

---

# Assessing the Role of World Bank in mediating the India-Pakistan Water Dispute

\_\_\_\_\_ Nazakat Ali  
===== Gaurav Bhattarai  
===== Asghar Iqbal  
\_\_\_\_\_ Qurat-ul-Ain

*Water is the key to agricultural economies of the countries that can be managed to meet the increasing demand. But, ever increasing demand for the shared water creates competition for its utilization, and, thereby, contributes to disputes. To utilize shared water resources, a dispute resolution mechanism seems essential, as it helps to manage the resources promptly and properly. In 1947, after the partition of the subcontinent in two geographical entities, India and Pakistan, India took the advantage of its upper riparian status, and discontinued the supply of water to Pakistan. This action became the reason for possible war threats between the two countries; however, few temporary ad-hoc agreements were made. The World Bank intervened only in 1950, whose negotiation led to a successful settlement of the dispute. Thus, this qualitative research design, using secondary data and reviewing published literature, aims to examine the negotiation process, and assess the role of the World Bank in mediating the Water Dispute between the two countries.*

**Keywords:** Water, agricultural economies, partition, subcontinent, world bank, water dispute

**Dr. Nazakat Ali**

Institute of Kashmir Studies,  
University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Muzaffarabad

**Mr. Gaurav Bhattarai**

Faculty at Department of International Relations and Diplomacy,  
Tribhuvan University, Nepal

**Dr. Asghar Iqbal**

Department of Kashmir Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore

**Ms. Qurat-ul-Ain**

Department of Defense and Strategic Studies,  
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

## Introduction

History provides evidence to the fact that the earliest human settlements, such as Indus, Mesopotamia and Egypt flourished and nourished along river Indus, Tigris and Euphrates. Precisely, for a long time, these rivers served as a catalyst for cooperation among the countries. However, the current demands for water in shared rivers are being metamorphosed into confrontations, despite a well-documented history of cooperation. Usually, the water dispute occurs, when one country unilaterally stores or utilizes the water from a shared river basin, and the other responds desperately against it. Currently, India-Pakistan, China-India, Bangladesh-India, Nepal-India in South Asia are examples of disputes over shared waters. Clearly, any unilateral action taken by the upper-riparian to store or interrupt the water supply to lower riparian, are sure to generate concerns and disputes with and amongst lower riparian countries. Hitherto, numerous disputes have taken place over the Transboundary Rivers including Nile, Jordan, Euphrates, Tigris, Ganges and Brahmaputra in Middle East and South Asian countries respectively. As the demand is more than supply, and because of the availability of water in these regions, it has created international and non-international disputes.

Still, there are admirable stories of water disputes settlement that have favored cooperation over the cases of confrontation. In this success, the contribution of international and non-international institution cannot be ignored, when it comes to water dispute settlements amongst users<sup>1</sup>. The history of the last five decades' reveals that maximum disputes have been settled by the tremendous efforts and contribution of different organizations by adopting international water courses laws, rules conventions. During this period of time, almost 150 treaties have been signed<sup>2</sup>. Amongst these treaties, the Indus Water Treaty is the best example of water dispute settlement<sup>3</sup>. In fact, this cooperation is the manifestation of fair mediation, diplomatic success and economic development of India and Pakistan.

### Historical Development of Dispute over Indus River during Colonial Era:

The Indus River and its five tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej and the Beas flow through the lands of China, India and Pakistan, and fall into Arabian Sea in Karachi (Pakistan). This is the one of the largest river systems of the world, which feed the water to millions of people and agricultural lands. Since ancient times, the water of Indus and its tributaries was utilized for agricultural and domestic purposes. One of the earliest human settlements "The Indus Valley" nurtured and flourished along sides of river Indus and its tributaries. Its significance for various purposes has always received substantial attention between users, by developing irrigation and storage facilities, to expand agricultural lands. The change took place, when the subcontinent was colonized by the British. They implemented various projects to utilize the waters of Indus Basin

to meet the food grains demand, and also to strengthen the government revenue<sup>4</sup>. To achieve this, the local and provincial bodies were devoted to work with British engineers and administration to develop the link canal system.

