

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st Century

Alina Hussain

Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore.

Khushboo Ejaz

Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore.

ABSTRACT

Keeping in view the importance of South Asian region and the relation of two major states of this region i.e. Pakistan and India, and the effect of their relation not only on this region but the on whole world, it is important to study the Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan. Historical, interpretative and explanatory methods have been used to analyze different events of Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan in the 21st century. This study concludes that Indian coercive diplomacy is the main cause of tension between Pakistan and India, and that the support from the US is encouraging India to use coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan.

Key Words: Indian Coercive Diplomacy, Pakistan, 21st Century, South Asian region.

Introduction

Coercive Diplomacy

According to the American Heritage Dictionary, diplomacy is “the art or practice of conducting international relations, as in negotiating alliance, treaties, and agreements.”

States use coercive diplomacy in order to compel a certain form of fulfillment of objectives from the other state.

Coercive diplomacy is the ability to amend another state's behavior using ways i.e. short of war that may involve fear, sanctions, or aggression. The aim of coercive diplomacy is to attain defense or capital through forceful influence without suffering the costs of war. Coercive diplomacy may involve preventing another state for doing something or its equivalent, and cause another state to act something that it would not do otherwise.

Coercive diplomacy refers to the use of threats or restricted application of force to convince an enemy to call off or amend an action.

Coercive diplomacy “is essentially a diplomatic strategy, one that relies on the threat of force rather than the use of force. If force must be used to strengthen diplomatic efforts at persuasion, it is employed in an exemplary manner, in the form of quiet limited military action to demonstrate resolution and willingness to escalate to high levels of military action if necessary” (Robert & Patrick, 2003).

Theoretical Framework

The coercive diplomacy has been used as a framework by many analysts in order to analyze cases of diplomacy between different countries.

Alexander in his book has provided a model of coercive diplomacy. According to him, it can compel an opponent to

1. Stop what he is doing;
2. To ask the opponent to undo what he has done.

According to Alexander George, policy makers should keep in mind four points: What to demand of opponent? How to exert pressure for obedience with the demand? What type of punishment to be given if demands are not fulfilled? It is based on either to rely only on threats of punishment or there is need to provide incentive for getting the desired objectives.

The objectives of coercive diplomacy are:

3. It tries to influence an enemy to move away from its objective.
4. It orders to persuade an enemy to undo the action formerly taken by it.
5. It may convince an enemy to formulate “fundamental changes in its government” (George, 1991).

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan

Historical Background of Pakistan India Relations

The politics of the South Asian region is too complicated to be explained. Before the Partition of India and Pakistan, the US had no interest in the South Asian region. But it developed its interest due to Cold War rivalry which was an ideological division of the whole world. To broaden the scope of capitalism the US wanted to make allies with different states hence it reached this region. At that time Pakistan was willing to become ally with the US but India refused following its non-allied policy. Despite status of non-alignment during the cold war India established friendly relations with the Soviet Union. India was a place of great appeal and advantage for the US, regarding its large democracy, big market, and its large population. The US did not completely or openly supported Pakistan during the three Indo-Pak wars, 1948, 1965 and 1971, instead America fully supported India's point of view on all the issues. After the Cold War America became the sole superpower and the relationship between the US and India became stronger. India also reviewed its relations with US and reorganized its policies (Riaz, 2011). At the beginning of 21st century India and US developed strategic partnership.(Bukhari, 2011).

After the 1965 war the situation changed, dispute remained in the scenario, though there were periods of normal interactions between both states but the situation never gained the level of complete peaceful relations between Indian and Pakistan (Rizvi, 2011).

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st Century

Post 9/11 the relation between India and Pakistan started becoming unpleasant, India was not in favour of the US decision to help Pakistan fight war on terror. India at that time began to use its coercive diplomacy against Pakistan by trying to influence the decision of the US and pushing the blame of terrorist activities on Pakistan. India promoted that Pakistan supported the terrorist groups.

