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Sucheta Ghosh in her "The Role of India in the Emergence of Bangladesh" gives the impression that the Indo-Pak relations were very much hostile not only from the partition of Indian sub-continent on the basis of ‘Two-Nation Theory’ in 1947 but from pre-partition rivalry between the Congress and the Muslim League. While the Muslim League identified the Congress as the biggest enemy of the Indian Muslims, the Congress, on the other hand, considered the League a stooge of British imperialism and as a stumbling block to independence. Though the partition of India was ultimately accepted by both the Congress and the Muslim League, it was actually brought about through brutal communal riots and forced migration. As a result, the two nascent states were born in an atmosphere of extreme bitterness and tension. The partition could solve only one old problem creating two National States i.e. Hindustan and Pakistan but gave birth to a number of disputes many of which still exit. The minorities in both the States felt unsecured; the controversy over the Indus water, British India's assets, transfer of evacuees' property, and above all, the Native States' problems specially the Kashmir issue internationalized the Indo-Pak relations. These problems specially the last one not only vitiated the Two-Nation relations but involved UNO to sort out the problem. It kept Indo-Pak tensions constantly alive leading to the Indo-Pak wars in 1948 and 1965; the last Indo-Pak War in 1971 resulted in the emergence of a new Nation culminated in Bangladesh which further aggravated the Indo-Pak tensions and that may be marked as Indo-Pak Cold War. This is a new phenomenon in the history of South Asia.1

The above view is corroborated by Thomas Perry Thornton in Pakistan: Fifty years of insecurity by saying that more important was the factor of religion. The gulf that has been emerged between Hindus and Muslims over the century had been intensified by the British colonial policy and led the Muslim League to demand a separate nation. Islam would inform the foreign policy values of this new nation as a positive tie to other Muslim countries, but also in a negative sense of profound rivalry with India and fear of "Hindu domination." Mr. Thornton continues to say that the armed conflict that immediately developed over Kashmir was seen in Pakistan as proof that India did not accept the legitimacy of the Muslim nation. Kashmir became the focus of relations between India and Pakistan --- as a quarrel over territory, but even more as the symbol of the struggle between Islamic Pakistan and secular India.2

The Pakistani aggressive view in this regard is profound in The Report of the Hamoodur
The Report states in a complaint manner: "From the very outset, India's ambition has been to absorb Pakistan or turn her into a satellite. The colossal problem of refugee rehabilitation was created in 1947 by India to cripple our economy. This was accompanied by denying us our share of the assets of undivided India and the threat of diversion and stoppage of river-waters flowing into our country. Contrary to all agreements and principles, India forcibly occupied a major part of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and concentrated her forces there, thus posing a constant threat to our security." The Report continues to argue that the Indian leaders made no secret of their designs. Mr. Acharya Kripalani, who was President of the Indian National Congress in 1947, declared: "Neither the Congress nor the nation has given up its claim of a united India." Sarder Vallabh Bhai Patel, the first Indian Home Minister and the Strongman of the Congress Party, announced at the same time: "Sooner or later we shall again be united in common allegiance to our country." "Thus from the day of Independence, Pakistan was involved in a bitter and prolonged struggle for her very existence and survival. The central issue between India and Pakistan is whether an Islamic State and a secular Hindu State can co-exist in relative peace."

Sucheta Ghosh analyses the view of the Pakistan Government. She mentions that Karachi (later on Islamabad) presumed that the trouble in East Pakistan was instigated by India and considered it as an extension of Indo-Pak hostility. The Bengalis of East Pakistan, however, believed that their struggle against their counterpart in West wing was quite independent of India and they thought that the bogey of Indian interference was raised by the Pakistan authorities to sidetrack the main issue. India on her part had always denied the charge of interference in the domestic affairs of Pakistan, but in 1971 the internal disturbance of Pakistan took an acute form and through the influx of millions of refugees across the border of India it spilled over and created a major problem for India also. At that critical juncture, India's policy was influenced, inter alia, by two basic factors: her hostile relations with Pakistan and the rise of a new political culture among the Bengalis of East Pakistan. This new political culture emerged in the Eastern region as a result of its dispute with the Western wing and was not rooted in the anti-Indian Islamic ideology of Pakistan. The Indo-Pakistan enmity which was rooted in the past historical traditions was aggravated by mutual suspicion and apprehension as well as colliding ideologies and foreign policies. Pakistan had to defend her two wings, separated by a thousands miles of Indian Territory and to deal with the security problems of the North-West Frontier with an unfriendly Afghanistan. Furthermore, Pakistan started her independent existence with a paralysing fear about India indicating fear of Hindu imperialism. The Pakistani leaders and the Press had time and again pointed out that India never reconciled herself to the permanent existence of an independent Pakistan. Aslam Siddiqi in his book *Pakistan Seeks Security* explained this point clearly.
Sucheta Ghosh examines the allegations put forward by the Pak nationalist historians, press and the Pak officials: Pakistan's fear of Indian domination, however exaggerated it might have been, was not without foundation. There was a strong public opinion in India which considered the acceptance of the partition of the country by the Congress as great blunder. There were indeed some political parties in India which firmly believed in the concept of Akhand Hindustan and many responsible leaders publicly proclaimed that Pakistan would not last long. Even Mahatma Gandhi viewed on 11 May, 1947, "If the Prime Minister could possibly take up this attitude, he (Mr. Gandhi) would undertake to go with him from place to place and reason with Hindu audience, and he was sure that there would not be a Hindu opponent left to the unity of Bengal-- the unity for which the Hindus and Muslims had fought together so valiantly, and undone 'the settled fact' of so powerful a Viceroy as Lord Curzon. If he were Mr. Suhrawardy, he would invite the Hindus to partition his body before they thought of partitioning Bengal." Jawaharlal Nehru also said on 28 November, 1947, "India can not and will not remain divided. This is my conviction no matter how much I am criticized for having accepted the partition."5 "Among Congressmen, the greatest supporter of partition was Sarder Patel. --- He was also convinced that the new State of Pakistan was not viable and could not last. --- Pakistan would collapse in short time."6

