

How to Cite This Article: Shaheen, N., Ali, I., & Arif, M. (2023). The Worst to Best Hopes: An Appraisal of Pakistan-India Relations. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 555–561.
<https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i2.294>



The Worst to Best Hopes: An Appraisal of Pakistan-India Relations

Nighat Shaheen	PhD. Scholar, Department of Pakistan Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.
Imran Ali	Assistant Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.
Muhammad Arif	PhD. Scholar, Department of Pakistan Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan

Vol. 3, No. 2 (Spring 2023)

Pages: 555 – 561

ISSN (Print): 2789-441X

ISSN (Online): 2789-4428

Key Words

Pakistan, India, Kashmir, LOC, Terrorism

Corresponding Author:

Imran Ali

Email: imran_ali@iub.edu.pk

Abstract: *The relations between Pakistan and India share a critical relations history. Both the neighboring states fought major three wars in 1965, 1971 and 1998 (Kargil) and numerous medium and small-level clashes due to a number of different causes. The study founds Kashmir as the root cause as well as Line of Control (LOC) issues, interference in each other country affairs, political criticism and religious issues have been observed as misunderstandings between both countries. However, the leadership of both nations have a history to solve these issues through peaceful means but yet failed. This study relies on multiple sources i.e. primary and secondary through descriptive research methods. The study suggests that Pakistani and Indian delegates would do well to compromise their positions and build confidence between them as well as it will be necessary to retain some degree of flexibility with regard to the principles and points that are being negotiated.*

Introduction/Historical Evolution of Indo-Pak Relations

The history of relations between Pakistan and the rest of the world has been marked by misunderstanding, mistrust, a lack of confidence to make hopeful judgments, misinterpretation, and disharmony. These characteristics have persisted throughout their development. The contentious nature of India and Pakistan's relationship can be partially attributed to the political and historical situations that exist between the two countries. The bloody partition of the Indian Subcontinent in 1947 has had a profound effect on the dynamics of the relationship that exists between India and Pakistan. When Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah spoke to a crowd at Bombay's Chamber of Commerce after Pakistan's freedom, he said,

"Our new home is Pakistan, and your new home is India (Wojczewski, 2014).

Our goal is to have relations with our neighbors that are as amicable as those between siblings. We intend to treat our neighbors as we would our own family, as friends and business partners. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru argued that "we cannot be rivals forever and good relations are better than fighting" in a 1950 address to the Indian Parliament. A quote from Nehru: "Peaceful interactions are preferable to violent ones (Chatterji, 2020)."

Additionally, India and Pakistan attempted to create diplomatic links early on following the separation of the subcontinent; however, opposing territory claims and other clashes

dominated their interactions with one another. Even after they had each created their independent nation, tensions remained between the two groups because the leadership of the Hindu community refused to accept Pakistan's existence. This led to the continuation of many of the conflicts that had arisen between them. The hostilities between India and Pakistan had been slowly growing worse over the years, and India's goal was to completely eradicate Pakistan from the face of the world. Since their respective countries attained independence, these two nations have been involved in a total of four major wars (1948, 1956, and 1971), a military conflict in Kargil (1999), and several other armed skirmishes and standoffs. Instead thinks that the terrible separation that took place between India and Pakistan caused both nations to view themselves in opposition to the other, which in turn resulted in four wars between the two nations in the decades that followed the partition (Pramanik & Roy, 2014).

Kashmir Issue

Kashmir is the key issue yet unsolved between both states. There are many different perspectives on the Kashmir issue because different people with various ideologies and interests will prioritise different things. A fundamental issue, the right to self-determination, has been politicized and exaggerated to the point where it has become entangled in a complicated dispute between India and Pakistan. The conflict in Kashmir has been going on for a significant number of years without resolution. On January 1, 1949, the United Nations Security Council decided to put a stop to the hostilities that had been going on between Pakistan and India. However, this has never been the case concerning India. The conflict over Kashmir has not been settled because India and Pakistan see the situation from very different viewpoints and have very different expectations. Unresolved conflicts in Kashmir

provide a threat to national security throughout the entirety of South Asia (Varshney, 1991).

