
War And Peace: Decoding the Complex Relationship Between India And Pakistan Since 1947

Abhirup BHATTACHARYA³

ABSTRACT. This paper investigates the Indo-Pak relationship through the lens of structural realism explaining the conflicting situation which has been going on between them for the past seventy years and has affected their relationship ever since the time of their independence in 1947. Though, sharing the same border, tensions have often risen between these two South Asian super powers at times relating to several changing factors from time to time which have escalated their dispute. The sole motive of this paper has been to closely focus upon these major factors and analyse them through various qualitative approaches in order to explain this complex relationship and how it has deteriorated over these years. As a matter of fact, the paper finally draws upon certain conclusions of instability, armed hostility, vested interests of various international actors and lack of commitment as reasons to prove a sense of suspicion upon one another eventually causing this troubled relationship.

Keywords: Security Crisis, Anarchy, Armed Hostility, Nuclearization, Diplomacy, Powedynamics.

Introduction

THE INDO-PAK SECURITY CRISIS IS A LONG-LASTING IDEOLOGICAL and confrontational dilemma that started after the partition in August 1947. In the past 74 years, the two countries have not only had a troubled relationship but have also at times engaged in several military conflicts with each other. The main inception of their troubled relations began when the two territories were divided based on two particular religious identities with people from both sides of the territory failing to accept this division given their natural emotions. These two nations have often been at loggerheads with one another and have escalated their conflict to four full-scale wars on various accounts from the year 1947 – 1999. However, if we analyse this conflict then it is to be found

³ Abhirup BHATTACHARYA, MSc. International Relations, University College Dublin. Address: Kolkata, West Bengal, India. Email: abhirup1997@gmail.com

that the first and the second confrontation in the year 1947 and 1964 was mainly due to the border dispute related to the Kashmir region which is the root cause or the main inception of these two countries engaging into a direct clash. From there onwards, both these nations have never backed down from challenging one other at several platforms which has further escalated their fear of insecurity to that of the level of acquiring and testing their nuclear missiles which has eventually brought them into the limelight of being two potential nuclear-powered states who have in a way instilled in a sense of fear among the world that even the smaller nations were very much capable of producing nuclear weapons at a large scale.

Since then, both these nations have been useful strategic allies of the superpowers of the world and have often taken sides on several occasions to balance their support which has further increased the level of security paradox in South Asia affecting their relationship in the long run.

According to the nature of international politics, the whole crisis starts when one state misinterprets the interest and notion of the other state and acts accordingly to protect its interests which creates a sense of fear or insecurity for its counterparts. Similarly, the situation was the same when India successfully started to increase its military arsenal, Pakistan also thought of doing the same so that it can match up to the level of India. This whole concept of security and insecurity from both these nations has kept this dilemma going with time eventually creating an issue of global importance which has ultimately formulated an ongoing power crisis in South Asia. Though the issue of Kashmir and border dispute stands to be the most commonly talked about factor which has significantly played a role in degrading the Indo-Pak relations over these years, there are also several contemporary factors which have equally made it challenging for both these countries to mend their relations such as the issues on terrorism, refugee crisis, water sharing and proxy wars which continue to be a bottleneck until a date for both these territories where most of it remains unsolved even after several rounds of discussion at the highest level of diplomacy eventually creating a mistrust for one another and continuing to further complicate the situation. India and Pakistan are hence today, two highly discussed states in the global scenario where tensions are rising at a rapid rate just like a ticking time bomb which is ready to explode at any point in time. (Dixit, 2002)

Analysing the state of anarchy through the lens of structural realism

The concept of this paper is mainly based upon the theory of structural realism which holds one of the most important and established forms of theories in the area of international relations and international politics in this global contemporary scenario. This concept of neorealism or structural realism was mainly formulated by the neo-realist thinker Kenneth Waltz in his book 'Theory of International Politics' which explains the nature of the international politics through the lens of anarchy and defines that there is a clear absence of a proper centralized structure right at the top which in a way doesn't guarantee that one state wouldn't be attacked by another one.

Hence, due to this absence of a centralized structure, it has now become an inherent feature of international politics where, if one state is attacked by another it is the only remedy for the other state to take measures by increasing its capability to protect itself from getting invaded. Structural realists are hence of the opinion that the only way left for the states to secure their survival by attaining as much power as they can which will ultimately result in a state of anarchy.

