CHAPTER IV

PAKISTAN'S TWO LEVEL STRATEGY: 1965 AND 1971 WARS

Introduction

The course followed by another armed conflict between the two regional neighbours after 18 years was also the same. The similarity in planning and executing the second conflict on India by Pakistan in 1965 is as bizarre and unbelievable as it is befuddling to the purists of international relations, experts on South Asian security and strategists and tacticians the world over. Even if the adage, history repeats itself is true, the repetitions of errors of 1948 committed by Pakistan in 1965 would stupify the staunchest Pakistani supporter.

Level One of the Strategy

The period between 1948-1965 saw the development of Pakistan’s strategic thought towards India. During this period it established close relations with the People’s Republic of China, which directly impacted on the development of its strategy, specially military strategy against India. It also signed a cooperation agreement with USA, by which USA was committed to the preservation of the independence and integrity of Pakistan including the use of armed force.1 This alliance with USA not only led to transfer of massive military aid and technology but also of training doctrines, strategic and tactical thinking. As has been disclosed earlier, the Vietnam war influence came in evidence in the form of guerrilla war, during the American and Pakistan Army’s joint training programmes. During this period Maoist military doctrine also became particularly attractive to the Pakistani Military Officers because of the strategy of people’s war and it apparent relevance to Kashmir.

The Chinese rout of the Indian Army in 1962, by their use of infiltration and guerrilla tactics convinced the Pakistani Military Planners to adopt this as a form of National strategy. As it would also serve them as an ‘equalizer’ or ‘force multiplier’ between their own forces and the larger better equipped Indian Military establishment.

Because of these factors, Pakistan again resorted to the 1947-48 strategy of infiltration and guerrilla warfare, followed by conventional open war at an opportune moment. A brief overview of that plan of attack would be necessary, because of its similarly to the current proxy war being fought in Kashmir.

**Background to the Formulation of the Plan**

But before embarking on the issue of the planning and fighting of the 1965 war, it would be better if a mosaic of the political compulsions in Pakistan that led Pakistani leaders into this misadventure is formed at this stage. The Kashmir dispute remains the key to India-Pakistan relations. It is also interesting to note as to how the Kashmir dilemma weaves itself into the fabric of Pakistan's domestic polity. Ayub Khan emerged as the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistani army in 1950, courtesy Kashmir, as Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan needed him to neutralize the conspiracy of some senior Army Generals to renew the war in Kashmir.\(^2\) In 1958 Ayub became the Martial Law administrator of Pakistan but at the start of 1963 his popularity sank to a new low, as popular sentiments ran against him in Pakistan, when he failed to take advantage of the Sino-Indian Border war by marching his armies into Kashmir, which was the popular refrain of the people at that time. Enter Bhutto, his Foreign Minister who advised or coerced the President to take a hard look on Kashmir, not only because a Muslim population was being denied the right of self-determination, but because it would immeasurably improve the President's image at home.

As a military figure Ayub could never acquire popularity with the intelligentsia through political means. Nor would economic progress bring in its wake a satisfied and dedicated following. Only a military success could earn him this reward, and the battleground for such a test was readily available in Kashmir. During the 1965 general elections in Pakistan, Kashmir was a main issue in the government's election manifesto. On 28 December 1964, six days before the Presidential election Bhutto publicly declared that the Pakistan Government would "take retaliatory steps to counter the Indian attempts to merge the occupied parts of Kashmir with India. And you will see better results in that very short

---

future."\(^3\) President Ayub won the elections with a thumping majority. Therefore, the 1965 war was also initiated as a political tool to further the interest of Pakistan's domestic policy.

That the 1965 war was perpetuated and forced on the Pakistani Army prematurely by unscrupulous politicians and some military men with vested interests has been amply testified and brought out in books in the 1965 war written by senior Pakistani Military Officers, some of whom were holding the highest military appointments. General Mohammad Musa, the then Chief of the Pakistani Army Staff says; "The then Foreign Minister Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Foreign Secretary, Aziz Ahmed, spurred on by Major General Akhtar Husain Malik, who was Commander of our troops in Azad Kashmir, pressed the Government to take advantage of the disturbed situation in the valley and direct the Army to send raiders into Indian held Kashmir for conducting guerrilla activities there and to help, on a long term basis, the locals in organising a movement with a view to eventually starting an uprising against the occupying power..."\(^4\) The writer goes on to say that while he was in favour of the plan, the Army should be given some more time to prepare and be ready for any eventuality.

General Gul Hassan Khan of Pakistan army expresses similar sentiments; "with the passage of time the Foreign Secretary nominated himself as the Chairman (of the Kashmir Cell), and it was then that the loud thinking began to coagulate. As a consequence, GHQ (Pakistan Army Headquarters) was propelled into activity, by sending notes to the Government, warning it that with the launching of Gibraltar (infiltration and guerrilla warfare in Kashmir), war with India would become a certainty. Our signals urging caution on the Government failed to have the desired impact, and we were instructed to begin planning for Gibraltar, in earnest, in mid-May 1965... In this meeting, therefore, not only did we not reiterate our earlier forebodings about the out come of Gibraltar...."\(^5\) Air Marshal (Retd.) M. Asghar Khan, former Commander-in-Chief Pakistan Airforce, similarly observes "I found it difficult to believe that the President, who had always been cautious in his approach to international relations, particularly as they effected our contacts with India, should have agreed to a policy that had the germs of a conflict on a major scale... other well-meaning and

\(^3\) Ibid.


honest observers were genuinely proud of our Army's performance and they expressed their feelings whenever the opportunity arose. The press also played its part in creating an atmosphere of triumph and invincibility... the foreign office began to take a tougher line. Senior civil servants supported this line of thought and GHQ (Pakistan Army Headquarter) was persuaded to produce a plan of action.... Thus was operation Gibraltar born. The President's approval of the plan was acclaimed by top civilian advisors."

Maj. Gen. Shaukat Riza (Retd.) states "FM Ayub was not a wild eyed revolutionary crazed by dreams of reshaping the world. He was a realist. In his cabinet meetings he had emphasised that the security of Pakistan was not to be jeopardized for the sake of Kashmir, that fighting in Kashmir would escalate to war between India and Pakistan, a war which Pakistan could not win without foreign help. How then did he get led into war? The answer lies in President Ayub's background as a soldier and his generous nature. An efficient military organisation operates with minimum written orders. This standard of efficiency is achieved through intensive training and the ability of various echelons to read each others mind; in other words mutual trust. All great leaders inspire trust in their subordinate. A military leader who does not trust his subordinates, but nevertheless clings to them, is a bad leader. Ayub trusted those who served under him for any length of time. As President, however, he was not dealing with soldiers. He was dealing with men whose order of priorities were different. Bhutto disarmed Ayub by calling him "daddy" and behaving like an over zealous son. The President gave him more than affection. He gave Bhutto his trust." 7

The foregoing underline the fact that the Indo Pakistan war of 1965 was engineered and initiated by Pakistan's foreign office led by Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Mr. Aziz Ahmed, the Foreign Secretary and the Kashmir Cell that had been formed to discuss and formulate the Kashmir strategy.

The Kashmir cell actually was a part of and functioned under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representatives of Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the Inter-services Intelligence Directorate (ISI) Chief of General Staff and Director Military operations also

6 Air Marshal (Retd.) M. Asghar Khan, The First Round Indo-Pakistan War 1965 (Gaziabad: Vikas Publishing House, 1979), pp.73 & 75.

formed part of this cell. The plan for attack on India to free Kashmir was hatched in the Kashmir cell, sometime end of 1964, which was to become the basis of operation Gibraltar.\(^8\) Thereby, proving that the attack on India was premeditated and preplanned: General Musa in his book *My Version* expresses similar thoughts “I personally discussed with the President the concept and timing of launching raids in Kashmir and the dangers inherent in the foreign office proposal. He assured me he would put his foot down to discourage such moves. It was therefore not only surprising but also distressing, that, despite the Supreme Commander’s concurrence with us, it was decided in May 1965 (the operation was launched in the first week of August 1965) that GHO should plan an execute them.

The sponsors and supporters of the raids had at last succeeded in persuading the President to take the plunge that led to an all out armed conflict with India, which I feel, he himself wanted to avoid and which the armed forces had to face under strategic limitation and when there was a great quantitative imbalance in the defence services and resources of the two countries”.\(^9\)

The above makes it abundantly clear, that the mastermind behind this decision was Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, working through foreign secretary Aziz Ahmad. Ayub Khan was practically made irrelevant in this enterprise. Though Pakistan has consistently denied any connection with the infiltration raid into Kashmir. Nevertheless, the evidence is convincing that Pakistan prepared and launched the guerrilla attack and carefully deployed her mechanised forces to give it maximum support. Russell Brines says “In July (1965), a European official of a specialised UN agency returned from the Punjab (Pakistan) with this information - Pakistan are assembling a massive tank force in the Punjab. The Indians are asleep, and they won’t know what hit them - some foreign observers with access to unpublished information had concluded at this same time that Pakistan had decided to attack in a desperate attempt to change the course of history.”\(^10\)

The correspondent of the Times, London reported form Rawalpindi that “There can be no doubt that the guerrilla actions in Indian Kashmir result from infiltration from this side

---

\(^8\) Air Marshal (Retd.) Asghar Khan, op.cit., n.6, p.x.

