

Major Conflicts Between India and Pakistan: A Critical Analysis of Historical Tensions and Geopolitical Dynamics

Anwar ul Mustafa Shah (Corresponding)

Doctoral Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Sindh, Jamshoro

Dr. Aslam Pervez Memon

Professor (Retd.), Department of Political Science, University of Sindh, Jamshoro

Dr. Naimatullah Shah

Professor, Department of Public Administration, University of Sindh, Jamshoro

amustafa.shah@usindh.edu.pk

Abstract

Relations between India and Pakistan have remained parallel and worst hostile as well ever since independence in 1947. In nearly 75 years, there were three wars between the two and a number of serious localized military clashes, including those on Ran of Ketch in 1965, followed by Kargil in 1999. The disputed territory of Kashmir played a significant role to maintain continuity, focusing the past conflicts of 1947 and 1965. As these two countries exploded nuclear weapons in 1998, their long-standing hostility has attracted and seriously concerned by the international community that their competition could rise to a nuclear war and cause disasters to both countries and the world as well. Whereas the Kashmir including some other outstanding issues, such as, water dispute, Sir Creek, Siachen and boundary disputes have also recorded the extreme level of conflicts between the two rivalries. Regionalism has played a significant role in European continent; however, in South Asia hegemonic attitude of

India has marginalized the role of regional organizations such as SAARC. The world and south Asia witnessed the changes over two decades after the cold war, the liberalization of world trade, the growth of fundamentalism and revolutionary changes in the field of communications. Recognizing the intensity of the relations, India and Pakistan's changing regional and international affairs which has drastically impaled to the leaders and governments of both the countries to initiate talks on their outstanding issues. The cross-border talks were an initiative step which attempted to provide a new forum to debate on these substantive issues resulted in the division of the two nations. Keeping in view the cited developments and their influences on the relations between India and Pakistan, some factors remained constant, the unresolved dispute over Kashmir, the growth of military spending, moves towards Nuclearization and perpetuation of an “**adversarial psychosis**” are still under question.

This research has critically analyzed historic rivalry between India and Pakistan. It has also provided viable recommendations that how to contain major irritants between two States especially Kashmir issue and Nuclearization in region. In this research the purposive sampling method is used to justify the given hypothesis and objectives. The data is collected through the secondary data and results are deduced from the analytical approach.

Keywords: Indo-Pak Conflicts, Historical Tensions, Geostrategic and Geopolitical Dynamics

Introduction

Main Irritants in Relations

In both nations, the Jammu and Kashmir issue is the key point of all conflicts, they made three Total Wars in 1948, 1965 and finally in 1975 respectively and faces many military conflicts in their 70 years' age. The partition of British India was accompanied by numerous unfortunate circumstances, when British withdrawal from India and a new country named Pakistan came into existence, at least half a million Muslim, Sikh and Hindus

were killed in communal disturbances, about twelve millions Muslims which were living in India migrated to Pakistan and Sikhs and Hindus, who settled in Pakistan were migrated to Indian state, the transfer is one of the most huge migrations of people in the recent age, the result create tension in both sides and blamed each other to not giving security to migrants (Ali,1984).

Kashmir Dispute

The issue of Kashmir is the main problem between India and Pakistan since independence; both neighbors have battled three major wars in the name of Kashmir, which is also main source of conflict and irritating the relations between two South Asian nations. Kashmir is Asia's most essential geostrategic district, located among Pakistan, China, and India but it is main source of conflict between Pakistan and India from the date of Partition of Sub-Continent in 1947. The Britain and Soviet Union were also rival in the nineteenth century to involve a deliberately critical region of Kashmir, which was considered as buffer zone between them. British government hold the Kashmir as a key strategic policy till the partition of India. "Everything that occurred in the vicinity of J&K from 1846 to 1947 was somehow a result of this vital strategy." Kashmir's geo-political significance stayed critical after partition. Nehru point out the Kashmir importance as "The state of Kashmir runs in common with those of three countries' China, Soviet Union and China". Security of Kashmir...is vital to security of India, especially part of Southern Kashmir and India is common". Pakistan's first premier Liaquat Ali portrayed Kashmir as "the annexation of Kashmir by India is undermining Pakistan's security". He has additionally acquired, saying, "Kashmir's key position is to such an extent that without Pakistan it cannot guard itself with a heartless government that could come to India."

