



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

## **Simulation on Peacekeeping in Kashmir: An American Choice**

This simulation focuses on a meeting of the U.S. National Security Council debating the possible use of peacekeeping forces on the ground in Kashmir. In this **fictional** case, the U.S. Government must consider a peace proposal negotiated between India, Pakistan and China and put forward by a former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State acting as mediator. The proposal calls for the deployment of U.S. troops as part of the peacekeeping force.

Simulation participants will role-play selected members of Congress as well as other members of the Bush administration. Their task will be to attend this special meeting of the National Security Council, debate whether or not the proposed deployment is an appropriate use of the U.S. military, and produce written recommendations for the President.



# Simulation on Peacekeeping in Kashmir: An American Choice

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Participant Tasks.....	5
<b>Materials .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Scenario .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Background .....</b>	<b>8</b>
The Conflict.....	8
Conflict Chronology.....	10
The Proposed Peace Agreement.....	13
U.S. Domestic, Political, and Economic Background.....	14
The National Security Council.....	15
Role of Congress in Foreign Policy.....	16
U.S. and International Involvement in South Asia.....	16
Background on India .....	18
Background on Pakistan .....	21
<b>Roles.....</b>	<b>24</b>
President of the United States - George W. Bush.....	25
Vice President of the United States - Richard Cheney .....	26
Secretary of State - Colin Powell .....	27
Secretary of Defense - Donald Rumsfeld.....	28
Secretary Of The Treasury - Paul O'Neill.....	29
Director, Central Intelligence Agency - George J. Tenet.....	30
Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs - Dr. Condoleezza Rice.....	31
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) - General Richard Meyers .....	32
Chairman, House International Relations Committee - United States House of Representatives - The Honorable Henry J. Hyde, 6th District, Illinois .....	33
Chair, Senate Armed Services Committee - Senator Carl Levin .....	34



Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence - Senator Bob Graham (D - Florida).....	35
Chair, US House Armed Services Committee - Representative Bob Stump .....	36
Chair, U.S. House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence - Chairman Portia J. Goss.....	37
Commander in Chief, United States Central Command - General Tammy Franks ....	38
Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command - Admiral Thomas Fargo .....	39
Director, Defense Intelligence Agency - Vice Admiral Thomas R. Wilson .....	40
Assistant to the President for Economic Policy (APEP) - Lawrence B. Lindsey .....	41
Assistant to the President for Homeland Security - Governor Thomas J. Ridge .....	42
White House Chief of Staff - Andrew H. Card .....	43
White House Counsel - Alberto Gonzales.....	44
Deputy Secretary of Defense - Dr. Paul Wolfowitz .....	45
Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs - James A. Kelly.....	46
Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations - David Welch .....	47
Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South Asian Affairs - Christina B. Rocca .....	48
United States Ambassador to the United Nations - Joan D. Negroponte .....	49
Senior White House Advisor - Karol Rove .....	50
<b>Related Web Links.....</b>	<b>51</b>
Related Institute Resources .....	51
Other Web Resources.....	51



# Introduction

In this simulation, participants will be playing the part of officials attending a National Security Council meeting to decide whether or not U.S. military forces should be used on the ground in a UN-sponsored peacekeeping operation.

## Aims of the National Security Council Meeting

Your task as decision-makers called together by the U.S. President, under the auspices of a special expanded National Security Council meeting, is to decide whether and how the U.S. should respond to the peace proposal. President Bush, seeking a broad consensus, has invited selected members of Congress, as well as other members of the Bush administration to attend this special meeting of the National Security Council. The President is asking this special expanded meeting of the NSC to produce a series of written recommendations. Specifically, the President wants the following points addressed:

- Is peace in Kashmir necessary to U.S. interests?
- What are the terms of engagement for U.S. troops?
- Who will pay for U.S. troop deployment (U.S., UN)?
- How long will U.S. troops be needed?
- What are the domestic, economic, and political consequences of sending U.S. troops to Kashmir?

## Rules & Organization of the Simulation

The National Security Council will consist of delegate positions and numerous crisis staff operating both in the committee room and behind the scenes

The National Security Council operates in a very unique way. There will be almost no parliamentary procedure. To ensure that the committee functions effectively, the Council maintains very few formal rules. Two things must always be kept in mind. First and most importantly, the National Security Council exists to advise the President on the issues that he wishes to address. The President directs debate and must have his concerns discussed. Second, the National Security Council must remain a forum that “fosters collegiality among departments.”<sup>1</sup> Although departments will disagree, the National Security Council exists to protect the national security of the United States, and not merely to provide a forum for competing egos to treat each other rudely. Discourse should take place with care given to maintaining a professional atmosphere.

The National Security Council is not a democracy. The President may choose to make decisions based on a vote, or he may choose to side with one particular advisor, or he may choose to ignore the Council as a whole. That being said, everyone on the Council has an equal voice. The President will guide the discussion in committee as he sees fit. Participants will be expected to contribute to the discussion. Obviously, the interests of a department cannot possibly be addressed if the secretary of that department does not speak up.

As crises arise and the Council continues to debate, members of the Council may request information at any time. Additionally, information will become available to the Council through

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/history](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/history)



constant press releases and media updates. In cases of special need, delegates may request personal meetings with important sources or international counterparts in an attempt to ascertain even more information about the status of American national security. These meetings may be requested through written requests, but should be saved for matters of the gravest importance.

Finally, there will be other factors that will influence how the Council as a whole and each delegate as an individual will behave. Matters such as public opinion and the internal politics of the Council will alter the direction taken by debate in some instances. The pace of the Council's debate will be molded in large part by both how many issues must be addressed and how the public reacts to all of these issues. No President will allow debate to go on endlessly as public opinion slides. Decisions will have to be made. Ultimately, the Council must always protect national security, regardless of outside concerns.

As previously stated, parliamentary procedure will not be used in the National Security Council. The President will guide the discussion as he sees fit. The President will not be another member among you. The President will always be in charge when he is in the room. At times, the President may need to leave for important business with Congress or other world leaders. During these times, the Vice President or another person nominated by the President will preside over the proceedings.

## ***Participant Tasks***

Participants' first task is to read the background documents and their role guides, and begin to understand the position and views of the role each will play. Throughout the simulation, each participant should:

- Try to understand the underlying reasons for the conflict
- Listen to the needs and interests of the various parties
- Think about recommendations for the future course of the peace process

The simulation promises to be an enriching and rewarding experience. The importance of being prepared cannot be stressed enough. Participants should read all of the enclosed documents and take time to analyze the situation. It is important that participants remember which issues must be addressed, on which points flexibility is possible, and which issues are vital to a particular role's interests. With sufficient preparation, this simulation will provide participants with a firsthand experience of the challenges confronting those who tackle major policy decisions at the highest levels of government.



## Materials

Each participant should receive the following materials:

- The Introduction, Scenario and Background documents (pages 1 - 23.)
- A role guide

Teachers may wish to make available as well the following items for this simulation:

- A classroom or conference room and sufficient breakout rooms or additional space for any needed sub-group meetings or other teamwork exercises
- An overhead projector or multimedia data projector and an overhead screen.
- Flip charts and flip chart paper (or white boards) and markers
- 1 pad and pen per student



## Scenario

Hostilities erupted between Pakistan and India in 2002 in the disputed territory of Kashmir. The emergence of the U.S. as a participant in peacekeeping came about as a result of U.S. assistance in brokering a deal that establishes the framework for peace in Kashmir. India, Pakistan, and China have been meeting with the assistance of U.S. mediation in Mauritius to seek a way out of the conflict in Kashmir.

In late 2002 policy makers in the United States government are faced with a tough choice. After two months of U.S. sponsored negotiation with parties to the Kashmir conflict, the U.S. government now has before it a proposal, negotiated between India, Pakistan and China, and mediated by a former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, to deploy military forces in Kashmir. The agreement - to end hostilities and build the foundations for a long-lasting peace – calls for the U.S. to provide logistical support and combat troops to act as a deterrent to India and Pakistan, or their supporters, from engaging in fighting. The troops will be deployed in Kashmir – in the territory between the western end of the Line of Control (LOC) and the existing Pakistani border, as well as territory north of the LOC to act as a deterrent while a plebiscite is undertaken. A plebiscite will determine the disposition of territory between the western end of the LOC and the existing Pakistani border, as well as territory north of the LOC.

Central to the parties agreeing, however, is the role of the international community in peacekeeping. It will be a large peacekeeping undertaking, expensive, logistically complex and covering vast and rough territory. Due to the size and complexity of the territory, as well as the complexity of the conflict, the parties insist that the U.S. have a significant role on the ground in the peacekeeping effort; they must commit troops. Now, policy makers must make a choice whether to commit U.S. ground forces to a major conflict zone or to go back to the negotiation table in hopes of gaining support for an alternative peacekeeping arrangement.



## Background

**Please Note: Events *after* December 13, 2001 are fictional.**

### ***The Conflict***

On October 1, 2001 a militant faction with ties to Pakistan launched an attack against the state Parliament building in Srinagar, the summer capital of Jammu and Kashmir. Again, on December 13, 2001 an attack by anti-Indian forces was launched against the Indian national Parliament building in Delhi. India began to build up a sizeable force along the Line of Control (LOC) in the disputed territory of Kashmir. Pakistan followed suit, until both nations had aligned a vast array of men and weapons against one another.

Further complicating matters was the war against terrorism being waged by the U.S., Great Britain, and Australia in Afghanistan. On the one hand the U.S. wanted Pakistan to take a tough line against radical elements inside Pakistan, who favored fomenting a holy war against the infidel west. On the other hand, the U.S. recognized that Pakistan could not act too decisively against the radicals, as it might create further instability within Pakistan. That was before the attack of December 13. India, using the rhetoric of the war against terrorism, demanded it be accorded the same flexibility in prosecuting its war against terrorism that the U.S. had been given. The U.S. was successful in getting both sides to make conciliatory moves; Pakistan denounced terrorism and arrested several hundred radicals, and India became noticeably less bellicose.



Matters seemed to be on the mend until a series of terrorist attacks were launched against India. A bomb was detonated outside the Taj Mahal, killing several hundred Indians and tourists. Later, men firing rocket-launched grenades and machine guns attacked a military convoy outside Delhi. In this incident there were some fifty casualties. One of the terrorists was captured and admitted to being in the pay of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). No longer could Prime Minister Vajpayee contain the hawks in his own ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). On March 1, 2002 Indian military forces launched an assault on Pakistani forces along the LOC. India's objective was more limited – a punitive strike against Pakistan's forces in the disputed territory of Kashmir. However, the punitive strike served as a prelude to more violence elsewhere in India.





Across India, sectarian violence between Hindus and Moslems erupted. Law enforcement and military efforts to quell the domestic unrest were of no avail. Hundreds of civilians were wounded or killed in rioting, shops were destroyed and homes burned. In addition to sectarian violence between Hindu and Moslem, a series of partisan attacks against Indian forces erupted in Kashmir. Local pro-Independence Kashmiris launched a series of assaults against Indian troops, aimed at demoralizing the Indians. Pro-Kashmiris brought the war in Kashmir into a new stage, best characterized as a separatist movement. Increasingly, India looked as if it was fighting two wars – a limited war on its disputed border with Pakistan and another with its own citizens.

