

INDIA'S POLICY OPTIONS TO CHANGE PAKISTAN'S BEHAVIOUR

ANKIT KUMAR

The India-Pakistan relationship is one of the few in the world which is dictated by passions and emotions on both sides of the border. The result of a hockey match between India and Pakistan in any part of the world has repercussions in the subcontinent. One day, the leaders of the countries would be holding talks to resolve disputes and make permanent peace and the very next day, there would be an attack. This showcases the dynamics of the relationship between India and Pakistan, which despite sharing a common history and culture, are poles apart. What India and Pakistan share with each other is mutual dislike, disdain and mistrust. Kashmir continues to remain a flashpoint, with warnings that a fourth war on Kashmir is imminent¹. For India, avoiding another war and eliciting a favourable outcome will remain a challenge. Are these indicators that India needs to adopt a new kind of approach with Pakistan?

The Secretary General of the United Nations Ban Ki-moon has reiterated on several occasions that peace in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) can be achieved only through dialogue. There is nothing new in this suggestion. In fact, it has been one of the oldest approaches and has been repeatedly tried so as to establish a peaceful relationship which would be conducive to resolution of the disputes. The Shimla Agreement (1972), Lahore Declaration (1999), Agra

Ankit Kumar is a doctoral candidate at the School of International Studies (SIS), JNU, New Delhi.

1. "Pakistan's PM Sharif 'says J&K Could Trigger a New War with India'", *Daily Mail*, available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2518303/Pakistans-PM-Sharif-says-J-K-trigger-new-war-India.html>. Accessed on December 10, 2014.

Despite all the challenges and predictions of its collapse, Pakistan's economy has grown at the rate of 5 percent since 2005. With the changes in the trend in Pakistan and Asia, an economically stronger Pakistan might prove to be a bigger national security threat for India than it has been so far.

Summit (2001) – the list suffices to suggest that India has made several attempts to have a meaningful dialogue with Pakistan which would bring about some stability in the relationship, which could then result in a possible permanent settlement of the disputes. But the result speaks for itself. Contrary to expectations, Pakistan's policies against India have only become more sinister. The all-powerful Pakistan Army and Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) have been at the forefront to derail the peace processes. Pakistan continues to use state-sponsored terrorism to carry out attacks in India. As recently as in the South Asian

Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Summit held in Kathmandu in November 2014, Pakistan made all efforts for, and succeeded in, blocking India's efforts for regional integration. With such a background, if a dialogue is possibly held, how meaningful would it be? Importantly, is it possible to reach a win-win solution?

Pakistan has managed to beat the odds. Despite all the challenges and predictions of its collapse, Pakistan's economy has grown at the rate of 5 percent since 2005. With the changes in the trend in Pakistan and Asia, an economically stronger Pakistan might prove to be a bigger national security threat for India than it has been so far. This article makes a case for a gradual shift in India's Pakistan policy if India is to feel secure in South Asia. A powerful China and a stronger Pakistan could spell double trouble for India even if India improves its defensive capabilities. In such a scenario, it is imperative that India should try to explore if it can force Pakistan to change its behaviour. Changing Pakistan's behaviour, though not easy, is important, because as Lord Meghnad Desai puts it, "Pakistan is no longer a threat, it is a pin-prick" and the best way to deal with such irritants is to force them to change their behaviour.

This article is not about what India and Pakistan should do to resolve their disputes and make peace with each other. There are many peaceniks who still believe, and advocate, that the way forward to having a good relationship with Pakistan is through dialogue. But if history has taught anything, it is that India and Pakistan cannot have a peaceful relationship, at least not in the near future. Because 67 years of dialogue have failed to improve the relationship and the final outcome of the peace process is inconsequential. India and Pakistan perceive each other as mortal enemies. On the one hand, Pakistan promises India a peaceful relationship if the dialogue is continued but, on the other hand, it uses the peace process as an opportunity to carry out covert operations against India.

On the one hand, Pakistan promises India a peaceful relationship if the dialogue is continued but, on the other hand, it uses the peace process as an opportunity to carry out covert operations against India.

The same happened when Nawaz Sharif was reelected as prime minister but soon all the euphoria and optimism for a peaceful India-Pakistan relationship dissipated when the Pakistan Army took charge of the situation. This article explores the policy options that could be employed by India to force a behaviour change on Pakistan. More than a friendly relationship with Pakistan, India should be concerned about its security. This paper suggests four options that may be utilised in combination to force Pakistan to mend its ways.

PAKISTAN: A FAILED OR A FAILING STATE?

According to the theory, propounded by authors James Robinson and Daron Acemoglu, in the book *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*, it is political institutions that determine the fate of nations and not economic policies, geography, culture, or value systems². Nations succeed when political and economic institutions are “inclusive” and “pluralistic”, creating incentives for everyone to invest in the future; and nations fail when

2. Michele Boldrin, David K. Levine and Salvatore Modica, “A Review of Acemoglu and Robinson’s *Why Nations Fail*”, at <http://www.dklevine.com/general/aandreview.pdf>. Accessed on December 12, 2014.

institutions are “extractive,” protecting the political and economic power of only a small elite that takes income from everyone else³. The theory is sufficient to suggest the status of Pakistan as a success or failure. Pakistan’s ranking on the Failed State Index issued by the Fund for Peace dipped from 13 in 2013 to 10 in 2014⁴. However, this is not surprising given that Pakistan has been in the list of top 10 failed states ever since the ratings started in 2005. This begs the obvious question that even after so much financial aid, why has the situation not improved? There are various reasons for this, ranging from geographic location, absence of an education system, lack of economic reforms, etc. But the most important of all is perhaps that Pakistan wants to maintain an image of a ‘failing state’.

