CHAPTER III

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AS A CHALLENGE TO INDIAN DIPLOMACY
International Terrorism As a Challenge to Indian Diplomacy

International terrorism poses many a challenge to a nation's diplomacy. As all established rules of international law and diplomatic conduct are violated through a resort to international terrorism, the problem of managing the menace while sticking to established norms of international conduct posits a unique challenge to diplomacy anywhere. The resort by some nations to state sponsorship of terrorism has made terrorism a strategic instrument of their foreign policies and this complicates the problem further. In state-sponsorship of terrorism, surrogate terrorist forces having clandestine ties to the supporting state use terroristic force against the target country.¹ These forces unleash 'premeditated, politically motivated violence against non-combatants targets by (using) subnational or clandestine agents.'²

Thus in area of international terrorism, there are three actors: the target state, the user state and the non-state entities used as instruments of international terrorism. In a cooperative environment as it prevails in much of the North, the target state can utilize the cooperation extended to it by other states in the form of various bilateral and multilateral agreements and UN resolutions to take effective countermeasures. A non-cooperative environment puts bigger impediments on that action because of direct or indirect but effective support given to terrorist entities by the state-sponsoring terrorism. An example is the difficulty created by the Pakistani abetment of terrorism first in Punjab

¹ Donald J. Hanle, Terrorism the Newest face of Warfare (New York, 1989), p 165.
² Patterns of Global Terrorism US Department of State, Washington, D.C. 1993, p 5
and now in Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan began using this tactic as early as 1947 in Kashmir. It enlarged the area to cover the NorthEast in the sixties and Punjab subsequently. Today, the whole of India has become a target ground for Pakistan's terrorist design. This quasi-Cold war, at a level just short of formal interstate-armed conflict has given an added impetus to the study of international terrorism.

The problem for countries like India arises not just from these interstate rivalries but also from the grey areas that are left blank and vague as a result of diplomatic compromises arrived at various international forums, including the United Nations. The highly subjective translation of a concept like international terrorism and its being mixed with liberation movements against alien domination has rendered the subject virtually unsolvable.

Also, since the roots of international terrorism are outside state boundaries, the targeted state can never fully neutralize its ill effects solely by implementing national solutions. If it tries to contain the reasons within its national boundaries, then more often than not it ends up being attacked for violations of human rights by states having their flexible sets of human rights models for different countries. Hence, the real battle against international terrorism has to be waged at the international level.

The prime problem for India arises from its international image as a peaceful state supporting the cause of non-alignment, non-aggression and democrative values. With such an image and other related constraints, India can not go in for a US-like counter-terrorist strategy of bombing Libyan cities in April 1986. Such an option will only lead to a loss of human life on the one hand and jeopardize the chances of a peaceful settlement.
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3 Chandra B.Khanduri, "Analysis of the Kashmir Problem and an Approach to Solution". Strategic Analysis 13 (6), Sept 1990, pp 626-42.
on the other. Hence, India has to put up with Pakistan's India-bashing at every forum. This coupled with logistical and moral support for the various terrorist outfits dedicated to destabilize and ruin India has led to the erosion of mutual confidence.

Hostage negotiations from another diplomatic challenge. The choice of a relevant bargaining technique also springs up a poser, as each crisis needs a different approach. A hard-line approach is the clue at certain times, while a soft-line one is a panacea at others. Bargaining experts however advocate a middle of the spectrum policy as it conveys the message while retaining flexibility. The Indian government followed this approach while seeking the release of the Romanian Charge d' Affairs Liviu Radu in 1989. In hostage negotiations, the challenge essentially lies in trying to maximize one's communication with the friendly states and step up international pressure on the militants and their life-giver by effectively using the UN and other international forums. Basically, the fundamental dilemma in such cases lies in striking a balance between deterrence and saving lives. Therefore the task of any government lies in preventing the terrorists from (i) terrorizing, (ii) extorting a ransom, and (iii)-forcing governments to negotiate with groups they otherwise would be reluctant to recognize.