The disputed region of Kashmir between India and Pakistan has been at the epicentre of several conflicts that have broken out between the two countries. In its current iteration, the partition plan makes it abundantly clear that Pakistan will be in charge of Kashmir. India is unwavering in its commitment to upholding its ironclad policy, in contrast to the willingness of certain other countries to reach a compromise. When it comes to the conflict in Kashmir, India maintains a steadfast and unyielding position. Because there are so many Muslims living in Kashmir, he was positive that Pakistan will eventually seize the territory. The concept of two countries served as motivation for Muslims living in the subcontinent to search for a nation of their own, in which they could openly practice their religion of Islam. As a result of the widespread belief among Hindus and some Muslims that the Indian National Congress was the only political organization in the country with any legitimacy, opposition to the two-nation idea was widespread (Cohen, 2002).

Muslims in both Pakistan and Kashmir believe that the distribution of territory is not complete unless Pakistan incorporates Kashmir into its territory. This is because the primary cause of the conflict is the violation of the concept of the two nations. Because of the Kashmir issue, these two neighboring countries have engaged in a total of three large wars with each other, all of which were ultimately unsuccessful. Because the people of Kashmir are lawfully exercising their right to self-determination in conformity with UN resolutions, a conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir is uncalled for. India and Pakistan should avoid this conflict at all costs. This independence was granted to the people who lived in 584 different princely states, but to this day, it is still withheld from the people who live in Kashmir (Subbiah, 2004).

Kargil Conflict

The Kashmir Valley plays a pivotal role in the larger fight taking place in Kashmir due to the existence of an Indian reinforcement line there. The conflict reinforced the reality that a nuclear showdown is a real possibility. Each country tested nuclear weapons in the run-up to the war. The actions made by the international community averted a full-scale nuclear war. In 1999, a dispute between Pakistan and India came perilously close to triggering a nuclear war between the two countries. The only reason a nuclear conflict wasn't started was because the United States got involved. Washington, which helped end the Kargil conflict, had its preconceptions tested by what happened. Since then, the United States has voiced its worry over the region's potential for instability in South Asia. The United States has been a driving force behind recent official and public-to-public visits and talks between Pakistan and India to discuss and resolve disputed subjects, most notably the conflict in Kashmir. The goal of these endeavours is to have open dialogue and find peaceful solutions to contentious issues, such as the conflict in Kashmir. International players' involvement led to a ceasefire in the conflict. The Kashmir conflict, which has been simmering between Pakistan and India for a long time, finally reached a tipping point thanks in large part to the efforts of the United States of America (Joeck, 2008)

Water Issue

When India shut off Pakistan's water supply in 1948, the people living in Pakistan were terrified of the possibility that India might eventually achieve full authority over Jammu and Kashmir. This fear was exacerbated by the fact that India had just cut off Pakistan's water supply. This is true not only for the beginnings of the Kashmir conflict but also for several other border disputes and accusations of migrations of ethnic minority groups. When describing the current condition of relations between India and Pakistan, both the

government and the media tend to utilise vocabulary that is both contradictory and aggressive. This conversation is getting started right now because water plays such an important role in the plan that we now have in place. It is reasonable to anticipate that there will be an increase in the number of conflicts that involve water in the future because both the global population and the use of energy are expected to maintain their upward trends. "As a result of this, a great number of countries are fighting for control of water resources to guarantee that they will have sufficient amounts for the foreseeable future. India, which is located on the upper riparian side, and Pakistan, which is located on the lower riparian side, are at loggerheads about who will get what portion of the water in the Indus basin. Pakistan is having a hard time for several reasons, the most pressing of which is a severe lack of access to electricity because India is not adhering to the terms of the treaty and is building dams on water that is legally Pakistani territory. This is causing the country to experience severe difficulties. Pakistan would not be able to meet its energy requirements unless political tensions are defused and new hydroelectric power plants are built. It is in everyone's best interest for India and Pakistan to resolve their water conflicts in a way that is mutually acceptable to one another if they wish to see tranquilly and peace throughout South Asia (Riffat & Iftikhar, 2015).