Indian Coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan

In response to attack on Indian Parliament in 2001, India launched Parakram operation on December 19, 2001 and placed a large army along the border with Pakistan. It was a coercive instrument that emerged from a longstanding rivalry, ongoing conflict, domestic politics, and the post 9/11 global war on terrorism. This was a deliberate move taken to threaten military action against Pakistan to support India's demand to end alleged Pakistan supported cross-border terrorism.

Attack at the army base near Jammu, in 2002, India blamed Pakistan for the attack because L-e-T was suspected of involvement in the attack, and 36 persons were reported dead in the attack.

Attack on the Red Fort on 22 December 2000, the attack was carried out by Lashkar-e-Taiba (L-e-T). Red Fort is the Indian military unit and security interrogation cell. The terrorists breached the security cover around the Red Fort and opened fire at the Indian military personnel on duty killing two of them on spot. The attack was carried out after two days of ceasefire declaration between India and Pakistan, and this attack was held to affect the declaration.

Samjhauta Express bombings in 2007, the Samjhauta Express is an international train that runs from India to Pakistan. Around 68 people were killed in the bombing, mostly Pakistani civilians but also some Indian security personnel and civilians. Terrorist groups were blamed for the bombing.

Mumbai attack in 2008, India holds Pakistan responsible for the Mumbai attacks as it is said that 10 Pakistan was involved in the attack. India blamed the Lashkar-e-Taiba for the plan and execution of the attacks. Pakistan opposed blame and made demands for evidence; India provided evidence in the form of interrogations, weapons and telephone. Indian officials demanded from government of Pakistan to hand over suspects for trial. (Rizvi 2011)

Indian officials were of view that the attack was supported by the agency of Pakistan.

After Kulbhoshan episode it is clear that Indian intelligence agency RAW is working for causing instability in Pakistan by providing support to the insurgents involved in Baluchistan conflict.

The Indo-US nexus effecting Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan

The first time when the US supported India in its conflict with Pakistan was at the time of Kargil war. When Pakistan went to ask for help from the US, the US asked

Pakistan to withdraw its forces from LOC, Pakistan did as the US asked. It also came as shock to many Indian military officials.

The visit of the US president in 2000 to India and Pakistan also reflected the US interest in India over Pakistan because president visited India for 5 days and visited Pakistan for only five hours.

Military standoff

The threat of war in the South Asian region has always been there, the attack on the Indian parliament in 2001 also resulted in creating tension in this region. After the attack India placed its millions of soldiers along the border of Pakistan.

This increased in tension between Pakistan and India, at this time there was a threat of conventional war to be started between both countries and hence the US and UK realized this threat of war and took initiative to resolve this issue. After talk initiated by the US, India and Pakistan agreed to withdraw their troops back to their cantonments (Nayak & Krepon, 2006).

Rationale

Coercive diplomacy has been used by major powers in order to dictate their policies to small and weak states and gain interests. The US has used coercive diplomacy in post 9/11 period towards many states in order to achieve its agenda in the current century. Post 9/11 India is also using coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan following the footsteps of the US in the South Asian region. Different events in the present century reflect that the Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan is creating instability and insecurity in the South Asian region and this is being done with the U.S support to India. It is therefore important to study the role of the Indian coercive diplomacy in creating tensions between India and Pakistan in 21st century.

Research Objectives

- To study the concept of coercive diplomacy
- To identify different cases of Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan in twenty first century
- To analyze the effect of Indian coercive diplomacy on India and Pakistan relations
- To analyze the impact of the Indo-US nexus on South Asian region and peace prospects
- To analyze the policy adopted by Pakistan against Indian coercive diplomacy
- To recommend policy initiatives and diplomatic portions, to Pakistan Government in order to counter Indian coercive diplomacy

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st Century

Statement of the Problem

Indian coercive diplomacy is the main cause of tension between India and Pakistan in twenty first Century.