\(^9\) General Mohmmad Musa H.J., op.cit., n.4, p.6.

in an operation conceived, planned and directed by the Government of Pakistan - General Nimmo, investigated the reports of guerrilla activities and informed U. Thant that Pakistan guerrillas were active across the CFL. The Secretary General called Nimmo to New York for discussions and decided to publish Nimmo's reports. But Pakistan threatened to walk out of the UN if the reports were published. The Secretary General changed his mind and submitted the reports to the UN Security Council only weeks later on 3 September. The report said that "General Nimmo had indicated to me that the series of violations that began on August 5, were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the CFL from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the India side."11

Plans: Operation Gibraltar and Operation Grandslam

The final operational plan was hatched sometime in May 1965 soon after the Kutch Skirmish. The task assigned to the Army was two fold; one, to train locals to enable them to embark upon sabotage in the Indian - held part of Kashmir; two, to train guerrilla and induct them across the cease fire line, with a view to disrupting conditions in the valley and eventually arming the locals and helping them rise against the Indian Army of occupation. As the saboteurs in the first instances had not produced the desired results, our Government decided to set in motion the second option - to launch guerrillas into Indian held Kashmir.... The guerrilla operation was named Gibraltar and another operation, involving the employment of regular army, supplementary to it, was called Grandslam, the aim of which was the capture of Akhnur. The seizure of Akhnur would sever the only road link between India and Kashmir".12

About the Plan General (Retd.) Mohammad Musa H.J., the then Pakistan Army Chief says "After the Government finally decided that deep raids should be launched in Indian - held Kashmir, I directed Commander 12 Division, Major General Akhtar Hussain Malik, to prepare a draft plan for the operation, code named 'GIBRALTAR'.... Broadly, the plan envisaged, on a short-term basis, sabotage of military targets, disruption of communication, etc. and as a long term measure, distribution of arms to the people of occupied Kashmir and


initiation of a guerrilla movement there. With a view to starting an uprising in the valley eventually. The Gibraltar force consisted of approximately 7000 (Indian writers put the figure at 30,000) Mujahidin from Azad Kashmir... Later operation GRANDSLAM was to be launched by regular army to capture Akhnur". 13

In short therefore the plan for invasion and subversion was to be carried out in two stages.


b) In Jammu a major offensive was to be launched by regular Army to capture Chhamb, Akhnur Bridge and if possible Jammu town, soon after the ‘coup’ in Srinagar had taken place.

Dr. C.P. Srivasatava, an IAS officer, who was Prime Minister Shastri's aide has mentioned in his biography on Shastri, that the Pakistani plan envisioned seven stages.

Stage 1: Commence infiltration across the cease fire line on 5 August 1965 by sending about sixty companies each consisting of 110 armed personnel, with instructions to move to sixty different locations throughout Kashmir and to launch at each such location an orgy of arson, murder, destruction of bridges, communication and other government properties, etc. by using hand grenades, explosive, stenguns, etc.

Stage 2: In the expectation that by 8 August 1965 large scale damage would have been caused in Kashmir, announce on 8 August 1965 over a ‘new’ radio station called ‘sadai-Kashmir’ (the voice of Kashmir), purported to be located within Kashmir (though actually located in Pakistan occupied area), that, on the occasion of the anniversary of the arrest of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the people of Kashmir had risen in revolt against the government, describing the terrorists activities of the infiltraters as ‘peoples’ uprising; announce also that a revolutionary council had been established by the people which had decided to cancel all agreements with India.

Stage 3: Announce over Sadai-Kashmir that the revolutionary council had taken over all authority in Kashmir and that patriots were gaining resounding victories.

Stage 4: Repeated denials by Bhutto that Pakistan had sent in the infiltrators and reiteration by Bhutto that what was happening in Kashmir was a local uprising, which had nothing to do with Pakistan at all.

Stage 5: The anticipated response by India against the infiltrators to be described as futile attempts to suppress rebellion; and steps taken by India across the cease fire line to stop further infiltration to be described as aggression by India into Pakistan occupied Kashmir.

Stage 6: Pakistan Army to launch massive attacks across the cease-fire line and across the International Frontier into the Chhamb and in Kashmir in order to capture Akhnur, Pakistan’s propaganda to describe this invasion as defensive action forced on Pakistan by India’s aggression across the cease fire line.

Stage 7: Immediately after launch of ‘defensive’ action in Chhamb, Pakistan army to launch a massive attack with Patton Tanks on East Punjab with a view to capturing Amritsar.  

Conduct of Operation Gibraltar

When Operation Gibraltar was launched it took the Indian Army by complete surprise initially as nothing of this sort was being expected. Lt. Gen. Harbaksh Singh, writes “Although during the past few weeks vague intelligence reports had been coming in regarding the training of infiltration by Pakistan and the possibility of their being inducted into Kashmir, but each report gave a different and often contradictory version. But for want of accurate information I could not definitely put my finger on its nature, scope or timing... is a tribute to the high standard of Pakistani security measures. It is also a poor reflection on our intelligence organisation... The news of Pakistan’s elaborate plan for this gigantic venture came to us as a surprise massive campaign that was to follow, we had no information.”

(Reminds one of Kargil, where a similar thing occurred much later in May-July 1999).

---


Infiltration commenced into Kashmir on 5 August, 1965 and continued unabated. In his broadcast to the Nation, on 13 August Shastri called the guerrilla infiltration "a thinly disguised armed attack on our country organised by Pakistan". S.M. Burke also points out that on 5 August armed infiltrators in civilian clothes began to cross the cease-fire line from the Pakistani side... This proved to be the prelude to open war between India and Pakistan. The Indians alleged that the guerrillas were regular Pakistani troops dressed as civilians and the operation was a thinly disguised armed attack by Pakistan on India. The Pakistani's claimed the infiltrators were Azad Kashmiris wishing to assist fellow Kashmiris who had risen to assist the fellow Kashmiris, who had risen in revolt against Indian oppression. Whatever the exact identity of the raiders, the facts remain that the ultimate control over Azad Kashmir rests in Pakistani hands and Pakistan, therefore could have restrained the war from crossing the line if she had exerted herself to do so. Ayub had evidently succumbed to the pressures already described and decided to take the attendant risks.16

Pakistan's reaction to all these reports and allegation was typically diplomatic and very much akin to their reactions in 1947-48 under similar circumstances. As a matter of fact they once again put into practice the diplomatic technique of deniability they had by now perfected and which had now become an integral part of their strategy. While not denying the fact that armed infiltrators had crossed the cease-fire line from Azad Kashmir, they refuted the Indian allegation that they belonged to a special unit of the Pakistani Army named 'Gibraltar Force'. They said that the infiltrators were Azad Kashmir war veterans who had gone to the assistance of their kinsmen on the other side of the cease-fire line. As Foreign Minister Bhutto put it: 'Infiltrators can only come from outside. The cease-fire line is an arbitrary line that divides the same people and those people are Kashmiris who have the same blood, same culture, same language, same stock and you cannot infiltrate in your own home... How can you commit aggression against you own people? You can only liberate your own people.'17 Bhutto went on, on the subject on several stressing the fact that the responsibility of the rebellion cannot be attributed to Pakistan. On 10 August 1965 he said that what was happening in Jammu and Kashmir was merely the intensification of the "Liberation struggle

which they (the people of Kashmir) have been carrying on for the past 17 years".\(^1\)
He repeated the same thing on 12 and 15 August. Pakistan also informed the UN Secretary General on 12 August that none of its forces had infiltrated into “India occupied Kashmir” and that so far as Pakistan was aware, no Azad Kashmir forces had crossed the cease-fire line.\(^2\)

Pakistan eventually failed in its attempts and operations Gibraltar and Grandslam came a cropper as the infiltrators were detected before they could carry out the intended coup. The information came from Kashmiri Muslims themselves, shepherd boy, Muhammad Din reported to the police in Tungmarg the presence of strangers who tried to bribe him to get information, he then promptly guided the security forces to the infiltrators hideout. A few hours later in an entirely different sector, one Wazir Mohammad of Dhabrot village in the Mendhar sector was also offered cash prize etc. but he too ran and informed the security forces. These acts reinforce the fact that the local Kashmiri Muslims in general did not respond to the call of liberation. Pakistan at this stage had practically no mass support in the valley and that is why this ingenious plan failed to take off. The Indian Army’s response to the infiltrators was swift and decisive. Indian Armed forces, initially though taken by surprise, swung immediately into action and launched counter attacks all along the border in Kashmir on 14 August 1965.

With a view to sealing off the borders so as to seal the raiders entry routes and capturing the bases of the infiltrating force located in Pakistan occupied Kashmir, thereby, first isolating them and then annihilating them piece-meal. Indian Army in a major operation captured the strategically important Haji Pir Pass in Pakistan. Letting the air out of the Pakistan Army’s balloon. Altaf Gauhar writing about these developments states: “On 28 August the Indians occupied Haji Pir Pass which left Gibraltar in a critical situation. Gen. Musa rushed to Bhutto’s house along with one of his aides, and putting a map on the table, started explaining how the loss of Haji Pir Pass had left the Pakistani forces at the mercy of the Indians…. He had been to Murree to discuss the situation with Gen. Malik who was in

---

\(^1\) Pakistan Times (Lahore), 11 August 1965.

\(^2\) Ibid., 14 August 1965.
dire straits and was desperately insisting that Grand Slam must be launched immediately otherwise everything would be lost.”

Level Two of Pakistan Strategy

Having studied Pakistan's level one strategy in some detail including a brief overview of their level two strategy and the strategic interrelation between the two during the 1965 war. It is incumbent that a more elaborate study of their level two strategy be conducted independently, with a view to clearly differentiate between the two strategies, which eventually converge on to a common objective. The code name given to this level two strategy, in as far as the use of military force is concerned, was “Operation Grand Slam”, and it is this operation that is being discussed here-in-under.

Operation Grand Slam

This operation envisaged the employment of Pakistan regular army in J&K in conjunction with its ongoing “Operation Gibraltar” (discussed above) in the valley. The aim of the operation was to capture the Akhnur Bridge, which would have choked off the Indian army fighting in the Naushera-Poonch-Rajauri sector and also isolating the Indian Army fighting in the valley. Russel Brines, talking about the plan writes: “The initial objective of the attacking column was to capture or destroy the Akhnur bridge, thus cutting off Indian forces in the north-western sectors of the front. If that objective were achieved, the Indians expected a second thrust by fresh Pakistani tank forces headed for Jammu, South-east of the battle area. The conquest of Jammu would have severed the second main road into northern Kashmir, thus cutting land communications and isolating the Indian Kashmir garrison... Pakistan gave the operation the code name “Operation Grand Slam”. The details of the plan as brought out by Major General Shaukar Riza of Pakistan army are as follows:-

a) Phase 1 : Destruction of enemy west of Tawai in Laleal, Dewa, Sakrena and Chhamb by 4 Sector (an Infantry Brigade) and 102 Brigade group.

b) Phase 2 : Capture Akhnur by 10 Brigade group.

c) Phase 3 : 102 Brigade to operate on axis Akhnur. Jhangar-Dharmsal, link up with 25 Brigade operating against enemy Line of Communication Naushara-Jhangar-Dharmsal and then move to capture Rajauri...


d) H-Hour (Time and Date) for attack was fixed for 0500 hours 1st September”.