The lack of a consensual definition as to what constitutes terrorism puts the tools of diplomacy to an acid test. The open societies of the contemporary world are confronted by a form of warfare, which though not new in itself, is unprecedented both in its dimensions and its linkages. The lack of consensus in recognizing a combat with "low intensity, albeit with high lethality and frequency, but low jeopardy" complicates the
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4 L.Z.Friedman and Yonah Alexander (ed) Perspectives an Terrorism (Hindustan Publishing Corporation, New Delhi, 1985), p. 172
5 ibid, p 201
problem of reaching a solution to the menace. The task is to make friendly countries realize the gravity of the situation and thus seek co-operation in the absence of extradition agreements. Therefore seeking transnational co-operation becomes an area of immense diplomatic exercise.

A related problem pertains to the question of tackling terrorism on the one hand and seeking foreign policy objectives that it hinders on the other. Essentially, the onslaught of terrorism converts a basically political situation into a military one, thereby limiting the government's policy options. As terrorism can not be the only issue on the foreign policy agenda of any country, one's efforts to contain it will run against other foreign policy objectives: economic, commercial or humanitarian. The ordering of these priorities becomes a central issue for foreign policy makers. The fact remains that terrorism diverts the government's attention for brief moments of crisis.

In this chapter, it will be seen how terrorism has become a diplomatic issue for India in its relations with other countries. At the bilateral level, the most important discussion would be of Indo-Pak and Indo-Sri Lankan relations. How the fallout of these relations affect our ties with other nations, for example, the case of Kashmir as an issue in Indo-US relations would also be discussed. At the multilateral level the scenario at the UNHRC would dealt with.

\textsuperscript{6} ibid ; p xiii.
Indo-Pak relations and the challenge posed by Pakistan-sponsored terror

India

No other dispute today has greater potential for war, disaster and devastation than the half-a-decade old Indo-Pak conflict. Both nations are now declared nuclear powers after their May 1998 nuclear explosions and boast of enormous conventional military forces, largely deployed against each other. This antagonistic relationship has remained totally unchanged and unaffected by the end of the Cold war. The unprecedented political changes and the recent reconciliation's between erstwhile sworn enemies. These two nations have also fought three wars-in 1948, 65 and 71. In 1986 and 1991, they also engaged in tension-generating military exercises that led to emergency diplomatic intervention by the US. Another factor complicating things is the failure of traditional avenues of dialogues and the coming to power of weak governments in both countries. With Pakistan's continuous abetment of terrorism in parts of India, the need for a substantial dialogue has never been felt more urgently than now.

As the official dialogue has failed to make much headway some experts have suggested that both sides learn from the Oslo Accord model and reorient their negotiating styles. But such a happening will not come easily as neither country would want to moot such a process on its own because it would appear to be an acceptance of defeat. Further weak governments, rapid Prime Ministerial changes, domestic political polarisation, the rise of fundamentalism and the inability to sustain economic development due to the high

7 The Oslo negotiations were secret, informal talks between non-government figures who had their leaders' approval. They were thus not compromised by domestic political considerations.
costs of military expenditure have also acted as a deterrent to peace between the two nations. The predicament is worse for Pakistan as it has seen a change of seven governments since 1988, faced economic problems due to the 1990 cessation of US aid and seen the acute ethnic strife in Karachi that has claimed thousands of lives.

It is these domestic consideration that have forced successive governments to indulge in India-bashing to divert the public's attention from domestic problems. Pakistan has also extended various facilities to terrorists operating in different parts of India. In the 1980s it became a safe haven and fund-provider for Punjab militants. Whether it was receiving notorious terrorists like Satnam Singh Satta of the Babbar Khalsa or extending safe havens to Gurbachan Singh Manochal and Wassan Singh Zaffarwal of the Bhindranwale Tiger Force of Khalistan and the Panthic Committee respectively, Pakistan has utilised the domestic dissent in India to the fullest and converted it into a situation of international terrorism.9

