since the time of the ancient Kandyan kingdom, and the decision is in line with that, explained a senior Minister, adding that "even if the elephants are given away, we will monitor them".

I don't know if an elephant will get a better home, but what if the move ends up separating some elephants from their families?



FILE PHOTO: REUTERS

"eye to eye". This Russian stand continued from 2002 to 2012, when finally they began to ask questions. For example, how come the U.S. keeps announcing more and more aid for the war in Afghanistan, there's more fighting, more casualties, more terrorism there?

Why was the war moving in a negative way, as if its purpose was to create more terrorists? So I ask, how come, compared to the solidarity from the world in 2002, the U.S. lost all its allies on Afghanistan?

Russia's move to bring peace and stability to Afghanistan is certainly a welcome step. The Taliban are Afghans. Those who are Afghans and want to give up violence must be encouraged and supported to do so. The Russians aren't the only ones to talk to the Taliban. The U.S. held talks with the Taliban, both directly and through Pakistan. They met in Qatar, I know that, and so have other countries.

The Germans have held talks. The Norwegians conducted meetings between Taliban and Afghan civil society representatives in Oslo. So why single out only Russia?

India hasn't stopped others from talking to the Taliban, but believes this will not lead to peace, as the latest April 21 attack in Mazar-e-Sharif has shown, in which over 140 soldiers were killed by the Taliban. Do you still feel including the Taliban will work?

I have made it very clear that I can no longer call the Taliban my brothers. Their outrages against the Afghan people are horrendous, and I say every attack they commit now is helping continue the U.S. presence in Afghanistan. If they truly want the U.S. to leave, they must engage in a peace process with the

Afghan government and people.

India is a stronger partner of the U.S. today, and the U.S. has publicly called for it to have a greater role in Afghan security. What is your view on what India should do?

The U.S. has done the right thing in asking India to do more in Afghanistan. This is something I had asked the Indian leadership when I was President, and I know President Ghani has done the same. My view is that while it is okay for the U.S. to ask this of India, India should do more on its own initiative, have its own foreign policy on Afghanistan.

Today, the U.S. may ask India to do more, tomorrow it may ask India not to do more. Will India pull back then? India should have its own policy on Afghanistan, based on its own view of the region, its own interests in the region, and the interests of peace and stability in Afghanistan. Yes, India should do more on its own terms, not on requests from America.

What does this "do more" mean? Does it mean boots on the ground?

No, it doesn't mean boots on the ground, we don't need that. The "do more" means provide Afghanistan what it needs to stand on its own feet, to enable Afghanistan [Army] to defend the country, to enable Afghanistan to fight extremism and the violation of our sovereignty from across the Durand Line, to help Afghanistan back to normalcy as a strong state. And do it all as an India-Afghanistan initiative, not because any third country requests India. I am sure it already has such a policy, and I hope we will see more of it.

FROM The Hindu ARCHIVES

FIFTY YEARS AGO MAY 3, 1967

U.S. gift of vaccine jet-guns

The Union Health Minister, Dr. Chandrasekhar, took a vaccine gun from an American diplomat and fired the first "shot" at him to-day [May 2]. Dr. Chandrasekhar thanking the U.S. Government for the automatic jet injector, looked at the diplomat with the gun in hand. Mr. Joseph N. Greene promptly rolled up his sleeves and let himself be immunised by one of the four guns that could vaccinate 700 people an hour. Along with the guns has come, in response to an Indian request a fortnight ago, a token consignment representing 10 million emergency doses of freeze-dried small-pox vaccine for droughtstricken Bihar and other areas. A gift of 650 million doses has been supplied by the Soviet Union for the national small-pox eradication programme.

A HUNDRED YEARS AGO MAY 3, 1917


Sir S. Sinha's speech

Mr. McLeod, Chairman of the East Indian Section of the London Chamber of Commerce, served a luncheon to the Indian delegates to the War Conference. Sir S. Sinha said that the problems between India and the rest of the Empire were being treated with mutual forbearance and understanding and if that spirit continued the difficulties would vanish. He believed that any fear with regard to the security of British supremacy in India would shortly disappear, because the loyalty of India in the war would convince Britons that India desired to remain always an integral part of the Empire. He believed that the war would also bring about mutual trust and confidence between the different sections of the people of India. India wanted more autonomous power in regard to finance and more equitable adjustment of the burden devolving on India. Each part of the Empire must contribute according to its resources and power to the defence of the Empire. Referring to the expansion of industry and commerce of India.

DATA POINT

A high threshold

Out of 51,203 letter-petitions received under PILs by the Supreme Court in 2015, only 306 were forwarded to the judges for adjudication. Acceptance rates have barely crossed 1.5%



SOURCE: INDIAN JUDICIARY ANNUAL REPORT (2015-2016); *UPTO 31/7/2016



SINGLE FILE

Targeted treatment

Lakhs of HIV deaths can be averted as India follows WHO's recommendations

R. PRASAD



Two years after the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended that antiretroviral therapy (ART) be initiated in people living with HIV irrespective of the CD4 (a type of white-blood cell) counts, India has aligned its policy with the guideline. In a major shift, Union Health Minister J.P. Nadda had recently said that any person who tests positive for HIV will be provided ART "as soon as possible and irrespective of the CD4 count or clinical stage". Nearly 4.5 lakh deaths can be averted through this move.

It was in 2002 that the WHO first issued its ART guidelines. In the absence of AIDS-defining illnesses, the WHO set CD4 count less than 200 cells per cubic millimetre as the threshold to begin ART treatment. Over time, it changed its guidelines and, in 2013, increased the threshold to CD4 count less than 500 cells per cu. mm.

Change in WHO guidelines

The recommendation was based on the evidence that an earlier initiation of ART will help people with HIV live longer, remain healthier and "substantially reduce" the risk of them transmitting the virus to others. The availability of safer, affordable and easy-to-manage medicines that could help to lower the amount of virus in the blood played a key role in the WHO's decision. Earlier initiation could avert an "additional three million deaths and prevent 3.5 million more new HIV infections between 2013 and 2025," noted the WHO in 2013.

In 2015, the WHO once again changed its guidelines. Based on evidence from clinical trials and observational studies since 2013, it became clear that an earlier use of ART, irrespective of the CD4 count, results in better clinical outcomes. Accordingly, it recommended that ART be initiated in HIV-positive people at any CD4 count.

As per 2015 estimates, India has 2.1 million HIV-positive people, of which only 1.6 million have been diagnosed and about a million are on treatment. But over half a million people are not even aware of their HIV status.

With the government changing its treatment guidelines, the 0.6 million who have been diagnosed but not been on treatment are now eligible for treatment. Of the 0.6 million, about 0.25 million have been enrolled for pre-ART care and can be started on treatment almost immediately. But the biggest challenge will be to identify the 0.35 million who have been diagnosed but not on treatment and the 0.5 million who have been infected but have not been diagnosed. Also, nearly 80,000 people get infected each year.

Even as efforts are on to expand the 1,600 treatment delivery sites that are currently operational, there should be greater focus now on identifying people with HIV. The government has plans to start community-based testing to bring it closer to those in need, and target special groups that are more vulnerable to infection such as partners of people who are HIV-positive.