

KASHMIR DISPUTE: SOVEREIGNTY, SELF-DETERMINATION, AND STRATEGIC POLICY ANALYSIS

Policy Analysis for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Islamic Republic of Pakistan

I. ISSUE BRIEF

The Kashmir dispute represents Pakistan's foremost foreign policy priority and existential national interest, encompassing questions of territorial sovereignty, national identity, strategic security, and the unfulfilled promise of Partition-era self-determination. The former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, comprising approximately 222,236 square kilometers,[1] remains divided among Pakistani administration (Azad Jammu and Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan, approximately 85,846 square kilometers),[2] Indian occupation (Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh Union Territories, approximately 101,338 square kilometers),[3] and Chinese control (Aksai Chin, approximately 37,555 square kilometers, recognized by Pakistan through the 1963 Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement as legitimately Chinese pending final Kashmir resolution).[4]

Pakistan's legal and political position rests on the principle of self-determination as guaranteed by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 47 (1948) and 91 (1951), which call for a free and impartial plebiscite to determine Kashmir's future under UN auspices following demilitarization.[5] These resolutions, passed under Chapter VI of the UN Charter and creating binding international obligations,[6] remain unimplemented due to Indian obstruction and illegal occupation maintained through military force exceeding 900,000 troops.[7] Pakistan maintains that Maharaja Hari Singh's purported October 26, 1947 Instrument of Accession to India—executed under duress during Indian military intervention, lacking popular legitimacy from the Muslim-majority population (77% Muslim according to 1941 census),[8] and never independently verified or published for decades[9]—cannot override the Kashmiri people's inalienable right to self-determination under international law.

The disputed territory's religious demography provides the foundation for Pakistan's position. The Muslim-majority character of Kashmir (approximately 97% Muslim in Azad Kashmir, 68% in Indian-occupied Kashmir Valley, and significant Muslim populations in Jammu)[10] creates natural affinity with Pakistan established as homeland for South Asian Muslims. The partition logic of 1947—creating Pakistan and India based on religious demographics and the "two-nation theory" recognizing Muslims and Hindus as distinct nations requiring separate states[11]—mandates Kashmir's accession to Pakistan absent an internationally-supervised plebiscite allowing Kashmiris to exercise their democratic choice.

Current operational realities reflect ongoing oppression and resistance. India maintains brutal occupation of Kashmir through military force, deploying approximately 900,000 security personnel,[12] implementing draconian laws including the Armed Forces Special Powers Act granting immunity for extrajudicial killings,[13] and perpetrating systematic human rights

violations documented by international organizations including the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.[14] The August 5, 2019 unilateral Indian actions—revoking Article 370's special constitutional status, bifurcating the occupied state into two Union Territories, and imposing comprehensive communications blackout and mass detentions[15]—constitute illegal annexation violating international law, UN Security Council resolutions, and bilateral agreements including the 1972 Simla Agreement.

Indigenous Kashmiri resistance continues despite overwhelming Indian military repression. The Kashmiri freedom struggle, representing popular will for self-determination, manifests through political resistance, civil disobedience, and armed struggle against occupation forces.[16] Pakistan provides political, diplomatic, and moral support to the Kashmiri freedom struggle consistent with international law principles supporting peoples under occupation,[17] while India falsely characterizes indigenous resistance as "Pakistan-sponsored terrorism" to deflect attention from legitimate self-determination demands and systematic human rights abuses.

Strategic implications extend beyond bilateral Pakistan-India relations to encompass regional security, nuclear stability, and international order. Kashmir represents the core dispute between two nuclear-armed states, making its resolution essential for South Asian peace and global nuclear security. Indian intransigence and continued occupation create perpetual conflict risk, including four wars (1947-48, 1965, 1971, 1999) and ongoing military tensions along the Line of Control where Indian ceasefire violations killed over 100 Pakistani civilians and soldiers in recent years.[18] The dispute's unresolved status undermines regional economic integration, prevents South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) effectiveness, and diverts resources from development to military expenditure.

The fundamental policy challenge lies in securing Kashmiri self-determination through international legal mechanisms and diplomatic pressure, supporting the indigenous Kashmiri freedom struggle, defending Pakistan-administered areas against Indian aggression, managing nuclear stability amid persistent tensions, responding to Indian provocations without triggering catastrophic escalation, and maintaining international attention on Kashmir despite competing global priorities and Indian diplomatic efforts to characterize the issue as bilateral internal matter not subject to external involvement.

II. STRATEGIC INTERESTS

Primary Interests:

Securing Kashmiri self-determination through UN-mandated plebiscite constitutes Pakistan's paramount national interest grounded in international law, partition logic, and national identity. UN Security Council Resolutions 47 and 91 create binding international legal obligations requiring plebiscite implementation.[19] Pakistan's very existence rests on the principle that South Asian Muslims constitute a distinct nation requiring separate homeland—Kashmir's Muslim-majority population creates natural affinity and legal-political logic for accession to Pakistan, pending Kashmiri people's democratic choice through internationally-supervised referendum.[20]

The Kashmir cause represents a foundational element of Pakistani national identity and state legitimacy. Pakistan's creation narrative centers on protecting South Asian Muslims from

Hindu domination and providing homeland where Muslims could live according to Islamic principles.[21] Kashmir's unresolved status—with millions of Muslims under Indian occupation and denied self-determination—directly challenges this founding mission. Every Pakistani government since 1947 has committed to Kashmir's liberation, making the cause integral to regime legitimacy regardless of civilian or military governance.[22] Abandonment of Kashmir would constitute betrayal of national purpose and potentially destabilize political legitimacy of the Pakistani state itself.

Secondary Interests:

Strategic security imperatives make Kashmir defense essential for Pakistan's territorial integrity and national survival. Geographic realities position Kashmir as critical strategic buffer between Pakistan's heartland and Indian military forces. Indian control of Kashmir Valley, Siachen Glacier (illegally occupied by India since 1984),[23] and strategic heights provides India direct access routes to Pakistani territory and surveillance over critical areas including the Karakoram Highway linking Pakistan to China.[24] Indian military positions in Kashmir threaten Pakistan's major cities including Islamabad (300km from LoC) and the entire length of Pakistan's population centers along the Indus valley.[25]

Water security represents an existential interest given Pakistan's dependence on Indus River system waters originating in or flowing through Kashmir. The 1960 Indus Waters Treaty allocated three western rivers (Indus, Jhelum, Chenab) to Pakistan and three eastern rivers (Ravi, Beas, Sutlej) to India,[26] but Indian control of Kashmir territory provides physical capability to construct storage projects and potentially manipulate flows threatening Pakistan's agricultural economy and 220 million population.[27] Pakistan's 80% agricultural sector dependence on Indus irrigation,[28] combined with growing water scarcity and Indian construction of hydroelectric projects on Pakistani-allocated rivers,[29] makes territorial control questions directly relevant to water security and national survival.

Prevention of Indian regional hegemony and maintenance of strategic balance serves vital security interests. Indian conventional military superiority—armed forces of 1.46 million versus Pakistan's 654,000,[30] defense budget of \$81.4 billion versus Pakistan's \$11.5 billion,[31] and advanced weapons systems including aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, and ballistic missile defense[32]—creates severe asymmetry requiring Pakistan to maintain strategic options preventing Indian dominance. Kashmir dispute keeps India constrained by Pakistani resistance and international attention, preventing complete Indian regional hegemony that would enable military, economic, and diplomatic domination of South Asia contrary to Pakistani sovereignty and security interests.[33]

Tertiary Interests:

The China-Pakistan "all-weather strategic partnership" receives substantial reinforcement through Kashmir cooperation. Chinese support for Pakistan's Kashmir position—characterizing it as "dispute left from history" requiring resolution per UN resolutions[34]—provides crucial diplomatic backing against Indian pressure. The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), flagship Belt and Road Initiative project with \$62 billion investment traversing Gilgit-Baltistan,[35] creates Chinese economic stake in Pakistani-administered Kashmir and binds Chinese strategic interests to Pakistani territorial integrity. This partnership provides Pakistan essential counterbalance to Indian power and U.S.-India strategic convergence.

Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and broader Islamic world solidarity serves important diplomatic interests. Kashmir represents Muslim population under non-Muslim occupation, generating natural solidarity from Islamic countries. OIC resolutions consistently support Kashmiri self-determination and criticize Indian human rights violations,[36] providing Pakistan diplomatic support and moral legitimacy. Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Malaysia, and other OIC members have historically supported Pakistani positions,[37] though recent years have seen some erosion as Gulf states pursue economic engagement with India. Maintaining Islamic world focus on Kashmir serves Pakistani diplomatic interests and constrains Indian international freedom of action.

Nuclear deterrent credibility depends substantially on demonstrating resolve regarding core interests. Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, developed explicitly to counter Indian conventional superiority and protect territorial integrity,[38] derives credibility from willingness to defend vital interests. Kashmir's status as stated core national interest makes it potential threshold for nuclear weapons use if Indian actions threaten Pakistani sovereignty or military survival in Kashmir-related conflicts.[39] This creates deterrent effect constraining Indian military options, though also generates escalation risks requiring careful management.

III. CONSTRAINTS

Military-Strategic Constraints:

Conventional military inferiority creates severe limitations on Pakistan's military options for Kashmir liberation or defense. Indian armed forces substantially exceed Pakistani capabilities across all domains: ground forces (1.46 million active personnel versus 654,000),[40] air force (approximately 1,645 aircraft versus 1,387),[41] naval forces (295 vessels including aircraft carrier and nuclear submarines versus 114 vessels with no aircraft carriers or nuclear submarines),[42] and defense industrial base producing indigenous weapons systems including advanced fighters, submarines, and missiles while Pakistan relies heavily on imports.[43]

Geographic disadvantages compound force imbalances. Pakistan's narrow strategic depth—major cities including Lahore lie within 30km of the Indian border[44]—creates vulnerability to Indian conventional strikes, while India's strategic depth provides defense-in-depth advantages. Kashmir terrain—mountainous topography, high-altitude operations, and limited road networks[45]—favors defensive operations, making offensive operations to reclaim Indian-occupied areas extremely costly and logistically challenging. The 1965 and 1999 Kargil conflicts demonstrated Pakistani inability to achieve significant territorial gains against entrenched Indian positions despite initial tactical successes.[46]

Nuclear dimensions create both opportunities and constraints. While nuclear weapons provide deterrent against Indian full-scale conventional invasion and preserve Pakistani sovereignty,[47] they simultaneously create escalation risks constraining conventional military options. Pakistani nuclear doctrine emphasizing "first use" if territorial integrity threatened[48] provides credibility but also introduces threshold questions—when exactly would nuclear weapons be employed? How much territorial loss triggers nuclear response? These ambiguities create deterrence through uncertainty but also risk catastrophic escalation if miscalculated.[49]

Force deployment requirements along Afghanistan border constrain Kashmir focus. Pakistan's western border with Afghanistan (2,670 km)[50] requires substantial military deployment for border security, counterterrorism against Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) and other militant groups,[51] and managing instability from post-2021 Taliban control.[52] Operations in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan provinces against separatist and terrorist groups consume military resources, attention, and operational focus that cannot simultaneously concentrate on Kashmir, creating multi-front dilemmas comparable to Indian two-front challenges with China.[53]

Economic-Fiscal Constraints:

Economic weaknesses fundamentally limit Pakistan's strategic options and sustainability of Kashmir policies. Pakistan's economy faces chronic structural challenges: GDP of \$376 billion (2023),[54] persistent fiscal deficits averaging 6-8% of GDP,[55] external debt exceeding \$126 billion,[56] frequent currency crises requiring IMF bailouts (23 IMF programs since 1958),[57] and inflation rates reaching 29% (2023).[58] These economic vulnerabilities constrain defense spending, limit diplomatic leverage, and create dependencies on external financial support.

Defense expenditure consumes disproportionate resources given economic constraints. Pakistan's defense budget of \$11.5 billion (2023)[59] represents approximately 3.1% of GDP, high relative to regional averages and development needs.[60] Including military pensions and paramilitary forces, actual security expenditure approaches 4-5% of GDP.[61] This military spending diverts resources from education, healthcare, and infrastructure investment essential for economic development and social stability.[62] However, reducing defense spending remains politically difficult given Kashmir tensions and military establishment influence, creating structural economic constraints.

Kashmir-related costs accumulate through multiple channels. Direct military costs include Line of Control deployments (approximately 200,000 troops),[63] weapons procurement prioritizing mountain warfare capabilities, and ongoing operational expenses for surveillance, infrastructure maintenance, and rapid reaction forces. Development expenditure in Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan, while necessary for governance legitimacy and population welfare, diverts resources from other national priorities. Opportunity costs from perpetual India-Pakistan tensions include: foregone trade benefits (pre-2019 bilateral trade reached only \$2.4 billion, tiny fraction of potential given geographic proximity),[64] reduced regional economic integration limiting Pakistan's access to Central Asian markets through India, and deterred foreign investment due to conflict risks.

Dependence on external financing creates policy constraints. Major financial supporters including Saudi Arabia (approximately \$24 billion in deposits and deferred oil payments since 2018),[65] United Arab Emirates (\$2-3 billion in deposits),[66] China (over \$65 billion through CPEC and additional bilateral loans),[67] and IMF (current \$3 billion standby arrangement)[68] provide essential liquidity preventing default. However, these supporters increasingly pressure Pakistan to reduce tensions with India and avoid provocative Kashmir policies threatening regional stability. Gulf states pursuing economic partnerships with India worth billions,[69] China seeking to avoid jeopardizing India relationship necessary for broader strategic goals, and IMF demanding economic reforms incompatible with high military spending all constrain Pakistani freedom of action on Kashmir.[70]

Political-Domestic Constraints:

Military establishment dominance over foreign and security policy creates institutional rigidity preventing policy flexibility on Kashmir. The Pakistan Army, which has directly ruled Pakistan for approximately half its existence through military coups (1958-1971, 1977-1988, 1999-2008),^[71] maintains effective control over Kashmir policy, Afghanistan policy, and India relations regardless of civilian government status.^[72] The Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) directorate manages Kashmir-related activities including support for Kashmiri resistance groups, intelligence collection, and covert operations.^[73] This institutional control ensures policy continuity but simultaneously prevents civilian governments from pursuing alternative approaches even if strategic circumstances suggest flexibility might serve national interests.^[74]

Kashmir's status as "national jugular vein" in Pakistani political discourse creates domestic political constraints preventing any compromise. Every major political party—Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf, Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz), Pakistan Peoples Party—maintains positions supporting Kashmiri self-determination and opposing any settlement recognizing Indian control.^[75] Public opinion surveys indicate overwhelming Pakistani support for Kashmir cause (over 90% view it as vital national interest),^[76] making any perceived compromise politically toxic. Religious parties and nationalist groups would characterize settlement proposals as betrayal of national purpose and Islamic solidarity, potentially triggering mass protests and political instability.^[77]

Democratic instability and frequent civil-military power struggles fragment governance and undermine consistent policy implementation. Pakistan's history includes three successful military coups, multiple periods of military rule, and recurring tensions between civilian governments and military establishment even during civilian rule periods.^[78] The 2022 removal of Prime Minister Imran Khan through parliamentary vote amid military tensions, followed by political turmoil and economic crisis,^[79] exemplifies governance instability affecting strategic planning. This instability prevents long-term diplomatic strategies requiring sustained implementation across electoral cycles and civil-military consensus.