Though the Government of India recognized Pakistan as an independent state, it did not accept the 'Two-Nation Theory' propounded by Jinnah as the basis of partition upon which the state was created. The leadership of Pakistan has persistently accused India of not having reconciled to India's partition, and planning to undo it. The Dawn, a leading Pakistani newspaper, had once alleged that India's policy was "that Pakistan should be friendless and defenseless, so that we could be perpetually held no ransom and at some future time swallowed up." The anti-Indian policy of Pakistan, blaming India specially the Hindu community for all the problems is clearly manifested in what former Pakistan Prime Minister Z.A. Bhutto wrote in The Myth of Independence. He wrote that the Muslims had ruled over the sub-continent for 700 years and finally they succeeded (in 1947) in carving out their homeland. According to Bhutto, Hindu masses were disturbed by this historic "complex" and their defeat. He said that Muslim Pakistan was a challenge to Hindu nationalism. He was of the opinion that Indian leadership was forced to accept Pakistan as they were left with no alternative.7

In that complex situation, Pakistan was very much worried about its security like France just after the conclusion of the First World War (1914-1918). Pakistan believed that the only way to ensure her security was to preserve a balance of power with India. Thomas Perry Thornton explains it in the following way:
"Thus from the very inception, Pakistan was an "insecurity state" that perceived itself not only as small and disadvantaged but as on the defensive against a real and present threat, with its survival at stake." Mr. Thornton continues to say that Pakistan initially sought to offset geopolitics through religion: "it was to be part of the universal community of believers, and as the first nation to be formed in the name of Islam felt that it should and would receive full support of the universal community of Muslims, the ummah. Thus, Pakistan's foreign policy as it flowed over a very rocky bed defined by hostility toward a vastly stronger India."8

The Islamic ideology of Pakistan had a clear anti-Indian undertone. It was the same old ideology which was adopted previously by the Muslim League in its fight against the Congress, which was identified as a Hindu organization. The Islamic ideology was necessary for Pakistan not only as a shield against India but also as a means for the maintenance of her internal cohesion. Though Jinnah demanded a new state for the Indian Muslims on the basis of two-nation theory, the battle for Pakistan was actually launched not under the banner of nationalism but in the name of Islam. Even after Pakistan's birth, no sense of Pakistani nationalism developed among its people. In the absence of any spirit of territorial nationalism, Pakistan grew up as an Islamic country based on theocracy.9 To prove this point, Sucheta Ghosh, explains the attitudes of the Islamic scholars like Aslam Siddiki who in his book Pakistan Seeks Security deplored that "the ulcer of racialism and geographical nationalism have become engrafted on the body politic of Islam, eating into its vital" He, therefore, urged the Muslim intellectuals to "rediscover the spirit of Islam in the context of ever-widening panorama of modern science and knowledge." Islam, thus, served two different, though intertwined purposes of Pakistan. It was an instrument to promote national integration on one hand and to mobilize the people against the perceived danger from "Hindu" India on the other. The necessity of Islam was, therefore, felt not only by the orthodox section of the Muslims in Pakistan, but also by the top-ranking leaders like M. A. Jinnah, Ayub Khan and Z.A. Bhutto, whose loyalty to modernism was undiluted. It is admitted by all that the main thrust of Pakistan's foreign policy was anti-Indianism. Sucheta Ghosh refers to G.W. Choudhury who puts the idea as follows: "The main aim of Pakistan's foreign policy has been to obtain a shield against a possible attack from India, while the main aim of India's foreign policy seems to be to isolate and weaken Pakistan." Pakistan's foreign policy has, thus, passed through four stages of evolution: i) closer association with the Commonwealth, ii) attempts to build up a Muslim bloc, iii) military alliance with the western bloc specially with the USA, iv) friendship with China. The most important and persistent single factor present in all the stages was her quest for security against the possible invasion by India.10
The above idea is clear from the view of Mr. Z. A. Bhutto. He says, "..... There will always be a quantitative inequality in the sub-continent. The imbalance can grow or lessen but it will remain because of the vast difference in the resources of the two countries (India and Pakistan). For this reason, Pakistan entered into alliances with the United States of America." In this context, Mr. Bhutto explains the background of the Entente between Pakistan and People's Republic of China in the following manner, "The People's Republic of China is the only country which will be sympathetic to Pakistan's real requirements. This is so because that country's interests in the sub-continent coincide with those of Pakistan."11

