A Tri-Perspective Analysis of the 1971 Indo-Pak War: Individual State and Systemic Dimensions

Dr Aleem Gillani[1]*, Prof Dr Sajid Mehmood Shahzad[2], Mr. Abdul Rehman[3]

[1]*Cluster Head (Faculty of International Relations), Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University, Islamabad Campus. Email: aleem_gillani@hotmail.com
[2]Vice Chancellor, Minhaj Univerity Lahore, Email: smfoee@hotmail.com
[3]Lecturer, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Central Punjab, Email: abdur.rehman1@ucp.edu.pk

*Corresponding Author: Dr Aleem Gillani
*Cluster Head (Faculty of International Relations), Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University, Islamabad Campus. Email: aleem_gillani@hotmail.com

Abstract
The present study aims to explain the 1971 Indo-Pak War using Kenneth Waltz's three images of war. It employs individual state and systemic lenses for in-depth analysis. The analysis starts at an individual level with a specific focus on the actions decisions and personal traits of key leaders such as Indira Gandhi Yahya Khan and Mujibur Rahman. A state-level analysis also looks into political dynamics within India and Pakistan to see how domestic politics regime type and internal pressures shaped each country's strategies and decisions. In addition to these decisions or actions by key leaders, this research recognizes the significant role of systemic forces. Going further than the systemic level is an examination of the broader international context including the role played by global power dynamics alliances as well as geopolitical strategies. This study gives a detailed account of why the war happened and its aftermath.

Introduction:
The 1971 Indo-Pak War resulting in the emergence of the new country of Bangladesh is seen as a turning point in South Asian history. It began with Pakistan accelerating its preparations for military conflict by seeking a first-strike advantage over India preempting any possible invasion of the East. However, on November 21 1971, the Indian Army launched a massive pre-emptive strike against the West Pakistani cities of Lahore and Sialkot. The aim was to leave Pakistan stranded as well as lend support to the Bangladeshi insurgent factions rallying for the formation of an independent state Bangladesh. In response, Pakistan declared war on the Western Front on December 3 1971. Although the largest impacts were in East Pakistan little was realized elsewhere on the Western Front. This paper examines the conflict through individual state and systemic dimensions to provide a comprehensive description of the war and its consequences for regional politics and international relations (Raghavan, 2013).

Literature Review:
Numerous authors have studied the 1971 Indo-Pak War from different angles making the literature vast and diversified. Key works include Sisson and Rose (1990) whose detailed analysis of the war portrays it as a series of misunderstandings and cascade effects in decision-making. Their view is that the war reflected a spiral of misperception in which India and Pakistan lost control not as part of any conscious strategy on either side. Raghavan (2013) frames the war about wider historical trends and international influences while highlighting factors such as external intervention over contingency and conjuncture. Bueno de Mesquita (2002) offers a theoretical framework for global politics and the part leaders play in conflicts becoming more violent by analyzing war within an individualistic/systemic scope. Bass (2013) discusses the international response to the crisis particularly focusing on the controversial US stance. Jahan (1972) examines why national integration in Pakistan failed focusing on the political economic and cultural disparities as root causes of conflict. These groundworks together provide a holistic explanation of how the 1971 war cannot be distilled down to just one narrative or point of view without missing out on other crucial elements (Sisson & Rose, 1990).

Theoretical Framework:
The theoretical framework for the current study is based on three war-images as postulated by Kenneth Waltz: individual-level, state-level and systemic level. This approach opens the possibility of a three-pronged analysis. It considers how leaders at various stages make seemingly idiosyncratic decisions which create political dynamics that may or may not persist as well as fitting such actions into theories about system-based effects (Waltz, 1979).
The first image discusses the role of individual leaders as independent individuals with their behaviour and their choices is shared by Waltz. The second image examines the state as an actor at home its governing institutions and societal culture gaining relevance to the nation. The third one deals with the international system focusing on global power politics alliances and

geopolitical stakes that affect state behaviour. Attracting these three perspectives the study seeks to answer in detail the 1971 Indo-Pak War and the significance of the role played by individual agencies as well as state-level factors rather than systemic forces.

