



MALMÖ UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF CULTURE
AND SOCIETY

India-Pakistan Conflict –A Case Study since 1998



Ikram Noor

781225-8775

Master Thesis in International Relations (IR 631E)

International Master's Program in Global Political Studies

Autumn 2014

Table of Content

Acknowledgement	5
Abstract	6
List of Acronyms	7
Chapter 1: Introduction	8
1.1 Background of the India-Pakistan Conflict.....	9
1.2 Origin of the India-Pakistan Conflict.....	9
1.3 Aim of the Study.....	12
1.4 Research Question	12
1.5 Significance of the study.....	13
1.6 Composition of the thesis.....	14
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	16
2.1 Introduction.....	16
2.2 Realism	16
2.2.1 Classical Realism.....	18
2.2.2 Structural Realism.....	19
2.3 Security Dilemma	20
2.3.1 Defensive Realism	21
2.3.2 Offensive Realism.....	22

3.0 Review of Previous Studies on Pakistan and India conflict	23
Chapter 3: Methodology	26
3.1 Introduction.....	26
3.2 Research Design: Qualitative Case Study	26
3.3 India-Pakistan conflict as Case Study.....	27
3.4 Data Sources.....	28
3.5 Analysis of Data: Qualitative Content Analysis	30
3.6 Delimitations	32
Chapter 4: India-Pakistan Conflict since 1998	33
4.1 Introduction.....	33
4.2 Nuclear Tests of India and Pakistan in May 1998	33
4.3 The Kargil Conflict (May-July 1999).....	34
4.4 India-Pakistan Conflict in 1999	36
4.5 Incident of 11th September 2001 and India-Pakistan conflict.....	36
4.6 India-Pakistan Conflict after 2008	38
Chapter 5: Analysis	40
5.1 Realism and India-Pakistan Conflict since 1998	41
5.2 International Anarchic Structure.....	43
5.3 India-Pakistan Conflict since 1998 as a Security Dilemma.....	44

Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations.....	47
6.1 Conclusions.....	47
6.2 Recommendations.....	48
Bibliography	49

Acknowledgement

My stay at Malmo University has been the most glorious time of my life. I am extremely grateful to honorable Mr. Mikael Spång, for his endless encouragement and motivation. He played a vital role in my research and made it possible. I feel immensely proud to be a part of this university. I dedicate this study to my parents.

Furthermore, I present special thanks to all my teachers, colleagues, and friends at Malmo University and in my hometown.

Abstract

The aim of this study was to understand and explain the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 to date through the theoretical framework of realism and more specifically through that of the security dilemma. Security dilemma—a situation where one state tries to enhance its security, while inevitably decreasing the security of other countries—has already been applied to understand and explain many historical cases of conflicts like two world wars. In the current study, the realism and security dilemma was used to understand and explain the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 to date, especially with two core security issues, that is, the nuclear issue and the Kashmir dispute. The time was chosen because the relations between India and Pakistan approached its tipping point in May 1998 when India launched its nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May 1998. Following this, Pakistan also conducted its own nuclear tests on 28th and 30th May 1998. Consequently, South Asian region descended into the most unmanageable anarchy.

This study used qualitative case study research design since the study aimed to explore the single case of the India-Pakistan conflict. Several secondary sources were used to develop a narrative and descriptive account of the historical events occurred in the sampled period. The nature of the case study is explanatory as it aimed to understand and explain the conflict. The qualitative content analysis was used to analyze the content of the sources to reach conclusions.

The finding of the study suggested there was a security dilemma as the security environment and perception of insecurity existed between India and Pakistan in the post-May 1998 scenario. India-Pakistan relations were characterized by deep-rooted mistrust, uncertainty, terrorism and holders of nuclear capabilities and regional dynamics. Moreover, Kashmir dispute is also the main reason of fueled weapons race and nuclear proliferation in South Asia. The study recommends that both India and Pakistan can themselves find the solution for getting out of this South Asian international anarchic structure by resolving the nuclear tensions through bilateral means as fast as possible.

List of Acronyms

APHC	All Party Hurriyat Conference
BJP	Bharatiya Janata Party
CDP	Composite Dialogue Process
CBMs	Confidence Building Measures
CD	Conference on Disarmament
CTBT	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
DAE	Department of Atomic Energy Commission of India
ISI	Inter-Services Intelligence
JD	Jamaatud Dawa
NPT	Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
NWS	Nuclear Weapon States
PAEC	Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission
PML-N	Pakistan Muslim League – Nawaz
RAW	Research and Analysis Wing
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
UN	United Nations
The US	United State

Chapter 1: Introduction

The conflict between Pakistan and India is considered as one of the most intractable conflicts in the world (Cohen, 2013:33). The conflicts between the two countries do not involve only them but have consequences for the South Asian region and to some extent the world at large. The latter because both India and Pakistan nowadays are nuclear powers. This makes it interesting to look closer at the conflict. The conflict involves several issues, for instance, disputes over territory, national identity, water sharing disputes and relative power position in the region are the causes of this conflict (Paul, 2006:610).

Most of the conflict centers on Kashmir, it is the main cause of the conflict. Given the importance of Kashmir for the conflict between Indian and Pakistan, it will be the focus of this thesis. In May 1998, India and Pakistan piloted nuclear tests in a war-like situation. Since then both states have come twice to the verge of war, there is fear that the next armed conflict between India and Pakistan would initiate the expansion and use of nuclear weapons (Wheeler, 2010:319). More specifically, therefore, the thesis focuses on understanding the implications of both states having nuclear weapons.

In May 1998, India and Pakistan piloted nuclear tests in a war-like situation. Since then both states have come twice to the verge of war, there is fear that the next armed conflict between India and Pakistan would initiate the expansion and use of nuclear weapons (Wheeler, 2010:319). The disputed territory of Kashmir is considered as the main cause of the conflict between India and Pakistan (Bose, 2009, Rid, 2015). It is often cited that Kashmir dispute is the main reason of fueled weapons race and nuclear proliferation in South Asia—and since 1998; it became the nuclear flashpoint as a core security issue between India and Pakistan. Therefore, this research study is focused on the disputed issue of Kashmir. The background context of this conflict is considered because the current relations are obviously connected to the historical roots.

1.1 Background of the India-Pakistan Conflict

The India-Pakistan conflict has historical roots, going through a cycle of ups and down since they were established as two independent states. This hostility has caused three major conventional wars in 1948, 1965 and 1971 (Rid, 2015:147). In addition, there have been two limited wars, that is, Brasstacks in 1988 and Kargil in 1999, causing massive losses on both sides (Rid, 2015:147).

India-Pakistan constituted one-fifth of the world's population and conflict between these two countries not only impact them directly but also the South Asian region as well. Indeed, both the nuclear-equipped nations are spending large amounts of their GDPs to enhance their defense capabilities. Pakistan is a state-run mostly by non-democratic military generals whereas India is one of the largest democratic systems in the world (Cheema, 2006).

1.2 Origin of the India-Pakistan Conflict

The conflict originated when British India was divided into two new sovereign states, India and Pakistan, in 1947. The British partition plan was announced on 3 June 1947 and according to that, "Muslim majority areas were to be given to Pakistan while Hindu majority areas were to be given to India" (Cheema, 2015:49). The leaders of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, representing India and Pakistan respectively, accepted this suggestion (Sattar, 2007:5).

The princely state of British India, Jammu and Kashmir was the Muslim majority area and it was ruled by a Hindu Maharaja. The Muslim Kashmiri population revolted against the Maharaja. The Pashtun tribesmen—concerned with the Maharajah of Kashmir's moves to hand over Kashmir to India—came to help their Kashmiri brothers (Cheema, 2015:49). As result, a war of liberation against Maharaja was proclaimed. Kashmiris aided by the Pashtun tribesmen advanced on Srinagar, the capital. The Maharaja decided to flee to Delhi and later he directly appealed to India for military assistance (Cheema, 2015:49).

The Governor-General of India, Mountbatten, accepted Maharaja's plea with the condition that "the Kashmiri people would be offered a referendum to decide their future" (Cheema, 2015:50). The Maharaja was afraid of losing Kashmir to Pakistan; therefore, in October 1947, he signed a

treaty of accession to India (Khan, 2009:12). Indian Prime Minister, Nehru, who was himself a Kashmiri Hindu, sent troops to the Kashmir (Cheema, 2015:50).

This triggered the first of the three India-Pakistan wars, lasting fourteen months. India took the Kashmir dispute to the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). On 1st January 1948, the Indian representative in the UNSC put forward a formal complaint against Pakistan—and requested the UNSC to halt Pakistan from interfering in Kashmir—since Maharaja had signed a treaty of accession to India (Cheema, 2015:49-50). There was ceasefire agreement between India and Pakistan under the umbrella of the United Nations, which became effective on 1st January 1949 (Paul, 2005:8).

After that, Kashmir was divided into Pakistani-held and Indian-held parts. Pakistan held one-quarter of the territory and India occupied the remaining quarters of the Kashmir territory. Pakistan's part of the Kashmir was further divided into a nominally autonomous territory called Azad Kashmir—and the directly controlled Pakistani northern territories. Since independence, there is an ongoing struggle between India and Pakistan, both wanting to get full possession of the Kashmir territory. The plebiscite promised by the UN and India was never held. Kashmir is still the most belligerent issue between India-Pakistan requiring settlement according to the charter of the UN (Khan, 2009:62-63).

The Kashmir dispute was also responsible for the second India-Pakistan war that occurred on 1-23 September 1965. This war was a conventional attack on the Cease Fire Line (CFL). This involved not only a land warfare but also bitter air strikes for two weeks—but later culminating in a military stalemate. On 22 September 1965, the UN-mandated a ceasefire and the two states signed the peace agreement in the Soviet Union. Both sides agreed to reinstate the status quo by exchanging the territories seized by either side across the Cease Fire Line (Roy-Chaudhury, 2009:61).