Under the above circumstances, attempt has been made to find out the nature of the Indo-Pak relation vis-à-vis Tripura. As the Indian sub-continent was divided on the basis of Two-nation Theory, the emergent issue between the two nations was the minority problem. The Report of Hamoodur Rehman Commission runs on this issue thus: After the partition of the Sub-continent the first major event, apart from the problem of refugees and the division of assets, which brought the two countries on the verge of confrontation, was the Indian treatment of the large Muslim minority in that country. The Report mentions that the result of the serious issue was the Liaquat-Nehru Pact of 1950 which was willfully dishonoured by the Indian authorities giving birth to the frequent communal riots involving acts of loot and arson, kidnapping, rape and killing of innocent Muslims.12 It is well known that the issue in question is not a one-way traffic. A series of Hindu-Muslim riots took place in the sub-continent before and after partition which led to the migration of Hindus from Pakistan to India and Muslims from India to Pakistan.

V N Khanna puts it in the following way: Immediately before and after the partition of India in 1947, large scale riots, looting, raping of women, kidnapping took place both in India and Pakistan which were directly responsible for the problem of displaced persons and minorities. The Inter-Dominion Agreement of 1948 had clearly provided that the responsibility for the protection of the displaced persons and minorities rested on the Government of both the countries. But both India and Pakistan accused each other of deliberately causing communal conflicts and riots. At this critical juncture of communal crises, an agreement between India and Pakistan, called the Nehru-Liaquat Agreement was signed on April 8, 1950. Despite this agreement, the protection of minorities could not be ascertained both in India and Pakistan specially in Pakistan. Meanwhile, two members of the Nehru Cabinet, Dr. Shyma Prasad Mukherji and K.C. Neogi resigned by way of protest against the Agreement. The only Hindu member of Pakistan Cabinet, Mr. Jogendranath Mandal had resigned as a protest against ill-treatment of minorities specially the Hindus in that country. The problem of minorities remained a live issue between the two countries because mil-
lions of displaced persons in both the countries were in urgent need of rehabilitation which was almost unbearable for both the countries. The tiny and hilly Tripura received additional burden of 6,09,998 Bengali refugees (official record) from East Pakistan from the period from August, 1947 to March, 1971; while in 1971 the population of Tripura stood to 1,556,342.13

The states like Tripura, West Bengal, Assam were adversely affected by that immigration. This serious aspect is dealt with in detail in the first chapter. From the discussions of Dr. J B Ganguly (now late), Dr. Ranjit De (now late), Dr. Mahadev Chakraborty, Dr. Bijan Mohanta and others, it is clear that a demographic revolution took place in Tripura which make the Hindu Bengalis coming from East Pakistan an overwhelming majority in Tripura state creating enormous tension in the mixed society of the Tribal and the Bengalis. Dr. Bijan Mohanta explores the fact that even before the independence, the Regent Queen of Tripura put her claim over those areas (i.e. Chakla-Roshnabad) which were once within the principality of Tripura's Maharaja in order to maintain Tripura's bigger entity and save it from isolation. Mr. B K Debbarma, Chief Minister of the State, was sent to Delhi to place the demand before the Central Authority. The Chief Minister held parleys with the high dignitaries including Sarder Ballabh Bhai Patel. As the things seemed to have not been taken up in right earnestness, another telegram was sent on 14 July, 1947, to Sarder Patel from the Tripura Durber as reminder. The telegram runs as follows: 14

A COMPACT AREA COMPRISING TRIPURA STATE CHITTAGONG HILL TRACTS LUSHAI AND KHASI HILLS TOGETHER WITH HINDU MAJORITY AREAS IN NOAKHALI TIPPERA AND SYLHET DISTRICTS CONTIGUOUS TO TRIPURA STATE UNDER THE INDIAN UNION ABSOLUTELY NEEDED TO BE FORMED ON POLITICAL STRATEGICAL AND ECONOMIC GROUNDS SAVE FROM ISOLATION TRIPURA STATE WHICH HAS ALREADY JOINED INDIAN UNION. WE ARE REPRESENTING TO BENGAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION. EARNESTLY SOLICITING YOUR HELP.

The Regent Queen Kanchan Prava Devi personally called on Sarder Patel in July, 1947, to acquaint him the precarious condition of the state of Tripura and requested him to take necessary steps to save Tripura from isolation. But the Bengal Boundary Commission (the Radcliffe Commission) put Tripura into a great trouble. It deprived Tripura of the Chakla-Roshnabad Zamindary; thus cut off the state from the main land.