Methodology:

This study is based on a qualitative research methodology primary and secondary sources have been employed to conduct analyses concerning the 1971 Indo-Pak War. These come in the form of government papers speeches and first-hand legacy accounts from notable participants. Secondary academic books journal articles and historical analyses. The study is framed in terms of individual state and systemic levels of analysis (Bayley, 1971).

The literature review consists of a thorough examination and analysis of archival materials historical documents and primary sources. Thematic coding was also implemented to identify themes and patterns across the various analytic levels. This paradigm made it possible to provide an in-depth analysis of the causes behind this kind of war (Freedman, 2000).

The study additionally involved a systematic literature review of studies that demonstrate gaps in existing literature. The objective of triangulation in the research is to have dependable and credible results brought about through data collected from multiple sources.

Individual Level Analysis:

General Agha Muhammad Yahya Khan:

General Yahya Khan showed an inadvertent approach or inept handling of important national affairs. He used others as decision-makers. His strategy was a key factor in the escalation of tension. Yahya Khan later imposed martial law and took over power in 1970 which brought a massive political change in Pakistan. The elections emphasized the deep political division between East and West Pakistan. It was because Yahya failed to resolve the autonomy question of East Pakistan. He miserably failed to understand that the need of the hour was a political solution rather than using hard power (Khan, 1985).

Yahya's mismanagement of the post-election violence and his decision to start military operations in East Pakistan (after authorising and promulgating a secret plan titled "Operation Searchlight") led to widescale atrocities. This lack of foresight over the likely outcomes of his policy as well as very poor handling of the political crisis worsened a conflict which soon tipped into full-scale war (Sisson and Rose 1990).

Yahya Khan's leadership style was characterized by his dependence on the decisions made by those around him. It depicted an inadvertent approach towards the most important national issues. This policy played a significant part in heightening the conflict. Yahya conducted the 1970 elections after imposing martial law and assuming power which resulted in substantial political changes within Pakistan. The polls demonstrated the great political divide between East and West Pakistan. It only made things worse when he was unable to address calls for autonomy in East Pakistan and relied on military responses instead of negotiations (Clausewitz, 1832).

This is how Yahya handled the post-election crisis particularly his decision to engage in military operations in East Pakistan under an operation called "Operation Searchlight" leading to widespread violence. His failure to foresee what would come out of his actions as well as his inability to manage the political crisis effectively contributed towards conflict escalation that culminated in war (Sisson & Rose, 1990). The legacy of Yahya Khan's leadership during this critical period is a testament to the complexities and challenges of military governance in a politically fragmented state.

Yahya's governance was the manifestation of a similar scout-kind of the military mindset that emphasized domination, not consultation. He ended up uniting albeit using brute power in a country that was immensely divided and his so-called unity became the haunting ground as it reflected resistance all over East Pakistan. The history of Yahya Khan's leadership during this momentous period illustrates the difficulties and complexities faced in seeking to attain military rule within a fragmented political entity.

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman:

Sheikh Muijibur Rahman played a major role in politics. His ability to influence others remained instrumental in achieving whatever he wanted at that time. Especially his oratory skills made the difference as he could mobilize the Bengalis towards secession. His Six Points Formula which sought more autonomy for East Pakistan and his calculated exploitation of the growing public sentiment against West Pakistan brought further momentum to separatist forces. Mujib was able to voice what the Bengali people were concerned about and was able to cash the ripe moment (Raghavan, 2013).

Mujib succeeded in reconciling the many factions and parties among the independent East Pakistan Bengali-speaking region of 30 million people. Naturally, his Six-Point Formula advocating the regional control of economic resources and political autonomy struck an immediate cord with a largely Bengali congregation. Although there were initial attempts to find a political solution Mujib's demands became unreasonable and the military deadlock on both sides turned into an anti-government resistance. He contributed crucial leadership to the so-called independence movement to gather more force which culminated in the declaration of independence (Jahan, 1972).