As far as the regular troops of the Pakistani army that were allocated for operation Grand Slam is concerned. General (Retd.) Mohammad Musa. H.J. (Chief of Pakistan Army during that period) writes:

"The counter offensive force consisted of:-
(a) initially:-
(i) One brigade of Azad Kashmir regular force, based on Bhimber;
(ii) One Pakistan Army brigade of 12 Division;
(iii) One infantry brigade of 7 Division;
(iv) 7 division integral armoured regiment; and
(v) the whole of 4 Corps Artillery heavy and medium guns
(b) after Tawi was crossed:
(i) all the infantry brigades and supporting arms mentioned in (a) above and
(ii) remainder of 7 Division”.

The Conduct of ‘Op. Grandslam’

The operation was launched at dawn on 1 September 1965, initially it achieved both surprise and success. After giving heavy resistance. The Indian Army was forced to withdraw from the Chhamb sector and reinforce the Akhnur sector, Major General Lachman Singh Lehl, PVSM, Vrc writes: “Commander 191 Infantry Brigade Group asked permission to withdraw from Chhamb after last light. The brigade was ordered to fall back to Akhnur”. Pakistan having captured Chhamb, had to just cross the Munnawar Tawi and attack Akhnur, out at this stage an interesting event occurred, that was bewildering to say the least, and that changed the course of history.

After capturing Chhamb by the night of 1 September, 1965, the Pakistan army paused on 2 September and did not advance, thereby breaking the momentum of attack and

---

giving the Indian army time to regroup and reorganise itself at Jaurian. Perhaps the Pakistani army deliberately paused to regroup for their final assault on Jaurian. Pakistani authors give different versions for their failure to advance on 2 September. General Musa writes:

“Our counter offensive... captured Chhamb a few hours later than we expected... up to that stage, it was commanded by Maj. Gen. Akhtar Hussain Malik, who was to hand over command to the Commander of 7 Division, Maj. Gen. Agha Mohd. Yahya Khan... Maliks successor.... The inadequacy of Maliks nerve centre - tactical headquarters - constrained him to rely much more on the means of communication of the corps artillery headquarters.... he was unable to exercise effective personal control over his troops at that very crucial phase of the fighting which caused the initial delay. The change of command did not impose it, as it seems to be generally believed”.25

On the other hand, Brigadier A.A.K. Chaudhry of the Pakistan Army writes: “Change of Operational Command on 2 September, from Maj. Gen. Akhtar Malik to Maj. Gen. M. Yahya Khan came as a surprise to those taking part in operation GRANDSLAM... Whatever might have been the reasons for it, the change had far reaching results as far as the progress of the operations was concerned”26 Gul Hassan writes “(Musa) told me he had effected a change of Command, General Yahya Khan, who had his H.Q. nearby, was to relieve General Malik... I was stunned by this disclosure”.27

Whatever be the reasons for the pause, it gave the Indian Army time to prepare and plan the next step, the plan involved an Indian counter offensive in Pakistan’s heart, i.e., Lahore and Sialkot, the loss of which is absolutely unacceptable to them. This, when Pakistan resumed their attack on Jaurian after the pause, on 3 September, the Indian counter offensive had already been launched, taking Pakistani military leadership by surprise. In order to counter the Indian advance and to strengthen the threatened sectors in their Punjab. They were forced to call off their attacks on Jaurian and withdraw their troops from there. Thus was Jaurian saved, and operation Grandslam failed.

About this Brigadier A.A.K. Chaudhry writes: “On the morning of 6 September 1965, Maj. Gen. Yahya Khan... informed us that the Indian army had launched a two pronged

25 General Mohammad Musa, op.cit., n.4, pp.39-41.
attack across the international border... Before Maj. Gen. Yahya Khan concluded his conference, a staff officer came with a wireless message... GHQ (Pak Army Headquarter) had enquired whether he could take Akhnur if the corps artillery and the armoured regiments were not taken away from him... He deliberated for a moment and then turned to the staff officer and said “No”. Soon afterwards, orders were issued... to move 4 Corps Artillery Brigade and 7 Infantry Division to the Sialkot Sector”. 28

At this stage in battle, with the focus of fighting shifting to Punjab, the operations in J&K were relegated to a secondary priority. Operation Grandslam failed just a whisker away from success. General Harbaksh Singh admits: “Pakistan’s gamble in Chhamb Sector came to within an ace of success”. 29 Pakistan’s plan of offensive against Akhnur was both bold and tactically sound. The element of surprise tilted the scales heavily in their favour. India’s timely reaction against Lahore sector, the dogged fighting quality of the Indian Commander and troops, Pakistan’s tardy handling of the offensive had ended it in a failure.

With the failure of both operations Gibraltar and Grandslam. A ceasefire followed on 23 September 1965.

Mention here needs be made to the development and refinement of Pakistan’s two level strategy on Kashmir. The strategy when first employed in 1947-48, was in a very rudimentary manner. In 1965, it was implemented in a much more refined and evolved fashion. Lawrence Ziring observes “The Pakistanis believe their cause in Kashmir is just. Kashmir is disputed territory... Thus they distinguish between their support for the Kashmiri Liberation Front and an overt attack upon which they perceive as India proper. Most Pakistanis freely admit and indeed publicize their support for the Kashmiri Muslims. Although the Pakistan Government hedges on whether or not it is responsible for arming and training forces for conflict in Kashmir the activism of the Pakistan Army in the summer and fall of 1965, as in 1948, are known and substantiated”. 30 Russel Brines also reinforces this argument when he commented on the 1965 Indo-Pak war “Modern tactics have supplied new tools for low-cost combat. Guerrilla warfare, once solely a defensive strategy imposed on the

30 Lawrence Ziring, op.cit., n.2, pp.61.
weaker adversary, has become an offensive weapon for disguised aggression... it was attempted by Pakistan in Kashmir. Limited war, likewise, has become a method of political intervention in the affairs of another state. The potentialities range from small scale tribal and border conflicts to major clashes between powerful armoured forces in the Middle East, and, perhaps, again in the subcontinent (India and Pakistan).”

Lt. Gen. P.S. Bhagat V.C. an eminent Soldier Scholar has rightly observed and also prophesied in 1974 that 1965 was not the end of its two pronged strategy in Kashmir, he states ‘The hand and direction of China was clearly behind the even limited scale of irregular warfare that was introduced by Pakistan in the Indo-Pakistan conflict. It met with little success, but this will not mean the end of irregular warfare, it could well be the forerunner of much larger scale of irregular warfare in any war in future."

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri also visualised Pakistan implementing its two level strategy in Kashmir even before active hostilities broke out between the two countries. In one of the meetings of the parliamentary executive as well as the general body of the Congress Party held during the first week of August, he made his assessment of Pakistani intentions, which at that time might have been taken as ‘obiter decta’, but which in retrospect can be perceived as prophetic. He said simply that Pakistan’s definite objective in his, view was to create a situation which would allow its regular army to follow infiltrators into the Kashmir valley." Gen. J.N. Chaudhry the then Chief of the Army Staff also alluded to this two pronged strategy of Pakistan during his discussion with General R.H. Nimmo, the Chief Military observer of the United Nations, on 22 August 1965 he said “the Pakistani regular troops had been firing across the cease-fire line with heavy artillery in an attempt to soften the pressure from Indian security forces on Pakistani infiltrators who had been surrounded and

31 Russel Brines, n.10, pp.16,17.
33 Ibid., p.52.
contained on the Indian side."\textsuperscript{35} D.R. Mankekar in his book "Twenty Two Fateful Days" also refers to this strategy

"It was a three phased operation spread over several months. The operation opened with the softening process with an intensification of border tension. Cease-fire violations, shelling, intrusions and provocations from across the 470 mile cease fire line in Kashmir suddenly multiplied... The next phase in the operation was an escalation to mass scale infiltrations of trained armed guerrillas into Kashmir, timed for the first week of August. The infiltrators assignment was to sabotage strategic installation and spark a rebellion in the valley, which was August 9. In the third and final phase, the Pakistan army, was to intervene to 'liberate' the Kashmiris from India, and in the process if necessary, wage a war with India."\textsuperscript{36}

The writer has translated the two level strategy into its implementation on ground in a tactical manner, in three phases.

Some disclosures made by Altaf Gauhar, the then information secretary of the Pakistan government, in his book Ayub Khan would be worth recounting, as they throw ample light on the fact that aggression on India was not only preplanned but was initiated by Pakistan.

"Ayub went to Murree on 13 May 1965, six weeks before the cease-fire in the Rann of Kutch became effective, to examine the plan that had been prepared by General Akhtar Malik, General Officer Commanding of 12 Division, to launch guerrilla operations in Kashmir. General Malik, a tall handsome officer, highly respected by his colleague and popular amongst his men, explained the details of 'Operation Gibraltar' on a sand model. Bhutto, General Musa and some other Senior Army Officer were present at the briefing which went on for over an hour. Towards the end Ayub put his finger on Akhnur, an important town of great strategic, value, and asked 'But why, don't you go for the Jugular". "That would require a lot more men and money" replied General Malik. After some discussion Ayub sanctioned some additional funds and told that Commander-in-Chief to provide the necessary manpower. Thus was Akhnur introduced into the operation... The assault on Akhnur was later given the code name Grand slam."\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p.218.
\textsuperscript{36} D.R. Mankekar, Twenty Two Fateful Day: Pakistan Cut to Size (Bombay: Manaktalas, 1966), pp.8-9.
\textsuperscript{37} Altaf Gauhar, op.cit., n.20, p.211.
The foregoing clearly proves the fact that this war, as was the case with the 1947-48 war, was initiated and started by Pakistan. That Pakistan was again the aggressor cannot be contended. This fact has been acknowledged not only by the world leadership and media but by Pakistani civilian and Military leadership themselves. From the President, Field Marshall Ayub Khan to General Mohammad Musa, the then Chief of Pakistan Army and Air Marshall M. Asghar Khan, the Chief of the Pakistan Airforce. Lal Bahadur Shastri the Prime Minster of India on the other hand appealed to and warned Pakistan to desist from her path of aggression. Just before the Rann of Kutch episode, at a Public meeting in Hyderabad on 21 March 1965, Shastri appealed to the Pakistan government not to resort to the use of force to resolve minor disputes over demarcation of the India-Pakistan border involving a few acres of land. These issues could be solved by the officials of the two governments sitting together.