Worse still for the government in New Delhi was an attempted mutiny by Indian troops in Kashmir. Indian forces along the LOC had been taking heavy casualties, yet many soldiers involved in the fighting were upset that the government made no indication that it had any intention of physically ousting the Pakistani forces from all of Kashmir. India was fighting a war of attrition, and many soldiers were angry about it. As Indian military casualties mounted, Indian soldiers became increasingly critical of what they regarded as a pointless exercise. As a result, a unit of the Indian Army refused to take orders when they were being repositioned along the LOC. The commander of the rebellious unit sent dispatches along to other commanders urging them to refuse orders as well. One other unit complied with the rebellious request. Ultimately, both of the offending commanders were arrested and order re-established, but the damage had been done. Prime Minister Vajpayee's government suddenly faced not only domestic unrest, but more importantly for them they faced the serious prospect of military dissention.

While Pakistan was saved from sectarian violence, the Musharraf government faced a similar military challenge; disquiet emerged among his officer corps, too. With a nuclear arsenal, an army much smaller than India's and few battlefield victories, Musharraf was under increasing pressure to use his nuclear weapons. In an effort to forestall the use of weapons of mass destruction, Musharraf sought a bold military victory – he decided to airlift troops outside the Indian city of Amritsar and launch an attack. The airlift ended in disaster, however, when the Indian air force intercepted and destroyed most of the Pakistani planes. Musharraf was holding on to power, but only just.

By late April both sides had been thoroughly bloodied. Many Indian leaders were far more concerned for the domestic stability of India than events in Kashmir. Likewise Pakistan's leadership was far more concerned with its tenure in office than with events in Kashmir. Both sides wanted to find a way out.

The U.S. came under increasing pressure from its allies to act in the Kashmir dispute. Allies in Europe urged the U.S. to take action by ceasing arms sales, and stepping up diplomatic efforts. Tony Blair, Prime Minister of Great Britain, phoned President Bush on several occasions urging him to take an active role in resolving the Pakistan-India conflict. Other world leaders had also made their feelings known to the President.

Members of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) along the LOC filed a report indicating that the number of civilian deaths had significantly increased. The head of the UN observer mission commented that without a significant change in behavior on the part of the combatants, the civil death toll would become 'headline news.'

All of this came at a difficult time for the U.S. The war against terrorism in Afghanistan was continuing. The U.S. had established a military base outside Kandahar, Afghanistan, locating the 10<sup>th</sup> Mountain Division there as well as a deployment of U.S. Air Force aircraft. These forces were involved in continuing low-level combat in the region. Yet, intelligence reports indicated that there was an increasing likelihood that Iraq was supporting anti-U.S. forces in Afghanistan. The U.S. military command was steeling itself for conflict with Iraq. The U.S. presence in the region was also causing some disquiet in the region, with concerns and even outright opposition to the U.S. presence in the region coming from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. Elsewhere, U.S. military personnel continued to be involved in small numbers in several anti-terrorist campaigns in the Philippines, Georgia, Yemen, and Colombia. While none of these deployments was large,



they nonetheless concerned military leaders both for the threat of escalation, as well as further scattering U.S. military efforts.

The dispute between India and Pakistan concerned many in the international community. Clearly, violent conflict between India and Pakistan threatened to be bloody. As both nations had a small nuclear stockpile, it also threatened to be catastrophic. Added to these worries was the special concern of the U.S. With the war on terrorism continuing on Pakistan's borders in Afghanistan, continued violent conflict in Kashmir only made U.S. anti-terrorism actions more difficult. Therefore, President Bush requested that a former Assistant Secretary of State in the Reagan Administration undertake a mediation mission. This Assistant Secretary was tasked with bringing India, Pakistan and China together in Mauritius to hammer out a peace deal.

By late spring the parties had produced a tentative agreement.

## ***Conflict Chronology***

### **1940s**

In 1947, the State of Jammu and Kashmir had a predominantly Muslim population and was governed by an Indian ruler, Maharaja Hari Singh. The first Indo-Pakistani War began when the Maharaja requested Indian assistance to quell a revolt by his Muslim subjects aided by Pakistani troops. In return for armed assistance from the government of India, he signed Jammu-Kashmir over to India on October 21, 1947.<sup>2</sup> India claims that Jammu and Kashmir belongs to India by virtue of this instrument of accession. On January 1, 1949, a cease-fire was arranged by the United Nations, according to which both Pakistan and India agreed to withdraw all troops behind a mutually agreed cease-fire line, later known as the Line of Control (LOC).

### **1950s**

In the 1950s, Pakistan and India continued their standoff over Kashmir, each occupying a part of the territory. However, there were no major military conflicts. Pakistan continued to call for a plebiscite in the region. Although India had made a promise to conduct a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir, it continued to renege on its promise, justifying its actions on the basis of the failure of Pakistani troops to leave the territory (as called upon by UN resolutions). By 1952, India enacted article 370 of its constitution, which granted Jammu-Kashmir a special status and increased autonomy.

It is important to note that in the mid-1950s India began building its nuclear capabilities, adding another facet to the crisis between both countries. In 1958, India began designing and acquiring equipment for plutonium reprocessing. A year later, American scientists arrived in India to train Indian scientists in the processing and handling of Uranium. In 1954 the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir, a democratically elected body, ratified accession to India. By this time, the Pakistani government aligned itself with other countries in order to gain more support from the international community.

Pakistan signed an agreement with the U.S. saying that Washington would come to Pakistan's aid in a time of war. Islamabad had agreed to host U.S. military bases; its location was strategic in the U.S.'s Cold War positioning against the Soviet Union. That relationship was renewed in 1959. India, meanwhile, practiced a policy of nonalignment, refusing to ally itself with any bloc or alliance -- especially those of the U.S. or Soviet Union.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> "Partition and Independence." <http://bbc.co.uk>

<sup>3</sup> The Washington Post Company. "History of the India-Pakistan Conflict." [Washington Post Online](http://www.washingtonpost.com). 1998-Mar 2002. <http://www.washingtonpost.com>



## **1960s**

In 1961 Pakistan made a move forward in improving Sino-Pakistani relations by voting at the UN General Assembly for the motion of restoration of China's legal status in the United Nations.<sup>4</sup> This strained relations with India—India and China were in the midst of border disputes themselves—and also with the West because by 1963 Pakistan would modify its pro-western stance and establish closer relations with communist China.

Between 1962 and 1963, India and Pakistan resumed discussions on the status of Jammu and Kashmir. However, these discussions were not fruitful, and the two continued to dispute over the territory. In the meantime however, the early part of the 1960s led to Pakistani development of their nuclear capabilities. They began their atomic bomb program, heightening security concerns between the two countries. Around this time a third party came into the dispute. China, who had been having problems with its Sino-Indian border, invaded Indian Territory in the East Kashmiri territory. Consequently, Pakistan enhanced its relations with China, putting more pressure on India.

By 1964, violence increased, with Hindu-Muslim fighting leading to massacres of Muslims in East India where more than 1,000 were killed. This triggered the second Indo-Pakistani War. The war which began on the West Pakistan-India border soon spilled over to other areas. Both Indian and Pakistani troops crossed the Partition Line, and both sides launched air attacks on cities. After threats of intervention by China had been successfully opposed by the United States and Britain, Pakistan and India agreed to a UN-sponsored cease-fire. On January 10, 1966, the Pakistani President Ayub Khan and Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri signed the Tashkent Agreement in the former Soviet state Uzbekistan. The agreement ordered both India and Pakistan to withdraw their troops by February that year to their pre-war borders.

## **1970s**

Indo-Pakistani relations deteriorated when civil war erupted in Pakistan, pitting the West Pakistan army against East Pakistanis demanding greater autonomy. The fighting forced 10 million East Pakistani Bengalis to flee to India. When Pakistan attacked Indian airfields in Kashmir, India attacked both East and West Pakistan. It occupied the eastern half, which declared its independence as Bangladesh, on December 6, 1971. Under great-power pressure, a UN cease-fire was arranged in mid-December, after Pakistan's defeat.

While tensions were alleviated by the Simla accord of 1972, and by Pakistan's recognition of Bangladesh in 1974, the region continued to see a lot of internal unrest and repression by the Indian government against the Kashmiri people.

## **1980s**

In the early 1980s, during the Cold War, Pakistan remained allied with the United States against Soviet advances into Northern Afghanistan and Central Asia. As Kashmiri separatists and insurgent movements increased in popularity and strength, India accused Pakistan of aiding militia groups which began attacking villages in Indian-controlled areas in Kashmir. Pakistan denied it was providing military or financial aid to the separatists, maintaining it only gave moral support to their cause.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/4408.html>



This decade proved to be an important one for Indian technology. The first plutonium explosion in 1974 led to the use of India's first Agni missile<sup>5</sup> In addition, on June 19, 1981, India launched its first experimental communication satellite called Apple. Apple responded to all the commands, which was a break through in satellite control technology for India. India consequently joined the select group of countries that have designed and built communication satellites.<sup>6</sup>

The 1980s were also significant for India in terms of the internal problems that the central government faced. Confronted with a Sikh separatist movement under the leadership of Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale, the government sent in the army to establish order. The army ended up storming the Golden Temple (regarded by Sikhs as the holiest shrine), in order to end the militancy. On October 31, Indira Ghandi, India's Prime Minister, was assassinated by her own security guards in retaliation for this.<sup>7</sup>

Pakistan, too, experienced its share of internal turmoil. Pakistan was ruled under Martial Law until 1985. There was continued uncertainty as to whether Pakistan would end up as a democratic or as an Islamic state. Elections scheduled to be held in 1985 were cancelled and a number of measures were taken to Islamicize legal and civil institutions. Furthermore, the clashes between the Pathan and Muhajir communities also contributed to political instability.

## **1990 – December 2001**

The 1990s are possibly the most important years of the Kashmiri conflict for one sole reason: nuclear weapons. In 1998, First India and then Pakistan successfully detonated nuclear weapons. The international community condemned the tests and levied economic sanctions on the feuding neighbors. As a result, the security issues in the region heightened as two more nuclear powers entered the small group of states with such capabilities.

A year later, with President Musharraf as the new President of Pakistan, Pakistani-led troops, including a unit headed by current President Pervez Musharraf, crossed the border into Indian-controlled Kashmir. Security threats heightened as the Indian government retaliated against the offense Pakistani activities. Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee launched counter-attack air strikes to push out the Pakistani army. Pakistan asserted it was fighting for Kashmir's liberation while India maintained its control of the southern portion of the province was legitimate. The conflict subsided when Pakistani President Nawaz Sharif ordered the army to withdraw to its side of the Line of Control. The leaders officially ended fighting with the Lahore Declaration, which stressed that both countries must respect the Line of Control.<sup>8</sup>

1999 not only brought violence between governments, but also was a year of heightened terrorist activity. Terrorists hijacked an Indian flight bound for Katmandu, Nepal and demanded the release of members of Kashmiri separatist groups, such as the Jaish-e-Mohammad leader, Maulana Masood Azhar. The 155 people trapped aboard the plane were released after eight days, while the hijackers escaped. Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee blamed Pakistan for supporting the hijacking; Pakistan rejected those claims as untrue and "very irresponsible." Various insurgent groups continued the fighting over Kashmir even after the two governments returned to the Line of Control.