Among other tactics used by Mujib were mass mobilizations strikes and civil disobedience. It caused the administration in East Pakistan to grind halt. His power to tap into worldwide sympathy and support for the Bengali cause was also important. However, the leadership of Mujib was not without controversy; his steps also generated violent reactions which led to more bloodshed and further divided East Pakistan from West (Sen, 1982).

There were two primary reasons behind its success; the Charismatic leadership of Mujib and his sheer capacity to arouse sentiments in the Bengali population. His speeches and appearances stirred the Bengali nation to action giving momentum towards a clearer idea of a united purpose. This helped to keep the flame of so-called independence burning which eventually resulted in a free Bangladesh (Bayley, 1971).

Mujib led with a mix of pragmatism and idealism. While moving deftly through the politics of East Pakistan he managed different constituencies while never losing sight or vision for his people. The legacy of Mujib as a leader serves to demonstrate the efficacy in moments of crisis and what charisma can do from its perspective that it held in holding sway over the masses (Bueno de Mesquita, 2002).

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto:
The political ambitions of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and his refusal to share power with Mujib further exacerbated the crisis. Much of the conflict was fueled by Bhutto and his refusal to accept Mujib's demands or work towards breaking out of the political stalemate. It was because of the reason that Bhutto had supremacy in West Pakistan and he had no trust in handing over power to Mujib. This political deadlock sparked tensions between the two regions (Raghavan, 2013).

The boycott of the national assembly session in Dhaka and the vituperative statements of Bhutto further worsened matters. His political machinations and opposition to Mujib's leadership in East Pakistan were major factors preceding the war. Mujib's political ambitions led to jesting and theatrics with Bhutto which resulted in a breakdown of negotiations and the subsequent military confrontation (Laporte, 1972).

Bhutto's confrontational and uncompromising style of leadership antagonised possible friends and exacerbated existing tensions. His language has also been taken to underscore the differences between East and West Pakistan encouraging a sense of division. Bhutto's desire to pursue a centralised state in West Pakistan compelled him to take a firm stance towards the Awami League which hardened positions on both fronts eventually also entailing any peaceful settlement on this side (Huntington, 1996).

One of Bhutto's strategies was to use his base in West Pakistan against that of Mujib in East Pakistan. One of the key issues that precipitated a major political crisis was his unwillingness to accept the results of the 1970 elections which gave majority status (majority seats -type II) to the Awami League party as represented by seat distribution in the National Assembly. Bhutto demanded a power-sharing deal that would primarily benefit West Pakistan over East Pakistan and the deadlock soon exploded into war (Freedman, 2000).

The political astuteness of Bhutto was visible on his way to power but stubbornness and no common point between him and Mujib had overridden all the benefits. His actions during the crisis period laid bare in broad daylight the bankruptcy of zero-sum politics which placed power at a higher pedestal than national unity and stability. Bhutto's legacy is a mixed one with Bilawal reluctant to talk on record about his great-uncle but praising him in general as an inspirational figure who established the foundation of Pakistani politics (Keohane, 1984).

State Level Analysis:
The origins of the 1971 war lay in the political and structural weaknesses within Pakistan that had long been imposed by its despotic military regime upon East Pakistan. This divide between East Pakistan and West Pakistan coupled with poor governance both politically and militarily (as well as their decision-making from time to time) was just the right soil for conflict. Execution of crucial issues such as political representation economic disparity and linguistic divergence by the state fuelled these regional disharmonies.

Political Instability:
The election of 1970 in which the Awami League triumphed in East Pakistan led to the deepened political cleavage between the two regions. Those elections were a watershed showing just how fed up East Pakistan was with the West. The Awami League led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman won a landslide victory securing 160 of the 162 seats in East Pakistan. Still, the political leadership in West Pakistan was never ready to admit defeat despite the results (Wendt, 1992).

The response of the state to election results declaring martial law and starting military operations made the situation even worse. Launched on March 25 Operation Searchlight was meant to quell the movement against secession in East Pakistan but it resulted in creating a quagmire of problems. The resultant humanitarian crisis saw millions of Kashmiri refugees flooding into India and the Pakistani state was considered responsible for everything (Sisson & Rose, 1990).

