



**NAVAL
POSTGRADUATE
SCHOOL**

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**PAKISTAN'S KASHMIR POLICY
AND STRATEGY SINCE 1947**

by

Matthew P. Taylor

March 2004

Thesis Advisor:

Peter R. Lavoy

Second Reader:

Feroz Khan

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE March 2004	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Pakistan's Kashmir Policy and Strategy since 1947			5. FUNDING NUMBERS
6. AUTHOR(S) Matthew P. Taylor			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) This thesis analyzes Pakistan's Kashmir policy and strategy since 1947. Pakistan has sought to obtain the accession of Kashmir for over fifty years. This policy has its origins in Pakistan's struggle for a separate state for South Asia's Muslims, its belief that India never accepted Pakistan's existence, and Pakistan's domestic cleavages and institutional weaknesses. Because these beliefs and characteristics continue today, Pakistan is unlikely to drop its claim to Kashmir. Pakistan's strategy to achieve its objectives has included diplomacy, war, and proxy war. This thesis explores how internal and external variables have impacted Pakistan's methods and what this means for the current effort to end the proxy war in Kashmir. Although Pakistan is unlikely to abandon its claims to Kashmir, an analysis of Pakistan's shift from diplomacy to war in 1965 and from diplomacy to proxy war in 1990 demonstrates that Pakistan's strategy responds to external constraints and opportunities. The United States may not be able to end the dispute over Kashmir by pressuring Pakistan to drop its claims, but Washington retains sufficient influence to persuade Pakistan to use a peaceful strategy to pursue its claims to Kashmir.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Kashmir, Pakistan, strategy, policy, U.S.-Pakistan relations, proxy war, South Asia, Islamist			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 105
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**PAKISTAN'S KASHMIR POLICY
AND STRATEGY SINCE 1947**

Matthew P. Taylor
Captain, United States Air Force
B.A., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1997

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 2004**

Author: Matthew P. Taylor

Approved by: Peter R. Lavoy
Thesis Advisor

Feroz Khan
Second Reader

James J. Wirtz
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes Pakistan's Kashmir policy and strategy since 1947. Pakistan has sought to obtain the accession of Kashmir for over fifty years. This policy has its origins in Pakistan's struggle for a separate state for South Asia's Muslims, its belief that India never accepted Pakistan's existence, and Pakistan's domestic cleavages and institutional weaknesses. Because these beliefs and characteristics remain today, Pakistan is unlikely to drop its claim to Kashmir. Pakistan's strategy to achieve its objectives has included diplomacy, war, and proxy war. This thesis explores how internal and external variables have impacted Pakistan's methods and what this means for the current effort to end the proxy war in Kashmir. Although Pakistan is unlikely to abandon its claims to Kashmir, an analysis of Pakistan's shift from diplomacy to war in 1965 and from diplomacy to proxy war in 1990 demonstrates that Pakistan's strategy responds to external constraints and opportunities. The United States may not be able to end the dispute over Kashmir by pressuring Pakistan to drop its claims, but Washington retains sufficient influence to persuade Pakistan to use a peaceful strategy to pursue its claims to Kashmir.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	A SHIFT IN STRATEGY?	1
B.	PAKISTAN’S KASHMIR POLICY AND STRATEGY.....	4
1.	Foundations of Pakistan’s Kashmir Policy	5
2.	The Evolution of Pakistan’s Strategy.....	9
C.	POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES	11
D.	SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS	14
II.	KASHMIR	17
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	17
B.	ORIGINS OF THE KASHMIR CONFLICT.....	18
1.	Pakistan’s Strategy at Partition.....	20
2.	Pakistan’s Decision to Intervene in 1948	21
C.	DOMESTIC POLITICS BEHIND PAKISTAN’S KASHMIR POLICY.....	24
1.	Kashmir’s Implications for Pakistan	24
2.	Pakistan’s National Identity Challenge	25
3.	Institutional Imbalance	28
D.	CONCLUSION	30
III.	THE FAILURE OF DIPLOMACY	33
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	33
B.	PAKISTAN’S STRATEGY: FROM DIPLOMACY TO WAR	34
1.	Plebiscite and the United Nations Paralysis	36
2.	The U.S.-Pakistan Relationship	37
3.	Catalysts.....	42
C.	ORIGINS OF THE SHIFT TOWARD ASYMMETRY: REALIGNMENT OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS.....	44
1.	The Division of Pakistan and the Military’s Nadir.....	44
2.	Expansion of Islamists’ Influence	47
3.	Foundation of U.S.-Pakistan Relationship Crumbles.....	49
D.	PAKISTAN’S STRATEGY: DIPLOMACY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS	51
1.	Maintaining Kashmir’s Disputed Status	52
2.	Nuclear Weapons	54
E.	CONCLUSION	55
IV.	PROXY WAR.....	57
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	57
B.	TOWARD PROXY WAR	58
1.	Consolidation of the Military-Islamist Coalition	60
2.	Establishment of the Jihad Constituency and Infrastructure	61

3.	Kashmir Rebellion	65
4.	U.S.-Pakistan Relations: From Partnership to Punishment	66
C.	PROXY WAR STRATEGY.....	69
1.	The Consequences of the Proxy War Strategy.....	71
2.	The Role of Militancy in Pakistan’s Strategy.....	72
D.	KARGIL AND THE POST-11 SEPTEMBER ENVIRONMENT	74
1.	Kargil.....	74
2.	Kargil’s Lessons	76
3.	The Impact of Post-11 September Changes.....	77
E.	CONCLUSION	81
V.	CONCLUSION	83
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	83
B.	FINDINGS	83
C.	IMPLICATIONS	86
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	91

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	The Disputed Region of Jammu and Kashmir	19
Figure 2.	Pakistan's Major Ethnic Groups	27

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. Peter Lavoy for his guidance and patience with the completion of this thesis. A special thanks also goes to Feroz Khan, who provided invaluable insight and experience on this project. I also would like to express my gratitude to my wife, Evie, for her love and encouragement.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. A SHIFT IN STRATEGY?

The dispute over Kashmir has been the root cause of two of the three wars India and Pakistan have fought since gaining their independence in August 1947. The origin of the conflict lies in the partition of the Indian subcontinent and each nation's struggle for identity. Since Kashmir's population was seventy percent Muslim, Pakistan believed that it was rightfully part of the state that was founded as the homeland for South Asia's Muslims. India, on the other hand, claimed to be a secular democracy and sought control over Kashmir to prove its secular credentials. Because India's leaders had fought vehemently against the idea of two nations in South Asia, Pakistan's leaders believed India's purpose in Kashmir was to disprove the two-nation theory, while simultaneously weakening Pakistan so that it would collapse and return into the fold. Kashmir's implications for the ideological foundations of each state have made both sides unwilling to compromise. During the last fourteen years, the gap between them only seemed to widen as India battled an insurgency in Kashmir that it asserts originates from, and is directed by, Pakistan.

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks against the United States on 11 September 2001, India has sought to end Pakistan's proxy war in Kashmir by taking advantage of the atmosphere created by the U.S. war on terrorism. After a terrorist assault against the Indian Parliament in December 2001, India mobilized over five hundred thousand troops along its border with Pakistan. War was averted, but India repeated its threats of military action again in May 2002 after a terrorist assault on an Indian military camp in Jammu. The attack resulted in the death of over thirty people, most were the wives and children of military personnel stationed at the camp. In a speech to Indian troops mobilized along the India-Pakistan border after the attack, Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee warned Pakistan that if insurgents continued to infiltrate across the Line of Control (LoC) into Indian-held Kashmir, there would be a "decisive fight."¹ The Prime Minister declared in his press release the following day, "We will not let Pakistan carry on with its

¹ "Warships Move as Vajpayee Warns of 'Decisive Fight,'" *Dawn*, 23 May 2002, <http://www.dawn.com/2002/05/23/top4.htm>.

proxy war against India any longer.”² Despite Pakistan’s denials that it did not control the insurgency, the India gambit paid off when U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld linked the Kashmir struggle to the primary target of the U.S. war on terror when he stated that he had “seen indications that there are al Qaeda operating near the Line of Control.”³ Even U.S. President George W. Bush, who is reluctant to criticize the Pakistani government because of President Pervez Musharraf’s contribution to the U.S. war against the Taliban and al Qaeda, said he was, “insisting, along with other world leaders ... that President Musharraf show results in terms of stopping people from crossing the Line of Control.”⁴

Public acknowledgment by the United States of linkages between the insurgents in Kashmir and al Qaeda was an important victory for India because it advanced India’s efforts to categorize Pakistan’s activities in Kashmir as state-sponsored terrorism. President George Bush’s call on President Musharraf for action implied the validity of the Indian argument. So the question is, can Pakistan actually stop infiltration across the Line of Control? Since capitulation in Kashmir is an untenable position for any Pakistani government, must Pakistan continue this proxy war in Kashmir because, as *The Economist* suggested, “to stop would mean surrender?”⁵ If stopping the infiltration does not mean surrender, what should the United States do to encourage Pakistan to use peaceful means to seek a solution in Kashmir?

To answer those questions, this thesis examines the historical evolution of Pakistan’s strategy in Kashmir. Pakistan has attempted to achieve its policy objectives in Kashmir using diplomacy, war, and proxy war. What were the primary reasons for each strategy and how has the U.S.-Pakistan relationship influenced Pakistan’s decision-making toward Kashmir?

2 “Press Statement Issued by Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee,” 23 May 2002, <http://pmindia.nic.in.speech/content.asp?id=279>.

3 Quoted in Philip Smucker, “Al Qaeda Thriving in Pakistani Kashmir,” *Christian Science Monitor*, 2 July 2002, 1. Rumsfeld qualified his statement several days later calling the reports indicating this activity “speculative.” See John Lancaster and Karl Vick, “India Mulls Troop Withdrawal; Rumsfeld Backs Off Remark About al Qaeda in Kashmir,” *Washington Post*, 14 June 2002, 20.

4 Quoted in Paul Watson and Sidhartha Barua, “India Claims Proof of Foe Aiding Rebels,” *Los Angeles Times*, 30 May 2002, A1.

5 “The Elephant and the Pekinese,” *Economist*, 16 May 2000, http://www.economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story_id=292327.

By examining how both internal and external variables have impacted Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir, this thesis makes four conclusions. First, Pakistan's Kashmir policy is unlikely to change in the near-term because it is inextricably connected to Pakistan's struggle with its national identity, its institutional weaknesses, and five decades of hostility with India, which has served to reinforce its suspicions about Indian intentions in South Asia. Second, although Pakistan's policy has been relatively static, Pakistan's strategy is flexible and has shifted on several occasions. Pakistan's strategies have ranged from conventional war to diplomacy to proxy war. Third, Pakistan's strategy is determined by a combination of internal and external factors. Domestic politics contribute heavily to what strategies are pursued. For instance, the coalition that formed between the military and the Islamist parties during the 1980s created a constituency that saw the advantages of a proxy war strategy and also benefited from the implementation of that strategy. At the same time, external developments have been crucial to how Pakistan pursues its goals in Kashmir. In fact, changes in the external environment have been the key determinants of shifts in Pakistan's strategy. Fourth, the status of the U.S.-Pakistan relationship has had a significant impact on Pakistan's Kashmir strategy. The major declines in U.S.-Pakistan relations have contributed to Pakistan's decisions to escalate the conflict in Kashmir through either war or proxy war. Conversely, periods characterized by extensive U.S.-Pakistan cooperation correspond to periods in which Pakistan largely depended on diplomacy to address the Kashmir issue.

The United States and India are seeking a major shift in Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir. Even more, Pakistan is being pressured to abandon a strategy it believes has been successful. In addition to being effective, the strategy to "bleed India" in Kashmir is modeled on the strategy employed against the Soviets in Afghanistan, which was coordinated with the United States. A decision to halt assistance to insurgents in Kashmir would be a major shift in Pakistan's strategy and a more nuanced understanding of Pakistan's strategy will enhance U.S. efforts to reduce the possibility of war in South Asia.

B. PAKISTAN'S KASHMIR POLICY AND STRATEGY

This thesis treats Pakistan's policy and strategy distinctly. Policy is defined as a stated objective or goal, the desired end state; whereas, strategy is the method utilized to achieve the stated policy. There are two reasons this distinction between policy and strategy is made. First, while Pakistan's policy in Kashmir has been relatively static, Pakistan's strategy has fluctuated. This difference seems to indicate that the casual mechanisms for each are distinctive. Pakistan's policy since 1947 has been to seek Kashmir's accession to Pakistan. The political language used to support this goal is that Kashmir is indivisible and Kashmir's right to self-determination should be fulfilled in accordance with the 1948 United Nations Security Resolutions. To advance this policy, Pakistan has negotiated with India, went to war with India, and aided an insurgency against India. The second reason policy and strategy are treated distinctly is that the most pressing problem today is ending the proxy war in Kashmir because it could be the trigger for the next war between India and Pakistan. Since Pakistan's strategy has demonstrated significantly more flexibility than its policy, the United States should focus its immediate efforts on changing Pakistan's strategy.

The framework of this thesis is loosely based on a 1988 essay by Robert Putnam that attempted to provide a "framework for understanding how diplomacy and domestic politics interact."⁶ He argued that a country's policy, its "win-set" or acceptable solution, was determined by: (1) the distribution of power, preferences, and possible coalitions at the domestic level; (2) the nature of political institutions at the domestic level; and (3) the strategies chosen by the negotiators. Putnam's framework was designed to show how a state's foreign policy is subjected to tensions at both the domestic and international level. But, ultimately domestic factors determine a state's policy because any agreement made at the international level must be "ratified" in some form at the domestic level. Foreign policy is conducted at the inter-state level but the formulation of foreign policy is done at the domestic level. The internal politics, ideology, and history of a country determines its foreign policy goals even if the external environment is not conducive to their achievement. This framework is particularly useful because it provides a way of

⁶ Robert D. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organizations* 42 (Summer 1988): 441-52.

understanding how Pakistan's policy in Kashmir has survived fifty years of disappointment. It can even be argued that Pakistan's objectives in Kashmir are against its national interests. Still, internal attributes of Pakistan have made Pakistan's policy in Kashmir quite resilient. This thesis applies this framework to Pakistan's policy but it focuses on strategy and treats it as a dependent variable, rather than an independent variable. Instead of assuming that strategy is simply chosen by decision-makers, it analyzes strategy as a product of the same internal-external interaction that creates a country's policy.

Pakistan's strategy has shifted on several occasions and this thesis examines the broad shifts in Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir and analyzes how internal and external variables impact the timing of the shifts and the type of strategy Pakistan employs. It looks at the Kashmir dispute as a negotiation in which Pakistan has used strategies ranging from diplomatic overtures to war in an effort to achieve its policy aims, and asks why certain strategies were employed at certain points. The results of this analysis are optimistic because they indicate that changes in the external environment and Pakistan's relationship with the actors in the external environment have a major impact on Pakistan's strategy. Most significantly, this study shows that while the United States may not be able to get Pakistan to abandon its claims to Kashmir, it can play a crucial role in getting it to shift toward a peaceful strategy.

1. Foundations of Pakistan's Kashmir Policy

Pakistan's policy in Kashmir has its origins in the two-nation theory that Muhammad Ali Jinnah utilized to convince the British that a separate nation for the Muslims of South Asia was necessary in order to protect them and to ensure peace. Jinnah's insistence on two nations, one Hindu and one Muslim, was driven by the belief that Muslims would be politically, economically, and socially dominated by Hindus in a single state.⁷ The outbreak of communal violence between Hindus and Muslims during the struggle for independence reinforced Jinnah's claims. Once the decision was made to have two separate states, Jinnah and his Hindu rivals, Jawaharlal Nehru and Mohandas

⁷ Akbar S. Ahmed, *Jinnah, Pakistan, and Islamic Identity: The Search for Saladin* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 80.

Gandhi, began to jockey for territory. Pakistan's leaders believed that Kashmir's territorial contiguity with Pakistan, its economic and political ties with Pakistan, and its Muslim majority made its accession to Pakistan a near certainty. When this did not happen, Pakistan's leaders interpreted Kashmir's accession to India as evidence of an insidious Indian scheme to weaken and eventually eliminate Pakistan.

Despite having won the battle for a separate state, Muslim concerns over Hindu domination persisted. In a statement to the United Nations Security Council in January 1948, Pakistan charged, "That India has never wholeheartedly accepted the partition scheme and has, since June 1947, been making persistent attempts to undo it."⁸ India's use of its military to quash independence bids by the princely states of Hyderabad and Junagadh reinforced Pakistani trepidation. From the Pakistani perspective, India's actions in Kashmir were seen as the most threatening to the survivability of Pakistan and the most poignant evidence of the Hindu desire to dominate South Asia. Therefore, Pakistan's leaders believed it was necessary to challenge Indian rule in Kashmir and presented its position on Kashmir as a principled stand in support of Kashmir's right to self-determination against Indian aggression.

Some observers refuse to accept Pakistan's position that its policy on Kashmir is based on principles of self-determination and instead assert that Pakistan's obsession with Kashmir is a result of a dominant army, which gains enormous advantages by maintaining a hostile status quo with India.⁹ The Pakistan army tries to maintain a hostile status quo with India over Kashmir because "[it] doesn't want to relinquish its position in society," asserts Major General Ashok Krishna, director of the Institute of Peace and Conflict in New Delhi during the Kargil conflict.¹⁰ More recently, the hostile army theory has mutated into an Islamic militant army theory. On the eve of President Bill Clinton's five-hour visit to Pakistan in March 2000, Selig Harrison declared that Clinton's "trip will strengthen a military regime controlled by Islamic fundamental

⁸ Pakistan's Complaint Against India, S/646, 1948, cited in Sisir Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1966), 145.

⁹ This argument is often found in the U.S. press and supported by Indian military officers and scholars. See Pamela Constable, "As Civilian Heads Pursue Peace, Militaries Fuel Kashmir Conflict," *New York Times*, 30 May 1999, 19. "Military Hard-Liners Pressure Pakistani Leader," *Wall Street Journal*, 27 June 2002, 15.

¹⁰ Quoted in Pamela Constable, "As Civilian Heads Pursue Peace, Militaries Fuel Kashmir Conflict," 19.

elements who are committed to stirring up trouble with India. [...] This is a regime dominated by Islamic fundamentalists. They are not going to let up on Kashmir.”¹¹

The problem both of these theories have is that they do not account for the near unanimous support Pakistan’s policy in Kashmir receives from the population and throughout the government. On the whole, the policies and strategies of Zia ul-Haq and Ayub Khan, both generals that assumed the Pakistan’s presidency, do not differ substantially from their civilian counterparts in Pakistan and the record of Pakistan’s military leaders does not support the argument that Pakistan’s policy is caused by the result of an obsessed military. Both Ayub and Zia sought a settlement in Kashmir mostly using diplomacy. Although the 1965 operation is a rather glaring exception, up to that point Ayub had made several attempts to negotiate a resolution to Kashmir with India’s Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

Nevertheless, the assertion that Pakistan’s army benefits from the hostility over Kashmir is not totally inaccurate; they have. Furthermore, Pakistan’s policy in Kashmir is not based solely on its commitment to Kashmir’s self-determination. In fact, Pakistan’s policy to oppose Indian control of Kashmir was reinforced by several features of the state that have provided incentives for various groups to politicize the issue of Kashmir and to rally public opinion behind the Kashmiri cause. Since Pakistan’s inception in 1947, ethnic and sectarian cleavages have threatened Pakistan’s unity. Ayub Khan, clearly described the problem in a 1960 *Foreign Affairs* essay, in which he stated, “Till the advent of Pakistan, none of us was in fact a Pakistani.”¹² Those that became Pakistani were Indians of either Punjabi, Pashtun, Baloch, Sindhi, or Bengali ethnicity. Pakistan’s political leaders, many who were Mohajirs, those Muslims that migrated to Pakistan from areas that became part of India, could not make appeals for national solidarity in terms of an ethnic nation. In addition to these ethnic divisions, the state’s political institutions have been weak and it has been unable to extend its authority throughout the country.

¹¹ “Mission to Pakistan,” *NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, 24 March 2000, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/asia/jan-june00/pakistan_3-24.html.

¹² Mohammed Ayub Khan, “Pakistan Perspective,” *Foreign Affairs* 38 (July 1960): 549.

Pakistan's leaders had only two options that held broad enough appeal to overcome these divisive tendencies. The first was Islam, which was problematic for the secular leaning politicians, bureaucrats, and military officers that occupied the positions of power in the new state. Trained and schooled in British secular ideals, they were leery of rallying around an idea that inherently put them at a political disadvantage vis-à-vis the Islamic religious authorities.

The second unifying idea was the threat posed by India. Pakistani leaders of all shades pandered to a public stung by the tragedy of partition and emphasized Kashmir in Pakistan's struggle against the Hindu behemoth. Pakistan's first prime minister, Liaquat Ali Khan, expressed this sentiment that Kashmir was part of the larger struggle of Muslims on the subcontinent against Hindu aggression in a speech in November 1947: "Our heart goes out to them—our brethren in this mortal struggle, for the choice before them now is freedom or death. If the plans of their enemies succeed they will be exterminated, as Muslims in various other parts of India have been exterminated."¹³

Whether the threat was real or imagined, Pakistan's Kashmir policy has become highly politicized and inflexible because of Kashmir's implications for Pakistan's national identity and the widespread support the struggle received from the major domestic actors.¹⁴ Moreover, fifty years of hostile relations with India have reinforced Pakistan's Kashmir policy because it reinforced the assumptions that India never accepted Pakistan. India's occupation of Kashmir was intended to simultaneously demonstrate that Pakistan was politically unnecessary and physically weaken it. Kashmir became sacrosanct in Pakistani politics and it is politically untenable to "lose" Kashmir. Over time, the cost of surrender in Kashmir has risen. Too much Pakistani blood has been spilled over Kashmir for any government to survive a capitulation on Kashmir. In addition to years of confidence building with India, altering Pakistan's policy on Kashmir will require major domestic changes,. The United States should, at least in the short-term, focus on encouraging Pakistan toward a strategy that does not provoke an Indian retaliation that could spiral toward nuclear war.