Indeed, when such an inter-river link canal system was put into practice, it brought Six millions of acres barren and uncultivated lands into one of the productive crops in the South Asian continent. It is seen as a colonial state's achievement, providing security against famine, and also increased the revenue of the state. From 1860 to 1947, irrigation system of Indus water was expanded to large extent, which covered area of 20 million hectares with irrigation capacity<sup>5</sup>. Such conversion of lands reduced food shortage threats and also increased the government revenue. The expanding canal network created some complexities amongst provinces, as all the provinces started the conversion of maximum desert lands into agricultural lands. But, the growing population, joint and integrated water channels of canal system made the water supply a daunting task among provinces. It was reflected in the disputing claims at inter, intra-state and regional level that steadily stirred up socio-political and geo-political disputes during the colonial era<sup>6</sup>.

Prior to British colonialism in the subcontinent, the water resource of Indus Rivers was not deemed as a matter of disputes. It was only during the British period the competition for water supply led disputes between upper and lower provinces. The 1<sup>st</sup> issue emerged between Punjab, Bahawalpur and Bikaner, which was later settled by mutual Tripartite Agreement in 1920<sup>7</sup>. This agreement had created the opportunities for development of future schemes like Sutlej Valley Canal Project. It was, however, objected by the Bombay Government, citing that Punjab's withdrawal of water will have an adverse effect on the irrigation system in Sindh, and complaints were submitted to the Central Government of India. Even the Central Government found it complex, resultantly, sent to the Secretary of State to Indian government in England. Eventually, it was settled by an executive order by sanctioning Sutlej Valley Canal project and Sukkar Project in Punjab and Sind respectively. These two large projects transformed millions of uncultivable lands into productive lands. The expanding demand for agricultural land led authorities to harness more and more water. Finally, the central government decided to monitor the share of water, to overcome the upcoming disputes. In 1921, "Indus Water Discharge Committee" was created, to monitor the daily flow of rivers at different places<sup>8</sup>. Even the central government constituted a commission in 1935, headed by Mr. Anderson. The commission recommendation were included, Punjab is not allowed to utilize new waters, which could interrupt existing supply or future water shortage for lower riparian. This decision remained as a matter of political disagreement between upper and lower riparian states<sup>9</sup>. Finally, it was addressed by the secretary of state. It was not the last. There were also other projects including BhakraNangal, Thal and Haveli which remained a source of disagreement and political discourse.

With the passage of time, the British government became conscious over the growing disputes, and therefore, Indian Act of 1935 was constituted, which added provisions to address the water disputes through legal framework. Provisions from 130 to 134 stated that if there were any cases of “interference with water supplies,” the states or provinces can approach the governor general of India, particularly when the water rights of the complaints were threatened by other parties. Further, in case of prejudicial threats, the dispute can be investigated by constituting a commission. Owing to this mechanism, the governor general of India ordered to form special commission “Rau Commission in 1941” aimed to address the disputes<sup>10</sup>. The chairman of commission, Justice B.N Rau with Chief engineers of Uttar Pradesh and Madras, had given its decision in 1942, which they stated, the any fresh man made activity related the stoppage of water would directly create the water shortage for agriculture in Sindh. Therefore, as recommended, Punjab had to pay 2 hundreds millions to Sindh for 2water reservoirs at Guddu and Kotri to meet the water demands during critical seasons<sup>11</sup>. However, this decision remained unsatisfactory for both the parties, thereby, referred to the Central Government of India<sup>12</sup>. Various rounds of discussion were held to resolve it but the differences over share of water were the main obstacle to resolve the dispute. It was lingering for the next couple of years, till the partition of the subcontinent into two new dominions of India and Pakistan.

### **Development of Water Disputes between India and Pakistan:**

In 1947 the British India was divided according to the partition plan of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 1947, into new states of India and Pakistan. The new boundary line demarcated by Sir Cyril Radcliff between the two countries, created the base for future conflict between India and Pakistan. Poorly handled partition process triggered further disputes over certain areas of the subcontinent, even after 1947<sup>13</sup>. The Kashmir dispute is one, which exists even after three wars and various multilateral and bilateral lateral talks. This issue has various reasons and water can be traced as one of them, as the rivers flowing through Kashmir are the life-blood of its agricultural based-economy. Hence, control over Kashmir means control of water resources of the Indus Basin. By controlling Kashmir, India easily could damage Pakistan's economy. The division of the subcontinent between India and Pakistan was not only the division of land, but also the people were divided, resources were allocated, assets were divided and waterways were partitioned. As far as the partition of waterways is concerned, the Redcliff boundary line in Punjab province disrupted the integrated canal system from their headworks. These headworks of canals like Upper Bari Doab, and Sutlej Valley were awarded to India and the lands irrigated by these headworks were remained in lower stream Pakistan. To this, the India cleverly took the advantages of its upper riparian status and discontinued the downstream flow of water to Pakistan that became the cause for water dispute.

