

Zeeshan Ahmad *

Maghfoor Ullah †

Munazza ‡

Pulwama Attack: Implications on the India and Pakistan Bilateral Issue of the Indian Kashmir

Abstract: *Since the division of the subcontinent into two separate states, Kashmir remains a highly volatile region between the two nuclear powers of south Asia, constantly both powers involved in a series of tragic wars on Kashmir. Diplomatic efforts failed and pave way for war and the Pulwama attack was one of their expression. This study explores the bilateral relations between the two states in the wake of the Pulwama attack and its implications on bilateral relations and the region as a whole.*

Key Words: Kashmir, Pakistan, India, Pulwama Attack, Diplomacy, War

Introduction

Since India and Pakistan achieved independence in 1947, the relations between them have been such that the talks of peace, cooperation and trade have often taken place parallel to the threats of war. Pakistan and India both have tense relation since their birth. This is because of the pre-partition relations between Muslim and Hindu populations and the contagious division of the sub-continent by the British raj. In the general range of suspicion, mistrust, and rivalry, new and unpredicted troubles raised after 1947 and turn out to be signs of the seemingly never-ending conflict between India and Pakistan. Kashmir is the conclusive determinant in defining the nature of bilateral relations of the old rivals.

Kashmir has become so important to ruling classes in both these states (Hilali, 2005). There are various reasons that have dictated India-Pak relations. The features generally contain the existence of numerous religions or ideologies, the role of personalities, the legacies of colonial rule, and the faultiness of domestic and international political systems, mutual images. (Cheema, 1999). The Kashmir conflict considered as incomplete agenda of partition also tormented their ties with distrust and animosity. The disagreements over the Kashmir region ignited two of the three major Indo-Pakistani wars in 1947 and 1965, and a limited war in 1999. Since 2003 they have preserved a fragile cease-fire, they often exchange fire across the disputed border, known as the Line of

* Undergraduate Student, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, KP, Pakistan.

† Undergraduate Student, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, KP, Pakistan.

‡ Undergraduate Student, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, KP, Pakistan. Email: Munazzakhan1221@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)

Control (LOC). Both blame each other of violating the cease-fire and claims to be shooting in response.

India and Pakistan have confronted various security hazards from day one since partition due to the aggressive relations which was a major threat for Pakistan in past. As a matter of fact, traditional Indian potentials were a major to Pakistan, but the transformation between the two states afterwards a nuclear explosion in 1998 (Johnson, 2005). While analyzing the causes of hostility between Pakistan and India, several factors need to be considered. These include mutual discernments and mistrust, divergent policy pursuits, the role of historians, and the role of outsiders.

Another central aspect is the legacy of the unpleasant relationship between political wings i.e., the Congress and All India Muslim League which served the interest of Hindus and Muslims, respectively in British India during the pre-independence period.

The manic clashes in between the Congress-League that arose in the last period of the Independence movement eventually established the platform so that India and Pakistan could not be reasonably friendly with each other (Kux, 2006, p. 24). The main reason for conflicts between the nations lies in how valued Kashmir is in terms of resources, national security, and geography. One of the main incidents was the Pulwama incident that occurred between India and Pakistan. The terrorist attack took place on February 14, 2019; a convoy of vehicles from India's Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) of India was attacked by a suicide bomber in Pulwama. Jaish-e-Mohammad, a Pakistani-based terror group. India blamed Pakistan to be responsible for the attack. However, Pakistan refused any participation in the attack. In retaliation, Indian fighter jets crossed the border and bombed the alleged

Jaish-e-Mohammad bases in the city of Balakot, but Pakistan still denies it.

Theoretical Framework

There are numerous theories that define the relationship between two or more nations, including liberal internationalism, which believes that via dialogues, promotion of commerce and trade, arbitration, and setting up democratic government a peaceful relation could be established. (Scott Burchill, 2005) yet the relations between the two nations show that both nations have never reconciled via mediation or communication except for a few times.

Nonetheless, the relationship between the binary nations can be described by the Realist hypothesis and is appropriate to define the relationship between two countries. While offensive realism means that the state ought to wage and start a war against others for the benefit of the state. (Girffth, 2007) Thus, India's Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) is an invasive strategy that involves limited warfare.