¹³ Quoted in Sisir Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, 131.

¹⁴ Amelie Blom, "The Multi-Vocal State: The Policy of Pakistan on Kashmir," in *Pakistan: Nationalism without a Nation?*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot, 283-309 (New York: Zed Books, 2002).

2. The Evolution of Pakistan's Strategy

While Pakistan's objectives in Kashmir have been relatively unchanged throughout its history, Pakistan's strategies intended to achieve these objectives have shifted over the last fifty years. This thesis examines two major shifts. The first is Pakistan's decision to launch a military assault in 1965 after fourteen years of diplomacy. The operation failed to achieve its objectives, so Pakistan resorted to a strategy that focused on maintaining Kashmir's disputed status through diplomacy in conjunction with the development of nuclear weapons as security guarantee. In 1990, Pakistan's strategy shifted again when it added a third element to this strategy by initiating a proxy war against India in Kashmir. Three conclusions are drawn from the analysis of these shifts. First, changes in Pakistan's domestic power structure have an important impact on Pakistan's strategy because they can either reduce or increase the strategies available to the policymakers. Second, Pakistan's assessment of what the external environment necessitates or allows has been crucial to the type of strategy Pakistan utilizes. Third, the U.S.-Pakistan relationship has had an important influence on Pakistan's strategy decisions.

Events related to the partition of the Indian sub-continent and the weaknesses of the new Pakistani state are mostly responsible for Pakistan's uncompromising stance on Kashmir. But, despite its inflexible stance, Pakistan used diplomatic instruments to pressure India to yield on Kashmir during the 1950s and early 1960s. This strategy did not shift when India forsake the option of a plebiscite in Kashmir, the pillar of Pakistan's legal position. It only came after Pakistan assessed that it had rectified the military imbalance that had existed vis-à-vis India after partition and the U.S.-Pakistan relationship suffered a major decline. After the United States warmed up to India during the early 1960s and then initiated an economic and military aid program to India after its war with China in 1962, Pakistan concluded that time was not on its side and that its window for obtaining a satisfactory solution to Kashmir was closing. A brief uprising, which began after a hair believed to have belonged to the Prophet Muhammad went missing, provided Pakistan's leaders with reason to believe Kashmiris were ripe for revolt. However, it was nearly two years later, in August 1965, after U.S.-Pakistan

relations had gone from strained during the Kennedy Administration to poor with the Johnson Administration, that Pakistan launched a military assault into Kashmir. It was an effort to accomplish militarily what their diplomatic strategy had failed to do.

The East Pakistan rebellion and India's intervention in 1971 divided Pakistan in half and resulted in the independent state of Bangladesh. The event directly challenged Pakistan's claim that all Muslims of South Asia should belong to one state. Although the tenure of Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is often seen as a period of relative stability in Kashmir, Bhutto's decision to launch Pakistan's nuclear development program and his rhetorical campaign to maintain Kashmir's disputed status reveal that he conceded nothing to India. In fact, Bhutto's pursuit of nuclear weapons began the process of moving Pakistan's strategy toward asymmetric options because conventional military options were no longer considered feasible. Additionally, Bhutto's mishandling of the political situation in Pakistan increased the popularity of Islamist forces during the 1970s. After his rigging of the elections in 1977, the chaos that engulfed the nation provided the impetus for General Muhammad Zia ul-Haq to reassert military control in Pakistan.

Zia, a devote Muslim, recognized the popular support that the Islamist parties possessed and, rather than suppress them, chose to co-opt the Islamists into his government. The nature of the Afghan war institutionalized the bonds between the military, the Islamist parties, and their associated mujahedin fighting in Afghanistan. Notably, as during the 1970s, Kashmir was relatively calm during most of the 1980s and there was little mention of cross-border terrorism by the Indian leadership. In 1989, however, the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan and the following year the United States abandoned its relationship with Pakistan. More importantly, in 1989 an indigenous Kashmiri uprising provided an opportunity for Pakistan to reverse the Indian attempts to degrade Kashmir's status as disputed territory. Without U.S. assistance and with weak political leadership, diverting the attention of the highly energized, extremely violent segment of Pakistani society returning from Afghanistan and refocusing the political economy that had developed to fight the Soviets was a highly attractive option. Thus, Pakistan shifted from a strategy of negotiations to a proxy war strategy.

Pakistan's strategy to bleed India continued through the 1990s under both Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, a Punjabi with a close relationship with the Islamist parties, and Benazir Bhutto, the daughter of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who was educated in the West and espoused secular, progressive principles similar to her father. Through most of the 1990s, it appeared that Pakistan was getting the results it sought from its strategy in Kashmir. India was unable to pacify the region, and therefore it remained an issue on the international agenda (although relatively low on that list). Also, Indian soldiers were dying and Pakistani soldiers were not. By 1999, however, the insurgency began to wane and the Pakistani-supported mujahiden had managed to alienate the Kashmiri people. With the threat of nuclear war looming over South Asia after India and Pakistan tested nuclear weapons in May 1998, Pakistan believed that it could make a limited incursion across the LoC and India's ability to retaliate would be constrained because of international concern over the possibility of nuclear war. Instead, the Clinton administration viewed Pakistan's provocation as a threat to the entire world and Nawaz Sharif was offered only limited political cover and no option but to order the withdrawal of Pakistani forces.

After 1999, Pakistan's conditions and reputation in the world worsened. In addition to the Kargil fiasco, Sharif's aggressive attempts to consolidate domestic power alienated nearly every major power group in Pakistan, particularly the military. Three months after Kargil, Sharif was overthrown in a military coup. Pakistan was edging toward "rogue nation" status: it was a dictatorship, it was an illicit exporter of nuclear weapons and technology, it was increasingly wracked by sectarian violence and organized crime, and political Islam was expanding its influence, particularly in the NWFP and Baluchistan.

C. POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES

The terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001 dramatically altered the geopolitical equation in South Asia. The Taliban's refusal to turn over Osama bin Laden to the United States forced Pakistan to choose between its ally in Afghanistan and the United States. Pakistan's decision to abandon its Afghan neighbor and support the U.S. war against the Taliban and al Qaeda significantly improved Pakistan's

economic and political position. In exchange for its assistance, the United States lifted sanctions imposed on Pakistan for its nuclear tests in May 1998, increased Pakistan's clothing and textile export quota by fifteen percent, provided one billion dollars in aid, and supported it in its efforts to restructure thirty-eight billion dollars in foreign debt.

Despite its break with the Taliban, President Musharraf made it clear that it would not abandon its Kashmir policy.¹⁵ However, Pakistan worried that India would take advantage of the situation to pressure Pakistan to end its support for the Kashmir insurgency.¹⁶ Pakistan's concerns were substantiated when India mobilized along the border in response to a terrorist assault against its Parliament building in New Delhi in December 2001. The threat of war between India and Pakistan created a dilemma for the United States. Pakistan is essential to the successful execution of the war against terrorism. It provided bases for U.S. operations in Afghanistan and has cooperated extensively in U.S. counter-terror efforts. In addition to the more than five hundred terrorists detained and turned over to the United States, nearly all of the high-ranking al Qaeda members captured to date have been caught by Pakistani authorities, including the suspected masterminds of the attacks on 11 September 2001. Nevertheless, Pakistan's support of the insurgency in Kashmir has been spearheaded by Islamic fundamentalists linked to al Qaeda. It is a strategy that makes the U.S. war on terror appear selective, which damages U.S. credibility. Moreover, it runs the risk of triggering a war between India and Pakistan that "has no certain terminus short of nuclear war."¹⁷

The United States was able to diffuse the crisis that lasted for over half of 2002 by getting President Musharraf to agree to crack down on militant groups in Pakistan. He has outlawed several of the most ruthless and active Kashmiri militant groups and thousands have been arrested. Many were subsequently released and this led to speculation that Pakistan was temporarily appeasing the United States and would continue to support the proxy war strategy once the situation cooled. Whether or not this turns out to be the case largely depends on three factors, all of which point in an

¹⁵ "Highlights of General Pervez Musharraf's Address to the Nation," *Dawn*, 19 September 2001, <http://www.dawn.com/events/speech/20010919/>.

¹⁶ See Department of Defense, *Cable [Title Excised]*, 4 October 2001, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB97/ta130.pdf>.

¹⁷ "The Elephant and the Pekinese," *Economist*.

optimistic direction at this juncture. These factors are: the status of the U.S.-Pakistan relationship, India's willingness to make a diplomatic strategy worthwhile for Pakistan, and Pakistan's assessment of a proxy war strategy's cost and benefits.

U.S. policymakers should acknowledge that Pakistan is unable to simply abandon their support for the militants without substituting another strategy to replace it. Ignoring the Kashmir dispute is not an option for any Pakistani government. If Pakistan agrees to cut-off support to militant groups, it must be able to claim that a peaceful strategy is producing, or going to produce, some meaningful concessions. One necessary component of any plan that shifts Pakistani strategy toward negotiations is continued U.S. interest in the Kashmir issue in addition to a U.S. commitment to Pakistan that extends beyond simply using Pakistan in the war against terror. If Pakistan believes they are simply pawns in a greater U.S. game, it is unlikely to abandon its current strategy. Despite the current spat of anti-Americanism, Pakistanis want and value a strong relationship with the United States.¹⁸

In addition to the Pakistan's need for American involvement, the Pakistan government must also be able to point to an Indian willingness to consider their demands in Kashmir. Militarily, India has no reason to negotiate with Pakistan over Kashmir, nor does India want to be seen as caving to terrorist pressure, which it believes could set a precedent for other regions within India that seek autonomy or independence. However, Kashmir is a political problem. Despite India's desire to point to elections as evidence of Kashmiri contentment with Indian rule, the current Indian efforts to crackdown in Kashmir appears to be failing. In October 2003 before the onset of winter, the violence in Kashmir was "in one of the bloodier phases of its 14-year insurgency,"¹⁹ and recent reports from human rights groups within Kashmir assert that there has been a surge in Kashmiri participation in the guerrilla campaign.²⁰ India has an incentive to reverse both trends, and a demonstrable Indian willingness to negotiate on Kashmir would go far to

¹⁸ See "Text of President Musharraf's Address to the Nation," *Dawn*, 12 January 2002, <http://www.dawn.com/2002/01/12/speech020112.htm>.

¹⁹ "Seasonal Cheer," *Economist*, 23 October 2003, http://www.economist.com/PrinterFriendly.cfm?Story_ID=2156255.

²⁰ David Rohde, "India Grapples With Changes in the Kashmir Insurgency," *New York Times*, 16 November 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/11/16/international/asia/16KASH.html>.

provide Pakistan with the political will to more aggressively halt the violence coming from its side of the border. Without both the commitment of the United States and an Indian willingness to negotiate, Pakistan has limited incentive to go beyond lip service to the Indian demand to halt cross-border activity.

With that said, the decision is up to Pakistan. It is responsible for its own destiny. The disproportionate amount of economic resources spent on defense and war, in addition to the external resources that have been diverted away from Pakistan because of sanctions and instability, have cost Pakistan immeasurably. The costs of the war on Pakistan's society has been equally detrimental, particularly with the weapons, violence, and religious fundamentalism that have spilled into Pakistan as a consequence of the proxy wars waged in Afghanistan and Kashmir. The two assassination attempts on President Musharraf in December 2003 highlight these dangers. The United States can assist. India can negotiate. But ultimately, only Pakistan can make the decision to utilize a more peaceful strategy to pursue its claims to Kashmir.

D. SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

This thesis contains five chapters. Chapter I introduces the problem facing the United States today and briefly explains the underlying factors driving Pakistan's policy and strategy in Kashmir. The subsequent three chapters are organized chronologically. Chapter II focuses on the roots of the conflict and the foundation of Pakistan's policy and Chapters III and IV addresses subsequent shifts in Pakistan's strategy. Chapter V expands on the findings of this study and their implications.

Chapter II provides the background of the Kashmir dispute and explains why Pakistan's policy on Kashmir was established. Ethnic cleavages, weak national identity, limited internal security capabilities, and fragile political institutions contributed to a situation in which Pakistan's leaders promoted the anti-Indian feeling that was ignited by partition. The struggle in Kashmir served to reinforce anti-Indian attitudes and functioned to unite the various ethnic groups that composed the new Muslim state.

Chapter III analyzes Pakistan's decision to abandon diplomacy and launch a military assault into Kashmir in 1965. Three variables account for the shift: India's

abandonment of the plebiscite option, Pakistan's belief that it had remedied the military imbalance that India initially possessed at partition, and a souring of U.S.-Pakistan relations. These three factors converged to produce a situation in which Pakistan's leaders believed its opportunity to change the status quo in Kashmir was dissipating and that it was necessary to act.

Chapter IV examines the two-decade shift toward a proxy war strategy. There are three elements of the evolution toward proxy war. First, it is the product of a transition toward asymmetric warfare in response to the military defeats the Pakistan army endured in 1965 and 1971. Second, the Islamization of Pakistani society that began in the 1960s, gained momentum in the 1970s, and was accelerated and expanded by the policies of Zia ul-Haq, when combined with the repercussions of the Afghan-Soviet war altered the nature of Pakistan's politics and where power rested. The Afghan war expanded the institutional linkages between Islamist organizations and the Pakistan military, specifically the Inter-Service Intelligence Directorate (ISI). The Islamists and the ISI developed a vested interest in waging guerrilla warfare. Third, India's mismanagement in Kashmir and a decline in U.S. concern with South Asia provided Pakistan with an opportunity to more aggressively pursue its policy objectives in Kashmir.

Chapter V concludes that the U.S. war on terror and India's exploitation of the consequences make Pakistan's proxy war strategy in Kashmir unviable. One way or another Pakistan must change its strategy in Kashmir. This thesis illustrates why Pakistan has chosen the strategies it has at particular moments and why the current strategy is in place.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. KASHMIR

A. INTRODUCTION

Although the *Far Eastern Survey* concluded in 1948 that it was “all but inevitable” that Pakistan and India would quarrel over Kashmir,²¹ it was not inevitable that the two countries would go to war, or that Kashmir would become the crucible of the India-Pakistan relationship. This chapter briefly examines the beginnings of the conflict, describes the events that led to the war of 1948, shows the evolutionary nature of Pakistan strategy, and addresses why Kashmir became so important to Pakistan.

The first section looks at Pakistan’s reasons for believing Kashmir was rightfully part of the new Islamic republic and how the strategy to secure Kashmir evolved from negotiations to war. This first conflict is important because the way in which Pakistanis perceived Indian actions would have a major impact on their policy in Kashmir for the next fifty years. Pakistan’s decision to go to war in 1948 was not some irredentist land grab designed by some fanatical Muslims in Karachi.²² Rather, Pakistan’s decision was based on its understanding of the strategic situation vis-à-vis India, what it believed India’s intentions were, as well as the realities of Pakistan’s own internal politics.

The second section explains the domestic political dynamics that caused Pakistan to take an increasingly uncompromising position on Kashmir. Uncompromising in that, because of the ideological nature of Pakistan’s claims to Kashmir, Pakistan’s stated policy on Kashmir was to reject any proposed solution that called for the division of Kashmir. At the same time, internal factors, such as Pakistan’s crisis of identity, encouraged politicians and others to use the Kashmir dispute to unite the population by focusing on a common danger. The domestic realities of this time period are significant because they establish the foundation of Pakistan’s policy and the persistence of those domestic characteristics continues to impact Pakistan policy today.

²¹ Alice Thorner, “The Issues in Kashmir,” *Far Eastern Survey* 17 (11 August 1948): 173.

²² Karachi served as Pakistan’s capital until 1959.

B. ORIGINS OF THE KASHMIR CONFLICT

In response to the independence movement that energized the subcontinent in the aftermath of the Second World War, Britain tried to retreat from its colony in South Asia as quickly as possible in 1947. In its haste, it decided to allow the rulers of the 565 princely states that previously recognized the paramountcy of the British Crown to determine the future of their territories by fiat. The princes were given the option to join either of the new states or opt for independence but were advised by Lord Louis Mountbatten, the British viceroy responsible for overseeing the partition process, to consider territorial contiguity and religious affiliation of their subjects. The princely state of Kashmir was problematic because it straddled both India and Pakistan, three-quarters of its population was Muslim, the maharaja was a Hindu, and it was the third wealthiest Indian state at the time (see Figure 1).²³ Mountbatten further counseled the princes that it would be in their own interests to accede to one of the two new states. Most did, but several rulers choose independence. Hari Singh, Kashmir's unpopular maharaja who was resented by his predominantly Muslim subjects, wanted independence. Nearly all of the princely states that did opt for independence were quickly incorporated or conquered by either Pakistan or India, but the decision by Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir still haunts the subcontinent.

²³ Thorner, "The Issues in Kashmir," 173.



Figure 1. The Disputed Region of Jammu and Kashmir²⁴

As the British withdrew from South Asia in 1947, a rebellion broke out in the Poonch region of Kashmir. At least one account claims that the revolt had been launched as early as the spring over taxation.²⁵ Another account claimed the revolt was touched off by rumors that the Maharaja had acceded to India.²⁶ Though the impetus and the timing may be debatable, there is general agreement that the rebellion was indigenous and was initiated by a Muslim segment of the population in the Poonch region.

The uprising was brutally crushed by Singh's mostly Hindu troops and, unsurprisingly, the movement assumed a communal character. Once the Pashtun tribesmen in the tribal areas of Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP) learned of the incident they declared a jihad and began to make their way to Kashmir. The tribesmen overwhelmed the prince's troops and were approaching Srinagar, the

²⁴ *Economist*, <http://www.economist.com>.

²⁵ Lord Birdwood, "Kashmir," *International Affairs* 28 (July 1952): 302.

²⁶ Sir William Barton, "Pakistan's Claim to Kashmir," *Foreign Affairs* 28 (January 1950): 300.

Maharaja's seat of power, when Singh fled to Jammu. There he made an appeal to the Indian government for assistance.

Prime Minister Nehru was inclined to assist Singh, but replied to the Singh that it would be inappropriate for India to intervene in Kashmir unless it acceded to India. With the tribesmen on the doorstep of Srinagar and his circumstances growing more desperate, Singh signed the Instrument of Accession on October 26, 1947. Indian troops were airlifted into the capital and rapidly turned the tide of the battle.

1. Pakistan's Strategy at Partition

Until May 1948 official Pakistani involvement in the struggle was piecemeal and uncoordinated. Pakistan's resort to military force was not a strategy that Mohammed Ali Jinnah and his All India Muslim League (AIML) were contemplating even as late as July of 1947. Jinnah's strategy for ensuring the accession of Kashmir to Pakistan was based on his assumption that, "Kashmir will fall into our lap like a ripe fruit."²⁷ Apparently, it was obvious to Jinnah that Kashmir's Muslim majority, its economic relationship with Pakistan, and its existing transportation and communication links with Pakistan would secure the accession of the third largest economic entity in British India. By comparison, India lacked even a direct road to the Kashmiri capital of Srinagar. When the rebellion began in August, the Pakistani government was struggling to handle the disaster Partition had unleashed in the Punjab while at the same time wrangling with India over its fair-share of British India's assets; therefore it possessed a limited capability to significantly impact developments in Kashmir. Even the demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir, which became a critical component of their case in Kashmir, was given little support "so long as there remained a possibility of persuading or forcing the Maharajah to exercise his power of accession."²⁸

Also factoring into the decision to negotiate Kashmir's accession to Pakistan rather than rely on the use of force was the success that Jinnah and the Muslim League had experienced with constitutional bargaining and legal devices in its struggle for a

²⁷ Quoted in Owen Bennett Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 57.

²⁸ Thorner, "The Issues in Kashmir," 177.

separate nation.²⁹ The new leaders applied this experience to their efforts to peaceably ensure the accession of princely states, like Kashmir, to Pakistan and used Standstill Agreements, which continued existing relationships, and Instruments of Accession. Operating under the assumption that Kashmir was clearly destined to be part of Pakistan, in conjunction with a desire to avoid war, the Pakistani government signed a Standstill Agreement with the Maharaja.

The Standstill Agreement that Pakistan signed with the Maharaja shows that despite the conviction that Kashmir was an integral part of Pakistan's future, Pakistan had essentially adopted a wait-and-see approach to the dispute. The Pakistani government was not a mere bystander to be sure; the Pakistani Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan decided in mid-September 1947 to assist the rebels. But the rebellion in Poonch was self-generated, the tribesmen from the NWFP learned of the situation in Kashmir "through the agents of freedom fighters,"³⁰ and though segments of the Pakistan army did assist the tribesmen, at least one outside observers assessed, "The tribes appear to have been leaderless."³¹ Relying on the goodwill of the Maharaja at the outset and not fully comprehending his independent aspirations, the Pakistan government's strategy toward Kashmir was driven by events that it played little or no role in directing. However, the advance of the tribesmen set off a chain of events that brought the Indian army into Kashmir and in a position to occupy the entire princely state and thus pose a strategic threat to Pakistan's survivability. Therefore, Pakistan was forced to make a decision on whether or not it was willing to back up its claim to Kashmir with military force.