In the theory of structural realism, it has been seen that there are specifically three elements which majorly form the sphere of international politics i.e., "the organising principle, differentiation of units and the distribution of capabilities" which not only explains the nature of the international politics but it's the way of functioning. (Dunne and Schmidt, 2014)

Among these three above-mentioned elements, the organising principle mainly explains the hierarchy and anarchy related to the domestic operation of the state due to the absence of any appellate authority whereas the second element explains that all states function in the same way as they all are equal units irrespective of their nature.

However, the third and final element defines the ranking order and the strength of the nations in the truest possible sense in determining the structure of the state.

According to structural realists, it has been argued that for states to survive foreign aggression, various forms of strategies and confidence-building measures are adopted and hence they form various alliances to maintain the balance of power which not only helps them to protect themselves from the wrath of other states but periodically

increase their military, economic and social capabilities to the highest possible extent.

Structural realism can further be divided into two spheres which are offensive realism and defensive realism. Offensive realists are of the view that states due to their anarchic nature tend to accumulate as much power as they can to survive and overpower other states as they are often uncertain about the intention of these states and hence try to compete by gaining control over their counterparts to attain ultimate hegemon. However, defensive realists believe that due to the anarchic nature of international politics, defensive or preventive measures are really helpful as they help to protect the state from any external threats by balancing its powers with that of other states and not simply maximising its capabilities based on an aggressive expansion. (Mearsheimer, 2001)

Hence, while analysing through the lens of neorealism, it can practically be defined that there is a sense of anarchy between both the states of India and Pakistan ever since the time of their inception, where one state is always trying to build pressure upon another through various acts of aggression in order to gain complete supremacy in the South Asian region. Various neorealists have often discussed this through their literature about the several instances that happen to be the possible factors which have significantly implicated upon the declining nature of the relationship between these two super powers.

Choudhury (1971) in his book has discussed the various factors of the Kashmir dispute, water sharing problem, territorial claims, and minority rights issues which have highlighted the political and foreign relations of India and Pakistan from 1947-65. It is mainly explained from the historical perspective which has engraved a deep sense of mistrust between the two nations eventually leading to a military conflict due to the lack of proper governance and mutual distrust. The Kashmir dispute has therefore been a central figure held at the core of the India Pakistan issue as discussed by (Koithara, 2008) which explains that this issue has prevailed over these years not only due to the unresolved emotional perspective and minority resentment but the deep political powerplay and territorial competition between India and Pakistan which is often taken as leverage to downplay each other.

Another interesting factor that has changed the conventional war tactics as explained by (Dixit, 2002) is the Kargil conflict between India and Pakistan and its effective road towards nuclearization which has changed the status of both these nations in the South Asian dynamics by making them active nuclear warheads. Asserting this perspective, it

has been mentioned in the work of (Basrur, 2008) that due to this competition between the two arms race there has been a significant rise in the level of insurgency and terrorism with the introduction of newer tactics of pressure building upon each other which has further affected the relationship between them. Eventually, the bilateral peacebuilding process has been discussed with the help of the Tashkent Agreement and the Shimla Peace Accord which had initially proven to be successful for both nations but had afterwards backfired adding more to the suspicion among them which in the later years created a sense of non-cooperation with each other. The viewpoint of the various international organizations and specifically the major powers of the world have been discussed by Chopra (1971) which has explained the critical intervention of the United Nations in the Indo-Pak dispute and the closeness of the United States and the Soviet Union with that of South Asian regional powers including its rearrangements from time to time.

Though this literature has significantly contributed to the various factors explaining the nature of the relationship between India and Pakistan over these years, it still holds much ambiguity to explain this complex bonding with the help of the modern contemporary tactics that have played a significant role in becoming a roadblock to the maintenance of the peacebuilding process affecting the overall relationship between these two nations.

A continuous situation of armed hostility since 1947

War of 1947

India and Pakistan 1947 were divided into two states which created an uproar among the natural sentiment of the common people. It had not only created a sense of division among the two states but had also put a strain on their mutual ties which were starting to suffer over time. Since the time these two nations were separated, they started to have two distinct identities which eventually led to the First Kashmir War or the first military conflict with Pakistan. If we look at the conflict between India and Pakistan, the Kashmir valley has always been a sight of a dispute between these two states where both the states have had their distinctive interests, which eventually escalated the conflict back in 1947. Though both these states were two independent nations by then,

Kashmir was still under the rule of Maharaja Hari Singh who did not ally with any of them.