Hypothesis

H1: Indian coercive diplomacy is the major cause of conflict between India and Pakistan in 21st century.

H2: Indo-US nexus is the main cause of Indian coercive policies towards Pakistan in 21st century.

Literature Review

Bukhari (2001) analyzed the strategic relations between India and the US, and the implications it has on Pakistan. The relationship became strong between India and US in post-cold war era, when the US emerged as hegemonistic. The relationship became strong following 2000 when head of states of both countries visited each other. In Post 9/11 era both countries implemented a co-operative framework of relationship which dealt with democracy, security and economy. In 2005 the US president gave a statement that the US would assist India to become one of the major powers of world. The strategic partnership improved in 2006 with another statement from US that India was the key player in improving the US role as a major power. The visit of US president Barack Obama has further strengthened the partnership with India by encouraging India's demand for permanent seat in United Nations Security Council. The author further provides his view on the Indo-Pak strategic relation and he describes both states as rivals and that Pakistan's defense strategy is India centric. Bukhari explains that the strategic balance in South Asian Region is influenced by the major powers of the world, especially the US. The strategic relations of US with India can put Pakistan's security interest at stake. In the end it is concluded by describing the implications of Indo-US nexus on Pakistan i.e. it would cause imbalance of power between India and Pakistan. Pakistan's political, economic, defense and external affairs would also be affected and Pakistan also has a threat that if India gets a permanent seat in UNSC then it would influence Pakistan's internal matters. To counter these implications Pakistan needs to adopt diplomatic measures and try to put pressure on the US by its policies towards war on terror and should also establish good relations with other major powers of the world like China.

Henry Stimson Center reports that the intense disruption between India and Pakistan is of much concern for Washington, DC as they believe that "war was possible". A number of senior administration officials were inquired, and it was recalled that in 2002 for ten months India and Pakistan kept one million soldiers at the ready on the border. As reported the trigger to the crisis was a brazen attack by militants on the Indian Parliament in December. This was followed by various

peaks in the crisis. It was said that the peaks grew in part out of tensions between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, high level the US officials were deeply involved in crisis management, seeking to avoid war and to assure the return of military forces to their respective cantonments. In the end it is concluded on the note that the crisis ended and merely went into remission.

Riaz (2011) examines the history of the South Asian region, and the involvement of the US in this region. After the 9/11 incident India tried to declare Pakistan as a terrorist state and the source of creating tension in the South Asian region. Pakistan has always been supportive towards the US but since the past years it is viewed that the US has become supportive of India and that Indo-US nexus is having a negative impact on Pakistan. The support of the US to India is going to make India strong in this region which is going to create great troubles for Pakistan.

Motwani (2012) explained diplomacy and coercive diplomacy and case studies of different countries' coercive diplomacy. Writer explained a case study of failed coercive diplomacy by giving example of Indian coercive diplomacy against Pakistan. India after the attack on its parliament alleged Pakistan and adopted offensive policy; it mobilized a large army along the border with Pakistan to threat it and also tried to pressurize it by creating influence from other countries. Pakistan responded to Indian coercive diplomacy by placing its armed forces on the Indian border. India failed to achieve its objectives; it was only able to achieve one aim out of its four demands. Indian coercive diplomacy failed because of Pakistan's high stake in Kashmir and its willingness to absorb massive costs for rebellious and its perception of the conflict as a zero-sum game made India's demands out of reach no matter how much pressure was exerted on Pakistan.