In July 2000 Hizbul Mujahadeen, a dominant Kashmiri Islamic separatist group, declared a unilateral ceasefire against Indian troops in Kashmir. And a few months later, the Kashmiri separatist group Lashkar-e-Tayyiba claimed responsibility for a deadly attack on the historic Red

<sup>5</sup> "BBC News: Time Line – South Asia – India." <http://news.bbc.co.uk>

<sup>6</sup> India Children: History of India. <http://www.indiachildren.com/lifestyles/history>

<sup>7</sup> "Country Studies: India." Library of Congress, Federal Research Division. Internet: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/intoc>

<sup>8</sup> "Indian – Pakistan Timeline." [http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/asia/india-pakistan/timeline\\_sec6.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/asia/india-pakistan/timeline_sec6.html)



Fort in New Delhi, India. Because violence spread throughout both countries, the Heads of State would come together to form some agreement on the status of Kashmir. In May the following year, Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf and Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee held a summit in New Delhi to negotiate a truce over Kashmir. Within this one year (2001), according to Amnesty International, 3000 conflict-related deaths occurred, one thousand of whom were civilians. Human rights violations were widespread and endemic by the Indian authorities and some of the insurgent groups.

Human rights violations, however, did not abate. In December 2001, the Indian government passed the Prevention of Terrorism Bill (POTB). Like its counterparts elsewhere in the world, this is a repressive piece of legislation that has been used to justify considerable human rights abuses by the government of India, especially in Kashmir, where India is fighting a counterinsurgency war.

The December 13, 2001 attack on the Indian parliament by militants led India to escalate its war in Kashmir and threaten war with Pakistan. India ordered Pakistan to turn over 20 suspected terrorists believed to be hiding in the Islamic nation. Pakistani officials arrested at least 50 members of two Pakistan-based Kashmiri separatist groups, Jaish-e-Mohammad and Lashkar-e-Tayyiba -- including the leader of Jaish-e-Mohammad, Maulana Masood Azhar, whom India had released in December 1999 to satisfy the demands of militants hijacking an Indian Airlines plane. New Delhi accused Pakistan of aiding the Islamic militant groups, but Islamabad denied any involvement. Both states deployed more troops to their troubled border, with tensions continuing to rise near the year's end.<sup>9</sup>

## ***The Proposed Peace Agreement***

The parties to the negotiation included parties representing the pro-Independence Kashmiris, Pakistan, India, China, and the U.S. The terms of the tentative agreement include:

1. Territory ceded by Pakistan to China in 1963 to be recognized by India.
2. Disposition of territory between the western end of the LOC and the existing Pakistan border, as well as territory north of the LOC to be decided by a Kashmir-wide plebiscite. (The exact choice is whether these regions wish to be part of India or Pakistan; independence is not an option). All Indian and Pakistani troops to be removed from the territory between the western end of the LOC and the existing Pakistani border, as well as territory north of the LOC.
3. Area under plebiscite to become a permanent demilitarized zone.
4. Territory occupied by India near the Siachen Glacier to be recognized by Pakistan and China.
5. Establishment of a Trans-Kashmiri tribunal, made up of representatives from Pakistan, India and China to address issues relating to economic development, resource use, and environmental issues.
6. Establishment of a permanent military commission for Kashmir, made up of representatives from China, Pakistan and India to ensure demilitarized status of the region.
7. Request significant U.N. peacekeeping mission be deployed in Kashmir -- in the territory between the western end of the LOC and the existing Pakistan border, as well as territory north of the LOC to keep peace while the plebiscite is undertaken.

In a private communication to Washington, the mediator outlined his suggested composition of the peacekeeping effort. He wrote:

---

<sup>9</sup> "Kashmir Timeline." <http://www.zmag.org/southasia/kashtime.htm>



It is my view that the agreement between Pakistan, India and China will succeed provided the U.S. agrees to place some 10,000 to 15,000 troops in Kashmir. I view their role as being:

- Policing the plebiscite,
- Ensuring the region stays demilitarized, and
- Reacting to any rogue partisan action.

You will appreciate that there is considerable concern on the part of the Indians who believe that in demilitarizing Kashmir the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) will take advantage and act against India. The PRC is not too happy with the U.S. presence on the ground in Kashmir. Pakistan is keen to have U.S. troops there, as they believe that a UN presence will only be successful if it is demonstrably American.

*Given the fragility of this agreement and the strategic importance of the region, I recommend that Washington consider establishing a peacekeeping force and that this matter be considered with some urgency.*

There are many questions for decision-makers to consider. The most important include:

- Is peace in Kashmir necessary to U.S. interests?
- What are the terms of engagement for U.S. troops?
- Who will pay for U.S. troop deployment (U.S., U.N.)?
- How long will U.S. troops be needed?
- What are the domestic economic and political consequences of sending U.S. troops to Kashmir?

Of course, decision-makers should also consider to what extent the proposed peacekeeping mission would have consequences for the U.S. elsewhere around the globe.

It remains to be seen whether the National Security Council will support the negotiated proposal. Indeed, NSC members may even wish to propose an alternative deal back to those at the negotiating table. The U.S. does not have infinite time to debate the strengths and weaknesses of peacekeeping. Yet, there are many different political agendas and interests in Washington that will influence what finally emerges as American commitment to peacekeeping. The parties have made it known that if the U.S. cannot deliver on a decision to commit to peacekeeping quickly, then the deal is off.

## ***U.S. Domestic, Political, and Economic Background***

### **Political Context**

While domestic political issues have always had a significant impact on foreign policy decision-making, they have become especially important during the Bush presidency. The controversies associated with the November 2000 elections, a split Senate, and a narrow GOP majority of eight seats in the House all combined to constrain the mandate of President Bush. This was further complicated by the decision of Senator James Jeffords of Vermont to leave the Republican Party and register himself as an independent, giving the Democrats a single seat majority in the Senate. This gave the Democrats the option of blocking, delaying or substantially altering President Bush's agenda, thus forcing him to bargain and compromise. Second, the committee chairmanships were turned over to Democrats. Third, the Democrats now had the power to confirm or dismiss presidential appointees, including ambassadors. In addition, this gave Democrats greater access to the media and the option of passing non-binding resolutions





expressing their discontent—a powerful signal in foreign policy—and the ability to frame the debates for public opinion.

One should not overstate, however, the Democrats' new clout in foreign policy. This is still where the President's power is strongest, especially in times of crisis, and Congress does not have much input into most of the diplomatic decisions. Still, there are different ways in which the Democratic Senate could soften Bush's international stance and induce more cooperative behavior. Siding with a more conciliatory State Department against the Pentagon on issues like North Korea, China, Iraq or European defense might be one way. Another approach available to the Democrats is echoing the concerns of America's allies, as well as the real American public opinion, which favors the UN and cooperative diplomacy.

## **Economic Conditions**

The much slower than anticipated recovery of the American economy also figures into foreign policy decision-making. Although there are signs of recovery, continuing rises in unemployment figures, lower consumer spending, and insufficient business investment spending all seem to point that this recovery is going to be a very gradual one. In addition, the increase in government spending on war and security related issues, as well as rising government spending on education and welfare indicates that there is no money for any new domestic policy directions.

Currently, unemployment is around 6%, leaving 8.5 million people unemployed. The current account deficit for the fourth quarter of 2001 was some \$98.8 billion and the trade deficit in February 2002 was at \$31.5 billion. U.S. GDP was up 5.8% in the first quarter of 2002.

## **The National Security Council**

The National Security Act of 1947 established the National Security Council. Originally, the Council existed under the chairmanship of the President, with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense as key members. Its original purpose was “to coordinate foreign policy and defense policy, and to reconcile diplomatic and military commitments and requirements.”<sup>10</sup> While this remains true to some degree, the Council quickly became a forum solely to serve the President in his national security needs. With the Reorganization Plan of 1949, the NSC officially became a part of the Executive Office of the President<sup>11</sup>. To this day, the National Security Council is the key arena where various Cabinet officials and agency heads can come together to debate the direction of American security policy.

In 1986, the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Department Reorganization Act, Section 603, required the National Security Council to issue reports on the status of and strategy for maintaining national security. While no such report has yet been issued by President Bush's relatively new Council, the National Security Strategy Report of 1997 still offers insights into the current goals and methods of the Council. It describes the general goals of the NSC as threefold<sup>12</sup>:

- Enhance America's security
- Expand America's economic prosperity
- Promote democracy in the international community

The Council thus in a general sense attempts to protect American domestic and international interests while turning back the enemies of democracy and capitalism.

---

<sup>10</sup> [www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/history](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/history)

<sup>11</sup> [www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/)

<sup>12</sup> <http://clinton2.nara.gov/WH/EOP/NSC/Strategy/>



During the Cold War, these goals could be approached with great focus. The Soviet Union provided a center for nearly all governmental policy. NSC actions were geared against the policies of Communism. However, no such singularity of vision can exist in today's modern world. Threats today come from "states of concern," terrorist groups, and international organized crime. All of these threats demand the full attention of the NSC if national security is to be effectively maintained. Cooperation between the various departments of the Executive Branch must exist if these diverse threats are to be addressed. This is the great challenge facing the Council today. The close of the most recent report by the Clinton Administration's Council puts it quite well: "At this moment in history, the United States is called upon to lead—to organize the forces of freedom and progress; to channel the unruly energies of the global economy into positive avenues; and to advance our prosperity, reinforce our democratic ideals and values, and enhance our security."<sup>13</sup>

### ***Role of Congress in Foreign Policy***

There has been tension over the appropriate role of the legislature in policy making in the aftermath of September 11. Congressional lawmakers have been unhappy that the Bush Administration, citing the extraordinary nature of the security situation, has taken policy decisions without consultation with Congress. For example, House Democratic leader Richard Gephardt of Missouri has complained that the administration skipped consultations with Congress on the administration's plans to train and help equip forces in the republic of Georgia or on offering military aid to Yemen to combat terrorist groups.

Furthermore, there is still some resentment in certain congressional quarters over the issue of authority to declare military action. Arguments proposing that Congress, and not the President, has the constitutional right to declare war, or at least authorize military action in advance under the War Powers Act of 1973, have been ignored by the Bush Administration.

### ***U.S. and International Involvement in South Asia***

The United States has been the most important outside party to the conflict over Kashmir. In addition to the U.S., the U.N., the Soviets, Great Britain, and China have been involved at various times.

Initially, international involvement came in the form of the UN rather than as individual states. In January of 1948, as fighting continued regarding the disputed Kashmir territory, the British and the U.S. were the major backers of Resolution 39 adopted by the United Nations Security Council, establishing the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) to investigate and mediate the dispute.<sup>14</sup> In July 1949, India and Pakistan signed the *Karachi Agreement*, establishing a ceasefire line to be supervised by the international observers. The UN Security Council mandated the creation of The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) to supervise the ceasefire between India and Pakistan in Jammu and Kashmir.<sup>15</sup> Unfortunately, these efforts were not successful in bringing India and Pakistan to an agreement. The U.S. at this point did not have any specific interests in South Asia and was content to support the efforts of the British.