Role of Media

The coverage given by the media has the potential to be a useful instrument in clearing up any ambiguities regarding the motivations of either party. Both online and print media must perform their duties in the most professional manner possible. The insufficient attention paid by the media to a variety of issues has proven to be the most significant barrier to the progress being made in the process of healing ties between these two South Asian powers. Propaganda and the dissemination of misleading information are

not guaranteed to result in success in all circumstances. The media can, in many situations, play a constructive part in assisting in the process of finding solutions to problems by bringing attention to relevant factors and igniting open discourse about the variety of available options. The news outlets of Pakistan and India must collaborate to raise awareness about the importance of respecting and understanding one another to maintain peace and harmony in South Asia (Bhatnagar). The enmity of the media is another obstacle, which has been called "a factor for the failure of peace attempts between the two parties." The majority of the propaganda that was spread on both sides was spread by news channels based in India. Nearly every time a violent occurrence, attack by militants or terrorist attack took place, the media pointed the finger at the other countries, in this case, Pakistan. More than a hundred Pakistanis were killed in the Samjhota Express Blasts in 2006, yet the media has propagandised the public into believing that Pakistan was responsible for the attack. Despite this, as the investigation went on, it became more and more obvious that Hindu fanatics were to blame for the violence that occurred. There was nobody in command of the negative media coverage, which contributed to the escalation of tensions between the two nations. It is abundantly clear that media and societal animosity have frequently failed representatives for negotiations. Considering that Musharraf's five-pronged cashmere method was roundly rejected by the Pakistanis in 2004 and that at selected points the media launched its campaign that did not survive the conflict resolution process, it is abundantly clear that media and societal animosity have often failed representatives for negotiations (Khan & Rashid, 2020).

Musharraf Era

The contentious past between Pakistan and India about territorial claims and water resources in Kashmir, Siachen, and Sir Creek is a contributing

factor to the current state of their strained relationship. This idea also plays a role in the Pakistani government's foreign policy against India. Both countries need to collaborate to find solutions to these issues. During his tenure as president of Pakistan, General Musharraf strove to strengthen relations with India and other countries. However, he was careful not to do so in a way that would jeopardize the sovereignty or security of Pakistan. During the press conference when he introduced himself, he provided an overview of his goals for India. He stated that he intended to safeguard India's honour by reacting to hostility with hostility, peace with peace, and threats with threats. Whoever threatened Pakistan should expect the same response from Pakistan's government. Under Musharraf's leadership, Pakistan's foreign policy shifted to place a greater emphasis on the Kashmir issue (Kardousd & Javaid, 2017).

However, some incidents destroyed the relations between Pakistan and India such as the hijacking of Indian Airlines Flight IC 814, which was travelling from Kathmandu, Nepal, to New Delhi. On December 24, 1999, approximately an hour after takeoff, the jet was taken over by its hijackers, who flew it first to Amritsar airport and then to Lahore in Pakistan. After refuelling in Dubai, the aircraft continued on to its destination of Kandahar in Afghanistan. New Delhi gave in to intense pressure from the media and agreed to the release of Maulana Masood Azhar in exchange for the release of the Indian hostages who were being held on the hijacked aircraft (Baruah, 2008).

Further, on December 22, 2000, terrorists affiliated with Lashkar-e-Toiba stormed New Delhi's Red Fort and took control of the building. Inside the Fort are both an Indian military unit and a secure interrogation room that is shared by the Central Bureau of Investigation and the Indian Army. Terrorists were able to get past the guards who were stationed at the Red Fort, and they were responsible for the deaths of two Indian soldiers. The fact that the strike took place

only two days after India and Pakistan declared a cease-fire makes it noteworthy that it took place (Thakur, 2011).

Later, on December 13, 2001, terrorists launched an assault on the building housing the Parliament of India in New Delhi. The suspicion that the terrorist organisations Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) and Jaish-e-Muhammad (JeM) were behind the rise of tensions between Pakistan and India in the years leading up to the military standoff that occurred in 2001 and 2002 was a contributing factor. Both the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) and Jaish-e-Muhammad were declared illegal organisations as a direct result of actions taken by President Musharraf (JeM) (Ahmad, Samsu, Khushk & Mahesar, 2016).