Dr. Mohanta indicates to another important fact of the Princely State and it was the con-
spiracy for annexing Tripura to Pakistan which was hatched both inside and outside Tripura. In Tripura, the Anjuman Islamia headed by Abdul Barik Khan, alias Gedu Miah, and Sirajul Islam alias Pera Miah, the President and the Secretary of the Organization, conspired for the annexation of Tripura with Pakistan. Externally, it was in the air that the ANSAR BAHINI of East Pakistan was getting ready to attack Tripura. It is presumed that the Anjuman Islamia got the supports of two top Brasses of the State like Captain Maharajkumar Durjoy Kishore Deb Barman, step brother of Maharaja Bir Bikram Kishore Manikya who was once an interim Minister of the State and Mr. Satya Vrata Mukherjee, MA, (Oxon), the Chief Minister of the State & a member of the Council of Regency appointed by the British Government. So, the Anjuman Islamia and other pro-Pakistani group started agitation for annexing Tripura state with Pakistan just after the death of Maharaja Bir Bikram at the age of 39 years only. It is also presumed that the death of the Maharaja was not natural and suspected an underhand game of the pro-Pakistani elements within the Royal family behind his sudden death. By that time Durjay Kishore founded a social organization with its militant wing styled as Seng Krak meaning beheading at one blow. This wing showed its ardent anti-Bengali (actually anti-Hindu) feeling and it began to propagate that the Bengali-refugee had been graving Tripura and so the Muslims and the Tribal in Tripura had no means to survive other than supporting the move for merger of Tripura with Pakistan. The research of Dr. Mohanta shows that big rallies of the Muslim National Guards or the Ansar Bahini began to take place in different parts of East Pakistan under the leadership of Mr. T. Ali (Tapajjal Ali) of Brahmanbaria, a prominent place under Comilla District. A big rally was also organized at Agartala obviously for the same demand by the supporters of Pakistan. When the situation was going out of hand, the people of Tripura got united and a big contingent of volunteers of the Proja Mandal, mostly the Tribal people marched on the roads of Agartala raising slogans against the conspiracy of annexing the state with Pakistan. The situation turned to be grave because the Government of India under the Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Home Minister, Sarder Patel, took the issue seriously. The Prime Minister of India attracted the attention of his counterpart of Pakistan about this unhappy development in Tripura and requested not to interfere in this touchy issue. After a period of long trouble, Tripura was saved from the conspiracy of annexation but the plains i.e. Chakla-Roshnabad could not be rescued and it was annexed to Pakistan.

With the merger of Tripura, a princely state, with the Union of India on 15 October, 1949, the political power was started to be shifted to the hands of the Bengalis. The rehabilitation of the Hindu Bengalis in Tripura after the partition at the cost of the Tribal people and their land was also viewed seriously by the conscious Tribal youths who formed a number of organizations like Bir Bikram Tripur Sangha with its Militant wing Seng Krak (1947), Paharia Union (1951), Adivasi
Samiti (1952), Adivasi Sangha (1953), Tribal Union renamed as Eastern India Tribal Union (1955), Tripura Upjati Juba Samiti (1967) to fight against the rehabilitation of the Bengali Hindu refugees in Tripura as well as the policy of favouritism of the Government towards the refugees. Mr. Sneha Kumar Chakma, the leader of the Eastern India Tribal Union, raised the slogan for a Tribal State comprising NEFA (North East Frontier Agency), Manipur, Khasi and Jayantia Hills, Mizo Hills, Naga Hills, Tripura and other Tribal areas of Assam against "Bengalee Hegemony" in Tripura. The Seng Krak which was banned in 1949 by A B Chatterjee, the Chief Commissioner of Tripura, appeared for the second time in 1967 in Dasda-Kanchanpur area of North Tripura and started a poster campaign directing the Bengali refugees to leave Tripura. The Tripura Upajati Juba Samiti (TUJS) raised the demands against the Bengali settlement in Tripura. The demands were:

i) Restoration of Tribal lands transferred to the non-Tribal people since 1960;

ii) Formation of a Tribal Autonomous District Council in Tripura;

iii) Reservation of Government jobs for the Tribal people;

iv) Recognition of Kok-Borak as an official language and medium of instruction and adoption of Roman script for Kok-Borak.

The TUJS had been carrying continuous movements for the interest of the Tribal people in Tripura. The Tribal people under the banner of TUJS observed hunger strikes in 1968 and in 1970 and organized a number of rallies to safe-guard the interest of the indigenous people. The GMP (the Gana Mukti Parisad), a tribal organization formed in 1948 & led by the Communist party, also fought for the interest of the Tribal people but they sought the cooperation of the democratic-minded people of the state. The Santi Sena Bahini of the GMP also stood against the communal frenzy. But the TUJS threatened a violent movement and claimed that the Bengalis who had settled in Tripura after 15 October, 1949, should be declared as "foreigners" and should be ousted from the state. To implement their demand the TUJS organized violent Block deputation and Bazar Boycott movements all over Tripura in May and June, 1980. To the contrary, the Amra Bangali, an organization of the chauvinistic Bengalis, opposed the agitation of the TUJS and gave a call for the Unity of the Bengalis which led to the confrontation of the two chauvinistic ethnic groups to fight against each other and ultimately gave births to various extremist groups like TNV (the Tripura National Volunteers), ATTF (the All Tripura Tiger Force), NLFT (the National Liberation Force of Twipra) etc. The people of Tripura witnessed an unprecedented ethnic violent riot
in June, 1980 and the bloodshed of the innocent people specially in the hilly regions of Tripura caused by the extremist groups specially by the TNV under the leadership of Mr. Bijoy Kumar Hrangkwal who voiced for Swadin Tripura. Dr. Mohanta remarks, "Thus, the darkest chapter of Tripura’s history of indiscriminate killings of innocent non-tribal people in June 1980 was written. The madness caused officially a loss of over 1300 lives, left 20,000 houses gutted, destroyed over 5 crores worth of grains and crops and made refugees 1/5 of the Tripura population".