The idea of partial war dates back to the 19th century when military schemer and theoretician delivered an idea of limited war. "In this book on limited war, the challenge to American strategy" Robert E.Osgood describes a Limited war as a battle which is achieving certain limited goals, which don't need most extreme military preparations and endeavors". This definition uncovers the differentiation between an all-out war that is portrayed as extreme military efforts and limited war. As per Thucydides states involve in wars due to three motives: Fear, honor and interest. Total war may be due to the component of fear, whereas in Limited war there is a component of interest and Honor (Thucydides). When a state starts a limited or total war, it is every time followed by some strategic statistics, in which various alternates are chosen in order to carry out Cost-Benefit analysis and the most ideal

decision is selected, with the least expense and greatest advantage, which is termed as "Rational actor model".

The rational actor model defines that a state, select or do not select any course of actions after some calculations and Cost-Benefit analysis. And in this process, the role of leaders, Bureaucrats, domestic imperatives and international factors play a vital role (Breuning, 2007).

The balance of power theory envisages that one state build up and improve its security relative to another state to prevent its security from being in jeopardy (Scott Burchill, *Theories of International Relations*, 2005). For that purpose both states have undertaken different initiatives to counterbalance each other and the attainment of nuclear capability and the development of missile system by both countries is one of them.

Historical Background of Indo-Pak Relations

Partition Dilemma and Post Partition Narratives

India and Pakistan were born out of a bloody division that encouraged both to define themselves hostile toward each other which made them fight four wars since the split (Oimstead, 2014).

Since the establishment of India and Pakistan frequent violations of the Line of Control, allegations of harassment of embassy staff on both sides are other outstanding evidence of tensions between the two nations. Throughout history, two nations have been at loggerheads with one another. Despite their best efforts, the two nations have failed to resolve their differences peacefully. (Noshin 2014)

The Kashmir conflict has been a hot topic awaiting a solution for many years. On 1, January 1949, the UN resolution signed a ceasefire agreement between Pakistan and India. However, India has never done that.

Because the opinions and demands of both countries on Kashmir are different, the issue remains a serious and unresolved dispute. The unresolved problem has proven to be a sanctuary breach in South Asia (Korbel, 1966).

Developments/antagonistic Relations 1949 WAR

India took this matter to the United Nations and as a result the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) passed a resolution of 17 January 1948 and 20 January 1948, calling for a ceasefire between India and Pakistan and later by a Resolution of 21 April 1948, calling for plebiscite in Kashmir under UN surveillance. (Jaffrelot, 2000)

India and Pakistan clashed over Kashmir shortly after separation. It was a Muslim-majority area ruled by a Hindu king named Maharaja Hari Singh. Overlooking the majority population's feelings and the parameters for state accession determined on October 26, 1947, the Maharaja proclaimed his intention to join India. It sparked a rebellion. India dispatched its regular army while tribesmen assisted Pakistan to exert pressure on the British to intervene, and ultimately sent soldiers in May 1948. After the UN intervened, the warlike situation dissipated. Despite this, Kashmir is divided into two portions, each administered by Pakistan and India. The two countries respondent of beginning a war claim to be the sole rulers of Kashmir. Meanwhile, the United Nations issued a resolution calling for a referendum to determine Kashmir's final status, and both nations consented to it. However, once Pakistan and the United States signed a defense treaty in May 1956, India declined to conduct the probe (Kent: Dawson Westview, 1980)

1965 WAR

The second war also fought over same problem in September 1965. The distress in Kashmir was escalated due to various factors. War began after Pakistan's operation Gibraltar, which provided a plan to begin an uprising against India in Kashmir. (Abdul Sattar, Pakistan's foreign policy, 2007)

In 1963, there was rising anger toward India's sometimes violent and corrupt administration in Kashmir, and the theft of holy hair from the famed Hazratbal Mosque in Srinagar sparked significant demonstrations and rioting among Kashmiri Muslims. The demonstrations lasted two years. Indian security forces brutally repressed them, resulting in widespread carnage. The increasing bloodshed in Kashmir sparked a second all-out war between India and Pakistan (Margolis, 2001).

India replied with a large-scale military operation in West Pakistan. The seventeen-day conflict, which was the greatest tank and armoured vehicle engagement since World War II, resulted in devastating deaths on both sides (Rachna Bisht, 2015).

India seized the valley between the Dras and Suru rivers during the battle. Following the signing of the Tashkent Agreement, India was required to return these regions. When the truce was declared, India held the upper hand against Pakistan (Wolpert, Stanley (2005))

1971 WAR

This war did not address the Kashmir issue, but it did alleviate the situation caused by the ongoing political conflict in former East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) between West Pakistan's Yahya Khan and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and East Pakistan's Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. As a result, Bangladesh declared independence from the Pakistani state structure. Following Operation Searchlight

and the 1971 Bangladesh bombings, an estimated 10 million Bengalis from eastern Pakistan fled to neighbouring India (Jaffrelot, 2004).

