

Kallol Chakrabarti

Designation: Independent Researcher & Published Author

EMAIL:

kallolchitralimagicpen@gmail.com

ORCID: [0009-0007-4971-8936](https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4971-8936)

The Shadow Doctrine: Guns, Dams, and Diplomacy in Asymmetric Conflict

Abstract:

Contemporary statecraft increasingly employs asymmetric, hybrid methods, supplanting conventional warfare. Nations utilize non-attributable instruments—ranging from proxy kinetic operations to resource leverage—to pursue geopolitical objectives without overt interstate conflict. This paper posits India's development of a "Shadow Doctrine" as a strategic response to Pakistan's persistent asymmetric threats [1]. This doctrinal evolution follows four conventional wars (1947-48, 1965, 1971, 1999 Kargil War) lost by Pakistan and the subsequent 1998 nuclearization of both nations [2]. This doctrine is analyzed through a tripartite framework: 1) Deniable Kinetic Retaliation (e.g., surgical strikes, operations targeting terrorist centers), 2) Hydro-Strategic Coercion (e.g., recalibrating Indus Waters Treaty utilization), and 3) Diplomatic Isolation (e.g., amplifying regional pressures and internal fissures). Examining events like surgical strikes (2016 Uri, 2019 Balakot), shifts in India's IWT stance, and evolving regional alignments, this paper argues India is formulating a silent, multi-domain strategy [3]. This strategy aims to reshape regional power dynamics while circumventing traditional warfare. The analysis critically assesses implications for Sino-Pakistani interests, Pakistan's internal stability, and the broader South Asian security architecture, also considering technological, international, and ethical dimensions [4].

Keywords:

Hydro-strategic coercion, Asymmetric deterrence, Gray zone conflict South Asia, Cross-border terrorism India Pakistan, Indus Waters Treaty security, Non-attributable operations, Multi-domain coercion strategy, Cyber warfare South Asia, International law water disputes, Ethical implications of hybrid warfare.

1. Introduction:

The Imperative for Unconventional Responses

The post-World War II security landscape reveals a significant transition from declared interstate wars towards hybrid conflict paradigms, where plausible deniability is a critical operational element [5]. For India, enduring cross-border security challenges (e.g., Mumbai 2008, Pulwama 2019) necessitated responses beyond conventional military postures [6]. Pakistan, after losing four conventional wars to India and the 1998 subcontinent nuclearization, increasingly adopted asymmetric strategies [7], [8]. These strategies leverage plausible deniability for disruptive actions, exemplified by the 2001 Indian Parliament attack and the 2008 Mumbai attacks [8]. Plausible deniability allows sponsoring states to evade direct accountability for such acts [9].

India's "Shadow Doctrine"—this paper's term for an inferred integrated application of kinetic, economic (hydro-strategic), and diplomatic pressures—emerged, particularly post-2014, to counter these tactics [10]. This conceptualization builds upon the author's prior exploratory work on this emerging strategic behavior [31]. This shift was marked by surgical strikes (2016 Uri, 2019 Balakot) and non-kinetic measures [11], [12]. Escalation scenarios encompass precision strikes on terrorist centers across Pakistan with minimal civilian casualties, a capability discussed in strategic circles [12]. This doctrine operates within the "gray zone" but possesses distinct characteristics tailored to the India-Pakistan

dynamic, destabilizing adversarial networks without initiating full-scale hostilities [13].

Its development is contextualized within realist interpretations of power balancing and an evolution of asymmetric environment deterrence theory [14].

2. Literature Review:

Synthesizing Disparate Fields:

Contemporary scholarship examines independent aspects of hybrid warfare frameworks, resource-based conflict dynamics, and proxy engagement strategies, collectively forming this analysis's conceptual foundation [15]. Langlois and Langlois offer critical insights into bargaining dynamics characterizing asymmetric deterrence relationships, yet their framework inadequately addresses the South Asian nuclear security context. Despite this substantial work, a significant theoretical lacuna exists regarding middle power operationalization of these strategic elements in a synchronized, cross-domain approach within specific regional contexts [3]. Sweijs et al. propose an integrated framework for analyzing hybrid threats but omit specific discussion of the India-Pakistan security dynamic.

