

Conflict Management between Pakistan and India: Challenges and Failures

Umbreen Javaid

University of Punjab, Lahore.

Naseem Sahrai

University of Punjab, Lahore.

ABSTRACT

Pakistan and India, two vital South Asian states have been at loggerheads since 1947. The hostility and enmity has remained at top in their foreign policies for most of their mutual history. Both states have engaged in number of wars, border conflicts and diplomatic clashes. The trust deficit, blame game and relational gap has increased with the passage of time. The hostility has not only affected their mutual relationship but also has played the role in instable South Asian Region. There has been numerous conflict management efforts through diplomacy, negotiations and mediation but have ended in new conflict. These conflicts have created new hostilities and clashes between both neighboring states. Both shared same border but have never shared same policies and aspects on same page. This has led to the relational gap at both governmental level and social grounds.

Key Words: Conflict Management, Track II Diplomacy, South Asia, Human Need Base Theory, Confidence Building Measures

Historical Perspective

Pakistan and Indian got their independence in 1947 from the British imperialism. Right from the start the security dilemma and lack of trust emerged as the most vital issues. The newly established states were not ready to bridge up the gap. On one hand India was not ready to accept the existence of Pakistan while on other hand Pakistani government was under severe threat of security from its neighbor. Henceforth the hostility took birth with the freedom of these states, this resulted in first war in 1948 after few month of independence of these newly born states. War of 1948 left a disputed issue of Kashmir unresolved and despite the mutual and international efforts it still remains in same state. The Kashmir issue proved to be the basic issue of confrontation and led to many future wars and border clashes (Haider, 2010; Mahajan, 1963)

Both states were engaged in a full-fledged war in 1965 over the same issue of Kashmir which proved to be among major wars. Both sides faced huge numbers of

South Asian Studies 31 (1)

human and economical loss. The war ended in stalemate was second major conflict between these states. After international intervention the issue was resolved and both sides decided to not to intervene in the internal and territorial issues of each other. This decision was short lived as after mere six years, another war broke out between them in 1971, which is considered by Pakistan as the Indian intervention in its internal issues. The war resulted in the disintegration of East Pakistan and establishment of new state in shape Bangladesh. This made both sides' further hostile and relation gap increased to new extent (Sedden, 2007; Haroon, 2007)

The Nuclear capability issue emerged as new issue of enmity in 1970s, which still prevails. India announced its nuclear capability in 1974 and in result Pakistan decided to start its own nuclear program for keeping the balance of power in the region. Although both states were not engaged in direct confrontation for next almost three decades but the nuclear issue remained the reason of trust deficiency. The nuclear power capability again emerged as top level when in 1998 both states tested their nuclear bombs and became the established nuclear powers which made the chances of war more lethal and destructive. In 21st century the nature of War changed between both states as border clashed and full wars were not fought rather indirect attacks and militancy in shape incidents like Parliament Attacks in 2001, Samjhota Express Blasts in 2006 and Mumbai Attacks in 2008 and Balochistan Insurgency in after 2005 emerged as the new clash points between both sides. (Johnson, 2002; O'Donnell, 2013; Biswas, 2015; Basrur, 2009)

Pakistan and India have engaged themselves in numbers of conflict management talks, negotiations and agreements but all of them proved to be futile in the end. The agreements like Tashkent Agreement in 1965, Shimla Accord in 1972, Lahore Declaration in 1998 and Agra Summit in 2004 proved to be major steps initially but in the end they were violated. This results in further resentment between these neighboring states. Furthermore both sides tried to resolve their conflicts through other channels like Track II diplomacy and were engaged in extensive talks with the help of retired diplomats, former military men, business groups and other social entities but like other efforts they remained unable to extract a successful or major positive result. Pakistan and India as two most important states of South Asian Region need to manage and resolve their conflicts at some point as this will not only be positive for them but will pave the way for a stable South Asia (Geneva Academy, 2015).