The issue however escalated when a local tribal militant group had captured a portion of Kashmir as per planned by Pakistan and had laid their eyes on the whole region which would have eventually benefitted them to have their grip over India. However, after realising the difficulty of the situation, the Hindu ruler of Kashmir back then Maharaja Hari Singh made his plea to the Indian government and eventually signed the Treaty of Accession to save his kingdom and the region of Kashmir from the hands of Pakistan. The Indian forces immediately after the accession took guard and bravely defended the territory with the help of their military strength. Finally, the Line of Control was also created as a measure to defend against any form of external threat and encroachment from the neighbouring country which still exists to date for the safeguarding of the respective territories and land.

The most important element to cause this dispute was the separation of identities based on religious views. India has always been a Hindu-governed state and Pakistan is a Muslim-dominated one which has often put the two nations at loggerheads due to their difference in idealism and their standpoint. Hence, the Kashmir valley having a majority of its population in their demography consisting of Muslims was a keen constituent of Pakistan. However, to save its territory and protect the idea of secularism India also had to counter the attack from Pakistan and gave a befitting reply accordingly. This issue had indeed given an initial message to India about Pakistan's ambitious movements and irregular activities which later on helped them to stay cautious about their actions.

War of 1965

The conflict of 1965 proves to be one of the most classic examples of the difference in opinion over the issue of border dispute mainly in the Kashmir region by India and Pakistan and forms to be one of the key factors in their declining relationship over these years. It had not only by then seen the interest of Pakistan in integrating the valley of Kashmir along with its territory but had also managed to gather the attention of the United Nations due to their previous clash in 1947-48. (Ganguly, 2001). The high command of Pakistan at that time very well knew that India was in no state of getting into another military confrontation mainly after its encounter with China in 1962 which eventually drained the former state to take the biggest advantage of grabbing the opportunity of conducting 'Operation Gibraltar'.

Pakistan has always believed that the region of Kashmir belongs to them due to the demographic structure over there with the majority of the population being Muslims governed in a Hindu-ruled state which has been their biggest weapon of instigation against the local people so that they can strategically counter India by lighting the flame of separation within the territory eventually benefiting them to possess their attack.

Though even after using these tactics the Pakistani troops were unsuccessful in their efforts mainly due to two reasons one being the up gradation of the military ammunitions by India mainly after the 1962 war with China and the second one being the emergence of the international actors such as the United States, United Kingdom and the USSR (back then) who wanted to maintain a balance of power during that Cold War era and tried to avoid another security crisis mainly after the aftermath of the World War II and had come up with the plan of the Tashkent Agreement. It was calculated that due to this costly war both the countries had lost over 8600 soldiers combined due to their over ambitious attitude in containing one another with the help of their military forces to show their actual capabilities putting the lives of millions of people as bait. The significance of this war was hence bound by the emergence of two dominant neighbouring forces who had formally declared their mutual disliking towards each other escalating their conflict to the highest possible level signifying the start of a security crisis in the coming years which was perceived as a threat to the bigger powers compelling them to ultimately intervene and act as a mediator between the states.

War of 1971

The Indo-Pak war of 1971 happens to have a great significance in the history of conflicts between India and Pakistan. Though it is said that this military conflict had lasted near about thirteen days but the real truth according to many theorists is that this was a conflict that had started way before between both these countries who had already engaged in two previous conflicts with each other which had more intensified the hostility by acting as a catalyst. Though this war had ultimately liberated the territory of East Pakistan to become the state of Bangladesh in what it is now, it had also brought along with it the deaths of thousands of people who were not only on the forefront but those who had taken part in the liberation which included extreme human rights violations like mass rapes and severe torture by the Pakistan armed forces upon the common people and women.