Use of Diplomatic Force by Pakistan : 1965 War

During the 1947-48, Indo-Pak conflict, Pakistan could not fully employ and exploit its tool of diplomacy as an adjunct of its two level strategy, mainly because of lack of resources and time. Events occurred so fast and without warning that there was no time to plan and implement a cogent and effective diplomatic offensive. It was only in the UN that it endeavoured to gain through the use of diplomatic force what it had lost though the use of military force in Kashmir.

However, the 1965 war scenario presented a totally different diplomatic battle ground. And since Pakistan had the initiative of planning and launching its offensive in J&K, it had plenty of time and resources to dovetail its diplomatic armament into the over-all operational plan and strategy on Kashmir this time. It set about garnering world support well before launching operations Gibraltar and Grandslam. To be precise it started its diplomatic chess game soon after India’s 1962 war debacle.

Pakistan’s Coercive Diplomatic Preludes to the 1965 War

Throughout 1965, Pakistan waged a war on the diplomatic and Political front, it was a war of nerves. It generally maintained the offensive, seeking to exert pressure on India by every means, ranging from the steady drumfire of the internal ‘hate India’ propaganda campaign to persistent diplomatic attempts to isolate India internationally. Despite India’s warnings to the dangers of such actions, it was in no mood to be warned. It appeared
implacably determined to force a showdown over the twin issues of Kashmir and Indian re-armament. In order to isolate India and gain support, it identified China, Soviet Union, Middle East and the Arab Nation, South East Muslim Nations, the Afro-Asian community and the US as the objective of its diplomatic campaign against India.

A New Relationship with China

Pakistan's relations with China improved almost in direct proportion to the deterioration in Sino-Indian and US Pakistani relations. This was in contrast to its earlier pro-western and anti-communist policy. This turn around came about primarily after the 1962 Sino-Indian conflict. After the Sino-Indian war neither did Pakistan want trouble with China on the border issue, nor did China want anymore enemies on its border infact both needed new friends as China-Soviet and US-Pakistan relations were at this instant at the lowest ebb. Consequently, on 2 March 1963 a Sino-Pakistani border accord was signed which was the first major agreement between the two countries. Under this accord, as has been brought out earlier, Peking obtained some 2,500 square miles of territory in Pakistan occupied Northern Kashmir (Hunza and Gilgit) and Pakistan acquired 750 sq. miles of grazing land and salt mines in areas previously occupied by the Chinese. This was followed by an Air transport agreement signed in Karachi on 29 August 1963, this made the Pakistan International Airlines the first international carrier to operate through China. In September the same year a barter trade agreement was concluded between the two countries.

On 19 February 1964 Premier Chou En-Lai visited Pakistan and won the gratitude of all Pakistanis by openly siding, with Pakistan on the Kashmir issue. The Ayub-Chou En-Lai joint communique "expressed the hope that the Kashmir dispute would be resolved in accordance with the wishes of the people of Kashmir as pledged to them by India and Pakistan". This Chinese stand was more remarkable considering that it could be cited against China by those advocating a plebiscite solution of the Taiwan issue. Henceforth Pakistan and China began supporting each other in all international forums and institutions.

In March 1965 President Ayub Kahn paid an eight day state visit to Peking, during which the foundations were completed for a two phased use of the Chinese presence. Firstly,
Ayub emphasised in several speeches the 'friendship' and 'peaceful' aspiration of the Chinese communists. This theme was elaborated and repeated at length in international Pakistani propaganda. Secondly, the Chinese lent themselves to a position of support behind Pakistan and her claims on Kashmir. During the Ayub visit, Peking subscribed second time to a communique supporting a plebiscite. Marshall Ch’en Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, used the occasion to make the first of several equivocal statements implying Chinese military support for Pakistan. The evident purpose was to intimidate India. The possibility of Chinese involvement was used extensively by Pakistani leaders in the drumfire of threats which characterised 1965. The signing of the Sino-Pakistan border protocol and a cultural pact in Rawalpindi on March 27 was turned into a major propaganda event. Bhutto said "particularly since the independence of the country, we have been victims of aggression from India. On each and every occasion India has wronged us. Even today India holds in her hands, the soul of Pakistan, the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan without Jammu and Kashmir is like a body without a head. There is no conceivable reasons or justification for India to do such a wrong to Pakistan. It is not correct to say that the other countries will ensure that India will not commit aggression against Pakistan. We are already victims of perpetual aggression. India is in perpetual aggression against Pakistan". 39

At this juncture pressure on India was more enhanced since the Chinese had already exploded a nuclear device on 16 October, 1964 and her military shadow had grown over Asia. The getting together of Pakistan and China against India was therefore more threatening and intimidating than ever.

**Pakistan and Soviet Union - A New Era**

During this period Pakistan initiated several measures to improve its relationship with USSR, with a view to isolating India. The Soviet-Pakistani rapproachement, was also furthered by a variety of reasons. First, the rush of western arms to India; aftermath of the Sino-Indian conflict, caused Pakistan to move out of the western orbit making it virtually non-aligned and therefore more acceptable to the USSR as a good neighbour. Secondly, the massive Indo-West cooperation in economic and military fields created a fear in the Soviets minds that India may be drawn to the Western defence pacts. Thirdly, Soviets felt that, now
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since Pakistan has been freed of western influence it should not come into the Chinese orbit. Fourthly, it wanted to play the role of mediator between India and Pakistan with the hope of bringing them together against the pre-dominance of China in Asia.

Consequently, in August 1963, a £11 million sterling Soviet loan and barter agreement was concluded between USSR and Pakistan. On 7 October an agreement was signed between them, permitting Pak airlines to fly into the USSR, this was the first time that USSR had allowed a foreign airline to operate in and out from their territory. On the Kashmir issue too the Soviets displayed a perceptible shift in their earlier stance of full fledged support to India. This was done when the issue was debated again in the security council between 3 February and 18 May 1964. The Soviet representative, in his statement on 13 May said that the dispute between India and Pakistan should be settled by the two interested parties by peaceful means. India received a clear indication that the Soviet Union was formulating a new policy towards Pakistan when Vice-Premier Mikoyan visited Delhi, less than a month after Nehru's death, and asked Lal Bahadur Shastri whether it was not time for India and Pakistan to take stock of their relations.

In early April 1965, Ayub made an eight day state visit to USSR, consequent to the visit Pakistan and USSR signed three important agreements on loans, trade and cultural exchange. A joint communique contained one positive diplomatic gain for Pakistan. Both sides declared “resolute support for the peoples who are waging a struggle for their national liberation and independence and for the peoples who are fighting for their right to determine their future in accordance with their own will... in order to promote universal peace and harmony institutional agreements should be implemented”.40 Hinting that this was a reference to Kashmir, Ayub said that the principles enunciated in this part of the communiqué “have a direct relevance to many problems of this area”.41

When Shastri made his own visit to Moscow in June 1964, he failed to get any mention on Kashmir into the communique. Moscow also refrained from giving any public indication that it would support India with any vigour in future disputes over Kashmir. From this dual position, Russia exercised what proved to be the decisive influence on the military
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situations in the sub-continent. That Ayub’s personal contact with Soviet leadership had in fact opened a new era in Pakistani-Soviet relation soon become evident from the Russian attitude in the Indo-Pakistani war of 1965.

**Pakistan and the Islamic World**

Pakistan now set about enhancing and improving her ties with the Muslim world. Besides other reasons of Islamic Nationalism, Universal Muslim Nationalism and trade and economic ties. Ayub wanted to win over the Muslim states, specially of Asia against India, who also had always held a special place in the Muslim world because of its large size and Muslim population, its geo-strategic location, potential resources and its influence in the countries of the world.

(i) **Relations with UAR**: The first Muslim state with whom Ayub endeavoured to improve ties was the United Arab Republic, who had not approved of Pakistan joining the western sponsored Baghdad Pact, particularly Egypt, which considered that pact as a threat to her hegemony in the Middle East. In April 1960 Nasser visited Pakistan, Ayub returned the visit in November 1961. However, President Nasser, who was a great personal friend and admirer of Nehru, reacted to these overtures in a rather lukewarm manner.

(ii) **Relations with Iran and Turkey**: Perhaps the most satisfying and potentially the most fruitful relationship which Pakistan, led by Ayub, forged during this period with Muslim countries was the Regional Co-operation for Development (RCD) in the summer of 1964. Its other members, Turkey and Iran both members of CENTO, together with Pakistan formed three links of a highly strategic chain. Though no formal alliance for mutual defence had been created, the relations of the RCD partners, who met regularly at various levels kept growing more intimate with the passage of time. The Shah of Iran told the people of Pakistan that Iran would “stand by you in good and bad day.” President Cevdet Sunay of Turkey remarked that the level of Turco-Pakistani relations had ‘reached a level far above that of alliances.’
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(iii) Relations with Indonesia: Pakistan took advantage of the drift between India's relations with Indonesia to strengthen its ties with it. This was another step in line with its policy of isolating India.

Soekarno visited Pakistan in June 1963, where, a note of cordiality was noticeable in the Joint Communique, which stated, that the two Presidents "expressed their resolve to intensify their efforts to Liberate the Afro-Asian peoples and to secure the right of self determination of the peoples still held in bondage. They hoped that in view of the need for strengthening the Afro-Asian solidarity, an honourable and equitable settlement of the problem of Kashmir would be reached in the near future". By April 1964, China, Indonesia and Pakistan was working closely together to make the second Afro-Asian conference a success. The same month the foreign ministers of Pakistan and Indonesia jointly declared from Djakarta that Indonesia now fully agreed with Pakistan that the Kashmir dispute involved the question of the fundamental rights of the people of Kashmir, and joined Pakistan in calling for 'an early solution of this dispute in accordance with the wishes of the people of the state'.