Conflict Management: Definitions and Theoretical Framework

Some of the major definitions of the Conflict Management are:

- Conflict management is about ways in which parties try to deal with conflict
- Conflict resolution, otherwise known as reconciliation, is conceptualized as the methods and processes involved in facilitating the peaceful ending of [conflict](#) and [retribution](#).

- Conflict management, otherwise known as reconciliation, is conceptualized as the methods and processes involved in facilitating the peaceful ending of [conflict](#) and [retribution](#).

Under these definitions, the scholar has derived the concept of conflict management as the “*Process of analyzing and discussion different aspects and outcomes to resolve the conflicts tangible or intangible prevailing among the states of the world*”

Theoretical Debate

The theoretical debate of conflict management mainly revolves around three main theories. The first one known as the Human Need Base Theory that was derived by the Australian Scholar John Burton (1986). John is of the view that the conflict cannot be resolved unless the basic needs of the human beings are considered. The theory was extracted from the scholarly work of an American Psychologist. Burton has added its own element in the theory which he called “Role of Defense” which means that one has to defend its interest in all conditions as the needs the fundamental elements of a human being and they need to be defended.

This theory has different meaning and aspects in different disciplines like biology and sociology. In these disciplines it is taken as an element which becomes rare or scarce because of the common need of human beings. Likewise in Psychology the theory is based on the study of the motivational aspects of human beings. Combining all those studies and disciplines, Burton called his theory as the non-negotiable conflict study which mostly addressed to the serious and long term issues while keeping the basic needs of human beings (Burton, Sandole, 1986)

The second major theory of conflict management is known as the “*Interest Based Negotiation Theory*”. The theory is derived and explained by Roger Fisher in 1990s who was an academic at Harvard Law School. Fisher believes that conflict resolution can be achieved by extracting the common interests by the involving parties. The theory which is totally opposite to the position bases negotiation theory. In Fisher’s theory the parties negotiate about the issues like esteem, security and pleasure and discussed the common interests while in position based ideology, one party holds its own position while the other holds its own. These rigid positions by these parties ultimately result in the non resolution of the conflict. While in the Interest based negotiations the parties use the empathy for one another and search the underlying interests for them and resolve the conflict. According to Fisher the fundamental needs and elements of human being are security, economic prosperity, sense of belonging, control over life and recognition. These needs are relatively close to the needs explain by Burton in his theory (Fisher, 1981)

The last and major theory of conflict management is known as *Conflict Transformation Theory*. The scholars like Paul Lederach, Robert Baruch, Joseph Folger, R. Varnayen and Peter Wallenstein are considered to be the initiators of this school of thought during 1990s. The basic element of this idea was that the

South Asian Studies 31 (1)

conflict resolution started to be called as Conflict Transformation or Peace Building Process in international relations. According to the scholars of this school of thought the conflict is not the last stage of an issue rather it always remain in dynamic shape where the chances of extracting new outcomes is available. The conflict keeps on transforming itself from one stage to another (Varnyen, 2000: Kelman, 1999)

The theory is considered to be the sub-discipline of the post-modern sociological or philosophical studies which concludes that the including parties like negotiators and mediators can charge with: “enlarging the boundaries of political community, overcoming sectional and factional differences, expanding the domain of moral responsibility...and promoting relations who conform to some standards of international order”. (Varynen, 2000)

These three basic theories of conflict management explain, analyze and extract the final outcomes of conflicts in international relations. The conflicts between Pakistan and India can be analyzed and studied under these school of thoughts, like the reasons because of which these conflicts emerged, the process of these conflicts to become tangible or non-tangible, the possible mutual interests both parties can have, the basic needs of human beings on both sides for which the conflict should be resolved, and options to transform the conflict from highly hostile to a peace making process. Above all the challenges and failures of the Conflict resolution efforts between Pakistan and India can be thoroughly studies under these theories.