This political instability was compounded by the weak governance and institutional vulnerability of Pakistan. The central government's handling of the political crisis through military means represented deeper structural problems. The political system was unresponsive non-transparent and insensitive to the legitimate aspirations of East Pakistanis thereby leading towards growing frustrations. The processes were resented by a large section of society on account of it exclusion of the majority from power-sharing practices (Betts, 2000).

What was even more amusing was the failure of the approach to solving its political crisis. Their decision to delay the convening of the National Assembly's imposition of martial law and its military operations in East Pakistan was indicative that the leadership was unfit to handle the crisis. These measures pushed the Bengali population to be more alienated and calls for independence became strident.

This course of political instability in Pakistan was also shaped by the wider forces of post-colonial state-building. The additional complications resulting from merging different regions and peoples into a single nation-state were exacerbated. It was because the colonial legacy that Pakistan inherited had bequeathed complex fault lines of bitter divisions and inequities. How such structural flaws were left unattended and how authoritarian ways of governance resorting to added an element of delicacy into the very existence on the part of the state. This factor was evident until it nearly drove things out of control during a time when institution failure emerged as a grim necessity for warding off a crisis in East Pakistan (Morgenthau, 1948).

Language Controversy:

The national language of Urdu was imposed which led to tensions with the Bengali-speaking majority in East Pakistan and ultimately behind ire brewing objecting to neighbouring West Pakistan's perceived monopoly. Seen as an attempt to marginalize those from East Pakistan with its language policies implemented not long after the country gained independence. This created ripples of protest and alienation across Bengal.

Language controversy escalated to a head on February 21 1952 when police fired at protesting students in Dhaka. The Bengali Language Movement was a major movement in 1952 pushed by the protesters demanding their languages be given separate official status. Similarly, it would later become part of the Legislative Assembly's resolution towards independence. The state's inattention to the linguistic and cultural aspirations of Bengalis also caused immense discontent which translated into a demand for autonomy (Raghavan, 2013).

The language policy in many ways highlighted the wider culture and political domination regularly faced by the Bengali-speaking people. The planned obsolescence of Urdu as the national language was a rejection of Bangla identity and heritage compounding this sense of estrangement. The response of the state to the language movement only succeeded in widening further divisions between East and West Pakistan providing a precursor for what was to unfold in future years (Smith, 1991).

The issue was not only about the language but also the economy as well because this same group of Bengali speakers had already been disenfranchised in terms of government jobs and higher education. Such linguistic discrimination helped fuel the yawning economic rift between East and West Pakistan breeding increasing demands for self-rule or secession. The language movement brought tension to the forefront and became the rallying point of independence.

The cultural and linguistic policy actualized by the Pakistani state stemmed from a national identity project that was deeply committed to homogenizing Pakistan's diverse population. Yet what that vision failed to appreciate was the extent of Bengali cultural and linguistic identity. It denies that the imposition of Urdu was just one linguistic issue rather it was perceived as a symbol of larger-scale cultural oppression and control by West Pakistan. It was not simply linguistic but cultural self-expression and political autonomy that made the resistance to this policy (Ganguly, 1999).

Economic Disparities:

West Pakistan was perceived to be dominated in terms of the economy and economic imbalance in East Bengal was apparently significant. The more populous East Pakistan got a smaller chunk of resource and development projects. This need to become economically independent gave rise to resentment and a quest for more economic freedom (Kennedy, 1987).

The problems with East Pakistan were compounded by their economic grievances and natural disasters which ravaged the region; in particular, a devastating cyclone in 1970 killed hundreds of thousands. It also made the Bengali population feel more neglected and marginalized due to their perception that the central government had failed miserably in responding adequately to these crises.

This situation led to the devices of political linguistic and economic discrimination among regions in East Pakistan. These unresolved grievances which the state proved unable to either resolve or compensate victims for become the biggest stumbling block of the time. It was accused that the natural wealth of East Pakistan which was being used to fill up empty exchequer and planned economic policies at the national level gave little priority or preference for development projects there. This economic exploitation perception reinforced the call for autonomy and later independence (Bruce, 2008).