Pakistan-US Relations: A Balancing Act

During the period 1960-1965 Pak-US relations came under serious stress and strain primarily because of US economic and military aid to India pre and post Chinese aggression and the drifting closer of Pakistan towards Sino-Soviet communist axis. However, Pakistan continued her efforts to isolate India by keeping her western allies placated, by remaining a party to the defence alliances of the West. Also, the fact that foreign aid, mostly from USA, was desperately needed by Pakistan for its economic and military development without this aid Pakistan would collapse.

Pakistan knew that America could use the bait of aid as an instrument of political pressure. She was aware of US sensitivity regarding its relations with Peking and Moscow, and her own dependence on US economic and military assistance. Therefore, she had but one choice, to play the balancing act. Regarding her détente with Peking (and Moscow) she argued that the purpose of the alliances was to prevent war from coming to the Middle East
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and South East Asia; by promoting friendship with neighbours Pakistan was eliminating a threat to peace in the regions, and thereby achieving the very object of the alliances (Western). She held that she was not developing friendship with the Communist countries at the cost of her relations with Washington. Americans, too tried to restore their relation with Pakistan in order to counter further Chinese influence in Pakistan. The long term objectives of US aid policy were “probably to use economic aid so skillfully as to shape the direction of economic and political development in Pakistan along what America considered right or desirable lines”. The objectives of US foreign aid are not only to encourage the growth and survival of non-communist political institutions, but also to serve US national interests. It is conducted to keep USA secure and strong and to prevent isolation.

Diplomacy in International Forums and Institutions

Pakistan coercive diplomatic blitz during the period, naturally, included various international forums and Institutions, as the Pakistani’s believed this was perhaps the most opportune moment for the western allies and other international forums and institutions to put pressure on India for a Kashmir settlement. These are covered in the succeeding paragraphs.

(a) CENTO Ministerial Council Meet at Karachi in 1963: Pakistan presented its case on Kashmir. The American Secretary of State and the British foreign secretary were both present, and they learnt from Ayub that no Pakistani government could consider abandoning the Kashmiris. He also emphasised that increased domestic pressures were causing the Government to assume risks it had long sought to avoid, picking up on the theme, Bhutto, the new Foreign Minister of Pakistan said that Pakistan was firmly opposed to the partition of Kashmir valley or its joint control by India and Pakistan. In other words the only way to solve the dispute was to agree to the Plebiscite which the UN had recommended. The Chairman of the CENTO Council of Ministers quietly asked Pakistan not to discuss Kashmir in this forum as it does not form part of the Agenda.

(b) Once Again in the Security Council: In April 1963 India announced holding of General Election for the Kashmir Assembly with the intention of formally integrating Kashmir into the Indian Union. This incensed Pakistan no end. This was followed by the loss
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of the sacred hair of Prophet Mohammad from the Hazratbal Shrine in Srinagar in Dec. 64 and the mounting unrest following it. Pakistan once again found an opportunity of bringing the case before the UN Security Council on 3 January 1964, and cautioned against the consequences of the plan to merge Kashmir with India. Pakistan's chief delegate Mohammed Zafrullah Khan insisted in a letter to the Council that Prime Minister Nehru was seeking to consolidate India's hold over the disputed territory in deference of UN resolutions. The same day, with the aim of influencing the Council, Pakistan held a "Protest Day" as an expression of resentment against India and show of solidarity with the people of Kashmir. When the exchange in the UN began to peter out, Foreign Minister Bhutto intervened personally, but to no avail. The Council listened, deliberated, but was unable to convince the disputants that a compromise formula was in their mutual interest.

Arms Race by Pakistan: Use of Indirect Force

Another tool that Pakistan fully utilized in its use of indirect force in Kashmir, was the starting of arms race, immediately after the war. Little realizing the fact that its actions forced both India and Pakistan to become 'proxies' for China and the Soviet Union in the subcontinent. Whereas, Pakistan started this dangerous game by acquiring large quantities of arms from Peking immediately after the war. India was forced to look towards Soviet Union for this kind of support. The sub-continent had the potential of and becoming another strategic storm centre, like the Middle East, this fact, both the conflicting communist countries realized and happily pandered to the large scale weapon needs of both India and Pakistan. This phenomenon is continuing till date. Pakistan's defence budget for 1966-67 was $473 million which is 19 percent of the Government revenues (India's in comparison was only 17 percent). Pakistan increased its ground forces by 70,000 additional men, it added 215 Chinese T-59 tanks, plus 30 lighter T-34 tanks. It received an unspecified number of MIG-19 aircrafts also. All these Chinese weapons were displayed to the public by Pakistan on their National Day parade on 23rd March 1966. The Minister of external affairs, Mr. Swaran Singh, stated that, "the government of India was taking necessary steps to meet any situation created by Chinese Military supply of equipment to Pakistan. We have also talked about this to important
countries and there are different reactions from different countries". The Defence Minister, Y.B. Chavan said “This action of Pakistan constitutes a grave threat to our security”.48

Besides China, Iran, USA, West Germany and even USSR supplied arms to Pakistan, specially, after Gen. Yahya Khan’s visit to USSR on 7 July 1968. On 7 October 1970, the US Government decided to supply B-57 Bombers and F-104 fighter interceptors to Pakistan. The intention of creating the arms race in the subcontinent, Pakistan not only wanted to mollify the Pakistani Public but also to apply pressure on India. “A West German tourist on a round the world trip witnessed feverish military activity and arms build up in West Pakistan under Chinese military and technical experts in May 1966. He saw rows and rows of Chinese and American tanks and other modern military weapons. He also heard about the activities of the Chinese experts actively engaged in building bases in the Pakistan occupied Kashmir. The tourist said a senior Pakistani military official told him at a reception that they were preparing for some sort of an action in the near future and this time it would be now or never”.49

During the Indo Pak war, American military aid was stopped to both the belligerent countries. In order to pressurize USA to resume aid Ayub cut down the American monitoring bases in Pakistan from four to one. The Washington Post on June 26, 1966 said “this gives Pakistan a potent leverage in military aid dealing here”. The State Department, the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency favoured resumption of military supplies to Pakistan as a price for re-opening them. USA was forced to resume military aid to Pakistan in 1966. In April 12, 1967, the United States publicly announced that she had resumed supplies of spares to Pakistan and India. There were not be sold directly to them but might be purchased from a third country. The New York Times on April 12, 1967 said that “India was included in the announcement only because publicly the United States could not resume shipments to Pakistan without at least holding out the same possibility to India”.50

---
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Pakistan's Diplomacy and the Tashkent Meet

Pakistan continued with the use of diplomatic force even after the 1965 war. After the ceasefire, USSR had volunteered to mediate between India and Pakistan. The venue chosen was Tashkent.

While dwelling on the topic of the acceptance to attend the Tashkent meeting by both India and Pakistan, it would be pertinent to state the diplomatic machinations indulged into by Pakistan and Bhutto. By resorting to lies to suit their purposes Bhutto went to Moscow on 23 November for consultations. After a long meeting with Kosygin on 25 November, Bhutto told a press conference in Moscow that the prospects of a peace conference between India and Pakistan were ‘fairly good’ and a meeting between Pakistan and Indian leaders the end of the year or early next year’. The Statesman (Calcutta) and Dawn (Karachi) published Bhutto’s statements on 27 November that “Pakistan had accepted Premier Aleksei Kosygin’s offer for Tashkent talks unconditionally”. On his return to Pakistan, however, Bhutto twisted this statement and claimed that his Moscow talks dwelt on the entire mechanism of Soviet attempts to solve the Kashmir dispute and were ‘extremely useful and profitable’. Bhutto knew that no mechanism of solving the Kashmir dispute came under discussion during his talks in Moscow”.

Ayub himself decided to go to Washington and London with the aim garnering the support of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Prime Minister Harold Wilson, so that joint pressure might be brought by them upon India and the Soviet Union to find a settlement to the Kashmir dispute. Ayub left for Washington on 10 December, enroute, he stopped at London on 11 December for a meeting with the British premier. Where he suggested to Wilson the possibility of the commonwealth setting up a self-executing machinery for Kashmir along the lines of Rann of Kutch Agreement. Though Wilson refused to accept the suggestion, the underlining fact is, that Ayub was yet insisting on a larger international institutions involvement in the Kashmir dispute, in consonance with his countries strategy on Kashmir.
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Ayub reached New York on December 12, where he addressed the UN General Assembly on 13 December 1965, and brought the Kashmir issue before the forum. The next day he met President Johnson in Washington and had a meeting with him that lasted for more than three hours, where he, very emotionally put forward his case about US arms aid to India and the Kashmir dispute. However, USA insisted on staying away from getting involved in the issue.

On 1 January, 1966 Ayub left for Kabul enroute to Tashkent and spent two days there, ostensibly to gain the support of King Mohammad Zahir Shah and to request him to use his good offices to ensure favourable outcome of the talks at Tashkent. On 3 January 1966, Prime Minister Shastri and President Ayub Khan reached Tashkent. During the conference also Shastri invited Ayub to accept the principle of peaceful co-existence and repudiate war as a means of settling issues between the two countries. He also offered a no war pact. Ayub while rejecting Shastri’s offer said “an agreement rejecting war between the two countries can be effective only in the event that it follows upon specific measures for setting the disputes that divide them”.

Once again, as in the past, an offer of permanent peace had been repudiated by Pakistan. Had Shastri’s candidness been met with equal frankness and faith in peace by Ayub, the outcome of the Tashkent talks would have changed the history of the subcontinent.