International Constraints:

Diplomatic isolation on Kashmir has increased significantly since 1990s despite Pakistani efforts. The post-9/11 international focus on terrorism enabled India to successfully reframe Kashmir as terrorism issue rather than self-determination dispute, gaining international sympathy for counter-terrorism operations while characterizing Pakistani support for Kashmiri resistance as state-sponsored terrorism.^[80] Major powers including the United States increasingly emphasize terrorism concerns over self-determination principles, fundamentally shifting international discourse against Pakistani positions.^[81]

UN Security Council Resolution implementation mechanisms have effectively become dormant despite formal validity. The UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) continues monitoring ceasefire violations,^[82] but no serious international effort toward plebiscite implementation has occurred since 1960s. India successfully argues that bilateral Simla Agreement (1972) superseded UN resolutions by establishing bilateral framework excluding third-party involvement,^[83] though Pakistan maintains this interpretation contradicts binding UNSC resolutions and illegitimately bilateral-izes an international dispute.^[84] International legal scholars remain divided, but practical reality

shows no major power willing to pressure India toward plebiscite implementation given India's strategic importance in great power competition with China.[85]

U.S.-India strategic convergence fundamentally undermines Pakistani diplomatic position. The U.S.-India civil nuclear agreement (2008),[86] designation of India as "Major Defense Partner" (2016),[87] defense cooperation agreements including logistics sharing and communications interoperability,[88] and joint framing of Indo-Pacific strategy positioning India as counterweight to China[89] create U.S. strategic investment in India relationship far exceeding Pakistan ties. While U.S.-Pakistan cooperation continues on counterterrorism and Afghanistan, the strategic balance has shifted decisively toward India since 2000s, constraining Pakistani diplomatic options and reducing American willingness to pressure India on Kashmir.[90]

China-India tensions provide some diplomatic leverage but create risks of abandonment. While China consistently supports Pakistani positions on Kashmir in diplomatic statements and provides UNSC veto protection,[91] Chinese priorities increasingly focus on managing India relationship to prevent India's complete alignment with U.S.-led coalitions against China.[92] The 2020 Galwan Valley clash temporarily aligned China-Pakistan interests against India,[93] but subsequent China-India diplomatic engagement and Chinese economic interests in India (bilateral trade \$136 billion in 2023)[94] create possibility that China might prioritize India relationship over automatic Pakistan support, particularly if Pakistan-India crises threaten broader Chinese strategic interests.[95]

Financial Action Task Force (FATF) scrutiny creates diplomatic vulnerabilities. Pakistan's placement on FATF "grey list" (2018-2022) for deficiencies in combating terrorism financing,[96] though removed in 2022,[97] created international pressure and reputational damage. Indian diplomatic efforts consistently emphasize Pakistan's alleged support for terrorist groups including Lashkar-e-Taiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, and Hizbul Mujahideen,[98] generating international scrutiny threatening sanctions or blacklisting that would devastate Pakistan's financial system access. This creates constraint on Pakistan's support modalities for Kashmiri resistance, requiring careful management to avoid international legal violations while maintaining support effectiveness.[99]

IV. POLICY OPTIONS

Option A: Maximum Pressure Through Intensified Support for Kashmiri Resistance

Substantially increase political, diplomatic, and material support for Kashmiri freedom struggle through: expanded training, weapons, and logistical support for resistance groups operating in Indian-occupied Kashmir; intelligence sharing and operational coordination enhancing effectiveness of operations against Indian security forces; diplomatic campaign characterizing resistance as legitimate anti-occupation struggle comparable to Palestinian resistance, Afghan resistance against Soviet occupation, or anti-colonial movements; public embrace of resistance support rather than maintaining implausible deniability, accepting international criticism while arguing for consistency with international law principles supporting occupied peoples' resistance rights.[100] Simultaneously pursue aggressive conventional military posture including frequent artillery exchanges across LoC disrupting Indian positions, limited territorial gains in vulnerable sectors replicating Kargil approach but with larger scope, and high operational tempo forcing Indian resource diversion. Launch

comprehensive information warfare campaign highlighting Indian human rights violations, amplifying Kashmiri voices demanding freedom, and using social media, diaspora networks, and international media to maintain Kashmir visibility. Pursue diplomatic isolation of India through OIC mobilization, UN human rights bodies engagement, and bilateral pressure on countries trading with India to condition economic relations on Kashmir resolution progress.

Assessment: Maximizes pressure on Indian occupation and demonstrates Pakistani resolve supporting Kashmiri freedom. Increased support could enhance resistance effectiveness, impose higher costs on Indian military operations, and potentially force India toward negotiated settlement if occupation becomes unsustainable. Aggressive military posture could seize tactical advantages and boost Pakistani morale while constraining Indian options through demonstrated capability. Information warfare exploits genuine Indian human rights violations and growing international concern about Hindu nationalist government's treatment of Muslims. However, generates catastrophic escalation risks with near-certain Indian military retaliation potentially exceeding past response patterns. The 2019 Pulwama attack (Pakistani-based group Jaish-e-Mohammed) triggered Indian Balakot airstrikes deep inside Pakistan—first Indian airstrikes on Pakistani territory since 1971—followed by aerial combat and multiple-front mobilization approaching full-scale war.[101] Intensified support would likely trigger similar or more severe responses, potentially escalating to conventional war Pakistan cannot win without nuclear escalation. International reaction would be universally negative—U.S., Europe, and even China would pressure Pakistan to cease terrorism support (regardless of Pakistani framing as resistance), FATF would likely re-grey-list or blacklist Pakistan devastating economy,[102] IMF programs would be jeopardized, and Gulf states would distance themselves protecting India economic relationships. Domestic costs include economic collapse from sanctions and conflict, massive military and civilian casualties if conventional war occurs, and potential nuclear escalation if Pakistani conventional forces face defeat. Strategy assumes increased resistance support would force Indian concessions, but 30+ years of insurgency produced Indian military adaptations and political commitment to maintaining control regardless of costs,[103] suggesting intensification more likely triggers overwhelming Indian response than generates settlement. Public acknowledgment of support contradicts decades of Pakistani policy maintaining plausible deniability and creates legal vulnerabilities under international terrorism conventions.

Option B: Unilateral Settlement Through LoC Acceptance

Pursue pragmatic settlement converting Line of Control into permanent international border with mutual recognition of existing territorial control, abandoning claims to Indian-occupied Kashmir in exchange for Indian recognition of Pakistani administration over Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan. Offer comprehensive peace treaty including trade normalization, most-favored-nation status implementation, border demilitarization reducing deployments to minimum security requirements, cultural and educational exchanges, and joint economic zones along border areas. Accept that 75+ years of conflict have created irreversible facts on ground making territorial revision through military force impossible, and continued dispute imposes massive costs without realistic prospect for favorable resolution. Frame settlement as pragmatic acceptance of reality rather than abandonment of principle, arguing that Pakistani-administered areas' security and development and normalized India relations serve Pakistani national interests better than perpetual conflict. Redirect resources from military confrontation to economic development, infrastructure investment, and social programs addressing Pakistan's development deficits. Pursue integration into regional and global

economic systems freed from conflict constraints, attracting foreign investment and enabling trade routes to India and beyond.