Another issue of Indo-Pak relations vis-a-vis Tripura is the border problem. Rekha Saha in her book *India-Bangladesh Relations* opines that the border problem had also largely affected the relations between the two countries. Smuggling and decoities had been recurring events in the border areas of the two countries ever since partition. A survey of the northern bordering areas of Sonamura subdivision conducted by the research scholar confirms the statement of Rekha Saha in respect of Tripura. There is not a single family leaving in that region that had not been affected by the decoits or the thieves coming from East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) who specially lifted cows and other belongings of the poor peasants. The open border can easily be utilized by the decoits and thieves who came with arms and used the arms while they were being resisted by the villagers. Jakir Hossain, son of Badsha Mia, of Valuarchar village under Sonamura Sub-division, narrates a very sad story of the firing which caused a bullet injury to his father while he tried to resist the cow-lifting attempt of the decoits. Badsha Mia was referred to the G B Hospital (Govinda Ballabh Hospital) at Agartala and after a long treatment the Doctors saved his life. These types of instances are often found during the survey. The old men and women of the area admitted that they were suffering from this acute problem from the partition of India in 1947. The police and Border Security Force (BSF) tried to resist the attempts of the thieves and the decoits with the help of the villagers. They arranged night-patrolling with the peasant volunteers but that was not a full-proof measure, said Mr. Ananda Mohan Deb, an old villager of Boxanagar village under Sonamura Sub-division in an interview at Boxanagar on 31 December, 2009.

Other important aspect which embittered the Indo-Pak relationship vis-à-vis Tripura since the partition relates to the delimitation of borders specially in the Muhuri Char area under Belonia sector under south Tripura which is still a pending issue. Haribhushan Pal, a well-known writer & intellectual and a resident of Belonia in his *Janapad Beloniar Itibritta, History of Belonia Sub-division of South Tripura District* offers valuable information on the disputed land i.e. Muhuri Char. He says that the said land came to the limelight with the partition. Pakistan officially demanded the ownership of the land in 1963 and by the next year it resorted to arms to occupy the
disputed land. The EPR (East Pakistan Rifles, now Bangladesh Rifles) fired 3 round bullets on 7 October, 1964, to disperse the Indian peasants who used to cultivate in the land. He argues that the 1929 settlement confirmed the ownership of Princely Tripura over that land. The local people used the land for cremation purpose also. But the Govt. of Pakistan and, later on, the Govt. of Bangladesh opposed the argument of the Indian Government. This created unnecessary tensions in both the countries specially in Tripura and Feni district of East Pakistan (later on, Bangladesh). Rekha Saha deals with this aspect in detail. She argues that the Land Boundary Act of 1974 signed between the Government of Bangladesh and the Government of India had a separate provision (i.e. sub-clause 5) on the Belonia sector. This clause, according to Ms. Saha, was inserted in the agreement mainly to rectify the Radcliffe Award of 1947. The said Award provided that the left bank of the river Muhuri flowing through Belonia was to be part of Pakistan. But the sub-clause 5 of the Article 1 of the Land boundary Act (1974) stated that "The boundary in this area should be demarcated along the mid-stream of the course of the Muhuri River at the time of demarcation. This boundary will be fixed boundary. The two Governments should raise embankment on their respective sides with a view to establishing the river in its present course." Despite all such attempts, border clashes between the two countries could not be averted. Even during the Janata Government rule which tried its level best to maintain cordial relation with Bangladesh at any cost, there was an exchange of fire for several days between the Border Security Force (BSF) and the Bangladesh Rifles (BDR) from November 4, 1979 along the Belonia border of Tripura. The exchange of fire took place when the Indian farmers had attempted to harvest the new land. The firing continued for few days and both sides, instead of restoring normalcy, continued to blame each other. A research paper on the Border Dispute between India and Bangladesh claims that the last confrontation took place during 22-24 August, 1999. This disputed Muhuri Char is only 79 acres of land. Of this, India is in possession of 24 acres and Bangladesh farmers cultivate only two and half acres, while 52 acres of land remain almost initialised for years due to tension. The dispute which caused annual border clashes was essentially over the cultivation of the remaining 52 acres of land by the Indian farmers and the subsequent protest by the Bangladesh farmers. The paper gives us the information that the Mohuri river, originating from the hills of Tripura (one of the state of India) enters Bangladesh territory (formerly East Pakistan) at Belonia creating the CHAR (local name for an island) area, the ownership of which is yet to be ascertained by the two Governments.