Ifthikhar (2012) examined the reasons for failure of Indian coercive diplomacy. According to the writer India tried to accuse Pakistan for being involved in the terrorist attack on the twin tower, and when attack on Indian parliament India adopted coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan in which it tried to pressurize Pakistan by operation Parakam, i.e. placed army along the border. During those 10 months, it was throughout a skillful display of clever diplomatic maneuver by Pakistan and displaying of a strong credible prevention from the pressure imposed by India, during that time a conventional as well as nuclear, war could have been launched. The Indian said that bodies of five persons were not of any Indian hence they were Pakistani people and the Home Minister, L.K. Advani, declared in Parliament that "the dead men looked like Pakistanis." On 21 December India banned all air and road communication with Pakistan. Then UN got involved and both states moved their army back in October 2002. India's attempt of using military to coerce Pakistan to attain political interests failed due to aggressive response of Pakistan. In the end writer concludes by saying that attempts like these would be again repeated in the future by India.

Kalyanaraman (2002) focuses on the event of Indian military mobilization as an event reflecting coercive diplomacy aimed to convince to stop cross border terrorist activities. This act of coercive diplomacy failed to achieve the desired

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st Century

objectives due to the reason that Pakistan was not ready to move back from its policies and that Pakistan had high stakes involved in the Kashmir issue. India also failed to gain its interests because enough force was not exerted by India that could have resulted in the desired goals. Pakistan was successful in resisting the international pressure influenced by India.

Khan (2003) highlighted political decision taken by India with reference to Pakistan like the stance of Indian political party BJP. Aftermath of Kargil war has been discussed and the post 9/11 relationship statues have also been discussed. The writer describes nuclear capabilities of both states as “deterrence stable” while analyzing the strategic and conventional force capabilities of India and Pakistan.

Rizvi (2011) is of the view that India and Pakistan have had problems in the past and now initiative should be taken to resolve the conflict between both countries. The relationship between both states has had its ups and downs. The writer has analyzed the relation from the past events like the 1965 war till the Mumbai attacks in 2008. The efforts to revive dialogues between India and Pakistan had begin in 2001 but failed to achieve any end because of the attack on Indian parliament in 2001. Rizvi then provides with a table showing the diplomatic exchanges made between both countries during 2001. The writer then gives view that the political will is important to attain peaceful relations between India and Pakistan. He relates the factors which have a great influence on relations of both countries i.e. media, domestic politics, issues overplay, and the influence of past events. Then he focuses on the incident of Mumbai attack and its implication on India Pakistan relation, India blamed L-e-T for being behind the attack which indirectly was accusing Pakistani involvement in the attack because L-e-T is working for the tribal areas of Pakistan. India and Pakistan both provided their views on the terrorist activities occurring in the world. In the concluding paragraph writer provides suggestions to both countries that they should focus on resolving important issues and that the role of media and the politicians of India and Pakistan is essential in maintaining peace between both states.

Research Methodology

Research Methods

Qualitative approach has been adopted for this research. Content Analysis is the research methodology. Secondary data has been analyzed for this research. Historical, interpretative and explanatory methods were employed for carrying out case studies of different incidents which shows Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st century.

Mode of data collection

The secondary data i.e. books, journals, online journals, and newspaper have been collected from the library of Kinnaird College for Women and Government College University Lahore.

Result & Analysis

The Attack on the Indian Parliament

(Motwani, 2012)

N, Event	The attack on Indian parliament created tension between India and Pakistan and in stability in South Asian region. The attack was carried out by five people who were accused to be belonging to Pakistan. The five people came in a government number plate car and started firing on the people and then launched a suicide bomb.
Date	December 13, 2001.
Mode of threat	Home minister of India LK Advani claimed involvement of Pakistan in this attack; it was done a media event. India threatened to launch surgical attacks in Pakistan if militant organizations were not stopped; attack (L-e-T).
Impact	The attack resulted in launching Parakram operation on 19 December 2001 by India. India and Pakistan both placed millions of soldiers along the border; this led to creating tension between both states and resulted in threat of war. United states and United Kingdom both also felt the threat of a war probably to be starting between India and Pakistan. Five policemen, a Parliament security guard, and a gardener were killed, and 18 others were injured, during the firing and dozens were killed by the suicide bombing.