2. Pakistan's Decision to Intervene in 1948

It would have been difficult for Pakistan's new leaders to allow India's army to take all of Kashmir in the face of the Pakistani public's call for action. The devastation and chaos that characterized partition left the population in a highly charged emotional condition. According to contemporary accounts, in addition to the fiery of the frontier

²⁹ M. Rafique Afzal, *Pakistan: History and Politics, 1947-1971* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

³¹ Birdwood, "Kashmir," 303.

tribesmen, Punjab, the Pakistani province that had suffered the most during partition and also the richest and most powerful, “was dangerously excited at the rumors that Dogra troops were driving thousands of Moslems out of Punch into Pakistan, and action to hold up the Indian advance seemed the only possible answer.”³²

The problem was larger than merely defying public opinion. Even if the leadership attempted to dampen the inflamed public opinion, Pakistan’s leadership was not in a position to challenge the segments of the population most angered by the events in Kashmir and who had weak, if not non-existent, loyalty to the new entity called Pakistan. Most significantly, the Pashtun tribesmen leading the charge in Kashmir posed a significant internal threat to Pakistan.

Because of the method the British Raj had used to establish a limited amount of control and stability in its northwest frontier the tribesmen waging jihad were a legitimate threat to the nascent state at independence. After the disasters of the two Afghan wars in the nineteenth-century, the British approached the frontier region with caution and usually chose to negotiate with the tribal leaders and influence them through intermediaries. The frontier tribes, composed mostly of Pashtuns, received money and arms in exchange for stability and their assistance in patrolling the passes which connected the land routes from the sub-continent to Central Asia. The tribes became relatively well armed and financed as a result of this policy. Lt General Sir Douglas Gracey, a Briton who served as the first acting commander-in-chief of the Pakistan army, worried that, “An easy victory of the Indian army, particularly in the Muzaffarabad area, is almost certain to arouse the anger of the tribesmen against Pakistan for its failure to render them more direct assistance and might well cause them to turn against Pakistan.”³³

The Pakistan military was ill prepared to confront this internal security threat. The combination of the fragile condition of the military and the strength of the Pashtun tribesman had political consequences for Pakistan’s options in Kashmir. Sir William Barton’s 1950 essay in *Foreign Affairs* provides a vivid description:

Much has been made of the culpability of the Pakistan Government in not preventing the tribal people from

³² Barton, “Pakistan’s Claim to Kashmir,” 304.

³³ Quoted in Victoria Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 1996), 157.

entering Kashmir in the winter of 1947-48. If an attempt had been made to drive them back, the whole border from Chitral south to Quetta would have burst into flame, and at the time Pakistan forces were still disorganized and largely unequipped, thanks to India's refusal to hand over Pakistan's share of the military supplies left by the British. They could not have held down a tribal rising and might have been driven across the Indus. This would have given the Afghans an opportunity of taking territory as far as the Indus, which they look on as Afghanistan irredenta.³⁴

The advances of the Indian military forced the Pakistan army's hand. Although in a bad position materially and politically to challenge the Pashtun thrust into Kashmir, the military was not completely hapless. The success of the Indian army against the tribesmen led General Gracey to assess, "India is not to be allowed to sit on the doorsteps of Pakistan to the rear and on the flank at liberty to enter at its will and pleasure [...] it is imperative that the Indian army is not allowed to advance."³⁵ Pakistan's military strategists determined that Pakistan could not be a viable state if India controlled Kashmir in its entirety, thus the decision was made for the Pakistani army to officially enter the battle in May 1948.³⁶

The Pakistani military drove the Indian troops back enough that Pakistan felt strategically comfortable to sit down at the negotiating table. Under the auspices of the United Nations, a ceasefire line was established and both states agreed that once Pakistani combatants had withdrawn and India's had been reduced to the minimum level required to guarantee law and order, the status of Kashmir would "be determined in accordance with the will of the people."³⁷ In consultation with the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP), the two countries were to negotiate a process to "determine

³⁴ Barton, "Pakistan's Claim to Kashmir," 303.

³⁵ Quoted in Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*, 70.

³⁶ Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, 157.

³⁷ United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, *Resolution Adopted by the UNCIP on 13 August 1948* (Document No. S/1100, Para 75, 9 November 1948), <http://www.un.int/pakistan/00home04.htm>. UNCIP was a five-member commission established by the UN in January 1948 to mediate and investigate the dispute. In 1951 the United Nations Military Observers Group for India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) replaced the UNCIP.

fair and equitable conditions whereby such free expression will be assured.”³⁸ Neither the withdrawal nor the plebiscite was ever to occur.

The issue would not die, however, because the nature of Pakistan’s internal politics made it very difficult for any Pakistani leader to settle the issue without major concessions from the Indian government. The concessions were not forthcoming.

C. DOMESTIC POLITICS BEHIND PAKISTAN’S KASHMIR POLICY

Pakistan secured control over one-third of Kashmir and largely ameliorated its strategic concerns with the cease-fire agreement in January 1949,³⁹ but Pakistan choose to continue the struggle for Kashmir rather than accept the cease-fire line as the border with India. This section explains why Pakistan insisted on continuing its quest for Kashmir’s right to self-determination instead of agreeing to divide Kashmir along the cease-fire line.

Pakistan’s Kashmir policy is embedded in the nature of its internal politics at independence. The tragedy of partition and Kashmir’s symbolism for the new nation made it extremely difficult for any Pakistani government to simply acquiesce to the status quo in Kashmir. In addition to the fact that Pakistanis believed that Kashmir should have been part of Pakistan, the public rage after Partition, and Pakistan’s limited internal security capabilities discussed above, there were three additional reasons for Pakistan’s decision to support the Kashmiri struggle and those groups within Pakistan that fought it: Kashmir’s symbolism to the new nation, weak national identity, and Pakistan’s institutional imbalance.

1. Kashmir’s Implications for Pakistan

To Pakistan, Kashmir status demonstrated that India never accepted Pakistan’s existence. Although Kashmir straddled both India and Pakistan, Kashmir’s religious composition and its economic and logistical connections to the region that became

³⁸ United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, *Resolution Adopted by the UNCIP on 13 August 1948* (Document No. S/1100, Para 75, 9 November 1948), <http://www.un.int/pakistan/00home04.htm>.

³⁹ “The Stand-off on the Roof of the world,” *Economist*, 17 January 2002, http://www.economist.com/PrinterFriendly.cfm?Story_ID=940049.

Pakistan made it apparent to Muslims that Kashmir would join the new Muslim nation.⁴⁰ In fact, after the acceptance for the demand for Pakistan, “the AIML had hardly any doubts about Kashmir’s accession to Pakistan.”⁴¹ When Kashmir did not “fall into their laps” as Jinnah expected, it came to symbolize the treachery of Hindu leaders and their British patrons. From the Pakistani perspective, India’s claim to Kashmir exhibited its desire to weaken and dominate Pakistan, while also demonstrating India’s belief that Jinnah’s two-nation theory was a fallacy. Therefore, the struggle for Kashmir was the struggle against Indian domination and manipulation.

In addition to Pakistan’s belief that Kashmir was India’s attempt to discredit Pakistan, the circumstances surrounding the struggle for Kashmir at partition appeared to indicate British complicity in the Hindu plot. Specifically, Kashmir was seen as Mountbatten’s attempt to assist his friend, Jawaharlal Nehru.⁴² This perception that India’s actions toward the Kashmir issue were part of a Indo-British conspiracy calculated to weaken Pakistan also contributed to Pakistan’s approach to the Kashmir dispute.

2. Pakistan’s National Identity Challenge

The view that Kashmir was an attempt to erode Pakistan’s independence provided the ideological and emotional underpinnings of Pakistan’s position, but internal politics also contributed to Pakistan’s policy on Kashmir. One important factor leading to Pakistan’s policy was the crisis of identity that Pakistan suffered from the moment of independence.⁴³ The problem was arguably explained best by Ayub Khan, when he remarked, that prior to 1947 “none of us was in fact a Pakistani.”⁴⁴ Although Jinnah’s two-nation theory divided the subcontinent along religious lines, Islam alone had not been a strong enough force for Jinnah to forge a sense of nationalism.⁴⁵ One reason that

⁴⁰ Akbar S. Ahmed, *Jinnah, Pakistan and Islamic Identity: The Search for Saladin* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 138.

⁴¹ Afzal, *Pakistan: History and Politics, 1947-1971*, 25.

⁴² Ahmed, *Jinnah, Pakistan and Islamic Identity*, 136-139.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 191.

⁴⁴ Mohammed Ayub Khan, “Pakistan Perspective,” *Foreign Affairs* 38 (July 1960): 549.

⁴⁵ Ayesha Jalal, *The State of Martial Rule: The Origins of Pakistan’s Political Economy of Defence* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 23.

Pakistan's Islamic identity was problematic because the predominantly secular-leaning leadership did not want to make Islam the sole basis of national identity because it had the potential of ceding power to the religious authorities. Pakistan's new secular leadership envisioned a secular, Islamic state and too much focus on Islam could provide the traditional religious authorities a lever on which to assume political authority.

But the primary reason for Pakistan's identity crisis was that ethnic and tribal loyalties trumped any religious or national ones. The Pashtun in the NWFP are one example how ethnic division were a problem for the new state and how Kashmir became tied to internal issues. The area that constituted the Northwest Frontier Province of British India was primarily populated by Pashtuns and abutted Afghanistan, which had a Pashtun majority and a Pashtun ruler. Even after the two disastrous Afghan wars the British were intent on preventing a Russian advance through either the Khyber or Bolan Pass and in addition to arming the tribes, also allowed the tribes a level of autonomy comparable to the princely states. The use of intermediaries to extend British influence, known as the Sandeman system, resulted in the continuation of tribal and ethnic loyalties in the NWFP and the provinces inhabitants felt little loyalty or solidarity to a larger Muslim community in South Asia. When the prospect of independence arose, Gaffar Khan, the "Frontier Gandhi," was remarkably successful in mobilizing a Pashtun nationalist movement that sought independence for the NWFP. In fact, had it not been for Jinnah's ability to convince Mountbatten that allowing independence for ethnic groups could open a Pandora's box, it is likely the NWFP and the adjacent tribal areas would have opted for independence.⁴⁶

When the vote was held to determine to which nation the NWFP would join, Ghaffar Khan boycotted it, but the decision for the Pashtun Muslims who did vote was easy—99 percent voted to join Pakistan.⁴⁷ Despite the overwhelming vote in favor of accession to Pakistan, the central government in Karachi realized the Pashtuns were going to be a problem. The nascent government was in no position to directly challenge the relatively well-armed tribesmen, and the jihad in Kashmir served as a useful distraction from the idea of a Pashtunistan, the proposed homeland for Pakistan's

⁴⁶ Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*, 137.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

Pashtuns.⁴⁸ To add to Pakistan's troubles, Afghanistan made claims to Pashtunistan and used this claim as justification for voting against Pakistan's membership in the United Nations.



Figure 2. Pakistan's Major Ethnic Groups⁴⁹

Besides the Pashtuns, Pakistan consisted of four other major ethnic groups: Baloch, Punjabi, Sindhi, and Mohajir (see Figure 2). The Mohajirs, Muslims that fled from areas of South Asia that had become part of India, possessed a disproportionate amount of political power because of their positions in the Muslim League. Sensitive to their status as minorities and transplants, many Mohajirs were the most ardent advocates of the two-nation theory and because of this they were especially sensitive to India's attempt to annex Kashmir. Surrounded by Pashtuns and Punjabis, ethnic groups that had

⁴⁸ Thorne, "The Issues in Kashmir," 177.

⁴⁹ University of Texas Library Online, Perry-Castaneda Map Collection, *Pakistan's Major Ethnic Groups*, <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/pakistan.html>.

reputations as fierce warriors, the Mohajirs reluctance to appear weak also contributed to their refusal to concede on the highly charged issue of Kashmir.

With both ethnic and religious definitions of nationality problematic, Pakistani leaders attempted to rally the new nation against the threat of the imposing Hindu neighbor as a way to forge a sense of unity. The consequence of the focus on India was the “India syndrome,” defined by Jean Luc-Racine, as “a feeling of insecurity [that] has been nurtured constantly since 1947 [...] its successive leaders have not been able to free the national mind from its Indian obsession—rather, they used it deliberately for their own purposes.”⁵⁰ Therefore, the decision to fight for Kashmir not only had ideology to support it, but it also had the political objectives, primarily that the struggle for Kashmir served to strengthen the tenuous national bonds of the new nation-state.

3. Institutional Imbalance

In conjunction with these nationalist goals, the internal struggle between the newly forming institutions further contributed to Pakistan’s uncompromising position on Kashmir. Pakistan’s prospects for a strong, secular, civilian government suffered a major blow when Jinnah died shortly after partition. Therefore, power rapidly devolved to the institutions that had been previously established by the British—the military and the bureaucracy. Prior to 1956, political power rested mostly in the hands of the Governor-General. The prime minister and his cabinet possessed very little power. In fact, they served at the behest of the governor-general. This early institutional imbalance had several political consequences with regards to Pakistan’s strategy toward Kashmir.

First, in order to compensate for their lack of real power, politicians attempted to build a political base by pandering to the public’s emotions. When combined with the Pakistani identity problem, this produced a situation in which the politicians played cheerleader to the public’s rage over Kashmir. In August of 1953, at a large demonstration in Karachi protesting the Indian government’s removal and arrest of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, the Pakistani Prime Minister told the crowd that his government would not rest “until they have secured for the people of Kashmir their

⁵⁰ Jean Luc-Racine, “Pakistan and the ‘India Syndrome’: Kashmir and the Nuclear Predicament,” in *Nationalism without a Nation*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot (London: Zed Books, 2002), 198.

inalienable right to determine their future by free exercise of their vote.”⁵¹ Three days later at an Independence Day celebration he declared: “We are bound to the people of Kashmir by ties of religion, culture, tradition, economy and geography. It is but natural that we should feel the deepest sympathy for them in their hour of trial.”⁵²

Kashmir’s implications for Pakistan’s sovereignty and national identity, Pakistan’s internal divisions and weaknesses, and the imbalance in institutional strength led Pakistan to see Kashmir in unconditional terms. Kashmir became a crucial element of the larger struggle between the Muslim League and Congress, members of which dominated both the Pakistani and Indian leadership positions respectively, meant that the dispute assumed a role larger than its strategic significance. In Pakistan’s case the dispute had dual purposes. On one had, Kashmir was an ideological struggle against India and its ambitions. On the other, the dispute served to unite an otherwise fractured polity. Since it had both ideological and nationalist implications, neither of which is easily compromised, Pakistan’s policy toward Kashmir became rigid and unyielding. As early as 1951 the Pakistani leadership’s policy was evident. During January of that year, the apprentice of Jinnah, Prime Minister Liaquat Ali, under the pressure of the upcoming elections in Punjab refused to attend the annual Commonwealth Prime Ministers’ Conference unless the issue of Kashmir was included on the agenda. The issue was eventually added, and he agreed to attend. At the meeting, he rejected any proposal that called for the partition of Kashmir.⁵³ This refusal to acquiesce to Kashmir’s partition became an enduring component of Pakistan’s Kashmir policy. A policy that refused to accept the ceasefire line as the international border and demanded that Kashmir’s status be determined by the will of the people in a plebiscite called for in the 1949 United Nations Resolutions.

Although Kashmir has some strategic and security relevance, Kashmir’s importance to Pakistan is driven by its implications for Pakistan’s sovereignty and national identity. To Jinnah and his Muslim League colleagues, India’s actions in Kashmir demonstrated that it never accepted Pakistan’s claim to nationhood. India’s

⁵¹ Quoted in Ardath W. Burks, “Constitution-Making in Pakistan,” *Political Science Quarterly* 69 (December 1954): 542.

⁵² Quoted in Burks, “Constitution-Making in Pakistan,” 542.

⁵³ Afzal, *Pakistan: History and Politics, 1947-1971*, 81.

attempts to integrate Kashmir into its purportedly secular system of government was intended to display the needlessness of Pakistan. As Pakistan faced its internal difficulties Kashmir was an issue that garnered nearly unanimous support among Pakistan's people, parties, and institutions. Therefore, Pakistan's stated policy on Kashmir was that it sought self-determination for all of Kashmir and that the state was indivisible.

D. CONCLUSION

Although Hari Singh's decision was bound to lead to some level of disagreement between India and Pakistan, the war of 1948 and Pakistan's decision to adopt an uncompromising policy were not inevitable. Pakistan's decision to intervene directly in the Kashmir dispute came only after the Indian army began to threaten the strategic viability of the new state. It is significant on this point to remember the fact that it was a British officer who made this assessment and who commanded the Pakistan army during the 1948 war because it demonstrates that Pakistan's strategic concerns were real and not conjured up in order to rally the public against India. However, strategic necessity does not explain Pakistan's policy or strategy beyond 1949.

It is necessary to look at the Pakistan's internal politics to understand why its leaders choose to continue a struggle against a foe that it possessed few advantages against and little leverage over. The fragile nature of Pakistan's identity was a major reason for continuing the struggle beyond 1949 and so was the institutional imbalance that caused Pakistan's civilian leaders to seek political mileage from the dispute. Ironically, however, it was India's actions in the Kashmir dispute that provided the ideological and emotional material necessary for Pakistan's struggle in Kashmir. From Pakistan's perspective, India had every intention of dominating South Asia and its actions in Kashmir was merely one in a series of Indian actions that revealed that plan. In the princely states of Junagarh and Hyderabad (the richest princely state) where circumstances were the reverse of Kashmir—the rulers were Muslims but only a Muslim minority resided within their states—India ignored the wishes of the rulers and used military force to subdue the states.

India's actions and Pakistan's internal realities have led Pakistan's leaders to adopt a policy that refuses to recognize the cease-fire line as the border no matter how politically expedient. The factors driving Pakistan's Kashmir policy have changed little since 1947. Pakistan has yet to ameliorate its ethnic problems, its ability to assert its writ throughout the country remains dubious, the institutional imbalance has only worsened, and the unending hostilities with India have bolstered Pakistan's attitudes about India's hegemonic ambitions. Therefore, Pakistan's policy has changed little since the establishment of this policy. Nevertheless, after the cease-fire went into effect on 1 January 1949 Pakistan sought to remedy the situation through negotiations rather than force. The next chapter discusses why Pakistan choose this strategy and why it eventually abandoned it and went to war.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. THE FAILURE OF DIPLOMACY

A. INTRODUCTION

In August 1965, Pakistan launched a military operation into Kashmir. The operation was planned to have two stages. The first stage envisioned a contingent of insurgents infiltrating across the cease-fire line and seizing the radio station and the Srinagar airport. This failed. The second stage was intended to capitalize on the disarray that was expected to consume the Indians after Kashmir was “liberated” and consisted of a military invasion designed to take the Pathankot road, which if secured would have cut the Indians off from the Valley of Kashmir. The second stage was executed reasonably well, but when the Indian army broadened the war by attacking across the international border and headed toward the Punjabi city of Lahore. The Pakistani army was caught off guard and the city was left totally exposed. Unwilling to risk the loss of Lahore, Pakistan created a moat by destroying around seventy bridges that crossed a canal just outside the city. At the same time, the Indian army also made a surge toward the town of Sialkot. The Indian decision to threaten major Pakistani cities produced its desired effect, the war quickly ground to a stalemate and Pakistan agreed to withdraw its forces.⁵⁴

Although Operation GIBRALTAR, the insurgency stage, and Operation GRANDSLAM, the military assault, were poorly planned and had additional problems in their execution, the details of the operations lie outside the scope of this thesis. This chapter is concerned with why Pakistan shifted from diplomacy to military force in its effort to seek a satisfactory solution to the Kashmir dispute.

This chapter examines the dynamic that led Pakistan to instigate a war that caused the United States to halt its aid to the country and also started the unraveling of Ayub Khan’s presidency. The first section addresses why Pakistan’s Kashmir strategy initially consisted of negotiations and appeals to the United Nations after 1949. The second section explains why the factors contributing to Pakistan’s decision to negotiate were no longer in place by 1965. The third section analyzes the aftermath of the 1965 war and

⁵⁴ For a brief summary of events related to the 1965 war see Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, 200-7. Also, see Sumit Ganguly, *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions since 1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 43-46.

how Pakistan adjusted its Kashmir strategy to the new domestic and international realities of the day.

B. PAKISTAN'S STRATEGY: FROM DIPLOMACY TO WAR

In 1965, after five years of declining amicability between the United States and Pakistan, President Johnson cancelled a scheduled meeting with President Ayub Khan. While the cancellation itself can not be said to have caused Pakistan's decision to resort to a military option, it did signal the death for the only extant external factor restraining Pakistan from seeking a military solution. With these restraints removed, and with India accelerating its efforts to integrate Kashmir into India's political system by stripping it of its special status, Pakistan began to see time as its enemy.

Pakistan attempted to negotiate a settlement to the Kashmir dispute from 1949 to 1965 despite its no-compromise Kashmir policy for three primary reasons. First, Nehru's adherence to the logic that a plebiscite was necessary for the accession to be considered legitimate. Second, the Pakistani army recognized its military disadvantage vis-à-vis India. Finally, the dominant powers in Pakistan, the military and the bureaucracy, were intent on building a relationship with the West and obtaining Western aid, particularly military equipment and training. They realized that open hostilities with India would have disrupted these efforts. For these reasons, Pakistan implemented a strategy of diplomacy. However, this section shows that when these reasons for restraint were removed Pakistan abandoned its attempts to negotiate a settlement with India and attempted to apply a military solution to the Kashmir dispute.

After the Indian-Pakistan war of 1948 ground to a stalemate, Pakistan's Kashmir strategy was to negotiate a resolution. Initially, it was willing to negotiate because India agreed that a plebiscite was necessary in order to determine the will of the people. Pakistan believed the results of the plebiscite would be in its favor and this strategy made sense. But India abandoned its commitment to a plebiscite in the mid-1950s and Pakistan continued to use peaceful means and sought ways to use diplomacy to pressure India. The reason Pakistan continued to use diplomacy as a tool to achieve its objectives in Kashmir was primarily because the dominant players in Pakistan's domestic politics considered its relationship with the West, namely the United States, a higher priority.