The geo strategic status of Kashmir can be portrayed as: "After 1947, Kashmir turned into a more key resource than in magnificent circumstances with its military centrality both in India and in Pakistan lay in its area and its helpfulness for each state military posture, India's control of the Kashmir valley was basic for the security of the remote area Ladakh at the Chinese outskirts. In a conflict with Pakistan, India could be vulnerable to the rapid

penetration of Pakistani armor and tactical aviation network in Kashmir, which aims to cut off the area from India. Notwithstanding, Kashmir had various associations with the Pakistani territory, its separation had caused financial interruption and Kashmir's common access roads drove mostly to western Punjab." In Kashmir issue, Pakistan cannot be stable with India through direct contacts because of on the grounds that regional power will never be accepted without India's predominant adjust, Pakistan would lose Kashmir. Local and worldwide interest is additionally engaged with the Kashmir contention; however, Pakistan, China, India, and former USSR were met at Kashmir, it indicates the importance and strategic intersection of Kashmir in the core of Asia, and the possession of India on Kashmir will cut off Pakistan from these countries (Akhtar, 2012). The partition of British India was full of mistakes, which creates many blunders in the history of India and Pakistan, acquired an unpredictable arrangement of issues and among them was the greatest Kashmir issue. Once Mountbatten said that princely states that "Normally geographical situation and communal interests and so forth will be the factors to be considered" the British government was decided that all Muslim populated areas must join newborn Pakistan and the Hindus citizens join India, approximately, there were 586 princely states in united India, they had ordered to join either India or Pakistan in 1947, however, three states Kashmir, Junagadh and Hyderabad decide to join Pakistan. The issue of Hyderabad and Junagadh quite different from Kashmir, in both princely states vast majority of the peoples was Hindus, and the princes belong to Muslim community and want to join Pakistan, but Vice Roy executed Jinnah that "accepting of Junagadh by Pakistan will consider totally against of Partition Plane. So, Pakistan was trailed by Mountbatten and India forcefully joined Hyderabad and Junagadh states. However, on account of Kashmir India ignore all the rules of Partition plane, the majority of population of Kashmir was Muslim and its rules was Hindu, according to Partition Plan, Kashmir must join Pakistan because of its Muslim majority population, but it was forcefully annexed with India. India put a file before UN, which said for truce but in addition also encouraged India to control

power to the peoples of Kashmir for their Political future. However, until now, India does not give power to Kashmiri peoples for their future Political life (Baqai,2016). India argues that the Pakistan's defense arrangements with the United States debilitated India's security, which gave India reason for his abdication to hold a choice. Pakistan's interest to join the US defense associations was totally unique. To her, this could keep India out of the throat of Pakistan and give security to its political power and regional trustworthiness. India and Pakistan battled three major wars in their 70 years age. However, nothing could be accomplished to determine the Kashmir issue.

Kashmir after 9/II

The 9/II incident delayed the freedom struggle of people of Kashmir when the Pakistan based organizations like Jaish-e-Muhammad Lashkar-e-Tayaba start to support Kashmiri freedom movement, which is restricted by the America and the other European countries. India constantly pointed the finger at Pakistan military agency Inter Service intelligence, Theo political parties and different groups to help freedom movement. India facilitated the dramatization of the militant's attack on the Assembly of Kashmir to obliterate the Freedom movement of the Kashmir and marked Freedom fighters as terrorist and blamed Pakistan for supporting Kashmiri freedom fighters. India asked Pakistan to prosecute the leaders of religious organization Lashkar e-Tayaba and Jaish-e-Muhammad. Relations between both nations crumbled as India shutdown the diplomatic relations, it also eliminated air links and roadways, India moved thousands of troops to Pakistan border to increase tension. Pakistan answered in a same way and the risk of nuclear war on the ground (Mahmood, 2017). To take out underlying foundations of terrorism and suppressed the militants, India was going to attack on Pakistan. But it did not take action due to two major reasons.