### **Negotiations for water dispute settlement from 1947 to 1950:**

Indeed the division of one state with all assets between two opponent parties was not an easy task for any expert, especially when it comes to land. The same happened in the subcontinent, when the British India was partitioned into Pakistan and India. The boundary line commissioner who demarcated the new boundary between new states, also found this task as difficult and problematic particularly due to the integrated canal system. For this, he envisioned the idea to leadership of both states, Pandit Nehru and Muhammad Ali Jinnah, that the integrated canals of Punjab should be a joint venture, operated by both the countries<sup>14</sup>. But, they did not pay heed to Redcliff's suggestions. Interestingly, Muhammad Ali Jinnah stated to Redcliff "get on with his job" and even remarked that "he would rather have desert in Pakistan than fertile fields watered by the courtesy of Hindus". Also, Jawaharlal Nehru stated that it's "India's affairs to decide on what it should do with its rivers"<sup>15</sup>.

Actually, the Pakistani concerns were that the boundary line demarcated between two countries wasn't its choice and Pakistani political circle was of the view it was the strategy of Indian National Congress and Redcliff to trap Pakistan. This boundary line recognized India as the upper riparian, which started demonstrating aggression towards the lower riparian Pakistan. Such views demonstrated India's intention when India stopped the water supply to Pakistan in 1948 just after one year of partition. India's this action was considered a matter of threat which could damage its agricultural based economy. Some temporary arrangements were made to restore the water supply to Pakistan. However, its vulnerability to water supply from India remained a constant threat till the final settlement of the dispute in 1960. The Indus water is the life for Pakistan's agriculture and people that could not survive or give away this resource. The similar views were expressed by the David Lilienthal "no army with bomb shell could devastate a land as thoroughly as Pakistan could be devastated by India's shutting off water that keep the field and the people of Pakistan alive"<sup>16</sup>.

Keeping in view the intensity and futuristic outlook of the dispute, an ad-hoc agreement was signed on 10<sup>th</sup> December 1947 to restore the water supply to Pakistan. This temporary settlement was to expire on 31<sup>st</sup> March 1948, and stipulated that further negotiations could be made for the final settlement. The Indian circle often claims that Pakistan deliberately did not take any effort to reach a final settlement till the expiry of agreement on 31 March. On the 1<sup>st</sup> April of 1948 India again discontinued the water supply to Pakistan and this action precipitated the full blown water dispute<sup>17</sup>. It was the time when Pakistan was struggling to draw the straight lines in its administrative setup and economy.

The discontinuity of water from India was a clear aggression, and Pakistan could take a stern decision, but the founding leadership of the country tried to manage it

through diplomatic efforts. India also realized the intensity of the dispute and agreed to restore the supply of water through Delhi agreement of 4<sup>th</sup> May 1948. According to this agreement, both the parties agreed on pre-partition position that the supply shall not be disturbed and waters of Punjab shall be divided equally<sup>18</sup>. But, Pakistan demanded a permanent settlement and uninterrupted supply of water, because it was a grave and unending threat from India. The similar views were expressed by its leadership in a note on 16 June 1949, calling for the equitable share of waters or otherwise suggested for case to the International Court of Justice (ICJ)<sup>19</sup>. But, the Indian leadership trickily suggested that a commission of judges from both the sides to resolve the dispute before turning to the ICJ. This stalemate made no headway, and the good office of the World Bank intervened in 1951.

