

the role of nuclear weapons, where India argues that it can carry out a policy of "hot pursuit" of insurgents into Pakistan as it has a second strike capability, while Pakistan argues that nuclear weapons allow Pakistan to continue its insurgency into Kashmir.

Ashok Kapur (University of Waterloo) also dealt with the role of lessons learned from past actions in the conflict for India and Pakistan for future policy choices. In his paper "Major Powers and the Persistence of India-Pakistan Rivalry" he examined the role of great powers in the conflict. Kapur argues that Pakistan has learned that it cannot win Kashmir through conflict, and it cannot rely on creating instability and soliciting international involvement, especially after the Kargil war. The third lesson it must draw is that it needs to deal directly with India, especially since India continually refuses to allow international mediation over the issue. Kapur saw the change in the attitudes of the US and China toward the Kashmir conflict and the change in India's relations with these two principal major power actors as having a positive effect on the possibility of peaceful negotiations between India and Pakistan. Thus, changing alliance relations are forcing Pakistan to rethink its diplomatic and military strategy vis-à-vis India. In India's case, the lesson learned is that peace is possible only by talking and convincing the generals, who hold the real power in Islamabad even when civilian leaders are in official positions, that negotiating is the only option.

Both Leng and Kapur were questioned on several points during the discussion period. The issue of learning the right lessons in the conflict was discussed. What happens if either state is not learning the right lessons? What causes lessons to be learned? What have the two actors learned? Is learning the same in both states?

The third session dealt with domestic causes of the enduring conflict. Vali Nasr (Naval Postgraduate School) examined the formation at the domestic level of Pakistan's national interest in "National Identities and Pakistan-India Conflict." He argued that the main political battles on the ground are between the Army and Islamists. As such, Kashmir is a domestic political question. But within Pakistan there are many different branches of Islam, and this hinders the development of a strong Pakistani national identity. This lack of a clear national identity increases the intensity of the conflict over Kashmir, as until there is a sense of what Pakistan is, Kashmir will act as a beacon for national identity, and prolong the conflict.

Steve Saideman (McGill University) discussed the role of the domestic politics within India, Pakistan and Kashmir itself in the continuance of the enduring rivalry. His argument is that enduring rivalries are a product of the domestic politics of the different participants. His paper "At the Heart of the Conflict: Irredentism and Kashmir" presented an examination of the supporters and opponents of irredentism within the three regions. If we could successfully identify those key supporters and opponents, we can develop incentives and disincentives to affect their decisions vis-a-vis the conflict. He pointed out that the key difference between the India-Pakistan and the India-China territorial disputes is the role of irredentism in the former conflict.