- (1) Lack of information about the area of these religious organization
- (2) Use of power could consider a total war between two nuclear rivals

So, the plan of attack on terrorist camps was cancelled but India regularly threatening Pakistan and blamed for supporting of terrorism, the stressed relations between two nuclear powers were some decreased when the Atal Bihari Vajpayee took an interest in the SAARC summit in Islamabad in 2004. Some of the time it felt that both nations had been closer of each other on the grounds of Confidence building measures, Delhi government showed its interest on solving Kashmir issue and Pakistan also showed its desire, India change her attitude and gave a confidence to Pakistan for Kashmir issue solution.

In Pakistan and India, a noteworthy change was made on Kashmir in 2005, when the two nations consented to open Line of Control for the first time since independence and started a transport service between Muzaffarabad and Srinagar. Remaking the connections between Azad and Indian held Kashmir, it was actuality a noteworthy advancement since Kashmir dispute. President of Pakistan Pervez Musharraf suggested India about the solution of Kashmir issue in 2006, He suggested about "demilitarization, self-governance and joint- management of Jammu & Kashmir by the India and Pakistan". India reacted with a proposition for a consultative mechanism between both Kashmir's. Despite the fact that India's proposition for "cooperative, consultative mechanism" stayed on Pakistan's proposition for a "joint management", it is building the confidence about solution of Kashmir between India and Pakistan (Ibid, 2017).

There were also some real developments took place about solving the issue in 2007, and desires for settling peaceful solution were on the ascent as Pakistan and India went friendly settlement in the view of the following settlement:

- (1) LOC between Pakistani and Indian Kashmir does not change
- (2) Line of Control is open for transportation for Kashmiri people.
- (3) The Pakistan and India will provide full autonomy to two Kashmiris under their control
- (4) Tourism, trade, education, water, and environmental issues must be solved by an advisory mechanism.
- (5) Both countries moved back slowly their troops from both Kashmir's.

But the genuine gap between two nuclear powers over issue of Jammu and Kashmir limited down by the many certain aspects of above arrangements. As Indian government alleged Pakistan for not giving sovereignty to Azad Kashmir, however proclaimed that she had granted extensive autonomy to held Kashmir. The second distinction is that India speaks to Kashmir's portrayal just in the advisory system, Pakistan has restricted to ask that Pakistan should be a representative in consultative mechanism as well as India. On the issue of Kashmir, there is another conflict between them, Pakistan wants to decrease troops from Kashmir area, but India does not want, because of these distinctions, there is no development has been done on the issue. Also, the Mumbai attack of 2008 slowed down the negotiation over Kashmir between India and Pakistan and regularly blamed Pakistan for it. As per official estimates by India, almost 40,000 Kashmiris lost their lives, since 1989, when riot started, as per informal estimates there were more than 90,000 individuals killed, half of them are civilians. New Delhi ended peace talks with Islamabad and declared that there will be no talks until the Mumbai attackers are arrested. However, India would have overlooked that Pakistan had officially restricted terrorist organization and destroyed its system (Khan,2018).

Water Issue

Water sharing has been an important issue now a day between two South Asian nations India and Pakistan. there is a treaty in the name of Indus Water Treaty is available between them which was signed few decades ago, a one of the important agreements which reduce the tension about water but now a days water issue has tuned into an imperative place for dialogue because of the insecurity in Pakistan, and this circumstance has prompted lawful, moral and geological discourses in the South Asian situation, as water has turned into a conspicuous theme of dialogue now. Pakistan has been a characteristic interest body because of a lower shoreline region. Similarly, as the issue of terrorism and Kashmir is the unsolved problem, now the water line has achieved so far that it has a comparative position. Since the freedom India and Pakistan faces many challenges as they fought three major wars and