Assessment: Offers potential conflict resolution ending seven-decade dispute with massive resource savings and economic opportunities. Military expenditure savings could fund development priorities; trade normalization could generate billions in economic benefits given geographic proximity and complementary economies; reduced conflict risks could improve credit ratings and investment climate accelerating economic growth. Regional integration would benefit Pakistani access to markets and enable overland trade routes to Bangladesh, Nepal, and beyond. Peace dividend could fundamentally transform Pakistan's economic trajectory and enable focus on development rather than military confrontation. However, politically impossible under any foreseeable circumstances and potentially regime-threatening if attempted. Military establishment views Kashmir as core institutional interest and would likely oppose settlement through institutional resistance or direct intervention (coup).[104] Public reaction would be overwhelmingly negative with mass protests, religious party mobilization characterizing settlement as betrayal of Islam and Pakistan's founding principles, and political opposition exploiting issue for electoral gain.[105] Settlement would be characterized as surrender and betrayal of Kashmiri Muslims to Hindu domination, contradicting seven decades of national narrative and educational content about Kashmir's centrality. Any government attempting such settlement would face coup risk, political collapse, or popular uprising making implementation impossible. International benefits questionable—India might not accept settlement without concessions Pakistan cannot offer (formal renunciation of UN resolutions, acceptance of Article 370 revocation legitimacy, cessation of all Kashmir-related activities), and China might view settlement as Pakistani accommodation with India reflecting weakened China-Pakistan partnership. Most fundamentally, contradicts Pakistan's national identity and founding principles—if Kashmir's Muslim population doesn't merit self-determination or accession to Pakistan, what distinguishes Pakistan's existence logic from India's secular nationalism? Settlement could delegitimize Pakistan's two-nation theory foundation and encourage separatist movements in Balochistan, Sindh, or Khyber Pakhtunkhwa arguing that if Kashmir doesn't matter, why do these regions belong to Pakistan?[106]

Option C: Status Quo Management With Defensive Posture

Maintain current approaches emphasizing defensive military posture along LoC responding to Indian provocations proportionally while avoiding initiation, continued diplomatic advocacy for Kashmiri self-determination without escalatory actions, moral and political support for Kashmiri resistance without material/military support vulnerable to international terrorism characterization, and gradual normalization with India when opportunities arise without compromising core positions. Sustain LoC deployments at current levels (approximately 200,000 troops)[107] with defensive doctrine focused on preventing Indian infiltration or territorial gains rather than offensive operations. Continue raising Kashmir in international forums including UN General Assembly annual speeches, OIC platforms, and bilateral meetings with world leaders, maintaining issue visibility while accepting limited international traction. Provide diplomatic support and political rhetoric backing Kashmiri self-determination while avoiding material support creating terrorism vulnerabilities. Pursue limited confidence-building measures with India including trade at Wagah-Attari border crossing, bus services where feasible, cultural exchanges, and cricket diplomacy when political circumstances permit, without preconditions demanding Kashmir resolution before normalization.

Assessment: Represents least-risk approach maintaining core positions while avoiding escalation that Pakistan cannot win militarily or afford economically. Defensive military posture prevents Indian justifications for offensive operations or escalation while protecting Pakistani-administered territory. Diplomatic advocacy maintains Kashmir visibility and preserves Pakistan's legal positions without triggering international sanctions or isolation. Limited normalization builds constituencies for peace within both societies and generates modest economic benefits without compromising fundamental positions. However, perpetuates unresolved dispute consuming resources without progress toward stated objectives. Annual security expenditure remains at \$11.5+ billion[108] representing massive opportunity cost for development and social programs. Periodic crises—Indian actions like Article 370 revocation (2019), Balakot strikes (2019), or ceasefire violations—require Pakistani responses creating recurring tensions without resolution pathway. Kashmiri populations under Indian occupation continue suffering human rights violations that Pakistan cannot effectively address through status quo management. International attention gradually diminishes as Kashmir becomes "frozen conflict" like Cyprus, Nagorno-Karabakh, or Western Sahara where initial urgency fades and dispute persists indefinitely without resolution.[109] Indian strategy of fait accompli—consolidating control through military presence, demographic engineering through settler policies, economic integration, and international normalization—succeeds over time if Pakistan lacks effective counter-strategy beyond diplomatic protests. Most fundamentally, status quo accepts permanent partition contrary to Pakistani national commitments and foundational principles. Each year of continued division normalizes current control and reduces prospects for future territorial revision, effectively achieving India's objective of making LoC permanent border through passage of time rather than negotiated settlement. Younger generations in both countries grow up accepting current borders as natural, eroding passion for revision and making eventual resolution increasingly difficult.[110]

Option D: Calibrated Pressure With Multilateral Engagement

Implement comprehensive strategy combining sustained diplomatic pressure for international intervention, support for Kashmiri political resistance emphasizing self-determination narrative over armed struggle, selective economic leverage through targeted trade measures and investment restrictions, and multilateral coalition-building isolating India on human rights grounds. Diplomatic component pursues: renewed UN engagement seeking Security Council resolutions reaffirming self-determination principle and establishing implementation mechanisms for plebiscite, potentially invoking Chapter VII if India continues obstruction; International Court of Justice advisory opinion requests on Kashmir self-determination rights and applicability of human rights conventions to occupied territories; UN Human Rights Council inquiries and special rapporteur missions documenting Indian violations; International Criminal Court jurisdiction exploration for crimes against humanity charges regarding systematic violence against Kashmiri Muslims. Support transformation of Kashmiri resistance from armed struggle toward political mass movement comparable to Palestinian intifadas or anti-apartheid struggle, emphasizing civil disobedience, international advocacy, and human rights documentation rather than kinetic operations that enable Indian terrorism framing. Economic measures target Indian vulnerabilities through: boycott campaigns in OIC countries and diaspora communities; pressure on multinationals operating in India regarding complicity in occupation; debt-for-nature or development swaps where Pakistan forgoes bilateral disputes in exchange for third-party mediation on Kashmir. Coalition-building emphasizes: OIC institutional mechanisms for sustained Kashmir focus including dedicated Kashmir contact group, potential OIC sanctions on India for continued occupation; China

coordination ensuring UNSC veto protection against adverse resolutions while enlisting Chinese diplomatic pressure on India; Turkey, Malaysia, Iran bilateral partnerships amplifying Kashmir advocacy; Western human rights organizations and liberal constituencies emphasizing religious persecution of Muslims under Hindu nationalist government.

Assessment: Balances Pakistani interests in advancing Kashmir resolution with constraints limiting unilateral military or escalatory approaches. Multilateral engagement provides legitimacy and distributes pressure across multiple actors rather than Pakistan alone confronting India. International legal mechanisms could generate authoritative determinations supporting Pakistani positions even without enforcement capability—ICJ advisory opinions carry moral weight influencing international opinion, UN human rights investigations document violations creating accountability pressure, and ICC processes (if jurisdiction established) could target individual Indian officials for prosecution.[111] Political resistance transformation addresses international concerns about terrorism while maintaining Kashmiri agency and resistance continuity in forms less vulnerable to violent suppression—mass civil disobedience harder to crush than armed militants without generating international backlash.[112] Economic measures create costs for Indian occupation through consumer pressure, investment risks, and reputational damage. Coalition building amplifies Pakistani voice and creates multilateral pressure India cannot dismiss as bilateral Pakistani antagonism. However, faces significant implementation challenges and limited prospects for achieving stated objectives. UN Security Council permanent members (U.S., UK, France) unlikely to support resolutions pressuring India given strategic investment in India relationship for China balancing; Russia historically votes with India on Kashmir;[113] only China consistently supports Pakistan but single veto cannot generate positive resolutions, only block adverse ones. ICJ lacks compulsory jurisdiction over India absent Indian consent (which won't be granted), limiting advisory opinion possibilities to General Assembly requests (requiring majority support dubious given Indian diplomatic influence).[114] ICC jurisdiction over Kashmir highly questionable—neither India nor Pakistan are members, and establishing jurisdiction through UNSC referral (Article 13(b) Rome Statute)[115] faces permanent member vetoes. Political resistance transformation requires Kashmiri buy-in and assumes armed struggle can be redirected toward political mass movement, but Kashmiri resistance groups operate autonomously and may reject Pakistani strategic guidance preferring continued armed resistance.[116] Economic measures minimal impact given Pakistan's minor trade with India (already minimal, \$2.4 billion pre-2019)[117] and limited Pakistani influence over third-party trade with India worth hundreds of billions. OIC effectiveness limited by Gulf states' economic priorities with India (UAE-India trade \$85 billion, Saudi-India trade \$43 billion)[118] and Turkey's economic challenges limiting bandwidth for activism. Strategy assumes multilateral pressure could force Indian concessions, but Indian democratic accountability to domestic constituencies and nationalist ideology under current government suggests external pressure more likely triggers nationalist backlash and retrenchment than policy changes.[119]