The Kashmir dispute was not responsible for the third India-Pakistan war that occurred on 3-17 December 1971. The secession of East Pakistan (presently known as Bangladesh) aided by India had the reason of this. This war was a devastating blow to Pakistan as it lost its eastern part—and a large number of soldiers and citizens (approx. 90,000) were held as prisoners of war (PoW) by

India (Roy-Chaudhury, 2009:61). In July 1972, peace talks were held in the Indian town of Shimla and Shimla Agreement was signed on 3rd July 1972. Under this agreement, Cease Fire Line (CFL) was now the Line of Control (LoC) (Roy-Chaudhury, 2009:62).

However, Kashmiris aided by Pakistan kept the issues alive on the international forums throughout the 1980-1990s. In the late-1980s, the separatist movement of Kashmiris again gained momentum in Indian Kashmir. The Kashmiri separatists were supported politically and militarily by Pakistan. India blamed Pakistan for the insurgency in Indian held Kashmir—and accused it of providing training and sending militants to join and support the separatist movement of Kashmiris. Throughout the 1990s, Pakistani support to the separatist movement of Kashmiris kept the two countries at loggerheads (Khan et al., 2007:11).

Beside several efforts for the resolution of conflict, as peace proposals, such as the Lahore peace process of 1999, and the Agra Summit of 2001, could not accomplish, due to the outbreak of serious predicaments in the conflicting background. Both countries suffer protection too deceptively in an endless controversy (Ganguly, 2002:1).

In the post 9/11 scenario, there was also another factor ‘transnational terrorism’, which fueled India-Pakistan hostility (Paul, 2005: XIII). This hostility was featured by the full deployment on the border from December 2001 to October 2002 (Sridharan, 2007:9).

In India and Pakistan, numerous terrorist attacks have taken place. India blamed Pakistani-based militants for committing attacks in India. For example, “the 2000 suicide attack on the Red Fort in New Delhi, the 2001 attack on the Indian parliament and the 2006 and 2008 Mumbai bombings” (Swami, 2009:144) were alleged to be committed by Pakistani-based militants. In addition, many guerilla attacks have been within Indian-held Kashmir (Swami, 2009:146). For Pakistan, the rise of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) has been a constant source of the domestic threat. However, the threat perception of India remained a major threat factor—and the unresolved Kashmir was a major source of tension and threat to security and peace in Pakistan.

India-Pakistan conflict’s overall track record depicts that it is difficult to prevent a crisis between the two states. Kashmir is the core issue in the India-Pakistan conflict (Hasan, 2005:74) and

appears to be an unending conflict (Rid, 2012:5). Because the future of the state of Jammu & Kashmir has been a highly contentious issue between India and Pakistan, regional security depends on the fate of Kashmir.

1.3 Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to understand and explain the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 through the theoretical framework of realism and more specifically through that of the security dilemma. I use the concept of the security dilemma to understand the India-Pakistan conflict. This concept helps to highlight both the causes of the conflict, more specifically the territorial claims regarding Kashmir, and the difficulties to arrive at any resolution that is stable over time. The introduction of nuclear weapons into the conflict by both Pakistan and India acquiring nuclear weapons is both understandable in the background of this dilemma and is something that further exacerbates the dilemma. The focus of the study is the examination of the patterns of actions by the states as well as the state's behavior towards conceived threats against external forces.

This study is a qualitative case study of the conflict, aiming to understand and explain the security dilemma.

1.4 Research Question

The following main research question guides this study:

How is the security dilemma manifested in the conflict between India and Pakistan since 1998?

This research question is further divided into two sub-research questions:

1. How is the security dilemma manifested in the nuclear issue between India and Pakistan since 1998?
2. How is the security dilemma manifested in the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan since 1998?

1.5 Significance of the study

Many factors make the India-Pakistan conflict interesting and important area of research. Previous research has shown that the India-Pakistan case is unique in the nuclear propagation meadow because of the possible use of nuclear arms. The situation of India and Pakistan creates uncertainty for the rest of the world. Indeed, security issues have been remained unsolved. The rise of terrorism in South Asia especially the situation in Afghanistan and the proxy war between India and Pakistan is very important in the context of International relations. Both countries are in South Asia and share a common border and the conflict between the two countries have a long history since their independence. The conflict trajectory can jeopardize the peace of the world community. Therefore, there is a need for developing knowledge which not only explains the factors but also provides useful recommendations to avoid conflicts between the two conflicting states.

The case study of India-Pakistan is also vital because it poses a useful opening to elucidate about the origins of war in a non-European context. That is why this study specifically focuses on the South Asian discord, which has remained perpetual conflict. Even though there are plenty of measures that distinguish India and Pakistan from each other, yet they share a mutual history. India and Pakistan are dissimilar from each other in multiple ways out of which culture and religion are the most projecting which stands as the most noteworthy difference. On the other hand, among all the disputes between India and Pakistan, the Kashmir conflict is the oldest one, which is getting eviler with the passage of time while lasting mysterious. Moreover, the research study is vital to explain the conflict between India and Pakistan since 1998. It is essential to understand the dynamics of India-Pakistan conflict with a regional and global perspective—to create peace in the South Asian region.

Additionally, research studies in Pakistan and India conflict are mostly historical in nature. These historical research studies provide significant insight into an important aspect of the conflict but they lack the theoretical perspectives required to adequately understand, explain and provide recommendations for effectively managing this conflict in South Asian context. Very few studies have been done to understand and explain the Pakistan-India conflict using the theoretical literature. The relative dearth of theoretically informed research studies provides a justification for this study.

1.6 Composition of the thesis

This research thesis consists of following structure:

The first chapter comprises of introduction, background, and origin of the conflict, to develop an understanding of the background of the issues, which exist between the two states. This chapter also provides aim of the research study along with the significance of the study.

The second chapter develops the theoretical framework to understand the case of India-Pakistan conflict. It mainly deals with the elements of realism theory and security dilemma, which would be subsequently applied to the case of India-Pakistan conflict. In addition, this chapter provides a brief review of some of the research studies conducted in Pakistan and India conflict.

The third chapter explains the methodology used to conduct this research study. This chapter demonstrates how qualitative case study research design was used to explore the single case of the India-Pakistan conflict. Moreover, it also describes the methods of data collection used in this study. The secondary sources used in this study are also identified. Furthermore, it provides details of the methods and techniques used to analyze the data collected from secondary sources. Since the qualitative content analysis was used to analyze the content of the secondary sources, a detailed description is provided to show ways how the researcher reached the conclusions given in the last chapter.

The fourth chapter provides a narrative and descriptive account of the historical events that took place in the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 as extracted from the secondary sources. This depiction of the historical events is based on the analysis of the description given in the research material (mostly published research studies) analyzed.

The fifth chapter incorporates the research findings and analysis. This chapter provides an analysis of the India-Pakistan conflict using realism and more specifically, using the concept of security dilemma to understand the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998. The aim of this chapter is to combine and see the narrative and descriptive account of the historical events provided in chapter 4 through the lenses of realism and security dilemma.

The last chapter provides the conclusion of the research with recommendations. The chapter concludes that the realist paradigm has been accurate in explaining the future of Pakistan and India conflict where it suggests that there is no immediate solution to the problem of India-Pakistan conflict because the immense diversity of public opinion and different political and military players who have divergent interests complicate this conflict situation. It recommends that both India and Pakistan can themselves find the solution for getting out of this South Asian international anarchic structure.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the theoretical framework of this study. The aim is to situate the study in the relevant literature and prepare the ground for the qualitative content analysis of the secondary data. Moreover, the theoretical framework later helps in illustrating and summarizing the findings of this study.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section of the chapter begins by highlighting the main tenets of realist theory. The second section outlines the concept of security dilemma along with defensive and offensive realism. The third section provides a review of the published research in the research problem being investigated in this study, that is, Pakistan-India conflict since 1998.

2.2 Realism

Realism is one of the most well established theoretical perspectives to explain international relations (Steans et al., 2013:53) and certainly has potential to understand and explain the realities of international politics, like hostile relations and peace in the context of Pakistan-India conflict. There is certainly an extensive debate on the merits of realism with respect to other theoretical traditions. While it is important to keep that in mind, it seems to me that given the protracted conflict between India and Pakistan and the escalation of the stakes in the conflict through both countries having nuclear weapons, something I will discuss in terms of the security dilemma, there are reasons to build the analysis of the conflict on realism. Voinea asserted that

Realist theory continues to be one of the most accurate tools for understanding the events in the sphere of international relations. Realism takes an explanatory rather than a normative approach to its study of International Relations, and through its analytical character provides a pragmatic framework for the examination of current issues in the international arena (2016:1).

Some of the theorists take realism as “a general theory of politics” (Donnelly, 2013:31). However, other theorists take “realism as a theory of international politics”—and it is true since “realism

focuses on the elements of the international system-states, power, and international anarchy” (Glaser, 2016:14). Donnelly defined realism theory as “a tradition of analysis that stresses the imperatives states face to pursue a power politics of the national interest” (2013:29). This theory’s usefulness to explain international security issues is also well documented (Glaser, 2016, Elman, 2012) and particularly helpful in developing an understanding of the security issues related to the India-Pakistan conflict.

Realist explanations of the security issues are based on certain assumptions. First, it is assumed that the nature of the international system is anarchic. Second, the international system is defined by power. Third, states are assumed to be rational and unitary actors (Donnelly, 2013). These assumptions are elaborated as:

State behavior is driven by leaders flawed human nature, or by the pre-emptive unpleasantness mandated by an anarchic international system. Selfish human appetites for power, or the need to accumulate the wherewithal to be secure in a self-help world, explain the seemingly endless succession of wars and conquest (Elman, 2012:11).

Such assumptions provide a powerful lens to understand and explain Pakistan-India conflict—where the conflict has gone through a cycle of ups and downs since the establishment of two states, and where hostility has resulted in three major conventional wars and two limited wars (Rid, 2015:147).