According to Christine Fair, an expert on Pakistan, “Pakistan is not a failed state. It is not a failing state, and it’s not a state that will fail. Pakistan is actually very stable. Pakistan’s military takes basically all the resources that it wants and needs, and invests those resources into the security competition with India. And that’s how it is able to draw in the international community and extract sustained international aid.”⁵ This aid is essential to keep the entire state on life support, and Pakistan as well as the international community will ensure that the aid does not dry up. So, the theory in India that Pakistan will collapse and it will be a bad thing for India is simply a myth. Because history suggests that the Pakistan Army is going to ensure the survival of the state at any cost.

If two states want to have a good and mutually beneficial relationship, it is essential that both bury or resolve their disagreements, and cooperate. India wants a peaceful relationship with Pakistan and the political class in Pakistan has reluctantly tried to reciprocate. However, whole-hearted support from Pakistan is missing. The political section and a significant

3. William Easterly, “The Roots of Hardship”, *The Wall Street Journal*, at <http://www.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304724404577293714016708378?mg=reno64-wsj&url=http%3A%2F%2Fonline.wsj.com%2Farticle%2FSB10001424052702304724404577293714016708378.html>. Accessed on December 12, 2014.
4. “Fragile State Index 2014”, The Fund for Peace, at <http://library.fundforpeace.org/library/cfsir1423-fragilestatesindex2014-06d.pdf>. Accessed on December 14, 2014.
5. “Pakistan Exploits ‘Failed State’ Image, Says US Scholar”, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), at <http://gandhara.rferl.org/content/pakistan-fair-failed-state/26544552.html>. Accessed on December 14, 2014.

Pakistani middle class wish to have a peaceful relationship with India. But unfortunately, they do not have much say in deciding Pakistan's foreign and security policies. Pakistan has been, and would continue to be, ruled by the military, either directly or indirectly. So regardless of who gets elected to power, the democratically elected government has no power or authority over the military and its policies.

Pakistan, though formed on the basis of religion, was not a theocratic state. The idea of Pakistan was to be a liberal constitutional state with a Muslim majority. But the initial instability in the top leadership saw power slip to the Punjabi dominated military which became the ruler of the state. The priority of the military rulers was to keep Pakistan united by any means and so a national narrative of nationhood was imposed upon all the different regions of Pakistan. Pakistan, as a nation, continues to struggle for an all inclusive narrative and national identity. There is no single narrative to combine the four separate regions into one nation. It has lacked a leadership which can fashion an inclusive narrative. This is why democracy is so fragile in Pakistan. Being a Muslim alone is not enough to survive in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The one good thing has been that no leader has so far tried to make Pakistan a purely Islamist state. But this might change with the rise of radical Islamism in Pakistan. Meghnad Desai says that the fragility of nationhood of Pakistan is the reason why all the sides in Pakistan need India as an enemy and Kashmir as a cause to keep them united⁶.

Economically, the country has not done very well. There is high inflation, widespread corruption, unemployment and an economy which is dependent on foreign aid for survival. There is also an acute energy crisis in several areas of Pakistan. However, in the last five years, Pakistan's economy has improved despite the clumsy state of affairs. Pakistan recorded a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of \$237 billion in 2014 which was 5 percent higher than last year⁷. The problem is that instead of using the GDP for

6. Meghnad Desai, "Out of My Mind: The Idea of Pakistan", *The Indian Express*, available at <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/out-of-my-mind-the-idea-of-pakistan/99/>. Accessed on December 15, 2014.

7. "Pakistan's GDP Growth Rate", *Trading Economics*, available at <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/pakistan/gdp-growth>. Accessed on December 15, 2014.

It can be assumed that Pakistan cannot have a peaceful relationship with India until the military is brought effectively under the civilian authority. The ISI also would have to be reined in for the peace process to be given a chance.

development and the welfare of the population, a large part of it is provided to the military. And this is not surprising given that in Pakistan, the military is considered the most important institution as the survival and existence of the state depends on it. To get all the privileges, the military has to keep emphasising its importance to the people of Pakistan and so it is extremely difficult for the military to agree to a good relationship with India as it would undermine its importance and, hence, its power. So, without exaggeration, it can be assumed that Pakistan cannot have a peaceful relationship with India

until the military is brought effectively under the civilian authority. The ISI also would have to be reined in for the peace process to be given a chance.

WHY THE US SUPPORTS PAKISTAN

For all those who are coming to the forefront to rescue Pakistan, stating its new-found zeal to eliminate terrorism, need to pause and rethink. The Pakistani military under Gen Raheel Sharif claims that it is targeting terrorists. However, Pakistan's approach towards eliminating terrorists remains selective. All the operations are being conducted in the northwest of Pakistan, ostensibly to target Al Qaeda. Pakistan is fighting the extremist groups that are opposed to the state of Pakistan like the Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP). This is where the argument from Pakistan of the good and bad Taliban fits in. Pakistan is fighting the TTP, only after the dialogue failed, because it considers the TTP as the bad Taliban. To show the US how serious it is about fighting the extremists, the military claimed to have killed a top Al Qaeda leader, Adnan Shukrijumah, who was on the most-wanted list of the US government. Questions are likely arise about what has changed the Pakistani mindset about terrorism. The answer is simple: the Pakistani military is simply trying to give the US reason for continued support and aid to Pakistan.