This war not only signified the creation of Bangladesh and the disintegration of East Pakistan but had successfully made the Pakistan regime weaker strategically which was utilised by India tactfully. Pakistan, since its inception, has always had several changes in their governments which had proven weaker with time and had drastically failed to create any significant development for the region of East Pakistan which mainly caused the revolt. The general mass of East Pakistan which largely comprised of the people from the Bengali speaking community were not only neglected but was never given their due share of fair governance which caused a huge economic and social void between East and West Pakistan. This sense of disagreement between the common people and the government slowly turned into chaos which was further complicated by the deployment of the armed forces which ultimately led to the creation of the 'Mukti Bahini' who were supported by the Indian government and their military forces.

The government of Pakistan had criticised this move of the Indian government of meddling in their internal matters to which the Indian government stated and defended by mentioning the urgency to intervene in the situation to protect the sovereign rights of the common people of East Pakistan who were dominated by the inhumane atrocities and treatment by the Pakistani forces which further fuelled the war. Finally, on 16th December 1971 after thirteen days of war Bangladesh got liberated with the help of the Indian forces and Pakistan was defeated. This war was not only won by India due to the large military assistance arriving from Moscow by the former USSR under the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation but was also due to the geostrategic advantage of the war location. Pakistan was not only further divided but had received a severe setback due to this war which many in their government considered as an insult, resulting in a deep closeness and proximity towards China in the distant future, which also led to a common agenda of building a troubled relationship with India due to its border dispute and conquest for supremacy in the South Asian region eventually leading to a military standoff in 1962. (Jaffrelot, 2016)

War of 1999

The state of Pakistan has always secretly wanted their share of control over the territory of Kashmir which got more triggered with their back to back losses in the war of 1965 and 1971 causing a great deal of embarrassment for the government. Although, in 1999 after a brief period of peace Pakistan managed to find its way to unlawfully capture

certain territories that belonged to India to possess some effective strategic benefit to attack the other territories which would have eventually led down to the main pathway from Leh to Kashmir ultimately fulfilling their motive. By this time, India and Pakistan were both active nuclear states who had already started to raise the tension among each other through their ambitious nuclear abilities which had not only shocked the world but had started to evolve a security dilemma for the other international actors.

Raising these concerns, Pakistan attacked India in 1999 which came to be known as the famous 'Kargil War' eventually named after the territory upon which this war was fought. The Line of Control (LOC) which was mutually created after discussions between both these nations to maintain its border control was violated and crossed by the Pakistani forces illegally under the garb of militants to capture these areas. The Indian forces in retaliation to this act fought back bravely keeping no stone unturned in taking back the territories that were captured with the help of their efficient soldiers and effective military capabilities mainly by air and on land. (Abbas and Stern, 2015)

Both these countries eventually lost hundreds of soldiers apart from the many thousands wounded due to this violent conflict. This war was also ultimately somewhat subdued with the help of certain diplomatic interventions by the international actors whose main aim was to maintain the balance of power in the world since this military conflict was between two states who now had nuclear weapons which could have been a potential threat to the society then as the world had already seen the after-effects of the Second World War. Along with this, many defence and strategic experts have also mentioned that since this war was fought at such a high altitude having such extreme climatic conditions, it was difficult for both these nations to continue this battle for long which would have plunged their economies. Even after several wars and military conflicts, Pakistan still believes in integrating itself into the region of Kashmir by gaining the sympathy of the Muslim majority by supporting the militants who voice their opinions by planning their insurgency against India has primarily maintained the mistrust and the hostile situation between both these countries along with various newer factors of the contemporary scenario that further contributes to the dilemma affecting their overall association. (Lavoy, 2009)

Though this literature has significantly contributed to the various factors explaining the nature of the relationship between India and Pakistan over these years, it still holds much ambiguity to explain this

complex bonding with the help of the modern contemporary tactics that have played a significant role in becoming a roadblock to the maintenance of the peacebuilding process affecting the overall relationship between these two nations.

The emergence of modern warfare tactics and nuclearization

Nuclear experiments

Due to the system of anarchy in international politics, it is somewhat inevitable for both these nations to refrain from acquiring more and more power to match up to each other's standards which formed one of the primary reasons for uplifting their military abilities. India had declined to sign the non-proliferation treaty earlier which had helped them to formally test their nuclear capabilities in 1974 for the first time which was directed as a measure that was taken after its war with Pakistan in 1971.