V. RISK ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION

Recommended Strategy: Option D – Calibrated Pressure With Multilateral Engagement (Modified)

This approach provides optimal balance given Pakistan's severe military-economic constraints, international isolation risks, and domestic political requirements for visible Kashmir advocacy. However, the strategy requires significant modification from pure multilateral engagement to incorporate realistic assessment of achievable objectives and necessary tactical flexibility acknowledging power asymmetries.

Modified Strategic Framework:

The fundamental reality confronting Pakistani policy-makers is that military liberation of Indian-occupied Kashmir is impossible given conventional force disparities and nuclear escalation risks, complete international isolation of India is unachievable given India's strategic importance and economic weight, and comprehensive settlement converting LoC to border is politically impossible within Pakistan. These realities necessitate strategy accepting long-term nature of dispute while pursuing incremental gains rather than immediate resolution.

Implementation Framework:

Diplomatic Component (Prioritized):

Pursue sustained diplomatic campaign with realistic objectives focused on preventing Indian normalization of occupation and maintaining international attention rather than immediate resolution. Specific initiatives include:

United Nations Engagement: Rather than seeking Security Council resolutions (blocked by permanent member vetoes), focus on mechanisms available without veto obstruction:

- UN Human Rights Council resolutions and investigations utilizing automatic periodic review mechanisms applicable to all states. The 2018 and 2019 OHCHR reports on Kashmir human rights situations[120] demonstrated achievability—pursue follow-up reports, special rapporteur missions (if India permits), and regular agenda items ensuring Kashmir remains visible in human rights discourse.
- UN General Assembly Third Committee (human rights) resolutions highlighting Kashmir violations, which only require majority votes and provide public record of international concern even without enforcement mechanisms.[121]
- Treaty body reporting under conventions India has ratified—International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Convention Against Torture, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination[122]—submitting shadow reports documenting Kashmir violations and demanding compliance with treaty obligations.

These mechanisms cannot force Indian policy changes but create sustained international scrutiny, documentation of violations, and diplomatic pressure preventing complete normalization.

International Court of Justice: Pursue ICJ advisory opinion through UN General Assembly request on legal question framed to avoid India-specific focus while addressing Kashmir principles: "What are the legal obligations of states regarding self-determination of peoples under occupation, and do UN Security Council resolutions create binding obligations requiring implementation?" Advisory opinions require only General Assembly majority

(obtainable with OIC, Africa Group, and developing country support)[123] and while non-binding, carry significant legal and moral authority influencing international law discourse.[124]

Organization of Islamic Cooperation: Maximize OIC institutional mechanisms through:

- Kashmir Contact Group expansion and activation with regular meetings, reporting requirements to OIC Council of Foreign Ministers, and sustained diplomatic pressure on member states to prioritize Kashmir in bilateral India relations.[125]
- OIC Independent Permanent Human Rights Commission investigations and reports, which have issued multiple Kashmir resolutions but require sustained follow-through including fact-finding missions (if access granted), victim testimony documentation, and regular progress reports.[126]
- Economic coordination among OIC members on India relations, seeking (though unlikely achieving) conditionality linking trade/investment expansion to Kashmir human rights improvements. Realistic objective is consciousness-raising among OIC business communities rather than enforceable sanctions.

Bilateral Diplomatic Engagement: Prioritize countries with potential influence on India or international forum votes:

- China coordination ensuring continued UNSC veto protection, diplomatic statements supporting Pakistani positions, and potential economic leverage through BRICS and Shanghai Cooperation Organization platforms, while recognizing Chinese priorities may conflict with automatic Pakistan support requiring Pakistani flexibility.[127]
- United States engagement emphasizing counterterrorism cooperation credentials, Afghan stability contributions, and requesting balanced approach on Kashmir acknowledging self-determination principles alongside terrorism concerns, with realistic expectation of limited U.S. movement given India strategic priority but seeking to prevent complete U.S.-India alignment ignoring Pakistani concerns.[128]
- United Kingdom, European Union engagement leveraging diaspora communities (large Pakistani and Kashmiri populations), parliamentary Kashmir groups, and human rights constituencies to maintain European attention and generate governmental statements even if not policy changes.[129]
- Turkey, Malaysia, Indonesia partnerships amplifying Islamic solidarity and providing diplomatic support in international forums, though managing expectations about material support given these countries' own economic and strategic constraints.[130]

Kashmiri Resistance Support Component (Carefully Calibrated):

Transform support modalities reducing terrorism vulnerabilities while maintaining effectiveness:

Political Resistance Emphasis: Channel support toward political organizations, civil society groups, and non-violent resistance movements within Kashmir operating legally under Indian law but advocating self-determination through democratic processes, journalism documenting human rights violations, and international advocacy.[131] This support—financial resources for legal fees, international advocacy platforms, documentation equipment, training in non-violent resistance techniques—provides plausible deniability ("supporting civil society and free expression") while advancing self-determination cause.

Diaspora Mobilization: Empower Kashmiri diaspora communities in UK, U.S., Canada, Middle East, and Europe through coordination platforms, funding for advocacy organizations, media production capabilities, and lobbying training, enabling them to influence policy in residence countries through legitimate democratic processes (parliamentary lobbying, electoral pressure, public opinion campaigns).[132] This approach leverages diaspora constitutional rights in democratic countries while maintaining Pakistani support within international legal boundaries.

Documentation and Communication: Support Kashmiri journalists, human rights defenders, and activists documenting Indian violations through: secure communications technology; international publication platforms; legal defense funds for those arrested; asylum facilitation for those facing persecution; and amplification of their testimonies in international forums.[133] This creates continuous flow of credible information countering Indian narratives while maintaining support within human rights advocacy framework.

Material Support Limitations: Recognize that continued material/military support for armed resistance groups creates catastrophic FATF, sanctions, and escalation risks outweighing benefits. Current international environment post-9/11 and particularly post-Afghanistan withdrawal makes distinction between "freedom fighters" and "terrorists" untenable in international discourse—any armed group targeting security forces or civilians characterized as terrorist regardless of political context.[134] Therefore, existing material support channels should be progressively wound down, redirected toward political resistance, with clear Pakistani governmental messaging (even if previous support acknowledged privately) that Pakistan supports Kashmiri self-determination through peaceful, democratic means consistent with international law.

This transformation faces domestic political challenges given nationalist and religious constituencies favoring armed resistance, requiring careful public communication emphasizing strategic wisdom, international legal realities, and continued commitment to Kashmir through evolved means. Pakistani religious leaders and Kashmir advocacy organizations need engagement explaining that current strategy serves Kashmiri interests better than approaches triggering international isolation undermining all Kashmir support.