The leaders of the terrorist organisations Jaish-e-Mohammad (JeM) and Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), who are suspected of being responsible for the attack on the Indian parliament, were requested to be given over. This was another request that was made. Pakistan has stated that it will provide evidence if it is requested to do so, as well as reject the charges. In addition, Pakistan put its armed forces in a defensive position along the border and the Line of Control (LoC). In many instances, they came dangerously close to starting a war. "The troops of both countries stood eye ball to eye ball" over a year, with each side coming perilously close to declaring war multiple times. During this time, "the forces of both countries stood eyeball to eye ball." As the level of animosity between the two countries rose, the likelihood of a nuclear war breaking out between them increased. Concerned about military antagonism and nuclear participation, the international community worked to restore regular relations and calm the situation. U.S. President George W. Bush sent his sympathies to the Indian Prime Minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, during a phone call in which they discussed the recent terrorist attack on the Indian Parliament. In addition to this, he coordinated clandestine operations against transnational terrorist groups with President Musharraf over the phone. When

Pakistan made an effort to stop Islamic terrorist organisations from participating in jihad in Indian-occupied Kashmir, there was a fundamental shift in the country's policy toward India. Pakistan's stance toward India shifted significantly (Bashir & Ahmed, 2013).

Towards Betterment

After some time, Pakistan resumed participating in the peace process by resuming Composite Dialogue, establishing new diplomatic contacts, resuming overflights, and other related activities. Kargil demonstrated not only that war is never the answer to a problem and that military adventures are pointless in place of peace and progress, but also that trust between Pakistan and India was severely damaged as a result of the conflict. A parallel history of communication between India and Pakistan is also something that needs to be considered if one wishes to have a complete understanding of the conflict that was just described. Following the events of Kargil, which lasted for more than a year, both parties reached the conclusion that it was time to resume negotiations. When Vajpayee published an article on January 1, 2001, stressing the importance of doing something about the situation in that region, India took the first step toward finding a solution to the problem that has been plaguing Kashmir since it began. On the first of the year 2001, the Prime Minister of India made a statement that was particularly uplifting. After that, he voiced his optimism that high-level officials from both countries would meet one another in the near future. After making his views known to the public through the media, it took the head of the Indian government approximately four months before he issued an invitation to President Musharraf to meet in Agra. The initiative was formally introduced to the public during Musharraf's visit to India in July, during which both he and Modi participated in formal discussions.

According to statements made by former Minister of Foreign Affairs Abdul Sattar,

meetings in Agra were attended by only the two parties involved and one note-taker from each side. Throughout the course of the negotiations, there were a lot of highs and a lot of lows. People in Pakistan had a positive outlook on how the talks would turn out because the news media, particularly on television, had presented the outcome in a favourable light. The optimism was, for the most part, misplaced, and efforts to make headway toward a solution to the primary problem in Kashmir were thwarted. On the other hand, after making some headway, the two sides were ready to sign a joint declaration when the Indian side suddenly withdrew from the negotiations. It has been determined that a number of factors, including Musharraf's breakfast meeting with Indian media on July 16, contributed to the failure of the Agra Summit. During this meeting, he emphasized how critical it is to find a peaceful solution to the Kashmir conflict in order to build cordial relations. The unsigned draught declaration states that "Progress towards the settlement of Jammu and Kashmir issue would be conducive towards normalization and will further the establishment of a cooperative relationship in a mutually reinforcing manner." This statement was made in reference to the ongoing conflict in Jammu and Kashmir. The consensus among knowledgeable individuals is that the summit was cancelled at the eleventh hour without adequate prior planning. The failure of the summit in Agra can be attributed to inadequate planning as well as the hidden reservations of influential policymakers on both sides (Malik & Cheema, 2017; Bashir & Ahmed, 2013).

Musharraf's Formula on Kashmir

Jammu and Kashmir have been a source of contention between Pakistan and India ever since Pakistan was founded in 1947. Both nations assert territorial claims to this area. In spite of seven decades of attempting to resolve their differences amicably, the two sides remain deadlocked and are instead focused on maximising their own interests. The narratives

they tell themselves and the justifications they offer for their positions on the problem are also distinct from one another. After the revolution of 1989–1990, Pakistan fought to have the issue of Kashmir recognised internationally, while India used repressive means to try to stop the separatist movement in Kashmir. The problem has now gone global thanks to Pakistan's efforts. It was also thought that General Musharraf had taken Pakistan's conventional stance on the Kashmir issue further from its prior position than any of his predecessors had done. To break a stalemate in 2001, he had a one-on-one with Atal Behari Vajpayee, the Prime Minister of India. Turns out that encounters were a big deal in getting things back to normal with India. According to a statement attributed to Musharraf, "We agree with the decisions made by the UN Security Council and we back those decisions fully. But we won't get into that right now, and instead will say that, in order to find a solution to this issue; both parties need to be willing to talk to each other flexibly, looking past their current positions to find common ground. We are prepared to rise to the occasion. And India has to be flexible." Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf laid out a four-point strategy to end the conflict in Kashmir in an interview with the Indian television network NDTV on December 5, 2006 (Kardousd & Javaid, 2017; Gul, 2007). These points were appreciated around the world and things were under consideration on both sides of the borders and hopes emerged from worst to best, however, there were no results finally.