After its successful test in May 1974, India named this nuclear missile 'Smiling Buddha' which was conducted as a part of its Nuclear Weapons Programme. India treated this as a great success for the development of its scientific research and considered this a breakthrough that would further secure its territory against any form of external threat. Though, this wasn't perceived in the best of its interests by several international actors who were not only in opposition to it but had started questioning this peaceful programme as a violation of certain agreements with them. However, putting this aside India managed to successfully experiment with its second nuclear test in 1998 at the Pokhran Test range. This mission was carried out secretly as it was under the lens of the United States intelligence agencies who kept a close watch on the situation. India was even warned by the United States that it does not conduct any further nuclear experiments but the pressure was already mounting upon the government as the general elections were near and the common people wanted some strict measures to contain Pakistan and its attacks that had been going on for a very long period of time.

Pakistan on the other hand took this act as a serious challenge and conducted its nuclear experiments by the code name Chagai-I and Chagai -II just after two weeks as a measure to counter its neighbouring state. It didn't take much time to understand that it was a stringent

response to India whereas Pakistan was also keeping itself well prepared to fight back in any difficult situation. These nuclear tests of 1998 weren't taken well by the international sphere where there were various sanctions imposed upon India and both these nations eventually had to face the wrath of the United Nations as a consequence of their move. Various experts started to raise their concern over the South Asian region which was now a battlefield for these two developing states who were emerging strong and were starting to match up to the level of the superpowers. Some were even upon the notion of assuming a potential security crisis that was slowly developing between these two emerging powers who were now the dominant players of this region giving some serious competition not only to each other but to the other states as well. (Ahmed, 1999)

Terrorism and insurgency

Terrorism and insurgency had started to grow their roots during the 1990's period in India which showed the change in warfare tactics and the emergence of the state sponsored terrorism by Pakistan through its various incidents. It was not unknown to the world about the 1993 Bombay blasts (now Mumbai) which had shaken the city with 12 bombing attacks killing 257 people and making 1400 injuries. Following this incident in 2008 Mumbai was again under attack and was hit by the terrorist activities where several important locations were targeted by these insurgents carrying out their activity killing 174 people and making hundreds injured. This incident was widely condemned by the whole world which had extended its support to India to fight the battle against terrorism and insurgency.

India also had to go through the 2001 Parliament attacks which proved how terrorism was a threat to society and how India as a state was being the soft target. This incident demonstrated that a place even as safe as the Parliament House was at risk and could be targeted if not protected properly. Even in the Kashmir valley mainly after 1989, insurgent activities had taken a rapid toll where these militants were suspected of being supported by the state of Pakistan to carry out these activities inside the territory of India for their larger benefit that would have eventually helped them to build their consensus in Kashmir.

Not only it was in India but countries like the United States had also had to go through the aftermath of terrorism which incurred a huge pain after the 9/11 incident proving how terrorism could affect the lives

of the common people and how it should be stopped at once by the efficient use of proper resources and forming of confidence-building measures to counter the external and internal threats which put the security of a nation at risk. It is therefore extremely important for every government to safeguard its territory and its national interest by putting its military and intelligence agencies into good use.

Terrorism is a new age warfare strategy of the militants which has no face and is in full force whenever it finds a territory vulnerable and unprotected putting even the most powerful countries at risk. India hence had to eventually take stricter measures after these incidents against Pakistan at the borders to safeguard its security. It had to further develop an initiative through the various diplomatic communications and negotiations with other countries to bring back the perpetrators who had carried out these terrorist activities upon the Indian soil.

The level of insurgency in India had taken a toll after the 2001 and 2008 attacks and kept on rising from time to time. It was nothing unusual for the citizens at one point in time to switch on their television sets and not receive any news of insurgency and militant activities mainly in the Kashmir region which has always been a sensitive topic for both nations of India and Pakistan.

It was also not unknown that there were various allegations against Pakistan of supporting the several insurgent groups economically and socially right from the back so that it is easier for them to put pressure on the Indian government on the issue of Kashmir. However, in 2016, the Indian government decided to take a strong step against the insurgent groups after their militant activities in the regions of Gurdaspur and Pathankot in Punjab which caused a huge uproar. But the main incident that devastated and triggered the Indian government was the insurgent activity in the army base camp of Uri, where four militants had entered and killed 19 soldiers which directly challenged the law and order of the state. The whole nation not only mourned this incident but every citizen and news channel wanted a clarification from the government which was under tremendous pressure and looking for the right opportunity to retaliate back.