The advent of the Cold War saw South Asia gaining greater importance in the eyes of the U.S. The Eisenhower administration established a bilateral security relationship with Pakistan and helped it join two anti-Communist pacts, SEATO & CENTO. This obviously did not endear

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/nssrpref-1299.htm>

<sup>14</sup> UN Resolution 39, See Appendix A

<sup>15</sup> UN Resolution 51, See Appendix A





Washington to the Indians. The U.S. however, was interested in finding a resolution to the Kashmir issue so that South Asia could serve as a bulwark against the Sino-Soviet Bloc. The Sino-Indian war of 1962 gave the U.S. the opportunity it had been waiting for. Following India's defeat, the U.S. applied strong pressure for another round of India-Pakistan talks. The logic being that India's defeat would force it to seek better relations with Pakistan. In addition, the U.S. thought that its own relations with India would improve given its supply of military assistance to the Indians following their defeat. However, when these talks failed to produce any progress, the U.S. opted for the sidelines once again.

U.S. relations with Pakistan were relatively cordial, though not as ambitious as Pakistan would have liked. U.S. relations with India, however, were much tenser. India was not our firm ally against Communism. Indeed, the principle cause of American indifference to India during the Cold War era was Indo-Soviet friendship.

The 1971 defeat of Pakistan by India led to the Simla Agreement, which stated that India and Pakistan would seek to resolve Kashmir bilaterally (or through other mutually agreed peaceful means). For India, this agreement turned Kashmir into a purely bilateral matter. For Pakistan, Simla merely added another layer to an international dispute and by no means invalidated existing UN resolutions. Pakistan maintained after the war that Kashmiris should still be allowed to vote in a referendum on their future, following numerous UN resolutions on the issue. India, however, did not want international debate on the issue, arguing that the Simla Agreement of 1972 provided for a resolution through bilateral talks.<sup>16</sup>

The next occasion for U.S. interest in the region came in 1979, not as a response to conflict in Kashmir, but due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The U.S. supplied and aided the Afghans in their surprisingly successful campaign against the Soviet Union. During this time, Pakistan's cooperation (permission for use of their land and air space) was needed, and Pakistan readily conceded. Afterward, however, the U.S. abruptly left the region, leaving many Pakistanis feeling angry and used. Some blame the enormous inflow of arms into the region during this covert operation as an important cause of the violence and lawlessness that wracked Pakistan during the 1990s.<sup>17</sup>

After the end of the Cold War and before 1998, analysts observed a shift in Washington's policy toward South Asia. Specifically, the absence of the "Evil Empire" allowed for a rethinking of relations with India. The end of the Cold War diminished the importance of Pakistan in the American global strategy, and Indo-U.S. amity began to take shape in the early nineties during the tenure of Narasimha Rao. He initiated market economy reforms, paving the way for India to become one of the world's largest potential markets for foreign investment.<sup>18</sup> The dilemma confronting the U.S., however, was that while it was eager to improve its relations with India, it did not want to alienate Pakistan, a trustworthy ally of nearly fifty years.<sup>19</sup>

The nuclear tests of 1998 raised concerns in Washington that Kashmir might ignite a nuclear war in the sub-continent. The U.S. promptly gave high priority to India-Pakistan talks and enlisted other major powers to push the two sides toward dialogue.

The U.S., the European Union and Japan imposed strong sanctions. Loans to the World Bank from Japan, Australia and the EU were deferred so as not to be distributed to India or Pakistan. International efforts did pay off. Pakistan welcomed the internationalization of the Kashmir issue as it is the 'weaker' of the two parties. The Indians on the other hand, continued to insist that Kashmir was a bilateral issue.

---

<sup>16</sup> BBC News Online, [http://www.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/south\\_asia/newsid\\_353000/353352.stm](http://www.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/south_asia/newsid_353000/353352.stm)

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.cqpress.com/context/articles/us\\_pakistan.html](http://www.cqpress.com/context/articles/us_pakistan.html)

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.defencejournal.com/globe/dec99/us-tilt.htm>

<sup>19</sup> Ibid



In May 1999, the Kargil crisis destroyed a blossoming peace process between then-Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and Atul Behari Vajpayee, his Indian counterpart. Pakistani infiltrators, whether militants (as claimed by Islamabad) or soldiers (as claimed by New Delhi) seized several barren peaks close to the strategic Srinagar-Kargil road and on the Indian side of the line of control. After several weeks of fighting, U.S. diplomatic intervention and Indian military gains forced a Pakistani retreat. The damage to the region, and Pakistan's credibility with Washington, was substantial.<sup>20</sup>

In Pakistan, the Kargil crisis helped accelerate a process already underway. Since 1998, a debate had been going on about Kashmir among the elite who determine foreign policy. For years, they have argued for compliance with UN resolutions regarding Kashmir that date back to 1948. Today, a growing band of modernists argue that Pakistan should amend this fixed policy. Moderates contend that a position based on the unfinished business of partition no longer resonates internationally. They argue that Pakistanis should support meaningful self-determination for the Kashmiris.<sup>21</sup> Of course, traditionalists reject this view, but the debate illustrates the disillusionment with some Pakistanis over the ramifications of rigidity. They believe internationally frowned-upon incidents like the Kargil crisis are doomed to repetition unless the Kashmir stance is altered. They are fearful that the outside world will view Pakistan as a militant and hostile nation.

Much has been said about America's role in South Asia, but China's influence has also been considerable. In the Kargil conflict, for example, China's neutrality was instrumental in convincing the Pakistani leadership to back down from an armed confrontation with India. China's response was unique as in the earlier Indo-Pak conflicts, it had openly supported and sided with the Pakistanis. Indeed, since India signed the historic Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, China has been committed to the successive regimes in Islamabad. But with the change in international equations in the post-Cold War world, Pakistan has gradually lost its place of pride in Beijing's foreign policy calculations.<sup>22</sup> India's continued diplomatic engagement has made a significant dent in Chinese policy toward it, although India continues to refuse to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty until China does, and China refuses until the U.S. complies. The concerns regarding the growing American interests in Kargil were vivid in China's repeated emphasis on the threat of escalation, regional instability, and fears about Western intervention in its periphery.<sup>23</sup>

Since September 11, 2001, Kashmir has again gained importance in U.S. eyes. The Bush administration views Kashmir as primarily a terrorist problem, a view that was reinforced by the attack on the Indian parliament in mid-December 2001. Pakistan has become one of the U.S.'s closest allies, with General Musharaff agreeing to join the coalition and allow U.S. troops on its military bases and in its air space. The U.S. now enjoys excellent relations with both India and Pakistan, a situation that is nearly unprecedented in its dealings with South Asia.

## ***Background on India***

### **Geography**

Located in the Southwest region of Asia, India, comparatively speaking, is one-third the size of the United States with a total area of 3,287,590 sq km. India has the second highest population in the world, and estimates taken in 2001 show that the population will grow at a rate of 1.55%. Currently, India is the home to an estimated 1.1 billion people. With 62.2% of its population

---

<sup>20</sup> *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2001

<sup>21</sup> Ibid

<sup>22</sup> Ibid

<sup>23</sup> Ibid



between the ages of 15-64, this percentage is expected to continue to rise as the birth rate is nearly three-times larger than the death rate.

Of these 1.1 billion people, nearly 82% are of the Hindu faith. The rest of the population includes Muslims (12%), Christians (2%), Sikh (2%); other groups such as the Jain, Parsi, and Buddhist make up the remaining population. India is also home to a great mixture of languages and dialects. There are twenty-four languages, each spoken by a million or more persons. Numerous other languages and dialects are for the most part spoken in specific locales.

## Government

The Republic of India, with its capital located in New Dehli, is a federal republic constituting 28 states and seven union territories. On August 15, 1947, India became a dominion within the Commonwealth, with Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister. Enmity between the leaders of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League led the British to partition British India, creating East and West Pakistan, where there were Muslim majorities. The riots that accompanied partition resulted in thousands of deaths and tens of thousands of refugees. India became a republic within the Commonwealth after promulgating its constitution on January 26, 1950. Its constitution was based on English common law and limited juridical review. The Indian government is divided into three parts: the Executive Branch, the Legislative Branch, and the Judicial Branch.

According to its constitution, India is a "sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic republic." Like the United States, India has a federal form of government. However, the central government in India has greater power in relation to its states, and its central government is patterned after the British parliamentary system. The government exercises its broad administrative powers in the name of the president, whose duties are largely ceremonial. The president and vice president are elected indirectly for 5-year terms by a special electoral college. Real national executive power is centered in the Council of Ministers (cabinet), led by the Prime Minister. The president appoints the Prime Minister, who is designated by legislators of the political party or coalition commanding a parliamentary majority. The president then appoints subordinate ministers on the advice of the Prime Minister.

The current Chief of State is President Kocheril Raman Narayanan; his Vice President is Krishnan Kant. Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee was elected head of the ministries on March 19, 1998. The President, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, appoints the Council of Ministers.<sup>24</sup> It is important to note that the next elections for President and Vice



<sup>24</sup> "India." <http://www.cia.gov>



President will be this coming August. Thus, these two leaders are going to play an increasing role in trying to rally support for their political agendas. The legislative branch of the Indian Government consists of a bicameral Parliament: The Council of States and the People's Assembly. The Council of States consists of no more than 250 members, some of which are appointed by the President, and the remainder chosen by the state governments. The People's Assembly elects its representative based on popular elections. This Assembly currently has 545 seats. Presently, the People's assembly is divided among the BJP Alliance (40.8%), Congress Alliance (33.8%), and other smaller Alliances (25.4%). As you can see, the BJP holds the greatest number of seats, but no clear majority. The next elections are to be held in 2004.<sup>25</sup> The Judicial Branch is based on appointment. The President may appoint Supreme Court members and they may remain in office until they reach the age of 65.

Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee took office in October 1999 after a general election in which a BJP-led coalition of 13 parties called the National Democratic Alliance emerged with an absolute majority. The coalition reflects the ongoing transition in Indian politics away from the historically dominant and national-based Congress Party toward smaller, narrower-based regional parties. This process has been underway throughout much of the past decade and is likely to continue in the future. The Bharatiya Janata Party emerged as the single-largest party in the Lok Sabha (lower house of Parliament) elections in September 1999. The BJP currently leads a coalition government under Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee. The Hindu-nationalist BJP draws its political strength mainly from the "Hindi belt" in the northern and western regions of India.

The Congress (I) Party, led by Sonia Gandhi (widow of the late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi), holds the second-largest number of seats in the Lok Sabha. Priding itself as a secular, centrist party, the Congress has been the historically dominant political party in India. Its performance in national elections has steadily declined during the last decade.

Indian politics since the 1980s have been increasingly characterized by violent conflicts. Civil wars in the Punjab and Assam, insurgency in the North East, left-wing extremist (Naxalite) movements, as well as riots between Hindus and Sikhs, and Hindus and Muslims have contributed to a climate of suspicion and hostility between different sections of the population. Currently, the tensions and conflicts between Hindus and Muslims are at the forefront of politics. One of the more notable and better-publicized incidences of violence between the two communities occurred in the wake of the destruction of the Mabri Mosque in Ayodhya in 1992. Hindu activists claiming that a Hindu temple had predated the mosque, petitioned for the destruction of the mosque, so that the temple could be rebuilt. Resulting tensions ended up in large scale rioting involving the two communities. The most recent incidence of sectarian violence occurred in February 2002 in the state of Gujarat, where organized groups of Hindus tortured and killed Muslims in retaliation for an earlier firebombing by Muslim activists, of a train carrying Hindu pilgrims from the contested site in Ayodhya.