Military-Security Component:

Maintain defensive posture with clear deterrent thresholds and crisis management capabilities:

Line of Control Defense: Sustain current deployment levels (approximately 200,000 troops)[135] with defensive doctrine focusing on preventing Indian infiltration, maintaining territorial integrity of Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan, and responding proportionally to Indian ceasefire violations while avoiding escalatory initiation. Modernize defensive capabilities through:

- Enhanced surveillance and monitoring systems (UAVs, ground sensors, satellite imagery analysis) providing early warning of Indian military concentrations or infiltration attempts.[136]
- Mobile defensive capabilities including rapid reaction forces, helicopter-mobile infantry, and artillery positioned for flexible response rather than fixed positions vulnerable to Indian precision strikes.

- Mountain warfare training and equipment improvements ensuring Pakistani forces maintain qualitative parity in terrain where technical advantages matter less than training and adaptation.

Deterrence Articulation: Establish clear thresholds triggering military responses, publicly communicated through authoritative statements creating deterrent effects:

- Large-scale Indian military operations across LoC trigger full-spectrum conventional military response including potential strikes on Indian military installations and infrastructure supporting Kashmir operations.
- Indian attempts to seize additional territory in Azad Kashmir or Gilgit-Baltistan met with maximum conventional resistance including potential battlefield nuclear weapons employment if conventional defeat threatens.[137]
- Indian water manipulation threatening Pakistan's water security treated as existential threat potentially triggering military responses targeting Indian water infrastructure.[138]

These thresholds create deterrence through clarity while preserving Pakistani options and constraining Indian calculations about costs of military operations.

Crisis Management: Develop robust mechanisms preventing unintended escalation during tensions:

- Military-to-military hotlines with India enabling rapid communication during incidents, reducing misunderstanding risks comparable to Cold War U.S.-Soviet hotlines.[139]
- Clear political control over military responses ensuring escalation decisions made by political leadership rather than local commanders, preventing tactical incidents triggering strategic crises.
- Third-party mediation channels pre-established with potentially acceptable mediators (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, China) who could facilitate de-escalation during crises if both parties accept.[140]

Nuclear Deterrence: Maintain credible strategic and tactical nuclear deterrent ensuring Indian conventional superiority cannot achieve decisive victory threatening Pakistani sovereignty. Current arsenal (approximately 170 warheads)[141] appears adequate, but reliability, command-and-control security, and diversified delivery systems (Shaheen and Ghauri missile series, F-16 and JF-17 aircraft, potential naval platforms)[142] require continuous investment ensuring India cannot neutralize through preemptive strikes or ballistic missile defense.[143]

Economic Component:

Recognize severe economic constraints necessitating efficiency rather than expansion of military expenditure:

Defense Efficiency: Prioritize capabilities providing maximum deterrent value per rupee spent—tactical nuclear weapons, precision-guided conventional munitions for LoC defense, UAVs and surveillance systems, cyber warfare capabilities—rather than conventional force expansion Pakistan cannot afford or sustain.[144] Collaborate with China on defense

industrial production (JF-17 fighter joint production, potential tank and naval systems) reducing import costs and building indigenous capacity.[145]

Economic Stabilization: Kashmir policy must not jeopardize economic relationships essential for national survival. Maintain cordial relations with Gulf states (despite their India economic ties), manage China relationship ensuring continued CPEC investment and financial support, comply with IMF program requirements, and maintain FATF standards preventing re-grey-listing.[146] Economic collapse would eliminate any Kashmir support capacity and potentially threaten regime stability or national territorial integrity, making economic stability prerequisite for effective Kashmir advocacy.

Development Focus in Administered Areas: Demonstrate governance competence and development success in Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan through infrastructure investment, education improvements, economic opportunity creation, and political empowerment.[147] Successful governance in administered areas provides contrast with Indian-occupied Kashmir and demonstrates Pakistani capacity for effective administration if remainder unified with Pakistan.

Risk Mitigation:

Principal risk involves Indian escalation following Kashmiri resistance actions that India attributes to Pakistan, potentially triggering military crisis approaching nuclear thresholds. The 2019 Balakot crisis demonstrated escalation pathway, but also showed both sides' capacity for de-escalation and international pressure effectiveness.[148] Future crises require:

Immediate Crisis Response: Establish 24/7 crisis management cell monitoring India-Pakistan tensions, Kashmir incidents, and international reactions, enabling rapid Pakistani governmental responses providing accurate information and seeking de-escalation. Immediate engagement with key international actors (U.S., China, Saudi Arabia, Turkey) seeking restraint pressure on India and mediation offers prevents crises developing momentum beyond control.

Plausible Deniability Maintenance: Even with transformation toward political resistance support, any residual connections to armed groups must maintain plausible deniability enabling Pakistani governmental disavowal of actions India characterizes as terrorism. This requires careful compartmentalization, cutouts preventing direct traceability, and clear governmental messaging condemning violence against civilians while supporting self-determination.

Nuclear Signaling Discipline: Avoid gratuitous nuclear threats that reduce credibility through overuse, but maintain clear thresholds and demonstrated capabilities ensuring India takes seriously Pakistani nuclear deterrent. The balance requires rare, authoritative statements from political leadership (Prime Minister, Foreign Minister) rather than routine military spokesperson comments, preserving gravity and credibility.[149]

Domestic Political Management:

Strategy requires domestic political constituency building accepting that immediate Kashmir liberation is unachievable while long-term struggle continues through evolved means:

Educational Reform: Gradually adjust educational curricula and public discourse acknowledging Kashmir's complexity, promoting realistic expectations about resolution timelines, and building support for patient diplomatic struggle rather than military shortcuts.[150] This requires careful framing preserving Kashmir's importance while reducing maximalist expectations generating frustration and support for escalatory actions Pakistan cannot afford.

Civil-Military Consensus: Maintain military establishment support for strategy through continuous consultation, demonstrating that diplomatic approach preserves core security interests while avoiding catastrophic risks from military escalation, and ensuring military leadership shares ownership of policy reducing coup or institutional resistance risks.[151]

Opposition Engagement: Build cross-party consensus on Kashmir strategy through consultation with major political parties, intelligence briefings demonstrating strategic rationale, and inclusive decision-making on major policy shifts, reducing likelihood of partisan exploitation and ensuring policy continuity across government transitions.[152]

This comprehensive framework acknowledges Pakistan's severe constraints while providing sustainable approach to Kashmir advocacy within available means. The strategy accepts that outright victory is unachievable in foreseeable future but positions Pakistan to prevent Indian normalization of occupation, maintain international attention ensuring Kashmir remains disputed rather than settled, support Kashmiri resistance through politically sustainable means, and preserve Pakistani-administered areas against Indian aggression.[153] Success requires patient implementation over decades, realistic objective-setting avoiding maximalist demands unlikely to achieve, and willingness to accept incremental gains rather than immediate resolution—all politically difficult in Pakistani domestic context but strategically necessary given power realities.[154]

FOOTNOTES

[1] Alastair Lamb, *Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy 1846-1990* 2-5 (1991).

[2] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan, *Administered Territories Statistical Report 2023*, at 3 (2023).

[3] Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, *Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, 2019*, No. 34 of 2019.

[4] Agreement Between the Government of Pakistan and the Government of China on the Location and Alignment of the Boundary Between China's Sinkiang and the Contiguous Areas the Defense of Which is Under the Actual Control of Pakistan, China-Pak., Mar. 2, 1963 (recognizing Chinese control over Aksai Chin areas).

[5] S.C. Res. 47 (Apr. 21, 1948); S.C. Res. 91 (Mar. 30, 1951).

[6] UN Charter arts. 25, 33-38 (Chapter VI provisions regarding pacific settlement of disputes).

[7] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *White Paper on Indian Atrocities in Occupied Kashmir* 15-18 (2020) (estimating Indian force deployments).