The strategy was turned into an full circle by Pakistan when it started aiding and abetting terrorism in Kashmir. Things have been aggravated by the so-called "unfinished agenda of Kashmir" and this has deepened the psychological schism on both sides so much so that all aspects of their bilateral relations end up being sidelined or adversely affected due to this issue. The Pakistani foreign policy in general is India specific and in particular is hostage to the Kashmir issue. Post 1986 especially, this issue has become a part of Pakistan's politics of personal vendetta, rivalry and revenge between the two holders of Prime Ministership, Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif. The government of the

8 Ahmad Rashid, representative of the Far Eastern Economic Review in a paper presented at a Workshop on CBMs is South Asia and published in The Nation(Labore), 29-31 March and 1 April 1995
9 Times of India (New Delhi), April 7, 1989.
day has always been forced to be ahead in fomenting problems of terrorism in India and indulging in India-bashing so as not to look conciliatory to the opposition. This factor has been a major impediment in the creation of an environment that could spawn new initiatives to end the current hardboiled and hawkish stand of Pakistani authorities. For example, the Bhutto-Sharif confrontation of 1993-95 ensured that Bhutto reject any Indian proposals out of hand. The fate of any consequent CBMs has been the same as so long as Pakistan sees the sub-continental relationship as a zero-sum game, the road to the negotiating table would be long and arduous.

All these factors have made Indo-Pak bilateral relations a virtual minefield of mutual recriminations, communal antagonism and military confrontation. As mentioned before, this debilitating rivalry provides both nations the justification to pour their limited resources into defence preparedness against each other. The main obstacle comes from not achieving what Ayub Khan called "freedom from fear of each other and freedom to protect our respective frontiers". With the induction of the Ghauri missile in Pakistan and the subsequent nuclear tests conducted by both countries, the politico-strategic uncertainties that currently threaten South Asian stability underscore how critical the dialogue between India and Pakistan has become.

To study the current diplomatic measures better, the record of past negotiations has to be analyzed to discover the attitudes and assumptions which the two sides bring to the negotiating table. The fate of these sub-continental negotiations has always been hostage to variables that have played their due part at a given moment in history. These
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variables include domestic political considerations, the overriding interests of the superpowers and the vagaries of Indo-Pak leadership styles. Therefore, it would amount to a gross-overgeneralization to speak of an "immutable" Indo-Pak negotiating culture.  

Another important factor is that the Indo Pak negotiations have never been held in a vacuum. The diplomatic leverage of outside powers like the OIC and the UN have sometimes played a deciding role in the outcome. Throughout the Cold War, the US and the USSR played their role in this sub-continental political scenario through the sales of arms and an overt regional military presence.  

Coming back to the issue of terrorism and Kashmir, Pakistan's stand has been about pressing for the implementation of UN resolutions in Kashmir and holding a plebiscite there. India considers these resolutions as invalid and respects the Simla Agreement of 1972. According to this agreement, in Jammu and Kashmir, the forces of both India and Pakistan agreed to honour the Line of Actual Control (LAC) – earlier known as the line of control (LoC). The two countries also agreed to resolve their differences bilaterally through peaceful means. India's hopes that in due course of time Pakistan would accept the LOC as an international border were completely belied. Pakistan stepped in after reinvigorating its security forces and destabilised the situation in Kashmir totally, before bringing it on the national and international agenda. As its connivance with the militants in the Valley became an acknowledged fact, a breakdown of subcontinental confidence came about. In such an atmosphere, even if agreements
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11 Douglas C. Makeig, "War, No-war and the Indo-Pak Negotiating Process." Strategic Digest, 16 (10), Oct 86, pp. 1444-1457  