### **External Concerns: Road to the Settlement of the Dispute:**

The standoff in negotiation may have existed for a longer time, if David Lilienthal from Tennessee Valley Authority, America would have not have made a tour to India. He was the personal guest of Indian Prime and visited India as the functionary of the World Bank to work on India-Pakistan water dispute. On his return, he expressed some ideas by his writings in Collier's magazine, in which he envisioned the development of the Indus River system through a unified manner on the lines of Tennessee River system<sup>20</sup>. Apparently, David was the functionary of the WB, but his objective behind India visit, was to serve as a strategic mission for his country .i.e. bring India closer to America and prevent it joining the communist bloc of China<sup>21</sup>. In his first tour to India, Lilienthal did not arrive in Pakistan. It was his second visit on the advice of one journalist, Lippmann, he visited Pakistan. He met with Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan and discussed some issues including that of Kashmir, while in India, he worked on improving India-America relations. During his stay in in India he visited on some project sites on rivers and probed into India-Pakistan water dispute, development of projects and use of Indus rivers water<sup>22</sup>. After holding discussion with the leaders of both the countries, he proposed following suggestions for the Indus system; (a) large water storages (b) financial arrangements for developmental works (c) equal representative from both the countries including the World Bank team.

### **Role of World Bank in Dispute Settlement:**

David Eugene R. Black, the President of the Bank, was already conscious of the sensitivity and severity of this dispute of the severity of this issue, and thus he admired the suggestions floated by Lilienthal for the settlement of the dispute. Most important was the engagement and motivation for the negotiation process. Finally, he opened the discussion with the leadership from both the countries for the long lasting settlement of the water issue. Both the countries leadership welcomed the intervention of the WB that ended the stalemate over water.

Therefore, in subsequent moves, the President inked the important points to be followed for disputes resolution.

- a. The Indus Basin has sufficient water for both the countries;
- b. The Indus river Basin would be considered as a single unit;
- c. The negotiations would sideline past grievances, and retain a technical over the political focus<sup>23</sup>.

In 1952, the first meeting was called by the WB in Washington that included the equal representation from India-Pakistan with Bank's team. The initial agenda of the meeting was to prepare an outline for the program, i.e. technical requirements, to make the maximum supply of water available for countries' needs. Within three weeks, the representatives from both the countries agreed with WB team on the following points:

- (1) determine the available water supplies;
- (2) determine the water demand as per irrigable lands in both the countries;
- (3) calculation of data and surveys from both sides;
- (4) preparation of cost estimates and construction timeline for new projects with complete plan detail.

Further the information collected by the both the countries would be duly verified, its acceptance and addition of any relevant document is conditional to its relevance and materiality. In the subsequent meetings, called in Karachi in 1952 and in Delhi 1953, both the parties were unable to come up with any idea or hydrological engineering solution for the water dispute resolution<sup>24</sup>. To this, the WB also asked the parties to submit their own comprehensive plan about the division of water. Therefore, the desired plans were submitted by 1953 in which both the countries simply demanded water for irrigation.

These proposals were competitive and apposite to each other and also failed to produce any mechanism on how to make the water available on equitable demands. India in its plan allocated 90 MAF for Pakistan and 29 MAF for its own. While the Pakistan proposed 15 MAF for India and 102 for its own. Pakistan rejected India's plan according to equitable needs, which was indeed correct on the basis of ground reality, and dependencies on the Indus River Basin. Then, both the countries submitted revised plans in which India demanded all the water from the Ravi, Sutlej and Beas and 7 percent water from the Indus, the Chenab and the Jhelum, while the Pakistan demanded 70 percent water from eastern rivers and 93 percent from western rivers. Both the parties' claim for water had enough differences to overcome the dispute<sup>25</sup>. In 1954, finally, the WB proposed its own plan in accordance with hydrological engineering and full management support of the Bank. The Bank proposed the entire flow of eastern rivers with small uses from western rivers to be allocated for India. While all the western rivers (except a small amount used in disputed territory of J&K) would go to Pakistan. In this proposal, the Bank also proposed timeline for the construction of projects<sup>26</sup>. Actually, this

plan was the implementation of India's first proposed plan, and therefore, India accepted it, but Pakistan refused to accept on solid grounds.