Three core elements of realism are ‘powerful tools’ to understand the security issues plaguing Pak-India conflict. Although there exist some subtle differences between the two variants of realism, that is, classical and modern realism, three core elements—statism, survival, and self-help—are found in both classical realists and modern realists (Dunne and Smith, 2011:143). Dunne and Smith (2011) state that the state-centric assumption of realism (statism) is based on the idea that the collective will of the people is legitimately represented by the state, which enables the state to exercise authority within the boundaries of the state. Moreover, according to the state-centric assumption of realism, a condition of anarchy exists outside the boundaries of the state where there is the lack of an overarching central authority (Dunne and Smith, 2011:143).

The second element, survival, delineates that each state is responsible for safeguarding her own well-being and survival in an anarchical system whereas the third element, self-help, is “the principle of action in an anarchical system where there is no global government” (Dunne and Smith, 2011:144).

Anarchy—the absence of government—has traditionally been held at the major problem of international relations by realists. Steans et al. (2010) argue that “anarchy prevailed because, in international relations, there was no sovereign authority that could enforce the rule of law and ensure that ‘wrongdoers’ were punished” (Steans et al., 2010:53). Additionally, Steans et al. (2010) argue that “the pursuit of power and national interest were the major forces driving world politics” (Steans et al., 2010:54). Glaser adds to it that “states are typically characterized in terms of their basic motives and interests, most prominently security” (2016:14). In this way, anarchy allows rather encourages the expression of the worst aspects of human nature (Donnelly, 2000, Mearsheimer, 2001).

It is the realist approach to international system which can explain the conflict of India and Pakistan in a comprehensive way since their relations are characterized by an anarchic system where each state considers threats of force from the other state. These threats force both states “to selfishly seek and expand power in an endless competition to ensure survival or maximize absolute power” (Mearsheimer, 2001). Power is considered as an important feature of the environment that a state faces in the international politics (Glaser, 2016:15). Since the nature of the international system is believed to be anarchic, great importance to power and military capabilities is given by the states (Glaser, 2016:16), which is clearly evident in the case of India and Pakistan conflict.

What follows next is a description of two variants of realism, that is, classical and modern realism—along with some subtle differences between them.

2.2.1 Classical Realism

Classical realism or political realism emphasizes politics, power, and the national interest. In addition, much emphasis is laid on the centrality of anarchy, fixed human nature, the role of statesmanship and attributes of state power. According to Dunne and Smith (2011), classical

realists believe that fundamentally human nature is to pursue power—and the inborn urge to dominate others. Moreover, they believe that the fundamental characteristics of human nature are reflected in the behaviors of the states, thus under the realist assumptions, states are self-seeking egoists (Dunne and Smith, 2011). Additionally, states see their foreign policies considering the national interests (Jørgensen, 2010:83).

2.2.2 Structural Realism

For structural realists, the struggle for power in the international politics is not the attribute of human nature (Dunne and Smith, 2011:104). They believe that state's behavior regarding power has little to do with human nature. It is rather the structure of the international system that forces states to pursue power. When there is no guarantee that one state will not be attacked by another state—in the absence of a higher authority, the only option left with each state is to become powerful enough so that protection of the state is ensured if it is attacked by any other state (Mearsheimer, 2013:72). Consequently, states compete for power to ensure their survival (Mearsheimer, 2013:72). Therefore, it is asserted that through classical realism is the point of departure for structural realists, but they set aside those characteristics of international politics that depend on nature of human beings to underscore the impact of the international system structure that constrains it (Donnelly, 2013:37).

According to structural realist theory, three elements constitute the structure of the international system: “organizing principle, differentiation of units, and distribution of capabilities” (Dunne and Schmidt, 2014:108). Two different organizing principles proposed are anarchy and hierarchy. Anarchy here refers to the decentralized realm of international relations whereas hierarchy forms domestic order. With respect to the second element of the structure, differentiation of units, it is argued that all states are functionally same units—it does not matter whether a state is democratic or not, they behave in the same way (Dunne and Schmidt, 2014:108). The third element, distribution of capabilities, constitute the most important element of the structure of the international system since it determines the rank ordering of the states (Dunne and Schmidt, 2014:108).

Various elements of the structure of the international system push all states to prioritize their own survival—therefore, if we focus on survival motives of the states alone, we can understand the several ways states interact with each other. Glaser states that:

All states give priority to ensuring their own survival, although states may have other goals, we can understand their interactions by focusing on the survival motive alone...The international system will drive states into the competition, even though they lack fundamental conflicts of interest (2016:18).

These survival motives of the states may yield arms races and alliances among various competing states (Glaser, 2016:18)—as the international anarchy pushes states into a condition of self-help. Major state powers have to look out for themselves when an international authority does not exist to protect them. Glaser argues that “states value power manifested in some combination of territory, population, economic resources, and military capabilities—because it enables them to protect against attack” (2016:18). This is done by developing external and internal balancing: States acquire power and develop their capability to defend—by forming alliances with other states (external balancing)—and by increasing economic competence and acquiring larger and better military forces (internal balancing) (Glaser, 2016:38, Donnelly, 2013).

Having discussed the realism theory and the various concepts associated with this theory—the next section deals with a related concept, that is security dilemma.

2.3 Security Dilemma

The security dilemma—a situation in which a state pursues to intensify its own security can reduce the security of its adversary—lies at the core of defensive realist’s arguments. The term “security dilemma,” was coined by John Herz and he elaborated it as follows:

Groups and individuals who live alongside each other without being organized into a higher unity...must be...concerned about their security from being attacked, subjected, dominated, or annihilated by other groups and individuals. Striving to attain security from such attacks, they are driven to acquire more and more power to escape the effects of the power of others. This, in turn, renders the others more insecure and compels them to

prepare for the worst. Because no state can ever feel entirely secure in such a world of competing units, power competition ensues, and the vicious circle of security and power accumulation is on. (Herz 2014:60)

Thus, the security dilemma puts states into in “a spiral of illusory fears” and because of “unnecessary defenses” in the presence of anarchic pressures (Donnelly, 2013:42). Therefore, “the main argument of all the realist approaches explaining the contours of a security dilemma revolve around three basic assumptions: 1. An anarchic environment leads to uncertainty. 2. A lack of trust that exists among states. 3. A misperception of each other’s motives or intentions” (Pervez, 2009:73).

The security dilemma can explain competition between security seeking states (Glaser, 2016:25). Waltz empirically examined alliance behavior of states and concluded that states balancing behaviors of the states mainly occur because of threat (1987:1-20). For example, a security dilemma can occur when a state tries to deploy its military forces to enhance its security, but a potential adversary state considers it a move for attacking (Glaser, 2016:25). Therefore, it is highlighted that “uncertainty about the adversary’s type whether it is a security-seeking state or a greedy state—is an essential element of security dilemma” (Glaser, 2016:25).

In the presence of severe security dilemma, it will be harder to achieve security because in this case, competition is more attractive for states—thus resulting in war (Glaser, 2016:26). However, where mild security dilemma exists, peace prevails (Glaser, 2016:26).

2.3.1 Defensive Realism

Defensive realism argues that a general tendency towards competitive behavior is not generated by the international system and states can be highly secure under some conditions (Glaser, 2016:24). Defensive realism underscores that balancing occurs when any state becomes too powerful (Donnelly, 2013:47). A balancing coalition will be formed between the other great powers who have built up their militaries leaving the aspiring hegemon less secure or even it may

destroy it (Mearsheimer, 2013:75). Taliaferro (2000) asserts that “defensive realism predicts greater variation in the internationally driven expansion” and suggests that “states ought to generally pursue moderate strategies as the best route to security” (Taliaferro, 2000:129).

2.3.2 Offensive Realism

Offensive realists see the world as competitive. Formulation of offensive realism by Mearsheimer (2001) outlines that states pursue power as a means, not an end—and states are uncertain about other states’ intentions—often assuming the worst about intentions of others. However, he asserts, “states try to maximize their power and pursue hegemony when possible” (Mearsheimer, 2001). Additionally, he argues “states seek to survive under anarchy by maximizing their power relative to other states” (Mearsheimer, 1990:12). However, Glaser (2016:23) argues that offensive realists are also of the view that states prefer to buck pass (the act of trying “to get another great power to check the aggressor while they remain on the sidelines” (Mearsheimer, 2001:139) than to balance (the act of “seriously commit themselves to containing their dangerous opponent” (Mearsheimer, 2001:139).

Offensive realists and defensive realists differ in their explanation of uncertainty and the anarchic environment. Pervez argues:

According to the offensive realists, there is no end to uncertainty and the anarchic environment in which every state must interplay. For the offensive realists, uncertainty is infinite and is the ‘determinative constraint on state behavior’ while for the defensive realists, although the core assumption of uncertainty remains, it is not infinite and it is assumed that the factors leading to such a dilemma can be overcome by reconciliation. (2010:72)

Therefore, the offensive realists suggest that a security dilemma can be avoided by maximizing the power of the state to its highest level, ultimately acquiring the world’s hegemony.

The development of theoretical framework is considered an important step in the case study. The aim of this study is to understand and explain the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998. Therefore, a theoretical framework is constructed using various published theoretical

works on the security dilemma concept in the realism theory—as it seemed the most suitable theory in understanding an international conflict and offering the most relevant explanation for India-Pakistan conflict (Dunne and Smith, 2011).

The next section provides a brief review of some of the research studies conducted in Pakistan and India conflict.

3.0 Review of Previous Studies on Pakistan and India conflict

Research studies in Pakistan and India conflict are mostly historical in nature. These studies usually discuss the relationship between India and Pakistan—and find the reasons of suspicion, hatred, distrust rooted in the incidents that took place at the time of creation of India and Pakistan in 1947 (Cheema, 2006, Majeed: 2013). For example, Majeed (2013) analyzed arm race, Kashmir conflict, Siachen Dispute, Kargil and other issues between Pakistan and India in historical perspective and highlighted the role of policymakers on both sides in lessening the tension between the two countries. Hagerty and Hagerty (2005:16) highlight that partition left in its wake on an Indo-Pakistani dispute over the political status of the area Kashmir. This disputed territory has been the scene of two major wars 1947-1948 and 1965, one limited war 1999, and various serious crises between India and Pakistan.