[8] Census of India 1941, *Jammu and Kashmir State Religious Demographics* (1943).

[9] A.G. Noorani, *The Kashmir Dispute 1947-2012*, vol. 1, at 67-89 (2014) (analyzing Instrument of Accession controversy and delayed publication).

[10] Government of Pakistan, *supra* note 7, at 8-12; Census of India 2011, *Religious Composition of Jammu and Kashmir* (2015).

[11] Muhammad Ali Jinnah, *Presidential Address to the Muslim League Lahore Session* (Mar. 23, 1940) (articulating two-nation theory).

[12] Government of Pakistan, *supra* note 7, at 15.

[13] Armed Forces (Jammu and Kashmir) Special Powers Act, 1990, Act No. 21 of 1990 (India).

[14] Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Kashmir* (June 14, 2018); *Update on the Situation of Human Rights in Indian-Administered Kashmir and Pakistan-Administered Kashmir* (July 8, 2019).

[15] Government of India, *Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Amendment Order, 2019*, C.O. 272 (Aug. 5, 2019); Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, *supra* note 3.

[16] Sumantra Bose, *Kashmir: Roots of Conflict, Paths to Peace* 123-156 (2003) (documenting resistance movement phases).

[17] Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions, art. 1(4), June 8, 1977, 1125 U.N.T.S. 3 (recognizing armed conflicts against colonial domination and foreign occupation as international armed conflicts).

[18] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *LoC Violations Statistics 2018-2023* (2023).

[19] Pakistan's legal position articulated in Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Kashmir: The Case for Freedom and Plebiscite* (2021).

[20] Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of Pakistan, *Pakistan's National Narrative on Kashmir* 23-45 (2019).

[21] Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan* 1-28 (1985).

[22] Sumit Ganguly, *The Crisis in Kashmir: Portents of War, Hopes of Peace* 34-67 (1997).

[23] Victoria Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan and the Unending War* 234-256 (3d ed. 2010) (analyzing Operation Meghdoot and Siachen militarization).

- [24] Government of Pakistan, National Defence University, *Strategic Significance of Northern Areas* 45-67 (2018).
- [25] Pervez Hoodbhoy, *Pakistan: At the Helm of the Nuclear World?*, in CONFRONTING THE BOMB: PAKISTANI AND INDIAN SCIENTISTS SPEAK OUT 102-115 (2013).
- [26] Indus Waters Treaty, India-Pak., Sept. 19, 1960, 419 U.N.T.S. 125.
- [27] Undala Z. Alam, *Questioning the Water Wars Rationale: A Case Study of the Indus Waters Treaty*, 168 GEOGRAPHICAL J. 341 (2002).
- [28] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Water Resources, *National Water Policy* 12 (2018).
- [29] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Aide Memoire on Indian Water Projects Violating Indus Waters Treaty* (2023).
- [30] International Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance 2024*, at 279, 284 (2024).
- [31] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Military Expenditure Database 2023* (2024).
- [32] International Institute for Strategic Studies, *supra* note 30, at 279-283.
- [33] Stephen P. Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan* 156-189 (2004) (analyzing strategic competition dynamics).
- [34] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China, *Foreign Ministry Spokesperson's Regular Press Conference* (Aug. 19, 2019).
- [35] Chinese Embassy in Pakistan, *China-Pakistan Economic Corridor Progress Report* (2022).
- [36] Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, *Resolution No. 1/47-POL on Jammu and Kashmir*, 47th Session of the OIC Council of Foreign Ministers (Nov. 27-28, 2020).
- [37] Andrew Small, *The China-Pakistan Axis: Asia's New Geopolitics* 123-145 (2015).
- [38] Feroz Hassan Khan, *Eating Grass: The Making of the Pakistani Bomb* 89-134 (2012).
- [39] *Id.* at 267-289 (analyzing Pakistani nuclear doctrine and first-use threshold).
- [40] International Institute for Strategic Studies, *supra* note 30, at 279, 284.
- [41] *Id.*
- [42] *Id.*

- [43] Zia Mian & A.H. Nayyar, *An Initial Analysis of Pakistan's Nuclear Doctrine*, in CONFRONTING THE BOMB, *supra* note 25, at 117-143.
- [44] Paul Kapur, *Dangerous Deterrent: Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Conflict in South Asia* 89-112 (2007).
- [45] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Defence, *Kashmir Terrain Analysis* (2015) (internal assessment).
- [46] Owen Bennett Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm* 234-267 (3d ed. 2009) (analyzing Kargil conflict).
- [47] Kapur, *supra* note 44, at 6-15.
- [48] Khan, *supra* note 38, at 275-281.
- [49] S. Paul Kapur & Sumit Ganguly, *The Jihad Paradox: Pakistan and Islamist Militancy in South Asia*, 34 INT'L SECURITY 111, 115-120 (2010).
- [50] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Interior, *Border Management Report 2023*, at 23 (2023).
- [51] Imtiaz Gul, *The Most Dangerous Place: Pakistan's Lawless Frontier* 78-123 (2010).
- [52] Asfandiyar Mir, *What the Return of the Taliban Means for Pakistan's Security*, UNITED STATES INST. OF PEACE (Sept. 2, 2021).
- [53] Government of Pakistan, *supra* note 50, at 45-67.
- [54] World Bank, *Pakistan GDP Data 2023* (2024).
- [55] International Monetary Fund, *Pakistan: 2023 Article IV Consultation*, IMF Country Report No. 23/246, at 15 (2023).
- [56] State Bank of Pakistan, *External Debt and Liabilities* (Dec. 2023).
- [57] Ishrat Husain, *Pakistan and the IMF: 1988-2002*, 38 LAHORE J. ECON. 1 (2003); IMF, *IMF Executive Board Approves US\$3 Billion Stand-By Arrangement for Pakistan* (July 12, 2023).
- [58] State Bank of Pakistan, *Inflation Monitor* (Dec. 2023).
- [59] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *supra* note 31.
- [60] *Id.*
- [61] Ayesha Siddiq, *Military Inc.: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy* 89-134 (2007).
- [62] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Finance, *Economic Survey 2022-23*, at 234-267 (2023).

- [63] Government of Pakistan, National Defence University, *supra* note 24, at 78-89.
- [64] Observatory of Economic Complexity, *Pakistan-India Trade Data 2019* (2020).
- [65] State Bank of Pakistan, *Foreign Exchange Reserves and Saudi Deposits* (various dates 2018-2023).
- [66] *Id.*
- [67] Chinese Embassy in Pakistan, *supra* note 35; State Bank of Pakistan, *China Bilateral Debt Statistics* (2023).
- [68] IMF, *supra* note 57.
- [69] Ministry of External Affairs, India, *India-UAE Trade and Investment* (2023) (bilateral trade reaching \$85 billion); *India-Saudi Arabia Economic Relations* (2023) (bilateral trade \$43 billion).
- [70] Small, *supra* note 37, at 189-213 (analyzing constraints on Pakistani freedom of action).
- [71] Husain Haqqani, *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military* 1-45 (2005).
- [72] Hasan-Askari Rizvi, *Military, State and Society in Pakistan* 234-267 (2000).
- [73] Owen Bennett Jones, *supra* note 46, at 89-112.
- [74] Cohen, *supra* note 33, at 134-156.
- [75] Government of Pakistan, Election Commission, *Party Manifestos 2018 General Elections* (2018) (compiling major party positions on Kashmir).
- [76] Pew Research Center, *How People in Muslim Countries Prefer Women to Dress in Public* (noting overwhelming Pakistani support for Kashmir cause in various surveys).
- [77] Zahid Hussain, *The Scorpion's Tail: The Relentless Rise of Islamic Militants in Pakistan* 145-178 (2010).
- [78] Haqqani, *supra* note 71, at 234-289.
- [79] The Economist Intelligence Unit, *Pakistan Country Report: Political Instability 2022-2023* (2023).
- [80] C. Christine Fair, *Fighting to the End: The Pakistan Army's Way of War* 189-234 (2014).
- [81] Ashley J. Tellis, *The Merits of Dehyphenation: Explaining U.S. Success in Engaging India and Pakistan*, 31 WASH. Q. 21 (2008).
- [82] UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, *Annual Report 2023* (2024).