Conclusion

India and Pakistan have a long past that includes many conflicts and agreements to end hostilities. There have been multiple conflicts between the two nations ever since they both gained freedom in the same year in 1947. India and Pakistan, two countries in South Asia, have tried many times to work together peacefully, but their efforts have all failed for various reasons. The age of the parties, the progress of continuing negotiations, and the existence of a contract were all taken into

account when assessing these disagreements. Although internal political factors are important in conflict resolution, strong and determined leadership is often the deciding factor between success and failure, optimism and despair. The key causes such as terrorism activities, interference of both states in each other affairs, LOC issues, political non-seriousness, and the Kashmir issue are the main issues that are destroying the peace between both states.

The pursuit of harmony must proceed without interruption. Pakistani and Indian delegates would do well to compromise their positions. Building confidence between each other is a shared responsibility. Strengthening international ties and fostering more in-person interaction between the populace at large are both crucial. In order to find a way to settle the major bilateral concerns that exist between the two countries, it will be necessary to retain some degree of flexibility with regard to the principles and points that are being negotiated.

References

- Ahmad, M. M., Samsu, K. H., Khushk, G. M., & Mahesar, P. A. (2016). Relations between India and Pakistan after Mumbai Attack 26/11. *JL Pol'y & Globalization*, 45, 227.
- Baruah, A. (2008). The Fourth Party. *India International Centre Quarterly*, 35(3/4), 194-199.
- Bashir, M, A & Ahmed, M. (2013). Pak-India Relations during Musharraf Era: Behavioral Study of Leadership. *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2).
- Chatterji, R. (2020). Peace and Conflict Studies: A prolegomenon. In *Peace and Conflict Studies* (pp. 10-21). Routledge India.
- Cohen, S. P. (2002). India, Pakistan and Kashmir. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 25(4), 32-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390412331302865>
- Gul, N. (2007). Pakistan-India Peace Process 1990-2007: An Appraisal. *Pakistan Horizon*, 60(2), 47-64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41500063>
- Joock, N. (2008). The Kargil War and nuclear deterrence. *Asian Security Studies*, 117-143. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203892862.ch7>
- Kardousd, M., & Javaid, U. (2017). Foreign Policy of Pakistan Towards India In Musharraf Era. *The Journal of Political Science*, 35, 40-51.
- Khan, D., & Rashid, M. (2020). Crucial water issues between Pakistan and India, CBMs, and the role of media. *South Asian Studies*, 28(1), 13-221.
- Malik, M. S., & Cheema, P. I. (2017). Agra Summit and Media Coverage: An Analysis. *Journal of Political Studies*, 24(1), 227-243.
- Pramanik, S., & Roy, T. K. (2020). Neutrosophic Game Theoretic Approach to Indo-Pak Conflict over Jammu-Kashmir. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 2, 82-101. Retrieved from <http://fs.unm.edu/NSS2/index.php/111/article/view/261>
- Riffat, F., & Iftikhar, A. (2015). Water issues and its implications over India-Pakistan relations. *JPUHS (Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society)*, 28(2), 11-20.
- Subbiah, S. (2004). Security council mediation and the Kashmir dispute: reflections on its failures and possibilities for renewal. *BC Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.*, 27, 173.
- Thakur, R. (2011). Delinking Destiny from Geography: The Changing Balance of India-Pakistan Relations. *India Quarterly*, 67(3), 197-212. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45073023>
- Varshney, A. (1991). India, Pakistan, and Kashmir: Antinomies of nationalism. *Asian Survey*, 31(11), 997-1019. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2645304>
- Wojczewski, T. (2014). The persistency of the India-Pakistan conflict: Chances and obstacles of the bilateral composite dialogue. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*, 1(3), 319-345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347797014551269>