These imbalances could be observed in several socio-economic indicators such as income infrastructure development (poverty line) and access to education. The comparison between East and West Pakistan is just another example. Although it was generating significant revenue for the national economy as a whole East Pakistan received very limited investment in state development. This economic disparity helped fan the sentiment of oppression and bolstered calls for more autonomy in financial matters (Bueno de Mesquita, 2002).

A broader geopolitical context also influenced the state's economic policies. The central government's inadvertent approach towards East Pakistan and its tilt towards West Pakistan as a strategic if not also economic hub led to severe grievances. The economic sufferings pertained not only to how resources were shared but also to an acute sense of deprivation in terms of their lives (Bayley, 1971).

East Pakistan was even more economically disadvantaged than before with the central government responding less and less effectively to natural disasters and other emergencies. For example, the lack of support in the 1970 cyclone was regarded as Central Government apathy and unconcern for the cause of the Bengali population. That feeling of being overlooked only helped the sentiment of detachment to grow and also cemented the calls for secession (Goldstein, 2003).

Systemic Level Analysis:

The geopolitical interests of the big powers such as the United States of America. The Soviet Union and China along with other systemic forces also shaped the outcome. The Cold War backdrop also played its part in the superpower engagement of this conflict each vying to advance stakeholder interests on South Asian soil.

Geopolitical Interests:

The US was worried about its friends in India and the wider conflict implications. It did extend limited diplomatic support and some material assistance to Pakistan but held back from direct military involvement.

China supported Pakistan during the 1965 events and also in a limited capacity provided service to her in 1971. China was deep into its border issues with India and engaged to the hilt in protecting its turf within this region. While it never militarily involved itself one of the early statements after the Pakistani government pushed for support was from Saudi Arabia (Huntington, 1996).

The Soviet Union on the contrary contributed to a large extent with aid for India. The strategic partnership was solidified in 1971 with the signing of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace Friendship and Co-operation. The role of the Soviet Union was crucial as it provided intelligence support and military equipment to India which helped become a successful ally during the war (Raghavan, 2013).

The role of the superpowers in this conflict was conditioned by their wider geopolitical considerations during the Cold War. While the US tried to ensure power equilibrium in South Asia and avoid any Soviet influence; the Soviets wanted their strategic partnership with India. China's support of Pakistan was driven in part by Chinese border disputes with India and its wish to contain Indian influence (Betts, 2000).

The role of superpowers in the 1971 war was further enunciated by their domestic political factors. The foreign policy of the Nixon administration in the US was based mainly on détente with China and rapprochement that is warming up contacts (dealing or getting rid of a disagreement) breakup etc with the Soviet Union. It was this strategic calculus that informed the cautious behaviour of the US during the troubles such as avoidance of doing anything which would endanger its wider geopolitical aims (Bueno de Mesquita, 2002).

The broader context of decolonization and the emergence of new states in the post-World War II era also influenced superpower geopolitical interests. During the Cold War America and Russia were at loggerheads with each other. They were surrounded by multiple regional wars including the Indo-Pak war of 1971 as they eyed on expanding their span power while putting a hold on others (Laporte, 1972).

International Intervention:
It became a global geopolitical issue when international actors stepped in. The South Asian strategy of the superpowers played a key role in their support and conduct during the war. This support to India in conjunction with the comparatively much smaller assistance of the US and China to Pakistan as well had a significant effect on the outcome of the war (Freedman, 2000). Diplomatic efforts by the US to mediate between both sides were made in the hope of preventing a regional conflict from exploding into a full-fledged war. But it was hobbled by its strategic alliances and wider Cold War dynamics. By anchoring part of the US Seventh Fleet in the Bay of Bengal it was expected that things would get settled.

In the end, it was the backing of India by the Soviet Union that swung things decisively in New Delhi's favour. Indian forces were aided by Soviet military advisors and equipment while the USSR's all-out diplomatic support allowed for a more even footing in relations with Washington through the UN. The 1971 war reflected the larger systemic forces at work and how a local conflict could be shaped by broader contours of world power (Waltz, 1979).