India intervenes in the ongoing liberation movement in Bangladesh. (Syed Badrul Ahsan 2011).

Pakistan was beaten, and its eastern flank was permanently gone. As if that weren't enough, India took over 90,000 men as prisoners of war (PoW) (Zaid, 2017)

Kargil War

Since India and Pakistan accompanied nuclear tests in May 1998, the world appears to be paying close attention to events in South Asia. The Kargil conflict was South Asia's first small military engagement between Pakistan and India since nuclearization. Historically, once the subcontinent was divided, Kargil had a vital position and was hence the cause of Pakistani assaults. The goodwill demonstrated by Pakistan's and India's Prime Ministers at the Lahore Summit has clearly collapsed as a result of the events in Kargil. The Kargil conflict, which continued from May to July 1999, was a minor skirmish between the Indian and Pakistani militaries that resulted in the deaths of around 1,300 people. (Kapur, 2008: 116)

The Kargil War is not regarded a full-fledged war "It is, nonetheless, one of the most significant clashes between Pakistan and India."The location is critical in connection to the Kashmir conflict since there is an Indian support line in the Kashmir Valley. The dispute underlined the terrible dangers of nuclear war. Atomic weapons were tested just before the battle. With the help of the world community, a full-fledged nuclear war was averted." (Hussain, 2006)

The Kargil crises were a wake-up call for the US, as Pakistan and India fought to the verge of nuclear war in 1999, which was

only averted by US intervention. The United States began to be concerned about the volatile situation in South Asia after that. The US urged India and Pakistan to engage and address problematic problems, including the newest Kashmir dispute, and a series of formal and public conversations and visits began at the US's demand. (Javaid, 2013)

Pulwama Attack and its Implications on Bilateral Relations

The situation in Pre and Post Pulwama Attack

In the winter of 2019, on 14 February, Adil Ahmad Darhad, an Indian national from Kashmir drove his explosive-laden vehicle into a convoy of the Central Reserve Police Force on the Srinagar-Jammu highway, uncovered the sharp fault-lines between Pakistan and India, killing 44 cops and wounding 70. The assault was asserted by JeM, which had stimulated and upheld the perpetrator to do the assault. (Abi-Habib et al. 2019). Over the next few days, India and Pakistan were engaged in antagonistic threats and huge tit-for-tat artillery exchanges on the Line of Control, which isolates Indian-and Pakistani-controlled pieces of Kashmir, afterwards India postponed numerous confidence-building measures related to travels-and trade. In simply two weeks, the scenario had intensified into very threatening crisis India and Pakistan had encountered since their open nuclearization in 1998 (Yusaf, 2019).

Indo-Pak Stance on Pulwama Attack

The rapid fallout of the assault prompted tensions between India and Pakistan. The two nations reacted to the public pressure to give a solid reaction to Pulwama attack. India accused Pakistan of plotting and carrying out the deadly attack. Similarly, Pakistan out rightly denied India's

allegations, saying it was indigenously designed, planned and executed.

Similarly, in previous major crises, India withdrew its ambassador from Pakistan (Pakistan followed the same pattern), withdrew its MFN position, and suspended cross-border transport and rail services. Additionally, tariffs were increased by 200%, threats were made to prevent the advance of water to Pakistan as guaranteed by the Indus Water Treaty, and the Jammu and Kashmir state administration removed the security of separatist leaders, while that the Prime Minister of Naya Pakistan (a slogan used during the election campaign) Imran Khan, a cricketer turned politician, alerted India to refrain from any act. He said in a nationwide video message that India indicts Pakistan without any proof and offered a joint investigation. On the contrary, he highlighted the serious human rights violations perpetrated by the Indian security forces in Jammu and Kashmir and noted that India needs to reflect on what is driving Kashmiri youth to take up arms and lose their fear of death. (Hussain, 2019)

Furthermore, India was taking diplomatic steps to isolate Pakistan. The Ministry of External Affairs said in a statement: "[it] will find all attainable diplomatic steps to guarantee and assure detachment of Pakistan from the international community of which undeniable proof is direct participation in the act." (Sharma, 2019)

On the other hand, Prime Minister called the session of National Security Council meeting on Thursday, February 21st to discuss the political situation following Pulwama attack. The NSC statement reaffirms its commitment to fight in opposition to terrorism and banned organizations led by Hafiz Saeed including Jammad ud Dawa (JuD) and Falah-i-Insaniyat (FIF). The PM further instructed the top decision makers to quicken the 2014 National Action Plan which was organized

to fight against terrorism. Simultaneously, the NSC also granted armed forces proper approval “to react in a decisive manner to any animosity or misadventure by India”. (Hussain, 2019)

A strong response to the Pulwama attack was provided reacting to public pressure, India announced it would vigorously retaliate, while Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan by assuring India said he would take action against perpetrators of the Pulwama terror attack if New Delhi shares “actionable intelligence”, However he warned against any “revenge” retaliation.