difference small conflicts and Pakistan's water comes from Indian occupied Kashmir, which has turned into a belated flashpoint. In the partition of sub-continent in 1947, the border line between India and Pakistan was drawn without regarding the rules of irrigation system, using the upper riparian, India singularly slices of fresh water supply to Pakistan in April 1948. India's request was that Pakistan should accept Indian rights on the fresh water of the Pakistani and Indian Punjab. The Indian attempt led a genuine water row between both nations because as India, Pakistan has also an agricultural land that also need water for its land, Pakistan's whole land depends on river water for agriculture, Pakistan did not accept this Indian act because as this formula India is situated on upper riparian zone and it have the right to use water first than Pakistan use water with an Indian agreement, India supply some water to Pakistan in 1948 after a pro India agreement, but it is impossible that without total water Pakistan can survive, the tension is developing that this action will lead a war in both countries. After the initiative taken by World Bank and negotiation, both countries signed a treaty named "Indus Water Treaty" in Karachi during the era of Ayyub Khan, it was the first initiate taken by both governments for the solution of water issue. The proposed determination comprised of a mass range interbasin transmittance of fresh waters due to departure of a lower shoreline zone Pakistan while it was not just a solution to the problem, but it was definitely an alternative decision. Obvious geopolitical and other applicable components (Kidwani, 2010).

Nuclearization in South Asia

The South Asian strategic structure is consisting of a bipolar condition between Pakistan and India, which is associated with a regional security complex and other central powers. It is trusted in South Asia, that peace and prosperity can just emerge with nuclear power. The nuclear installations are described as a huge equalizer and definitive methods for opposing the adversary's present or future conventional strength. The strategy of Pakistan identifies the conventional military imbalance with India and trust that nuclear arsenals are a safe option to avoid from arms race and future war. India should realize that by installing nuclear arsenals and forcing Pakistan to

follow his example, it has killed its ordinary advantage. In South Asia, Pakistan and India are two nuclear countries which share a common border with each other but with the troubled relationship, fought 3 major wars and one war of 1971 leading to the separation of Pakistan. The delicate peace in the region creates both countries to become struggler for nuclear power. India initially conducted its nuclear device in 1974 and after that in 1998, in response, Pakistan detonated atomic tests in 1998. The arms race between India and Pakistan indicates syndrome reaction to its best practice. The nuclear position made by India is not only damage peace and prosperity of South Asia, but international efforts to control arms race is also dismissed. In such an insecure situation, where India would like to do anything at any time but there is no power to ask from India for nuclear weapons, however major powers also support India for producing nuclear weapons. The real appraisal uncovered that India's mission for regional hegemony and overwhelming spending of nuclear buildup bound Islamabad to build its security spending, and it is viewed as Pakistan is going to be the world first developing country who developed its nuclear power fast.

In this situation, Pakistan must choose the option to try to balance the power in South Asia because its security approach is India-focused. Reality control reveals that India is wanted to make South Asia a region of nuclear arms race, and its duty of Pakistan that it must take action to ensure its security and sovereignty. The nuclear cooperation would bring about deadly implements in South Asia, which ultimately threatens the intimidation of the region and the world. A sensible appraisal of the circumstance in South Asia uncovers that both Pakistan and India are racing to get their own goals; however, targets of both countries are different. Pakistan tries to secure country while India wants to become a powerful nation in the South Asian region, New Delhi as a nuclear power had continually attempting to extend its nuclear devices with the sponsorship of European powers. India is considered more powerful than Pakistan and it is still enhancing missile technology and modernizing nuclear devices to sponsor its goals as a regional power in South Asia. There are many new challenges to South Asian nations in the

settlement of Security and Peace, In the emergency situation, Pakistan needs to proceed qualitative and quantitative change in its nuclear devices to adjust the impacts of India's proactive mission Military's Cold Start Doctrine and the Missile Defense system. Pakistan on its part has reacted to these difficulties by building up a short-range, low harvest and a front-line weapon called "NASR" and a surface ballistic missile named, Ababeel. These patterns are fit for showing the complete the credibility of its nuclear power. The contributions of missiles like Ababeel and Nasar in Pakistan's defense system are transactions to arrange South Asia's stability and security. Another important reality is that nuclear non-proliferation systems in particular Missile control system and Nuclear Supply are subjected to US manipulated self-interests that contradict the goals of creating such systems. For instance, India's struggle to increase missile technology and the United States support to enter into nuclear suppliers group giving the wrong impression that it is neutral for this situation, they have the possibility to cause unfriendly impacts on Pakistan's nuclear condition in India. In South Asia's geostrategic scene, the strategic relationship of Pakistan with China is providing an opportunity to India that balancing power on developing strategic ties with United States as singed US-India civilian nuclear pact. US duties regarding encourage India's entrance to trade control frameworks and the Security Council have complicated the regional security. However, in the shadow of treaties with US, India creating and enhancing its center base. The treaty allowed India to proceed uninterrupted fuel supply, which is for use of non-military purpose, but Indian records show that there is no plan to use nuclear as a civilian purpose, but it is a reason for armed purposes. Pakistan should react to these difficulties by strengthening its nuclear capacities as India buys atomic innovation under the umbrella of US nuclear civil deal (Rana,2020).