Finally, on 28th September 2016, the Indian forces launched their retaliatory attacks in the form of surgical strikes upon these insurgents in Pakistan occupied Kashmir (POK) which is believed to be a breeding ground for these insurgents. This was also backed by the cancellation of the Indian government's participation at the SAARC summit that year

which had sent a strong signal not only to the insurgent groups but to Pakistan and its state-sponsored terrorist activities.

The Indian forces had also been able to eliminate the Hizbul leader, Burhan Wani in 2016 which was a great success to counter terrorist activities in the region of Kashmir. However, it was a short-lived moment of peace as the militant group, JeM had launched their suicide bombing attack on a car in Pulwama, carrying the Indian armed forces taking more than 40 lives of these soldiers who were in charge of protecting their nation. The Indian government retaliated back with the help of the Indian Air Force by conducting the airstrikes in the Balakot region which was presumed to be a hiding base for these militants. Pakistan on the other hand denied any claims of its involvement with the Pulwama incident and condemned the attacks of India which were carried out on its territory violating the LOC. Though these incidents have further soured the complicated relationship between India and Pakistan, India has somehow managed to show the latter its changing stance of stronger retaliation against any form of state-sponsored terrorism and insurgent activities.

Water sharing dispute and proximity towards Afghanistan

The dispute between India and Pakistan has not only been kept limited to the conventional warfare techniques but explored to the point of the non-conventional techniques as well through their competition in the Afghanistan region and their water sharing dispute regarding the Indus Waters Treaty (IWT). This treaty signed in 1960 was mainly supported by the World Bank suggesting that the sharing of this water of a set of rivers is to be divided between India and Pakistan would eventually benefit both the countries and their livelihoods. However, right from the time of partition, there was a disagreement between both these nations regarding the distribution of the sharing of the water which eventually took the worst possible turn when the Indian government threatened to take stringent measures against Pakistan with the sanctions on the water projects which showed an act of protest against the terrorist attacks upon the brave soldiers of India in Uri. The Pakistan government had even approached the International Court of Justice (ICJ) stating that it was a clear violation of the Treaty regulations and that they were ready for a bilateral settlement with India. But in 2019, the Indian government decided to take even stricter measures by changing the routes

and diverting the flow of water towards the Indian states as a response to the Pulwama attacks limiting the use of water for Pakistan.

Also, in this changing course of power dynamics in the South Asian region with the increase in the rate of insurgency and Pakistan's involvement in the Kashmir region has compelled India to lay its support to the state of Afghanistan by expanding its strategic ties. This has come as an opportunity for India to corner Pakistan which has a huge stake in Afghanistan considering it to be its strategic base and volatile relationship with the Taliban after 2001. India has eventually built an extensive rapport with Afghanistan after the establishment of its military base in Tajikistan which has not only helped them in back channelling with the adversaries of Pakistan but has also helped in providing a subsequent amount of pressure on them through various strategic measures. Along with this, it has also helped India in increasing its stake in Baluchistan which happens to be a soft target for Pakistan. Although, Pakistan is currently trying to regain the trust of Afghanistan with the help of China so that it can counter India and its growing dominance over the region along with its friendship with the United States. India, on the other hand, has established a great network in Afghanistan contributing to its economic and social status over the past decade which it refuses to let go off.

A new act of diplomacy towards peacebuilding

Though there have been four full-scale military conflicts that have taken place between India and Pakistan over more than 70 years there have been instances where both the countries have at times tried to resolve their issue with some peaceful dialogues and agreements when they could understand that it was the only option left to reduce the tension between them even at times with the mitigation of other international actors.