However, somewhere, Pakistan is doubtful about the American commitment, as an increasing number of Americans believe that Pakistan, though strategic, has become a liability for them. The US taxpayers are asking questions regarding why their money is being doled out to Pakistan which sponsors terrorism. Indeed, in Pakistan too, people are now questioning the dramatic increase in military assistance to Pakistan post 9/11 which they believe has contributed to the weakening of democratic and civilian institutions in the country, while it has helped to strengthen the military's grip on the socio-political spheres.⁸ The US military assistance and support to military dictators has been instrumental in reinforcing the Pakistan Army against the elected civilian governments. Perhaps because the Americans feel that Pakistan would continue to do the job for the US as long as the Pakistan Army is kept on the US payroll and things might be different if a powerful civilian government takes charge in Islamabad. Given the resentment against America in Pakistan, in a way, it is not the Pakistani state but the Pakistan Army that is an ally of the United States. Pakistanis have now realised that their country was made a frontline state by the US to fight the erstwhile USSR after the latter's invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, and again after 9/11 for the war on terror.

The US military assistance and support to military dictators has been instrumental in reinforcing the Pakistan Army against the elected civilian governments.

However, now that the Pakistan Army is hooked to the assistance from the US to such an extent, it is not difficult for the US to manipulate it. The US government's accusation, for the very first time in all these years, that Pakistan uses proxies to fight against India was a setback for the Pakistan Army. Hence, as a face saving exercise and to give some ammunition to the Pakistan lobby in Washington, the army claimed to have killed the top Al Qaeda leader but not before Gen Raheel Sharif spent two weeks in the US meeting several officials. It is essential for Pakistan to maintain its narrative

8. Murtaza Haider, "Can Pakistan Survive Without US Aid?", *Dawn*, available at <http://www.dawn.com/news/695692/can-pakistan-survive-without-us-aid>. Accessed on December 14, 2014.

of a country targeting terrorists.

A good question is why Pakistan has not conducted any operation against the numerous terrorist camps being run in Pakistan occupied Kashmir (PoK) despite the fact that a majority of Pakistani forces are stationed on the eastern border. If Pakistan is serious about tackling the threat of extremism, why is the government helping the Jamaat-ud-Dawa (JuD) Chief Hafiz Saeed, a US declared terrorist, with a \$10 million bounty, in organising anti-India rallies by providing trains to bring in his supporters to Lahore from other parts of Pakistan? It would also be interesting to know why the US is unwilling to do anything about it. Perhaps because Hafiz Saeed's primary target is India and not the US homeland, so why would the US want to strain its ties with Pakistan by eliminating Saeed or by pressurising Pakistan to do so. A popular theory in Pakistan is that the army understands that it cannot eliminate the leader of a powerful terrorist group as it would create more domestic problems for Pakistan. Saeed's anti-India activities serve as a distraction for the public, hence, Pakistan is now trying to "mainstream them" for convenience and perhaps make them part of the national politics⁹.

The US wants to build stronger ties with India to address the challenge of a rising China but, at the same time, it also wants to retain its strategic relationship with Pakistan. In a way, the US is trying to create a middle path where it can keep both India and Pakistan content. Current Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi has said many times that countries should not be selective about terrorism. However, both Pakistan and the United States continue to have a very selective approach, and classification of terrorist organisations into those that are a threat to them and so must be dealt with, and those that are not a threat to them, who are to be left untouched.

CAN PAKISTAN AFFORD TO MAKE PEACE WITH INDIA

In a famous 1947 article, popularly known as the X article, in *Foreign Affairs*, George F. Kennan had argued that the Soviet Union's hostility toward the United States was chronic and incurable, since it was rooted not in a classic

9. Cyril Almeida, "What Strategy?" *Dawn*. Accessed at <http://www.dawn.com/news/1149238>, on December 7, 2014.

conflict of interest between two great powers, but in deep-seated nationalism and insecurity on the part of Russia, which the US could do nothing about¹⁰. Dr. Shashi Tharoor believes that something similar could be said about India and Pakistan. He argues, "Straightforward disagreements between two states can be resolved through dialogue and compromise. But how can that work when Pakistan's abiding hostility towards India is rooted in fundamental insecurity about its national identity as the 'not-India' for the subcontinent's Muslims, and even worse, driven by the self-interest of a voracious military which commands a greater share of the national GDP than the military of any other country in the world, and needs this hostility to justify its power and privileges?"¹¹

K.P. Nayyar, in his article published in *The Telegraph* in 2001 titled "Hard Truth: No Place for Pakistan Softliners," stated that in Indian diplomacy, with Pakistan, there is no place for a softer approach.¹² This is reciprocated by Pakistan. The 1971 Bangladesh liberation war is etched in the memory of the Pakistan Army, which repeatedly warns the Pakistanis of another Indian invasion of Pakistan. The successful attempts of the Pakistani military and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) to derail the peace talks have only added to the frustration on the Indian side. Chances are that the trend will continue in the future as well. The diplomats in the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) hold the view that Kashmir is not the disease that ails Indo-Pakistan relations, it is only a symptom. They believe that even if the Kashmir issue, which is portrayed as the root of Indo-Pak hostility, is solved, Islamabad will find something else to needle and bleed India.

The Pakistan Army acts as a roadblock in the India-Pakistan peace process. It fears that peace between India and Pakistan will make Pakistan lose itself to 'Pakistanis'. Implying that the Pakistan Army would not be the most powerful authority in Pakistan any more if this were to happen.

10. George F. Keenan, "The Source of Soviet Conduct", *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 25, no. 4, at <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/23331/x/the-sources-of-soviet-conduct>. Accessed on December 16, 2014.

11. Shashi Tharoor, "Talking with Pakistan", *NDTV*, at <http://www.ndtv.com/article/opinion/talking-with-pakistanis-634766>. Accessed on December 15, 2014.

12. K.P. Nayyar, "Hard Truth: No Place for Pakistan Softliners", *The Telegraph*, at <http://www.telegraphindia.com/1010722/national.htm#head4>. Accessed on December 11, 2014.

For the Pakistan Army and ISI, the *jihadists* and the Afghan Taliban serve a purpose. All the efforts of Pakistan's armed forces are focussed on tackling the TTP because it is this group which is fighting the Pakistan government.