Conflicts between Pakistan and India: Wars and Border Clashes

Kashmir War (1947-48)

Pakistan and India got their independence in 1947. They fought their first war with in first year of their freedom. The 1947-48, Kashmir War is considered to be the first of the four full fledged wars between both states. During the process of partition, it was decided that states with majority population will join the state with respective majority i.e. Muslim majority states with Pakistan and Hindu majority with India. Kashmir is a Muslim majority area that was ruled by a Hindu Ruler who decided to annex with India despite the opposition of its masses. In the result of his annexation with India, masses started agitation and the protests erupted in the valley. (*The Hindu*, March 1, 2013)

To support the Kashmiri Muslims, the tribal troops from NWFP now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) and FATA marched towards Srinagar. These tribal troops moved forward without any support of Pakistani military which was in weak and shaky condition at the time. When these troops moved forward rapidly, the Hindu ruler of Kashmir, asked for military assistance from India which was obliged immediately. The Indian forces along with British Troops captured the two third area of Kashmir including Jammu Kashmir and Ladakh, where as the tribal area got hold of one third area of the valley. On January 1, 1949, a cease fire was

signed between Pakistan and India under the mediation of United Nations and it was decided that Kashmir Issue will be resolved according to the wishes of Kashmiri People under the UN resolution but it was never being conducted by India henceforth the issue remains unresolved and biggest conflict between both states as it became the reason of another three wars between these two hostile states. (Schofield, 2003: Alastair, 1997)

War of 1965: Second War over Kashmir Issue

The second major conflict between Pakistan and India was the 1965 War. The war was the result of number of border skirmishes between both states from April and September 1965. The War was fought for seventeen consecutive days and ended after the intervention of international community. The official end of the war was considered after the signature of Tashkent Agreements between both states. At the end of the war, both states declared victory. According to some neutral analysts, India won the war while some think that Pakistan gain more grounds but largely it is considered to be the stalemate. This war saw the largest tank battle of the world since WWII. The real reason of this war was once again the issue of Kashmir which remained unresolved even after this major war. The War of 1965, highlighted the capabilities of fighting, training and weaponry of both states from which both states started to enhance their military powers to new level to keep the balance in the South Asian Region. (Johnson, 2005: Tucker, 2004)

War of 1971: Civil unrest and Indian Intervention in Eastern Pakistan

The War of 1971, may be the most significant and vital war between both states as in result of this conflict Pakistan was disintegrated and the East Pakistan, emerged as a new state, Bangladesh. The civil unrest started in the East Pakistan after political, economical and social differences between both wings of the state. This slowly led to the unrest in the Eastern part of Pakistan. The masses in the wing were not happy with policies of central government and were of the view that they were not being given due share in the national profit and earning. Field Marshall General Ayub Khan tried to resolve the issue by launching economical and political policies. The industries were shifted to the region and the people from that wing were taken into civil and military institutions but the policies did not prove to be successful and unrest kept on increasing. (Kemp, 2010: Nawaz, 2008)

The real conflict increased after the first General Elections of Pakistan in 1970s when both sides' political leadership refused to accept the dominance of others hence the insurgency and civil unrest started in the East Pakistan which led to the military operation by Pakistani military. India took the advantage of this internal unrest of Pakistan and started to interfere through the militant and terrorist elements and played a vital role in increasing the civil war inside Pakistan. The conflict reached to the point where military forces turned into direct and full war. In this war again thousands of people died and both sides faced heavy losses. Due

South Asian Studies 31 (1)

to strategic and geographic location the Pakistani Army remained unable to take up and fight to its full capacity resulted in the defeat. After the end of war, the Eastern Wing was disintegrated and become a new country named Bangladesh. (Cohen, 2004: Haqqani, 2005)

This war proved to be Indian interference in the internal matters of Pakistan which resulted in its division. The Conflict was proved to be a tangible one but after the creation of Bangladesh, both Pakistan and newly emerged state tried to negotiate on Interest based conflict resolution to survive with cooperation.