Pakistan was aware about its dependencies on eastern rivers, and the 1954 plan allocated insufficient water for its agriculture and people. It was also not in an affordable position to give away its water. Political pressure was also mounting in such a deal. Another factor was very important that made Pakistan uncomfortable i.e. financial issues for the replacement of water projects and construction of new projects, unilaterally. Thus, on account of these apprehensions, Pakistan refused the plan. During the course of whole negotiations, with the WB and various multiple issues pertaining to the geo-political landscape of the Indus Basin made Pakistan extremely conscious about dealing with India over water dispute. The 1954 plan was amended with 1956 Aide-Memoire, in which, the WB offered financial aid to Pakistan for water projects on western rivers<sup>27</sup>. Whereas India already accepted the 1954 plan, although, objected to the Aide-Memoire, because it was about the additional financial help to Pakistan. Parallel to the main negotiations, there were discussions to have an ad-hoc agreement under which India would allow supply of water to Pakistan for 6 or 12 months. A succession of agreements was signed, each of which were negotiated separately, starting on 1 April 1955 and lasting until 31 March 1960. The only period for which India and Pakistan were unable to agree on an ad hoc agreement was 1 October 1957 and 30 September 1958<sup>28</sup>.

In 1958, Pakistan witnessed the political and economic crisis and discontentment of people that encouraged the Army to take over control of the state and dismissed all the political activities. The Army ruler Muhammad Ayub Khan declared its legitimacy on take over and promises to normalize the situation. He put his best to reorganize the economic infrastructure of the country, and also started to work on pending issues with India, especially water. It was a time when Pakistan had water disputes with India on the two sides in Eastern Pakistan and Western Pakistan. Therefore, it had a limited choice to keep the dispute pending. Also India, as an upper riparian country, realized the future utility and Pakistan's dependencies on eastern rivers and started many projects to convert the water of eastern rivers. Thus, Ayub Khan unconditionally took decision to accept the 1954 plan and 1956 Aide-Memoire to secure its water supplies from India in 1955. Pakistan's decision to accept the WB proposal opened the way for final settlement of the dispute, which required two more years to draft the agreement. Finally, on 19th of September 1960, the agreement known as Indus Water Treaty was signed at Karachi by President of Pakistan Muhammad Ayub Khan, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru from India and the Bank's Vice President. The Indus water treaty consists of 12 articles, 79 paragraphs and 8 detailed Annexures. It was a technical surgery of Indus Basin Rivers with simple allocation of water as 80 % to Pakistan and 20 % to India. Seemingly, the division of water between the two countries was a surgical operation of whole projects and canals that developed during British times. The new distribution was entirely a new approach to develop the resource available to both the countries, which multiple techno-economic impacts.



### **Indus Water Dispute Negotiations: A Pakistani Perspective**

Despite the successful story of water dispute settlement, and the way this agreement normalized the relations between two countries, the Indus Water Treaty also survived in awkward times (despite three wars). The most significance of this treaty is that it has secured the water supply of both the countries. Particularly, for Pakistan, the treaty has much importance, because it was already facing a severe geopolitical challenge triggered by India as an upper riparian country. However, the critics and political circle in Pakistan is of the view that the Bank implemented India's plan to surrender its waters from eastern rivers. Further, they alleged that the Bank's also gave special and undercover favors to India by granting financial aid and water from western rivers<sup>29</sup>. Such criticism could be acknowledged in true words by some facts, as the Bank has reintroduced India's plan, when we compare the both plans. Secondly, Pakistan lost its permanent supply from eastern Rivers; lastly water allocation to India from western rivers is a persistent threat for Pakistan as India immediately after the treaty started the water aggression.

As far as the funds and financial aid is concerned, the Bank also favored India by giving \$56 million against its demand of \$33. Pakistan received only \$60 million, despite the construction of all new sources on western rivers. With this aid, Pakistan could hardly manage its link canals. Further, there is another opinion that the Bank permitted India to use its personal resources, while Pakistan hired foreign consultancies and engineering solutions and returned all the financial aid to foreign countries in the value of service and equipment<sup>30</sup>. Furthermore, the allocation of water to India from western rivers put Pakistan's futuristic needs and supply in unsafe hands as India is occupier in disputed territory Kashmir. In this disputed region, India retains as upper user of three western that were allocated to Pakistan. India's such position has strategic and economic leverage over Pakistan. So India gave Pakistan what Pakistan was, already without much-ado receiving of bought prosperity for its Punjab and a life for its future water strategy. Pakistan was to accept under duress as it later accepted the basic basin division plan of 1954<sup>31</sup>. There is a common understanding in Pakistani academia that WB's due favor to India inadvertently puts Pakistan in a precarious situation. To a large extent, these sentiments are becoming valid, when we see the construction and India's response on western rivers. In spite of intense criticism from Pakistani side, the role played by WB in Indus water dispute resolution is admirable. It was the time when Pakistan's resources and economy were under India's threats. By the virtue of this treaty, Pakistan secured and utilized maximum water of the Indus Basin.