Such studies provide significant insight into an important aspect of the conflict but they lack the theoretical perspectives required to adequately understand, explain and provide recommendations for effectively managing this conflict in South Asian context.

Very few studies have been done to understand and explain the Pakistan-India conflict using the theoretical literature. However, Roggeveen (2015) uses the security dilemma as a theoretical framework to analyze the Pakistan-India conflict and concludes that a root-cause the security dilemma between India and Pakistan is anarchic world structure. However, He is of the view that “successful bilateral cooperation is dependent on the resolution of the Kashmir-dispute, and thus, both countries first have to show serious effort to solve this single dispute before long-term cooperation is even possible.” (Roggeveen, 2015:9). Similarly, Pervez (2010) studied the security dilemma within the context of Pakistan-India conflict using the social constructivist theoretical

framework and employing anthropological observations. He elaborates the constructed-ness of the security dilemma at the elite level by highlighting the role played by the socio-cultural components of the rivalry between the two states (Pervez, 2010:273). Abbasi (2010) also studied Pakistan's security interests and nuclear behavior using constructivism, neo-liberalism, and neo-realism. Abbasi (2010) concludes that the three schools of thought offer useful arguments to help explain security interests and nuclear behavior. In addition, Paul (2006) identifies factors fueling India-Pakistan conflicting relations and asserts that the combination of a lot of factors such as unsettled territorial issues, political incompatibility, irreconcilable positions on national identity and absence of economic and trade relations between the two states as a structural factor which explains the endurance of the rivalry. Additionally, Kronstadt (2009) examines the India-Pakistan conflict, particularly focusing on the Kashmir dispute and nuclearization of the region using two major theoretic approaches to understanding and explaining of security: Constructivism and realism. He argues that since both theoretical approaches have two security theory variants, four conceptual lenses were used to examine the research problem of the India-Pakistan conflict. He argues that "neorealist and neoclassical realist perspectives, with their emphases on the role of material power, offer persuasive, but oftentimes limited explanations of policy outcomes, while also contributing to creating the very insecurity they seek to explain" (2009: VI). He further argues that there is a need for resisting the temptation of understanding and explaining security conflict with the help one theoretical perspective and emphasizes the need for multi-perspectival understanding.

Similarly, Roy-Chaudhury (2009) explains in his text "India versus Pakistan from partition to the present" that there is lack of mutual trust between India and Pakistan relations. Both countries are facing many issues but the most intractable is the Kashmir issue. He further explains nuclearization has helped both countries to full conventional war. (2009:60) Roy-Chaudhury (2009) explains the role of India is hegemonic and Pakistan is its challenger. He also mentioned that incensement of terror attacks by non-state actors, which could generate Indo-Pakistani tensions. He explains all three major wars fought over Kashmir dispute and claims that Kashmir dispute is not just about conflicting territorial claims but ideological base also (2009:61-62).

Kapur (2005) has analyzed India-Pakistan hostile relationship in the light of stability/instability paradox. Kapur has argued that the stability/instability paradox is not fully assisted the situation in

South Asia and contends that the India-Pakistan conflict is the cause of stability/instability paradox (2005:130). He analyses the instability between India and Pakistan over Kargil conflict in the light of stability/ instability paradox (2005:130) and asserts that India-Pakistan conflict is the cause of strategic environment. Further, he has claimed that the South Asian security situation is different from the cold war situation (2005:130).

These studies have provided significant insight to understand the conflict between Pakistan and India. However, there is a general dearth of studies which provide an analysis of the India-Pakistan conflict using realism and more specifically, using the concept of security dilemma to understand the India-Pakistan conflict in the recent decades. The study here sees the significant events of conflicts between Pakistan and India occurred since 1998 through the lens of realism and security dilemma.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed description of the research design, that is, the basic structure guiding the selection and execution of data collection methods and the analysis of the subsequent data obtained through these methods. This is accomplished in three sections: First section deals with qualitative case study design and describes how this research design suited to the study of the problem explored. Second section deals with the method of data collection and the type of data used in this study. The third section deals with the method of data analysis, that is, the qualitative content analysis used to analyze the data.

3.2 Research Design: Qualitative Case Study

This study employs a qualitative case study design. This choice is based on the researcher's decision informed by the objective of the study to be conducted. Creswell claims that

Case study is a qualitative approach in which investigator explores a bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports case descriptions and case-based themes. (2007:73)

In the current study, the case phenomenon is the conflict between India and Pakistan with a special focus on the situation after 1998. The nature of this case study is explanatory that is, it focuses on identifying factors that may have contributed to the security dilemma between India and Pakistan. The explanatory case study research design was driven by the study's aim to understand and explain the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 using the theoretical lens of security dilemma and realism theory.

The choice of the qualitative case study design was also dictated by the researcher's use of multiple secondary sources of information as data sources to study India-Pakistan conflict since 1998. Therefore, this research is relying primarily on secondary literature, such as academic books,

critical analysis of main sources; articles in academic journals, newspaper articles, and reports, internet resources written by other authors—and the researcher put their findings into a new context.

This study is not the first to use secondary data. The choice of secondary sources of information as data sources was informed by already published literature. For example, many studies have used secondary data. For example, Lahti (2002) in “*The policies of the United States towards the Indian and the Pakistani nuclear weapons programs*” used the existing literature. Similarly, Mir and Wani (2014), in “*Kashmir-The origin of Indo-Pak conflicts war, peace, and dialogue*” used secondary data sources.

A case study research design was suited most because it helped to provide a perspective for understanding the contemporary phenomenon of India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 within its complex context using multiple sources of information (Yin, 2014). Yin (2003) states that the case study is a social science research method, which helps in the investigation of a phenomenon within its context using different data sources. Stake defined case study as “both a process of inquiry about the case and product of that inquiry” (2008:121). Furthermore, Yin states “the distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena” (2009:4). Therefore, this study aims to understand and explain the contemporary and complex phenomenon of India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 is suitably aligned with the chosen case study research design.

3.3 India-Pakistan conflict as Case Study

The case of India-Pakistan conflict was chosen as the focus of this study because of researcher’s interest in the issue as well as its importance to the peace of South Asia. The choice of explanatory case study enabled the researcher to understand and explain the India-Pakistan conflict in a comprehensive way. The choice of case study research design as a primary methodological tool of the research gave the researcher an indispensable opportunity to elaborate India-Pakistan conflict. Moreover, the explanatory type of case study allows the researcher to touch upon all major points that caused the conflict. Qualitative case study contributes to the empirical analysis of the study to a significant extent and helps in answering the research question raised in this thesis.

However, the researcher is aware of the disadvantages associated with using qualitative case study research design. In a qualitative case study, a researcher is the main instrument in the data collection and analysis. Therefore, there is always an issue of subjectivity involved in employing qualitative case study research design (Yin, 2014). Moreover, no or less generalizability of the findings often limit researcher. However, it is suggested that the researcher needs to make readers of case study aware of the biases that may affect findings of the study. Additionally, it is advised that thick description of the ‘case’ and the ‘context’ is provided to increase the transferability of the findings to other cases and contexts (Merriam, 2002, Merriam, 2009). In this study, rich description of the context, the background, and the case itself is provided. Thus, it is true that when limitations are managed well, the strengths of qualitative case study research design outweigh its limitations.

The researcher is also aware of the disadvantages associated with the use of the secondary data. Smith is of the view that “the very nature of secondary data leaves them particularly susceptible to criticism” (2008:21). This is because a very different research purpose was responsible for the creation or collection of the secondary data. Therefore, it is objected that it is full of errors; that it cannot be used to make useful comparisons; that secondary data, and official data, do not value neutral but are controlled by those in power; and that [it is] socially constructed” (Smith, 2008:21). However, Smith suggests that these objections can also be raised to the primary data. Moreover, a rigorous method of qualitative content analysis was used in this study to address these problems. Additionally, special steps were taken to ensure the authenticity and reliability of the documents analyzed in this study.

3.4 Data Sources

In this study, data were collected by conducting a qualitative content analysis of relevant empirical and theoretical data to construct a narrative of the major events occurred starting from May 1998 when the India-Pakistan relations approached their tipping point. India launched its nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May 1998. Following this, Pakistan conducted its nuclear tests on 28th and 30th May 1998. These events descended the south Asian region into the most unmanageable anarchy.

The research material consisted of many academic articles providing insight into the chain of events related to the India-Pakistan conflict in the post-1998 period. In this context, the contents of articles were examined to build a descriptive narrative of the events.

In addition, news and opinions from magazines and newspapers articles were used to corroborate the findings related to ongoing developments regarding the India-Pakistan conflict in the post-1998 period. Additionally, in this data collection process, some primary sources such as the speeches and declarations of Indian and Pakistani prime ministers and foreign ministers, as well as other political actors were also examined.

To reach the sources the academic journals, and the academic databases like Google Scholar, Jstor, Proquest, and Project Muse were used besides the books and internet websites. Key terms used to search the documents were: India-Pakistan conflict, Kashmir dispute, Kargil war etc. To achieve the objective of this study, secondary data were used to develop a narrative and descriptive account of the historical events since May 1998.

Primary data	Secondary data
The speeches and declarations of Indian and Pakistani prime minister and foreign minister, as well as other political actors	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic books and articles about India-Pakistan conflict underlining the post-1998 period 2. News and opinions from magazines and newspapers articles 3. Books and internet websites

It is pertinent to mention here that some primary sources such as the speeches and declarations of Indian and Pakistani prime ministers and foreign ministers, as well as other political actors, provided the relevant information for this study. These sources were inevitably helpful in providing the background knowledge of the events occurred. However, this political

communication was not part of the analysis (which is provided in the next chapter) because this was not the focus of the study. They were used to verify and corroborate a narrative of the major events occurring during the sampled period, that is, May 1998 to date. Therefore, in terms of written material, the content of the published research articles and books formed the core material to be analyzed and other sources were used for verification and corroboration of the truthfulness of the findings,

3.5 Analysis of Data: Qualitative Content Analysis

The content of research material collected through the searches was analyzed through the qualitative content analysis. Bowen claims that document analysis is most useful and applicable to qualitative case studies where the aim is “to produce rich descriptions of a single phenomenon” (2009:29). Additionally, Hardy and Bryman (2004) claim that for document analysis, the qualitative content analysis is the most widespread approach used in the systematically analyzing the content. This approach to the analysis of the documents excludes the quantification of the content and only meaningful and relevant passages of documents are identified and extracted (Bowen, 209:32). The analysis helped in constructing a narrative and descriptive account of the historical events that took place between India and Pakistan starting with India launching its nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May 1998.