The Pakistan Army had positioned itself many decades ago as the protector of the territory and ideology of Pakistan. It believes that it needs to maintain hostility with India for the continuance of its primacy in a country which is increasingly Islamist in character.

The ISI Game Plan: The late Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto had observed that the ISI has become a "state within a state," which is answerable neither to the leadership of the army, nor to the president or the prime minister. The failure of the state government to keep a check on the activities of the ISI, and on corruption, narcotics, and big money, all have made the ISI too powerful. Money generated from drugs is used by the ISI to finance the proxy war against India and Afghanistan.

For the Pakistan Army and ISI, the *jihadists* and the Afghan Taliban serve a purpose. All the efforts of Pakistan's armed forces are focussed on tackling the TTP because it is this group which is fighting the Pakistan government. However, given an opportunity, the Pakistan government would settle for a negotiated truce and power sharing with them. It is only the demand of the TTP for imposition of the strict *Shariah* law throughout Pakistan that is a roadblock in the negotiations. The Pakistani government and leaders like Imran Khan of the Pakistan Tehrik-e-Insaf (PTI) believe that they can reason with the religious extremists¹³. One can just imagine the outcome of this. The fight is not for an equal share of the state's resources but for imposition of an ideology that the extremists believe to be ideal for an Islamic state.

PAKISTAN IS NOT A BULWARK AGAINST ISLAMIC EXTREMISM

In India, there are two starkly opposite views on the stability of Pakistan and its implications for India's interest. One group readily buys the US

13.. "Imran Khan: Talks with Taliban are the Only Solution to Insurgency", *Euronews*, available at <http://www.euronews.com/2014/02/27/imran-khan-talks-with-taliban-are-the-only-solution-to-insurgency/>. Accessed on December 18, 2014.

argument that a stable Pakistan is essential for regional stability and to stop the flow of radical Islam into India¹⁴, whereas the other holds the view that a stable Pakistan is not in India's interest¹⁵. They believe that Pakistan works as a bulwark against *jihadists* and is essential in stopping the penetration of the radical Islamic ideology and the extremist groups into the Indian subcontinent. This is on the lines of the Cold War when the US viewed Saddam Hussain as a bulwark against Communism. The theory is that if Pakistan collapses, India will be exposed to these Islamic radicals and would become their target. Is India not already being targeted by the very same *jihadists* that Pakistan was supposed to stop but instead uses them?

The Pakistan Army cannot afford to allow the state of Pakistan to collapse as the army needs a state for its own survival. The famous saying goes that many states have armies but Pakistan is one where the army has a state and it rules it, most of the time directly.

Two things need to be clearly understood. Firstly, the Pakistan Army is the main force that has kept Pakistan united despite so much of domestic dissension and they would continue to do so in the future. In the words of US Secretary of State John Kerry, the Pakistan Army is a "unifying force". However, as Matthew Hulbert explains, "The issue with viewing the military as an agent of stability in Pakistan is that what it might notionally offer as a bulwark against nuclear catastrophe or an Islamic coup, it has consistently taken away by its persistent support of terrorist groups throughout much of its short history."¹⁶ The Pakistan Army cannot afford to allow the state of Pakistan to collapse as the army needs a state for its own survival. The famous saying goes that many states have armies but Pakistan is one where

14. "Stable Pakistan Good for India: Obama", *The Hindu*, available at <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/stable-pakistan-good-for-india-obama/article872580.ece>. Accessed on December 18, 2014.

15. Bharat Verma, "Stable Pakistan not in India's Interest" *Indian Defence Review*, available at <http://www.indiandefencereview.com/news/stable-pakistan-not-in-indias-interest/>. Accessed on December 18, 2014.

16. Matthew Hulbert, "Pakistan: Anatomy of a Crisis, Skeletal Opportunities", The Centre for Security Studies, available at <http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/pdfs/CSS-Analyses-47.pdf>. Accessed on December 18, 2014.

There is indeed very little doubt that Pakistan is looking up to China to take up the role of its big brother in South Asia. What is more surprising is that Pakistan is an important ally of two states that have adversarial relations with each other.

the army has a state and it rules it, most of the time directly.

The US would also keep supporting the Pakistan Army in order to ensure the survival of Pakistan. More so because it needs a Pakistan that would do what the US wants it to. And the Pakistan Army has used this effectively to blackmail the US government for obtaining various favours. It seems that whenever the Pakistan Army wants aid from the US, it catches or kills a high value target, which it had probably known about for a

long time.

Secondly, with the kind of Islamic radicalisation going on in Pakistan, it is quite possible that India would perhaps face the biggest threat of Islamic fundamentalism from Pakistan itself. The efforts of the current Pakistani central government, political parties and army to make the radicals a part of mainstream politics is certainly a pointer of further Islamisation of Pakistan. The dialogue with the TPP on religious laws, the open monetary and government machinery support to Hafiz Saeed and his organisation, the JuD, proves that Pakistan is willing to make religious extremism a part of mainstream national politics¹⁷. Even the US declaring the JuD a terror outfit seems to have made no difference as the Pakistan government continues to support the organisation and its anti-India activities. In fact, very few are aware that the concept of an "Islamic State" was propagated by Maulana Maududi, who wanted to establish Pakistan as an Islamic state. His political theory revolves around the idea that "religion and politics are an inseparable entity and the fulfilment of religious diktats is impossible unless and until we organise a political system as per criteria set by the religion." Gen Zia started the Islamisation of Pakistan after being influenced by this ideology. The same ideology seems to have been used by the Sunni

17. Suhasini Haidar, "Pakistan Mainstreaming Terrorism, says MEA", *The Hindu*, available at <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/pakistan-mainstreaming-terrorism-by-facilitating-saeed-rally-india/article6665459.ece>. Accessed on December 18, 2014.