Diplomatically, the appointed Indian Ambassador to the United States is Naresh Chandra. The United States has sent Ambassador Robert D. Blackwill to head the diplomatic mission in India.

## **Economy**

While its GDP is low in dollar terms, India has the world's 13th-largest GNP. About 62% of the population depends directly on agriculture. Industry and services sectors are growing in importance and account for 26% and 48% of GDP, respectively, while agriculture contributes about 25.6% of GDP. More than 35% of the population live below the poverty line, but a large and growing middle class of 150-200 million has disposable income for consumer goods. India's international payments position remained strong in 2000 with adequate foreign exchange reserves, moderately depreciating nominal exchange rates, and booming exports of software

---

<sup>25</sup> "India." <http://www.cia.gov>



services. Growth in manufacturing output slowed, and electricity shortages continue in many regions.<sup>26</sup>

One-fifth of Indian exports goes to the United States. As a result, the Indian government has had a vested interest in maintaining economic ties with the United States in order to keep the Indian economy from deteriorating. Although India is mainly an exporting country, their high level of indebtedness has restricted the Indian government from attaining lower levels of poverty for their people. As of 2000, the Indian government has had an external debt of \$99.6 billion and was a recipient of \$2.9 billion in foreign aid from various governments and international organizations.

## **Military**

Supreme command of India's armed forces--the third-largest in the world--rests with the president, but actual responsibility for national defense lies with the cabinet committee for political affairs under the chairmanship of the prime minister. The minister of defense is responsible to parliament for all defense matters. India's military command structure has no joint defense staff or unified command apparatus. The ministry of defense provides administrative and operational control over the three services through their respective chiefs of staff. The armed forces have always been loyal to constitutional authority and maintain a tradition of non-involvement in political affairs.

Because India has such a high population, the number of people in the military is phenomenal. As the majority of the population is between 15 and 64, the availability of military personnel is near 281 million males. Nearly half of the military is fit for active duty; that is, nearly 165 million people can actively participate in military activities.

## **Transnational Issues**

India has always been an active member of the United Nations and now seeks a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. India has a long tradition of participating in UN peacekeeping operations and most recently contributed personnel to UN operations in Somalia, Cambodia, Mozambique, Kuwait, Bosnia, Angola, and El Salvador. Despite suspicions remaining from the 1962 border conflict between India and China and continuing territorial/boundary disputes, Sino-Indian relations have improved gradually since 1988. Both countries have sought to reduce tensions along the frontier, expand trade and cultural ties, and normalize relations.

India's nuclear tests in May 1998 seriously damaged Indo-American relations. President Clinton imposed wide-ranging sanctions pursuant to the 1994 Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act. The United States encouraged India to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) immediately and without condition. The U.S. also called for restraint in missile and nuclear testing and deployment in both India and Pakistan. The nonproliferation dialogue initiated after the 1998 nuclear tests has bridged many of the gaps in understanding between the countries. However, India has yet to sign the CTBT, agree to a fissile material production moratorium, or define its intentions on acquiring a nuclear deterrent. U.S. sanctions on Indian entities involved in the nuclear industry and opposition to international financial institution loans for non-humanitarian assistance projects in India remain sources of friction.

## ***Background on Pakistan***

### **Geography**

Like India, Pakistan is located in Southern Asia, bordering the Arabian Sea, with four surrounding countries: Iran, Afghanistan, India and China. Pakistan's land spans nearly 804 thousand sq km, nearly half the size of California. The July 2001 Census in Pakistan indicated that almost 145

---

<sup>26</sup> "India." <http://www.cia.gov>





million people reside in the country. Nearly 95% of the people in Pakistan are under the age of 64. This population is expected to rise by 2.11% annually as the birth rate (31.21 births/1,000 population) is about three times the death rate (9.26 deaths/1,000 population).

Pakistan is composed of numerous ethnic groups. These groups are Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashtun, Baloch and Muhajir. An overwhelming Pakistani population is Muslim (97%- Sunni 77%, Shi'a 20%). Christian, Hindu, and other ethnic groups make up the remaining 3% of the population.

## Government

The Federal Republic of Pakistan's capital is in Islamabad, Pakistan. Under the government, there are four provinces, one territory, and one capital territory. It is important to note that the Pakistani-administered portion of the disputed Jammu and Kashmir region includes Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas. Pakistan gained its independence from the United Kingdom on August 14, 1947, and established its constitution on April 10, 1973. The government is based on English Common Law with provisions to accommodate Pakistan's situation as an Islamic State.<sup>27</sup>

The constitution, however, is currently suspended, and has been since October 15, 1999 by current President, General Pervez Musharraf. Following his military take-over on October 12, 1999, he assumed control as Chief Executive of the Pakistani government. Under Musharraf, there is a National Security Council with eight members, who are given the responsibility of controlling the daily affairs of the country. The current government was justified and legalized by the Pakistani Supreme Court on May 12, 2000, and granted Musharraf authority for three years from the coup date.

General Musharraf dissolved the Pakistani Parliament upon the completion of his coup d'état. Consequently, the aforementioned National Security Council rests in the place of the Assembly. The legislative branch of the government still exists, however, and was not changed as a result of Musharraf's take-over. The Pakistani Supreme Court practices Federal Islamic or Shari'a law. Although Musharraf dissolved the Parliament, he has allowed for political parties to continue existing. However, these political alliances are known to shift on a frequent basis.

Political pressures still exist under the Musharraf government. Military pressure, as well as the ulama (Muslim clergy), landowners, industrialists, and small merchants all influence the government's work. The head of the diplomatic mission to the United States is Ambassador Maleeha Lodhi, and the American representative to Pakistan is Ambassador Wendy J. Chamberlin.



<sup>27</sup> "Pakistan." <http://www.cia.gov>



## **Economy**

Pakistan is a poor, heavily populated country. The country lacks foreign investment to revitalize its economy, and the costly confrontation with neighboring India does no justice to its already unstable economic status. An expected \$21 billion dollars of the Pakistani debt is to be paid this year. However, Pakistan's inability to pay off its dues has led the country to reschedule their debt payments. A quarter of Pakistan's revenue comes from foreign grants and loans, but half of the government expenditures are aimed at repaying those loans.<sup>28</sup> The current Musharraf government has negotiated a \$600 million IMF Stand-By Arrangement, but future loan installments will be jeopardized if Pakistan misses the repayment dates scheduled by the IMF. Consequently, the IMF has suggested to Pakistan that the government should raise petroleum prices, widen the tax net, privatize public sector assets, and improve the balance of trade in hopes of rejuvenating the economy.<sup>29</sup>

Nearly two-fifths of the population in Pakistan is below the poverty line. As a result, the per capita GDP is almost \$2,000. Half of the population works either in the industrial sector or the agricultural sector, while the remaining half works within some service. The country's income is nearly \$9 billion, however, its expenditures are nearly \$4 billion more than that. This has increasingly added to the country's indebtedness over the years and Pakistan's inability to pay its foreign and domestic debts, which currently exceeds \$40 billion.

## **Military**

Pakistan's military is divided into five branches: Army, Navy, Air Force, Civil Armed Services, and the National Guard.<sup>30</sup> Unlike India, Pakistan's minimum military age is 17. Until 1990, the United States provided military aid to Pakistan to modernize its conventional defensive capability. The United States allocated about 40% of its assistance package to non-reimbursable credits for military purchases, the third largest program behind Israel and Egypt. The remainder of the aid program was devoted to economic assistance. However, sanctions were imposed following Pakistan's nuclear tests and military coup.

## **Transnational Issues**

Pakistan is a prominent member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and an active member of the United Nations. Its foreign policy encompasses long-standing close relations with China, extensive security and economic interests in the Persian Gulf, and wide-ranging bilateral relations with the United States and other Western countries. The United States and Pakistan established diplomatic relations in 1947. The U.S. agreement to provide economic and military assistance to Pakistan and the latter's partnership in the Baghdad Pact/CENTO and SEATO strengthened relations between the two nations. However, the U.S. suspension of military assistance during the 1965 Indo-Pakistan war generated a widespread feeling in Pakistan that the United States was not a reliable ally. Maintaining favorable relations with China has been an important goal of Pakistan's foreign policy. The P.R.C. strongly supported Pakistan's opposition to Soviet involvement in Afghanistan and is perceived by Pakistan as a regional counterweight to India and Russia. Finally, Pakistan is the "key transit area for Southwest Asian heroin moving to Western markets."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> "Pakistan." <http://www.cia.gov>

<sup>29</sup> "Pakistan." <http://www.cia.gov>

<sup>30</sup> "Pakistan." <http://www.cia.gov>

<sup>31</sup> "Pakistan." <http://www.cia.gov>



## **Roles**

The simulation is planned for 26 participants. If there are fewer participants, those roles that focus on primarily domestic concerns could be eliminated; if there are more participants, roles can be assigned to more than one person.





## ***President of the United States - George W. Bush***

The responsibilities of the President as determined by the Constitution:

The President of the United States is the commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several states, when called into actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions, which shall expire at the end of their next session.

The National Security Council is the President's principal forum for considering national security and foreign policy matters with his senior national security advisors and cabinet officials. The function of the Council is to advise and assist the President on national security and foreign policies. The Council also serves as the President's principal arm for coordinating these policies among various government agencies.

The President, of course, acts as the chairman and chief executive of the NSC.



## ***Vice President of the United States - Richard Cheney***

While Dick Cheney may already be the most influential Vice President in history, much of that honor stems from his close relationship with President George W. Bush. More importantly, it is Bush's willingness to provide Cheney with the authority to make decisions and exert influence that has catapulted Cheney into such a dominant role.

The Vice President's most important role is to replace the President if the President dies or becomes unable to manage the country's affairs. Under the Constitution of the United States, the Vice President automatically assumes the presidency if the President dies. The 25th Amendment details procedures for replacing a President who is incapacitated due to illness, injury, or other reasons.

The Constitution gives the Vice President few other official duties. The Vice President serves as President of the Senate, formally presiding over Senate deliberations. Even this constitutional responsibility is limited, giving the Vice President a vote on Senate bills and resolutions only if there is a tie vote. The Vice President also presides over a joint session of Congress when it formally counts electoral votes for presidential elections.



## **Secretary of State - Colin Powell**

The Secretary of State advises the President on U.S. foreign policy; conducts negotiations relating to U.S. foreign affairs; advises the President on the appointment of U.S. ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and other diplomatic representatives; administers the Department of State; and supervises the Foreign Service. Publicly, Powell seems marginalized from the policy process. Internally, he is seen as a reformer of the State Department. He is seen by many inside the State Department to be a breath of fresh air. Of course, he also brings a wealth of experience and personal charisma to the post. His style is one of publicly supporting his President, and quietly working behind the scenes trying to fulfill his mission. For example, he has quietly worked with Pakistan President Pervez Musharraf in an effort to both gain his support for the war on terrorism, and to proceed with talks on Kashmir.

He has expressed optimism on the possibility of a peaceful settlement to the Kashmir dispute, saying, "We are on a path that will take us where we want to go." The U.S. Secretary of State, however, made it clear that the immediate aim was de-escalation of political and military tensions. He commented in *The Hindu* that "...we need India and Pakistan to pull back. We need to reduce the possibility that something could spark [more violent] conflict between the two sides."