For the analysis of documents, the first step was to establish the authenticity of the collected documents. Bowen advises that “although documents can be a rich source of data, researchers should look at documents with a critical eye and be cautious in using documents in their studies” (2009:33). Additionally, Bowen advises that “documents should not be treated as necessarily precise, accurate, or complete recordings of events that have occurred” (2009:33). Therefore, authenticity was established by verifying that all the documents used for analysis had all the necessary information for the proper identification of the document (McCulloch, 2004). Second, the reliability of the documents was appraised. Documents were carefully used and were “not accepted as literal recordings of events that have taken place” (Yin, 2003:87). To ensure faithfulness of the account given in the document, the researcher used a wide range of different kinds of published documents and thus triangulated data from various research reports. Thus, the final results of comparing the reported events in the documents were the ‘final truths’ emerged

from different kinds of documents (McCulloch, 2004:41-46). In this regard, Tosh advice was helpful in dealing with multiple documents:

The procedure is rather to amass as many pieces of evidence as possible from a wide range of sources—preferably from all the sources that have a bearing on the problem at hand. In this way, the inaccuracies and distortions of sources are more likely to be revealed, and the inferences...can be corroborated. Each type of source possesses certain strengths and weaknesses; considered together, and compared one against the other, there is at least a chance that they will reveal the true facts—or something very close to them. (2002:134)

As the aim of analyzing the primary and secondary documents was to construct a narrative of the events, the methodological approach used was to interpret the collected documents.

More specifically, problem-oriented approach to the analysis of the documents was used (McCulloch, 2004). All the collected documents that fell within the focus of the research were read and reread and information which was deemed valuable was extracted from the content of the documents. The first reading of a document was rapid, purposeful and directed but not bound by the research questions. The aim was to get a sense of the whole to identify specific points in the document. The second reading was deep and efforts were made to annotate the relevant passages in the document writing a ‘thematic code’ in the margin. Both manifest and latent contents were the focus of the analysis. Research questions of the study directed the researcher’s attention to the themes and events in the documents and helped the researcher to code the text. The aim here was “to capture the finer nuances of meaning lying within the text, coding a long enough passage in each instance to provide sufficient context” (Bazeley, 2013:72). A similar process was carried out on the all the collected documents. All the text with same thematic code were brought to a place in a single word file and comparison of the texts was made. The final corroborated text was assumed to be providing the accurate information regarding the particular event. In this way, a descriptive and narrative account of the key events which took place since 1998 was created.

3.6 Delimitations

The India-Pakistan conflict can be studied from many viewpoints or through the lens of different theoretical frameworks. However, this study is delimited by one theory, realism, and more specifically, security dilemma concept—to keep it a manageable research study. Moreover, the research focuses on India-Pakistan conflict as an explanatory case study. Different variables and actors are involved in the India-Pakistan conflict internationally. For example, USA, Russia, and China are the significant external state actors with various strategic and economic interests in the issue being studied in this research. However, the main focus of this research is delimited to India and Pakistan, the main actors of the conflict being studied.

This chapter has provided a detailed description of the research design—incorporating the information regarding nature of data and how data were collected and analyzed. The next chapter provides a description of the results acquired through analysis of the documents.

Chapter 4: India-Pakistan Conflict since 1998

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to present a narrative and descriptive account of the historical events that took place between India and Pakistan starting with India launching its nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May 1998. This prompted Pakistan to conduct its own series of nuclear tests on 28th and 30th May 1998. This period was chosen to understand the India-Pakistan conflict because in May 1998 the relations between India and Pakistan approached their tipping point. This depiction of the historical events is based on the analysis of the description given in the research material (mostly published research studies) analyzed. Brief information about the historical developments that took place is given below.

4.2 Nuclear Tests of India and Pakistan in May 1998

On 11th and 13th May 1998, India carried out five nuclear tests which made it as sixth nuclear weapon state. In Pakistan, these nuclear tests were perceived as the alarming situation. Gohar Ayub Khan, then Pakistan's Foreign Minister, termed these tests, a "death blow to the global efforts at nuclear non-proliferation." He also demanded a strong condemnation from the international community (Hussain, 2005:7).

Indian nuclear tests created controversy in Pakistan among two contending groups—one favoring a strong Pakistani answer to the Indian nuclear explosions while other was supporting restraint. Those supporting restraint argued that Pakistan's nuclear tests would result in international economic sanctions—and Pakistan's troubled economic position would not permit viable survival for the country's economy in the post-explosion period. However, those favoring Pakistani response asserted that national defense and security would require urgent tit-for-tat nuclear tests.

The pro-bomb lobby was successful in this regard because of several factors. Under their pressure, Nawaz Sharif, then Prime Minister, stated that "as being a sovereign state Pakistan has every right to undertake measures for national defense and security" (Rizvi, 2001:952). Moreover, there was evidence that the Nawaz government's decision was fully supported by General Jehangir Karmat,

then Chief of Army Staff, and other high officials of the Pakistan military. Furthermore, Indian leaders' aggressive warnings to Pakistan to vacate Pakistan-administered Kashmir and to put stop to its anti-India policy aggravated and convinced Pakistan that strategic balance had been tilted in India's favor in the Indian post-test period—therefore, to rectify strategic balance Pakistan should give a matching response (Rizvi, 2001:952). This Pakistani perception was further strengthened by intensifying tensions along the Line of Control (LoC) (Rizvi, 2001:952).

In this critical situation, Pakistani PM, Nawaz Sharif, convened a meeting of the Defense Committee of the Cabinet—to review security options for Pakistan in the post-nuclear test's scenario. Powerful pro-bomb lobby's calls for an immediate response were positively answered. On 28th May and 30th May, two weeks after the meeting, Pakistan conducted five nuclear tests to match the Indian tests (Rizvi, 2001:953).

Nuclear tests helped both countries the bilateral relations for a short period as they removed the chances of war. However, both countries faced criticism and sanctions in the post-nuclear test's scenario. For instance, all South Asian states strongly condemned nuclear tests of India and Pakistan. Moreover, the United States of America banned aid that had been given for making both countries its infrastructure stronger and better. Trade relations between the two countries were stopped by Japan. However, the regulations and bans on the two countries were less obeyed with the passage of time.

The next section describes the conflict between India and Pakistan with a special focus on the Kargil conflict (May-July 1999)—when the conflict between India and Pakistan reached another peak with the start of the disturbing situation at Kargil. This development, in the post-nuclear test's scenario, further hindered the both sides' governments' initiatives for peace (Koithara, 2004:45).

4.3 The Kargil Conflict (May-July 1999)

In early 1999, the conflict between India and Pakistan took another turn. Behera gives a vivid description of the events along the intentions operating behind this: “Troops of Pakistan's Northern

Light Infantry, in the garb of Kashmiri militants, crossed the Line of Control and occupied strategic mountain peaks in Mushkoh Valley, Dras, Kargil, and Batalik sectors of Ladakh.” (2006:84). Pakistan’s move in Kargil again flashed the conflict between Pakistan and India—especially, the valley of Kashmir, the major bone of contention between the two.

It would be inexperienced to consider this move as new and unpredictable when there existed a continued conflict between Pakistan and India. However, in the context of dangers of nuclear war and the friendship moves, it was unexpected that a military clash could occur between the two contending countries. It was anticipated that the India and Pakistan nuclear tests would deter any future war between two nuclear states (Mazari, 2003:27). Besides, before the Kargil conflict, the visit of Atal Bihari Vajpayee, then Indian Prime Minister, to Pakistan created a friendly atmosphere—and interestingly, there was a perception in both countries that military clash between the two states unthinkable (Mazari, 2003:27).

Literature also suggests Pakistan’s intentions to initiate the Kargil conflict. Behera is of the view that it was:

To block the Dras-Kargil highway, cut Leh off from Srinagar, trap the Indian forces on the Siachen glacier, raise the militants’ banner of revolt in the Valley, question the sanctity of the Line of Control (possibly alter it), and bring the Kashmir issue firmly back to the forefront of the international agenda. (2006:84)

However, later events apparently showed that Pakistan was unable to achieve the above-stated objectives. Koithara, (2004:45) argued that this was because India was backed by unqualified international support— “a new development as it never happened in the wars that took place in the past between India and Pakistan.” (2004:45). Roy-Chaudhury (2009:183) reported that Kargil war came to an end when Pakistan had to withdraw from Kargil because this time Pakistan had support neither from China nor from America. Furthermore, “the favor of the nations was for India and not at all for Pakistan (Roy-Chaudhury, 2009:183). Under the Clinton-Sharif agreement, it was decided that armies of both nations, that is, India and Pakistan, would

respect the line of control—thus, restoring to the previous positions of the armies as were according to the Shimla Agreement (Roy-Chaudhury, 2009:183).

The battle of Kargil, “the first military confrontation in a nuclearized South Asia and arguably the first real war between two nuclear states” (Behera, 2006:225) showed how mistaken those observers were in thinking that the development of nuclear capabilities by both states would avoid any future war over Kashmir after 1998 between the two (Johnson, 2005:106).

4.4 India-Pakistan Conflict in 1999

Meanwhile, the political situation in Pakistan had changed as the Pakistan army chief, General Pervez Musharraf, took over the government of Nawaz Sharif on October 11th, 1999. Additionally, the international position of Pakistan was negatively affected by the occurrence of Kargil war because the world had an unwelcoming approach towards the nuclear advancements.