The military and bureaucratic leaders believed that Pakistan's future lay in a robust alliance with the West. Once it was rebuffed by India, the United States was eager to satisfy Pakistan's desires for ties with the West. The U.S. worked to incorporate Pakistan into its security arrangements, such as Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) and Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), as well as provided large amounts of military and economic aid. This relationship had contradictory consequences for the Kashmir dispute. On one hand, the U.S.-Pakistan relationship provided Pakistan with the patronage of a superpower that would support its case at the United Nations. Also, the relationship constrained Pakistan's strategy because the United States was intent on preventing war.⁵⁵ On the other hand, however, the U.S. military assistance to Pakistan made India more averse to discussing the issue of Kashmir.

During the early 1960s, the variables constraining Pakistan's strategy shifted. For one, the U.S. military aid served its purpose and the Pakistan army was a force that could conceivably defeat an Indian force that was stretched thin along its massive borders. Second, and most importantly, Pakistan reevaluated its relationship with the United States during the 1960s because of U.S. overtures to India. By 1965, the influence that the United States had over Pakistani decision-makers had seriously declined and Pakistan lost faith that diplomatic measures would facilitate a satisfactory outcome in Kashmir.

It is important to note that after the military took control over the Pakistan government its strategy toward Kashmir was not very different from the previous civilian governments. Only when the external situation began to shift did the military government alter its strategy toward Kashmir. Time became of the essence in the mid-1960s as the Indian strategy to absorb Kashmir progressed, the United Nations was seen as useless, and the United States began providing military aid to India on a level that Pakistan perceived as threatening to the already precarious balance of power on the subcontinent. With these threatening circumstances converging, Pakistan altered their strategy in Kashmir.

⁵⁵ United States Embassy, France, *Text of Presidents Letter to Prime Minister Nehru on Indo-Pakistan Relations*, 16 December 1959, <http://nsarchive.chadwyck.com>. The document is a memorandum from the U.S. Embassy in France to the Secretary of State relaying President Eisenhower's summary of his meeting with Nehru and includes a small message that Eisenhower wants Nehru to receive in response to their meeting.

1. Plebiscite and the United Nations Paralysis

Until 1953, diplomacy appeared to be making headway toward a positive solution to the issue. After Sheikh Abdullah was arrested in August that year the Pakistani public became enraged and the press agitated the situation by reporting exaggerated accounts of events. Pakistani Prime Minister Mohammed Ali Bogra attempted to ease the tension by requesting a meeting with Nehru. The two met and issued a joint communiqué that stated:

Both the Prime Ministers were actuated by a firm resolve to settle these problems as early as possible peacefully and cooperatively to the mutual advantage of both countries. ... The most feasible method of ascertaining the wishes of the people was by a fair and impartial plebiscite. ... the next step would be the appointment of a Plebiscite Administrator. ... by the end of April 1954.⁵⁶

The proposal promptly stalled, however, on the UN's choice of United States Admiral Chester Nimitz for Plebiscite Administrator. The negotiations continued through the rest of the year, but when Nehru got word of the aid package that Pakistan had negotiated with the United States he wrote, "The decision to give this aid has changed the whole context of the Kashmir issue, and the long talks we have had about this matter have little relation to the new facts which flow from this aid."⁵⁷ He added, "Now that the presence of arms has taken the place of the previous peaceful and cooperative approach ... we can take no risks now."⁵⁸ The talks continued but were inconsequential.

After 1954, India accelerated the process of integrating Kashmir into its political system in an effort to make it impractical and politically unrealistic to hold a plebiscite.⁵⁹ Indian efforts to remove Kashmir's special status were accelerated further after its war with China in 1962. Two articles of the Indian Constitution previously not applicable to Kashmir were made so, and Kashmir's legislature changed the name of the Kashmir

⁵⁶ Quoted in Sisir Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1966), 270. Gupta discusses the events surrounding the meeting on pages 263-272.

⁵⁷ Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, "Kashmir, India and Pakistan" *Foreign Affairs* 43 (April 1965): 532.

⁵⁸ Quoted in Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, 281.

⁵⁹ Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, 199.

head-of-state to governor and the Kashmir prime minister to chief minister.⁶⁰ The name changes were essentially demotions and were intended to give New Delhi more control in Kashmir.

Pakistan's hopes that the United Nations would resolve the issue in accordance with its earlier resolutions dimmed during the early 1960s. Ayub's Foreign Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, summarized this disappointment in a 1964 speech in London:

In 1948 the Security Council adopted a resolution which embodied a comprehensive plan for the settlement of the Kashmir question. The Soviet Union permitted passage of this resolution by abstaining from casting a vote on it. The Soviet Union maintained this posture until 1953, during which period the Council made several attempts [...] to move towards a peaceful solution of the problem. In 1954 and 1955 Pakistan entered into certain agreements for mutual defence with the United States and the United Kingdom. That led the Soviet Union to change its policy in respect of the Kashmir question and, from 1957 onwards, the Soviet Union has consistently obstructed the passage of any adequate resolutions on that question. [...] It is small wonder that, as a result, there was a revulsion of feeling against the Security Council.⁶¹

India's abandonment of the plebiscite in 1954 did not trigger a war, nor did its efforts to erode Kashmir's special status. Pakistan was not in a position to annex Kashmir militarily in the early 1950s, but the assistance Pakistan received from the West over the next decade would contribute to a belief among Pakistani strategists in 1965 that it could. As the possibility of a UN settlement diminished and the U.S.-Pakistan relationship soured, Pakistan shifted its strategy in Kashmir.

2. The U.S.-Pakistan Relationship

Despite assertions that the military inserted itself into Pakistan's political process because the civilian leadership was less hawkish on Kashmir, the strategy of the military

⁶⁰ Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 35.

⁶¹ Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, *The Quest for Peace: Selections from Speeches and Writings 1963-65* (Karachi: Pakistan Institute for International Affairs, 1966), 13.

government had important continuities that indicate that this probably was not the case.⁶² After General Ayub Khan took power in 1958, he attempted to ease tensions by exposing the irresponsible behavior of the political class in Pakistan. “Against India they scream for war, knowing full well that they will be nowhere near the firing line.” Shortly thereafter he added, “No Pakistani can forget Kashmir. We in the Army feel it more because we recognized the significance of the problem. Our efforts will be directed towards solving the problem satisfactorily and peacefully.”⁶³ In addition to the rhetorical restraint, the military’s position on Kashmir in the late 1950s was demonstrated by the lack of support Iskander Mirza, Pakistan’s first president after the 1956 constitution and former secretary of defense, provided to a plan by the Kashmir Liberation Movement to cross the ceasefire line. The argument of Muhammad Saraf, a leading Kashmiri activist, that crossing the ceasefire line would invoke the attention of the international community was dismissed because Mirza did not want to provoke India.⁶⁴ In late 1959, Ayub Khan even suggested the idea of joint defense agreement to Nehru. However, both men recognized the Kashmir issue must first be resolved before such a proposal was feasible.⁶⁵

It appears that the reason for the constraint demonstrated by the military-bureaucratic leadership was because of the high value they placed on fostering a close relationship with the West. A pro-Western alliance between the military and the bureaucracy was established early in Pakistan. These two institutions were the remnants of the British system and believed that Pakistan’s future success hinged on a strong relationship with the West. From their perspective, Kashmir could be politicized both domestically and internationally to the point that it served their interests, but it would not be the centerpiece of Pakistan’s foreign policy. Prior to 1956, Secretary Mirza and Ayub Khan, then Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan army, worked closely to ensure Pakistan’s overall foreign policy was controlled by the military rather than the politicians

⁶² The argument made by Indian scholar, Aswani Ray, *Domestic Compulsions and Foreign Policy* (New Delhi: Manas Publications, 1975) is summarized in Stephen P. Cohen, *The Pakistan Army* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 113.

⁶³ Quoted in Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, 340.

⁶⁴ Victoria Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan, and the Unfinished War* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2000), 95.

⁶⁵ Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, 342.

who Ayub was determined to prevent from getting “out of hand” and whom he had counseled to “go wholeheartedly with the West.”⁶⁶ When Prime Minister Nazimuddin attempted to link Pakistan’s relationship with the West to satisfactory solutions on the Kashmir and Palestine issues he was quickly dismissed by Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad. As head of the bureaucracy, Ghulam Mohammad agreed with Ayub, who was less concerned with relations with the Islamic world or an immediate solution to Kashmir and was more determined to maintain ties with the West.⁶⁷

The decision to ally with the United States resulted in over \$1.3 billion in economic and military assistance between 1955 and 1965, and although this assistance ultimately strengthened the military and contributed to its assessment that it could forcibly annex Kashmir in 1965, it also gave the United States a significant amount of influence over the Pakistani government. President Dwight Eisenhower’s comments to Jawaharlal Nehru in 1959 revealed the nature of that influence: “I also told Mr. Nehru that so far as any risk of danger that Pakistan might attack India is concerned, I could not believe there is even a remote possibility, and furthermore I believe the United States could be effective in preventing it.”⁶⁸ Nonetheless, American influence and Pakistani willingness to bend to American pressure would decline significantly with the departure of the Eisenhower administration.

In 1960 the U.S.-Pakistan relationship began to sour. In a 1964 essay for *Foreign Affairs*, President Ayub Khan summarized the Pakistani sense of betrayal by the United States: “Over the years, [non-alignment] has come to assume a mantle of respectability in American eyes. Indeed, some four years ago it gradually began to occupy in American estimation, a privileged position.” Four years ago meant 1960, John F. Kennedy’s assumption of office. Ayub added, “In particular, influential American circles began to advocate ‘massive aid’ to India.”⁶⁹ Khalid bin Sayeed, a Pakistani scholar, wrote in March 1964, “Ever since President Kennedy assumed office in Washington, Pakistanis

⁶⁶ Afzal, *Pakistan: History and Politics, 1947-1971*, 113.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 114.

⁶⁸ United States Embassy, France, *Text of Presidents Letter to Prime Minister Nehru on Indo-Pakistan Relations*.

⁶⁹ Mohammad Ayub Kyan, “The Pakistan-American Alliance: Stresses and Strains,” *Foreign Affairs* 42 (Jan 1964): 198.

became increasingly suspicious of American policy toward Pakistan” and there existed the belief that “Harvard intellectuals” within his administration even de-legitimized Pakistan’s right to exist separate from India.⁷⁰

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Kennedy’s special assistant, confirms the Pakistani assessment of the Kennedy administration in his exhaustive chronicle of the Kennedy years, *A Thousands Days*. “Of all the neutral countries, Kennedy was most interested in India, which he had long regarded as ‘the key area’ in Asia,” writes Schlesinger.⁷¹ After the Chinese crushed the Indians in the Aksai Chin war in the fall of 1962 the United States rapidly fulfilled India’s request for assistance. The initial response included around sixty planeloads of automatic weapons and ammunition, but the Pakistanis were more concerned with the hastily negotiated defense assistance agreement between India and the United States. Ayub Khan expressed his concern with the “massive aid from the West” which “arose from the fact that the Indian military build-up was aimed solely against Pakistan.”⁷² The American military aid contributed to a growing opinion in Pakistan that its support for the United States in the Cold War was taken for granted. Ayub Khan concluded that the military aid which India received after its clash with China removed the “remaining distinction between Pakistan and ‘non-aligned’ India.”⁷³ He added in the same *Foreign Affairs* essay, “ We consider that this continued arming of India ... poses a serious threat to Pakistan’s security.”⁷⁴

The U.S. assistance to India was more than just a response to the Aksai Chin war. It was part of a strategic shift toward India. In a meeting with the National Security Council in January 1963, Kennedy laid it out:

There is criticism about our lack of difference between the Allies and the neutrals. The [sic] Pakistanis are critical, but we must recognize the importance of the Indians. [...] While doing this we have moved away from the Pakistanis

⁷⁰ Khalid bin Sayeed, “Pakistan’s Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Pakistani Fears and Interests,” *Asian Survey* 4 (March 1964), 753.

⁷¹ Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002), 522.

⁷² Ayub Khan, “The Pakistan-American Alliance,” 199.

⁷³ *Ibid*, 200.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 200.

and they are moving closer to the Chinese and against the Indians. We have not been able to persuade the Pakistanis or the Afghanistans to change their policy on India. These forces were there long before we came on the scene and we cannot do much about it – we cannot settle all the disputes, but we want to keep them free from the Communists.⁷⁵

As the U.S-Pakistan relationship cooled, the Sino-Pakistan relationship markedly improved during the latter half of the 1950s. In March of 1963, Pakistan and China settled a border agreement that ceded a portion of Kashmir to the Chinese. Believing they had secured China's involvement in the Kashmir dispute, Pakistani enthusiasm over its relationship with China was nearly unrestrained. Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto declared in an address to Pakistan's National Assembly four months after the agreement: "An attack by India on Pakistan involves the territorial integrity and security of the largest state in Asia."⁷⁶

Pakistan's pursuit of a closer relationship with the Chinese caused consternation in Washington and became a major point of contention between the United States and Pakistan during the Johnson administration. In a National Intelligence Estimate prepared in March 1965, U.S. frustration with developments was evident: "In essence, the Paks seem to have arrived at the conclusion they can have their cake and eat it too. Actually, Pakistan is being a lot more friendly to Peiping than to Washington, despite the fact that we still pay all the bills (about \$450million in FY64)."⁷⁷

In contrast to Eisenhower's belief that the U.S. could prevent Pakistan from attacking India, when fighting broke out in the Rann of Kutch in April of 1965 a State Department memorandum concluded that U.S. "leverage in both countries [was] at a low point."⁷⁸ And, during a meeting with President Johnson and his top aides, which was

⁷⁵ U.S. National Security Council, "Notes on Remarks by President Kennedy before the National Security Council, Tuesday, January 22, 1963," 22 January 1963, <http://nsarchive.chadwyck.com>.

⁷⁶ Quoted in Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict*, 102.

⁷⁷ U.S. Department of State, *National Intelligence Estimate*, in *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS), 1964-1968, Volume XXV: South Asia*, http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxv/j.html.

⁷⁸ U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum From the Executive Secretary of the Department of State (Read) to the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs (Bundy)*, in *FRUS, 1964-68, Volume XXV, South Asia*, http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxv/k.html.

convened to address the hostilities in Kashmir in September that year, “The President said he had found out over the last few months how little influence we had with the Paks or Indians.”⁷⁹

Ayub Khan acknowledges that Pakistan’s perception of the United States had shifted dramatically during the early 1960s. He wrote in his autobiography, *Friends Not Masters*, “We could not ignore the growing military strength of India and we could not rely on the United States coming to our assistance if India were to embark on aggression against us.”⁸⁰ By August of 1965, the two factors that had previously restrained Pakistan after India’s abandonment of the plebiscite idea in 1954 had dissipated. The Pakistan military had leveled out the military imbalance that existed with India at partition and the ability of the United States to influence Pakistani decisions had declined dramatically despite the aid the United States had provided, and was continuing to provide, to the Pakistani government.

3. Catalysts

In December 1963 a strand of hair believed to be from the beard of the Prophet Mohammad, the most sacred Muslim relic in Kashmir, was stolen from the mosque at Hazratbul. The Kashmir Valley went into a brief chaotic spell which included riots and protests. The relic was quickly discovered by the Indian Intelligence Bureau and returned. The issue was defused almost completely in February 1964 when a panel of holy men confirmed the authenticity of the restored relic. According to author Victoria Schofield, Ayub Khan, under the advice of his civilian advisors, Bhutto and Aziz Ahmed, Ayub’s Indian affairs expert, came to the conclusion that the Islamic fervor unleashed by the relic incident indicated that “the valley of Kashmir appeared ripe for revolt.”⁸¹

Although the event contributed to Pakistan’s overall picture of the situation, its importance should not be exaggerated. There were other periods of Kashmiri discontent prior to the Hazratbul incident, most notably the protests that followed Sheikh Abdullah’s

⁷⁹ U.S. Department of State, *Memorandum for the Record*, in *FRUS, 1964-68, Volume XXV, South Asia*, http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxv/p.html.

⁸⁰ Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters: A Political Autobiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967,) 158.

⁸¹ Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict*, 108.

dismissal and arrest in 1953, and in those cases the Pakistani leadership did not determine that a military assault was feasible or necessary. Also, if Pakistan's leaders believed Kashmir was "ripe," then why was Operation GIBRALTAR initiated almost two years later? The event is important not because it fundamentally changed Pakistan's perceptions of the Kashmir dispute and lead them to miscalculate, rather it could only be important because the strategic environment in which Pakistan was operating had been dramatically altered.

In the year following the Hazratbul incident, Pakistani military strategists were able to confirm (they thought) their assessment that the strategic environment had been altered during the Rann of Kutch dispute. Pakistan's probes into a disputed march along its southeast border with India was met with a tepid response.⁸² At the same time, Pakistan's relationship with the United States had been fundamentally altered and in the spring of 1965 President Lyndon Johnson cancelled his meeting with President Ayub only weeks before it was scheduled to take place. Pakistan was stunned and angry. Its perception that the United States had forsaken its alliance with Pakistan was further reinforced and it was assessed that if the situation continued on its current course, an amenable solution to Kashmir could be lost forever. In fact, it served to reinforce Ayub Khan's conclusion that the U.S. decision to provide aid to India after its war with China without securing an agreement on Kashmir first, had virtually eliminated all hope of solving the issue diplomatically. According to Ayub, the negotiations that followed the U.S. aid agreement were the "same old story."

The Indians were playing for time. They had been able to secure a great deal of arms aid from the West and a joint statement promising talks on Kashmir did not seem too big a price to them. We had known all along that without direct U.S. interest India would not budge an inch [...] The great opportunity which history had offered for a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute was thus lost. Once the United States and other western countries had decided that they would not link arms aid to India with a settlement of the Kashmir dispute, the Indians were under no compulsion to enter into any serious discussion with Pakistan.⁸³

⁸² Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 41.

⁸³ Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters*, 152.

Ayub's assessment may, or may not, have been correct. However, it demonstrates that Pakistan believed the opportunity to resolve the Kashmir dispute through diplomatic means was dissipating.

In response to changes in the external situation, Pakistan developed an operation intended to capitalize on Kashmiri discontent. The operation was spearheaded by an infiltration of Pakistani forces, disguised as guerrilla forces, into the Kashmir Valley. According to the plan, the infiltrators would then mobilize the Kashmiri population and liberate them. As discussed above, events did not unfold as planned and Operation GIBRALTAR and the subsequent military operation, Operation GRAND SLAM, failed to achieve their objectives. At the Tashkent ceasefire negotiations that followed, it was agreed that the status quo would be restored. Curiously, the public was led to believe that the Pakistani army had actually won the war and that Ayub Khan had squandered the victory at Tashkent. When the public learned of the terms of the Tashkent Agreement violent demonstrations took place in Pakistan's major cities.

C. ORIGINS OF THE SHIFT TOWARD ASYMMETRY: REALIGNMENT OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

After the 1965 war, Pakistan's domestic politics spiraled into turmoil. When the dust settled six years later, the military was out of power and discredited, Pakistan was split into two nations, Islamist forces within Pakistan were expanding their political influence, and the most powerful man in the country, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, obtained the position of prime minister on a platform that was populist, anti-American, and pro-China. These factors forced Pakistan to re-evaluate their strategy in Kashmir and resulted in a shift back toward negotiations on the Kashmir issue and toward the exploration of asymmetric alternatives to challenge India.

1. The Division of Pakistan and the Military's Nadir

The military's dominance began to fade in the aftermath of the Operation GRANDSLAM debacle. The Pakistani population, led by the press to believe the military was victorious on the battle field, was disgusted when the terms of the 1966

Tashkent Agreement became known.⁸⁴ The public was convinced Ayub Khan had incompetently handled the negotiations because his former foreign minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, alleged the Tashkent Agreement “contained secret clauses detrimental to Pakistan’s national interests.”⁸⁵

Further damage to Ayub’s reputation domestically was done when the U.S. conditioned the restoration of economic aid on his government’s acceleration of the family planning program, which offended the religiously conservative segments of Pakistan’s population, and a unilateral reduction of military expenditure by five percent, which alienated those Pakistanis who believed a strong military was critical to Pakistan’s existence, especially in light of the American decision to sever aid during the 1965 war.⁸⁶ When combined with Pakistan’s faltering economy in the late 1960s, Ayub’s policies benefited both the Islamist and socialist parties in West Pakistan, especially Bhutto’s Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP). In East Pakistan, the situation was deteriorating and the military regime became entangled with the boiling Bengali nationalist movement.

In March 1969, the pressures overwhelmed Ayub and he resigned. He unconstitutionally designated his Commander-in-Chief, Yahya Khan, as his replacement. Yahya Khan recognized that sustaining military rule would be difficult in such an unfavorable environment. Thus, he made the rapid establishment of civilian government one of his primary objectives. He presided over national elections in December 1970. The public’s dissatisfaction with military rule was confirmed by the results; all former military officers who ran for office lost.⁸⁷

The election results revealed the ethnic cleavages that still divided Pakistan and political changes sweeping its society. The Awami League, the Bengali nationalist party, led by Mujib Rahman, nearly swept the election in East Pakistan and won 160 of the 162 seats. The League also secured an outright majority in Pakistan’s 300-seat National Assembly. In West Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s Pakistan Peoples Party managed to

⁸⁴ Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict*, 112.

⁸⁵ Afzal, *Pakistan: History and Politics, 1947-1971*, 340.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 322.