extremists who have established the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

SINO-PAK ALLIANCE

It is due to a combination of astute diplomacy, strategic geo-political location and weak democratic institutions that Pakistan has been a traditional, albeit unnatural, ally of the US and now China. There is indeed very little doubt that Pakistan is looking up to China to take up the role of its big brother in South Asia. What is more surprising is that Pakistan is an important ally of two states that have adversarial relations with each other. Though no one can conclude precisely who has wooed whom and who has used whom in this triangular relationship, it is the Pakistani population that has suffered the most in this game. Particularly, since 2011, the nature of the relationship between Washington and Islamabad appears to be changing due to the increasing distrust between them. This happened because of a series of incidents which included the killing of Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad without informing the Pakistani authorities, the US accusing the ISI of orchestrating a militant attack on its embassy in Kabul, the Central Investigation Agency (CIA) contractor episode, and a North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) military raid into Pakistani territory near Afghanistan that left 24 Pakistani soldiers dead which led Islamabad to block the US and NATO access to vital Ground Lines of Communication (GLOCs) linking Afghanistan to the Arabian Sea for a period of more than seven months. Now Washington has openly stated a fact that it had known for decades, that Pakistan uses terrorism as a non-state tool against India and Afghanistan. The increasing anti-American sentiment within Pakistan over the drone attacks in Pakistan, which are viewed as violation of Pakistani sovereignty, has become a political issue. These developments have

China's repeated emphasis on getting the support of the Indian government on the "one-China Policy" clearly illustrates its fears. However, Beijing's repeated transgressions on the "one-India policy" puts a question mark on its commitment toward India in return.

With the help of China, Pakistan is hoping to establish a potent domestic military industry which can also export weapons to the Islamic world.

put immense strain on the bilateral relationship¹⁸. There is a growing fear in the Pakistani military about being abandoned by the Americans. But with the improvement in defence relations between Russia and Pakistan, and Pakistan and China, the US might still hesitate to abandon Pakistan. However, the US policy-makers do understand that for them, Pakistan has become a liability.

China's repeated emphasis on getting the support of the Indian government on the "one-China Policy" clearly illustrates its fears. However, Beijing's repeated transgressions on the "one-India policy" puts a question mark on its commitment toward India in return. Issuing stapled visas to the residents of Arunachal Pradesh, calling PoK "Pakistani territory" and undertaking massive infrastructure development there, or the earlier practice of issuing stapled visas to military personnel posted in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) show that China is not consistent about the one-India policy¹⁹. For China, Pakistan is an important strategic asset, especially for China's India policy. With the kind of military activities and infrastructure development projects that China is undertaking in PoK, chances are that it would support Pakistan's case for PoK to be recognised as legitimate Pakistani territory.

With the help of China, Pakistan is hoping to establish a potent domestic military industry which can also export weapons to the Islamic world. A case in point is Pakistan's offer to sell the China-Pak jointly developed fighter JF-17 to Central Asian, African and Latin American countries. This marks a great shift in Pakistan's defence policy which had traditionally relied upon the US and other Western countries for supply of fighter jets to Pakistan. China has made huge economic investments in Pakistan and is helping Pakistan in setting up more nuclear power plants to tackle its energy crises.

18. Susan B. Epstein, K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan: US Foreign Assistance", CRS Report for Congress, available at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41856.pdf>. Accessed on December 8, 2014.

19. "One China? What about One India Policy: Sushma Swaraj to Wang Yi", *The Indian Express*, accessed at <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/one-china-what-about-one-india-policy-sushma-to-wang/>. Accessed on December 09, 2014.

The situation is becoming increasingly precarious because the threat of fighting a two-front war looms large on India now. India has fought a two-front war once. In 1971, India fought with then East and West Pakistan on its eastern and western flanks—a brief but decisive war in which it emerged victorious. The two-front war scenario that the Indian military planners envisage is with the assumption that in case India goes to war with either China or Pakistan, then the other country would automatically come to its ally's aid. In 1971, the US government had tried to persuade China to open a front with India in order to ease the pressure on East Pakistan²⁰. However, China refused to do so. This may have been due to the Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty that had been signed before the war or because China simply did not want to go in for another war with India, given its economic condition which was as bad as India's. But China's goals and ambitions are different now.

China has aided Pakistan and helped build its conventional as well as nuclear capability vis-à-vis India so that India remains tied down to the South Asian region.

In 1971, the Indian military planners had known for some time that a war with Pakistan on both fronts was imminent and they had time to plan and prepare for it. But a surprise offensive like that of 1965 or 1999, if launched, might prove to be more challenging. Would India be able to take on the combined might of China and Pakistan? The answer is debatable but it will be in India's best interest to avoid fighting a two-front war. And for that, India needs to prevent the two adversarial states becoming powerful in its neighbourhood. It is worth noting that at the time of Operation Parakaram (2001-02), when Indian and Pakistani forces had amassed on the border and a war seemed imminent, Beijing had assured Islamabad that "China hopes Pakistan will not initiate any assault. Pakistan should not get involved in wars and instead focus on economic construction. However, if a war does break out between India and Pakistan, Beijing will stand firmly on the side

20. Pankaj Mishra, "Unholy Alliance", *The New Yorker*, available at <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/09/23/unholy-alliances-3>. Accessed on December 10, 2014.

of Islamabad.”²¹ China has aided Pakistan and helped build its conventional as well as nuclear capability vis-à-vis India so that India remains tied down to the South Asian region. It is in this particular scenario that having a weak and isolated Pakistan seems the best possible strategy for India. However, there is another opinion in India which feels that Pakistan needs to be integrated more closely, politically and economically, with India and South Asia, which would enable Pakistan to have peaceful relations with India, even if the disputes are not resolved in the immediate future.