Table 4.2 Attack at the Indian Army base near Jammu

Event	Attack at the army base near Jammu, in 2002, India blamed Pakistan for the attack because L-e-T was suspected of involvement in the attack, and it is said that L-e-T is working from the tribal areas of Pakistan and that ISI was involved in the attack. Three fidayeen attacked Kaluchak cantonment in Jammu.
Date	14 May 2002.
Mode of threat	Indian information minister reported media and blamed Pakistan.

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st Century

Impact	36 persons were reported dead in the attack. The impact of the attack was that tension already existed between Pakistan and India after the attack on parliament and that issue had not been resolved, hence this attack worked as fuel to the fire of parliament attack, the tension between Pakistan and India increased. Civilians and the families of the army officers also lost their lives in this attack hence military took this attack personally.
--------	---

Rizvi (2011)

The Attack on the Red Fort

Event	Indian Red Fort was attacked by Pakistani terrorist group L-e-T. The attack was carried out after two days of ceasefire declaration between India and Pakistan, and this attack was held to affect the declaration.
Date	December 22, 2000.
Mode of threat	The accusations were made through the media.
Impact	It killed two soldiers and one civilian. It was considered as an effort to upset the India-Pakistan peace talks. But government of both states ignored this incident and continued their peace talks because they already knew that some organizations would try to disturb the peace process between them. A Pakistani nationalist Mohammad Afshaq was blamed by India to be behind the attack, this could be taken as a coercive act by India.

Rizvi (2011)

Samjhauta Express Bombing

Event	The 2007 Samjhauta Express bombings were terrorist attacks that occurred around midnight on 18 February 2007 on the Samjhauta Express. The attack happened only one day before the visit of Pakistan's foreign minister to India, the attack was to disturb the peace talks.
Date	18 February 2007.
Mode of threat	Pakistan was blamed by Minister of Railways of India that, Lalu Prasad Yadav, in his views given to the Indian press.

Impact	<p>68 people died and 50 were injured, most people who lost their lives were Pakistani.</p> <p>The Indian government and media began to blaming Pakistan for the attacks. Pakistan was accused of supporting terrorists and intentionally derailing peace efforts with India.</p> <p>Pakistani foreign minister did not cancel his visit, and Pakistan was of the stance that India should investigate about this attack.</p>
--------	---

Mumbai Attacks

Rizvi (2011)

Event	Mumbai attacks were twelve coordinated shooting and bombing terrorist attacks lasting for days across Mumbai, accusing members of L-e-T.
Date	26 November, 2008.
Mode of threat	Mumbai police pointed toward L-e-T, Mumbai police also alleged two Pakistani army officers to be involved in the attacks, and it was reported in newspapers.
Impact	<p>At least 164 victims and nine attackers were killed in the attacks. Among the dead were 28 foreign nationals from 10 countries. India accused that Pakistan ISI was involved in these attacks. Pakistan moved troops towards the border with India voicing concerns about the Indian government's possible plans to launch attacks on Pakistani soil if it did not cooperate. After days of talks, the Pakistan government, however, decided to start moving troops away from the border.</p> <p>This event was considered India's 9/11; this led to many anti-terrorist movements by government of India. At least 164 victims and nine attackers were killed in the attacks. Among the dead were 28 foreign nationals from 10 countries. India accused that Pakistan ISI was involved in these attack. Pakistan moved troops towards the border with India voicing concerns about the Indian government's possible plans to launch attacks on Pakistani soil if it did not cooperate. After days of talks, the Pakistan government, however, decided to start moving troops away from the border.</p> <p>This event was considered India's 9/11; this led to many anti-terrorist movements by government of India.</p>

Discussion and Analysis

The Attack on Indian Parliament

Attack on the Indian parliament was the first big event which showed the change in Indian policy, a first step of Indian coercive diplomacy. For 10 months both countries kept their armies at the border and it was a time when it was thought that a war could broke between both countries, this threat was felt by the US and UK hence they initiated a peace process. Due to pressure from the US, Pakistan and India removed forces from border and agreed to resume talks.