India, from the very outset was against including the Kashmir issue in the talks, whereas, Pakistan actually wanted this to form the core issue. Ayub even forced Kosygin to press Shastri to discuss Kashmir. Because President Ayub had also to mollify public opinion in Pakistan. This gives credence to the fact that in order to keep public opinion appeased, politicians in Pakistan had to play to the gallery, other national or international issues of greater significance had to be made subservient to the narrower interests of internal political demands. This has always been a corner stone of Pakistan’s polity and a bane to peace in the sub-continent. Kashmir, has been from the days of partition, hyped up so much in the psyche of Pakistani Public that, any concession on this could bring a government down.
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The talks carried on for six days, without any formal agenda, and result. The third day of the talks became the most critical day of this great event. Both the countries had exchanged drafts of the proposed treaty, for a declaration renouncing the use of force. The Pakistani delegation was pressing hard for some agreed mechanism to settle the Kashmir issue as the inevitable price that India must pay for joint renunciation of force. India, on the other hand was not budging, from the position that Kashmir's sovereignty was not negotiable. While this was going on, on 6 January, the Chinese stepped into the scene by issuing formal warning to India that said "The Chinese side will resolutely strike back if India continued her intrusions and provocations along their Himalayan border".\textsuperscript{56} This Chinese action seemed to have encouraged the Pakistani delegation whose stand suddenly hardened on the Kashmir issue. Bindra writes "It was observed that the sudden hardening of the Pakistani attitude to the Indian proposal to the renunciation of force was linked with the Chinese note".\textsuperscript{57} Pakistan's stress on the solution of the Kashmir issue was a calculated move to convince the Soviet Union and the world that the Kashmir issue was the main hurdle in the way of the Tashkent conference. This form of 'intrusive diplomacy' by China became another factor in the coercive diplomacy involved during the Tashkent talks.

On the sixth day, after the virtual breakdown of the talks, Shastri and Ayub reached a dramatic agreement reaffirming their obligation under the UN Charter not to have recourse to force and to settle disputes through peaceful means without prejudice to their basic positions on Kashmir. They signed a nine point declaration which provided for the withdrawal of all armed personnel by both sides to their 5 August positions. The two sides also pledged to observe the cease-fire and follow the principles of non-interference in each others internal affairs. The signing of the declaration was made possible by the stupendous and almost superhuman effort of Kosygin who, for almost 24 hours, kept on flitting from one delegation to the other. The Indian Express wrote that the Soviet Premier Kosygin appears to have "created a record in diplomatic history by talking from 10 in the morning till midnight, almost missing his lunch and dinner in an endeavour to create a climate of peace through his good

\textsuperscript{56} The Dawn (Karachi), 8 January 1966
\textsuperscript{57} S.S. Bindra, op.cit., p.57.
offices in this Asian subcontinent". On 10 January, while the delegations of both countries were preparing to return home Prime Minister Shastri died of a heart attack.

Another issue that needs dialection is that Pakistan had, after each war on Kashmir, signed a treaty with India but has later not implemented it in letter and spirit. In this case too, after the Tashkent declaration was signed, Pakistan did not implement it at all. As a matter of fact, no sooner had the Pakistan delegation reached back to their country they did a 'volte face' and started resorting to double speak, mainly in the face of strong anti-Tashkent reaction from the majority of people and political parties in Pakistan. With the violent anti Taskent reaction in Pakistan, Ayub's popularity plummeted from the heights it had touched before the cease fire. Such became the plight of the Government of Pakistan that Bhutto came up with the astonishing suggestion that the best course would be to disclaim the declaration. The perfidy of Pakistani politicians was not addressed to India only, but also amongst themselves they did not spare each other to gain personal political advantage. Bhutto spread all kinds of little canards against the Tashkent treaty and Ayub Khan. He hinted that the declaration was not the only document that Ayub had signed in Tashkent and that there was a protocol to the declaration which had been kept secret. Bhutto's evil mechanizations and unethical political methods pertaining to the Kashmir issue had started with Partition in 1947-48 and probably continued till he was finally hanged by Zia. To state that Bhutto was the Pakistani Machiavelli in regard to Kashmir would not be an over-statement.

Effects of Pak Diplomacy: 1965 War

China and the Indo-Pak War

China's support to Pakistan during the entire duration of war was complete and unconditional. It openly declared India as the aggressor and supported the Kashmiri’s right of self determination and charged the Soviet-American collusion with having encouraged the Indians to acquire Pakistani territory. On 16 September 1965 China gave India an ultimatum asking India to dismantle all the aggressive military structures she had illegally
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built beyond or on the China-Sikkim border, or else bear responsibility for all consequences arising therefrom. This ultimatum not only shook India but the entire world including the UN. Consequently, during the war India could neither move any troops from the Sino-India border but was under constant threat and pressure from Chinese troop movement close to the border. China also supplied war material to Pakistan, including T-59 tanks and MIG-19 fighter planes.62

**USSR and Indo-Pak War**

The gradual shift in Soviet policy from one of complete support of India to one of neutrality in the conflict came as a surprise to Indians and a boon to the Pakistanis, Kosygin repeatedly offered to moderate between the two countries. By doing so “The Soviet leaders considered this a golden opportunity to wean Pakistan away from the West and Chinese influence and bring about a rapprochement between India and Pakistan through their good offices.”63 T.N. Kaul further states “Of course the Soviet leaders had their own interest in this. It would be a feather in their cap and steal the thunder from the West and china. It would create a friendly area in the soft southern underbelly of USSR. It would strengthen their claim to be an Asian country, and give them a say in Asian affairs... It would decrease the western, especially American influence in Pakistan and also isolate China”64

And this is how the Tashkent Conference became a reality. Perhaps the most substantial gain of Pakistan’s diplomatic coup in this area was the erosion of India’s special relationship with USSR. Soviet economic and military aid to Pakistan progressively increased. Pakistan therefore was able to have friendly relations will all three major powers of the world, USA, USSR and China on a bilateral basic.

**The Muslim Countries and the Indo-Pak War**

Undoubtedly the most satisfying aspect of the Indo-Pakistan war for Pakistan was the sympathy and support it received from the sister Muslim country. This was the icing in Ayub's cake of diplomacy. The entire Muslim world with the exception of Yemen and UAR,
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expressed sympathy for Pakistan’s cause, and even Yemen and UAR only remained neutral. Iran and Turkey, responded favourably to Pakistan’s appeal for help, of Irani Government statement referred to the Indian attack on Pakistan as “aggression” and declared that the people of Iran “shall not fail to extend every possible assistance for their Pakistani brothers and sisters” The Prime Minister of Turkey similarly issued a statement that India’s action in extending hostilities “outside the area of dispute in Kashmir itself had caused great concern in Turkey, Pakistan’s ally in CENTO” On 10 September the Prime Minister of Iran and Turkey jointly expressed disapproval of the Indian attack on Pakistan. Both countries decided to aid Pakistan by providing Jet fuel, gasoline, guns and ammunition. Even large number of Turks and Iranians volunteered to fight against India and a number of nurses actually flew to Pakistan for service there.

Saudi Arabia described India was committing aggression against our Pakistani and Kashmiri brethren. Amir Mishaal, brother of King Faisal and Governor of Mecca volunteered to fight in the Jehad against India. Students and School Boys collected funds for Pakistan and the entire population acted as if Pakistan’s cause was their own. Jordan too treated Pakistan’s war as her own. King Hussien said Jordan would stand by the side of Pakistan “till right is restored, justice is done”. A fund was opened to collect money for Pakistan’s defence needs. Algeria also supported the Kashmiri peoples right of self determination. In an official statement, Syria also expressed her belief “in the sacred right of its (Kashmir’s) people to decide its own future.”

Indonesia’s support for Pakistan was most strident. Indians and Indian institutions were attacked and damaged by crowds in Djakarta. Sockarno assured ‘an emissary from
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The Times correspondent from Karachi reported:

"A small flotilla of Russian craft of the Indonesian Navy, lying in Karachi harbour, is the most conspicuous contribution made by Pakistan's various friends to her rearmament. There are six vessel, two submarines, two missile carrying boats in size between a frigate and a large motor torpedo boat, and two similar vessels without missiles, they came on a "goodwill visit" several weeks ago, but it is believed here that they have either been sent to Pakistan Navy or even made over to it... it is understood that MIGs have been offered by both Indonesia and China."\(^72\)

The Government of Afghanistan adopted a neutral attitude, but public sympathy was manifestly with Pakistan.

The effectiveness of Pakistani diplomacy of isolating India during the conflict can be gauged by the fact that in addition to Malaysia, which openly supported India, the only countries in the world who favoured India were Yugoslavia and Singapore. Commenting on the state of India's "Foreign Relations", a Hindu editorial noted her isolation in this war and ruefully observed that all India 'had achieved since independence was to maintain fairly easy relations superficially with most of the world without establishing a firm friendship with any country on a give-and-take basis.\(^73\) This was then the state of Indian diplomacy vis-a-vis Pakistan's diplomatic blitz during the war. The success of Pakistan's diplomacy in isolating India from practically all the countries of the world during the war, lies in the fact that Ayub Khan was better able to analyse the needs of his country, specifically, those related to security, and was therefore successful in formulating and implementing it.

**Pressures Tactics by Pakistan after the War**

Apart from the battle front and diplomatic hostility, Pakistan also resorted to pressure tactics within India. First, it started a series of disturbances in Srinagar in early October. A series of anti-India demonstration were staged with students in the vanguard resulting in riots and retaliatory police action. It seemed rather strange that while during the 1965 war the
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entire valley remained calm, it should now suddenly erupt into a civil disturbance after the war. Surely there was much more to than what meets the eye “even the overtly pro-Pakistani in Srinagar lay low while India and Pakistan were at war over Kashmir last month. After the cease-fire they stirred, however, and, carrying the moderates with them, attempted to belatedly begin a popular agitation to voice the constant and general demand for self-determination.”

James S. Keats of the Baltimore Sun reported “officials in Kashmir have explained the arrest by saying that those detained have been stirring up trouble in the state which remains on a war footing. The state remained relatively quiet during the guerrilla war in August and subsequent full scale conflict between India and Pakistan, but has been rocked by sporadically violent demonstrations for the past month.”