⁸⁷ Sharif al Mujahid, “Pakistan’s First General Elections,” *Asian Survey* Vol 11 (February 1971): 170.

win eighty-one seats using a politic campaign charged with populist rhetoric intended to mobilize Pakistan's lower classes.⁸⁸

Before the new National Assembly convened, in which the Bengali Awami League would have possessed a outright majority, civil war broke out in East Pakistan. The Pakistan army's brutal crackdown in 1971 resulted in millions of refugees flooding into India. The Indian government, led by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, responded to the refugee influx with a military invasion of East Pakistan. The Indian invasion was a hugely successful operation that resulted in a quick defeat and resulted in over 90,000 Pakistani prisoners of war. For Pakistan it was, "A disaster on a scale with the Arab defeat by Israel in the 1967 war," concludes Gilles Kepel, expert on political Islam.⁸⁹ In less than a decade, the Pakistani military had been defeated twice by Indian forces.

The ethnic-centered Bengali nationalist movement had major implications for Pakistan's claims to Kashmir. Bengali nationalism directly challenged the foundations of the two-nation theory under which Pakistan was established. Jinnah's notion that South Asia's Muslims must be united within one nation-state was dead. Pakistan's inability to effectively handle the ethnic divisions between East and West Pakistan exposed the weakness of its communal claim to Kashmir. "At an ideological level," asserts Sumit Ganguly, "Pakistan's claim to Kashmir was effectively demolished."⁹⁰

The 1971 defeat also had several immediate consequences for Pakistani society and government. First of all, the performance of the Pakistani military in the war confirmed suspicions that the military's professionalism and capabilities had declined due to years of politicization.⁹¹ The military leadership implicitly acknowledged this conclusion and quickly began the process of extricating itself from politics. Second, the military's decline ended the era of secularization and westernization under military auspices. The military was the standard bearer for secularism and westernization during the formative years of Pakistan's development and its fall from grace left a political and ideological vacuum. Third, the political space abandoned by the military was occupied

⁸⁸ Anwar H. Syed, *The Discourse and Politics of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992), 80.

⁸⁹ Gilles Kepel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 99.

⁹⁰ Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 71.

⁹¹ Stephen Cohen, *The Pakistan Army* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 73.

by parties advocating a socialist or Islamist future for Pakistan. Bhutto's success in the 1970 elections running on a populist-socialist platform indicated that Pakistan still hung to the secular roots of the country planted by Mohammad Ali Jinnah, but the Islamist parties made significant inroads toward legitimizing the role of Islam in Pakistani society and government as well as expanding their power and influence during the 1970s.

2. Expansion of Islamists' Influence

From Pakistan's inception until the mid-1960s, the Islamist parties in Pakistan were mostly concerned with their survival and preventing the mainly secular bureaucracy and military from secularizing Pakistani society. The Islamist parties advocated a platform that sought the strict application of shariah (Islamic law) in Pakistan. More importantly, their leaders' claims to political authority based on their knowledge of Islam directly challenged the legitimacy of the largely westernized leadership. During the latter half of the decade, however, Ayub's government found common ground with the Islamists because of their common opposition to the Bhutto-led socialist movement. Still, the Islamist parties were unable to unify or broaden their platform and therefore could not expand beyond their traditional political base. The three main Islamist parties, Jama'at-i Islami (JI), Jama'at-i Ulama-i Islam (JUI), Jama'at Ulama-i Pakistan (JUP), combined to win only 18 seats in the 1970 elections, all in West Pakistan. The election results "dealt a severe blow to the morale of Jama'at members" concludes Vali Nasr.⁹² But beyond the disappointing results, they did manage to collect over 20 percent of the vote⁹³ and secured a position as an important political bloc in Pakistani politics.

The rapidly deteriorating situation in East Pakistan provided an opportunity to revive the Islamist parties after the electoral set back. Sayyed Abu'l-A'la Mawdudi, leader of the Jama'at-i Islami, the most influential Islamist party at the time, attempted to improve the nationalist credentials of Jama'at by mediating the dispute.⁹⁴ The Jama'at leaders lobbied both Yahya Khan and Mujib Rahman to mend their differences, but both

⁹² Vali Seyyed Reza Nasr, *The Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution: The Jama'at-i Islami of Pakistan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 168.

⁹³ Sharif al Mujahid, "Pakistan's First General Elections," 169. Also see Syed, *The Discourse and Politics of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto*, 81.

⁹⁴ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 168-9.

refused to compromise. As the situation worsened in East Pakistan, it became evident that the Awami League's position threatened the survival of Pakistan as one nation. In April 1971, "the Jama'at abandoned its role as intermediary and formed an unholy alliance with the Pakistan army."⁹⁵ The Jama'at decision was intended to provide the military religious legitimacy in its effort to hold the nation together. But, in the end, the Jama'at-military collaboration did little to address Bengali demands and Pakistan was bifurcated. As a consequence of the Jama'at's maneuver, the historically bitter relationship between the military and the Islamist was ended and the stage was set for future cooperation between the two.

After the division of Pakistan, Bhutto, as leader of the PPP, became the prime minister of Pakistan. Bhutto recognized the spreading popularity of the Islamist message and tried to woo the Islamist by co-opting their language. In his effort to dominate the political discourse, Bhutto frequently talked of "Islamic socialism" during his speeches, and he proclaimed that "Islam is our faith, democracy is our polity, socialism is our economy."⁹⁶ In 1973 he promulgated Pakistan's third constitution, which "has been described as the most Islamic Constitution in the history of Pakistan,"⁹⁷ in which, he restored the word "Islamic" to Pakistan's official name. He also attempted to forge closer relationships with other Islamic states, especially those in the Middle East. Nevertheless, his efforts did not pacify the Islamist parties because they continued to regard him as "a rabid secularist" whose actions were disingenuous. The Jama'at declared its opposition to Bhutto in December 1971 and continued to participate in anti-Bhutto activities throughout his tenure.⁹⁸

Bhutto's attempts to co-opt the Islamist agenda in fact had the opposite effect, and were crucial to legitimizing the Islamist parties and their demands, specifically the enforcement of shariah.⁹⁹ Bhutto's appeals to Islam revealed the weakness of his position and his adoption of Islamist rhetoric and reforms revitalized the Islamist parties.

⁹⁵ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 168.

⁹⁶ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 172.

⁹⁷ Mumtaz Ahmad, "Islam and the State: The Case of Pakistan," 255.

⁹⁸ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 172 and 177-187.

⁹⁹ Saeed Shafqat, "From Official Islam to Islam: The Rise of Dawat-ul-Irshad and Lashkar-e-Taiba," in *Pakistan: Nationalism without a Nation?*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot (New York: Zed Books, 2002), 135.

At the same time, he also alienated powerful segments of Pakistani society by promoting a socialist agenda, agitating ethnic tensions, and seeking to tame the military.¹⁰⁰

After several political setbacks in 1975 and 1976, Bhutto was convinced that a new round of elections were necessary. A coalition of Islamist parties managed to form the Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) to challenge the PPP at the polls. As the election neared, the PPP became sufficiently worried and it resorted to kidnapping, intimidation, and poll rigging in order to ensure victory.¹⁰¹ The PNA won only 36 seats compared to the PPP's 155 of the 200-seat National Assembly.

The PNA immediately denounced the elections as unfair and a conflagration of protests spread across Pakistan in 1977. In a last ditch effort to mollify the Islamists, and a move that implicitly acknowledged their power; Bhutto announced an Islamization program that included a prohibition on night clubs, casinos, alcohol, and gambling. The protests continued unabated. Eventually, with no end to the impasse in sight and the country rapidly destabilizing, the military, led by General Zia ul-Haq, disposed of Bhutto in a military coup.¹⁰²

3. Foundation of U.S.-Pakistan Relationship Crumbles

During the late 1960s and 1970s, the U.S. Pakistan relationship was overtaken by events and by 1979 had deteriorated considerably. Initially, Ayub Khan was concerned with the military and economic aid the United States provided to India after its war with China in 1962. The U.S. decision to halt aid to Pakistan during the 1965 Indo-Pakistan war severely damaged Pakistan's perception of the U.S. commitment. The decision also strengthened the case of those who advocated a tilt toward China and the Muslim world. Ayub's commitment to the United States remained in place immediately following the 1965 war, but the tension caused by Pakistan's desire to improve relations with China increasingly weakened the U.S.-Pakistan partnership.

Steadily, Ayub's close ties to the United States came to be seen as a domestic political liability. In an effort to distance himself from the alliance he was finding less

¹⁰⁰ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 174.

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 183.

¹⁰² Ibid, 182-187.

and less useful, in May 1968 he informed the U.S. government it no longer had access to the Badaber intelligence facility near Peshawar.¹⁰³ By the time the Johnson administration left office the U.S.-Pakistan alliance had been fundamentally altered. Pakistan no longer considered the United States a reliable ally and the formerly close relationship became increasingly estranged.

The realpolitik approach of the Nixon administration briefly slowed the alienation coming to define the relationship. The Nixon administration correctly recognized the Sino-Soviet split and did not view Islamabad's friendly relations with Beijing in the threatening light of previous American administrations. In fact, Nixon and his National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger, sought to exploit the Sino-Pakistan relationship and used it to facilitate the U.S. détente with China. Even Zulfikar Ali Bhutto sought to improve relations with the United States after he became prime minister in 1971 after years of anti-American rhetoric.

The rapprochement lasted beyond the Nixon administration and in 1975 the Ford administration lifted the arms embargo that the Johnson administration had put in place during the 1965 war. Meanwhile, Indira Gandhi's implementation of martial law in India and the military coup in Bangladesh that same year improved Pakistan's appearance in comparison to its South Asian neighbors. Uncharacteristically, Pakistan was more democratic than India for the first time in its existence.

The ascendancy of the nuclear proliferation issue in the United States and Pakistan's insistence on matching the Indian nuclear capability would ultimately undermine further improvements in the U.S.-Pakistan relationship. In reality, the relationships recovery was superficial in nature and was no longer considered by either side to be fundamentally critical to their national security objectives. To be sure, a positive relationship with the United States was still considered a pillar of Pakistan's foreign policy, but the relationship's importance was vastly outweighed by the priority

¹⁰³ Telegram from the Embassy in Pakistan to the Department of State, 31 May 1968, *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)*, 1964-68, Vol. 25, 491-499, http://www.state.gov/about_state/history/vol_xxv/index.html.

Pakistan put on its relations with China and other Muslim states, particularly Saudi Arabia and the Gulf oil states.¹⁰⁴

In 1976, the Ford administration, motivated by the imperatives of election year politics in the United States, set out with a heightened zeal to toughen up on Pakistan's suspected nuclear program. Having lost faith in the commitment of the United States, Pakistan was unwilling to halt its nuclear program. The inauguration of the Carter administration marked the beginning of the descent toward the nadir in U.S.-Pakistan relations, according to Dennis Kux, author of several books on U.S.-South Asia relations.¹⁰⁵ Carter ran on a platform emphasizing nuclear non-proliferation and human rights and Pakistan's nuclear program and the deterioration of Pakistani politics leading to Zia's military coup in 1977 cast Pakistan in an unfavorable light from the perspective of the new administration. In January 1978, Carter visited India and ignominiously skipped Pakistan. The following April, the United States suspended economic assistance to Pakistan because the Symington amendment to the U.S. Arms Export Control Act prohibited U.S. military and economic assistance to countries that did not sign the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT).¹⁰⁶ When the U.S. embassy in Islamabad was burned to the ground in 1979, the relationship reached "its lowest point ever," concludes Kux¹⁰⁷

D. PAKISTAN'S STRATEGY: DIPLOMACY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Two military defeats and the lost of Bengal significantly reduced the political power of the Pakistan military. The events indicated that Pakistan's foreign policy needed to be re-evaluated. Most significantly, the belief that the Pakistan military could wrest Kashmir from India was dead. Still, Bhutto's rhetoric indicates that Pakistan remained determined to continue the struggle for Kashmir. What changed was Pakistan's understanding of how it could confront India. Conventional military options were unviable. Moreover, Pakistan's relationship with the United States deteriorated so radically after the 1965 debacle that dependence on the United States was considered

¹⁰⁴ Dennis Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001), 224-25.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 227.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, 235.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, 242.

foolish. Therefore, during the 1970s, Pakistan's Kashmir strategy reverted to pre-1965 diplomatic measures. Although the rhetorical attacks made by Bhutto can only loosely be categorized as a strategy, his decision to set Pakistan on a course to develop nuclear weapons in order to maintain some ability to challenge India indicates that Pakistan refused to accept Indian dominance and acquiesce to the status quo in Kashmir. This was Pakistan's first step toward asymmetric options in its effort to prevent India from dismissing its claims to Kashmir.

After the Bangladesh war, Pakistan's options in Kashmir were substantially circumscribed. Pakistan's weakness was demonstrated by Bhutto's concession in the 1972 Simla Accord, the agreement that ended the Bangladesh war. In the Accord, the two nations "resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations."¹⁰⁸ This was considered a major concession by Bhutto at the time because India had sought since 1949 to reduce the role of external actors in the dispute. India believed that the United Nations had failed in 1949, and that the western powers, particularly the United States, were biased toward Pakistan because of India's socialist policies and non-aligned movement leadership. Therefore, Pakistani capitulation on this issue appeared to be a major victory for India. There was even speculation that Bhutto and Gandhi had agreed to transform the newly named "line of control" (LoC) into a permanent border once Bhutto felt politically secure on the domestic front.¹⁰⁹

Still, despite the major concession Bhutto conceded at Simla, he refused to compromise on the status of Kashmir. Instead, he continued to rhetorically agitate against India and he channeled the nation's attention and resources on building the ultimate deterrent against Indian aggression—nuclear weapons.

1. Maintaining Kashmir's Disputed Status

Bhutto had a number of reasons for reducing military tensions in Kashmir. For one, two consecutive military defeats demoralized the military. Pakistan was simply not capable of defeating India in a conventional battle. Secondly, despite the military's

¹⁰⁸ Simla Agreement, 2 July 1972. Available in Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 168.

¹⁰⁹ Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 71.

decline it remained his primary political opponent and still dominated national security issues. Therefore, Bhutto had little interest in aggravating a situation that would increase the role of the military. On the other hand, Bhutto could not simply settle for the status quo. Pakistan's inability to free itself from its obsession with India and the resulting insecurity, has been so thoroughly cultivated in Pakistan, if Bhutto was suspected of having compromised on Kashmir it could have meant his political demise.¹¹⁰

But while he moved to ease tensions on an issue the military dominated, Bhutto made sure the Pakistani public did not perceive him as capitulating on Kashmir. He continued to condemn Indian aggression and used international forums to ensure that Kashmir remained "disputed" territory. Contrary to allegations that he secretly agreed to convert the LoC into the international border, in his public statements he continued the struggle over Kashmir. In fact, Prime Minister Bhutto's 1973 article in the American foreign policy journal *Foreign Affairs* maintained Pakistan's argument that India annexed Kashmir illegally. Bhutto wrote: "India totally disregarded not only the principles on which partition had been effected but all norms of international conduct by sending her troops into Kashmir ... Subsequently, India refused to allow the people of Kashmir to determine their future according to their own wishes."¹¹¹

As for the war in 1971, which ostensibly discredited Pakistan's claim to Kashmir, Bhutto asserted, "Pakistan had been the victim of unabashed aggression ... it was but the climax of a long series of hostile and aggressive acts by India against Pakistan since the establishment of the two as sovereign and independent states."¹¹² The war and the subsequent independence of the Bengalis did not undermine the two-nation theory, rather it confirmed it from Pakistan's perspective. For Pakistan, the war verified India's aggressive nature and reinforced Pakistan's belief that Indian strategy in Kashmir was designed to discredit the founding principle of Pakistan all along. Although Bhutto may have believed a military option was no longer viable, his continuation of the uncompromising rhetoric of previous Pakistani leaders illustrates that he was not preparing the Pakistani public for a compromise to the Kashmir solution. In fact, the

¹¹⁰ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute* (New York: St. Martin's, 1994), 190.

¹¹¹ Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, "Pakistan Builds Anew," *Foreign Affairs* Vol 51(April 1973): 542.

¹¹² Bhutto, "Pakistan Builds Anew," 541.

second component of Bhutto's strategy reveals that he had little intention of resolving issues with India.

2. Nuclear Weapons

The second element of Bhutto's strategy was the development of nuclear weapons under civilian aegis. Bhutto declared in 1965, "If India builds the bomb, we will eat grass [...to] get one of our own."¹¹³ Once he became prime minister in 1972, he jumpstarted the Pakistani nuclear program. Four years later, he designated Abdul Qadeer Khan as head of the Pakistani nuclear program and had Khan report directly to him.¹¹⁴ Bhutto understood "the discrepancy between Indian and Pakistani military capabilities [and] India's power to protect its claim to Kashmir seemed insuperable."¹¹⁵ By building a nuclear weapon Bhutto was hoping to negate India's conventional military superiority while at the same time enhance his position vis-à-vis the military domestically. Additionally, the pursuit of nuclear weapons intended to ease the public's unease brought on by the 1971 defeat.

Bhutto's strategy of rhetorical agitation and nuclear development were a logical outcome of both the domestic and strategic situation. By focusing on diplomatic appeals, Bhutto necessarily reduced the role of the military. Additionally, his decision to develop nuclear weapons under his direct guidance was similarly intended to diminish the role of the military while also defying the Indians in the eyes of the Pakistani public. It was also reflective of the Pakistan's belief that the United States was not a country that it could count on in a crisis. Pakistan's nuclear program became the cornerstone of a national security strategy designed to neutralize India's conventional advantages and "consistently ranked higher on Pakistan's priority list than receiving economic aid and even military supplies," concludes Teresita C. Schaffer, director of the South Asia program at The Center for Strategic and International Studies.¹¹⁶ Though the decision to develop nuclear

¹¹³ Quoted in Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*, 187.

¹¹⁴ "Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission," Federation of Atomic Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/pakistan/agency/paec.htm>.

¹¹⁵ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 121.

¹¹⁶ Teresita C. Schaffer, "U.S. Influence on Pakistan: Can Partners Have Divergent Priorities?" *Washington Quarterly* Vol 26:1 (Winter 2002-03): 172.

weapons was not seen as a way to wrest Kashmir from India, it does indicate that Pakistan continued to see India as a threat and that it would not capitulate to Indian attempts to dominate South Asia. Bhutto's daughter and future prime minister, Benazir, said as much two decades later, "[R]olling back the nuclear program is not feasible. ... The nuclear program is linked with the Jammu and Kashmir issue."¹¹⁷

E. CONCLUSION

Beginning in 1949, Pakistan's Kashmir policy sought the self-determination for all of Kashmir and that the state was indivisible. A policy that seeks a change in the status quo, and a position that India, especially after 1954, was unwilling to accommodate. India's legal claim to Kashmir, its effort to prove its secularism, as well as its desire to avoid setting a precedent in which a portion of the state was lost on the basis of communal grounds because of the numerous ethnic and religious groups that make up the nation, made it unwilling to cede territory to Pakistan. Despite the distance between the two nations' position, Pakistan pursued a peaceful settlement to the Kashmir dispute. This strategy shifted in 1965.

After 1954, cold war politics made India reluctant to even discuss the issue with Pakistan. Nevertheless, Pakistan's options were restricted because its military was poorly equipped and under funded. Their effort to remedy this disadvantage led them to seek an alliance with the West. Pakistan's leaders understood that the continuation of the aid and assistance from the United States was dependent on their abstaining from the use of military force to achieve their aims in Kashmir. The high importance Pakistan placed on obtaining military and economic assistance outweighed the desire to wrest Kashmir away from India.

By 1965, the factors restraining Pakistani strategy were removed. India's declaration that Kashmir's accession was "full final and complete,"¹¹⁸ Pakistan's belief that it possessed the military advantage over India, and the deterioration of Pakistan's

¹¹⁷ Quoted in Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000*, 326.

¹¹⁸ Quoted in Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, 198.

relationship with the United States resulted in Pakistan's decision to shift from diplomacy to war.

Although the 1965 operation did not unfold as Pakistan's strategists may have hoped, it was not necessarily an illogical and irrational plan disconnected from the realities of the day. In fact, Pakistan's decision to abandon its diplomatic campaign was a response to changes in Pakistan's position in relation to the external players and its accompanying reassessment of the external environment. While the United States bears no responsibility for Pakistan's decision to embark upon a war against its neighbors, the deterioration of the U.S.-Pakistan relationship played a vital role in Pakistan's decision to shift its strategy in Kashmir.

Finally, despite the setbacks of the 1965 and 1971 wars, Pakistan maintained the struggle for Kashmir. Pakistan maintained its claims to Kashmir because internal politics made it difficult to abandon the issue. This indicates that Pakistan's policy on Kashmir continues to be a function of mostly internal politics. On the other hand, Pakistan's strategy is impacted by both internal and external factors, as these shifted, so did its strategy.

IV. PROXY WAR

A. INTRODUCTION

Despite the disastrous outcome of the 1971 war, Pakistan maintained its position that Kashmir was disputed territory and that its status should be determined by the will of the Kashmir people through a plebiscite. Recognizing the constraints of the external environment, it shifted to a strategy of diplomacy to preserve Kashmir's disputed status. This strategy lasted until the early 1990s when Pakistan's shifted its strategy again, and it began to support an insurgency in Kashmir on an unprecedented scale.

Although India had accused Pakistan of supporting insurgency in Kashmir since 1948, until 1990 there had been only two prior cases of substantial Pakistani support to insurgency efforts in Kashmir.¹¹⁹ The first occurred in 1948 when the nascent Pakistan army assisted the tribesmen from the Northwest Frontier. This assistance was unplanned and implemented in an unsystematic and decentralized manner. The second occasion was prior to the conventional military operation in 1965 and was intended to prepare Kashmir for that follow-on conventional assault. In contrast, the proxy war strategy that Pakistan launched in the early 1990s was comprehensive, organized, and intended to be long-term. Moreover, it was not planned as part of a conventional military operation. This chapter examines why Pakistan's strategy shifted when it did, why a proxy war strategy was chosen over other options, the reasons for and consequences of the Kargil operation, and how the changes induced by the 11 September 2001 attacks have impacted Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir.