Two nuclear power states of South Asia proceed to expand and modernize their military and weapons system. Motivated by the need to deal with identified security threats, each country is trying to expand nuclear devices and ballistic missile system. Such arms race is dangerous given the expanded doubt and the absence of diplomatic measures between India and Pakistan.

The two nation's chronic political instability, spotty nonproliferation record and the continuing threats of militant and rebel forces have paid particular attention to the safety of their nuclear materials.

Sir Creek Dispute

A 96 km long strip Sir Creek is a genuine issue between two south Asian nuclear power, which is situated between border of Sindh province of Pakistan and Gujrat of India. Where the Arabian Sea joins the land mass. It's basically a changed tidal channel, in alluring areas like Ran of Kutch, landmasses emerge and arrive at the water. Historically the conflict was started in 1908 when the Nawab of Kutch and Sindh demanded that the creek is their property, both sides are split principalities over the issue of Creek, however the issue was presented before the Bombay Presidency and apparently satisfactorily resolved in 1914, the Bombay government decision was documented in a Map, which is called map number B-44. There are two opposing passages in this judgment that make a similar thing to India and Pakistan (Altaf,2019). Passage No. 9 shows that there is a border between Sindh and Kutch "to the east of the Creek" is the property of Sindh, a southern province in Pakistan. However, according to paragraph no 10, Creek's area is navigable most of the year and quotes the commissioner of Sindh to support the point. However, when New Delhi and Islamabad embarked upon demarcation of borderline in 1958 to 1961, it again surfaced. The matter was referred to the UN tribunal in 1966 for settlement. During its proceedings, both states accept to the demarcation of boundary to the Boundary Pillar, number 1175 BP. However, the portion from BP 1175 to the mouth of Sir Creek, which is about 108 Km, was not referred to the Tribunal for settlement, either by Pakistan or India as both the countries felt that the map, B-44, (approved by British raj as recommended by Bombay Presidency during 1914) had conclusively established the Sindh – Kutch (Now Pakistan – India) boundary in that area. B-44 map was also considered by the Tribunal to be a very authentic document shows by both sides "where the borders were defined in the resolution of 1914 was authoritatively depicted" (Ibid,2019).

However, the demarcation of the boundary from Pillar No 1175 to the mouth of Sir Creek could not be done on ground and the demarcation work was suspended in 1969, because of the totally new interpretation by the government of India, It was said that the border with the western bank of the Creek is bound and later the position was changed to the mid of Sir Creek, the bank of Creek lies at the South-eastern boundary of Pakistan, 95 NMs from Karachi. Its average width is 2 Km which gradually increases to 17 Km at the mouth. The area around the creek is generally marshy, high & dry and covered with mangroves. Firm land exists towards Indian side in the vicinity of Sir Creek mouth at the entrance of Pir Sanai creek (Ibid,2019). Geographical features of Sir Creek and its surrounding area have changed over the period. Variance in features observed from Resolution Map of 1914 (B-44) are:

- a. Change in the orientation of the creek.
- b. Widening of creek's mouth.
- c. The appearance of high & dry patches at the creek mouth.

Sir Creek is more important for fishing and other economic resources than strategic or military purpose. It is viewed as one of the biggest fishing areas in Indo Pak. Also, the area of Sir Creek is important for economic purpose due to rich in shale gas and hydrocarbon, the land is Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Pakistani and Indian Stances

In claims made at the United Nations, India asked that Kutch was a well-defined entity and the Rao of Kutch paid tribute to imperial power first Mughals and the British government. Pakistan said that Kutch never had his own reality, the rulers of Sindh had attacked and taken parts of Rann in the eighteenth century and that Whole ran was the border between Sindh and Kutch. India supports itself by Thalweg Doctrine. The law also informs us that a stream can be isolated from its mid channel, two countries are settled upon the steadiness. Pakistan has not complied with the law by belligerence that it isn't worthy since Sir Creek isn't navigable, but it regards 1925 map.