The elimination of the terrorism in Pakistan became a priority for the General Pervez Musharraf's government (Koithara, 2004:45). In 1998, the suicide bombing started in Pakistan. The main players in the suicide bombing were Lashkar e Tayyaba and Jaish e Mohammad. These two groups used to work for the betterment of its fellow men before; however, United States declared the area insecure to live for the next generation. Suicide bombing in Pakistan was, however, a major reason for the Pakistan efforts to fight terrorism and the groups who were also in playing role in Kashmir insurgency. In May 2001, Pervez Musharraf went to India to continue the peace talks. However, the talk between India and Pakistan was not successful (Koithara, 2004: 45).

4.5 Incident of 11th September 2001 and India-Pakistan conflict

International war on terrorism had been generated by 9/11 US attacks. Pakistan as a strong supporter of the Taliban that protected al-Qaeda was in a serious dilemma. In changed context, Pervez Musharraf successfully ditched Taliban and it provided help to Afghanistan. Many steps were taken by Pakistan to divert the US and to carry the significance of war on terrorism. There were rivals who took disadvantage of this situation of Pakistan by putting the pressure of war on terrorism as Islamic war (Koithara, 2004:44).

Few events that gave a strong way for India to take serious measures against Pakistan were the terrorist attack on the Indian parliament on 13 December. It happened just three months after 9/11 and two months after an attack on Jammu & Kashmir's legislative assembly. India had been waiting for this moment since decades to "fix all the scores" (Koithara, 2004:46). India started with diplomatic measures by withdrawing of ambassadors, a sharp reduction of embassy staff on both sides, stoppage of all transport links between the two countries, and the banning of overflights by Pakistani aircrafts. India stopped transportation system between two countries. India took steps on the border as well and became very threatening to Pakistan (Koithara, 2004:46). India gave red alert to its army by setting mines and by deploying the army at borders because India was not satisfied due to terrorist activity from Pakistan (Koithara, 2004:46).

Before the speech of the Vajpai in Srinagar on 18th March 2003, India eased the operation as it came to know that the US is interfering in this matter and the operation between India and Pakistan lasted 10 days and the name given to it was 'Operation Parakram' (Koithara, 2004:46). Later during the mid of 2003, the terrorist activities in J&K were slowed down. In October, there were twelve significant non-military confidence-building measures (CBMs) including cross-LoC road travel (Koithara, 2004:46). Pakistan responded positively and a ceasefire covering the LoC and the Siachen control line came into force three days later (Koithara, 2004:46).

After the 9/11, there were many events that led Pakistan into a difficult situation and it was an impact of 9/11 event on India and Pakistan relations. The car bomb blast and firing attack gave a way for India to present itself as a victim of Pakistan terrorist attacks. After the attacks, besides dubbing Pakistan as the sponsor of terrorism, India took severe measures against Pakistan. And India insisted that Pakistan must ban all the terrorist groups that are involved in the attacks (Gul, 2004:66). It is confirmed that India has been exploiting the image of Pakistan and did its best in bringing its image to the front. India has been trying its level best to bring in the notice of global politics the darker side of Pakistan by highlighting its terrorist activities (Gul, 2004:66).

In the India-Pakistan connection, the 9/11 occurrences and the move in worldwide legislative issues have gone about as "impetuses in declining their officially discriminating relations, adding to the harm created by the disappointment of the Agra Summit" (Gul, 2004:73).

4.6 India-Pakistan Conflict after 2008

On 16 June 2009, an important meeting was held between President Asif Ali Zardari of Pakistan and Manmohan Singh on the sidelines at a gathering of the Shanghai Participation Association, held in Yekaterinburg, Russia. Singh conveyed a message with solidness to Zardari that Pakistan's territory should not be used for terrorism. Moreover, it was agreed by both officials that the secretaries' level talks be resumed (Ahmed, 2010:4).

Just after one month, Pakistani PM, Yousaf Raza Gilani, and Indian PM, Manmohan Singh, met at the yearly meeting of the Uncommitted Development at Sharm el-Sheik, Egypt (Ahmed, 2010:5). On 16 July 2009, they initially met for three hours and together issued a joint dispatch. Singh emphasized the need to bring the offenders of the Mumbai attack to fairness (Ahmed, 2010:5). Gilani guaranteed that Pakistan would do its best to do that. Both leaders concurred that the two nations will communicate concrete and noteworthy data on any future terrorist dangers (Ahmed, 2010:5).

Both leaders agreed to restore trust-building measure. Consequently, Indian secretary reached her Pakistani partner in Islamabad in June 2010 and secretaries of both countries held talks for the resumption of a dialog on all issues on February 6, 2011. Later, in the meeting of the 17th SAARC summit in the Maldives, President of Pakistan Asif Ali Zardari was welcomed by the Indian PM for a lunch in New Delhi, which later resulted in talks between the leaders. President of Pakistan took a private visit to the Sufi sacred place of Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti in Ajmer. After the gathering of the two leaders, Indian Prime Minister highlighted the cordial and helpful trade of viewpoints on various issues.

During the visit of Indian Foreign Minister to Pakistan, a new visa agreement between Pakistan and India was signed in September 2012. The agreement was hailed by both sides as it facilitated the liberalization of bilateral visa regime. Moreover, in December 2012, talks on conventional and non-conventional CBMs were held in New Delhi during the third round. On May 27, 2014, Pakistani PM, Nawaz Sharif, held talks with Indian PM, Narendra Modi in New Delhi, for the beginning of bilateral relations in recent era (Hashim, 2014).

This chapter has provided a brief description of the key events in the Pakistan-India conflict since 1998. The next chapter interprets these historical events with the help of realism and more specifically security dilemma concept.

Chapter 5: Analysis

This chapter provides an analysis of the India-Pakistan conflict using realism and more specifically, using the concept of security dilemma to understand the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998. The aim here is to combine and see the narrative and descriptive account of the historical events provided in chapter 4 through the lenses of realism and security dilemma.

The unresolved issue of Kashmir is the main source of deep-rooted mistrust and hostility in the India-Pakistan conflict. This study understands and explains the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 because in May 1998 both India and Pakistan conducted nuclear explosions. In 1999, Kargil crisis made Kashmir dispute a flash point. Kargil crisis pushed “the region in an environment of insecurity. Kargil conflict was the part of Kashmir and that issue is considered the main driving force behind the arms race between India and Pakistan” (Majeed, 2013:227).

In the context of India and Pakistan conflict, efforts of one country to enhance its security had been considered by another country as threatening or at least potentially destabilizing. Pervez (2013:2) claims that the security dilemma between India and Pakistan can be understood and explained using realist theory. He is of the view that India-Pakistan conflict has usually been considered as a power struggle between two states in an anarchic world system: “If India tests a new nuclear device or fires a missile it is perceived as an aggressive act by Pakistan and ultimately results in reciprocal action” (Pervez, 2013:2). Pervez (2013:2) emphasizes the need for studying the conflict beyond the material capabilities—where one country’s efforts to enhance its security had been considered by others as an act of aggression. For example, right after independence in 1947, Pakistani perception towards India was that of fear of annihilation when Indian leaders issued statements regarding partition as temporary whereas “India perceives Pakistan as a breakaway part of India and a constant threat to its own fragile communal balance” (Pervez, 2013:2). This fear has another dimension in the recent decade. When in 2008, India used a phrase like ‘limited war’ in relation to Pakistan after Mumbai terrorist attacks in India, exploit the dismal security relations between two countries provided terrorists an opportunity to gain from the hostile relations (Pervez, 2013:10).

5.1 Realism and India-Pakistan Conflict since 1998

It is stated that realism is the origin of strategic policy dealing that focus on the conflict of the nuclear race and its effects. It affects the military. It grew-up when in 1964 China came up with nuclear power. China could be blamed as an initiator of the nuclear race in the subcontinent (Kronstadt, 2009:194).

The military pattern was action-reaction. But the structuralism view is different, according to them there is need of security for both the countries and in the subcontinent, there is need of stability and there is need of blocking weapons proliferation (Kronstadt, 2009:194). India wants stability against China. According to neo-realists, maximizing the power is wise and sustain the power is the unwise principal (Kronstadt, 2009:194).

The nuclear invention of the subcontinent is intricate and tough especially at this stage when there is an uncertainty in the sub-continent (Kronstadt, 2009:194). Based on realist calculation of threat, the reason for the atomic growth of India was realistic. It can be compared with China's initiative. According to realist if it is not the topic of China atomic pressure then it is Indian atomic power (Thayer, 1995:492). It is observed that the military capabilities of the Asian subcontinent to bring innovation in the defense and weapons will bring the risk in the region (Arnett, 1997:243).

The structuralism perspective about the international relation suggests that the Indian decision to become a nuclear power is justified. However, it can support the Indian response in explaining the state security imperatives. Thus, it is obvious that the limitations involved in understanding the major core drivers of the India-Pakistan nuclear conflict are most worth mentioning. The Kashmir issue is also a parallel factor in the conflict between India and Pakistan. The role of politics is also important in this conflict (Kronstadt, 2009:195). It gave a method for the political leadership to come up with an idea to resolve this issue. According to the neorealist, there must be a strong political policy for nuclear conflict instead of making its defense stronger and stronger. The international proliferation has been playing a major role in the Indian politics.

Here is a factor that explains the power balancing formula of both the countries. It is explained by realism theory. India wants to balance its power with China as it has strong competition with

Pakistan but it has threats from China as well. Pakistan is also not behind in power balancing itself from a political aspect.

According to the optimistic analysts, this will decrease the chance of war in the regions as both the nations are equal in weapons and arms. The statesmen are aware of the destruction of the weapons. There are chances of no war in the region. While on the other hand pessimist analyst say that these countries will raise more conflicts to use the weapons. They both want to show each other the strength of the power. Thus, there is a need for realism theory to see and solve the issue on real grounds.

It is observed that the countries in international relations are not in the favor of taking help while they are in favor of helping themselves. This means that they must depend on themselves only. It is a practical approach. It saves them from depending on the other nations, which live nearby. Hence, it is a mandatory factor for any nation to gain a powerful status (Sagan, 2001:1). There are many reasons for India to become a nuclear power. India has been in the race of gaining the global attention on power. It has another factor that to beat China in the region the only way is to get nuclear power. The third factor was to lower down Pakistan in terms of technology and strategic terms (Sagan, 2001:1).