In, 1966 the famous Tashkent Agreement was not only signed but was declared as a mark of a peaceful settlement between the two nations who had engaged in a major military conflict back then with the rising issue of the territorial dispute in Kashmir. Matters were going out of hand at that time for both the nations when the Soviet Union along with the US mediated and urged both the countries to engage in a dialogue and look for a permanent solution at the conference in Uzbekistan under the supervision of the United Nations. Though, the agreement was signed it was still unclear about the actual intentions of both the nations where they failed to reach a permanent solution to the Kashmir

issue and the dialogue remained open-ended with a sense of rigidity from Pakistan and its government. (Rawat, 2015)

A similar situation happened in 1971 when India appeared to the rescue of East Pakistan that later on formed the state of Bangladesh and was under the dominance of West Pakistan. In this war of 1971, India intervened and helped the Mukti Bahini to fight against the atrocities and rampant human rights violations of the Pakistani military forces. However, a peace settlement in Shimla in 1972 was finally negotiated between India and Pakistan which not only gave rise to Bangladesh but also agreed upon the fact that both these countries would try to resolve the issue of Kashmir through the means of bilateral negotiations and without the intervention of any external actors. However, the United Nations and Amnesty International remain in close touch with the Indian government and keep a record of the happenings in Kashmir due to the various allegations of mistreatment towards the Kashmiri residents by the armed forces and the increasing rate of insurgency in the region.

India and Pakistan also witnessed a cold rivalry between them in the year 1998 which shook the international sphere to its core when both the countries tested their nuclear arsenals which gave a signal to each other about their intentions of becoming nuclear active states. This was seen as a strong message to counter each other through nuclear missiles to protect its territories from any external invasions. It was very much clear that the stage was set for another clash between these two countries who were then two powerful nuclear entities but eventually settled for an agreement and signed the Lahore Declaration in 1999 forming a great development in the bilateral relationship between them. However, this agreement hadn't lived up to its expectations as, after a few months of its signing the military forces of Pakistan invaded the territory of India with the sole objective of capturing its territory by having a passage to Leh and the valley of Kashmir.

Though India and Pakistan have relied upon each other in various instances and have tried to resolve their issues through the mutual process of various bilateral agreements and confidence-building measures, their shared disagreements and distrust of each other have always put an obstruction in their relationship with one nation not knowing the clear intension of another which in turn has eventually diluted the scope for mutual settlement and peaceful resolution creating a huge division.

Changing power dynamics in South Asia

India and Pakistan till date happen to share a common border which reminds us of the importance of these two global powers in the present time where we must not forget about how these two nations had started right from the scratches after their independence and are now at loggerheads with one another for the past seventy years due to their sheer mistrust and insecurities upon several issues which have escalated their conflict. This has now soared up to a situation where both these states are extremely suspicious about each other's capabilities and have left no stone unturned to compete at every possible level.

It has been viewed that the relationship between India and Pakistan has never been that cordial ever since their independence which has given rise to various sets of factors that have further deteriorated their relationship from time to time. These factors include the involvement of the various military, strategic and diplomatic conflicts which have eventually led to the mistrust of both the governments upon one other.

One of the prime elements of focus on this affecting relationship has been the outbreak of the four major full-scale wars fought since 1947 between these two nations which not only gave rise to the competing tendencies but had encouraged both the states in acquiring more and more power by evolving themselves into nuclear-powered states in 1998 and eventually attracting the attention of the bigger powers of the world who then formed strategic alliances to maintain the balance of power in the region.

It is also needless to say that the power dynamics in context to the regional politics in South Asia have been volatile as states are often fighting over their place where everyone wants to rise to the top by toppling one another. This happens to be one of the primary reasons that even if India and Pakistan would want to settle their disputes mutually there are other global forces behind them having their share of common interests who would eventually want this to continue for their vested self-interests.

This love-hate relationship between India and Pakistan however took an ugly turn after the 2008 Mumbai attacks with the increasing level of insurgencies and with the rise of terrorism which involved other non-combatant factors strategically encouraged by Pakistan ultimately forcing India to take some stern actions of retaliation after the several blows on its soil. However, even after the exchange of various diplomatic initiatives to date, the situation still keeps on deteriorating

between these two powers with the involvement of various contemporary factors which have further complexed the situation between the two governments with more rigidity towards each other.

It is also imperative to say that this issue involves two states having a total population of about 1.7 billion people which constitutes nearly one-fourth of the whole population of the world putting each one of them at risk with a major threat to the peace of the whole world.

However, given the current circumstances when the stakes are so high involving two prominent powers in South Asia having such valuable resources, it is almost inevitable for them not to collide anymore.

Also, acknowledging the fact that due to the state of anarchy in today's global politics where there is a devoid of a clear definite system in the world, most of the countries seek to gain as much power as they can and having said that India and Pakistan are no different states who are continuing to doing the same and keeping their conflict alive till date.