### **Assessing World Bank's Role in Dispute Settlement:**

The role of the good office of World Bank and its President Mr. E.R Black, in the mediating process to the signing of the Indus treaty was exceptional. The President of the WB made efforts for maintaining everlasting peace, and encouraging water development, in both the countries. Its constructive role and reputation in the

settlement of water dispute, giving financial aid to the parties was a significant valuable contribution. The WB is a consortium agency, which did not have any force or binding laws to bring the disputant parties on one table, but its reputation is highly valuable to bring several countries with financial support, was indeed an admirable involvement in the successful story of Indus Water Treaty. From 1947 to 1950 both the countries bilaterally made several attempts to settle this dispute but bilateralism failed when the parties' interests and survival was involved. Such a situation opened the way for multilateralism, and the same did happen in the India Pakistan water dispute. In 1952 onwards the third party involvement engaged both the countries in practical meaning full dialogue.

The WB started the discussion with objectives to focus on water dispute rather than other political and financial or border issues. The main purpose of this mediation was to make the water available to the people of both countries and their economic development. So keeping in view of this objective, all the political grievances were sidelined. For the successful dialogue the healthy and valuable Indus Basin monetary funds was collected. It was an outstanding support from Bank to strengthen the countries by providing the technical and engineering help to both the countries that they required. Such generosity from the WB in resolving the one of the grave conflict in the subcontinent was an emblem for successful mediation and resolution of dispute. The making the resolution as successful story and water of Indus as viable economic solution, the role of friendly countries is also acknowledgeable. The countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Australia, the New Zealand and the Germany, contributed in development fund that satisfied the current financial needs of Pakistan. In this financial support India also contributed \$174 million and WB loan was \$80 million to Pakistan<sup>32</sup>. During the course of negotiations and final settlement of the dispute, maximum financial and technical issues of each sides were addressed. Therefore, it is deemed as a comprehensive dispute resolution mechanism in view of its objectives.

The Indus Water dispute resolution and subsequent agreement was not possible without the interference of third party. In this meaningful and successful negotiations the role and interests of both the countries' leadership was also important factor. They created congenial environment for the third party intervention. The signing of the Indus Water Treaty was regarded as a major achievement that made the Indus Basin economically viable for the two countries. Even after the signing of the Treaty both the countries are engaged in disputes over the utilization of Indus Water. Numerous disputes have surfaced on hydro projects including Pakistan's water, because of conflicting approaches displayed by both sides. Actually, the Indus Water Treaty created a hierarchy of dispute settlement. In the initial stages, the matters were settled through Indus Water Commissioners, if they failed it was referred to neutral expert, again if it remained unsettled it was proceeded in the international court of arbitration. As far as the settlement of the dispute is concerned, it is steered by the World Bank. Baglihar and Kishangage cases are examples, where the World Bank made efforts for settlement. These cases were settled by the verdict of International Court of Arbitration. But the role

of the World Bank is always appreciable, which made sincere efforts for peaceful settlement of the disputes within its scope. The role played by the third party in the India-Pakistan water dispute indicates that the true spirit of any third party has the potential to resolve the disputes amongst users, by managing the political discourses or through financial arrangements.

**Conclusion:**

Immediately, after the partition of the subcontinent, the Indus water dispute between the two newly born states of Pakistan and India, became critical. The legacy of partition and demarcation of boundaries had given birth to various contentious issues including the geopolitical and geostrategic importance of Kashmir. The water dispute was also a contentious issue between the two countries, but due to the intervention of the good office of the World Bank, it was resolved in a peaceful and constructive manner. The analysis of this dispute, in this qualitative research, indicates that various complexities and difficulties were involved in mediating the dispute. Although the WB had helped to settle various disputes in the world, the India-Pakistan dispute was totally different, as both the countries were adamant over basic pre-partition water supplies. The countries' interests and future economic security created a tough task to reach an agreeable solution. In this situation, the WB provided financial assistance with technical support to bring peace between India and Pakistan. The water sharing formula set by the WB was accepted with recognition of each other's rights on eastern and western rivers. Financial assistance was arranged by the help of friendly countries, loans were also granted and technical support was provided. The generosity of the WB towards India and Pakistan was really a successful mediation of the Indus water dispute. It was only due to the role of the WB both the countries reached on trilateral Indus Water Treaty, signed on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September in 1960 by President of Pakistan Muhammad Ayub Khan, the Prime Minister of India Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Liff the Vice President of WB. Though, the Indus water dispute resolution and successful mediation brought peace and economic stability in the region but there is also a critical thinking on its negotiations and distribution of water. However, the role played by the WB and successful mediation of Indus Water Treaty exemplified that international organization and its financial support can play an important role for the resolution of water disputes.