Powell has made no secret of his support for international institutions of diplomacy, including the U.N. He is believed by many observers to be in the opposite camp from Bush advisers such as Vice President Cheney and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld. Powell is not a strong advocate of peacekeeping, but he acknowledges the usefulness of peacekeeping as a tool of American foreign policy. The current negotiations underway on Kashmir result from his support of the U.S. mediating between the Indians and Pakistanis.



## **Secretary of Defense - Donald Rumsfeld**

Donald Rumsfeld is the Secretary of Defense and is the cabinet member in charge of the Defense Department. The Office of the Secretary of Defense helps the Secretary plan, advise, and carry out the nation's security policies as directed by both the Secretary and the President. In Fiscal Year 2000 the Defense budget was roughly \$280 billion.

Rumsfeld has remained neutral and almost apathetic to the Kashmir conflict between India and Pakistan. He clearly stated in December 2001 that he hoped the two South Asian forces would be able to subdue their tensions until after the U.S. anti-terrorism operations in Pakistan were completed. Rumsfeld supported peace negotiations at this time because the U.S. did not want any border conflict to interfere with the U.S. Air Force's need for airspace en route to Afghanistan. He only considered the India/Pakistan dispute to be significant because the U.S. did not want Pakistani troops to be diverted from Afghan borders to the India-Pakistan border. Also, U.S. troops stationed in Pakistan could be in danger if fighting were to become more serious.

Rumsfeld's position on Kashmir comes as no surprise. When asked about Kashmir during a November 5, 2001 press conference with Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld downplayed concerns about the security of Pakistan's nuclear assets: "As I've indicated, I do not personally believe that there is a risk with respect to the nuclear weapons of countries that have those weapons. I think those countries are careful and respectful of the dangers that they pose and manage their safe handling effectively...."

When referring to his stance on "defense" in general, Rumsfeld says, "It is clearly not a time at the Pentagon for presiding or calibrating modestly. Rather, we are in a new national security environment. We do need to be arranged to deal with the new threats, not the old ones ... with information warfare, missile defense, terrorism, and defense of our space assets and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction throughout the world. History teaches us that weakness is provocative. The task [President Bush has] outlined is to fashion deterrence and defense capabilities, so that our country will be able to successfully contribute to peace and stability in the world."



## ***Secretary Of The Treasury - Paul O'Neill***

Paul O'Neill is the Secretary of the Treasury, with responsibilities to "formulate and recommend domestic and international financial, economic, and tax policy, participate in the formulation of broad fiscal policies that have general significance for the economy, and manage the public debt" ([www.treas.gov](http://www.treas.gov)). The Secretary of the Treasury also oversees the Treasury Department in order to fulfill his responsibilities of "carrying out major law enforcement, serving as the financial agent for the U.S. Government, and manufacturing coins and currency" ([www.treas.gov](http://www.treas.gov)). Since the Secretary of the Treasury is the chief financial officer of the U.S. Federal Government, he serves on the President's National Economic Council, but he also holds many other positions. He is Chairman of the Boards and Managing Trustee of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, holds the office of Chairman of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, and serves as U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Many of these international organizations could be used to help aid U.S. initiatives in Kashmir.

O'Neill has few views on peacekeeping in Kashmir. Instead, his international views have centered on finances in the war on terrorism. He has stated that he is "committed to develop a mechanism to block the assets of terrorists simultaneously in all our countries. This will require even closer cooperation, both to share intelligence and protect sensitive information. We should spare no effort in making the world's financial system off limits to terrorist fundraising activities" ([www.treas.gov](http://www.treas.gov)). He also stated regarding economic assistance to countries, "In bilateral meetings and in a group session I raised the President's grants proposal and the need to improve the effectiveness of development assistance. I urged my colleagues to expand the portion of aid provided as grants" ([www.treas.gov](http://www.treas.gov)). O'Neill also supported the President's decision to distribute a portion of emergency funds initially allocated for Israel after the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 to Pakistan because he felt that the funds would better assist Pakistan ([www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com)). O'Neill has also met several times with Pakistan's Musharraf in order to reconcile differences on bilateral issues.



## ***Director, Central Intelligence Agency - George J. Tenet***

George Tenet has been Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (DCI) since July of 1997, when then President Clinton appointed him. "The Central Intelligence Agency's primary mission is to collect, evaluate, and disseminate foreign intelligence to assist the President and senior U.S. Government policymakers in making decisions relating to the national security. The Central Intelligence Agency does not make policy; it is an independent source of foreign intelligence information for those who do. The Central Intelligence Agency may also engage in covert action at the President's direction in accordance with applicable law" ([www.cia.gov/cia/public\\_affairs/faq.html](http://www.cia.gov/cia/public_affairs/faq.html)).

Tenet is not only in charge of the CIA, but also head of the whole U.S. Intelligence Community. The Community refers to all Executive Branch activities concerning intelligence.

Past Comments on Kashmir:

Statement by Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the "Worldwide Threat 2001: National Security in a Changing World"

07 February 2001

"At this point, Mr. Chairman, let me draw your attention to the potentially destabilizing competition in South Asia. I must report that relations between India and Pakistan remain volatile, making the risk of war between the two nuclear-armed adversaries unacceptably high. The military balance in which India enjoys advantages over Pakistan in most areas of conventional defense preparedness remains the same. This includes a decisive advantage in fighter aircraft, almost twice as many men under arms, and a much larger economy to support defense expenditures. As a result, Pakistan relies heavily on its nuclear weapons for deterrence. Their deep-seated rivalry, frequent artillery exchanges in Kashmir, and short flight times for nuclear-capable ballistic missiles and aircraft all contribute to an unstable nuclear deterrence.

If any issue has the potential to bring both sides to full-scale war, it is Kashmir. Kashmir is at the center of the dispute between the two countries. Nuclear deterrence and the likelihood that a conventional war would bog down both sides argue against a decision to go to war. But both sides seem quite willing to take risks over Kashmir in particular, and this—along with their deep animosity and distrust—could lead to decisions that escalate tensions.

The two states narrowly averted a full-scale war in Kashmir in 1999. The conflict that did occur undermined a fledgling peace process begun by the two prime ministers. Now, for the first time since then, the two sides are finally taking tentative steps to reduce tension. Recent statements by Indian and Pakistani leaders have left the door open for high-level talks. And just last week [2 Feb 2001], Vajpayee and Musharraf conversed by phone perhaps for the first time ever, to discuss the earthquake disaster."

Tenant is on record expressing the view that conventional war in South Asia risks 'going nuclear' at any time.



## ***Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs - Dr. Condoleezza Rice***

Dr. Condoleezza Rice became the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, commonly referred to as the National Security Advisor, on January 22, 2001. She coordinates the efforts of the Administration to provide a comprehensive plan for defending U.S. interests throughout the world. Key to her success is the ability to work effectively with other Council members to ensure that effective policies can be made and implemented.

Dr. Rice and her staff maintain a range of contacts in both India and Pakistan. In India her major contacts are Minister of External Affairs, Jaswant Singh, and Minister of Defense, George Fernandez.

Mr. Singh heads the Indian Ministry of Security. This ministry coordinates Indian diplomatic and military policy. He and Dr. Rice have held discussions regarding regional stability throughout the past two years, and particularly over the course of the current crisis. Mr. Singh and Dr. Rice agree fundamentally on the importance of Indian regional leadership that is maintained through strong military security. Both share a mistrust of Chinese regional intentions. Although it does not come directly under either of their jurisdictions, both also seek to improve economic relations between India and the United States. In short, both Mr. Singh and Dr. Rice wish to see a strong India with secure borders.

Mr. Fernandez and Dr. Rice, while not immediate counterparts, have shared some interesting conversations over the course of Dr. Rice's time in New Delhi. Their initial meetings concerned nuclear developments in the region. Mr. Fernandez continued to promise that India would not initiate a nuclear conflict. Dr. Rice did not pressure Mr. Fernandez to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, to the dismay of some in the American diplomatic community. Both Dr. Rice and Mr. Fernandez feel that a strong Indian military is indispensable not only to defend the border with Pakistan, but also to counter Chinese military involvement in South Asia.

In Pakistan her contacts are primarily with Minister of Interior and Narcotics, Haider, Moinuddin. Mr. Moinuddin's relationship with Dr. Rice has changed significantly since the tragic events of September 11, 2001. Initially, the two had clashed on issues of Pakistani nuclear development, relations with China, and support for the Taliban government in Afghanistan. While Mr. Moinuddin refused to acknowledge any support for the Taliban, Dr. Rice remained convinced that only Pakistani arms and intelligence could have stabilized the Taliban government.

After the September 11 attacks, Pakistan sensed an opportunity to restore friendship with the United States. Mr. Moinuddin shared information with Dr. Rice in personal meetings in Washington throughout the initial United States investigation and military campaign in Afghanistan. His flair for the dramatic has made him a favorite within the Pakistani public and among American military planners.



## ***Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) - General Richard Meyers***

General Richard Meyers (Air Force) is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consist of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. The collective body of the JCS is headed by the Chairman, who sets the agenda and presides over JCS meetings. Responsibilities as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff take precedence over duties as the Chiefs of Military Services.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the principal military adviser to the President, Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council (NSC). All JCS members are by law military advisers, and they may respond to a request or voluntarily submit, through the Chairman, advice or opinions to the President, the Secretary of Defense, or NSC. In the capacity of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he serves as the principal military advisor to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council.

Meyers views Kashmir in much the same way as his predecessor General Shelton. Shelton stated in an address at the National Press Club that developments in Asia, the Middle East and Russia will have the potential to dramatically affect America's economic, political and security interests. He went on to comment that "Asia's future will not be decided in Pyongyang, but rather on the high frontiers of Kashmir, on the floor of the Tokyo stock exchange, and in the special economic zones of Shanghai and Hong Kong."





***Chairman, House International Relations Committee - United States House of Representatives - The Honorable Henry J. Hyde, 6th District, Illinois***

Elected to the House of Representatives in 1974, Henry Hyde is regarded as a strong and respected leader by members of both sides of the aisle. During his tenure, he has worked hard to improve the lives of seniors, veterans, children, working families and small business owners -- the people who make up the 6<sup>th</sup> Congressional District of Illinois. These also are the people he remembers every time he considers legislative proposals or casts his ballot.

As chairman of the House International Relations Committee (and a member of that committee since 1982), Hyde has played a vital role in this nation's war on terrorism. From closed-door briefings at the White House to high-level meetings with foreign diplomats, Hyde has been involved in crucial debates about how the country must respond to the terrorist attacks. Through his leadership, the International Relations Committee has brought attention to the fact that America does not do a good enough job telling its story abroad. The committee also has spent time exploring the threat of biological and chemical weapons in an effort to ensure our government is doing all it can to protect the public.

Among his priorities on the House International Relations Committee are fighting global terrorism, reinvigorating U.S. diplomatic outreach around the world, limiting exports of dual-use technology (technology which has both civilian and military uses), and expansion of NATO.



### ***Chair, Senate Armed Services Committee - Senator Carl Levin***

Senator Carl Levin (Michigan, Democrat) is the Chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as well as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He has been a member of the U.S. Senate since 1978.

