

Pakistan Must Recognize its Strength to Liberate itself from US-Indian Hegemony

[Al-Rayah Newspaper – Issue 556 – 16/07/2025 AH](#)

By: Abdul Majeed Bhatti

Ever since the cessation of hostilities brokered by US President Trump, Pakistan has been eager to start a meaningful dialogue with India on a range of security issues. This includes the future of Kashmir, de-escalation on the Line of Control (LoC) and most importantly reversal of India's suspension of the Indus Water Treaty (IWT). The latter meets 80% of Pakistan's water needs from three main rivers namely: Indus, Chanab and Ravi. [1]

However, India's response to Pakistani overtures have been repeatedly rebuffed. Home Minister Amit Shah told The Times of India, "No, it [WTI] will never be restored. We will take water that was flowing to Pakistan to Rajasthan by constructing a canal. Pakistan will be starved of water that it has been getting unjustifiably." [2] Shah strikes an ominous tone that appears to suggest that relations between the two nuclear powers have taken a turn for the worse.

In the short-term, there is very little India can do about its threats to turn off the tap. Presently, India does not possess the physical infrastructure to cut off the water that feeds Pakistan's agricultural tributaries. The construction of the canal to divert the water could take several years. Nevertheless, India can do enormous damage to Pakistan's crops by withholding sensitive data about the flow of water into Pakistan from the three rivers. In the past, India has been obliged to share this data, which Pakistan has duly used to avert crop disaster.

India's obstinance for resumption of dialogue, not only raises difficult questions about ceasefire terms agreed by Pakistan but also throws the spotlight on the statement issued by Pakistan's National Security Council (NSC) regarding India's pause of WTI. The NSC's statement considered this development an "act of war" and would be met by "full force across the complete spectrum of National Power".[3]

During the brief war, it was evident that Pakistan had achieved air supremacy over India, and New Delhi was forced to strive for a ceasefire because India's air force was effectively grounded. Rather than take advantage of this situation and press for the complete annexation of Indian occupied Kashmir or seize some territory like Srinagar, Pakistan chose a defensive posture, withdrew from its advantageous positions and agreed to the ceasefire terms—which at the very best was a resumption of dialogue with India. [4] But those talks never materialized, and India also refused any mediation efforts by Trump. Modi told Trump, "India will never accept third-party mediation on Kashmir." [5] Subsequently, Both Pakistan and America walked away empty handed.

Without addressing any of Pakistan's core security issues such as India's obedience of WTI, increased militarization of the LoC, India's brutal occupation of Kashmir and the stability of China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC)—Pakistan's Chief of Army Staff (CAOS), Asim Munir rewarded himself with the title Field Marshal, and nominated Trump for the noble peace prize. [6]

This is not the first-time, Pakistan's leadership has failed to convert tactical battlefield gains against India into strategic political wins. In 1999, Pakistan took the Kargil heights much to India's surprise and had the golden opportunity to liberate Indian occupied Kashmir but succumbed to American interference and was unable to hammer home a tactical advantage into a political victory.

The reason for these failures is twofold: First, the purpose of war extends beyond mere defense—it is to achieve clear political objectives, and this can only be accomplished via an offensive doctrine. This doctrine stipulates that defensive Jihad must be transformed into offensive Jihad accompanied by a host of political and diplomatic actions. When viewed from this lens, WTI - the primary strategic goal is securing uninterrupted access to the three vital rivers - can only be resolved by offensive measures aimed at achieving decisive, long-term strategic outcomes like the annexation of Kashmir.

Second, Pakistan's leadership continues to frame its actions within the ambit of international law and at every juncture looks for America's approval before taking diplomatic and military action. This is political suicide. One needs to look no further than Iraq, Libya and Iran to see how their blind obedience to international law destroyed these countries. If Pakistan's leadership continues on this path, Pakistan will experience a similar fate.

Within this context, Pakistan's leadership must boldly reflect and force itself to think out of the box when facing these challenges. This implies that Pakistan's political medium must liberate their mindset to function independent of US approval, and outside the ambit of international law.

For example, US strategic setbacks in Iraq, Afghanistan, Ukraine, and against Houthi forces should demonstrate to the Pakistani political medium that America's power to shape global order is waning. Furthermore, over the past forty years or so, America has enlisted Pakistan's help to defeat the Soviets in Afghanistan, maneuver India into Washington's orbit by using the Kashmiri uprising and nuclear tests to bring the pro-American BJP to power. Lest not forget, that without Pakistan's unstinting support for the global war on Islam, America could never hope to advance its new Middle East project.

It is this very dependency on Pakistan, which should clearly signal to Pakistan's political medium that America no longer views itself as indispensable to global stability but instead regards Pakistan critical to sustaining its crumbling influence. Without Pakistan's collaboration with America, India would have left occupied Kashmir decades ago.

Hence, if the political medium is unable to recognize Pakistan's strength and chart an independent course, then the country faces an existential crisis—one engineered by its own leadership and subservience to American interventions.

If these elites were to seriously consider a new civilizational project for Pakistan—one that would enable the country to gain independence from America, liberate Kashmir, and reclaim leadership over the Indian subcontinent—they would truly be harnessing Pakistan's vast civilizational, economic, and military potential.

Such a project already exists with *Hizb ut Tahrir*, which is working to establish the second Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) upon the method of Prophethood, making Pakistan its launching ground. This forthcoming Caliphate is the only viable refuge to rescue Pakistan from American dependency and Indian dominance, and to elevate it to a position of global leadership.

Therefore, working with *Hizb ut Tahrir* and handing authority to it is the fundamental solution to Pakistan's repeated setbacks and to the political and military leadership's betrayal of the people's and army's victories.

Reference:

[1, 2] Businesslike, (June 2025). India will never restore Indus water treaty with Pakistan: Amit Shah. Businessline. Available at: <https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/news/national/india-will-never-restore-indus-water-treaty-with-pakistan-amit-shah/article69720610.ece>

[3] Dawn, (April 25, 2025). Assault on rivers will be 'act of war'. Dawn. Available at: <https://www.dawn.com/news/1906354>

[4] FirstPost, (May 2025). Did Trump broker a ceasefire deal between India and Pakistan? Firstpost. Available at: <https://www.firstpost.com/explainers/india-pakistan-ceasefire-deal-us-president-donald-trump-13887378.html>

[6] Aljazeera, (May 2025). Pakistan promotes army chief Asim Munir to field marshal: Why it matters. Aljazeera. Available at: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/5/21/pakistan-promotes-army-chief-asim-munir-to-field-marshal-why-it-matters>

[5] MSN, (June 2025). Modi tells Trump: India will never accept third-party mediation on Kashmir. MSN. Available at: <https://www.msn.com/en-gb/news/world/modi-tells-trump-india-will-never-accept-third-party-mediation-on-kashmir/ar-AA1GXvfT?ocid=BingNewsSerp>