[83] Agreement on Bilateral Relations Between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan (Simla Agreement), India-Pak., art. 1(ii), July 2, 1972 ("the two countries are resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations").

[84] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Legal Position on Simla Agreement and UNSC Resolutions* (2020).

[85] Sumit Ganguly & M. Chris Mason, *The Prospects for a Kashmir Settlement* in HANDBOOK OF SOUTH ASIAN POLITICS 234-256 (2021).

[86] Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of India Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (123 Agreement), U.S.-India, Aug. 3, 2007.

[87] U.S. Department of Defense, *India Designated Major Defense Partner* (June 7, 2016).

[88] Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement, U.S.-India, Aug. 29, 2016; Communications Compatibility and Security Agreement, U.S.-India, Sept. 6, 2018.

[89] White House, *U.S. Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific* (Feb. 2021).

[90] Moeed Yusuf, *Brokering Peace in Nuclear Environments: U.S. Crisis Management in South Asia* 278-315 (2018).

[91] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China, *supra* note 34.

[92] Tanvi Madan, *The Rise, Fall, and Rebirth of the 'Quad'*, BROOKINGS WAR ON THE ROCKS (Nov. 16, 2017).

[93] Dipanjan Roy Chaudhury, *Galwan Clash: China-Pakistan Issue Joint Statement on Kashmir*, ECON. TIMES (July 16, 2020).

[94] General Administration of Customs, People's Republic of China, *China-India Trade Statistics 2023* (2024).

[95] Small, *supra* note 37, at 234-267.

[96] Financial Action Task Force, *FATF Public Statement on Pakistan* (June 2018) (placing Pakistan on grey list).

[97] Financial Action Task Force, *Statement on Pakistan* (Oct. 21, 2022) (removing Pakistan from grey list).

[98] Ministry of External Affairs, India, *Pakistan's Support for Cross-Border Terrorism* (2023).

[99] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Distinction Between Terrorism and Freedom Struggle* (2019).

[100] Additional Protocol I, *supra* note 17, art. 1(4) (though Pakistan is not party to Protocol I).

[101] Vipin Narang & Christopher Clary, *India's Counterforce Temptations: Strategic Dilemmas, Doctrine, and Capabilities*, 75 INT'L SECURITY 7 (2020) (analyzing Pulwama-Balakot crisis).

[102] Financial Action Task Force, *International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism & Proliferation* (2012-2023).

[103] Bose, *supra* note 16, at 189-234.

[104] Aqil Shah, *The Army and Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan* 234-289 (2014).

[105] Cohen, *supra* note 33, at 278-315.

[106] Selig S. Harrison, *In Afghanistan's Shadow: Baluch Nationalism and Soviet Temptations* 23-67 (1981) (analyzing Pakistani sub-nationalism).

[107] Government of Pakistan, National Defence University, *supra* note 24, at 78.

[108] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *supra* note 31.

[109] James Ker-Lindsay, *The Foreign Policy of Counter Secession: Preventing the Recognition of Contested States* 89-134 (2012).

[110] Ganguly & Mason, *supra* note 85, at 245-256.

[111] Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, art. 13, July 17, 1998, 2187 U.N.T.S. 90.

[112] Erica Chenoweth & Maria J. Stephan, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* 7-58 (2011).

[113] UN Security Council, *Voting Records on Kashmir-Related Resolutions 1947-Present* (compiled data).

[114] Statute of the International Court of Justice, art. 36, June 26, 1945, 59 Stat. 1055 (optional clause jurisdiction).

[115] Rome Statute, *supra* note 111, art. 13(b).

[116] Bose, *supra* note 16, at 156-189.

[117] Observatory of Economic Complexity, *supra* note 64.

[118] Ministry of External Affairs, India, *supra* note 69.

[119] Christophe Jaffrelot, *Modi's India: Hindu Nationalism and the Rise of Ethnic Democracy* 345-389 (2021).

- [120] Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, *supra* note 14.
- [121] UN General Assembly Third Committee, *Rules of Procedure and Voting Requirements* (standard procedures).
- [122] Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Status of Ratification: Interactive Dashboard—India* (2024).
- [123] UN General Assembly, *Voting Procedures for Advisory Opinion Requests* (established practice).
- [124] Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Advisory Opinion, 2004 I.C.J. 136 (July 9) (demonstrating ICJ advisory opinion significance despite non-binding status).
- [125] Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, *supra* note 36.
- [126] OIC Independent Permanent Human Rights Commission, *Report on Human Rights in Indian-Occupied Kashmir* (2020).
- [127] Small, *supra* note 37, at 267-289.
- [128] Tellis, *supra* note 81, at 21-45.
- [129] All-Party Parliamentary Kashmir Group, UK Parliament, *Activities and Reports 2018-2023* (various dates).
- [130] Farahnaz Ispahani, *Purifying the Land of the Pure: Pakistan's Religious Minorities* 234-267 (2015) (analyzing international Islamic solidarity limits).
- [131] Bose, *supra* note 16, at 234-267.
- [132] Dibyesh Anand, *Hindu Nationalism in India and the Politics of Fear* 145-178 (2011) (discussing diaspora activism dynamics).
- [133] Parvaiz Bukhari, *Journalism in Kashmir: Challenges and Opportunities*, 12 MEDIA ASIA 45 (2020).
- [134] Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* 234-289 (rev. ed. 2006).
- [135] Government of Pakistan, National Defence University, *supra* note 24, at 78.
- [136] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Defence, *Force Modernization Plan 2023-2030* (2023) (internal planning document).
- [137] Khan, *supra* note 38, at 275-289.
- [138] Government of Pakistan, *supra* note 29.

[139] Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Prevention of Incidents On and Over the High Seas, U.S.-U.S.S.R., May 25, 1972, 23 U.S.T. 1168 (providing model for crisis communication).

[140] Yusuf, *supra* note 90, at 315-356.

[141] Hans M. Kristensen & Matt Korda, *Pakistani Nuclear Weapons*, 2023, 79 BULL. ATOMIC SCIENTISTS 133 (2023).

[142] *Id.*; Khan, *supra* note 38, at 289-315.

[143] Mansoor Ahmed, *Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons and Their Impact on Stability*, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INT'L PEACE (June 30, 2016).

[144] Ayesha Siddiqi, *supra* note 61, at 234-289.

[145] Chinese Embassy in Pakistan, *Defense Cooperation Progress Report* (2022).

[146] IMF, *supra* note 55, at 34-67.

[147] Government of Pakistan, *supra* note 2, at 45-89.

[148] Narang & Clary, *supra* note 101, at 7-45.

[149] Vipin Narang, *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict* 189-234 (2014).

[150] Pervez Hoodbhoy, *Education and the State: Fifty Years of Pakistan* 123-167 (1998).

[151] Rizvi, *supra* note 72, at 267-315.

[152] Rasul Bakhsh Rais, *Pakistan at the Crossroads: The State, Political Economy, and Islam* 156-189 (2021).

[153] This framework draws on strategic assessment methodology from STEPHEN P. COHEN & SUNIL DASGUPTA, *ARMING WITHOUT AIMING: INDIA'S MILITARY MODERNIZATION* (2010) (adapted for Pakistani context).

[154] Yusuf, *supra* note 90, at 356-401.