J. Anthony Lukas of the New York Times reported that though many in Srinagar sound anti-Indian “This does not necessarily mean that they are pro-Pakistan. Srinagar’s Moslems did not rise last August to support the infiltrators as Pakistan had expected them to do.” All this and other evidence points to the fact that Pakistani agents might have been on the scene. Also, the presence and participation of some remainder infiltrators which were estimated to be around 300 to 400 still present and active in Kashmir cannot be ruled out. Secondly, Pakistan recalled its Ambassador and High Commissioner from New Delhi immediately after the Srinagar riots in October. India was forced to react in similar vein.

**Pressure Tactics by China**

While all this was going on between India and Pakistan, China, Pakistan’s ally increased military pressure in Sikkim and Ladakh. In this context a disquieting piece of news came on 18 November. According to the Institute of Strategic Studies in London, the Chinese had amassed upto fifteen divisions in Tibet, of which atlest six were stationed near the borders of Sikkim, Bhutan and Nepal. They had also constructed twenty five airfields or area airstrips in the Tibet. They had also completed two roads leading from China to the Indian border and a lateral road along the entire frontier from NEFA to Kashmir. In order to keep
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the pressure sustained China also resorted to aggressive military posturing by resorting to increased firing and aggressive patrolling action. Intrusions by Chinese troops into Sikkim by units of forty to fifty Chinese soldiers were reported between November 19 and 24, since September, the attacks became more stronger and militarily significant, in late November when Chinese troops in strength occupied positions along the Thag La ridge in NEFA on November 26.

On December 1, a unit of around 250 Chinese soldiers penetrated into the Namka Chu area and took up positions. These were the incursion routes used by them during the 1962 invasion. On December 9, small Chinese forces probed Indian positions in Ladakh. On December 10 the Chinese attacked in strength and captured the border village of Longju. On December 12 a sharp Sino-Indian Army encounter took place in Sikkim leaving thirty Chinese soldiers dead. 79

All these incidents on the Sino-Indian border were not incidental but premeditated with specific objectives in mind. Indeed these were pressure tactics aimed at, firstly, to support and strengthen Ayub’s position vis-a-vis India during the peace talks that were to follow so that Pakistan could get away by giving minimum concessions and secondly, this could be with a view to undermining the Soviet initiative by sabotaging the Tashkent peace talks and thirdly their motive for penetrating so deeply into NEFA at this time could also be with the objective of India’s tribally unstable NEFA and to give impetus to their movements of “national liberation” thereby creating unrest in this area. This could also encourage the ‘Kashmir Liberation’ movement while tying down India on both fronts. It would be logical to assume that this plan must have been evolved during the series of visits between the leaders of both countries just before, during and immediately after the war, namely, Prime Minister Zhou Enlai’s visit to Karachi in the Summer of 1964, followed by President Ayub’s visit to China during March 1965. On 4 September the Chinese Foreign Minister also visited Karachi and declared their full support to Pakistan. Reference here must be made to a secret meeting between President Ayub and Zhou Enlai during the third week of September 1965. Altaf Gauhar states “he (Ayub) flew to Beijing from Peshawar during the night of 19/20 September and returned the following night. The visit was a closely guarded secret and few people knew
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about it. In the President's House the daily routine was strictly followed... Ayub was accompanied by Bhutto and they had two long meetings with Zhou Enlai and Marshal Chen Yi. Ayub explained the military position and how the Indians, because of their superiority in numbers were beginning to strengthen their hold. Zhou Enlai said: “and don't forget that we will be maintaining our pressure all the time”, Ayub asked: “How long would you maintain that pressure?”, Zhou Enlai looked straight into Ayub’s eyes and said: “For as long as necessary.”

Mention of this secret trip is also found in Dilip Mukerjee’s book on Bhutto "Ayub himself went immediately after the cease-fire, along with Bhutto, on a secret one day trip to firm up arrangements.”

Pakistan’s Two Level Strategy: 1971 War

Though the focus of the 1971 war was towards East Pakistan and therefore are beyond the scope of this study discussion on issues valid to Jammu and Kashmir during this period need to be put on record as they have significant bearing on the study.

Pakistan’s Level One Strategy: Subversion

Just as events in East Pakistan were taking a historical turn during end of 1970, after the Awami League’s win in Pakistan’s National Assembly elections. Pakistan with her provocative acts started creating tension in Kashmir from the beginning of 1971. This student was then posted in Poonch in Jammu and Kashmir as a second lieutenant and had first hand knowledge of all events that took place on ground till the end of the 1971 conflict. In the second week of January 1971, the Plebiscite front of Jammu and Kashmir was banned and restrictions imposed on the movements of Sheikh Abdullah by the Indian Government. Pakistan, as usual, strongly condemned this action. This was done, as Pakistan was now creating trouble in Kashmir. A terrorist group called AL-Fatah, which had planned to assassinate the Chief Minister, Mr. G.M. Sadiq and his colleagues, was smashed by the Kashmir police. A large number of hand grenades and several incriminating documents were recovered from near the operational headquarters of the saboteurs. In the opinion of
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the Indian Government the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi had a hand in these activities. The subversive activities of Pakistan continued and when the members of the so called National Liberation Front hijacked an Indian airlines Fokker Friendship Plane to Lahore on 29 January 1971, the Pakistan foreign office spokesman described the plane incident as another manifestation of the fact that India's repressive measures in "occupied Kashmir" were driving the people to desperation. The hijackers were given a heroes welcome in Pakistan. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was among the Pakistani's who congratulated the two hijackers and said that no power on earth could stifle the Kashmiri struggle for liberation. The plane was blown up on the soil of Pakistan by the hijackers. Mrs. Gandhi held Pakistan responsible for the incident and demanded compensation for the damaged plane.

Pakistan's full involvement in, and responsibility for the underground organisation in Jammu and Kashmir, hijacking the Indian aircraft can be fully established, by Pak Governments own acts of omission and commission. A number of questions demand answers - why did Gen. Yahya Khan refuse to return the plane, cargo and mail to India? Why did he refuse visas to the crew of the Indian relief plane that was ready to bring back the passengers and crew? Why was Bhutto permitted to meet the hijackers? How did the two hijackers get in touch with the Pakistan Foreign Secretary, and why did he choose to become their representative in communicating their demands to India? Above all why did Pakistan, according to international law on hijacking, not arrest and hand over the hijackers to India, instead they were granted asylum and feted in Pakistan, they even allowed them to blow up the aircraft in the sensitive and, restricted premises of the airport.

'The People' an East Pakistan news paper close to the Awami league leader, explaining the reason behind the hijacking episode wrote, "The blowing up of the Indian plane looks a calculated more to poison our relations with India... knowing full well the implications of the Awami league's parliamentary majority, Mr. Bhutto conspiring with West Pakistan's politicians, has lent support to the senseless action of the hijackers so that Pakistan and India are locked in another bloody conflict. Should such a contingency arise, this would obviously dynamite the process of constitution making and transfer of power to the people... In so far as Mr. Bhutto is concerned his present move of hobnobbing with Kashmiri guerrillas is not different from his past record. It was not hard to understand with what motivation Mr.
Bhutto lent support to the hijackers five years after that devasting war with India. So what else Mr. Bhutto could have whispered into the ears of hijackers if not to blow up the plane.”

These incidents conveyed two issues, one, that the Pakistani intelligence agencies had been now incorporated into Pakistan’s strategic game plan of carrying out subversion in Kashmir, as during the 1947-48 and 1965 conflicts these activities were basically being planned and executed by the Army and politicians and secondly, Pakistan wanted to divert India’s and world attention away from its atrocities in East Pakistan by once again playing up the Kashmir ‘bogey’. The ‘Statesman’ in an editorial wrote “The Pakistan Government has willing or otherwise made the Kashmir issue central to this deplorable affair. The plane incident and the events in Kashmir that preceded it indicate that blackmail and subversion can be condemned only by fighting them.”

The plane incident contributed a lot towards increasing the tension between the two countries Pakistan intended to create the impression that a liberation struggle was going on successfully in Kashmir. To justify this action and to malign India, President Yahya Khan addressed identical messages to several heads of state, inviting their attention to the serious situation developing in Kashmir. Meanwhile Pakistan rejected India’s demands for compensation and handing over of the hijackers. They said that the hijackers were ‘not Indian nationals’ and therefore there was no reason for their handing over. They were touted as ‘Kashmiri freedom fighters’ by the Pakistani media.

It was during this time that, the history, politics and the entire destiny of Jammu and Kashmir changed. These were times of great transformation as evidence of insurgency, militancy and terrorism in the present form started surfacing in the valley for the first time. The contemporary movement in Kashmir had its origins during this time, and therefore, needs to be studied in greater detail.

It all started on 1st April 1970, when an armed gang raided the Tehsil Education Office at Pulwama and robbed Rs.70,000. With this loot the gang bought a piece of land in the village of Barsu and built on it a dwelling, which became its headquarters cum hide out, the village is located near Avantipur on the National Highway. On 2 January 1971, the
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Jammu and Kashmir Bank at Hazartbal was looted by this gang which escaped with Rs.91,175. A slender clue led the police to the solution of the mystery. One of the members of the gang identified by the police was a college student in 1967-68. His arrest led to a raid in the gang's Barsu hideout, where after a brief exchange of fire, the gang was captured with arms, explosives and incriminating documents. A little over Rs.91,000 robbed from the bank was recovered, thirty members of the gang were subsequently rounded up.

What came to light on interrogation of the gang was that they belonged to an underground organisation called 'Al Fateh', earlier called "National Liberation Front" and "Red Kashmir". The new name was ostensibly given to them, with a view to impress foreign opinion, which was already acquainted with the similar name of a notorious terrorist organisation in the Middle East. Financed and master-minded by Pakistan's Intelligence Bureau, some of its members had gone across to Pakistan to receive training in the use of automatic weapons and explosives. The plan had three phases - first, recruitment and training, second, commission of violent crimes to collect funds and subvert law and order and third, espionage to collect information about military dispositions movement of troops and equipment. The members were given code names and many of them were not aware of the real identity of each other.