There are two elements of Pakistan's decision to launch a proxy war. The first element is internal. Political shifts during the 1970s brought about an alliance between Islamists and the military that were reinforced and deepened during the Afghan war. The most important consequence of this relationship was that it created a powerful coalition that not only believed proxy war was an effective instrument but that also profited from the implementation of a proxy war. The second element is external and explains why Pakistan's strategy shifted when it did. The indigenously-sparked Kashmiri rebellion that

¹¹⁹ Robert G. Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 119.

started in 1989 indicated that India had been unable to successfully integrate Kashmir into its political system and created an opportunity for Pakistan to more forcefully pursue its objectives in Kashmir. A second external factor that influenced the shift in strategy was the decline in U.S.-Pakistan relations in 1990. It is difficult to determine the extent U.S. sanctions had an effect on Pakistan's Kashmir strategy, but it is not unreasonable to conclude that the U.S. decision to withdrawal from South Asia and impose sanctions on Pakistan removed any remaining constraints on Pakistan's decision to engage in proxy war in Kashmir.

The second half of this chapter discusses the reasons and consequences of the Kargil conflict and the impact of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks. India's response to the Kargil intrusion made it clear to Pakistan that attempts to substantially alter the LoC would not be tolerated even with the threat of nuclear war. However, the conflict does not appear to have impacted Pakistan's calculation that the proxy war strategy continued to be the most effective method of pursuing its objectives in Kashmir.

On the other hand, the geopolitical impact of the U.S. war on terror has already resulted in a number of changes that have forced Pakistan to reconsider its support for the militants in Kashmir. Most significantly, Pakistan appears to have come to the realization that the use of militant proxies runs the risk of putting national interests of higher priority at risk.

B. TOWARD PROXY WAR

When diplomacy failed to convince India to discuss the Kashmir issue in 1965, instead of initiating a proxy war, Pakistan launched a military operation. The results of the 1965 and 1971 wars demonstrated to Pakistan's leaders that conventional military options were unviable. According to the former director of arms control and disarmament affairs in Pakistan's Strategic Plans Division of Joint Services Headquarters, Brigadier General Feroz Hassan Khan, it was Pakistan's "twin losses to India in 1965 and 1971 [that] pushed it down the nuclear path."¹²⁰ India's ability to broaden any war beyond the Line of Control inherently put Pakistan at a disadvantage

¹²⁰ Feroz Hassan Khan, "The Independence-Dependence Paradox: Stability Dilemmas in South Asia," *Arms Control Today* (October 2003): 15.

because its major cities were concentrated along its border with India and therefore vulnerable to Indian attack. The threat of escalation was India's ace in the hole. In light of this situation, Pakistan turned toward a strategy that focused on maintaining Kashmir's disputed status while also developing nuclear weapons.

Pakistan's lack of a proxy war strategy was not due to an absence of Kashmiri insurgents. Actually, Kashmiri insurgent groups began to emerge as early as 1965, but were given little support by the Pakistani government because they sought independence for Kashmir, an option no Pakistani leader truly championed.¹²¹ Inspired by the Vietnamese war against the United States and the Algerian insurgency against the French, Kashmiris living in Azad Kashmir, formed the Jammu and Kashmir National Liberation Front (JKNLF).¹²² Through most of the 1970s and 1980s JKNLF activities were generally no more than an irritant to India because they never received sufficient support from the Pakistani government. The limited support the Pakistani government gave to the indigenous Kashmiri resistance groups in the late 1960s and 1970s demonstrated Pakistan's desire to maintain control over the Kashmir dispute. Indeed, supporting the insurgency might have cost the Pakistani government little in comparison to its pursuit of nuclear weapons. But, the pursuit of nuclear weapons was sold as a panacea to a Pakistani public dejected by the 1971 disaster, and was intended to show that the government was continuing to challenge Indian hegemony.

In addition to Pakistan's reluctance to provide much assistance to groups that ultimately sought independence, the limited assistance Pakistan provided was due to the fact that the proxy war strategy lacked both a constituency and the necessary infrastructure for implementation. By 1989, however, Zia's Islamization program and the Afghan war produced a powerful coalition between the military, the Inter-Service Intelligence Directorate (ISI), and several Islamist organizations. The development of this coalition and the impact it had on perceptions was critical to the Pakistani government's attitudes toward proxy war, especially a proxy war coordinated with Islamic militants.

¹²¹ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 122-24.

¹²² A section of Kashmir controlled by Pakistan that is nominally autonomous.

While this coalition opened up new possibilities for Pakistan, alone it was unlikely to have resulted in a shift in Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir. A shift in strategy required a major change in the external environment. In this case, Pakistan's shift was made possible by the conflagration of Kashmiri resistance that swept the Kashmir Valley in 1989. The rebellion instilled hope among Pakistan's leaders that Kashmir was not a lost cause and they intended to capitalize on the opportunity.

1. Consolidation of the Military-Islamist Coalition

When General Zia ul-Haq deposed Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in April 1977 he justified the military's intervention into Pakistan's politics on the grounds that the military had to save the country from the degeneration of the political process and the instability caused by Bhutto's mismanagement.¹²³ However, the growth of Islamist parties' influence during the 1970s meant Zia could not maintain military rule on the same premise as Ayub Khan. Bhutto's appeals to Islam and his twelfth-hour attempt to implement an Islamization program had revealed the strength of the Islamist parties in Pakistan, and with his demise they expected to inherit control over the government.¹²⁴

Regardless of the Islamists' expectations, Zia was unwilling to cede power to an ideology the military establishment considered a threat to Pakistan's political stability and long-term interests.¹²⁵ Even with the military's disappointment with the U.S. decision to halt aid in 1965, it still leaned toward the West and it knew the Islamist parties intended to curtail this relationship. Moreover, during Pakistan's first two decades of independence, the Islamist organizations had been considered a thorn in the side of military rule.¹²⁶

Nevertheless, once Zia decided to postpone the return to civilian rule, he needed to establish some semblance of legitimacy beyond the necessity to stabilize the country. To accomplish this, Zia set out to co-opt the Islamist organizations by promoting a policy

¹²³ Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 423-24.

¹²⁴ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 189.

¹²⁵ Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Islamic Leviathan: Islam and the Making of State Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 132.

¹²⁶ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 122-23.

of Islamization and promoting Jama'at members and their allies to ministerial positions.¹²⁷ Bhutto had made similar concessions late in his term, but Zia, unlike Bhutto, was generally regarded as a pious Muslim by the Islamist parties and therefore they considered his efforts genuine. The Islamists also found Zia's argument that early elections would mostly benefit the PPP under the current conditions persuasive.¹²⁸ Therefore, the Jama'at and its allies formed a partnership with Zia.

Zia's relationship with the Islamist organizations was not a partnership of equals. Zia intended to use Islam to perpetuate the rule of the military hierarchy. "For General, Zia, the promotion of Mawdudi and his disciples was a way to block the restoration of democracy and justify martial law by presenting it as a vehicle for setting up a true Islamic state,"¹²⁹ concludes Gilles Kepel. The Jama'at realized that it was the junior partner in the deal, but continued the partnership because of its access to previously unavailable perquisites and patronage. Senior leaders of the Jama'at were treated as elder statesmen by the Zia regime, and the educational, military, and bureaucratic institutions were opened up to them like no other time in Pakistan's history.¹³⁰

Penetration into these institutions allowed the Islamist to influence the Pakistan's decision-making process at unparalleled levels. Yet, Zia retained his position of advantage by employing divide and rule tactics with the Islamist organizations. Once he had persuaded the Jama'at to support him in his Islamization program he cultivated relationships with its Islamist rivals.¹³¹ After the Soviet's invaded Afghanistan the levels of patronage available to the Islamist and the incentives for the military and the Islamists to cooperate more extensively were strengthened and broadened.

2. Establishment of the Jihad Constituency and Infrastructure

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 was both a threat and an opportunity for Pakistan. With the Soviets pressing menacingly against Pakistan's

¹²⁷ Kepel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*, 100.

¹²⁸ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 190.

¹²⁹ Kepel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*, 101.

¹³⁰ Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution*, 195.

¹³¹ *Ibid*, 193.

western border and with India on its east, Pakistan had hostile governments on both sides. Pakistan was still struggling with the consequences of the East Pakistan's secession and the political changes sweeping, and had only recently quelled a rebellion in Baluchistan. Meanwhile, the United States was still stinging from its failure in Vietnam, the Iran hostage crisis made the Carter administration seem hapless, and the U.S.-Pakistan relationship had substantially worsened during the late 1970s over U.S. nonproliferation concerns.

Nevertheless, both countries immediately understood that their interests had converged once again. The Carter administration realized that challenging the Soviets in Afghanistan was a higher national security priority than maintaining sanctions against Pakistan for its nuclear program and presented an aid package to Zia. Zia recognized Pakistan's improved bargaining position and dismissed Carter's four hundred million dollar aid offer as "peanuts." However, the incoming Reagan administration put together an assistance package that solidified U.S.-Pakistan cooperation against the Soviets in Afghanistan.

Since neither the United States nor Pakistan wanted to directly confront the Soviets in Afghanistan, the Reagan administration and the Zia government agreed to cooperate in a proxy war against the Soviets. Under the terms of the deal, the United States provided money, weapons, and training to Pakistan, which Pakistan used to arm, fund, and train the various mujahedin factions engaging the Soviets. The strategy proved to be effective and the Soviets completed the withdrawal of their forces in February 1989. But, the proxy war strategy had repercussions on Pakistan's institutions, politics, and society that laid the foundation for another shift in Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir.

The Afghan war allowed the Pakistan military to re-asserted itself as the dominant force in Pakistan's politics, economy, and society. Zia's handling of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and Pakistan's rising stature in international affairs bolstered the military's status. Any influence it had lost after the 1965 and 1971 wars was regained. Consequently, during this period the military consolidated its control over Pakistan's foreign policy and many of its bureaucracies.

Additionally, ISI's expanded its power in Pakistan's national security affairs as a result of the clandestine nature of the U.S. aid and ISI's exclusive management of the distribution of that aid.¹³² As the link between the Pakistani government and the mujahedin, ISI managed enormous amounts of money and weapons. Once resources from the United States, Saudi Arabia, and other donors arrived in Pakistan, ISI managed the distribution of these resources to the various mujahedin groups and their associated Pakistani Islamist parties. Its management of the resistance groups gave it substantial leverage within Pakistan's decision-making establishment and made it a major player in Pakistan's national security apparatus.

There were several reasons why ISI chose religiously-oriented, fundamentalist organizations. First of all, military-Islamist connections had been established in the early 1970s in response to the coup in 1973 that brought the Daoud government to power in Afghanistan.¹³³ Second, an ideological affinity existed between Zia and the religious resistance groups. Third, as a mujahedin commander interviewed in 1992 observed, "The CIA and Pakistan funded the fundamentalists because they figured that those groups were least likely to compromise with the regime."¹³⁴

As a result of this direct interaction with the Islamists, ISI's ties to fundamentalist organizations produced extensive linkages that resulted in a convergence of their respective interests. The Islamists and ISI both recognized that their increased influence was largely due to their roles in conflicts that used insurgency methods and required a degree of plausible deniability for the Pakistan government.

In addition to the political access, money, and weapons that the Islamists received because of their role in the Afghan war, the conflict also increased Islamists' influence in society. Even the terms used to describe the struggle and those that fought it, *jihad* and *mujahiden*, "gave a boost to the revival of Islamic sentiments among the religious groups

¹³² Weinbaum, *Pakistan and Afghanistan: Resistance and Reconstruction* (San Francisco: Westview, 1994), 13.

¹³³ Olivier Roy, "The Taliban: A Strategic Tool For Pakistan," in *Pakistan: Nationalism Without a Nation?*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot (New York: Zed Books, 2002), 151.

¹³⁴ Mark Bauman and Markos Kounalakis, "Holy War Without End" *Los Angeles Times*, 23 Feb, 1992, 24.

in Pakistan,” notes Saeed Shafqat, Pakistani author and professor.¹³⁵ By portraying the conflict in Afghanistan as a jihad sanctioned by the tenets of Islam, the Islamist parties, which had typically performed poorly in elections, were able to mobilize support for their activities by tapping into an emotionally charged issue that nearly all Pakistanis supported. Additional influence was garnered by the Islamist parties because of their unequaled liberty to hold political rallies and conduct political activities at universities, labor unions, and other organizations. During the 1980s, both funding and recruiting improved dramatically for the Islamist parties.¹³⁶ Furthermore, Saudi petrodollars funded the establishments of thousands of madrassas that espoused a strict, austere, missionary message. This allowed the Islamists parties to enlarge their constituency by steadily churning out an army of individuals that supported their agenda of jihad and Islamization.

The Islamists’ alliance with Zia’s military regime, their ties to ISI, their role in sanctioning the conflict in Afghanistan, and their role in the actual conflict all contributed to a rise in the levels of militancy and fundamentalism in Pakistan. Nevertheless, Pakistan’s proxy war in Kashmir was not launched because the military had become more militant or that the government was determined to divert militants away from Pakistan because they could destabilize the nation. Although the militants could have presented a problem, it is unlikely that their return was the primary reason Pakistan shifted to a proxy war. In fact, Pakistan began supporting the proxy war before the end of the war in Afghanistan in 1992. Furthermore, the total membership of the most ruthless organizations was relatively small. According to *Jane’s Intelligence Review*, in 1999 Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT) consisted of only 300 individuals, Hizbul Mujahedin (HM) had 500-800, and Harkat-ul-Ansar, later Harkat-ul-Mujahedin (HUM) was composed of 350.¹³⁷ Although such numbers could cause problems for Pakistan, they did not present an existential threat to the state of Pakistan. Finally, in 1990, militants associated with

¹³⁵ Saeed Shafqat, “From Official Islam to Islamism: The Rise of Dawat-ul-Irshad and Lashkar-e-Taiba,” in *Pakistan: Nationalism without a Nation?*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot (New York: Zed Books, 2002), 134.

¹³⁶ Shafqat, “From Official Islam to Islamism,” 137.

¹³⁷ “Asia, Kashmir’s Main Militant Groups,” *Jane’s Intelligence Review*, 1 August 1999, <http://www.janes.com>.

the war in Afghanistan were not perceived to be the threat they are today and it is unlikely that it was considered vital to the state of Pakistan to divert them to Kashmir.

In the end, the Afghan War did contribute to the growth of militancy in Pakistan, but the more important consequences of Pakistan's war in Afghanistan was that a powerful coalition formed that benefited from proxy war, an infrastructure to implement a proxy war strategy was developed, and the advantages of a proxy war strategy seemed apparent. The success of the insurgency in Afghanistan made the proxy war option highly attractive. Pakistan was essentially able to wage war against the Soviets without having to bear the brunt of a conventional war. Still, Pakistan's shift in strategy required major changes in the external environment.

3. Kashmir Rebellion

In addition to the internal changes in Pakistan, the event that was critical to Pakistan's strategy shift was the indigenous Kashmiri rebellion that engulfed the state in 1989 and 1990. Without the rebellion it is unlikely that Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir would have changed in any substantial way for three reasons. First of all, previous attempts to stir up dissatisfaction, particularly Operation GIBRALTAR, were received warily by Kashmiris. Without evidence that Kashmiris were dissatisfied with rule from New Delhi and willing to challenge it, a proxy war strategy had little chance of succeeding. Second, the group leading the resistance against New Delhi was the JKLF (formerly JK/NLF), which Pakistan had provided only limited support in its effort to maintain the struggle in Kashmir. The JKLF's pro-independence platform was considered a risk and Pakistan did not intend to allow the organization to lead the struggle.¹³⁸ Third, Pakistan was aware that the initiation of a proxy war strategy in Kashmir while receiving billions of dollars of U.S. aid was likely to irritate Washington. If the United States was forced to deal with Indian accusations that its aid dollars were supporting a proxy war in Kashmir, it could have presented problems for Pakistan's more immediate objectives in Afghanistan. But shortly after the outbreak of the Kashmir

¹³⁸ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 124. Also see, "Pakistan Wary of Planned Kashmiri Border March," *Christian Science Monitor*, 20 February 1992.

rebellion the U.S.-Pakistan relationship would take a turn for the worse and this would no longer be a constraint on Pakistan's strategy.

Pakistan's behavior indicates that an external catalyst was necessary to produce a shift in strategy. By the mid-1980s the support within the government and the capability to assist insurgency operations in Kashmir existed and although the U.S. aid was not supposed to be used there, enormous amounts of arms and money had leaked into Pakistani society and could easily have been diverted to Kashmir. Yet, even as late as the mid-1980s when the political situation in Kashmir began to deteriorate and "charges of Pakistani involvement were openly bandied about by Congress leaders ... there was no Pakistani hand visible in the valley at all."¹³⁹ Indeed, throughout the 1980s while the changes described in the previous section occurred within Pakistan, Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir remained unchanged. Zia's strategy, like Bhutto's, focused on maintaining Kashmir's disputed status while at the same time continuing the development of nuclear weapons. Zia even attempted to defuse tensions with India. In the early 1980s, he offered a no-war pact to India, as well as the establishment of a nuclear-free zone.¹⁴⁰ Though the proposals were nearly identical to offers once made by Nehru, the India government rebuffed them because they were perceived as propaganda ploys intended to improve Zia's image in the eyes of Washington. Zia's "peace offensive" launched in late 1985, was received with similar skepticism by India.¹⁴¹ In fact, when the Kashmir rebellion caught fire in 1989 "Pakistan seemed to be taken unaware" by the intensity of Kashmiri resistance and appeared to have no plans in place to take advantage of such a contingency.¹⁴²

4. U.S.-Pakistan Relations: From Partnership to Punishment

The drift in U.S-Pakistan relations began in the early 1960s when Pakistan sought a closer relationship with China and the Kennedy administration tried to mend relations with India. By 1965, the interests of the United States and Pakistan had diverged

¹³⁹ Quoted in Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict*, 132.

¹⁴⁰ W. Howard Wriggins, "Pakistan's Search for a Foreign Policy After the Invasion of Afghanistan," *Pacific Affairs* 57 (Summer 1984): 297.

¹⁴¹ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 196-97.

¹⁴² Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, 243.

sufficiently enough that the relationship languished. Nixon and Kissinger improved U.S.-Pakistan relations, but the fragility of the relationship was exposed during the late 1970s. From the U.S. perspective, Pakistan's pursuit of a nuclear weapons program was the most formidable obstacle in the way of improved relations. Leaders in Pakistan, however, never quite grasped the importance of the issue in the United States. On the other hand, the United States did not understand that Pakistan no longer considered U.S. security commitments as credible and was unwilling to sacrifice its nuclear program in exchange for unreliable and conditional U.S. economic and military assistance. These two irreconcilable perspectives were put aside when the immediate challenge of the Soviets in Afghanistan rose to the forefront of both nations' security concerns, but they would quickly resurface when the threat dissipated. The percolating tension over the nuclear issue would ultimately boil over in 1990 and, similar to events in the early 1960s, the disintegration of U.S.-Pakistan relations would correspond to a Pakistani decision to shift its strategy in Kashmir.

When the Reagan administration brought to the table a \$3 billion aid-package and an F-16 deal in 1981, the United States secured Pakistan's cooperation in the struggle against the Soviets in Afghanistan. There was broad political support in both the United States and Pakistan for the joint effort to dislodge the Soviets from Afghanistan. But despite the convergence of strategic interests, powerful individuals in the U.S. Congress continued to press the Reagan administration on Pakistan's suspected nuclear weapons program. In late 1984, concerns began to mount within the United States that Pakistan's nuclear weapons program was continuing unabated and the only thing the certification process mandated under the Symington Amendment did was prevent Pakistan from actually exploding a bomb. During the 1986 debate over the Reagan administration's proposal to secure another six year package for Pakistan worth \$4 billion, Senator John Glenn (D-Ohio), who had been an indefatigable advocate for the non-proliferation cause, proposed an amendment to the U.S. foreign assistance act that would require the president to certify that Pakistan was *not developing* a nuclear weapon in addition to *not possessing* one.¹⁴³

¹⁴³ Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000*, 277.

The Reagan administration offered an alternative proposal that would require the president to annually certify that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear weapon. The resultant Pressler Amendment seemed innocuous enough at the time since most U.S. assessments did not think that Pakistan was near a nuclear weapons capability. For the next three years, Reagan was able to certify to Congress that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear weapon. Nevertheless, the Reagan and Bush administrations grew increasingly concerned, continually warning Pakistan's leaders that if it became evident that Pakistan possessed a nuclear weapon the president's hands were tied—U.S aid would be halted and there was little the president could do. Despite the warnings however, Pakistan's leadership did not believe the Americans would actually implement sanctions and they continued with their nuclear development program.¹⁴⁴

In May 1990, George Bush's deputy national security advisor, Robert Gates, made a trip to South Asia. Gates informed his Pakistani hosts that the United States had come to the conclusion that Pakistan did in fact possess a nuclear weapon. Pakistan denied the charge.¹⁴⁵ In October 1990, President Bush was unable to certify that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear weapon and U.S. military aid to Pakistan was frozen. Economic assistance already designated for disbursement was allowed to flow, but when that aid ran out, U.S. assistance was finished.

Pakistan's response to the sanctions was characterized by disbelief, shock, and anger.¹⁴⁶ From Pakistan's perspective, the U.S. action was representative of the disloyalty typical of the United States. The fact that Pakistan had ignored U.S. warnings was irrelevant, Pakistan maintained, because the United States was aware throughout the 1980s that Pakistan had a nuclear weapon and had managed to find ways to avoid sanctions until the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan.