Tensions escalated on February 26, when India staged air strikes on a suspected JeM terrorist camp inside Pakistan. India claimed that in the attack they have killed “a very large number of JeM terrorists, trainers, senior commanders and jihadist groups”. Pakistan retaliated the following day with air strikes in Indian Kashmir and abducted Abhinandan Varthaman the Indian Wing Commander who was piloting a MiG-21 Bison aircraft, whose aircraft was shot down during a mission over Pakistani airspace. (Yusuf, 2019)

India has reportedly considered launching a series of planned air strikes within Pakistan. Pakistan has promised an immediate and more comprehensive response. Fortunately, these plans never materialized. Instead, the disagreement eased quite abruptly in the next two days.

After two days on 28 February, Prime Minister Imran Khan issued a televised public address warning the Indian leadership regarding the nuclear capabilities of both countries, urging India to show restraint and suggesting the resumption of talks. (Safi and Zahra-Malik 2019)

A day later, PM Imran Khan announced the release of Varthaman. According to Pakistan’s foreign minister Shah Mehmood Qureshi his government had announced the

release of the IAF Wing Commander in a pursuit of peace. PM Narendra Modi welcomed Abhinandan’s release at a political rally and stated that the nation was proud of him. On March 1, 2019, an IAF delegation received Varthaman across the Wagah border.

Conclusion

Relations between Pakistan and India have been the subject of much controversy since 1947. There were wars and clashes, although both states tended to negotiate after each assault. Sadly, both sides have failed to turn the desire for peaceful coexistence into lasting harmony and collaboration. Thus, the key theme of this work was based on the hypothesis that bilateral efforts and third-party mediation can be an effective model for conflict resolution.

The UN position is different from traditional third-party mediations. The UN played a key role in ending the first and second Kashmir wars in 1949 and 1965, however they did not bring peace to Kashmir. Therefore, his work so far has been limited to resolving in terms of resolving the most serious dispute between Pakistan and India. However, the main reason is India's refusal to allow the UN to have an indisputable voice on Kashmir, yet the international organization cannot be excused for failing as it has rarely adopted a moral and legal view of the condition to assume a significant part in Kashmir. However, the UNSC resolutions remain valid and can be of great help in addressing the Kashmir crisis.

The root cause of the failure of bilateral efforts is the lack of an institutional system to deal with conflicts and tensions. The second cause is a deep mistrust between the two countries. The failure of the UN and the bilateral channel leaves room for other alternatives. Meanwhile, third-party mediation has a track record of effectiveness, it should be used to solve

major problems related to Pakistan-India relations. Indeed, in the meantime we are left with third party mediation as the simplest alternative, which has a background marked by success and also the potential to peacefully resolve Pak-India disputes.

Therefore, the international community has to realize its position as a mediator and turn its attention to South Asia, which has the potential for a nuclear focus.

Therefore, the international community must realize its role as mediator and refocus its attention on South Asia, which is a possible nuclear focus. India should reconsider its position and realize the importance of third-party mediations. Furthermore, it should allow the UN to use its good offices to help clear up the Kashmir dispute which is important for regional peace and good relations between the two states.

Although Indian and Pakistani officials appear to have effectively stayed away from nuclear escalation during the Pulwama incident, there will always be danger of unintended consequences between nuclear-armed rivals. These risks can and should be mitigated, in particular by promoting bilateral regulation between India and Pakistan. Importantly, since the third party has been blocking the massive escalation, the availability of a large number of characters inevitably makes communication difficult during the crisis. At the very least, India and Pakistan should use their direct channels reliably and constructively in times of crisis. New confidence-building measures and agreements aimed at initiating risk reduction measures, including in the nuclear field, should also be urgently considered.

However, even the best crisis management plans cannot provide a stable solution. This can only happen in preventive efforts. Therefore, crisis management must be integrated with efforts to address the root

causes of crises, with a view to eliminating them.