This attempt of coercive diplomacy was a failure for India because it was not able to pressurize it but Pakistan gave an aggressive response to it.

Military Standoff

The military standoff was a result of the attack on Indian parliament in 2001, India took the initiative to place its army along the border shared with Pakistan, and Pakistan in reaction to this also placed its army along the border. The standoff did not have any military aims but political one.

The standoff resulted in threat of war between both countries, and not just conventional war but the fear was also that the war could turn into a nuclear war. The whole world felt the threat of war hence the US decided to resolve the issues between Pakistan and India, the US exerted pressure on both states which resulted in withdrawal of troops of Indian and Pakistani army. The standoff lasted for 10 months and during that time Pakistan and Indian relations were tensed and the army officers and their family also suffered a lot due to this tension.

Cold Start policy

Indian coercive diplomacy of standoff could not achieve its desired goals but after the end of standoff India developed Cold Start policy towards Pakistan. It is a military doctrine of Indian armed forces that it is going to use in case of a war with Pakistan. In 2011 Indian armed forces launched Operation Vijayee Bhava in which their military troops were trained to cut down the time it takes to mobilize forces along the border with Pakistan. 2001 standoff India took 27 days to mobilize its troops.

Attack at Indian army base near Jammu

After the parliament attack incident, the second step of coercive diplomacy taken by India was to blame Pakistan for the attack at army base which occurred in 2002, India blamed that Pakistan's ISI was involved in the attack.

India to blame Pakistan was a change for India to again try to achieve its goals because when the attack occurred Pakistan and India were already in a phase of tension.

This time Indian army officers and their families were attacked hence the Indian army took the attack personally and ISI was blamed by Indian army.

This attempt of India to achieve desired goals also failed because India was not able to prove the allegations.

The Attack on Indian red Fort

The attack on the red fort is claimed by India to be carried out by a Pakistani nationalist Muhammad Ashfaq. The timing of the attack was important to be kept in mind because it occurred at the time when ceasefire was announced between Pakistan and India. India tried to blame a Pakistani being involved in this attack was an indirect accusation towards Pakistan being behind it in order to derail the peace process.

This can be considered as coercive diplomacy by India, but it also failed because Pakistani government still agreed for the peace process, this showed that Pakistan was not behind the attack.

Samjhauta Express Bombing

The timing of this event was also very important because it occurred only one day before the visit of Pakistan's foreign minister to India. In this attack almost 70 people lost their lives and most of them were Pakistani, but still the government of India and the Indian media started pointing fingers towards Pakistan.

The foreign minister of Pakistan did not postpone his trip, and continued his visit to India. The government of Pakistan was of the stance that we are going to investigate and India should also investigate this incident objectively. India failed to prove the allegations.

Mumbai Attacks

This is the biggest attack in the history of India; it lasted for 4 days with 12 shooting and bombing attacks on different places in Mumbai, an important city of India. It is also called as the 9/11 of India. For this attack Pakistan was blamed again, this was attempt by India to bring bad name for Pakistan in the international community.

Pakistan initially denied the accusations but after some time and investigating Pakistan said that L-e-T was behind the attack and was working from their center in Karachi, but still Pakistani government had nothing to do with it. India was of the stance that ISI was well aware about the attacks and was also assisting the terrorist groups. ISI was once again targeted by India, but again the results were same it was a failed attempt to put pressure on Pakistan to get their aims. But this

Indian Coercive Diplomacy towards Pakistan in 21st Century

time the scope of diplomacy was large because India provided some proofs to Pakistani government and governments of some other states, and also claimed that the attack was so sophisticated that it must be having some official assistance.

Pressure was exerted on Pakistan by US and UK to invest **agate** about the attacks and also to provide some persons who were accused to be involved, Pakistan due to the international pressure house arrested five persons but they were also freed after few days because their involvement could not be proved.