Brass Tack Operation: Critical War Threat

The Brass Tack Operation was the largest military exercise by the Indian forces in 1986-87. Almost half of the Indian Army was taking part in these exercises. India usually conducted its military exercises in the Northern regions which is close to the Kashmir but these exercises were arranged in the desert areas of Rajasthan near Sindh, Pakistan. Although India declared it as the regular exercise but Pakistan refused to accept it and considered it as direct threat for a swift attack on its territory to divide it into half and attack on its nuclear plants. Pakistan answered this Indian maneuver by rapidly moving its forces to Punjab border of both states. The mobilization and quick movement surprised India and after standing within 100 miles of Pakistani border for several months, it decided to retrieve. Along with that Pakistani Nuclear Scientist Dr Abdul Qadir said in an interview that Pakistan had the ability of nuclear bomb in 1987 which further become a reason of Indian retrieve (Niazi, 2012: Global Security Organization, October, 31, 2012)

The conflict was resolved by some important measures like Cricket Diplomacy by Pakistani President General Zia-ul-Haq through which he went to India in disguise of watching a match between Pakistan and India and talked to Indian government and authorities. This led to number of meetings like no attack on nuclear sites of both sides. The Brass Tack Operation although started by India, usually considered being a strategic victory of Pakistan Army because it surprised India with its mobility and fast movement and establishing a serious threat for Indian Army. (Abdullah, 2012: Kapur, 2009)

Kargil War: High Altitude Conflict

The Kargil War was fought in 1999 between Pakistan and India again on the issue of Kashmir. The war started when the freedom fighters and Pakistani Army personals attacked the Indian Posts at Kargil in winters and captured most of the Indian posts. The Indian Army retaliated with the help of its Air Force and took back most of its posts. The Pakistani army refused to admit that its military men were involved in the operation but later statement of Pakistani Prime Ministers and documents found on the bases proved that there was involvement of Pakistani Army in the operation. Both sides faced high number of casualties during this conflict. (Tavares, 2006)

The Kargil War is not considered to be the full fledged war but it is one of the critical conflicts between Pakistan and India. The region has the importance with the context of Kashmir issue as it was a reinforcement line to Indian Army present in Kashmir Valley. The War brought out the serious threat of the nuclear war as both states had tested their nuclear bombs very little time prior to this conflict. The Conflict was ended with the intervention of international community and halted it from becoming a full fledged nuclear war. (Hussain, October 21, 2006)

Military Stand-offs of 2001 and 2008

In 21st century both states have not fought the direct wars unlike the last century rather they remained involved in numbers of border clashes and two major military standoffs. The first one occurred in 2001-02 after the attack on Indian Parliament in Kashmir. The Indian government and authorities blamed Pakistan for the attack but Pakistani authorities refused any kind of involvement in the attack. This led to the military standoff between both sides from 2001 to 2002. Both armies stood on mutual borders eye ball to eye ball for almost an year. The issue was resolved again by the global interference and diplomacy. (Aziz, 2009)

The second major military standoff took place in 2008 after the Mumbai Attacks in which almost 160 Indian and Foreign Citizens were killed by the terrorists. Indian Government blamed Pakistani military for the attack but it was refused by Pakistan. During this standoff the militaries moved their artillery and man power to the borders of Kashmir, Punjab and Sindh. The Air Forces of both sides were on high alert even Pakistani Air Force tackled an Indian Fighting Jet from entering into Pakistani Air Space. This standoff was once again ended after the global diplomacy and Nuclear Threat as in case of war there was not assurance that both sides will not use their nuclear weapons.