It is an observation that India found it difficult to stay firm on its objectives. This gave Pakistan to come up with nuclear competencies. But after the nuclear tests, it provided with the way to have bilateral diplomacy. While making a conclusion and critically analyzing the theory it is important to look at both sides of any topic. It can have both negative and positive impacts. While discussing the realism theory there is a different statement in the favor and against the theory. But while keeping in mind the India and Pakistan conflict 1998, international relations theory has taken a central positioning around the globe. It has permanency and simple nature that appeals the policymakers. The realism theory is applicable in the real world as it has many faces.

Explanation of realism theory has dominated attitude about nuclear armaments since the Cold war and still persuasively explain nuclear proliferation. Classical realist assumed that “states are ‘unitary actors’ that always seek to maximize their power to survive in a competitive international system” (Ogilvie-White, 1996:44). While explaining the grounds about the introduction of nuclear

weapons, classical realist emphasized on external pressures. Majority of scholars presented the arguments about the acquisition of nuclear armaments seen as a rational reply of states trying to protect their interests as security representing the challenge to states' survival.

In case of India-Pakistan conflict, the introduction of nuclear weapons considers the alleged threats from each other. In that case, classical realism explains a few of the 'complex' 'dynamics' of nuclear proliferation. According to Synder, the heart of the realist theory is that "international politics presents a struggle for power among self-interested states" (2004:31). India-Pakistan conflict is a case of offensive realism because there is strong security competition between both states. Pakistan wants to secure her eastern border with India. Kashmir issue is a flashpoint between India and Pakistan for strategic importance (Larkin, 2013:2).

Theory of offensive realism can also help us explain the Kashmir conflict. As theory predicts a security competition exists between India and Pakistan as they are engaged against each other (Larkin, 2013:3). Both India and Pakistan compete to gain power at the expense of the other—always looking for beneficial opportunities. Both increase their relative power by developing their nuclear weapons. From realist point, Pakistan's claim for the accession of Kashmir is to get strategic strength and power. On the other hand, Larkin is of the view that "offensive realism is the main component of India's national security strategy. Holding Kashmir is vital for its own security and to gain power over its main rival, Pakistan" (2013:22).

Theory of realism also suggests that "states can still fight conventional wars even while possessing nuclear weapons" (Lavoy, 2009:4). Kargil war between India and Pakistan and the 2001-2002 military mobilization proved it. During these conflicts, both sides were not apprehensive about the risk of nuclear retaliation—and neither side setup their nuclear arsenals for use (Lavoy, 2009:4).

5.2 International Anarchic Structure

The reason for India and Pakistan conflict lies that there is no confirm the status of each other. They don't know about each other's intentions. There are other influences that describe the anarchical features those include the lack of the political maturity. The situations of anarchy become difficult to read the mind of the foe country. The intentions cannot be defined accurately.

In addition, the most drastic situation at the international level from the anarchic point of view can be the presence of nuclear war from both the countries. Then it would become unwise to block such situation (Schweers, 2008:3).

Anarchy as a factor of India and Pakistan conflict has many dimensions in strategic and economic gains. The dilemma of both states lies in the anarchy situation. However, the no implication of rule of law has made it more complicated. India's obsession to become a regional hegemony and regional power and Pakistan role after 9/11 has created many problems and gave rise to an international anarchy.

Kashmir-problem is the major bone of contention between two nuclear states (Schweers, 2008:4). Pakistan considers the Kashmir question as an important strategic problem requiring resolution for region's sustainability (Kronstadt, 2009:194). India rejects the involvement of international institutions in the resolution of Kashmir problem whereas Pakistan advocates resolution through international institutions (Schweers, 2008:4).

Another dimension of international anarchic structure prevails in the sense that China favors Pakistan and helps in establishing its nuclear capabilities which is a clear violation of the guidelines and a great challenge for the USA policies (Herz 2010: 51). The nuclear transfers may harm the USA's regional and global interests; therefore, the USA actively oppose against China favoring Pakistan (Herz 2010: 51).

In the recent decade, a situation of anarchy has also been created by the issues of security of Pakistani nuclear assets. Concern has been expressed at an international level that Pakistan's nuclear assets security is prone to leakage. A regular concern regarding Pakistan's nuclear program highlighted that "serious vulnerabilities still exist in the Pakistan nuclear protection and security structures" (Kronstadt, 2010: 50). Insider threats are considered more potent (Kronstadt, 2010: 50).

5.3 India-Pakistan Conflict since 1998 as a Security Dilemma

Increased mistrust and uncertainty of intentions characterize India and Pakistan conflict and realism is an international relations' theory which provides conceptual tools to forecast how states

act in their own national interest when confronted with mistrust and uncertainty in the anarchic international system. The theoretical literature suggests there exist no consensus among proliferation “optimists” and “pessimists” on the stable or unstable effects of atomic weapons on security dilemma. Therefore, Kronstadt asserts that nuclear weapons provide a connection to the concept of power as well as they can be considered security ‘threat’ to national security (Kronstadt, 2009:165).

Ahmed provides an insight into the issue, as “Pakistan’s decision to test in the wake of Indian tests might have been partially the consequence of a failure amongst the international society to penalize India” (2000:782). However, Pakistan’s this move developed a strong opinion in India that evident weaponization would be the solution of the issue (Ahmed, 2000:782). Therefore, the case of India-Pakistan shows characteristics of the security dilemma that emphasizes “a choice between two equal and undesirable alternatives”. India and Pakistan seek improved security. However, this results in action-reaction cycle of insecurity, thus reversing all efforts to attain security.

The neorealist explanation of the nuclear conflict 1998 between India and Pakistan suggest that development of nuclear weapons capabilities by the two states preserved and added to the overall both states’ enmity and security dilemma cycle. In addition, Pakistani prominent leadership has been regularly expressing their concerns regarding attainment of foreign defense weapons by India. This has been raising security tensions and creating an arms race with India—as predicted by the realist theory.

The neorealist explanation also suggests that the attainment of atomic weapons decreases the possibility of incidence of war; however, it can increase a state’s willingness to be engaged in limited hostilities. In case of India and Pakistan conflict in the late-1990s, both states held exercises of the military force emphasizing offensive, tri-service military operations. Islamabad expressed grave concerns over India’s Feb 2000 “Vijay Chakra” military exercises for producing limited wars. The cross-border firing between Pakistani and Indian forces in Kashmir can be interpreted in the context of neorealist (Bedi, 1998:108).

From the traditional realist perspectives, the diffusion of advanced military capabilities matters only when there had been threat perceptions (Kronstadt, 2009:167). The neoclassical view focuses

on the always probability of conflict whereas structural realist perspective dictates vigilance against the ubiquitous possibility of conflict (Kronstadt, 2009:167). Pakistan, the revisionist party in the conflict, always sees the subcontinent's security dilemma more as a threat to the very existence of the Pakistani state than India's allegedly relentless pursuit of regional hegemony (Kronstadt, 2009:167).

Realism theory takes the national interest as the basic element. The Indian and Pakistan national interest has been stuck at a point of Kashmir issue. It has been a security issue for both the countries. Due to this Pakistan is taken as the threat for India (Kronstadt 2009:180). Pakistan is the threat for the Muslim community in India both the issues that have been explained target the 150 million muslims in the region. The great threats for India are from Chinese nation (Kronstadt, 2009:180). It may serve as the threat to the Indian objectives. But the threat of Indian national culture for Pakistan cannot be ignored. There are other factors that play a major role in security dilemma for Pakistan. The factors are regional and cultural factors but the extra-regional actors like the US play a great role in enhancing this issue (Kronstadt, 2009:180).

Thus, realism has explanatory power when it emphasizes the relevance of power operating in international relations. It has proven indispensably useful theoretical framework to conduct an analysis of the India-Pakistan conflict since 1998 (Kronstadt, 2009:14). However, it has a largely static view of international compulsions and circumstances —that make it ill-suited to explain the change in South Asia (Kronstadt, 2009:14).

Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

Realism specifically the concept of security dilemma has been accurate in explaining and concluding the Pakistan and India conflict. There are many factors responsible for the start of the conflict, such as military, economic, strategic, societal, and political factors. All these factors drive both the parties into misunderstanding and start of the conflict to maximize the chances of harsh attitude towards each other. On the other hand, all these forces play a vital role in the constitution of foreign policy. Additionally, the anarchic structure of the world which shows that there is no power and authority and there is lack of accountability over it to check the wrong deeds fuels the Pakistan and India conflict.

While looking at the history of the Pakistan and India, it is concluded that during the span of 70 years, both countries have been involved in the wars and they have fought three wars and various battles and minor operations. They have been fighting the battles in the field of diplomacy, which have been fruitless and useless. Both the countries have been pointing at each other for mistrust and they did not miss a single moment for blaming each other for any incident. Since 1998, Pakistan and India anarchistic system is clearly evident in their troubled relationship and a root-cause of their security problems in the region.

However, the unhealthy relationship between India and Pakistan is sensitive to the well-being of the other nations of the world and hence, this topic is of most concern and importance for the international relations of countries. The nuclear war in Hiroshima and Nagasaki proved to be most destructive in the history of Japan. The after-effects are still felt by the habitats of the nearby. As the world has experienced the after-effects of nuclear war once in the history, that is why they are more alert now and thus are seeking a resolution to end the conflict between India and Pakistan so that both the countries are refrained from starting a serious fight that may include usage of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, both states' overall strategic and military rivalry is hindering much needed political, economic and social development. The analysis of the historical events vividly shows that

Pakistan's leadership should wait for the appropriate time to press for the Kashmir conflict's resolution. However, to drive to the sustainable peace process, all the people's pressure has significance. Moreover, both states must seize the moment whenever an opportunity presents itself.