The serious setback in relations alone is unlikely to have caused Pakistan to launch a proxy war. If that were the case, then Pakistan would have embarked on a proxy war in 1978 after U.S. economic assistance was halted in accordance with the Symington amendment. On the other hand, the imposition of sanctions in the fall of 1990 eliminated

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 310.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 306-7.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, 310.

any constraints Pakistan may have felt because of its relationship with the United States. The U.S. abandonment of its relations with Pakistan, and the subsequent attempt by the Clinton administration to foster better relations with India after it began to reform its markets in 1991, was déjà vu for Pakistani leaders familiar with the deterioration of U.S.-Pakistan relations in the early 1960s. The bottom line was that U.S.-Pakistan relations took a U-turn and the decline of the U.S.-Pakistan partnership coincides with a another major shift in Pakistan's strategy.

C. PROXY WAR STRATEGY

Shortly after the rebellion began in Kashmir, Pakistan began to provide weapons, training, and assistance to insurgents infiltrating across the Line of Control into Indian-controlled Kashmir.¹⁴⁷ These activities were done in combination with efforts to use international fora to highlight the Kashmir issue. Pakistan's strategy had several objectives. First, to make it extremely difficult for India to dismiss Pakistan's claims to Kashmir. Second, to steadily erode India's will and force it back to the negotiating table, where Pakistan could negotiate a more favorable outcome. Third, at a minimum, to tie down Indian forces in Kashmir.¹⁴⁸ In addition, the proxy war strategy had the added advantage that it provided Pakistan with plausible deniability and made the possibility of Indian retaliation against Pakistan more problematic.

A full understanding of the scale of Pakistan's support to the insurgents is unknown due to Pakistan's refusal to officially acknowledge that it provides anything more than moral and political support. However, Robert Wirsing concluded in his 1994 assessment of the conflict that "the infiltration has been *necessarily* a Pakistan-directed operation," and, "it most certainly has *not* been, as Pakistani civil and military officials continue to claim, a largely spontaneous affair (*italics in original*)."¹⁴⁹ The United States government acknowledged at least tacit support on the part of the Pakistani government in the 2000 State Department annual report on terrorism, *Patterns of Global*

¹⁴⁷ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 119.

¹⁴⁸ Ashley J. Tellis, "The Changing Political-Military Environment: South Asia," in *The United States and Asia: Toward a New U.S. Strategy and Force Posture*, MR-1315-AF (Santa Monica: RAND, 2001), 223.

¹⁴⁹ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 121.

Terrorism.¹⁵⁰ The report stated that the Musharraf government “continued previous Pakistani Government support of the Kashmir insurgency, and Kashmiri militant groups continued to operate in Pakistan, raising funds and recruiting new cadre. Several of these groups were responsible for attacks against civilians in Indian-held Kashmir.” The report noted that the Harakat ul-Mujahedin (HUM), a group designated by the United States as a foreign terrorist organization, “continues to be active in Pakistan without discouragement of the Government of Pakistan.” Beyond merely tacit support, a September 2001 RAND article concluded that Pakistan’s assistance included training and logistical, financial, and doctrinal support to the insurgents.¹⁵¹ The article found that there were at least 91 training camps where training provided by the Pakistan military included such topics as weapons handling, demolitions, urban sabotage, and escape and evasion techniques. According to the article, the Indian Research and Analysis Wing estimated the annual financial support provided to the militants in the range of \$125—250 million a year. The result of Pakistan’s official support was to “dramatically heightened the firepower and overall proficiency of the militants on the ground.”¹⁵² In terms of the actual infiltration of the militants across the LoC, Pakistan’s had at least some role. According to Brigadier Sayed Hassan Abbas Rizvi, a Pakistani army officer interviewed in 1990, “If my troops see these poor chaps (Kashmiri militants crossing to Pakistan) being butchered in front of us. I do not try to stop them from firing.”¹⁵³

The proxy war in Kashmir continued throughout the 1990s and appeared to achieve its desired effect. India’s efforts to cope with the insurgency frequently resulted in the excessive use of force and human rights abuses that provided Pakistan’s diplomats further evidence to buttress Pakistan’s claims at international fora. Moreover, the proxy war strategy cost India lives and treasure. In its efforts to battle the insurgency India was forced to increase the number of Border Security Forces ten-fold between 1989 and 1993. By mid-1993, the number of Indian army and paramilitary troops was estimated to be

¹⁵⁰ Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism, 2000*, 30 April 2001, <http://www.state.gov>.

¹⁵¹ Peter Chalk, “Pakistan’s Role in the Kashmir Insurgency,” RAND, 1 September 2001, <http://www.rand.org/commentary/090101JIR.html>.

¹⁵² Peter Chalk, “Pakistan’s Role in the Kashmir Insurgency.”

¹⁵³ Quoted in “Pakistan Keeps Firm Control of Young Kashmiri Militants,” *Christian Science Monitor*, 5 December 1990, 8.

between 300,000 and 400,000.¹⁵⁴ Most importantly for Pakistan, it made India's claims that Kashmir was not an issue appear incongruent with reality.

Although Pakistan's strategy appeared to be working as planned, it had several important consequences for Pakistan's institutions, its decision-making, and the nature of the dispute. The following section addresses these consequences. Additionally, it looks at the role of militancy in Pakistan's proxy war.

1. The Consequences of the Proxy War Strategy

Pakistan's proxy war strategy gave the ISI and the Pakistani military significantly more influence in the government's decision-making process, particularly with respect to Kashmir and Afghanistan. The clandestine nature of the strategy resulted in a large number of decisions made by a small segment of Pakistan's government. ISI's near monopoly of information provided it with additional leverage over decision-makers because they supplied the information that shaped the decision-making debate.¹⁵⁵

The political disarray that characterized Pakistani politics after Zia's death also contributed to the military's autonomy in Kashmir. Under Zia's regime the position of prime minister was emasculated. Pakistan's Eighth Amendment gave the president the authority to dismiss the prime minister, and the power was used liberally by Presidents Ghulam Ishaq Khan and Farooq Leghari. Ishaq Khan, who served as president from 1988 to 1993, dismissed Bhutto two years into her first term and then sacked her successor, Nawaz Sharif, two and a half years after he replaced Bhutto. Farooq Leghari, Bhutto's hand-picked choice for president and president from 1993 until 1998, turned on Bhutto in 1996 and dumped her three years into her second stint. The weakness of the prime minister reinforced the institutional imbalances in Pakistan's political system that, as discussed in Chapter II, have been present in Pakistan since its independence. It also contributed to the attitude amongst the military that Pakistan's national security affairs could not be left in the hands of the politicians. As a result of the proxy war strategy and Pakistan's internal political disorder, the civilian leadership became heavily dependent on

¹⁵⁴ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 146.

¹⁵⁵ Blom, "The Multi-Vocal State," 289.

the military and the ISI for information and advice. This arrangement essentially allowed the military and ISI to conduct Pakistan's affairs in Afghanistan and Kashmir almost independently.¹⁵⁶

Nevertheless, Pakistan's proxy war strategy was not a rogue operation. Benazir Bhutto's declared that Pakistan would fight "a 1,000 year war" against India in Kashmir and her trip to Muzaffarabad in February 1990 and her subsequent announcement that Kashmir's only option was accession to Pakistan indicate that the prime minister not only supported the effort she was involved in the decision-making process.¹⁵⁷ Her decision to shift Pakistani support to the Taliban in 1994 demonstrates that in addition to being aware of Pakistan's clandestine activities she possessed the ability to alter and redirect a particular strategy.

A second consequence of a proxy war strategy coordinated with Islamists and militants is that it began to impact the rhetoric Pakistan used to defend its claims to Kashmir. From its beginnings Pakistan justified its struggle in Kashmir in terms of self-determination and national liberation, but the role of the Islamists and the militants in the last decade caused many to talk in terms of a jihad in Kashmir.¹⁵⁸ In a dynamic similar to the war in Afghanistan, the use of Islamist language benefitted the Islamist organizations in Pakistan and may make it more difficult for Pakistan's leaders to be pragmatic in the Kashmir dispute.

2. The Role of Militancy in Pakistan's Strategy

Although militancy and the Islamists' influence on society and government grew during the 1980s, Pakistan's swift decision to aid the insurgency in Kashmir was not because Pakistan's leaders had been infected with militancy or were concerned with an Islamic militant backlash. The decision to support the insurgency was based on broad support across the political spectrum that included not only Islamist organization and the

¹⁵⁶ Ian Talbot, "Does the Army Shape Pakistan's Foreign Policy," in *Nationalism Without a Nation?*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot (New York: Zed Books, 2002), 324.

¹⁵⁷ Quoted in "Indian, Pakistani Papers Fan Flames of Crisis in Kashmir," *Christian Science Monitor*, 26 June 1990, 5. Also see Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 123.

¹⁵⁸ Yoginder Sikand, "The Changing Course of the Kashmiri Struggle: From National Liberation to Islamist Jihad," *Muslim World* 91 (Spring 2001): 229-257. Also, see Jeffrey Goldberg, "The Education of a Holy Warrior," *New York Times Magazine*, 25 June 2000, 37.

military, but also Western-educated politicians, such as Benazir Bhutto. In fact, when Bhutto was re-elected to her second term in October 1993, the Islamist parties combined to win only six of the two hundred and seven National Assembly seats and were said to be on the decline.¹⁵⁹ Also, as discussed above, Pakistan's support for the insurgency began prior to the influx of militants returning from Afghanistan.

Pakistan realized the Kashmiri rebellion presented a major opportunity to press its claims to Kashmir and quickly made the decision to support the insurgency. Still, Pakistan sought ways to control the direction of the insurgency, even if that meant cracking down on pro-independence Kashmir forces. Because Pakistan intended to control the direction of the insurgency and any eventual outcome, non-Kashmiri militant organizations with roots in Afghanistan would come to play a major role in the strategy.

Pakistan acted quickly to squelch talk of Kashmiri independence because it realized that a free and independent Kashmir could cost them Azad Kashmir as well as the Northern Areas. In February 1990 after a trip to Muzaffarabad, a town in Azad Kashmir where many of the Kashmiri groups are headquartered, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto made Pakistan's position clear when she announced at a press conference that Kashmir's only option was accession to Pakistan.¹⁶⁰ Then, in 1991 and 1992, the Pakistani government clashed with the JKLF over the organization's attempts to march across the LoC. In the 1992 incident, the organization's refusal to heed Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's order to desist resulted in at least twelve deaths when Pakistani government forces fired onto the marchers.¹⁶¹

The collapse of the Najibullah government in Afghanistan changed the face of the Kashmir conflict because it allowed Pakistan to shift its support away from the JKLF and to militant groups that had established relationships with the ISI. The end of the jihad against the communist in Afghanistan freed up significant resources and personnel that were then redirected to Kashmir. In 1993, Lashkar-e-Toiba, a fiercely militant group with roots in Afghanistan and a reputation for ruthlessness, emerged in Kashmir.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ Praful Bidwai, "Betting on Bhutto," *New Statesman*, 29 October 1993, 16.

¹⁶⁰ Wirsing, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, 123.

¹⁶¹ "Kashmir: Khan's Victory," *Economist*, 15 February 1992, 36.

¹⁶² Schofield, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, 272.

Like the Hizbul Mujahedin (HM), the LeT is dominated by non-Kashmiris and was pro-Pakistan. By the end of 1993, the Kashmir insurgency was dominated by pro-Pakistan organizations that were composed predominantly of militants from Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Arab states.¹⁶³ The Pakistani government believed that the influx of these groups into the Kashmir conflict would give it greater control over the direction of the insurgency.

D. KARGIL AND THE POST-11 SEPTEMBER ENVIRONMENT

Although the proxy war strategy served a number of Pakistani interests, the Kashmiri insurgency began to wane in the late 1990s. Pakistan's decision to depend on non-Kashmiri militants caused Kashmiri support for the insurgency to erode because the militants managed to alienate many Kashmiris with their ruthlessness. Meanwhile, India's more aggressive counter-insurgency tactics began to produce results.¹⁶⁴ In early 1999, Pakistan designed an operation that was expected to re-energize the insurgency. This section discusses that operation and its consequences, in addition to the impact of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks.

1. Kargil

In May 1999, India discovered that a large number of intruders had infiltrated across the LoC in the Kargil region of Kashmir and had ensconced themselves into highly defensible positions that allowed them to directly target the road from Srinagar to Leh. The road was significant because it was the only land route which the Indians could use to re-supply its troops at the Siachen Glacier where a low-intensity battle had smoldered between India and Pakistan since 1984. Once India's leaders came to a full understanding of the size of the intrusion and its tactical significance, India set out to retake the nearly 40 square miles of land that had been occupied. After adjusting to initial setbacks and revising their tactics, Indian forces were able to combine the use of air and artillery to enable its troops to retake two key positions. With the tide of the

¹⁶³ "Harakat-ul-Mujahideen," *Jane's World Insurgency and Terrorism* 19, <http://www.janes.com>

¹⁶⁴ Sumit Ganguly, "The Islamic Dimensions of the Kashmir Insurgency," in *Pakistan: Nationalism without a Nation?*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot (New York: Zed Books, 2002), 189.

battle turning, Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif sought relief in Washington. Instead, he was pressured by President Bill Clinton to order a complete withdrawal. Sharif complied and ordered a withdrawal of the "mujahedin" on 12 July.

In the wake of Pakistan's excursion into the Kargil region of Kashmir in 1999, a number of observers began to question the decision-making of Pakistan's leadership.¹⁶⁵ While tactically sound, the timing of the operation appeared incoherent. Less than a year earlier, Pakistan and India had both tested nuclear weapons for the first time. Plus, in an effort to demonstrate to the world that South Asians could be responsible nuclear powers the two nations had opened a dialogue, and in February 1999 they had celebrated the opening of the bus route that went from Lahore to Amritsar. Although mostly symbolic, the event was intended to be a confidence building measure that would ease tensions between the two nations. The Kargil operation derailed the rapprochement and raised the possibility that Pakistan was so obsessed with Kashmir that it was willing to trigger a war that could ultimately end with a nuclear exchange.

The Kargil operation was not irrational or the product of an over zealous rogue agency. In fact, the operation can be seen as an extension of Pakistan's proxy war strategy. Since the insurgency had lost momentum and in light of its numerous benefits, Pakistan sought a way to re-energize it.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, Pakistani strategist believed India's escalation advantage had been negated. Two reasons have been proffered for this assessment. First, the introduction of nuclear weapons led Pakistani strategist to conclude that India would not expand a conflict in Kashmir because it ran the risk of instigating a nuclear war.¹⁶⁷ Second, Pakistan believed India would not conduct a full-scale war against Pakistan because it could not guarantee victory and a stalemate would be a victory for Pakistan.¹⁶⁸ Whatever the reason, Pakistan's strategist assessed the conflict would be relatively constrained. Another factor that contributed to the decision to undertake the Kargil operation was that Pakistan saw the operation in the context of

¹⁶⁵ See Blom, "The Multi-Vocal State," 285-87.

¹⁶⁶ Ganguly, *Conflict Unending*, 121-22.

¹⁶⁷ Ashley J. Tellis, C. Christine Fair, and Jamison Jo Medby, *Limited Conflict Under the Nuclear Umbrella: Indian and Pakistani Lessons from the Kargil Crisis*, MR-1450-USCA (Santa Monica: RAND, 2001), 48-49.

¹⁶⁸ Shaukat Qadir, "An Analysis of the Kargil Conflict 1999," *RUSI Journal* (April 2002): 24.

the on-going India-Pakistan yearly competition to occupy territory along the LoC.¹⁶⁹ The Indian army's occupation of the Siachen glacier is the most blatant example of this activity. But other exchanges of territory and positions had occurred frequently over the previous two decades. The fourth factor contributing to the Kargil operation is that years of military autonomy in Kashmir created a situation in which neither its activities nor its judgments were subject to a sufficient amount of scrutiny by other Pakistani agencies.¹⁷⁰

2. Kargil's Lessons

Pakistan's forced retreat from the heights of Kargil was an embarrassment for its military. Nevertheless, a RAND study published in 2001 concluded that, despite the criticism of the operation, it is likely that Pakistan still believed that violence remained the best strategy to pressure India on Kashmir. At the same time, the results of the Kargil operation "probably caused the Pakistani leadership to conclude that Kargil-like operations are not legitimate in the current international environment."¹⁷¹ The reasons for this are two-fold. First, Pakistan's leaders still value their international reputation. Additionally, Pakistan understands that international, and particularly U.S., condemnation will entail severe economic and political consequences.¹⁷² Second, India's willingness to escalate the conflict, especially the extensive use of air power, demonstrated that nuclear weapons were not necessarily the firewall against a wider war that Pakistani decision-makers had anticipated.¹⁷³

The response of India and the world, especially the United States, to the Kargil operation clarified the boundaries on Pakistan's strategy. In response to these conclusion, Pakistan's re-calibrated its strategy but continued to support the proxy war.

¹⁶⁹ Feroz Khan, "The Independence-Dependence Paradox," 17.

¹⁷⁰ Most accounts of the Kargil operations concede that the operation was conceived by the military leadership and presented to Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in vague generalizations and its political implications were not completely thought out. See, Qadir, "An Analysis of the Kargil Conflict 1999," 24, and Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*, 87-108.

¹⁷¹ Tellis, Fair, and Medby, *Limited Conflict Under the Nuclear Umbrella* ix.

¹⁷² *Ibid*, xi.

¹⁷³ *Ibid*, xi.

3. The Impact of Post-11 September Changes

The terrorist attacks on the United States altered the geopolitical environment in South Asia. Three developments in particular have already impacted Pakistan's strategy in Kashmir. First, Pakistan came to the realization that the use of militant proxies runs the risk of jeopardizing higher priority national security interests. Second, the U.S. declaration that regimes that harbor terrorists will be held responsible created an opportunity for India to try and halt Pakistan's proxy war with the threat of escalation. Third, the renewal of the U.S.-Pakistan partnership provides Pakistan with incentives to restrain its strategy in Kashmir in exchange for the assistance and leverage the United States can provide it.

One major geopolitical consequence of the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon was President Bush's declaration on the evening of 11 September 2001 that the United States "will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them."¹⁷⁴ Taliban intransigence in the face of Pakistan's request for it to comply with the U.S. ultimatum to turn over Osama bin Laden demonstrated the limits of Pakistan's influence over its once-client. When the Taliban ignored Musharraf's advice "to be wise," he made it clear that Pakistan would not be sacrificed because of "stupidity." In President Musharraf's nationally televised speech on 19 September 2001, in which he explained his decision to support the U.S. operation he stated that Pakistan's "critical concerns are our sovereignty, second our economy, third our strategic assets (nuclear and missiles), and forth our Kashmir cause."¹⁷⁵ Musharraf's elucidation of Pakistan's core interests made it clear that Pakistan's proxies would not be allowed to jeopardize these core interests.

The U.S. decision to hold regimes that harbor terrorists accountable for the actions of those terrorists presented a dilemma for Pakistan's proxy war strategy in Kashmir. Despite its agreement to assist the United States in its war in Afghanistan, Pakistan planned to continue its proxy war in Kashmir. It realized the precariousness of its position, though. According to a source cited in a Department of Defense cable sent

¹⁷⁴ President George W. Bush, *Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation*, 11 September 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/print/20010911-16.html>.

¹⁷⁵ Quotations in this paragraph are from "Highlights of General Pervez Musharraf's Address to the Nation," 19 September 2001, *Dawn*, <http://dawn.com/events/speech/20010919>.

on 2 October 2001, “Pakistani leaders are concerned that the U.S. will agree to India’s demands that Kashmir be treated as a global terrorism problem.” The source continued, “Indian leaders are now feeling politically and military strong. They are likely to exploit the situation by actively lobbying the international community over Kashmir. [...] Pakistani leaders also expect that India might take some military action in Kashmir during the current crisis.”¹⁷⁶ This concern caused Pakistani leaders to stress that the insurgents fighting in Kashmir were “freedom fighters” and not terrorists.

Musharraf’s inclusion of the “Kashmir cause” as a core concern indicated that Pakistan was not willing to abandon its policy on Kashmir. Nevertheless, aware of the volatility of the situation, Pakistan wanted to at least temporarily lower the profile of the insurgents activities in the hopes that it could continue its strategy after the charged atmosphere eased. One militant group leader claimed, “All [the Pakistani authorities] told us to do was move our visible means of operation out of the spotlight.”¹⁷⁷ Lashkar-e-Toiba reportedly moved its offices out of Islamabad and took down its signs but continued to train its fighters there.¹⁷⁸ As events unfolded in South Asia it became increasingly challenging for Pakistan to maintain the notion that the insurgents in Kashmir were freedom fighters and as a result its decade-old strategy came under pressure.

Militants claiming to be fighting for Kashmir forced Pakistan to determine how much it was willing to put its sovereignty, economy, and strategic assets at risk to maintain the strategy it had used to pursue its “Kashmir cause.” Less than two weeks after Musharraf’s speech to the nation on 19 September, militants assaulted the Jammu and Kashmir state assembly in Srinagar and left at least 27 people dead. Then, on 13 December 2001, five terrorists assaulted the Indian parliament in New Delhi and killed nine security personnel. India reacted to the attack on its Parliament by recalling its High Commissioner of India to Pakistan, terminating air links, halting the bus service between Lahore and New Delhi, and mobilizing its military for war. India also sent Deputy Prime

¹⁷⁶ Department of Defense, *Cable [Title Excised]*, 2 October 2001, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB97/tal31.pdf>.