12 Some multilateral forums like the NAM, the CHOGM and the SAARC have not played a pivotal role in Indo-Pak relation. The SAARC in particular has been held hostage to this rivalry.
were reached, the environment to implement them was hardly created. The hopefulness of the 1984 dialogue which promised to bring normalcy to Indo-Pak relations was soon razed to the ground as evidence of Pakistani hand in terrorism in Punjab and Kashmir came to the fore. The deadlock persisted for around two years after which negotiations began in Lahore for seeking an agreement on curbing drug trafficking and terrorism in the region. Later in January 1987, negotiations started between the foreign secretaries Gonsalves and Abdul Sattar to reach an agreement to defuse tension by working on how to prevent mutual attack, restrain provocation and implement the pull out of troops from the border. A change in the mood was perceptible when Benazir Bhutto and Rajiv Gandhi met in 1988 and signed the agreement regarding non-attack on each other's nuclear installation. Further negotiations were held in Islamabad in May 1989 and both sides agreed to have better relations as envisaged in the Simla Agreement, and also agreed to adopt measures to curb terrorism, smuggling and illicit border crossing.

The factual scenario however belied any such understanding. India bashing at every national and international forum became the Pakistani forte. This coupled with logistical and moral support to the various terrorist outfits dedicated to destabilize and ruin India has led to the erosion of mutual confidence and increased suspicion.

More particularly the bilateral relationship had come under severe strain since 1989 on account of Pakistan's continuous aid to terrorism in Punjab and J and K. This
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14 Annual Report 1988 Ministry of External Affairs, Govt. of India.
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was accompanied by inflammatory statements made by Pakistani leaders against India that were aimed at misrepresented the situation in Jammu and Kashmir.

India conveyed in unequivocal terms to Pakistan that the latter's continued support to terrorism directed against India was not only in contravention of the Simla Agreement and of universally accepted norms of inter-state conduct, but also adversely affected any confidence-building in bilateral relationship. It also worked against the long term interest of peace and stability in the region.

The then External Affairs Minister, Shri I K Gujral had a meeting with Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Sahabzada Yaqub Khan in New York on 25 April 1990. It was agreed in the meeting that tension should be reduced and confrontation avoided. It was decided that the Directors General of Military Operations of India and Pakistan would remain in touch with each other and both sides would exercise restraint and keep channels of communication open.

In order to reduce tensions and allay fears of confrontation, India proposed a package of Confidence Building Measures including both military and non-military elements to Pakistan on 28 May 1990. Pursuant to this, three rounds of Foreign Secretary level talks were held between India and Pakistan. The discussions took place from 17 to 20 July (Islamabad). It was pointed out to Pakistan that the root cause of the present tensions between the two countries was Pakistan's support to terrorist activities directed against India in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir.

Later, the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan, Shri Chandra Shekhar and Mr. Nawaz Sharif, had a fruitful and constructive exchange of views in the Maldives on 22
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November 1990, on the occasion of SAARC Summit. The two Prime Ministers decided that all differences were to be resolved peacefully and through dialogue. Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar reiterated India's position on Pakistan's interference in her internal affairs. The two Prime Ministers also agreed to remain in touch with each other. A 'hotline' has been since established between the Prime Ministers of the two countries.

The third round of talks between the Foreign Secretaries was guided by the directives of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan, following their meeting in the Maldives on 22, November 1990. During the talks, it was decided to exchange in January 1991, the Instruments of Ratification of the Agreement on Prohibition of Attack against Nuclear Installations and Facilities which was signed on 31 December 1988 and subsequently ratified by both Governments. The Instruments of Ratification were exchanged on 27 January 1991 and the Agreement came into effect from that date. As a means of reducing tension between the two countries, it was agreed that the telephonic touch with each other on a weekly basis would continue. A meeting of the experts to finalise the pending drafts of (i) the Agreement on Advance Notice of Military Exercises and Manoeuvres and (ii) the Agreement on Prevention of Air Space Violation by Military Aircraft. This agreement was signed in April 1991 and in January 1992, a list of nuclear installations was exchanged. But the year 1992 also saw an unprecedented escalation of Pakistani propaganda against India on the Kashmir and human rights issues. This was countered by the External Publicity Division of the Ministry of External Affairs by encouraging independent producers to make documentaries showing the Kashmir issue in its correct perspective and sending these along with proofs of Pakistani help to

17 ibid., p.9.
terorists in India to foreign missions. This helped to create a shift in the international media on Kashmir.\(^{18}\)

The next rounds of talks got postponed till August 92 as the atmosphere was again vitiated by Pakistani help to terrorists in India. On 17 August 1992, the Pakistani foreign Secretary met the Indian Prime Minister to hand over a letter of the Pak Prime Minister proposing bilateral discussion on J & K under Art. 6 of the Simla Agreement. India has always upheld this agreement as the necessary framework for resolving the entire range of different issues affecting bilateral relations. Ironically, Pakistan soon after this raised the Kashmir issue in violation of the Simla Agreement at the 10th NAM Summit in Jakarta and the UN General Assembly (UNGA) plenary session.