The main factors contributing to the conflict between India and Pakistan are terrorism and prominent bilateral conflicts. A policy approach that combines the two offers a good chance of success. Pakistan must use all available resources to exhaust the terrorists operating on its territory. India and Pakistan must also sincerely pursue and hasten an end to the pending persecution of their citizens who are known to have been involved in terrorism on someone else's land in the past. In addition, both parties must establish a crude channel to share any intelligence information that may be useful in blocking terrorist sites.

At the same time, more attention is needed to address the issue of Kashmir, which has strongly supported the cause of violence in Indian Kashmir. India's drastic measures to end ongoing tensions among Kashmiri Muslims have sparked widespread outrage and disintegration among Kashmiri youth. The Pulwama attacker was shot dead after being beaten by Indian security forces. If that is the case, many young people in Kashmir will be drawn into violence and regional and international terrorist organizations will try to exploit them. India must use a humane approach in Kashmir to alleviate the situation.

In the meantime, India and Pakistan need to enter into a calm dialogue on Kashmir. This may seem far-fetched at the moment, but the last serious negotiations on this issue began in the same context during the 2001-2002 military confrontation. This led both sides to an agreement before the end of their peace process following the Mumbai attacks in 2008. The world should encourage India and Pakistan to return to similar talks. Otherwise, South Asia will soon find itself in another situation sooner or later.

References

- Ahmad, I., & Ebert. (2013). Will Pakistan's policy in India change strategically under Sharif? 37(6), 667-674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09700161.2013.847043>
- Amin, M. S. (2010). *Pakistan's foreign policy: a shelf*. Oxford University Press.
- Bajpai, K. P., Chari, P. R., Cheema, P. I., Cohen, S. P., & Ganguly. (1995). *Brasstacks and Beyond: Crisis Perception and Management in South Asia*: Manohar New Delhi.
- Burke, S. M. (1973). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Historical Analysis*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, S. M. (1974). *Mainsprings of Indian and Pakistan Foreign Policies* (New edition): University of Minnesota Press.
- Cheema, P. I. (1999). *CBM and South Asia. Confidence-building measures in South Asia*". Colombo: Regional Center for Strategic Studies, Colombo.
- Choudhury. (1971). *Pakistani relations with India*. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan.
- Dixit, J. (1995). Indian Politics of Pakistan: Role of National Political Factors. *International Studies*, 32, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24384169>
- Ejaz, A. (1998). Towards normalization: India-Pakistan peace process, 1997-1998. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41500063>
- Farooq, O. (2019, September 6). "Kashmir is 'Pak's jugular vein,' Imran says." <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/pakistan/kashmir-is-paks-jugular-vein-says-imran/articleshow/71016362.cms>;
- Fred, H., & Hamza, A. (1988). *State and ideology in the Middle East of Pakistan*. London: Macmillan education Ltd.
- Ganguly, S. (2016). *Deadly impasse: kashmir and indo-pak relations at the dawn of the new century*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hussain, D. M. (2019, February 25). *Pulwama Terrorist Attack and Indian Diplomatic Offensive against Pakistan's Achievements and Limitations*: <http://southasiajournal.net/%EF%BB%BFpulwama-terror-attack-and-indian-diplomatic-offensive-against-pakistan-achievements-and-limitations/>
- Hussain, I. (1980). *Kashmir dispute: an international law perspective*. rawalpindi: Services Book Club, 2000.
- Jaffrelot, C. (2018, October 24). Violation of the ceasefire in Kashmir: a war by other means? Obtained from Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Jaffrelot. (2002). *History of the origins of Pakistan*. hymn press.
- Khattak, M. U. R. (2011). Indian Military Doctrine on Cold Start; Pakistani capabilities, constraints and possible response.
- Shah, S. (2019, August 11). "Pakistan's New Plot in Kashmir: What to Do About Jihadists". www.wsj.com/articles/pakistans-new-plight-in-kashmir-what-to-do-about-the-jihadists-11565523414.
- Shahab, Q. U. (2013). *Shahabnama*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publication.
- Sharma, D. A. (February 27, 2019). *Pulwama Terrorist Attack: India's Response Escalates*. <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/pulwama-terror-india-escalates/>
- Tariq, A. H. B. (2011). *Kashmir: The case for freedom*. United Kingdom: Verso Books.
- Zaid, S. A. (2017, October 6). "The promise of democracy." Dawn news: <https://www.dawn.com/news/1360571>
- Ziring, L. (1980). *Pakistan: the enigma of political development*. Kent: Dawson Westview.