These above mentioned conflicts are among the major conflicts of Pakistan and India since 1947. Both sides have fought wars, involved in border skirmishes and have closely avoided the Nuclear Wars. (Afridi, July 9, 2009; Nick 2009)

Conflict Resolution: Challenges and Failures for Pakistan and India

There have always been major and vital challenges for Pakistan and India for resolving and managing their conflicts. Some of the major challenges both sides face are:

Lack of Trust

The top most issue and challenge for both sides is lack of trust between them. Since the inception, both states are not ready to trust each other. The issue of trust deficit remains between them. After any incident, issue or even minor clash both sides start to look each other with suspicion and a blame game starts. The border clashes mainly occurred because of this phenomenon as both sides are always on

South Asian Studies 31 (1)

alert against each other and because of this most of the talks, agreements, and accords have failed between them. During a negotiation process the atmosphere is full of lack of trust. The signed agreements have been failed and the talks have ended futile at the verge of signing by both sides. (Kibal, 2005)

The major examples are the Tashkent Declaration signed on January 19, 1966 by both sides after of 1965 war. The major clause of this agreement was that no side will interfere in internal matters of other side. This clause was clearly violated by India during 1971 mainly because of suspicion and lack of trust. During Agra Summit in 2004 the agreement was not signed by both states right at the last moment. Both sides were not ready to trust each other especially in case of Kashmir Issue. The Pakistani delegation wanted to call the fighters as freedom fighters of Kashmir whereas Indian wanted to call them as the terrorists and this resulted in no agreement. The same case has happened during the Parliament attack in 2001 and Mumbai Attacks in 2008 when both sides started to blame each other. Again there was no trust on each other. (Caranza, 2008)

This trust deficiency is the major reason of the conflict resolution effort failures between both sides. The efforts made to resolve issues have proved to be futile on both official and non-official fronts. All the round of talks on Kashmir issue have been ended in failure because both sides are not ready to believe each other although they have the UN Resolutions present for the resolution but still not ready to act upon them. (Khan, 2009)

Border Clashes

The hostility at the mutual border of both states is another major issue for the relations of Pakistan and India. This issue has become the reason of the failure of several conflict resolution efforts. The Border clashes and skirmishes have remained the major reason of hostility of both states since 1947. Right after the independence these neighboring states were involved in border clash in shape of Kashmir War in 1947. That was the point from where the unstable border issues like LOC, Siachin Issue, Run of Kuch conflict, and Water border has been the top of the foreign policies of both states. All these border clashes have become the main reason of the failure of diplomatic efforts and negotiations between Pakistan and India. (Carranza, 2008)

Furthermore these clashes have resulted in stretching the conflict and relational gap between both states to new level and much longer time period. The cross border firings usually ended in the death of civilians on both sides which leads to the new confrontation, blame games and widened relation gap. The border confrontation has took the shape of cross border terrorism in which both states blame each other of terrorist activities like Parliament Attack, Mumbai Attacks of 2008, Insurgency of Balochistan especially after 2005, the terrorism in shape of TTP. These all border conflicts have led to more suspicions and failure of peace process between both sides. The unstable border has resulted in unstable relations. The long border has never remained stable for longer time period which is the

reason of constant hostile relations of Pakistan and India. A stable border and less border conflicts will definitely assure sustainable and strong relations between these important South Asian states. (Clyde, 2015)

Lack of Economic Interdependence

The world has become a globalized village especially since 1991. The states have become economically interdependent on each other which led to more peaceful and stable relations among the states. One of the failures of conflict management between Pakistan and India is the lack of economic interdependence on each other. The economic interdependence most definitely increases the communication, contact between the states which increase the trust on one another and the threat of war reduce because of the economic interests and investment on each others' territory. Due to very low economic investment there are no mutual interests between both states which proved to be vital for failure of the conflict resolution efforts between both states. This challenge of no economic interdependence has been discussed and analyzed by both states on numbers of occasions but ultimately has failed due to numerous reasons.