So, this Char Land is supposed to be a bone of contention between the two countries actually three countries i.e. India, Pakistan and Bangladesh creating much tensions in those countries
and the subsequent attempt of the Government of India to erect fencing alongside the Indo-
Bangladesh border is pending in this Char area due to objection raised by Bangladesh. Cow
lifting, acts of thefts and decoities are common feature of this region till today.22

The question of Native States ruled by the Princes under British paramountcy was one of
the most complicated problems between India and Pakistan after 1947.23 Mohammed Ali Jinnah,
the founder of Pakistan, was vociferous supporter of the right of Native States numbering at least
560 to decide the fate of their states i.e. to decide whether to join India or Pakistan or remain
independent, after the independence of Indian Sub-Continent in 1947. He probably did this in the
hope of preventing the integration of hundreds of Native States with the Indian Union. The rulers
of the States like Junahgarh, Hyderabad and Kashmir boosted to remain independent. Junagarh in
Kathiawar region and Hyderabad were not problems for India because these were surrounded by
Indian states but Jammu & Kashmir with 77% Muslim population and with a Hindu Maharaja and
bordering new-born Pakistan stood to be a bone of contention between India and Pakistan. Paki-
stan desperately wanted Kashmir to be a part and parcel of that country but Hari Sing, the Maha-
raja, decided to remain independent; while Pakistan imposed an economic blockade against Kash-
mir. This was bound to be inconvenient for Kashmir since in those days all of Kashmir's commu-
nications ran through the territories that became a part of Pakistan. The situation became worse
while Pakistan infiltrated armed tribesmen into Kashmir to occupy the State. There was no doubt
that Pakistani regular army was also fighting inside the State. In this juncture of crises, the Maha-
raja appealed to the Government of India for help. On 24 October, 1947, the Govt. of India asked
him to sign the Instrument of Accession and then only India could send its army. Two days later,
the Maharajah signed the Instrument of Accession and, thus, acceded to India.24

India then sent her army to clear Kashmir of Pak-invaders. In December, 1948, the Govt. of
India appealed to the Security Council of the UNO and accordingly, a cease-fire was arranged by
the UN on 1 January, 1949, leaving almost one third of Kashmir under Pakistan control. Most of
the Western powers who did not like the Non-aligned Movement headed by Nehru adopted pro-
Pakistani stand in the debate on Kashmir in the Security Council and the said Council passed a
resolution on 21 April, 1948, for a plebiscite in Kashmir for the settlement of the dispute. On the
other hand, India was to reduce her forces progressively to the minimum strength required for the
support of the civil powers in the maintenance of law and order. Pakistan had not complied with
the resolution of the Security Council but continuously harped on the theme of plebiscite. Paki-
stan at the same time sought to strengthen herself by making a military alliance with United States
of America in 1954 and joined the SEATO (the South East Asia Treaty Organization) in the same year as well as CENTO (Central Treaty Organization which was earlier known as the Baghdad Pact.) in 1956. It was evident from the above that Pakistan was very much antagonistic towards India but not to the communists.  

By that time, India showed its spectacular attitude in framing a secular constitution which came into public on 26 January, 1950 and India was prepared to settle the Kashmir issue on the basis of status quo but Pakistan constantly demanded for a plebiscite for the solution of the problem. Not only that Pakistan come forward with friendly overtures towards China once Sino-Indian relations deteriorated in the 1950s, but it tried to befriend China at the cost of India. This is true to the dictum: "my enemy's enemy is my friend." In March, 1963, Pakistan also signed a border treaty with China demarcating the border between part of Kashmir that Pakistan holds and China. In August and September, 1965, Pakistan made more attempts to capture Kashmir. In that Indo-Pak war that ensued, Pakistan could not accomplish its mission. The Govt. of USSR hosted a peace conference in Tashkent in January 1966 to promote peace and friendship between India and Pakistan. The Peace Mission was headed by Field Marshal Ayub Khan, the Chief Martial Law Administrator, on behalf of Pakistan and Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Prime Minister, on behalf of India. Both the leaders agreed to settle the dispute by peaceful means.

The Indo-Pak relations over Kashmir not only adversely affected the sub-continent, but also aroused sharp reaction in the federal states. The following is the Govt. resolution moved by the then Chief Minister of Tripura, Sri Sachindra Lal Singh, in the State Assembly on 12 November, 1965, which runs thus: "Whereas after sending hordes of Armed infiltrations into Kashmir, Pakistan crossed the international border-line and mounted heavy attack in the Chhamb sector of Jammu & Kashmir on September 1, 1965, and continued aggression making air raids on civilian population not only in the neighbouring areas but also in distant areas like Tripura, this Assembly takes the grim resolution of meeting the said naked aggression on the soil of India and calls upon all the inhabitants of the country to continue their fight forgetting all the differences and preserve the integrity of the country." Nonetheless, the Hindu-Muslim relations went through a worst phase. An air of suspicion prevailed throughout both the countries. East Pakistan experienced horrible Hindu-Muslim riots in phased manner which had its direct impact on Tripura. A large number of Hindu minorities left their ancestral home to save their lives and took shelters in Tripura and other adjoining states of India. The Govt. of Tripura faced enormous troubles in rehabilitating the influx of refugees. An anti Muslim feeling was very much prevalent in Tripura specially in the 60s and a large number of Muslim families were evacuated and pushed to East Pakistan forcefully under
guidance of the Tripura administration. Thousands of families both Hindus and Muslims began to exchange their properties and changed their motherland to save their honour specially honour of the women and lives. Those kinds of exchange activities were performed mainly in secret manner.27