Existing Indus Waters Treaty research predominantly concentrates on juridical frameworks and engineering considerations; Vater's analysis represents this tendency, underexploring the treaty's potential function as a strategic instrument [16]. Concurrently, Grare's Balochistan examination provides detailed analysis of Pakistan's non-state actor employment as strategic proxies, yet theoretical literature contains comparatively limited exploration of systematic, deniable countermeasures by regional powers facing persistent asymmetric threats [17]. This research addresses this gap by integrating three previously disconnected domains—hydro-strategic leverage, non-attributable operations, and

diplomatic isolation—to conceptualize India's Shadow Doctrine. This framework is distinguished from generalized hybrid warfare theory by its tailored application to the specific nuclear-armed rivalry context and its distinctive coercive mechanism combination [3].

3. Deniable Kinetic Actions: The "Unknown Gunmen" Factor:

Incidents attributed to unidentified perpetrators, including targeted neutralizations of designated militants within Pakistani territory, indicate deniable kinetic operation capability development [18]. Schmitt's analysis highlights attribution's legal and ethical challenges in modern covert operations, a framework applicable to examining non-attributable incidents in South Asia. The fundamental methodological challenge here involves empirically establishing state sponsorship for such operations, typically requiring sophisticated pattern analysis and investigative journalism [19], [20]. As Floyd observes, plausible deniability is increasingly central to contemporary strategic competition [9].

Post-2014, India demonstrably shifted its posture after terrorist attacks with documented surgical strikes (2016 Uri, 2019 Balakot), signaling a transition from strategic restraint to calibrated response [21], [32]. Beyond acknowledged operations, Fair documents Pakistani allegations of India's approach extending to supporting separatist movements, undermining Pakistan's own asymmetric capabilities [39]. Similarly, Staniland's insurgent network analysis examines claims of external support for dissident movements throughout contested border regions [40].

Allegations documented in scholarly literature state these broader Indian activities include:

Support for Baloch separatists: Claims of covert backing destabilizing Pakistan's internal cohesion and China-Pakistan Economic Corridor projects [40]

Exploitation of ethnic fault lines: Encouragement of Pashtun nationalist movements

compounding Pakistan's domestic security challenges [39]

Provincial destabilization: Reported connections with urban political movements like the Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM) exacerbating Sindh province tensions [40]

Border region agitation: Efforts to intensify discontent among specific communities in disputed territories [39]

The strategic logic underlying such activities aligns with contemporary asymmetric deterrence theories: psychological disruption of adversary decision-making, proxy network fragmentation, and sufficient deniability to complicate proportional retaliation [9].

4. Operation Sindoor: A Paradigm of Narrativized Kinetic Response

The conceptual exploration of multi-domain operations in preliminary work on this doctrine introduced the "Operation Sindoor" framework, representing a distinct facet of India's evolving kinetic strategy [31]. This operation, as framed in strategic discourse, exemplifies the integration of military action with potent psycho-cultural messaging. The nomenclature "Sindoor"—a traditional vermilion mark symbolizing marital status and, by extension, the husband's protective role for Hindu women—was strategically employed. This framing reportedly followed incidents such as the Pahalgam attack, perceived by Indian security analysts as a Pakistani endeavor to instigate communal Hindu-Muslim divisions.

The strategic communication surrounding "Operation Sindoor," reportedly articulated by female military officers such as Colonel Sofia Ansari and Wing Commander Vamika, aimed to project a specific narrative: India, as a land where feminine divine power ("Devi Durga") is revered and many cities bear names derived from goddesses, will respond decisively to threats against national dignity, particularly those targeting women. This messaging intended to underscore a resolute national will.

Operationally, "Operation Sindoor" is reported to have achieved significant tactical successes. On its initial day of major action, it allegedly struck nine terrorist camps with precision, neutralizing hostile elements while explicitly avoiding civilian casualties. Subsequent phases reportedly involved sustained drone and missile attacks penetrating deep into Pakistani territory, including strategically significant areas like Punjab province. The continuing nature of "Operation Sindoor" underscores a sustained campaign. This operation, through its reported successes and deliberate narrative construction, highlights the Indian military's enhanced capabilities and the government's commitment to proactive, precision-based responses against perceived asymmetric threats.

5. Hydro-Strategic Coercion: Reinterpreting the Indus Waters Treaty

5.1 Legal and Strategic Context

The 1960 Indus Waters Treaty (IWT) remains the foundational transboundary water allocation framework; Pakistan is particularly dependent on the Indus basin for 60% of its freshwater needs—a vital resource for agricultural production and textile exports [22]. Recent Indian strategic discourse explores IWT reinterpretation through legal mechanisms like *rebus sic stantibus* (Vienna Convention Article 62: fundamental change of circumstances), with some policy analysts advocating linking treaty compliance to Pakistan's counterterrorism efforts [23].