Future plans included attempts on the life of Chief Minister of J&K and his colleagues, kidnapping of Ministers, next targets were to be police and army pickets which were to be attacked in order to provoke them to open fire on people, thereby starting a chain of violence and disorder. Finally, when conditions were ripe, the plans provided for intervention from Pakistan occupied Kashmir. This underground organisation maintained close contact with certain important leaders of the Plebiscite Front. Records of the Federation which had been seized showed links between this body and Pakistan. Under these circumstances, Abdullah and Beg who were in Delhi, were externed from Jammu and Kashmir, and the Plebiscite front declared an unlawful body. Three hundred and fifty members of the party were arrested.
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The ‘Modus Operendi’ of ‘Al Fatah’, was perhaps changed, and continues to function till date in the valley in the changed form, after Pakistan’s bitter experience of 1947-48 and 1965, when it used this strategy of internal subversion so unsuccessfully.

Alastair Lamb, the pro-Pakistan writer, himself tells the story of the leader of the two hijackers, who were members of the ‘Al Fatah’ organisation, quoting Lahore police authorities he says of Hashim Quereshi, “he was twenty years of age and had been working off and on in Srinagar as a seller of black market tickets for one of the cinema theatres in that town. He had visited Rawalpindi in 1969 where he met Maqbool Bhutt, Dr. Farooq Haider and one ex-Major Amanullah Khan (formerly of the Azad Kashmir Armed Forces), all leading figures in an organisation known as the Kashmir National Liberation Front into which he had been initiated before returning to Srinagar. In April 1970 he again crossed the cease fire line to Pakistan and stayed with Dr. Farooq Haider in Rawalpindi where, he said, he underwent some three months of training in sabotage under the supervision of Maqbool Butt.”

Dr. Farooq Haider, Amanullah Khan and Maqbool Butt whose name have just been mentioned were to play a very important part in the history of Kashmir over a decade later.

Pakistan’s Level Two Strategy

Consequent, to the aforementioned issues, Pakistan in desperation, launched a full fledged, war on India on 3 December 1971 in the western sector, by first carrying out a pre-emptive air strike on our military airfields and bases, much on similar lines that the Israeli airforce had done against the Arabs. (I am, myself a witness to this, I was on my post in the Poonch sector when I saw four Pakistani Sabre jets screaming back towards Pakistan after carrying out their raids. I reported the matter to my superior authorities. It was just before 6 p.m. on 3 December 1971), and soon thereafter the heavy boom of Artillery guns from both sides began to be heard. The war had commenced. I am, myself witness to the fact that Pakistan initiated the war, the proof were the returning Sabre jets and the exchange of fire after that. Till then, though there was tension in the air, resorting to use of artillery guns by either side had not been done in Jammu and Kashmir. Mrs. Gandhi in a broadcast to the
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nation soon after midnight declared, "The war in Bangladesh has become a war of India. This has been imposed upon me, my Government and the people of India a great responsibility. We have no other option but to put our country on a war footing." Emergency was declared the same night in India. India started retaliatory action in East Pakistan with the assistance of the 'Mukti Bahini'. On 6 December India formally recognised Bangladesh. The advance of the Indian Armed forces was so swift that on 15 December they reached Dacca and on 16 December 1971 the Pakistani Army in Bangladesh surrendered to the Indian Army on 17 December 1971, India announced a unilateral cease-fire which clearly showed the world that India had no temporal ambitions. The aim was to liberate Bangladesh, which had been achieved.

No sooner had the war ended, Bhutto, who had by then become the President of Pakistan started off his tirade on Kashmir, the cue was given to him by the Joint Communiqué of President Nixon of America and Chou Enlai of China, issued on 26 February 1972, after Nixon's China visit, which said, "consistent with the UN Security Council resolution of 21 December 1971, the United States favours the continuation of the cease-fire between India and Pakistan and the withdrawal of all military forces to within their own territories and to their own sides of the cease fire line in the Jammu and Kashmir". Even after the cease fire on 17 December 1971, Pakistan again tried to internationalize the Kashmir issue by launching a series of attacks on the Indian side of LOC during May 1972. On 9 May 1972 Pakistani troops violated the cease fire line in the Rajauri and Poonch sectors, by launching an attack which resulted in the death of an army officer and a BSF Jawan. It seemed that some elements in Pakistan were not in a mood to normalise relation with India. Also Pakistan maybe trying to capture as much ground as possible before the Shimla talks to
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be used as a bargaining chip, yet again, their aim could well be to project India as the aggressor.

On 14 July 1974, Bhutto told Kuldip Nayar the following:

"The right of self determination is given historically and by actual conditions. As far as Kashmir is concerned, the right of self determination was given to the people of Kashmir by India and Pakistan. It is admitted that they have this right of self determination. Both in the UN and outside, Pandit Nehru repeatedly said "Yes, they will exercise this right of self determination. Now, that is a question of principle. The right of self determination for Kashmir has been recognised by the world and the UN. If we are to support it as a principle of international law, a principle which has brought freedom to the third world and emancipation to even Eastern Europe to a great extent, and if we are to fight for the right of self determination for the people of Algeria how can I say that we are abandoning that right, or we take away that right?

Secondly, India is also partly responsible for making Kashmir a state, because in their own constitution she has given her a special position. What is the reason? There must have been some reason. India is responsible for delaying the settlement of this dispute to give Kashmir a special position. So, as long as the people want the right of self determination in Kashmir, nobody can stop it." He further said "support to the right of self determination did not mean that we shall export revolution. This position does not exist and it will not exist in future also. However, I give a solemn pledge on behalf of the people of Pakistan that as soon as the people of Kashmir launch their freedom struggle, the people of Pakistan would go all out in support and assistance, they would not hesitate to shed their blood for the people of Kashmir."  

It is essential to note that even when the war had been won and lost thousands of miles away from Kashmir. Bhutto’s, and by extension, Pakistan’s mind was still obsessed with Kashmir. Bhutto’s reference as early as 1972 to the “export of revolution” and the, shedding of blood by Pakistanis for the cause of Kashmir was an ominous harbinger of evil happenings in the valley, in times to come.

**The 1971 War: Creation of Bangladesh**

It is truly said that the seeds of the next war are sown by the peace of the previous one. This saying is so true in the context of Indo-Pak relations. The Indian victory and creation of Bangladesh from erstwhile East Pakistan in 1971 had two major implications. One, the creation of the Islamic State of Bangladesh gave a devasting blow to the ideology
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and the 'raison-d-etre' for birth of Pakistan - 'The Two Nation Theory', which, lay shattered and redundant. In the subcontinent now, there were two other countries, India and Bangladesh, with more Muslim population than Pakistan - the self appointed keeper of Islam in the region. The re-defining of South Asia's geography in this manner did not go un-noticed in Pakistan. In 1994, in a seminar at Lahore on the universal day of Human Rights, Mrs. Rubina Saigal, a leading Pakistani human rights activist said that, "Pakistan's current ethnic and sectarian violence has its roots in the two Nation Theory which created the country some 47 years ago. It is time for Pakistan to discard the theory". Her views were supported by others such as Begum Nasim Ashraf and Ms. Hina Jilani.96

The other major implication of the 1971 Indo-Pak war was the military humiliation of Pakistan. Having lost more than half its territory and population, and with more than 90,000 of its troops held as Prisoners of war. The myth of one Pakistani soldier being equal to four Indian soldiers lay hopelessly and shamefully shattered. Pakistan, therefore, was left with vengeance as the only food for its survival. It waited and prepared itself for revenge for almost two decades, knowing and realizing that winning a war with India was now just a pipe dream.

Thirdly and most significantly, is the lesson that Pakistan learnt from the war of liberation of Bangladesh, was the efficacy of the 'Mukti Bahini' the guerrilla force, that played a major role in the separation of East Pakistan from Pakistan. The strategy of proxy war, the importance of a friendly local population base, the induction of trained local fighters as vanguard; for the offensive by regular forces at an opportune moment, were all learnt, assimilated and replicated by Pakistan in J&K, particularly, in Kargil during May-July 1999. Md. Nalapat the noted journalist writes, "Kargil was the first manifestation of a new strategy, which replicates Indian tactics during the 1970-71 Bangladesh conflict: stepping up participation of conventional forces, so that they can serve as a spearhead for mercenaries". This he calls, "Bangladesh model of a mix of conventional and mercenary forces to exhaust India".97 About the overall strategy of India in Bangladesh, Maj. Gen. Sukwant Singh, who was the Deputy Director of Military Operations in the 1971 war, writes,
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"Two types of support were thought of at this stage. Firstly, a limited supply of arms was to be made available together with facilities for training in guerrilla warfare... The other form of support was diplomatic." The sentence, in brief covers India’s two level strategy in Bangladesh. Which Pakistan is trying to copy in Kashmir, with a view to take revenge for the separation and creation of Bangladesh.

The Shimla Agreement

After the war, the Shimla conference was held, between Indira Gandhi and Bhutto, the two Prime ministers, from 28 June 1972, onwards. The outcome of the conference, as far as J&K was concerned was, that it was accepted the two countries will resolve differences bilaterally. The salient features of the Shimla agreement were:-

a) The two countries resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations or by other peaceful means mutually agreed upon between them.

b) Pending final settlement of any of the problems between the two countries, neither side will unilaterally alter the situation and both shall prevent the organisation, assistance or arrangement of any acts detrimental to the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations.

c) In Jammu and Kashmir, the line of control resulting from the cease-fire of 17 December 1971 shall be respected by either side. Neither side shall seek to alter it immediately, irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretation. Both sides further undertook to refrain from the threat or the use of force in violation of the line.

The Shimla agreement, despite tremendous political, military and psychological advantages, India made no permanent gains in J&K. It left the problem unsolved even when it held all the aces and Pakistan possessed none. A golden opportunity to and for all, was allowed to slip by, the repercussions of which, are being felt now, in a manner unprecedented in form and intensity. However, the agreement was momentous for J&K because of two


reasons, these are: firstly, the principle of ‘Bilaterism’ in settlement of all disputes including J&K was-stabled and with this the UN resolutions of 1948 and 1949 were rendered null and void. Pakistan, however, later on reverted back to them, as they served their interest of ‘Internationalization’ of the issue better. Secondly, the sanctity of the Line of Control in J&K between the two countries was accepted and was to be respected by both sides. It was these two clauses of the Shimla agreement that eventually brought about Pakistan’s debacle during the Kargil war, specially in the diplomatic and global support context.