INDIA'S OPTIONS FOR PAKISTAN

The paramount concern for India should be its security and not “peace at any cost.” Peace is desirable but not at the cost of a country's own security. The prospects for a peaceful relationship between India and Pakistan do not appear bright in the foreseeable future. The negative perception of Pakistan in India and of India in Pakistan is one of the basic reasons for the hostility. While only about 13 percent Pakistanis view India favourably, about 15 percent Indians view Pakistan favourably.²² Until and unless Pakistan starts to see that it is not India that is its enemy but the extremism that the ISI has fanned and nurtured, its attitude towards India is not going to change. To have a peaceful relationship, first and foremost, it is important that countries have the right attitude for it. Many Pakistanis would blame ‘external actors’ for every terrorist attack in the country, despite the evidence pointing to the contrary, because of the army-backed narrative in Pakistan that militant attacks are the result of America's war on terror and countries like India and Afghanistan, are responsible for the growing militancy in Pakistan²³. A common Pakistani sees the Pakistan Army as its saviour which has made it the strongest and most privileged institution.

21. Mohan Malik, “The China Factor in the India-Pakistan Conflict”, *Asia-Pacific Centre for Security Studies*, available at <http://www.comw.org/rma/fulltext/0403malik.pdf>. Accessed on December 18, 2014.

22. “How Asians View Each Other”, Global Opposition to US Surveillance and Drones, but Limited Harm to America's Image, Pew Research Centre, available at <http://www.pewglobal.org/2014/07/14/chapter-4-how-asians-view-each-other/>. Accessed on December 19, 2014.

23. “Despite Billions in aid, US Unable to get Pakistan to Confront Militants”, Reuters, available at <http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/despite-billions-in-aid-us-unable-to-get-pakistan-to-confront-militants/article1-1298111.aspx>. Accessed on December 19, 2014.

The increasing Islamisation of Pakistan would create more problems in the relationship. Experts predict that with time, the country will become increasingly violent, for its neighbours and within itself. India requires peace to achieve economic progress and prosperity. If Pakistan is not going to allow India to be at peace, then India needs to adopt a new approach that would force it to make peace with India. Hence, it becomes all the more important for India to consider new approaches to deal with Pakistan.

Ignore: A former secretary of the Research and Analysis Wing (RAW) says that “for long we have held the mistaken notion that we can help Pakistan evolve differently and lead it to a path of everlasting peace and harmony. We have no such divine providence. Only Pakistanis can help themselves. We should not get overwhelmed by the argument that war is not an option for India while Pakistan has the option to unleash *jihad* under a nuclear cover. Since we cannot even try to mend Pakistan, it is best to largely ignore the country for the present and continue strengthening our capabilities till that country is ready to deal with India as a normal neighbour.”²⁴ However, the question remains: is turning a blind eye towards Pakistan a good enough strategy? Would it prove to be so effective that Pakistan would mend its ways? Ignoring Pakistan is not an option because even if India ignores Pakistan, the same kind of reaction is not going to be reciprocated by the other side. As Shashi Tharoor rightly points out, “India cannot grow and prosper by focussing on its economy without peace, and that is the one thing Pakistan can give. India cannot choose to be uninterested in Pakistan, because Pakistan is dangerously interested in India.”²⁵

Isolate: A second option is of isolating Pakistan within the region and keeping it weak by imposing economic sanctions. Unfortunately, India on its own does not have the wherewithal and influence to achieve this. Also, Pakistan has an ally in China which would make it impossible for

24. Vikram Sood, “Ignore Pakistan till it Starts Behaving Like a Normal Neighbour”, *Hindustan Times*, available at <http://www.hindustantimes.com/comment/analysis/ignore-pakistan-till-it-is-ready-to-deal-as-a-normal-neighbour/article1-1294911.aspx>. Accessed on December 12, 2014.

25. Shashi Tharoor, “Why We Cannot Ignore Pakistan”, *NDTV*, available at <http://www.ndtv.com/article/opinion/why-we-cannot-ignore-pakistan-636876>. Accessed on December 19, 2014.

Experts say North Korea has for decades played a carefully calibrated game of provocation to squeeze concessions from the international community and impress its own military.

the UN Security Council (UNSC) to impose any sanctions on Pakistan. Given Washington's mistrust of Pakistan, India could try to persuade the United States to take such a measure but given the geo-strategic location of Pakistan, the expectation that Washington would break off its ties with Islamabad is not likely to be realised. Also, Pakistan has claimed quite clearly that it would launch a nuclear attack on India if India tries to strangle Pakistan economically, so it is a risky strategy unless India's nuclear deterrence is able to deter Pakistan from launching a nuclear attack.

Pakistan's case bears significant resemblance to that of North Korea. In both states, there is an all powerful military elite that rules the country. All opposition is silenced. The society has been brainwashed and radicalised against a particular enemy. While for North Korea, the enemy is America, in the case of Pakistan, it is the nation of India. The welfare of people in both countries is the last thing on the minds of the military rulers.

But perhaps the greatest similarity between the two is their nuclear posturing. Both states have rationally maintained an irrational behaviour when it comes to nuclear weapons. While the North Korean leadership keeps threatening more nuclear tests (they have conducted three so far), Pakistan has signalled a very low nuclear threshold. Basically, the objective of both Pakistan and North Korea is to compensate for their weaker conventional capability through an irrational nuclear posture.