The economic interdependence could have saved number of clashes and wars between both states and have made the mutual relations strong as well as the regional circumstances stable and prosper. The economic interdependence has ended the hostility of many states in Europe but Pakistan and India has failed to acquire advantages from that model. (Sardar, 2005)

Social and Media Hostility

Although people on both sides of the border have lived together for centuries prior to the partition but the differences between them have proved to be a critical challenge for both Pakistan and India. The social, religious and traditional differences between masses of both states have proved to be another fundamental reason of the failure for establishing strong relations. Two states were divided mainly on the idea of Two Nation Theory which states that people on both sides are different in almost every aspect especially in religious values. Both have totally opposite teaching in most aspects of life. Furthermore during the partition, millions of people were killed by the mobs on both sides which sow a deep seed of hatred between Pakistanis and Indians. (Moahmmad. Naqvi, 2008)

On the other front the hostility on media is another challenge and reason of failures of peace efforts between both sides. The media propaganda has been held on both sides mainly by Indian media. In case of any incident, militant or terrorist attack the media started to blame the other state as in almost every case Indian media start to target Pakistan for the incident. The major example is Samjhota Express Blasts in 2006, in which over 100 Pakistanis were killed but Indian media started to blame Pakistan for the attack but as the investigations progressed, it was

South Asian Studies 31 (1)

proved that the right wing Hindu extremists were involved in the attack. This negative media propaganda has never been controlled by either side which has resulted in more enmity between both states. This media and social hostility has failed the negotiators on numbers of occasions as in some cases the masses are not ready to accept the proposed formula like Musharraf's five point Kashmir Formula in 2004 was strongly opposed by Pakistanis and on some point media started their own campaign which failed the conflict resolution process. (Khan, 2013)

Findings

The article has following findings:

- Pakistan and India has never enjoyed sustained and stable relations for longer time of period
- The Conflict Resolution are few and were never continued for a sustainable time
- Pakistan and India's conflict resolution efforts have always been hindered by some border clash, war or non-state actors' terrorism
- Both states have always kept the grudge and never have trusted each other wholly
- These two South Asian States have not taken the model of regional cooperation like European Union, hence always remained at loggers head with each other
- The governments of both states have remained unable to control the religious and nationalist elements in their territories which have led to more hostility at social and domestic level.
- The tool of economic interdependence has never been used by both neighboring states in today's globalized world because of which the hostility has always on rise.
- The deep rooted social enmity among the masses in a major reason for the failures in conflict management between these two states
- The failures of conflict management has not only led to the mutual enmity but also have created instability in the South Asian Region

Recommendations

- Pakistan and India need to establish constant communication channels which can even work during the hostile times
- The trust building measures must be taken by both governments through cross border interactions of different social groups like students, businessmen, diplomats and academics
- A Hot Line must be established between both heads of the states like US and USSR presidents during Cold War which diverted the Cuban Missile Crisis at last moment

- The media interaction needs to be increased especially through films medium as joint production can lead to more social understanding between the masses on both sides of the border
- The business forum must be established in which businessmen and groups will seek new business opportunities for stable relationship
- The back channel diplomacy needs to be practiced on regular bases as it will keep a window open for negotiation and dialogues

Conclusion

Pakistan and India have never enjoyed friendly relationship for longer time period rather both sides have remained hostile for most of the time in their mutual history. The Wars, border clashes and non-state militant attacks have increased the relational gap between them. Over the course of time the policies of both sides have hindered and failed the conflict management efforts. The conflict resolution and management steps like diplomacy, negotiations and mediations have mostly ended in failure and efforts ended in futile. Both sides need to increase the communication through different channels like social, economical, diplomatic, and unofficial diplomatic windows. The conflict resolution of different issues between these states is not only necessary for them but also for the whole South Asian Region.