Final Remarks

It cannot be denied that the use and stockpiling of arms and weaponry including nuclear artilleries can damage the basic human security of any state but at the same point of time it is also a harsh reality in the context of the nature of international politics where nations need to defend their borders from any kind of external threats which is why there is a basic conflict of ideas. However, it is now required more than ever that states put aside their own political and personal vendettas and fight against issues that affect humanity in the larger perspective in this twenty-first century such as poverty, terrorism, gender biases, political instability, and corruption, etc. It is to be understood by both of these nations that we already have had two costly World Wars where nuclear weapons were used which had already caused a huge loss of human lives eventually bringing in the chaos and human suffering that has been going on to date. Hence keeping that in mind to maintain peace and prosperity around the globe these two nuclear warheads must be much more accountable. Even from the global perspective, there is a good scope for India and Pakistan to negotiate among themselves in creating a strong framework for the ASEAN countries which can stress uplifting policies like 'PANCHSHEEL' and 'NAM' to guide the whole world towards a new path of peaceful coexistence by promoting peace and prosperity.

It is also a duty of the various international watchdogs to prevent this sort of situation from happening who are known to be free from any form of political pressure and are the flag bearers of peace and stability around the globe and not just mere observers. The world today as it is said by these international institutions needs newer actors and players who would show the right path towards greater contribution towards development with the minimum amount of destruction and loss of lives.

It can also be understood that the insecurity between both the nations has escalated due to the factors of regime change and political instability in Pakistan which has created a lot of tension between the governments ultimately creating an imbalance in their relationship and mutual trust in one another. Their fights also at the various diplomatic conclaves and international platforms have gone in vain as both the nations haven't been able to focus upon their present with their share of history and insecurity with each other. However, it is high time now for India and Pakistan to keep aside their past and regain their long-awaited mutual trust with the emergence of various newer issues that have now posed greater threats to society.

References

- Abbas, H. and Stern, J. (2015) *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the army, and America's war on terror*. New York: Routledge.
- Adnan, M., 2013. 'Areas of Engagement and Security Threats between India and Pakistan', *Journal of Political Studies*, (20:1), p. 131-142.
- Ahmed, S. (1999). 'Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons Program: Turning Points and Nuclear Choices'. *International Security*, 23(4), pp.178–204.
- Basrur, R.M. (2009) *South Asia's Cold War: Nuclear weapons and conflict in comparative perspective*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Chopra, S. (1971) *U.N. Mediation in Kashmir: A Study in Power Politics*. Kurukshetra, Vishal Publications.
- Choudhary, G.W. (1971) *Pakistan's Relations with India*. New Delhi: Meenakshi Publications
- Christophe Jaffrelot (2016) *Pakistan at the Crossroads: Domestic Dynamics and External Pressures*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohen, S. P., & Brookings Institution. (2013) *Shooting for a Century*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Dixit, J. N. (2002) *India-Pakistan in War and Peace*. Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

- Dunne, T. and Schmidt, B. C., (2014) Realism, in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Gahlaut, S. (2005). 'South Asia's Nuclear Security Dilemma: India, Pakistan, and China and India in the World Order: Searching for Major-Power Status', *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(04), 941–942.
- Ganguly, S. (2001) *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan tensions since 1947*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kapur, S. (2007) *Dangerous Deterrent: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Koithara, V. (2008) *Crafting Peace in Kashmir Through a Realist Lens*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Lavoy, P.R. (2009) *Asymmetric warfare in South Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J., (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. (New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Pavara, S. (2016). *On my terms: from the grassroots to the corridors of power*. New Delhi, India: Speaking Tiger.
- Raj Chengappa (2000). *Weapons of Peace: the secret story of India's quest to be a nuclear power*. New Delhi: Harper Collins Publishers, India.
- Rawat, R. (2015). *1965: Stories from the second Indo-Pak war*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Snedden, C. (2015) *Understanding Kashmir and Kashmiris*. London: C Hurst & Co Publishers.
- Snyder, J. (2004) *One World, Rival Theories*, *Foreign Policy*, (145:1), pp. 52-62.
- Waltz, K.N. (2010) *Theory of international politics*. Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press.