Asserted Legal Positions:

India's Argument: Persistent state-sponsored terrorism constitutes an unforeseen fundamental change, modifying treaty obligations [24]

Pakistan's Counter: The IWT's perpetual status and lack of termination clauses limit unilateral modifications; humanitarian consequences require consideration [25], [27]

Emerging Hydro-Strategic Dynamics:

1. Flow Control: Documented Chenab River flow reductions—attributed by Pakistani officials to upstream Indian infrastructure—exacerbated water stress in Pakistan's agricultural regions [38]
2. Secondary Pressure Points: India-Afghanistan cooperation on Kabul River management compounds Pakistan's water insecurity [28]

Strategic Implications: This integrated hydro-coercion approach represents a deliberate escalation in India's asymmetric strategy, combining:

- Legal reinterpretation of treaty terms [23-26]
- Physical control of water resources [38]
- Diplomatic encirclement through third-party agreements [28]

The cumulative effect imposes gradual economic costs while maintaining plausible deniability [3].

5.2 Economic and Environmental Implications

A reorientation of India's water management policies—including maximum Eastern river allocation utilization, expanded Western river infrastructure development within IWT technical parameters, suspension of certain treaty mechanisms, and collaboration on Kabul River governance—results in significant downstream water availability reduction [22]. Qamar et al. document how transboundary water issues already affect downstream region agricultural productivity. Such hydrological alterations introduce considerable stress to Pakistan's agriculture-dependent economy, where water-intensive sectors form a substantial national GDP component [26]. Zeitoun and Warner's hydro-hegemony framework provides analytical tools for understanding how shared water resource control translates into economic leverage in asymmetric power relationships.

These economic implications extend beyond direct agricultural impacts. Modified river flow regimes affect planned China-Pakistan Economic Corridor hydroelectric infrastructure operational viability, thereby introducing additional regional investment framework complexity [22]. Qamar et al. further note reduced water availability has measurable agricultural yield impacts in water-stressed regions, with particularly pronounced effects on water-intensive crops central to Pakistan's export economy.

Environmentally, substantial freshwater outflow reduction to the Indus Delta accelerates existing ecological degradation processes, including coastal aquifer saltwater intrusion, habitat transformation, and consequent population displacement [26]. Zeitoun and Warner's hydro-hegemony theoretical framework offers relevant analytical tools for understanding these environmental consequences as power asymmetry manifestations in transboundary water governance systems.

6. Diplomatic Isolation and Amplifying Internal Fractures:

6.1 Exploiting Internal Vulnerabilities

India's covert support for ethno-nationalist movements (e.g., Baloch, Sindhi) escalates Pakistan's internal fractures, triggering international forum debates about autonomy or human rights [17], [29], [33].

6.2 Leveraging Regional Dynamics

Afghanistan's collaboration with India on a Kabul River treaty weaponizes water sharing, compounding Pakistan's economic and geopolitical isolation [34].

7. The Technology Dimension: Cyber and Information Warfare:

The Shadow Doctrine incorporates a significant technological component, particularly cyber operations and information warfare [3]. These tools are employed to:

Critical CPEC infrastructure nodes—including Gwadar Port operations, cross-border communication networks, and energy grids—demonstrate measurable cybersecurity vulnerabilities exploited to disrupt Pakistan's economic corridors [36]. Such strategic asset targeting aligns with contemporary hybrid warfare paradigms weaponizing digital-physical system interdependencies.

Contemporary South Asian security landscape information operations demonstrate systematic social media platform weaponization to manipulate public discourse and India-Pakistan institutional trust [35]. These digital campaigns employ sophisticated disinformation tactics targeting pre-existing societal cleavages, thereby amplifying internal divisions and weakening national cohesion.

Support Kinetic and Diplomatic Efforts: Cyber tools gather intelligence for kinetic operations and shape the information environment supporting diplomatic narratives and isolation strategies [3].

8. Why the "Shadow Doctrine" Concept is Novel:

The 'Shadow Doctrine' concept's novelty stems from its integrated multi-domain framework tailored to India's asymmetric challenges with Pakistan—synergizing deniable kinetic action, hydro-strategic coercion, and diplomatic isolation distinctly from broader hybrid warfare theories [3], [5].