The Agartala Conspiracy Case

Notwithstanding the fact that the Agartala Conspiracy Case is a less-discussed topic in the history of North-Eastern States and of India, it was a turning point in the history of Pakistan and in the creation of one sovereign state like Bangladesh. In one article, "Swadinata O Jatiatabad" (Independence and Nationalism) Prof. Hasan Abdul Kaiyum hailed Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhasani and Zia-ur-Rahman as the leaders of freedom movement of Bangladesh and the saviours of nation respectively. He cautiously tried to by-pass the role of Sheik Mujibur Rahman and other leaders of Awami League saying that they fled away while people were in danger due to Pakistani aggression.28 On the other hand, Shahriar Kabir, a veteran columnist, while writing an article, namely, "Bangadesher Muktijudha O Bharat" (The Freedom Movement of Bangladesh and Bharat) did not pay any weightage to the role of Agartala or Tripura in the freedom movement of Bangladesh.29 But historical evidences provide the readers with a different picture.30

The Agartala Conspiracy Case not only elevated Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the President of Awami League, to the national Hero of Bengali nationalism which culminated in a very familiar word- "Bangabandhu" (the Saviour of Bangladesh / the Friend of Bangladesh) but also paved the way for liberation movement in East Pakistan leading to Bangladesh. This historic case generated mass-upsurge in Eastern Wing of Pakistan which ultimately compelled the Chief Martial Law Administrator & President of Pakistan, Mr. Ayub Khan (the 'Iron Man') to step down in favour of General Yahya Khan, another Martial Law Administrator. The Autonomy Movement that started under Six-point demands of Awami League in 1966 was in a moribund condition under the pressure of Ayub Khan Government but the Conspiracy Case gave it a regeneration and transformed it into a movement for independence of East Pakistan.31

So, Agartala, the capital town of Tripura, became famous not only in the history of Pakistan & the sub-continent but also in the history of the world. Agartala at that time became the headlines of many important newspapers. Subsequently, the word 'Agartala' came again and again in the speeches of the leaders of world in the UNO and other headquarters of the world politics.32 Mr. Thomas William, the Member of the Parliament of Great Britain and Law Adviser to the Queen of
Great Britain came to Dhaka to fight the Agartala Conspiracy Case in favour of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.33

In December, 1967, it was in the air that Pakistan Government was going to file a conspiracy case against some persons of Eastern Wing of Pakistan. The news was made public in January, 1968, while Pakistan Government issued three press notes. The first press note was issued on 1st January, and it was published in the Dailies the next day. The Government of Pakistan confirmed that some Government employees had been arrested for anti-national activities. The second press note was issued on 6th January and came to public on the next day which runs thus: For anti-national activities, some 28 persons had been taken into custody in East Pakistan. The Conspiracy was unearthed in the last month.34 The Press-note reiterated that the persons arrested so far were determined to secede East Pakistan with the help of India.35 It was also said that the enquiry had almost been completed and trial should begin immediately. Out of 28 arrested and accused of so far, Commander Muazzem of Pakistan Navy was named as number 1 (one). Surprisingly enough, after 11 days i.e. on 18th January, another Press note was circulated and it was in public that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the leader of Awami League and Autonomy movement, was accused as number 1(one). Ultimately, on 19th June, 1968, trial began against total 35 nos. accused on the charge of secession of East Pakistan with the help of India. As the accused were of various sections of the society i.e. of Politics, Navy, Army, Air force, and of Civil Services, a special Tribunal was set up under the Criminal Law Amendment (Special Tribunal) Ordinance of 1968 promulgated specially for the trial of the conspiracy case.36

When the case was filed, it was officially named as “State Vs. Sk. Mujibur Rahman and others--- accused.” But the Pakistan Government was not satisfied with that simple and traditional name. Major Nasser, the Public Relations Officer of the Army Squad, formed to look after that particular case, mentioned it as "Agartala Conspiracy Case” while he was briefing the matter to the Press. From that time onwards, the press widely publicized the case as "Agartala Conspiracy Case."37

Why Agartala? Agartala, the Capital Town of Tripura, was nearer to Dhaka, the Capital of East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) than any other capital town of India. Tripura was surrounded on three sides by the then East Pakistan. The Ayub Khan Government made a stormy situation in the politics of Pakistan unearthing a plot that Mr. Mujibur Rahman, ex-steward of Pakistan Navy (not Sheikh Mujibur Rahman) and Mr. Ali Reza skipped to Agartala in July, 1967, at the initiative of
Commander Muazzem and Mr. Ojha, the then First Secretary to the Indian Deputy High Commission Office at Dhaka for consultation regarding possible help in the collection of arms & ammunitions from India for the Mutiny designed by Commander Muazzem and others with the help of Sheikh Mujib. The Pakistan Government took the opportunity readily to brand Sheik Mujib as anti-national and pro-Indian; on the other hand, the Pak Government contemplated to crush the nascent rebellion which was really planned by some Navy and Army personnel. On the contrary, the Government of Ayub Khan had as such no solution to the Autonomy movement based on six-points of Sheikh Mujib. The Government arrested Sheikh Mujib on several times during a short span of three months' time (mid February to Mid May, 1966). But all these attempts went in vain and, in contrast, led to mass-upsurge in East Pakistan leading to the fall of Ayub Khan Government keeping in the scenario another Martial Law Administrator i.e. Yahya Khan.