Experts say North Korea has for decades played a carefully calibrated game of provocation to squeeze concessions from the international community and impress its own military.²⁶ Pakistan too has played a similar game with the help of the US and Chinese diplomatic and economic support. North Korea would have been more problematic had it achieved anything close to the military prowess of Pakistan. So a Pakistan reduced to the level

26. "North Korea Shells South in Fiercest Attack in Decades", Reuters, available at <http://in.reuters.com/article/2010/11/23/us-korea-north-artillery-idUSTRE6AM0YS20101123>. Accessed on December 16, 2014.

of North Korea might be easier to handle. For that to happen, the military aid to Pakistan from the US must be stopped, although China will continue to provide aid. Recently, China and Russia lent their support to India when the foreign ministers of the three countries issued a joint communiqué against terrorism, ostensibly aimed at Pakistan.²⁷ The mounting pressure on Pakistan to stop sponsoring terrorist activities would, perhaps, work.

Force Behaviour Change: A journalist suggests that India maintains a pretence about Pakistan, hoping that things would improve in the future, because it is easier than devising new policies to force behavioural change²⁸. It is time that India can and should use its image of a game-changer and leverage it with other countries to isolate Pakistan internationally. So far, India has kept its distance from the US because of the incongenial relationship in the past. The new Indian government has shown its intent to put an end to India's anti-Americanism, and rightly so. The interests of New Delhi and Washington converge significantly now. India should use its new found 'strategic partnership' with the United States to make it understand the leverages it has on Pakistan to change its behaviour. The US policy-makers must realise that Pakistan is an international threat, not just for India.

Those who believe that the Middle East is going to remain a priority for the US may be right. But in the future, with the US becoming the top producer of petroleum, it is quite possible that the US would become less influential in the Middle East. However, Israel's security is of primary

India should take greater interest in participating in the outcome of the nuclear negotiations with Iran. India could use an ally in Iran to challenge the combined strength of the Saudi-Pakistan alliance, with a focus on Pakistan.

27. Ananth Krishnan, "India Gets Greater Backing from China and Russia Over UN Security Council Seat", *Daily Mail*, at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2937182/China-Russia-India-seat-security-council.html>. Accessed on February 7, 2015.

28. Seema Sirohi, "Why Does the US Always Back Pakistan?", *The Times of India*, at http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/letterfromwashington/why-does-america-always-back-up-pakistan/?inttarget=no&utm_source=TOI_AShow_OBWidget&utm_medium=Int_Ref&utm_campaign=TOI_AShow. Accessed on December 12, 2014.

concern to the US, so, to safeguard Israel, the US will try to find a way out. A deal with Iran on nuclear development is one such step. India should take greater interest in participating in the outcome of the nuclear negotiations with Iran. India could use an ally in Iran to challenge the combined strength of the Saudi-Pakistan alliance, with a focus on Pakistan.

India should utilise its diplomatic skills to force the US Department of State to include Pakistan on the list of state sponsors of terrorism. As of now, only four countries are on the list and they are basically those that are not on good terms with the United States.

Table 1

Country	Designation Date
Cuba	March 1, 1982
Iran	January 19, 1984
Sudan	August 12, 1993
Syria	December 29, 1979

There is a strong case of putting Pakistan on the list because if the JuD is a terrorist organisation, as declared by UN and the US, and the Pakistani government supports it financially and with resources, then it makes Pakistan a sponsor of terrorism. The US Department of State's *Country Reports on Terrorism 2013* that was released in April 2014 clearly states, "The Pakistani military undertook operations against groups that conducted attacks within Pakistan such as the TTP, but did not take action against other groups such as Lashkar-e-Tayyiba (LeT), which continued to operate, train, rally, and raise funds in Pakistan during the past year. The Afghan Taliban and the Haqqani network leadership and facilitation networks continued to find safe havens in Pakistan, and Pakistani authorities did not take significant military or law enforcement action against these groups."²⁹ Thus, highlighting the

29. "Country Reports on Terrorism 2013", US Department of State, available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/225050.pdf>. Accessed on December 20, 2014.

selective approach on terrorism that Pakistan maintains. The report further stated, "India remained severely affected by, and vulnerable to, terrorism, including from Pakistan-based groups and their affiliates." If Pakistan gets designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, then the four main categories of sanctions resulting from the designation include restrictions on US foreign assistance; a ban on defence exports and sales; certain controls over exports of dual use items; and miscellaneous financial and other restrictions.³⁰ This is one effective way of ensuring Pakistan's isolation in the region.

Constrict Pakistan Economically but Cautiously: History has shown that Pakistan has tried to internationalise the Kashmir issue at every opportunity, regardless of what India does. Gen Raheel Sharif, in May 2014,³¹ and former President Asif Ali Zardari, in October 2014, have described Kashmir as the "jugular vein of Pakistan."³²

A retired lieutenant general had stated that India should explore the possibility of brinkmanship, as, at times, it is necessary to take risks in international relations. Economic warfare is one such strategy that India could use. This is a high risk strategy though because of the stated nuclear doctrine of Pakistan which says that Pakistan would launch a nuclear strike on India if it feels that India is trying to suffocate it economically. But should that stop India from testing this strategy?

The US has tried this strategy successfully with North Korea, Iran and now Russia. These countries can launch a nuclear strike on the US but the US' nuclear deterrence is credible enough to stop them from even considering that option. It is important to understand how economic warfare is fought and what would be its impact. The United States started economic warfare against Russia and it is turning out to be highly effective. The rouble is falling in the international market and has reportedly lost 40 percent of its value in the past one year. The falling currency means that Russia is forced to

30. "State Sponsors of Terrorism", US Department of State, available at <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/list/c14151.htm>. Accessed on December 20, 2014.

31. "Pakistan Army Chief Calls Kashmir the Country's 'Jugular Vein'", *Daily Mail*, at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2618158/Pakistan-Army-chief-calls-Kashmir-countrys-jugular-vein.html>. Accessed on December 12, 2014.