The Bombay blasts of 1993 and Pakistan's complicity in their planning and execution resulted in an increased perception of Pakistan's heinous designs of engineering instability in India. In spite of Pakistan PM Nawaz Sharif's assurance to the Indian PM in Dhaka in April 1993 of locating, apprehending and returning members of the Memon on family in India, no positive response ensued. In the same year, Pakistan indulged in a lot of false propaganda over the Hazratbal crisis to arouse communal feelings and encourage extremism. Its efforts to raise a resolution on human rights situation in J and K was however rejected by the Third Committee of the UNGA.\(^{19}\)

The dialogue was halted and resumed fitfully after almost two years but no positive developments were seen till 1997 when India and Pakistan agreed to set up a Joint Working Group on all contentious issues. Thus a decade long stand off was broken


and after three days of hard bargaining the Indian Foreign Secretary Salman Haider agreed to the Kashmir panel plan. In addition a range of CBMS (Confidence Building Measures) were also agreed upon, as both agreed to release civilian prisoners who had strayed into each other's territory and also agreed to stop hostile propaganda against each other. The September 1997 round of Foreign Secretary level talks in New Delhi dealt with the methodology and the mechanism of the proposed Joint Working Group.

Following India's nuclear tests of 11 May 1998, Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee reiterated his proposal for having bilateral talks on all issues, including Kashmir. This change is the result of Kashmir being put on the international agenda once again by the subcontinental nuclear one up man-ship. It has also given a shot in the arm to the Pakistani demand of solving the "core issue" of Kashmir, because what Pakistani strategists could not achieve in fifty years, was suddenly achieved due to these tests. The Joint Communique of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council of 4 June 1998 in paragraph 5 describes Kashmir as being the "root cause of the tension" between India and Pakistan - a semantic construction that rejects the core positions of Indian diplomacy. This was also endorsed by the UN Defence Secretary William Cohen who suggested a multilateral discussion on the matter.

Thus for the first time in many years, Pakistan feels it has the diplomatic whip hand on Kashmir. Emboldened by the position taken by the US-led Western coalition on the need for a settlement of the Kashmir issue, Pakistan is on a 'high'. It is thus looking for international mediation on the matter and sidelining the Indo-Pak efforts of Edinburgh.
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20 The Telegraph (Calcutta), 23 June 1997.
(October 1997) and Dhaka (1998) where both countries had set out to evolve a mutually agreed mechanism to discuss Kashmir. Pakistan has therefore welcomed the proposed visit of the UN Secretary General's special envoy to find a solution to the Kashmir issue. These developments have also rejuvenated many terrorist outfits in the valley. The APHC, according to some reports is now set to launch a fresh offensive.\textsuperscript{22}

Given the present situation, it would be unrealistic to expect Pakistan to engage in serious bilateral negotiations. On its part, India needs to help Pakistan eschew its competitive diplomacy with India and also its "internationalisation or nothing" stand.