## End Notes and Bibliography

- <sup>1</sup> A. Carius, G. D. Dabelko, and A. T. Wolf, "Water Conflict and Cooperation," (1998), <http://int.wilsoncenter.dev6.fayze2.com/sites/default/files/CariusDabelkWolf.pdf/>.
- <sup>2</sup> Transboundary Waters, International Decade for Action "Water for Life 2005-2015" United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). <http://www.un.org/waterforlifedecade/transboundarywaters.html/>.
- <sup>3</sup> A. Carius, A. T. Wolf, "Water Conflict and Cooperation," (1998).
- <sup>4</sup> Ashok Swain, "Environmental Cooperation in South Asia", Washington, D.C: Woodrow Wilson Press, (2002).
- <sup>5</sup> Ashok, "Environmental",
- <sup>6</sup> Zaigham Habib, "Water Issues and Politics in Pakistan", *Journal of South Asia Free Media Association*,
- <sup>7</sup> Bashir A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect* (Lahore: Brite Books, 2005), 294.
- <sup>8</sup> B.A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*, 294.
- <sup>9</sup> Palijo, *Sindh-Punjab Water Dispute 1859-200*, (Sindh: Centre For Peace and Civil Society, 2011), 12-13.
- <sup>10</sup> Bashir A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*, 295.
- <sup>11</sup> Report of the Indian Commission Simla, Vol. 1 (1967): 319.
- <sup>12</sup> Palijo, *Sindh-Punjab Water Dispute*, 14.
- <sup>13</sup> Mushirul Hassan, *Legacy of a Divided Nation*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997), 128.129.
- <sup>14</sup> N.D. Gulhati, *Indus Water Treaty: An Exercise in International Mediation*, (Bombay: Allied Publishers, 1973), 50.
- <sup>15</sup> Aloys Arthur Michel, *the Indus Rivers: A Study of the Effect of Partition*. (London: Yale University Press, 1967), 164.

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Lilienthal. E. David, "Another 'Korea' in the Making", *Collier's* (1951), 56.57.
- <sup>17</sup> B.A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*,
- <sup>18</sup> Asit K. Biswas, "Indus Water Treaty: the Negotiation Process," *Journal of Water International*, 17: 4, (1992), 201.209.
- <sup>19</sup> Palijo, *Sindh-Punjab Water Dispute*, 31-32
- <sup>20</sup> B.A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*, 161
- <sup>21</sup> B.A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*, 162.
- <sup>22</sup> B.A. Malik,
- <sup>23</sup> Undala Alam. Z, "Questioning the Water Wars Rational: A Case Study of the Indus Water Treaty," *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 68, no. 4, (2002), 342. <[http://www.jstor.org/stable/ 3451476/](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3451476/).
- <sup>24</sup> Aaron T. Wolf, "Case Study of Transboundary Dispute Resolution: the Indus Water Treaty," (n.d): 6.
- <sup>25</sup> Michel, *the Indus Rivers: A Study of the Effect of Partition*, 224.
- <sup>26</sup> Bashir A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*
- <sup>27</sup> UndalaAlam. Z, "Questioning the Water Wars Rational: A Case Study of the Indus Water Treaty, 342.
- <sup>28</sup> UndalaAlam. Z, "Questioning the Water Wars Rational: A Case Study of the Indus Water Treaty, 342.
- <sup>29</sup> Bashir A. Malik, *Indus Water Treaty in Retrospect*, 295.
- <sup>30</sup> B.A. Malik, *Indus Water*, 176.77.
- <sup>31</sup> G.W. Choudhury, *Pakistan's Relations with India: 1947-1966* (London: Pall Mall Press Ltd, 1968), 166.
- <sup>32</sup> Tabassum, *River Water Sharing Problem between India and Pakistan*, 29.