Conclusion

Categorically, the relations between Pakistan and India have always witnessed many fluctuations since their independence. They fought at different junctures but soon resumed talks after every encounter. Despite all such efforts, there is always something that hinders the long-lasting cordial relations. In early years of conflict, the role of mediator was crucial in stabilizing the relations and received much success but after the decision to hold only bilateral talks and not involving the third party proved as setback in achieving any breakthrough in negotiations. The role of UN was deemed important in solving the issues but it failed miserably to address the long outstanding conflicts despite its motto of global peace. India at every stand refused to accept the UN resolutions while Pakistan always welcomed it. The apple of discord between the two is Kashmir and the resolution of Kashmir will ultimately bring the peace to the region. Both initiated the Composite Dialogue process which was considered to get results and solve the issues, but it failed as it only addressed the minor issues not the major. The first and foremost reason for failure of talks is that there is not any framework and mechanism to channelize the talks let alone any results. Further, another reason is that there is complete mistrust between the two. The regional organization like SAARC has failed as according to its manifesto no political discussion and issues shall be discussed at the platform thus no fruition has been received from such platform except trivial annual sessions. In such scenario, the only viable option suitable is mediation of third party to resolve the problems as it has proved its success in 1965 and 1971 wars and in Indus Water Treaty. Thus, the attention should be diverted to this region as it poses as nuclear flashpoint. Pakistan and India were given the opportunity after the end of the cold war to revamp their relation independently without any affiliation. As the world was changed from bipolar to unipolar and many new ideas emerged in post-cold war scenario. The economic upliftment was the major notion in unipolar world and many nations followed such notion to become the welfare state.

The prevalence of peace is the key concept in post-cold war era and same can be seen in the attitude and policies of countries. The focus has shifted to economic enhancement. The globalization has connected the world as community. Both countries now try to lay emphasis on the peace initiatives rather than hostility. The war has never been fruitful for any country. There is dire need of communication at official level but also at people to people. The cross-border communication will help in building peaceful measures and confidence for future ties. Historically, both countries have engaged in negotiations at different intervals but ended without any fruition. Though unofficial dialogues were held at regular period, but no major breakthrough was achieved. There is need to erase the past bitterness and resolve the long-standing issues to facilitate the younger generations for future ahead. During the Musharraf regime and during civilian governments the ties with India were going smooth unless the Mumbai attack that halted the process. In recent times, the tensions have reduced but many outstanding issues are still to be solved to promote peace in the region. There are always mischief mongers who are there to hinder the peace process every time when there is positive thing is about to happen.

References

1. Akhtar Shahnaz, (2012) Dynamics of USA Pakistan relations in the post 9/11 period: Hurdles and future prospects, International Journal of Humanities and social science Vol.2 No. 11.
2. Ali, Akhtar. 1984. Pakistan's Nuclear Dilemma: Energy and Security Dimensions. Karachi: Economist Research Unit. Allan, Charles T. 1994. "Extended Conventional Deterrence: In from the Cold and Out of the Nuclear Fire?" Washington Quarterly 17(3), 203-233. Art,
3. Altaf, H. (2019). History of Military Interventions in Political Affairs in Pakistan.
4. Ibid
5. ibid
6. Baqai Gul Farah, (2016) Zulfiqar ali butto's role in Nuclear program of Pakistan (1971-1977) Pakistan journal of history and culture, Vol XXXVII, No 2.
7. . Khan, B., Khan, T. M., & Ahmad, S. (2018). Government-opposition Relations at Centre and Provinces: Analyzing Second Term of Benazir Bhutto Government. *Dialogue (Pakistan)*, 13(1).
8. Kidwai Saleem M (2010) US policy towards Muslim world, focus on the post 9/11 period, University press of America pp- 221-222-223.
9. . Mahmood Farani, H. (2017). *PAK-SOVIET RELATIONS DURING ZULFIQAR ALI BHUTTO REGIME: 1971-1977* (Doctoral dissertation).
10. Ibid.