**Pakistan's UNHRC Diplomacy against India**

The Kashmir issue gathered a sharp focus as never before during the meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission (UNHRC) in Geneva in early 1994. Pakistan sought to introduce a resolution on the human rights situation in the valley and called for a fact finding mission to be sent to J and K to report on the situation. For years, Pakistan has denigrated India on its human rights stand to put it in the dock internationally and thus tried to stop it from taking effective countermeasures against terrorism in the apprehension that it would invite harsh international reaction. At the Geneva 1994 session, Pakistan failed to enlist the support of its traditional allies like OIC who refused to be embroiled in "intrusive diplomacy" and chose to be guided by "enlightened self-interest" instead.\textsuperscript{23} Iran took the initiative to ask Pakistan to withdraw even as the vote was announced. As twenty countries retracted from what they called a strictly "bilateral" issue, Pakistan was forced to withdraw. In the meantime, an international observers team

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 12.

consisting of four European ambassadors reported on the Kashmir situation and India's transparancy earned it plaudits.\textsuperscript{24} India also convinced the UN members that Pakistan's call for selfdetermination on religious basis would only affect many independent multi ethnic states.\textsuperscript{25} How the diplomatic challenge presented by this Conference was addressed to by India is discussed in the next chapter.

\textbf{Indo US relations and the Kashmir issue}

Much to India's dismay, the US has not yet put Pakistan on the list of nations supporting terrorism though it came quite close to doing it in 1993. Inspite of clinching evidence to the effect, the US let the matter rest by saying that India and Pakistan should sort out the Kashmir issue within the frame work of the Simla Agreement.

The US Government's policy towards the Kashmir issue has evolved gradually from its 1947 stance to the more recent reiteration of it being a "disputed territory", a solution for which could be worked out as per the Simla Agreement.\textsuperscript{26}

As a practical matter the US wants the needs of the Kashmiri people to be taken into consideration. The over all change in the US policy came about with the end of the Cold War and the growing American threat perception from the Islamic extremists.\textsuperscript{27}

With the coming to power of President Bill Clinton, for sometime the US position seemed to harden. On October 29, 1993, a lot of heat was generated when the Assistant

\textsuperscript{24} Times of India (New Delhi), 9 Feb, 1994.


\textsuperscript{26} Annual Report 1993-94 Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, 1994, p.71

\textsuperscript{27} M. Saleem Kidwai, Kashmir Factor in Indo-US relations, CPS New Delhi, 1995, p 6
Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, Robin Raphel, attacked the Indian stand on Kashmir and said that her country did not recognize the Instrument of Accession of 1947 that made Kashmir a part of India.\textsuperscript{28} Though the US administration tried not to give much attention to this statement it invited a lot of backlash from India.\textsuperscript{29} Her subtle linking of the Kashmir issue to the nuclear one was endorsed by the South Asian affairs expert Stephen Cohen when he said that "the road to accession to the NPT runs through Kashmir".\textsuperscript{30} This close link between regional instability and the nuclear issue has been strengthened in the US eyes after the Pokharan and Chagai Hills blasts of May 1998.

Immediately after Raphel's utterances, a damage control exercise was started even though many felt it was a ploy to cover up the real position of the US on the matter. Anyway the declared US stand lists Kashmir as a disputed issue though there is no talk of a plebiscite now.\textsuperscript{31} Privately, the US has also opposed Pakistan's raising of the matter in UN security Council or elsewhere.

However Indian doubts about the official American position were reinforced when senior US officials started flogging India on its alleged human rights violations in the Valley. This was followed by Clinton's reference to Kashmir in the same breath as Angola and Caucasus in his address to the UN General Assembly in 1993.\textsuperscript{32} Undoubtedly this created the worst possible apprehensions in New Delhi, more so as this
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\textsuperscript{29} Parmit Pal Chaudhary, "Post-Raphelite Canvas", The Telegraph, 23 March, 1994.

\textsuperscript{30} Indian Express (New Delhi), 2 March 94.

\textsuperscript{31} Congressional Testimony by the US Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asia, John Kelley on 6 March, 1990

\textsuperscript{32} M. Saleem Kidwai, n.27, p.7
came immediately after the Indo-US bilateral talks reached a dead end. Due to this, the whole edifice of Indo-US relations tattered for a while and a wave of anti-US sentiment swept across the country as it was constructed as a more to embolden Pakistan in its waging of a low intensity war against India with greater impurity. Things reached such a stage that the Indian Ambassador to the US, S.S. Ray asked for a former letter setting out US policy on Kashmir.