The internationalization of regional conflicts vis-a-vis global power politics is thus further revealed by international intervention in a regional war. It was the engagement of superpowers that not only impacted on outcome of the war but even cast its effects on the regional order making the latter independent in post-war South Asia. It showed how regional actors are coordinating with and playing off one another amid international competition (Ganguly, 1999).

Humanitarian Issues in the 1971 conflict motivated International Response. The massive violence in East Pakistan led to an international outcry with demands for action. The crisis of refugees with the thousands and later millions of Bengalis taking a flight to India brought out human costs but also humanitarian overtones which affected global reaction.

The impending humanitarian crisis in East Pakistan suffering from the series of cyclones and the formation of refugee influx into India had created enormous international pressure on West Pakistan. This global attentiveness which is an important factor of various host countries and humanitarian actors' responses to date does not stand solely in sharp discrepancy with the treatment of other Western statesmen/architects or even former dictators but it also points at a more systematic relation between geopolitics and humanitarians concerns (Mearsheimer, 2001).

Results and Key Findings:
This study reveals the intricate balances of individual state and systemic factors that can plague even a brief war (such as the 1971 Indo-Pak War) with some far-reaching implications. At the individual level decisions and actions by leaders like Yahya Khan Mujibur Rahman Zulfikar Ali Bhutto moved this conflict into a war. The violence was greatly escalated due to Yahya Khan's dependence on military solutions and their indifference to political grievances in East Pakistan. The independence movement was stoked in the east when Mujibur Rahman leveraging his leadership of Bengali Nationalism forced Bhutto's hand through a campaign for secession while at the same time, Bhutto tried to wing it as premier and win. At a state level within Pakistan, there were tensions of political instability; economic disparities and language which contributed to the conflict. The inept handling of conflict through hard power created a quagmire of problems (Hameed et al., 2020).

The systemic implications including the conflicting geopolitical interests of superpowers in the Middle East propelled by their involvement played a significant part in driving how the war solution unfolded. The Soviet Union's support on humanitarian grounds to India vs the limited US and Chinese aid in similar terms altered the course of direction by contrast. In the context of the Cold War and superpower strategic calculations, an armed conflict in a region turned rapidly into a global geopolitical confrontation.

Instead, they reflect how addressing political economic and cultural grievances must be pursued through dialogue and negotiation rather than military options. It has underlined the imperative of regional cooperation and global assistance to prevent conflict including any element that it may cause or trigger. Key takeaways that matter are that the 1971 war has therefore important lessons for understanding and dealing with South Asian challenges (Morgenthau, 1948).

The findings also suggest that both misperceptions and miscalculations of the situation have exacerbated tensions. The heads of state in Pakistan India and the international community all had less than perfect information to work with leading them down misguided corridors that finally ended up disintegrating diplomatic channels causing eventual war. This is a key to prevent future atrocities like this.

These findings likewise underscore the importance of good governance political inclusivity and economic equity for ensuring national unity and stability. The spectacle of the 1971 Indo-Pak War is a telling reminder of how political mismanagement can lead to disastrous results and why the real need of the hour should be addressing causes without war but peace (Sen, 1982).

The findings of the study also have significant implications for policymakers operating in or looking to set/regulate policy about this region. The experiences of 1971 can provide both positive and negative insight into what it takes to secure regional peace consensus-building by addressing historical injustices and grievances as well as preventing the spread of a similar conflict. Similarly, the events of 1971 warn against delay and ineffective international intervention in humanitarian crises (Stern et al., 1999).

Conclusion:

The War of 1971 between India and Pakistan was a complex struggle characterized by personal ambitions intra-state political misfortunes as well as systemic international determinants. The war led to the independence of Bangladesh and changed global politics. The implications for the wider dynamics of war and peace in South Asia to have an appreciation of this conflict are profound.

Much of the conflict that led to war was orchestrated by individual actions and decisions executed by leadership such as those made by Yahya Khan; Mujibur Rahman; and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Historical political and structural insecurities in Pakistan shown by its numerous coups depict the mishandling of the situations. Moreover, there also were disparities in the economy as well as concerns with language that eventuated into a violent conflict. International actors and major powers' geostrategic interests have turned it into a global geopolitical struggle from the original regional conflict.