Integrated Multi-Domain Framework Specific to India: It encompasses India's synergistic use of deniable kinetic actions, hydro-strategic coercion, and targeted diplomatic isolation, tailored to Pakistan [3].

Hydro-Politics as Coercive Statecraft: It reframes India's water-related actions not merely as resource management but as instruments of deliberate coercive diplomacy [26].

Theorizing State-Sponsored Deniable Kinetic Actions by India: It attributes strategic logic to actions like "unknown gunmen" incidents and support for insurgencies as part of India's counter-asymmetry toolkit [9].

Synthesis of Disparate Strategic Elements: It uniquely combines hydro-politics, covert action, CPEC vulnerabilities, Pakistani internal fissures, and regional diplomacy into a singular strategic framework [3].

Emphasis on Legal and Non-Military Levers: It highlights the strategic weight given to legal interpretations (IWT, Vienna Convention) and environmental factors alongside kinetic and diplomatic efforts [23].

9. Comparative Analysis with Other Doctrines: Contrast with Russian Hybrid Warfare:

Unlike Russia's Gerasimov Doctrine, prioritizing global-scale information operations and political subversion, India's approach demonstrates a tighter regional focus on Pakistan. It uniquely incorporates hydro-strategic coercion as a force multiplier [5].

Distinction from Israeli Deterrence Models: While Israel's Dahiya Doctrine relies on overt, kinetic retaliation against civilian infrastructure, the Shadow Doctrine emphasizes deniable operations and asymmetric economic pressure (e.g., water governance manipulation) over explicit destructive signaling [30].

China's "Three Warfares" (Public Opinion, Psychological, Legal): Parallels exist in psychological and legal measure use [4]. However, the Shadow Doctrine's overt (though deniable) kinetic component and its specific hydro-strategic coercion are distinct from China's typical application, which often prioritizes non-kinetic means in its gray zone activities [13].

Iran's strategy centers on proxy warfare (e.g., Hezbollah, Houthis) and asymmetric naval tactics

(e.g., drone swarms, mine warfare) to extend regional influence while maintaining deniability [37]. In contrast, India's Shadow Doctrine combines:

1. Deniable kinetic operations (e.g., cross-border strikes)
2. Hydro-strategic coercion (e.g., Indus Waters Treaty leverage)
3. Diplomatic isolation campaigns

This multi-domain integration distinguishes India's approach from Iran's proxy-dependent model, emphasizing economic and legal levers alongside limited kinetic action [3], [14].

10. Discussion: Synergies and Strategic Logic:

The doctrine's emphasis on attribution avoidance through covert kinetics and cyber operations exploits Pakistan's inability to assign blame conclusively, thereby limiting escalatory risks while sustaining pressure [14].

11. Potential Outcomes, Risks, and International Response:

Strategic Implications of the Shadow Doctrine

Short-Term Projections: The doctrine's implementation generates immediate pressure on Pakistan's security infrastructure through targeted kinetic operations, while information warfare campaigns destabilize domestic political narratives [35]. Concurrently, transboundary water disputes—particularly concerning the Kabul River basin—are weaponized, compounding Pakistan's resource insecurity [34].

Long-Term Considerations: This multi-domain pressure provokes strategic recalibration in Islamabad, accelerating Pakistan's reliance on asymmetric proxies [37]. Such escalation pathways test regional nuclear deterrence frameworks despite India's no-first-use posture.

International Ramifications:

The U.S. and China adopt divergent positions: Washington cautiously monitors counterterrorism impacts while Beijing moves to secure CPEC investments against disruption [36]

International institutions face credibility challenges addressing resultant humanitarian concerns, particularly regarding water stress and refugee flows [34]

Collateral Effects: The doctrine's hydro-strategic components severely impact Pakistan's agricultural sector and domestic stability, while cyber operations create spillover effects compromising regional digital infrastructure [34], [35].

12. Ethical Considerations:

The Shadow Doctrine's strategies raise significant ethical questions:

Civilian Impact of Water Restrictions: Deliberate water resource manipulation has severe humanitarian consequences for downstream civilian populations, affecting agriculture, health, and livelihoods [22].

Backing insurgents and conducting deniable strikes offer tactical advantages but violate just war principles and normalize extrajudicial violence [29], [18].

Plausible Deniability and Accountability: The deniability emphasis undermines international norms of state responsibility and accountability for harmful actions [19].