¹⁷⁷ Douglas Frantz and Todd Purdum, “Pakistan Faces Increased U.S. Pressure to Curb Militants,” *New York Times*, 16 December 2001, A26.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

Minister L.K. Advani to Washington to convince the United States that the Kashmir insurgency should be considered part of the war on terror. He met with President Bush and U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell and his message appeared to be get through to the United States. At brief press conference, Powell stated that in addition to the Musharraf's arrest of the leaders of the organizations India held responsible for the attack, "There is room for additional work on his part."¹⁷⁹ What exactly the United States discussed with Musharraf is unclear, but a report from the U.S. Congressional Research Service concluded, "The United States communicated to Pakistan that it would have to rein in Islamic extremist groups within its borders."¹⁸⁰

India's threat of war resulted in an intensification of pressure from the United States on Pakistan to not only end its support of the militants but to crack down on them.¹⁸¹ By designating the LeT and JeM foreign terrorist organizations, the United States made the continuation of Pakistan's support for the organization equivalent to supporting terrorism. Understanding the repercussions of being labeled a state-sponsor of terrorism and having already broken the two-decade alliance with the Islamists when he abandoned the Taliban, President Musharraf began to prepare his country for a shift in strategy. On 12 January 2002, Musharraf told the Pakistani people:

Kashmir runs in our blood. No Pakistani can afford to sever links with Kashmir. The entire Pakistan and the world knows this. We will continue to extend our moral, political and diplomatic support to Kashmiris. We will never budge an inch from our principle stand on Kashmir. [...] No organization will be allowed to indulge in terrorism in the name of Kashmir. [...] Let there be no attempt of crossing the border in any sector as it will be met with full force. Do not entertain any illusions on this count.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ Embassy of India to the United States, "Press Statement by Mr. L.K. Advani and U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Colin Powell after their Meeting at the U.S. State Department," 9 January 2002, http://www.indianembassy.org/indusrel/2002/advani/advani_2002.htm.

¹⁸⁰ Congressional Research Service, "Pakistan-U.S. Relations," 10 March 2002, *CRS Issue Brief for Congress*, Order Code IB94041, <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/9057.pdf>.

¹⁸¹ John Burns, "Uneasy Ally in Terror War Suddenly Feels More U.S. Pressure," *New York Times*, 16 December 2001, B3.

¹⁸² "Text of President Musharraf's Address to the Nation," 12 January 2002, *Dawn*, <http://www.dawn.com/2002/01/12/speech020112.htm>.

Changes in the external environment made the continuation of a proxy war strategy too costly for Pakistan. Nevertheless, Musharraf made it clear that Pakistan would not abandon its policy on Kashmir. Musharraf repeated the Pakistani mantra that the Kashmir problem must be resolved “in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri people and the United Nations resolutions.”¹⁸³

When the terrorist attack in Jammu put India and Pakistan on the brink of war for the second time in May of that year, the pressure on Pakistan was intensified. A flurry of diplomatic activity by the United States was able to get India to back down from its threats of “decisive war.” “Key to the effort,” claims the CRS, “were promises by Pakistani President Musharraf to U.S. Deputy Secretary of State [Richard] Armitage that all infiltration of militants across the LOC would be halted.”¹⁸⁴ Musharraf’s pledge to Armitage ignited a storm of protest from militants and their supports. Sayed Salahuddin, head of the United Jihad Council, a militant umbrella organization, declared, “We are not bound to accept the decision Pakistan has made under international pressure.”¹⁸⁵ Protestors in Muzzaffarabad shouted, “Death to Musharraf,” and “We will not allow a weak ruler to sell out Kashmir.”¹⁸⁶

India’s response to the developments was cautious, but only two weeks after Armitage informed India of Musharraf’s pledge Vajpayee stated that if Pakistan ended terrorism from its soil, “India will be ready to have talks with Pakistan on all issues, including Jammu and Kashmir.”¹⁸⁷ Continuing on the path toward dialogue and peace will depend on U.S. and Indian policies that reinforce Musharraf’s decision and provide him with the political capital to maintain this shift in the face of resistance.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Congressional Research Service, “Pakistan: Chronology of Events,” 3 November 2003, *CRS Report for Congress*, Order Code RS21584, <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/26049.pdf>.

¹⁸⁵ “Pakistan’s Crackdown Draws Fire,” *Wall Street Journal*, 14 June 2002, A9.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ “Vajpayee: Keep Your Promise,” *Washington Post*, 23 June 2002, B1.

E. CONCLUSION

The proxy war in Kashmir has resulted in an estimated 40,000 deaths, more than all of the wars waged between India and Pakistan combined.¹⁸⁸ Pakistan's motivations are important because they reveal what can be done to stop it. The evidence presented above is encouraging because it shows that although militants have played a role in the insurgency, militancy does not drive Pakistan's strategy. In fact, political calculations typical within any government led to the military-Islamist coalition and the Pakistani government's assessment that a proxy war would be an effective strategy. The proxy war was not a rogue operation and had broad political support. Moreover, it must be remembered that in the early 1990s attitudes toward proxy war and the mujahedin were far different. They were simply not considered the threat that they are today. This applies to the United States as well, which had just finished its proxy war in Afghanistan in coordination with Pakistan.

The importance of external factors in Pakistan's shift in strategy should not be underestimated. Without the indigenous Kashmir rebellion, it would have been highly unlikely that Pakistan would have initiated a proxy war in Kashmir. Pakistan's shift required an event that could provide it with some reason to believe it could change the situation in Kashmir. Though deteriorating U.S.-Pakistan relations did not directly cause Pakistan to shift its strategy, they greatly reduced U.S. influence on Pakistan's decision-making. When the Clinton Administration warned that Pakistan could be placed on the official list of states that support terrorism, Pakistan's response was to simply reduce the most obvious indications that Pakistan was conducting a proxy war. The strategy continued but was "privatized." Direct government support was lessened and Pakistan channeled its support indirectly through retired military personnel and Islamist parties.¹⁸⁹

The Pakistani operation in Kargil in 1999 is best understood as a part of the overall proxy war strategy and was an attempt to re-energize the insurgency that it believed had effectively advanced its objectives in Kashmir. Although Pakistan may have misunderstood the significance of nuclear weapons, the Kargil operation was not

¹⁸⁸ "Terrorism Killed More In J&K Than Three Indo-Pak War," *Express India*, 22 February 2004, <http://www.expressindia.com/fullstory.php?newsid=6173>.

¹⁸⁹ Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000*, 322.

intended to set off the crisis that it subsequently did. Kargil did reveal some significant problems with Pakistan's decision-making processes but what is often overlooked is Pakistan's decision to retreat from the area as a result of U.S. pressure and India's reaction to the incursion. Even though Nawaz Sharif's decision was unpopular in some quarters, it was swiftly implemented and General Musharraf did not mention the Sharif's decision as a reason for his dismissal.

Finally, though militancy has risen in Pakistan during the last two decades, it does not drive Pakistan's strategy. Despite the military-Islamist alliance that had developed over two decades, the two groups have maintained vastly different concepts of Pakistan's vital interests. Musharraf's elucidation of Pakistan's "critical concerns" indicate that the military continues to see Pakistan's interest through modern concepts of national interest. The Islamists' fundamentalist interpretation of Islam see Pakistan's interest in terms of its duty to wage jihad against infidels and the complete Islamization of Pakistan. Musharraf's decision to support the U.S. in Afghanistan signifies the break in the military-Islamists alliance. This fracture means that the constituency that supported proxy war is no longer a coherent block and lessens the internal pressures to wage proxy war.

Pakistan strategy in Kashmir is driven by political calculations about what is possible and what is effective. External factors, particularly the United States, have played a critical role in defining for Pakistan what exactly are possible and effective strategies. With at least some degree of support from the United States, India has attempted to raise the cost of maintaining the proxy war strategy. In conjunction with a renewed partnership with the United States, the increased cost of maintaining a proxy war appears to have convinced Pakistan that another strategy is necessary to pursue its policy in Kashmir.

V. CONCLUSION

A. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. response to the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks was seized by India as the opportunity to press its case that the insurgency in Kashmir should be included as part of the global war against terrorism and therefore deserving of the same responses the United States is applying in its war against terrorism. The attack against the Indian Parliament in December 2001 provided India the opportunity to press its case. It mobilized its military and declared that it was prepared to attack terrorism at its source—Pakistan. The ensuing crisis sent the United States scrambling to avert war between the two nuclear neighbors in early 2002. In May that year, a terrorist attack in Jammu put the two nations on the brink of war for the second time. And again, the United States launched a high-intensity diplomatic effort to get the two countries to back down. Fortunately, U.S. efforts were successful and the tensions have cooled considerably since. In fact, the following April, Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee responded to President Musharraf's commitment to halt all cross border terrorism by offering "a hand of friendship" to Pakistan. In February 2004, the two nations began a process of bilateral "composite discussions" that has many observers uncharacteristically sanguine about the relationship's prospects. The problem is that Pakistan and India have been here before and yet the Kashmir dispute remains. Is this time different? The findings of this thesis are cautiously optimistic.

B. FINDINGS

The continuation of the domestic phenomenon driving Pakistan's Kashmir policy indicate that it is unlikely Pakistan will substantially alter its claims to Kashmir in the near-term. Although Musharraf has stated that he is willing to meet India "halfway" and put aside the U.N. Security Council Resolutions,¹⁹⁰ that should not be interpreted as tacit acceptance of the LoC as the border. Pakistan's claim to Kashmir has survived fifty years, two failed military operations, civilian and military governments, economic and

¹⁹⁰ "Pakistan Ready to Meet India Halfway on Kashmir," *Reuters*, 18 December 2003, <http://www.reuter.com/printerFriendlyPopup.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=4011964>.

military sanctions, and the threat of nuclear weapons. Even when the threat of war loomed in January 2002, President Pervez Musharraf stated in unequivocal terms Pakistan's policy on Kashmir:

Kashmir runs in our blood. No Pakistani can afford to sever links with Kashmir. The entire world knows this. We will continue to extend our moral, political and diplomatic support to Kashmiris. We will never budge an inch from our principle stand on Kashmir. The Kashmir problem needs to be resolved by dialogue and peaceful means in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri people and the United Nations resolutions. We have to find the solution to this dispute.¹⁹¹

The psychological and political underpinnings that caused Pakistan to seek Kashmir's accession at independence still exist. Ethnic cleavages continue to be a divisive issue, institutions remain weak, and the last fifty years have mostly reinforced Pakistan's beliefs about India's hegemonic intentions. The resilience of Pakistan's policy demonstrates that changes in the external environment, even military defeat, did little to change this policy. Even though he acknowledges the need for flexibility, Musharraf continues to stress that "Kashmir and strategic assets are our national interests and we will not give them up [...] There is no sell-out, I have said a hundred times, I am not a man to sell out."¹⁹²

In contrast to Pakistan's policy, its strategy has responded to external stimuli. Pakistan has used diplomacy, war, and proxy war to pursue its claim to Kashmir. Each strategy was the product of both internal and external constraints or opportunities and were selected because they were considered to be the most effective way to pursue Pakistan's objectives. India's conventional military advantage, its willingness to discuss Kashmir, and Pakistan's reliance on the United States during the 1950s led it to use diplomacy until 1965 when each of these constraining factors had diminished. Pakistan's realization after 1971 that India held the upper hand in a conventional military conflict resulted in a shift back to diplomatic efforts that primarily focused on maintaining Kashmir's designation as disputed territory. The shift to a proxy war strategy was possible because a constituency had developed in Pakistan that supported insurgency and

¹⁹¹ "Text of President Musharraf's Address to the Nation," *Dawn*, 12 January 2002, <http://www.dawn.com/2002/01/12/speech02112.htm>.

¹⁹² Quoted in "Musharraf Says No Sell-out on Kashmir," *Dawn*, 20 January 2004, <http://www.dawn.com/2004/01/20/toph4.htm>.

the eruption of the Kashmiri rebellion gave Pakistan reason to believe that it would be effective. The analysis in this thesis indicates that if Pakistan assesses the strategy is no longer effective, it can be discarded.

The United States has played a key role in Pakistan's strategy shifts. Pakistan's decision to go to war in 1965 was heavily influenced by its perception that the United States had shifted its allegiances to India in the 1960s. This shift, Pakistan believed, would strengthen India thus allowing it to disregard Pakistan's claims to Kashmir. Additionally, the 1950s and the 1980s are the periods of time in which the U.S.-Pakistan relationship were the most cooperative and are the same periods that Pakistan's leaders most actively used diplomacy to seek a resolution to the Kashmir dispute. Although it is difficult to know exactly how much U.S. sanctions influenced Pakistan's decision to launch its proxy war, its importance should not be discounted.

Despite the rise in militancy in Pakistan during the last two decades, Pakistan's leaders remain committed to the modernization and development of Pakistan. Pakistan's military, which has throughout Pakistan's history played a disproportionate role in Pakistan's affairs, continues to be a major force for modernization and economic development and it is particularly committed to a strong relationship with the United States. The Pakistan army may not be the secular, aloof, "British Generation" of its early decades,¹⁹³ but as an institution it continues to value Pakistan's international reputation and seeks to modernize Pakistan. In General Musharraf's speech on 17 October 1999, in which he attempted to explain his reasons for removing Prime Minister Sharif and also ease the concerns of the international community, he asked rhetorically, "In sum, we have lost our honor, our dignity, our respect in the comity of nations. Is this the democracy our Quaid-i-Azam [Jinnah] had envisaged?" He stressed throughout the speech, "Revival of our economy is critical." As for Pakistan's relationship with the United States, Musharraf stated, "We attach the highest importance to our friendly relations with all major powers, especially the United States."¹⁹⁴

¹⁹³ Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, 55.

¹⁹⁴ "General Pervez Musharraf's Address to the Nation," *Federation of American Scientists*, 17 October 1999, http://www.fas.org/news/pakistan/1999/991017-mushraf_speech.htm.

C. IMPLICATIONS

The manner in which Kashmir's accession was obtained, the belief that India's control over Kashmir was intended to weaken Pakistan so that it could not survive, and India's invasion of East Pakistan have all reinforced Pakistan's mistrust of India. If those are the underlying reasons for Pakistan's policy, then changing it will require, at a minimum, a change in Pakistani beliefs about India and a change in Pakistanis understanding of what Kashmir means to their nation. These are changes that will require years, and if Pakistan continues to support a proxy war they are changes that will not come. Therefore, the first task should be to focus on ending the proxy war.

President Musharraf indicated in his first major address to the nation after assuming power in October 1999 that he saw the rise of militant Islam as a threat to Pakistan. He stated, "Islam teaches tolerance, not hatred, universal brotherhood and not enmity, peace not violence, progress not bigotry." He also urged the ulema "to curb elements which are exploiting religion for vested interests and bringing bad name to our faith."¹⁹⁵ When he pitched his plan to rehabilitate Pakistan's reputation and economy by eliminating militancy and violence to an annual conference of Pakistan's top clerics in June 2001, he informed them that the world "looks upon us as terrorists." He explained, "We have been killing each other, and now we want to spread violence and terror abroad. Naturally, the world regards us as terrorists."¹⁹⁶ In August that year, the Pakistani government made its first strike against militant Islamist organizations when it banned the Lashkar-e-Jhangvi and Sipah-e-Muhammad. The events of 11 September 2001 appear to have accelerated Musharraf's plan to rein in the Islamist organizations, however, until that point there was no discussion of changing strategies in Kashmir. India's bid to utilize the atmosphere created by the U.S. war on terror forced Pakistan to re-assess the costs and benefits of maintaining its proxy war strategy.

Prior to the crisis in January 2002, Pakistan realized the rising violence, weapons smuggling, and growing militancy posed a threat to the nation. Sartaj Aziz, a former Pakistani foreign and finance minister, observed, "For every ten [militants] who are

¹⁹⁵ "General Pervez Musharraf's Address to the Nation," *Federation of American Scientists*, 17 October 1999, http://www.fas.org/news/pakistan/1999/991017-mushraf_speech.htm.

¹⁹⁶ Quoted in Burns, "Pakistan is Said to Order an End to Support for Militant Groups," A1.

trained here to fight in Kashmir, one goes and the rest stay in Pakistan to cause trouble.”¹⁹⁷ But the assault on India’s Parliament demonstrated that unpredictable militants proxies presented a greater risk to Pakistan beyond the danger of fomenting internal instability. The proxy war strategy was useful because it was a weapon that Pakistan believed it controlled. The Taliban’s obstinacy in the face of U.S. demands and the series of militant attacks against India indicated that any Pakistani notion of control was illusory. In late 2001, Retired Pakistani Lieutenant General Talat Masood acknowledged that Pakistan was going to have to make adjustments in its Kashmir strategy: “Thanks to the U.S. antiterrorism campaign, the mujahideen fighting in Kashmir will have to be reined in. The state has to have a monopoly of armed force. Above all, our possession of nuclear weapons makes this essential, because there is internal instability here, there will be attempts at intense international scrutiny of us.”¹⁹⁸

Musharraf’s decision to rein in the proxy war won him the enmity of the militants and their supporters. Retired Lieutenant General Hamid Gul, the former head of ISI, criticized Musharraf for “only echoing India’s position” by calling those who attacked India’s Parliament terrorists during his 12 January 2002 speech.¹⁹⁹ Since the speech, rumors have swirled about Musharraf’s ability to withstand the militant backlash. However, he has endured the criticism of the Islamist organizations as well as two failed assassination attempts in December 2003. Moreover, despite speculation, there has been no evidence that the military brass is opposed to the shift and is plotting a coup to unseat Musharraf.

Throughout his tenure, Musharraf’s administration has continued to focus on the rehabilitation of Pakistan’s reputation, its economy, and its relationship with the United States. His score on the economy has been positive and his decision to abandon the Taliban in the face of U.S. pressure restored Pakistan’s status as a U.S. ally. It has been more difficult for Musharraf to restore Pakistan’s international reputation because of the proxy war in Kashmir and the recent revelations by Abdul Qadeer Khan that he was

¹⁹⁷ Quoted in Anatol Lieven, “The Pressures on Pakistan,” *Foreign Affairs* 81 (January/February 2002): 116.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁹ Quoted in “Military Hard-Liners Pressure Pakistani Leader,” *Wall Street Journal*, 27 June 2002, A15.

surreptitiously selling nuclear technology to Iran, North Korea, and Libya. However, despite knowing that cracking down on Khan, a national hero in Pakistan, would bring public anger, Musharraf decided it was necessary to assuage U.S. and international concerns. It appears that Musharraf's is convinced that the costs of maintaining a proxy war in Kashmir now outweigh its benefits. The United States has a crucial part in ensuring that Pakistan remains committed to that assessment.

Pakistan's leaders recognize that their current favorable standing with the United States is largely due to the U.S. war on terror and Pakistan's willingness to assist in that war. Prior U.S.-Pakistan partnerships have been forged in response to common threats and when these threats receded, so did the usefulness of the relationship. This pattern has led to a perception on Pakistan's part that the United States has been a fickle friend. It remains concerned over what the United States will do when bin Laden is caught and the war on terror's urgency eases.²⁰⁰ Will U.S. assistance last beyond the capture of Osama bin Laden? Will sanctions be renewed against Pakistan for its nuclear program?

Although the United States should not expect Pakistan to shift its policy on Kashmir, it should continue its effort to persuade Pakistan to shift away from proxy war. In order to do this, a two-pronged strategy is necessary. First, the United States should establish a partnership with Pakistan that is grounded in the understanding that Pakistan's future is a national security interest of the United States. Pakistan's economic, political, and institutional development is in the interest of the United States. The U.S.-Pakistan relationship must be rooted in this belief. Pakistan still values and seeks a strong relationship with the United States. The United States should use this influence and establish a commitment to Pakistan that goes "beyond bin Laden."²⁰¹ The Bush administration is on the right track. Its agreement to provide a three billion dollar aid package over five years indicates a serious long-term U.S. commitment to Pakistan's development.

With a framework for a long-term U.S.-Pakistan commitment established, Pakistan must understand that with commitment comes responsibilities. Although the

²⁰⁰ Feroz Khan (Brigadier General (Ret.), Pakistan Army), discussion with author, 1 December 2003.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

United States and Pakistan cooperated in a proxy war against the Soviets in Afghanistan, the use of militant proxies has had negative repercussions for both the United States and Pakistan. Pakistan must understand that its national interests are jeopardized as a result of this proxy war strategy and it must end. The United States should continue to quietly press Pakistan to maintain its crackdown on militants within its borders. Beyond the economic and societal costs of the strategy, the introduction of nuclear weapons has made the frequent crisis instigated by the insurgency extremely dangerous.

Finally, India has a critical role in Pakistan's continued shift away from proxy war. India should maintain its position that it will no longer tolerate a proxy war strategy, but it also should provide Pakistan with incentives to pursue a peaceful strategy. Its agreement to discuss all bilateral issues, including Kashmir, in the composite dialogue meetings is an important first step toward India's acknowledgment that Kashmir is a political problem and that refusing to address the dispute with Pakistan over the last fifty years has failed to solve it. India's willingness to discuss the issue and the initiation of a process that facilitates confidence-building should provide Pakistan's leaders with the necessary political capital to maintain this shift away from proxy war and to continue the peace process.

Pakistan's Foreign Secretary Riaz Khokhar claimed after the talks in February 2004, "There is a realization on both sides that war is not an option."²⁰² Although it is a good first step, the road ahead is arduous. While the two nations may agree that their approach to the issue must change, creating the necessary flexibility in their respective policies is likely to take years. Kashmir is a political question loaded with national identity and sovereignty implications for India and Pakistan that make it far more important and complicated than simply a territorial dispute. Reaching a solution that accounts for these complexities will require years of confidence building measures and internal political changes, but a solution will not be reached with the continuation of the proxy war. The United States should not attempt to mediate the dispute. However, it should continue to stay actively involved and stress the costs the Kashmir dispute has on both countries and help the leaders of India and Pakistan fend off demands from hard-

²⁰² "Peace 'Roadmap' for S. Asia Rival," *BBC News*, 18 February 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/3498181.stm.

liners in their countries that advocate a more violent strategy to settle the dispute. Present circumstances have bought President Musharraf some time to make bold moves with regard to Kashmir and the United States is in a position to help.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Peter R. Lavoy
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
4. Feroz Khan
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
5. James J. Wirtz
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California