Lessons from the 1971 Indo-Pak War insisted that political economic and cultural injustices can not only be resolved through the relentless use of military power. It highlights the urgency for regional cooperation as well as international support in the prevention and resolution of conflicts. Lessons from the 1971 war were relevant then too and are for South Asia today as it wrestles with its tangled political inheritance.

Understanding these patterns can provide useful lessons for ex-ante conflict prevention again stressing the need for good governance and inclusive politics combined with equitable economic policies to prevent conflicts. This was a warning that India never heeded and the 1971 Indo-Pak War stands testimony to the fact that poor political management can create future conflict escalation under unaddressed grievances which could have been sorted amicably.

Conclusions from this study have broader implications for how domestic and international level dynamics interact in conflict processes. It consisted not of a bilateral conflict but part of wider geopolitical struggles and internal politico-military crises. This defies the need for sustained and inclusive dialogue in addressing conflicts from its multiple dimensions.

References:
1. Akram, Z. (2019). Principal actors involved in the 1971 war. Interview by author.
2. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.
3. Bass, G. (2013). The Blood Telegram: Nixon, Kissinger and a Forgotten Genocide. Knopf.
4. Bayley, D. H. (1971). India's response to the refugee problem. Journal of Asian Studies, 30(3), 567-581.
5. Betts, R. K. (2000). Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace. Pearson.
6. Bruce, J. P. (2008). Climate Change: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.
7. Bueno de Mesquita, B. (2002). The War Trap Revisited. Princeton University Press.
8. Chomsky, N. (2003). Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance. Metropolitan Books.
9. Clausewitz, C. V. (1832). On War. Princeton University Press.
10 Freedman, L. (2000). The Revolution in Strategic Affairs. Oxford University Press.
11. Goldstein, J. S. (2003). International Relations. Pearson Longman.
12. Haqqani, H. (2005). Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
13. Huntington, S. P. (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster.
14. Jahan, R. (1972). Pakistan: The Tragicomedy of National Integration. Columbia University Press.
15. Kaldor, M. (1999). New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era. Stanford University Press.
16. Kennedy, P. (1987). The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. Random House.
17. Khan, A. M. Y. (1985). The Great Tragedy. Jang Publishers.
18. Keohane, R. O. (1984). After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton University Press.
19. Kissinger, H. (1979). White House Years. Little, Brown and Company.
20. Kohli, A. (2001). The Success of India's Democracy. Cambridge University Press.
21. Laporte, R. (1972). The Political Instability in Pakistan. Asian Survey, 12(5), 387-402.
22. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. W. W. Norton & Company.
23. Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. Alfred A. Knopf.
24. Napathorn, C. (2022). Green Human Resource Management. Springer.
25. Nye, J. S. (2004). Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. PublicAffairs.
26. Paul, T. V. (2005). The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry. Cambridge University Press.
27. Posen, B. R. (1984). The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars. Cornell University Press.
28. Rajagopalan, R. (2008). Neorealism and the Indo-Pak Conflict. Cambridge University Press.
29. Raghavan, S. (2013). 1971: A Global History of the Creation of Bangladesh. Harvard University Press.
30. Sen, A. (1982). Choice, Welfare and Measurement. Harvard University Press.

31. Sisson, R., & Rose, L. (1990). War and Secession: Pakistan, India & the Creation of Bangladesh. University of California Press.
32. Smith, A. (1991). National Identity. University of Nevada Press.
33. Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Abel, T., Guagnano, G. A., & Kalof, L. (1999). A Value-Belief-Norm Theory of Support for Social Movements: The Case of Environmentalism. Human Ecology Review, 6(2), 81-97.
34. Sungu, L., Weng, Q., Xu, M., & Cao, X. (2019). Green Human Resource Management and Employee Green Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model. Business Strategy and the Environment, 28(7), 951-963.
35. Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of International Politics. Addison-Wesley.
36. Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425.
37. Wellde, M. (2002). The War Trap Revisited. Princeton University Press.