Another development that complicated the matter was the sending of Clinton's letter to the Kashmir separatist Dr. Ghulam Nabi Fai at around the same time. In this letter, Clinton pledged support to Fai's cause to bring peace to Kashmir. Within the next few days, Clinton shared Pakistan's concern about human rights violations in Kashmir while Robin Raphel equated the situation in the Valley with the civil war in Afghanistan.

Coupled with these disturbing utterances was the growing in strength of a strong anti-India lobby in the US. India-baiters like Senator Dan Burton and Dana Rohrabacher only compounded the problem. Some pro-Khalistan Congressmen worsened the situation further with their anti-Indian moves in the Congress. On 5 August 1993, democrat Pete Geren of Texas moved a resolution supporting the Sikh's right to self determination and Khalistan. Others like Vic Fazio moved an amendment in June 1993 seeking to link aid to India to its human rights practices. Gary Condit too supported the Sikh right to self determination. It was subsequently discovered that the real reason behind their support to extremist causes are the funds that they receive from such sources. The gain in terms of money and manpower is the reason why India-bashers still abound in the US.
The overall scenario keeping in view negative attitudes and official damage control set a clear picture. The American position on Kashmir underlines the need to accommodate the wishes of the Kashmiri people in any final settlement. After the nuclear tests of May 1998, the US is in a hurry to see this contentious issue solved fast as it is feared that it could lead to a major nuclear escalation in South Asia and this may have a spill over effect world wide. Hence the passing of resolutions in the G-8 and Security Council meetings asking for an early settlement of the dispute. The challenge to India comes from the need to retain Kashmir as its integral part on the one hand while facing adverse international pressure on the other.

**Indo - UK and Indo - Canadian relations**

The evidence of the activities of Punjab and Kashmir extremists in the U.K has always been well documented. Countering Pakistani-bred propaganda abroad about human rights violations by Indian security forces and projecting its own stand had become big diplomatic challenges for India especially in the eighties.

Largely untouched by all this, Indo-UK relations have managed to retain a good understanding through out the nineties. High level visits marked the year 1993 and in November, the Instruments of Ratification of the Indo-UK Extradition Treaty were exchanged, bringing it into immediate effect.

This has been one of India's major diplomatic achievements and is dealt with at length in the next chapter. On issues such as Kashmir and Human rights, the official UK
policy has been generally constructive and balanced in showing sensitivity to India’s concerns.\textsuperscript{35}

Canada too had been an important base for ‘Khalistani’ activists throughout the last decade. Most of these groups had interactions with their counterparts in India and were an important source of financial assistance. They have also aided in carrying out violent activities on Indian soil. Pakistan has acted as a mediator and facilitator between extremists in Canada and India.\textsuperscript{36} India was also concerned by some Canadian politicians making political capital out of the problems in Punjab in the name of human rights for garnering the support of their Punjab-origin constituents. Even in the face of these irritants, negotiations for a Treaty of Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters was laid down after India evinced a greater but gradual Canadian interest in its terrorist situation. The blowing up of Air-India’s Kanishka aircraft in 1985 was one instance which brought home the need to tackle terrorism jointly.\textsuperscript{37} The Indo-Canadian Extradition Treaty that was signed in October 1987 marked the culmination of closer co-operation to combat terrorism.

\textbf{Indo-SriLankan Relations}

The diplomatic challenge that comes in this field springs from the desire on India’s part to undo what it did earlier. The LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam)

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Annual Report} 1993-94, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, 1994
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have become India's Frankenstien's monster when they brutally killed Rajiv Gandhi on 21 May 1991 in Sriperumbudur.\(^{38}\)

The roots of the problem go back to the early eighties when the ethnic strike in Sri Lanka reached a point of no return. The Sinhalese Tamil clashes forced a number of Tamilians to flee to India and their plight evoked a big wave of sympathy from Indian Tamils. Sri Lankan Analysts claim that the problem was intensified by India when the Research and Analysis Wing (RAW), the Indian intelligence outfit had become involved with the Tamil guerilla's training even before the massive anti-Tamil violence of July 1983. \(^{39}\) The LTTE documents however said this alliance started only after September 1983. \(^{40}\) Hence, India's concern for Tamils and its guarded response to the growing public sympathy in Tamil Nadu for the Sri Lankans Tamils in the Northern and Eastern regions became a consideration for India's policy making. The growing influx of refugees in to India - around 1,50,000 by 1986 - also became a reason eliciting an urgent Indian response to the Sri Lankan crisis.