6.2 Recommendations

There is no immediate solution to the problem of India-Pakistan conflict because the immense diversity of public opinion and different political and military players who have divergent interests complicate this conflict situation. A mutually acceptable solution to the conflict has been hindered by the dogmatic stance of leaders coupled with the high political rhetoric of the leader.

This study concludes that the Kashmir issue has the potential to resolve many India-Pakistan conflict issues as it is the hurdle between the stability of the region. Pakistan and India must take steps to resolve their issues, especially Kashmir, which could be acceptable for everyone. The resolution of the Kashmir-dispute is very important for the successful bilateral cooperation. Both countries must show serious efforts to resolve this dispute before any kind of long-term cooperation is even possible.

The mutual threat can be decreased by normalizing relations between Pakistan and India. For this, proper policies for economic and socio-cultural co-operation can have a healthy effect on the relations. Different engagements like trade, economic relations, relaxed visa policies, trade conferences and discussion between parliamentarians would serve the roadmap for the normalization of relations (Adnan, 2013:132).

Creation of a security regime can help in mitigating the anarchic structure which has viciously trapped India and Pakistan into a conflict. Both India and Pakistan can themselves find the solution for getting out of this South Asian international anarchic structure. China cannot play a significant role in initiating a viable regime because such international nuclear power regime would be against the USA policies in the region (Schweers, 2008:6). Therefore, both India and Pakistan need to overcome this anarchy by resolving the nuclear tensions through bilateral means as fast as possible (Schweers, 2008:4)—if both states are really interested in the peace of the region.

Bibliography

- Adnan, M., 2013. Areas of Engagement and Security Threats between India and Pakistan. *Journal of Political Studies*, (20:1), p. 131-142.
- Ahmed, I., 2010. India-Pakistan Relations Post-Mumbai Terrorist Attacks. Online: <http://www.isasnus.org/events/insights/90.pdf> (Last Accessed: Access Date).
- Arnett, E. H., (1997) Military Research and Development in Southern Asia: Limited Capabilities Despite Impressive Resources, in Arnett, E. H. (ed.) *Military Capacity and the Risk of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.243-245.
- Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. (London: Sage Publications Ltd).
- Behera, N. C., (2006) *Demystifying Kashmir*. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press).
- Bose, S., (2009) *Kashmir: Roots of Conflict, Paths to Peace*. (London: Harvard University Press).
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, (9:2), pp. 27-40.
- Cheema, M. J. (2015) Pakistan-India Conflict with Special Reference to Kashmir, *South Asian Studies*, (30:1), pp. 45.
- Cheema, P. I., (2006) Explaining India-Pakistan Crises: Beyond the Stability-Instability Paradox in Cheema, P. I. and Bokhari, I. H. (eds.) *Arms Race and Nuclear Developments in South Asia* (Islamabad: Islamabad Policy Research Institute), pp.134-137.
- Cohen, S. P., (2013) *Shooting for a Century: The India-Pakistan Conundrum*. (Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution Press).

- Creswell, J. W., (2007) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc).
- Donnelly, J., (2000) *Realism and International Relations*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Donnelly, J., (2013) Realism in Burchill, S., *et al.* (eds.) *Theories of International Relations* 3 ed (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan), pp.29-54.
- Dunne, T. and Schmidt, B. C., (2014) Realism, in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Dunne, T. and Smith, B. C., (2011) Realism, in Baylis, J., Smith, S. and Owens, P. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.323-342.
- Elman, C., (2012) Realism, in Williams, P. D. (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (London: Routledge), pp.15-28.
- Ganguly, S., (2002) *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions since 1947*. (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Glaser, C. L., (2016) Realism, in Collins, A. (ed.) *Contemporary Security Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.13-29.
- Gul, N. (2004) Post-9/11 Pakistan-India Relations, *Pakistan Horizon*, (57:3), pp. 67-77.
- Hardy, M. A., and Bryman, A., (2004) *Handbook of Data Analysis*. (London: Sage).
- Hasan, S. (2005) India and Pakistan: Common Identity and Conflict, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, (24:4), pp. 74-80.

- Herz, J. H., (2014) *Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma*, in Elman, C. and Jensen, M. (eds.) *The Realism Reader* (New York: Routledge), pp.60-61.
- Hussain, R., 2005. 'Nuclear Doctrines in South Asia'. Online: <http://sassi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Nuclear-Doctrines-in-South-Asia.pdf> (Last Accessed: 1/11/2017).
- Johnson, R., (2005) *A Region in Turmoil: South Asian Conflicts since 1947*. (London: Reaktion Books).
- Jørgensen, K. E., (2010) *International Relations Theory: A New Introduction*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Khan, S., (2009) *Nuclear Weapons and Conflict Transformation: The Case of India-Pakistan*. (New York: Routledge).
- Khan, S. R., *et al.*, 2007. 'Regional Integration, Trade and Conflict in South Asia'. Online: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.452.1208&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (Last Accessed: 1/11/2017).
- Koithara, V., (2004) *Crafting Peace in Kashmir: Through a Realist Lens*. (India: SAGE Publications).
- Kronstadt, K. A. (2009) *What Drives Subcontinental Insecurity?: A Multitheoretic Examination of the India-Pakistan Conflict Dyad*. Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Southern California.
- Kronstadt, K. A., 2010. 'Pakistan: Key Current Issues and Developments'. Online: <http://www.dtic.mil/docs/citations/ADA524099> (Last Accessed: 1/11/2017).

- Lahti, M., 2002. 'The Policies of the United States Towards the Indian and the Pakistani Nuclear Weapons Programs'. Online: <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/18297/thepolic.pdf?sequence=2> (Last Accessed: 1/11/2017).
- Larkin, P. J., 2013. 'Kashmir-the Key to Peace in Afghanistan'. Online: https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/32853/13Mar_Larkin_Patrick.pdf?sequence=1 (Last Accessed: 1/11/2017).
- Mazari, S. M., (2003) *The Kargil Conflict, 1999: Separating Fact from Fiction*. (Islamabad: Institute for Strategic Studies).
- McCulloch, G., (2004) *Documentary Research: In Education, History and the Social Sciences*. (London: Routledge).
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (1990) Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War, *International Security*, (15:1), pp. 5-56.
- Mearsheimer, J. J., (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. (New York: WW Norton & Company).
- Mearsheimer, J. J., (2013) Structural Realism, in Dunne, T., Kurki, M. and Smith, S. (eds.) *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* 3rd ed (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.77-93.
- Merriam, S. B., (2002) Introduction to Qualitative Research, in Merriam, S. B. (ed.) *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.), pp.3-17.
- Merriam, S. B., (2009) *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. (San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons).

- Mir, S. A., and Wani, A. R. (2014) Kashmir-the Origin of Indo-Pak Conflicts (War, Peace, and Dialogue), *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, (4:25), pp. 115-117.
- Ogilvie-White, T. (1996) Is There a Theory of Nuclear Proliferation? An Analysis of the Contemporary Debate, *The Nonproliferation Review*, (4:1), pp. 43-60.
- Paul, T. V., (2005) *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Paul, T. V. (2006) Why Has the India-Pakistan Rivalry Been So Enduring? Power Asymmetry and an Intractable Conflict, *Security Studies*, (15:4), pp. 600-630.
- Pervez, M. S., (2013) *Security Community in South Asia: India-Pakistan*. (New York: Routledge).
- Rid, S. A. (2012) Kashmir: The Prisoner's Dilemma for India and Pakistan, *Peace Prints: South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, (4:2), pp. 1-11.
- Rid, S. A. (2015) Getting to Yes in the India-Pakistan Conflict: Addressing Indian Concerns on a Possible Compromise with Pakistan, *Peace, Conflict & Development*:21, March 2015).
- Rizvi, H.-A. (2001) Pakistan's Nuclear Testing, *Asian Survey*, (41:6), pp. 943-955.
- Roy-Chaudhury, R. (2009) India Versus Pakistan: From Partition to the Present, *The RUSI Journal*, (154:4), pp. 60-65.
- Sagan, S. (2001) The Perils of Proliferation in South Asia, *Asian Survey*, (41:6), pp. 1064-1086.
- Schweers, P., 2008. 'India and Pakistan: Trapped in a Security Paradox?', *Dusseldorf Institute for Foreign and Security Policy*. Online: http://www.intelligence-and-investigations.com/media/uploads/69_Security%20Dilemma.pdf (Last Accessed: 1/11/2017).

- Snyder, J. (2004) One World, Rival Theories, *Foreign Policy*, (145:1), pp. 52-62.
- Sridharan, E., (2007) *The India-Pakistan Nuclear Relationship: Theories of Deterrence and International Relations*. (India: Routledge).
- Stake, R. E., (2008) Qualitative Case Studies, in Denzin, N. K., And Yvonna S. Lincoln. (ed.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (Los Angeles: Sage Publications), pp.119-150.
- Stears, J., et al., (2010) *An Introduction to International Relations Theory: Perspectives and Themes*. (Essex: Routledge).
- Stears, J., et al., (2013) *An Introduction to International Relations Theory: Perspectives and Themes*. (London: Routledge).
- Swami, P., (2009) A War to End a War: The Causes and Outcomes of the 2001–2 India–Pakistan Crisis, in Ganguly, S. and Kapur, S. P. (eds.) *Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia: Crisis Behaviour and the Bomb* (London: Routledge), pp.144-161.
- Taliaferro, J. W. (2000) Security Seeking under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisited, *International Security*, (25:3), pp. 128-161.
- Thayer, B. A. (1995) The Causes of Nuclear Proliferation and the Utility of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime, *Security Studies*, (4:3), pp. 463-519.
- Voinea, E. (2016) Realism Today: Can the Pessimistic Perspective Account for Current Events in International Relations?, *E-International Relations Students*, (12:1).
- Wheeler, N. J. (2010) “I Had Gone to Lahore with a Message of Goodwill but in Return We Got Kargil”: The Promise and Perils of “Leaps of Trust” in India-Pakistan Relations, *India review*, (9:3), pp. 319-344.

Yin, R. K., (2014) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th ed. (New York: Sage publications).