Conclusion: The Shadow Doctrine as a Strategic Innovation

This analysis demonstrates India's Shadow Doctrine represents a South Asian security dynamics paradigm shift, characterized by its:

1. Integrated Multi-Domain Approach: Synergizing hydro-strategic coercion (Indus Waters Treaty leverage), deniable kinetics (surgical strikes), and information operations imposing costs below the conventional war threshold [3].

2. Distinctive Regional Adaptation: Unlike global hybrid warfare models (e.g., Russia's Gerasimov Doctrine), it tailors coercion to the India-Pakistan nuclear dilemma, using legal frameworks (e.g., rebus sic stantibus claims) as force multipliers [23].
3. Escalation Management: Balances pressure (e.g., water stress, diplomatic isolation) with deliberate ambiguity to avoid triggering Pakistan's nuclear red lines [14].

Future Research Imperatives: Validating and contextualizing this framework requires scholars to:

Empirically track doctrinal components (e.g., link Kabul River negotiations to Pakistan's internal instability)

Model escalation risks of simultaneous kinetic/hydro/diplomatic coercion

Audit ethical trade-offs (e.g., civilian impacts of water weaponization) [37]

Final Argument: The Shadow Doctrine's innovation lies not in individual tactics but in their orchestrated application—a template for asymmetric deterrence that redefines conflict in contested nuclear environments [7].

References:

[1] G. Perkovich and T. Dalton, "Not War, Not Peace? Motivating Pakistan to Prevent Cross-Border Terrorism," Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2016.

[2] C. Bluth, "India and Pakistan: A case of asymmetric nuclear deterrence," *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 299–315, 2010.

[3] T. Sweijs, S. Zilincik, F. Bekkers, and R. Meessen, "A Framework for Cross-Domain Strategies Against Hybrid Threats," The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies, 2021.

- [4] T. M. Azad, M. W. Haider, and M. Sadiq, "Understanding gray zone warfare from multiple perspectives," *World Affairs*, vol. 187, no. 3, pp. 76–98, 2023.
- [5] M. J. Mazarr, *Mastering the Gray Zone: Understanding a Changing Era of Conflict*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2015.
- [6] V. Asthana, "Cross-border terrorism in India: Counterterrorism strategies and challenges," ACDIS Occasional Papers, University of Illinois, 2010.
- [7] J. Ludvik, *Nuclear Asymmetry and Deterrence: Theory, Policy and History*. Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2016.
- [8] M. Dwivedi, "Cross-border terrorism: Irritants in Indo-Pakistan relations," *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*, vol. 21, no. 1/2, pp. 95–102, 2008.
- [9] G. S. Floyd Jr., "Attribution and operational art: Implications for competing in time," *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 68–91, 2018.
- [10] G. Perkovich and T. Dalton, "Not War, Not Peace? Motivating Pakistan to Prevent Cross-Border Terrorism," Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2016.
- [11] N. Bensahel, "Darker shades of gray: Why gray zone conflicts will become more frequent and complex," Foreign Policy Research Institute, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.fpri.org>
- [12] M. D. Lawrence, "Clash in the Gray Zone," *Military Review*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 50–61, 2024.
- [13] F. G. Hoffman, "The contemporary spectrum of conflict: Protracted, gray zone, ambiguous, and hybrid modes of war," The Heritage Foundation, Special Report No. 195, Oct. 2016.

- [14] F. C. Zagare & D. M. Kilgour, "Asymmetric Deterrence," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 417–438, 1993.
- [15] C. C. Langlois and J. P. P. Langlois, "Bargaining and the failure of asymmetric deterrence: Trading off the risk of war for the promise of a better deal," *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 159–174, 2006.
- [16] J. J. Vater, "The Indus Waters Treaty: Prospects for India-Pakistan peace," *Institute of South Asian Studies*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.academia.edu>
- [17] F. Grare, *Balochistan: The State Versus the Nation*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://carnegieendowment.org/files/balochistan.pdf>
- [18] M. N. Schmitt, "The Ethical and Legal Imperatives of Attribution in Covert Operations," *Harvard National Security J.*, vol. 12, 2021.
- [19] N. Freeman, "Fighting the 'Non-Attributable War' in Laos: A review article," *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 210–217, 1996.
- [20] M. A. Specter, S. Park, and M. Green, "KeyForge: Non-attributable email from forward-forgable signatures," in *Proc. 30th USENIX Security Symp.*, 2021, pp. 1065–1082.
- [21] C. C. Ioniță, "The concept of multi-domain operations and its multinational understanding," in *Proc. Strategies XXI: The Complex and Dynamic Nature of the Security Environment*, 2021, pp. 149–157.