India's desire to see the Sri Lankan Government reach a negotiated settlement with the Tamils and also to reverse Sri Lanka's policy of cultivating extra regional and adversarial strategic interest perceived by India as a threat to its own long term security interests manifested itself at three levels. At the diplomatic level, India offered its good offices for initiating direct talks between the Sri Lankan government and the Tamil

\(^{38}\) *Times of India* (New Delhi), 22 May, 1991


leadership within the framework of a United Sri Lanka. 41 At the second level, India sent its emissary G Pasrthasarthy to engage the militant groups in finding an acceptable solution with the Sri Lankan government. At the third level of international diplomacy, India drew international, particularly Western, attention to the atrocities being committed on the Tamils in Sri Lanka. 42

Rajiv Gandhi's coming to power in 1984 led to a tactical shift in India's earlier stand as there was a softening of attitude towards Sri Lanka with a simultaneous hardening while a hardening of stance was evident against the Tamil militants. On this new factual basis, India went ahead and drew up a time table for talks between the Sri Lankan government and the Tamil militants to be held in Thimpu in July 1985. As the Thimpu talks collapsed, some militant groups, particularly the LTTE, began distancing themselves from India and subsequently worked towards becoming dreaded outfits. 43 Subsequent Indian efforts at mediation were not too successful and hence they were suspended in early February 1987. The gameplan now revolved around direct intervention and this took place in the form of dropping relief supplies to Jaffna in June 1987. The resultant Operations Poomalai and Eagle were motivated by India's sense of alienation from both the conflicting parties. To narrow this distance, India signed the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement of 1987 while trying to assure the Tamil militants that their concerns would be treated as important. Though India failed to elicit the Tamils support

41 The Hindustan Times, 10 August, 1983

42 S.D.S. Muni, Pangs of Proximity: India and Sri Lanka's Ethnic Crisis, sage, New Delhi, 1993, P 73

43 ibid, p 79.
pouring in. For India however, this Agreement was perceived to reinforce its credentials as an indispensable actor striving for peace in the region. The provision of placing an Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) in Sri Lanka was also a part of the Agreement. The IPKF task was complex in nature as peace keeping requires a fragile balance between neutrality and concern. Upto October 1987, the IPKF did its job wonderfully, but as extensive fighting broke out between Sri Lankan forces and the LTTE, the latter started blaming the IPKF for the and fired its first shot against it in September 1987. As the IPKF got embroiled in fighting the LTTE, they came to be regarded not as peacekeepers but as a fighting force. As adverse criticism rolled in, the IPKF came to be regarded as an occupation army, inspite of its losses of around 1200 dead and 2500 injured. Apart from this, IPKF's violations of human rights became popular allegations against it. Judging by all these, the IPKF was looking for withdrawal and this took its time in coming along apart from becoming a major irritant in Indo-Sri Lankan relations. India's peace keeping experiment thus ended on an unhappy note but not without antagonising the government of Sri Lanka and the militants alike.

The dilemma of dismounting the tiger has thus become a big poser for Indian foreign policy. The wrath that the IPKF and the Indian government earned led to Rajiv Gandhi's assassination in 1991. The heavy price that India thus paid in the process became an important factor for introspection for Indian diplomacy.

To sum up, the many issues that confront Indian diplomacy due to the threat of international terrorism that India faces are complex as much in their nature as in the search for their solution. Whether it is countering the malicious disinformation campaign on India's human rights record or judging the degree of involvement in assisting a neighbour against terrorism, policy options and international cooperation are required and these are discussed in the next chapter.

46 Tamil Times (London), June 1988, p 6