32. "Asif Ali Zardari Describes Kashmir as 'Jugular Vein of Pakistan'", *The Economic Times*, at http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-10-14/news/55014284_1_ali-zardari-back-entire-kashmir-jugular-vein. Accessed on December 12, 2014.

Pakistan has been showered with billions of dollars in aid to fight terrorism and develop the economy (the US has given around \$28 billion since 2001 alone). But the truth is that the military aid has been diverted from anti-terrorism operations to anti-India activities and the economy of Pakistan continues to be in the doldrums.

export more to save its crumbling economy. Russia's main export is oil and gas and with the downward spiralling prices of oil, it is very unlikely that Russia would make a lot of money from it. The European Union (EU) has given a further setback to Russia by forcing it to abandon Gazprom's South Stream pipeline, which was to supply gas to Turkey. The EU is concerned that importing more gas supplies from Russia would make Moscow the dominant gas supplier in the EU³³. Under pressure from the EU, Bulgaria is not allowing Russia to proceed with the pipeline though its territory. Experts claim that the 30-year oil deal that was signed between Russia and China earlier this year

was at a concessional rate³⁴. Putin's inability to rescue the Russian economy is clearly frustrating him.

Indo-Pak trade relations are very limited so India alone imposing economic sanctions would not make much of a difference. Therefore, it is important that Pakistan's economy is targeted by blocking the economic aid that comes from the US and other international organisations, whereby India could force Pakistan's central government to cut the share of the military from the budget. Also, with so much of corruption prevalent in Pakistan, it is not clear what amount of the loans and assistance is actually utilised for economic purposes. Instead, Pakistan should be pressured to carry out domestic economic reforms, which would bring down the power of the political elite and the military. Of course, Pakistan's economic activities are very limited so the targets are limited, nonetheless, it is important

33. "Putin Says Russia Will Abandon South Stream Pipeline", *The Wall Street Journal*, available at <http://www.wsj.com/articles/putin-says-russia-will-abandon-south-stream-pipeline-1417461666>. Accessed on December 11, 2014.

34. Paul J. Saunders, "The Not-So-Mighty Russia-China Gas Deal", *The National Interest*, available at <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-not-so-mighty-russia-china-gas-deal-10518>. Accessed on December 13, 2014.

that the military and economic aid to Pakistan is dried up. Pakistan has been showered with billions of dollars in aid to fight terrorism and develop the economy (the US has given around \$28 billion since 2001 alone)³⁵. But the truth is that the military aid has been diverted from anti-terrorism operations to anti-India activities and the economy of Pakistan continues to be in the doldrums. This shows that there is no accountability of the aid that is given to Pakistan.

The meagre trade between India and Pakistan has further not been able to convey to Pakistanis the importance of India as a trading partner for Pakistan.

Separate Politics and Economics: Dr. Tharoor suggests something on the model of China-Japan relations. He advocates that for India and Pakistan to have a peaceful and mutually beneficial relationship, both should keep politics and the economy separate. He says that India should adopt a new approach that “separates the issue of political dialogue from that of trade and people-to-people contact.”³⁶ However, the onus for such an initiative would be on India and it can punish Islamabad for each incident of violence by freezing the talks. Would suspending talks make Pakistan stop using violence against India? Not really, but the Pakistani leadership did get restless when India suspended the talks between the foreign secretaries earlier this year in response to the Pakistani diplomats holding talks with the Kashmiri separatists despite a warning from the Ministry of External Affairs. India could engage with the traders and artists, and earn their goodwill. Promoting people-to-people contacts is a major effort that needs to be undertaken because much of the negativity and misperceptions can be addressed through this move only.

However, Pakistan has showed that it would use economics too for political purposes as was evident when it refused to give India the MFN (Most Favoured Nation) status. The meagre trade between India and Pakistan has further not been able to convey to Pakistanis the importance of India

35. “Pakistan ‘Received \$25.91b’ From US Since 9/11”, Direct Overt US Aid Appropriations for and Military Reimbursements to Pakistan, FY2002-FY2015, available at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/pakaid.pdf>. Accessed on December 13, 2014.

36. Tharoor, n. 25.

as a trading partner for Pakistan.³⁷ If the bilateral trade figures improve significantly, perhaps then Pakistan itself would understand the importance of India and that might lead the political leadership to seek an improved relationship with it but only if they are able to control the military. India would also have to entice the Pakistani trading community for this.

CONCLUSION

India has always made efforts for friendly relations with all countries. However, when it comes to securing the national interest and ensuring national security, countries sometimes have to be ruthless, as was suggested by Chanakya. If there is requisite will on both sides, then India and Pakistan too can coexist peacefully. But it needs to be kept in mind that this should not happen at the cost of national interest. Ultimately, it comes to the decision-makers to choose the kind of policy approach they want to adopt with respect to Pakistan. But since the earlier policies have not given India the desired results, it is imperative that a new policy approach is adopted to make Pakistan change its behaviour and attitude towards India. This is where economic isolation of Pakistan can prove to be effective.

There will be a change in the Pakistan-India relationship only when things within Pakistan change. India can either wait for that to happen or take proactive measures and make that change happen through threats and incentives. For India, ensuring its economic development is far more important than doing the usual business with Pakistan. The economic growth of India might be able to entice Pakistan to seek better relations with it. But till that happens, India needs to adopt a new approach in policy which would force Pakistan to change its behaviour. A balanced mix of the policy of isolation while, at the same time, offering better returns if Pakistan mends its ways, should be used to change Pakistan's behaviour. The dialogue should go on as it would convey the message to Pakistan that India is ready for a better relationship but only if Pakistan is ready to reciprocate.

37. "India, Pakistan Need to Take Steps to Boost Trade", *The Economic Times*, available at http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-01-21/news/46411534_1_trade-facilitation-regional-integration-trade-and-investment-issues. Accessed on December 19, 2014.