

2. What specific factors explain the persistence of this conflict? (Main factors may include: power asymmetry; incompatible national identities; differing domestic power structures; irredentism; great power involvement; nuclear weapons)
3. What changes are required in the factors identified that could bring an end to the conflict?

These remarks led into two theoretical presentations on current International Relations (IR) theory and the enduring rivalry. Paul Diehl (University of Illinois) and Gary Goertz (Arizona State University) presented (*in absentia*) "Theorizing Enduring Rivalries: Application of the India-Pakistan Case," applying their past work on other examples of long standing inter-state rivalries. Their paper attempted to both chart the origins and conditions leading to the rivalry between India and Pakistan, and offer some possible ways of terminating the conflict. They started the paper by highlighting the explanatory weaknesses of the current IR literature in explaining the India-Pakistan enduring rivalry. They posited the theory of "punctuated equilibrium" to better explain the origins and development of the conflict. Three phases of the theory were highlighted:

1. Political Shock leading to
2. Stasis, leading to
3. Embedding of the rivalry

In the first phase, an internal or external shock causes a rivalry to begin (in this case it is argued that the joint independence of India and Pakistan in 1947 served as this shock). But these shocks only help set the stage for the rivalry. What is necessary, and present in this case, to continue the rivalry is a question of territorial possession. In this case, Kashmir served as the keystone in developing the enduring rivalry, acting as a symbolic, economic, and strategically important region for both India and Pakistan. The authors noted that 81% of all enduring rivalries are based on territory.

They continued their paper by examining why the enduring conflict reached the phase of stasis. Only 5.4% of conflicts between states ever reach this point. Why do most die out quickly, but not this one? One would be the lack of a preponderance of power in the conflict – Pakistan has the advantage territorially and strategically in a short conventional war but India has the advantage in any protracted war, as it has the larger resource base. But due to the role of great power intervention, conventional conflicts between the two do not extend beyond short periods. This is due to the nuclear equation, where both sides are nuclear weapons holding states. The international community has a vested interest in making sure that the conflict does not escalate beyond border skirmishes. While some would argue that any one of these factors should help end the rivalry, in essence they have led to its embedded nature.

They concluded by examining possible ways to terminate the conflict. But their evaluations were not optimistic – solutions are not probable in the short term. Democratization of Pakistan is not a solution, as statistically the rivalry heats up during a transition to democracy in Pakistan. Second, it is not sure that a democratic Pakistan would be more conciliatory on the Kashmir issue. Third, it is not clear that