- [22] M. U. Qamar, M. Azmat, and P. Claps, "Pitfalls in transboundary Indus Water Treaty: A perspective to prevent unattended threats to the global security," *npj Clean Water*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2019.
- [23] W. A. Qureshi, "The Indus Basin: Water cooperation, international law and the Indus Waters Treaty," *Michigan State International Law Review*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 211–232, 2017.
- [24] A. Ranjan, "Indus Waters Treaty Negotiations: Geopolitics, Disputes and Cooperation," *SAGE Open*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1-11, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1177/02627280241303540>.
- [25] M. Mateen, "Geopolitical challenges to the Indus Water Treaty: Balancing national interests and regional stability," *Academia Int. J. Social Sci.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 24–35, 2023.
- [26] M. Zeitoun and J. Warner, "Hydro-hegemony – a framework for analysis of trans-boundary water conflicts," *Water Policy*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 435–460, 2006. DOI: 10.2166/wp.2006.054.
- [27] S. Elijah, "Resources and Regional Stability: The Rise and Decline of Hydro-Hegemonic Powers in the Nile River Basin," Stellenbosch University, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://scholar.sun.ac.za/handle/10019.1/125896>
- [28] S. R. H. Bukhari, A. U. Khan, S. Noreen, and F. Bashir, "Hydro Imperialism: China's Advanced Hydro Strategic Control," *Remittances Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 45-61, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380098372>
- [29] A. B. Fichtelberg, *Crimes of War: Atrocity and Accountability*, Oxford University Press, 2021.
- [30] A. Malka, "Israel and Asymmetric Deterrence," *Comparative Strategy*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 489–509, 2008, doi: [10.1080/01495930802430080](https://doi.org/10.1080/01495930802430080).

[31] K. Chakrabarti, *The Shadow Doctrine: Guns, Dams, and Diplomacy in Asymmetric Conflict*, white paper, The People Management, 2025. [Online]. Available:

<https://nodes.desci.com/dpid/399/v1>.

[33] W. C. Ladwig III, "Indian Military Modernization and Conventional Deterrence in South Asia," *J. Strateg. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 696–726, 2018. [Online]. Available:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2017.1307742>

[33] F. Grare, *Balochistan: The State Versus the Nation*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2013. [Online].

Available: <https://carnegieendowment.org/files/balochistan.pdf>

[34] A. Ranjan and D. Chatterjee, "Cutting Across the Durand: Water Dispute Between Pakistan and Afghanistan on River Kabul," *World Water Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 45–63, May 2020,

<https://doi.org/10.1002/wwp2.12015>

[35] R. Kumar and S. Jha, "Weaponizing Social Media: India-Pakistan Information Operations," *Int. Secur.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 78–103, 2023.

[36] S. Ali, M.H. Zakir, and M. Arif, "The CPEC-Sovereignty Dilemma Between Prosperity And Autonomy: An Exploratory Study," *Pakistan Islamicus*, vol. [issue], pp. [page range], 2023.

[Online]. Available: <https://pakistanislamicus.com/>

[37] F. Ward, "Iran's Hybrid Maritime Strategy in the Persian Gulf," *Naval War College Rev.*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 45–68, 2021. [Online]. Available: [https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-](https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol74/iss3/5/)

[review/vol74/iss3/5/](https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol74/iss3/5/)

[38] M. U. Qamar, M. Azmat, and P. Claps, "Pitfalls in Transboundary Indus Water Treaty: A Perspective to Prevent Unattended Threats to Global Security," *npj Clean Water*, vol. 2, no. 1, Art. no. 22, Dec. 2019.

[39] C. C. Fair, *Fighting to the End: The Pakistan Army's Way of War*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014 <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199892709.001.0001>

[40] P. Staniland, "Organizing insurgency: Networks, resources, and rebellion in South Asia," *Int. Security*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 142–177, 2012, https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00091

Note: This manuscript is a significantly developed iteration of a preliminary draft previously shared on Desci nodes. It has undergone substantial modifications, including the rigorous integration of academic citations and an expanded reference list, to meet the standards of scholarly publication.