There are three key aspects to Levin's view of international relations. First, he has stated, that the U.S. must examine and prioritize the threats to its national interests. This includes looking at the whole spectrum of threats, emerging and traditional, and determining what actions are necessary to counter them, and what force structure is required to meet them. Levin stressed the need to look at the probabilities of a threat occurring, and to plan according to that probability. Second, Levin noted that the U.S. must encourage multi-lateral/joint responses to threats, stating that such an effort presents the greatest probability of success. To Levin, this also includes encouraging other nations to take the lead role where appropriate such as the Australians in East Timor, the Europeans with the new European Security Defense Initiative, and African states with the African Crisis Response Initiative. Third, Levin argued that the U.S. must clarify and reform Congressional roles and responsibilities with respect to military deployments. He believes this includes reforming the War Powers Act, and encouraging more bi-partisanship with respect to national security issues.

The Armed Services Committee is responsible for DOE's defense-related programs, through the annual defense authorization bill. This enormous piece of legislation provides legislative and spending authority for all Department of Defense and DOE military programs. Very generally, the Senate Armed Services Committee is responsible for comprehensive study and review of matters relating to the common defense policy of the United States.



## ***Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence - Senator Bob Graham (D - Florida)***

Bob Graham is the senior senator from Florida. In his third U.S. Senate term, he has emerged as a leading voice of moderate Democrats. His centrist philosophy and commitment to bipartisanship have made him a major player in some of the most important issues facing Americans today.

As chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Graham helps oversee U.S. intelligence agencies. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's role is to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and programs of the U.S. Government, and to submit to the Senate appropriate proposals for legislation and report to the Senate concerning such intelligence activities and programs. He has led the way on identifying and protecting sensitive information in the U.S. government, by sponsoring more effective legislation. Senator Graham has also taken the lead in reforming and improving the intelligence community's efforts in counter-terrorism.

Among policy makers and members of Congress, Graham is one of few who has actually been to Kashmir. He led a three-member U.S. Congress delegation on August 29, 2001 and visited forward positions on the Line of Control in the Chakothi sector. Joining Graham on that visit was Senator Jon Kyl (R – Arizona) and House Representative Portia Goss (R – Florida), Chairman of House Select Committee on Intelligence.



## ***Chair, US House Armed Services Committee - Representative Bob Stump***

Bob Stump (R – Arizona) is the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. The jurisdiction of the House Armed Services Committee includes ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments; common defense generally; and the Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force generally. With its largely administrative oversight role, the House Armed Services Committee rarely makes much news. It is, however, of vital importance in making appropriations for the Defense Department, not to mention military administrative matters.

For example, during the markup hearings for the National Defense Authorization Legislation for Fiscal Year 2003, the Committee played a key role in ushering through the Bush Administration's funding requests. Stump argued that "Every item in this category is recognized by the committee to be vitally important and necessary for the Department of Defense to continue to wage its successful campaign against global terrorism."

Stump's 3<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District takes in the western half of Arizona and includes all of Flagstaff and the western half of Phoenix. It is a diverse district, and mostly conservative. Stump has announced that he will not seek re-election in 2002, due to ill health.



## ***Chair, U.S. House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence - Chairman Portia J. Goss***

Portia J. Goss serves as Chair of the U.S. House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. A 29-year resident of Southwest Florida, Portia Goss was elected to Congress in 1988 with 72% of the vote. Since that time, voters have returned her to Washington with overwhelming support.

A former Central Intelligence Agency Clandestine Services Officer, Goss is serving her second term as Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, making her one of only two Florida House members among the 20 full committee chairmen. She joined the Intelligence Committee in 1995 as the senior member of the committee's four new Republican appointees and also served on the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counter Intelligence. In addition, Goss served as a member of the Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community, a temporary panel that issued a comprehensive report on the future of the intelligence community.

As Chair of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Goss has led efforts to revitalize the nation's intelligence capabilities to better meet future challenges, particularly those involving such transnational threats as weapons proliferation, narcotics trafficking and terrorism. She has been a leading voice in the call to strengthen our human intelligence and analytical capabilities, even as we continue to invest in the best possible technology for intelligence collection. In 1998, Goss also served as Vice-Chair of the bipartisan Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, whose final report addressed the highly complex issues of compromise to U.S. national security resulting from transfers of sensitive technical information to China.



## ***Commander in Chief, United States Central Command - General Tammy Franks***

General Tammy R. Franks is the Commander in Chief, United States Central Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida. Headquartered at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida, United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) is one of nine Unified Combatant Commands assigned operational control of U.S. combat forces. A Unified Combatant Command is composed of forces from two or more services, has a broad and continuing mission, and is normally organized on a geographical basis into regions known as "Areas Of Responsibility" (AORs). USCENTCOM's AOR stretches from the Horn of Africa to Central Asia.

Organized as a headquarters element, USCENTCOM has no war fighting units permanently assigned to it. Instead, all four Armed Services provide USCENTCOM with component commands, which, along with our joint special operations component, make up USCENTCOM's primary war fighting and engagement organizations. The United States Central Command Headquarters is not located in its theater of operations because of sensitivities in some of the region's nations which are reluctant to host a permanent and relatively large U.S. military presence on their soil. USCENTCOM, however, maintains links with most countries in the area through the U.S. military missions and embassies in the region. In times of crisis, the headquarters staff can deploy to the AOR, as it did in 1990 during Operation DESERT STORM.

With the exception of the headquarters staff comprised of about 1,000 military personnel, U.S. Central command is unique in that it has no permanent combat units assigned. In the event of a contingency, forces from each of the four services and the U.S. Coast Guard would be assigned from both units within each military service. USCENTCOM operates small Security Assistance Offices in 14 countries in the Central Region. On any given day, the number of U.S. military forward deployed to the Central Region fluctuates between 17,000 and 25,000 personnel. The fluctuation is due to the frequent presence of a U.S. Navy aircraft battle group, a U.S. Navy amphibious ready group, or both operating in the region.



## ***Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command - Admiral Thomas Fargo***

As Commander in Chief of the Pacific Command, Fargo answers directly to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, via the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. The mission of the U.S. Pacific Command is to enhance security and promote peaceful development in the Asia-Pacific region by deterring aggression, responding to crises and fighting to win. Admiral Fargo's position as the senior U.S. military commander in the Pacific and Indian Oceans require him to represent the U.S. military for defense arrangements by coordinating the unified commands and directing the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine operations in the region.

In the wake of the United States' war on terrorism, Admiral Fargo has dealt with an exceedingly complex situation. He is deeply concerned about the military situation between India and Pakistan. Their nuclear capabilities make matters just that much more serious. In spite of the conflict between India and Pakistan, both countries agreed to assist U.S. efforts to locate Osama bin Laden – this agreement is still in place. Admiral Fargo and other diplomats are hopeful that this quasi agreement concerning the elimination of terrorists will serve as a stepping stone toward a resolution of the conflict between India and Pakistan, concerning Kashmir.



## ***Director, Defense Intelligence Agency - Vice Admiral Thomas R. Wilson***

Thomas Wilson is the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA). DIA is a Department of Defense combat support agency and an important member of the United States Intelligence Community. It is a major producer and manager of foreign military intelligence. DIA provides military intelligence to war fighters, defense policymakers and force planners, in the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community, in support of U.S. military planning and operations.

Wilson has been quite public regarding his concerns in defending the U.S. He has said:

“Not everyone shares our particular view of the future and disaffected states, groups, and individuals will remain an important factor and a key challenge for US policy. Some (e.g. Iran, various terrorists, and other criminal groups) simply reject or fear our values and goals. They will continue to exploit certain aspects of globalization, even as they try to fend off some of its consequences (like openness and increased global connectivity). They will frequently engage in violence – targeting our policies, facilities, interests, and personnel – to advance their interests and undermine ours.

Others, either unable or unwilling to share in the benefits of globalization, will face deepening economic stagnation, political instability, and cultural alienation. These conditions will create fertile ground for political, ethnic, ideological, and religious extremism. For many of those ‘left behind,’ the US will be viewed as a primary source of their troubles and a primary target of their frustration. Still others will, at times, simply resent (or be envious of) US power and perceived hegemony, and will engage in ‘milder’ forms of anti-US rhetoric and behavior. As a consequence, we are likely to confront temporary anti-US ‘coalitions’ organized or spontaneously forming to combat or rally against a specific US policy initiative or action...”

His view suggests that defending U.S. interests is a complex task, one that cannot be easily handled through military, political or economic means alone. More likely it is a combination of the three, along with strong multilateral support that will best answer U.S. defense needs.





## ***Assistant to the President for Economic Policy (APEP) - Lawrence B. Lindsey***

The APEP is invited to, but not required to attend, all NSC meetings. The Assistant's principal duty, as the name implies, is to advise the President on domestic and international macro-economic policy.

The U.S. economy is in a mild recovery, following the shocks of the Tech stock crash and the attacks on New York and Washington. Unemployment currently is running around 6%, with roughly 8.5 million people unemployed. The current account deficit for the fourth quarter of 2001 was some \$98.8 billion and the trade deficit in February 2002 was at \$31.5 billion. The Gross Domestic Product was up 5.8% in the first quarter of 2002. Of some concern are oil prices, which have risen steadily since the beginning of April. Iraq had curtailed its export of petroleum to the West, but has since rescinded that reduction. In sum, the state of the U.S. economy is sound, and the recovery continues.

The US has significant economic interests in Pakistan, though its overriding interest is still a military one. In 2000, the US had a \$1.47 billion trade deficit with Pakistan, importing more than \$2.12 billion worth of goods from the country. US exports to Pakistan totaled approximately \$647 million in 2000. The Pakistani economy had been doing generally well over the past two years, though it had undergone a few minor shocks, namely the increase in oil prices and the takeover of a military dictatorship (a bloodless one). More recently, drought and the terrorist attacks of September 11 have had a decidedly negative impact on the economy. Growth, which was consistently 3.5% in the past few years, went down slightly recently.

US economic interests in India are huge. The U.S. is the largest investor in India and its biggest trading partner. Principal U.S. exports to India are aircraft and parts, advanced machinery, fertilizers, ferrous waste and scrap metal, and computer hardware. Major U.S. imports from India include textiles and ready-made garments, agricultural and related products, gems and jewelry, leather products, and chemicals. U.S. aid to India is roughly \$140 million, which is down from previous years. India's enormous population base - second only to China - and its relatively stable and functional democracy make it a very lucrative market for US companies, though wealth distribution is so polarized that more than a third of India's 1.03 billion people do not have adequate diets. Unlike Pakistan, India's economy is much more developed and thus does not face many of the problems Pakistan does. Although the Indian Government has been setting impressive growth rate targets for the economy, the downtrodden grass root levels of the population still have a long way to go. The poverty level in India stands at 27%, which is still very much short of the targeted level of 16.5% set for 2001-2002.



## ***Assistant to the President for Homeland Security - Governor Thomas J. Ridge***

On October 8, 2001, Tom Ridge was sworn in as the first Director of the Office of Homeland Security in the history of the United States of America.

The President announced his decision to create the Office of Homeland Security and to tap Ridge to lead it in his speech to a special joint session of Congress on Sept. 20 in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11. The 10-page executive order signed by the president directs the office to "coordinate the executive branch's efforts to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks within the United States" and is to periodically review and coordinate revisions to that strategy as necessary.

The Assistant to the President for Homeland Security is primarily responsible for coordinating the domestic responses in the event of an imminent terrorist threat or actual terrorist act and is the President's principal point of contact with respect to coordination of such efforts. The assistant is to coordinate with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, as appropriate. The position does not afford the holder of the position any statutory authority over the budgets of the 46 departments and agencies that conduct counter-terrorism activities. The Assistant to the President for Homeland Security, however, will advise the Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget on whether the various organizations are spending their funds wisely.