References

- Alastair, Lamb. (1997). *Incomplete Partition: The Genesis of the Kashmir Dispute 1947-1948*: Cambridge: Roxford.
- Abdullah, Sannia (2012). Cold Star in Strategic Calculus. *IPRI Journal*. 12
- Afridi, Jamal. (July 9, 2009). Kashmir Militant Extremists. Washington DC: Council of Foreign Relations
- Aziz, Sartaj. *Between Dreams and Realities: Some Milestones in Pakistan's History*. Karachi: Oxford University Press
- Biswas, Arka. (2015) Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Deconstructing India's Doctrine Response. IDSA
- Burton, John. Sandole, Dennis. (1986). Generic Theory: The Bases of Conflict Resolution. *Negotiation Journal*. 2(4).
- Basrur, Rajesh. (2009). Nuclear Weapons and India-Pakistan Relations. IDSA
- Clyde, Wilcox. (2015). *Religion and Politics in Comparative Perspective: The One, The Few and The Many*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Clyde, Wilcox. (2015). *Religion and Politics in Comparative Perspective: The One, The Few and The Many*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cohen, Stephen, (2004). *The Idea of Pakistan*. New York: Brookings Institute Press
- Global Security Organization. (October 31, 2012). Brass Tacks. Washington DC: Global Security Org.
- Geneva Academy. (2015). India: International Peace Treaties and Agreements. RULAC.
- Fisher, Roger. Ury, William (1991). *Getting to Yes: Negotiation and Agreement without Giving In*. Auckland: Business Books Limited
- Haroon, Sana. (2007). *Frontier of Faith: Islam in Indo-Afghan Borderland*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

South Asian Studies 31 (1)

- Haqqani, Hussain. (2005). *Pakistan between Mosque and Military*. Karachi: United Book Press
- Hussain, Javed. (October 21, 2006). Kargil: What Might Have Happened. *Dawn*
- Haider, Suhassini. (2010). Three Minutes that Changed India Pak ties. *The Hindu*
- Johnson, Donald. (2002). India-Pakistan Relations: A 50-Year History. *Asia Society*
- Johnson, Robert. (2005). *A Region in Turmoil: South Asian Conflicts since 1947*. Reaktion Books
- Kelman, Herbert. (1999). *Resolution in International Conflict; An interactional Approach*. Chicago: Hall
- Kapur, S. Paul. (2009). *Dangerous Deterrent: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia*. Singapore: NUS Press
- Kemp, Geoffrey. (2010). *The East Moves West India, China and Asia's Growing Presence in the Middle East*. New York: Brookings Institute Press
- Kibal, Kanwal. (2005). India-Pak Talk: Trust Deficit and Currency of Hope. VIF
- Khan, Rashid. (2009). Friendly Exchanges and People-to-People Contact Between Pakistan and India: Imperatives and Impediments. *ISSI Journal*
- Khan, Obaid. (September 22, 2013). Pakistan-India Conflicts Spur on Social Media Young. *UPI*
- Mahajan, Chand. (1963). *Looking Back*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House
- Mahajan, Chand. (1963). *Looking Back*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House
- Nawaz, Shuja. (2008). *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, Its Army and Wars Within*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Mohammad, Ibrar. Naqvi, Raazia. (2008). Pakistan's Cultural Diplomacy with India. *Cultural Diplomacy Organization*.
- O'Donnell, Frank. (2013). Indian and Pakistan in 2013: Nuclear Extroversion, Political Introversion. *European Leadership Network*
- Schiffrin, Nick. (November 25, 2009). Mumbai Terror Attacks: 7 Pakistanis Charged- Action Comes a year After India's Worst Terrorist Attacks. *ABC News*
- Sardar, Imran. (2005). Trade Liberalization between India and Pakistan: Focusing on Direct and Indirect Barriers. Islamabad: IRS
- Schofield, Victoria. (2003). *Kashmir in Conflict; India, Pakistan and the Unending War*. London: Ashgate Publications
- Tavares, Rodrigo. (2006). *Understanding Regional Peace and Security*. Goteborg University.
- The Hindu*. (March 1, 2013)
- Tucker, Spenser. (2004). *Tanks: An Illustrated History of their Impact*. New York: Oxford Publications
- Varnyen, R. (2000). (Eds). *From Conflict Resolution to Conflict Transformation: A Critical Review*. England: Ashgate Publishing

Biographical Note

Prof. Dr. Umbreen Javaid is Director, Centre for South Asian Studies and Chairperson, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore-Pakistan.

Naseem Sahrai is Ph.D. Scholar at Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