US actively participated in solving this case, it investigated on its own and also arranged trials of the accused terrorists in its own country.

Conclusion

Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan in the 21st century has all the elements of coercive diplomacy theory that has been proposed by Alexander George. India has used the coercive tool of threat, military standoff and blaming Pakistan for exporting terrorism as a tool of coercion against Pakistan in this time period but India was unable to force and pressurize Pakistan for changing its foreign and defense policy.

After analyzing the different events such as the attack on the Indian parliament, the attack on Indian army base, attack on the red fort, Samjhuta express bombing and the Mumbai attacks, it can be concluded that these events reflect the presence of Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan in the 21st century. Through the use of coercive diplomacy, India tries to allege Pakistan to be supportive of terrorist activities occurring in India. The first step of strong Indian coercive diplomacy was the reaction to the attack on the Indian Parliament in 2001. The military standoff can be considered as the change in the Indian foreign policy. India's change in its policy and it becoming coercive towards Pakistan can also be said to be due to the Indo-US nexus and due to the support from the US, India has adopted an aggressive policy. On the basis of the case of different events, this study concludes that the Indian coercive diplomacy towards Pakistan is the main cause of derailing the peace process between Pakistan and India.

Limitations

- This study is purely based on secondary data as it was difficult to get access to official documents and agreements.

Recommendations

- Government of Pakistan should adopt such policies which would reduce the effect of Indian coercive diplomacy.
- Pakistan's government should convince regional and extra regional powers to have balanced approach while dealing in the South Asian region.

References

- Anonymous. (2001, 12 21). *Reddify.com*. Retrieved 2 20, 2014, from Reddify.com: <http://www.reddify.com/news/2001/dec/13par11.htm>
- Art, R. J. & Cronin. P. A. (ed.) (2003). *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy United States*. Washington, DC: Institute of Peace Press. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/United-States-Coercive-Diplomacy/dp/1929223447>
- Aziz, H. (2012, November 12). Pakistan admits Pakistanis, let training camps used for Mumbai attacks. *The News Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://www.thenewstribune.com/2012/11/12/pakistan-admits-pakistanis-let-training-camps-used-for-mumbai-attacks/>
- Bukhari, S. S. H. (2011). India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implication on Pakistan. *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*. 1 (1). Retrieved from <http://berkeleyjournalofsocialsciences.com/jan%204.pdf>
- Fani, M. I. (n.d.). The Indo- US strategic partnership in post 9/11: Implications for Pakistan. *Pakistan Vision*. 10 (2). Retrieved April 15, 2014, from http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/studies/PDF-FILES/Artical%20No-7-V10,%20No.2%20Dec_09.pdf
- Ganguly, S. & Kraig, M. R. (2011). The 2001-2002 Indo-Pakistani Crisis: Exposing the Limits of Coercive Diplomacy. *Security Studies*. 14 (2). 290-324. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09636410500232958#.U19eGFWSxap>
- Joshi, S. (2006). *The practice of coercive diplomacy in the post-9/11 Period*. (Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh graduate school of public and international affairs). Retrieved from <http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/10430/1/SharadJoshiDisstDec06.pdf>
- Kalyanaraman, S. (2008). *Operation Parakram: An Indian exercise in coercive diplomacy*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/2437244/Operation_Parakram_An_Indian_Exercise_In_Coercive_Diplomacy
- Nayak, P. & Krepon, M. (2006). *When India, Pak nearly went to war*. Washington: Henry Stimson Center.
- Rizvi, H. A. (2011). *Pakistan Indian relation-old problems: New initiatives*. Pakistan. Retrieved from <http://www.pildat.org/publications/publication/FP/PakistanIndiaRelations-OldProblemsNewInitiatives.pdf>

Biographical Note

Alina Hussain is M.Phil Scholar at the Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore, Pakistan.

Khushboo Ejaz is Assistant Professor at Department of Political Science, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore, Pakistan.