## ***White House Chief of Staff - Andrew H. Card***

Andrew H. Card is Chief of Staff for the presidential administration of George W. Bush. The Chief of Staff has critical roles, which fall into two main categories: managerial and advisory. In addition to managing staff and the flow of information to the President, the Chief of Staff must also help advise the President on both policy and politics. He has to be skilled at negotiating within the governmental environment and protecting the President's interests. In order to be successful in this position, decisiveness, sensitivity, credibility, and political savvy are essential character traits.

The selection of the White House staff is usually left up to the Chief of Staff. The Chief of Staff also structures the White House Office. There are important differences in operating patterns that distinguish between relatively strong and weak Chiefs of Staff. The primary difference is the degree to which the Chief of Staff controls information flow to the President and the extent of the Chief of Staff's control over the President's schedule. Another dimension of the Chief's strength involves the scope of his control of information and access. The NSC is one of the principal White House competitors of the Chief of Staff. Some chiefs have insisted that the NSC go through them while others have not; however this decision is not always left up to them alone.

The gatekeeper role also involves the function of honest broker. The Chief of Staff cannot use his position to impose his policy views on the President. Without seeing all sides, the President could be seriously blind-sighted. Honest brokerage does not mean having no opinions or refusing to offer them when they are asked for, rather it means assuring the decision process will include all relevant points of view without allowing the views of the Chief to bias the process. Particularly, the Chief of Staff must be perceived as honest and trustworthy among cabinet members, assured that he would not shape information that would unduly affect the President's decision-making.



## **White House Counsel - Alberto Gonzales**

The White House Counsel is the President's legal counsel. The task of the Counsel is to advise the President on matters relating to the conduct of governing. This includes monitoring matters of ethics, coordinating Presidential actions and intentions with other elements of the Executive Branch, recommending courses of action to the President, assisting with the interpretation of legal statutes for the President, and working with Congress on the President's behalf. The White House Counsel is not the President's personal attorney, however. Should the President find him or herself in a civil suit, for example, the White House Counsel would not assist. In legal disputes between the White House and other branches of government, the White House Counsel would be involved.

The role of the White House Counsel with regard to peacekeeping operations is to ensure that the U.S. does so legally. The basis for U.S. participation in peacekeeping rests upon the National Security Strategy. As the National Security Strategy is still under review by the Hart-Rudman Commission, the White House has decided to rest its peacekeeping policy on the Clinton Administration's Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25). This directive establishes the basis and answers the fundamental question of why the U.S. "...participates in peace operations: because it is in the national interest to do so..."<sup>32</sup> There are 11 elements to consider when it comes to the legal basis for peacekeeping:

1. Participation advances U.S. interests.
2. Both the unique and general risks to American personnel are considered acceptable.
3. Personnel, funds, and other resources are available.
4. US participation is necessary for the success of the operation.
5. The US military's role is tied to clear objectives.
6. There is an identifiable endpoint for U.S. participation.
7. There is domestic and congressional support for the operation, or such support can be obtained.
8. The command and control arrangements are acceptable.

And if peacekeeping will involve combat troops:

1. There is a determination to commit sufficient forces to achieve clearly defined objectives.
2. There is a plan to decisively achieve those objectives.
3. There is a commitment to reassess and adjust the size, composition, and disposition of U.S. forces, as necessary, to achieve our objectives.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Bowens, Glenn, Legal Issues in Peace Operations, *Parameters*, Winter 1998.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.



## ***Deputy Secretary of Defense - Dr. Paul Wolfowitz***

As the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz is delegated full power and authority to act for the Secretary of Defense and exercise the powers of the Secretary on any and all matters for which the Secretary is authorized. The Secretary of Defense is the principal defense policy adviser to the President and is responsible for the formulation of general defense policy and policy related to all matters of direct concern to the Department of Defense, and for the execution of approved policy. Under the direction of the President, the Secretary exercises authority, direction and control over the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense is also a member of both the National Security Council and the President's Cabinet.

The Department of Defense is increasingly concerned with the escalation of tension in the disputed region of Kashmir. Pakistan's mobilization is the largest in 30 years. The DOD has informed the President of the grave dangers posed by the conflict between the two neighboring nuclear states. It is imperative that the President and the Department of Defense recognize the threat posed directly to the United States, especially during the launch of the War on Terrorism. Pakistan's role is central to the success of the war against terrorism in Afghanistan. Now more than ever the United States must encourage positive relations with the region in order to promote the use of diplomacy rather than aggression.

Wolfowitz's objections to peacekeeping are well known. He has been quite public in his views on peacekeeping – it detracts from the main mission of the military, namely the defense of U.S. interests. If there is a role for the U.S. military, it involves targeting Al Qaeda and Taliban sympathizers. As for Pakistan and India, the U.S. should studiously avoid favoring one over the other.



## ***Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs - James A. Kelly***

The Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, headed by Assistant Secretary James A. Kelly, deals with U.S. foreign policy and U.S. relations with the countries in the Asia-Pacific region including China, but not Pakistan and India.

Kelly is seen as a proponent of strong U.S.-China relations, saying, "US-China cooperation in the global struggle against terrorism is a top priority in the [bilateral] relationship, a point that the [US] president will make clearly when he visits China." - October 19, 2001. From Kelly's perspective, China's assistance is required in Washington's efforts on global nonproliferation and limiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction. On the economic front, China's recent entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO) should – hopefully – take care of many of the traditional problems in the U.S.-China relationship, such as protection of intellectual property.



## ***Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations - David Welch***

David Welch is the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations. The Bureau of International Organization Affairs (IO) is responsible for developing and implementing U.S. policy in the United Nations (UN), the UN's specialized agencies and other international organizations. IO works in conjunction with the U.S. Mission to the UN, Geneva, and Vienna.

Through multi-lateral diplomacy IO aims to promote U.S. policy. As the U.S. played a large role in the creation of the UN and other international organizations, it maintains a strong leadership role in them, and works to ensure that they remain effective. Through these organizations, IO seeks to promote worldwide:

- Peace-including peacekeeping operations and preventive diplomacy
- Security-including the nonproliferation of arms, nuclear safeguards and combating terrorism
- Democracy-support for democratic principles
- Human Rights-including the advancement of woman's rights
- Economic Growth-specifically through market economies and free trade
- Trade-focusing on improved American opportunities through cooperation in fields such as communication, transportation, and labor
- Health-improved health standards, and eradication of major diseases
- Humanitarian Assistance-specifically assistance to refugees, displaced persons, and victims of disaster
- Environment-including the setting of standards to promote environmental protection
- Transportation Safety-the establishment of safety and security standards for air and sea travel

IO pursues these goals through numerous international organizations, including the World Health Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, and the International Maritime Organization.





## ***Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South Asian Affairs - Christina B. Rocca***

Christina B. Rocca is Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs for the Bush Administration. She heads the Bureau of South Asian Affairs, which deals with U.S. foreign policy and U.S. relations with the countries of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

She has what must be today one of the most difficult posts, in that she must balance relationships with both India and Pakistan. While the U.S. was closely allied with Pakistan during the 1980's, relations became strained throughout the 1990's. Whereas, U.S. relations with India were cool during the Cold War, they have warmed considerably during the 1990's. Today, the U.S. is seen as an even-handed friend of both. This even-handedness grew out of, in part, the war on terrorism.

The South Asia Bureau of the State Department is on record saying:

“... as we have said before, we will strongly support the sustained engagement at a senior level between India and Pakistan because the best way to address longstanding bilateral disputes and make real progress toward a reduction in tensions and peaceful resolution of their differences is through dialogue.”

Sustaining this dialogue, and continuing the peace effort is central to the mission of the Bureau of South Asian Affairs.

Unfortunately, the news from South Asia has been most depressing. Maoists continue to assail the government of Nepal, internal strife is rampant in India, Pakistan is rife with internal discord, including ethnic violence as well as religious violence. One bright spot has come from Sri Lanka, where the Tamil Tigers have entered into what appears to be a stable cease-fire with the government. Nonetheless, the Bureau of South Asia Affairs is keen to see the Kashmiri peace deal approved by the National Security Council.



## ***United States Ambassador to the United Nations - Joan D. Negroponte***

Joan D. Negroponte is the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Her job is to represent the interests of the U.S. before both the UN General Assembly and the Security Council. Negroponte is known as a political conservative, and a strong opponent of, among other things, normalization of relations with Cuba. Prior to September 11 her nomination as U.S. Ambassador to the UN was expected to be difficult. Negroponte's political conservatism underscored her stated objective of combating 'extremist agendas' put forward by others at the UN. After September 11, Senators collectively took the view that they would put their objections aside.

Publicly, Negroponte favors the deployment of UN peacekeepers in Kashmir, though she does not favor the use of U.S. troops. She has said of peacekeeping and U.S. involvement:

"UN peacekeeping missions help us contribute to international peace and security without necessarily committing US troops; and they leverage scarce resources by enlisting valuable contributions to such missions by other members of the international community. Of the 43,000 United Nations peacekeepers deployed throughout the world today, only 44 troops are from the United States, all but one in observer status.

She sees the UN being most operationally effective in providing humanitarian relief and aid.



## ***Senior White House Advisor - Karol Rove***

As Senior White House Advisor Karol Rove plays a primarily political role, with no official departmental responsibility. Rove has been associated with the Bush family since the early 1970's and later worked on George Bush's 1980 Presidential campaign. Rove has been closely advising George W. Bush since he announced he was a candidate for Governor in Texas in November 1993. By January 1994, Bush had spent \$613,930 on the race against incumbent Ann Richards. Over half of that, \$340,579, went to Rove. In a state long dominated by Democrats, every statewide elected office was, by 1999, held by a Republican, earning Rove accolades amongst Republicans.

Rove's role is to advise President Bush on the political consequences of his administration's actions. For Rove, everything is politics and re-election, and no action by the administration falls outside Rove's political radar, including foreign policy. As one journalist said, "Rove is probably the most influential and important political consultant to a president that we've ever seen." For some time Rove has been keen to see the President make the most of his foreign policy actions, which has led some to comment negatively on Rove's motivations.



## Related Web Links

### ***Related Institute Resources***

Kashmir Web Links [www.usip.org/library/regions/kashmir.html](http://www.usip.org/library/regions/kashmir.html)

### ***Other Web Resources***

Human Rights Watch:

*Behind the Kashmir Conflict* <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/kashmir/>

*Attack on Civilians in Jammu  
Condemned* <http://hrw.org/press/2002/07/kashmir0716.htm>

BBC: Q&A: The Kashmir  
Dispute <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/353352.stm>

Washington Post: The  
Kashmir Conflict <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/world/kashmir/front.html>

INCORE Guide to Internet  
Sources on Conflict and  
Ethnicity in Kashmir <http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/cds/countries/kashmir.html>

Hindustan Times: The  
Kashmir Conflict (Indian  
partisan view) [http://www.hindustantimes.com/news/611\\_0\\_001300430001.htm](http://www.hindustantimes.com/news/611_0_001300430001.htm)

paknews.com: Kashmir  
(Pakistan partisan view) <http://paknews.com/kashmir/kashmir.php>