Indo-Pak relations suffered a jolt since its birth in 1947. The policy of the Government of Pakistan was channelised to oppose any kind of move by India. Kashmir was mainly the bone of contention between the two countries as mentioned earlier. Two big wars had already been waged without any fruitful result. The 1965 Indo-Pak war was a big failure to Pakistan as well as to its Martial Law Administrator, General Ayub khan. So, Pakistan Government wanted at any cost to show India aggressive towards Pakistan. The divulsion of Agartala Conspiracy Case gave it a massive opportunity to show India plotting conspiracy against Pakistan. The Pakistan Govt. thought that its allies and other international reaction would rescue her from both internal and external danger. So, the Pak. Govt. contemplated to kill two birds in a single shot. It came to the conclusion that while the people of Pakistan came to know that Sheikh Mujib was involved in the conspiracy to secede East Pakistan with the help of India, he would rather be a criminal instead of a hero in the eyes of the people of Pakistan and he could easily be hanged to death. And, thus, Pakistan would be saved from a great danger like the Autonomy Movement. But it did not happen; on the contrary, Sheikh Mujib and his party, the Awami League became more popular than ever while the popularity of the veteran Martial Law Administrator and President, Mr. Ayub Khan, lowered down to the lowest ever.

The autonomy movement which was started in 1966 and continued throughout the year 1967 came to a standstill for sometime. As Nehal Karim says, "Actually, there was an atmosphere of intolerable suffocation in the East Wing under the tyrannical rule of Ayub Khan particularly after 1965. The State Emergency was declared in September 1965 during the Indo-Pak war which continued till March, 1969. During this time, the Press was fully brought under control by the
Government through Press and Publication Ordinance and the establishment of the Press Trust. Political opponents of the regime were put behind the bars indiscriminately under Security Act. Dissent was suppressed with ruthless hand. Free thinking was also under strict surveillance. An authoritarian University Ordinance continued to enforce discipline in temples of learning. The Govt. even tried to ban the pursuits of art and culture and the Tagore music and his literature were under embargo." In those unprecedented circumstances, the proceedings of the so called Agartala Conspiracy Case helped in crystallizing the nationalistic zeal of the people of East Pakistan. The sufferings of the Bengalis, their deprivations, exploitations and injustice done to them were all the central theme of the proceedings. Moreover, the reports of the proceedings in the newspapers inspired the Bengalis more than ever to try for an independent homeland. What the Bengalis had been thinking or discussing secretly so far, they began to voice it openly. Separation from Pakistan became a vital issue for their survival as an ethnic group.

Nehal Karim mentions that on account of Government's aggressive mood in the Agartala Conspiracy Case, the people in East Pakistan felt hurt and that forged the feeling of unity in their minds. “This happened particularly in the case of students. They were so much surcharged with the nationalistic feelings that they spearheaded the entire movement against the Ayub Regime and even the politicians were obliged to lend their support to the agitational activities.”

In the latter part of 1968 while most of the leaders of Awami league were in jail or under custody and while other opposition leaders were at dilemma, various students' organizations in Eastern Wing came together to form a common platform like all Parties' Students' Action Committee i.e. SAC. The three dominant components of the SAC were East Pakistan Students' League (Rightist) and two factions of East Pakistan Students' Union (Leftist). The SAC led massive movements in East Pakistan with their Eleven-Point Programmes which included Six-Point Programmes of the Awami League. Nehal Karim remarks that the Agartala Conspiracy Case brought both the Leftist and the Rightist Students' organizations to fight not only against Ayub's regime but also against colonial dominance of East by West Pakistan. The Eleven-Point Programmes of the SAC were so popular that the dominant political parties irrespective of leftist and rightist threw away dilemma and supported the students' movements. The SAC demanded the withdrawal of all political cases including the Agartala Conspiracy Case. These issues gathered such a momentum that the people of Eastern Wing spontaneously supported and made it a turning point.

The mass upsurge of 1968-69 stands to be unprecedented in the history Pakistan and made all the political parties in Pakistan specially in East Pakistan to think otherwise. On January 8,
1969, eight political parties of Pakistan came together to form a common platform like Democratic Action Committee or DAC. Only Pakistan Peoples' Party (PPP) of Z.A. Bhutto and National Awamy Party (NAP) of Maulana Bhasani remained out of DAC.52

The DAC took 8-Point programme excluding the demand for autonomy but including the demand for release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and other political leaders. So, Agartala Conspiracy Case got no preference in the mind of the leading political parties. Prof. Abdul Halim writes that the DAC as an organization represented whole Pakistan and took a remarkable role in the great mass upsurge of 1968-69. It called for an All Pakistan General Strike on February 14, 1969, and the strike was brilliantly successful.53

The popular movement, however, continued and turned to be violent while Asaduzamman, a student leader was shot dead. Violence begets violence. In mid February, Sergeant Jahurul Haque (accused no.17) of the Agartala Conspiracy Case and Dr. Samsuzzuha, Proctor of Rajshahi University, had brutally been killed by the military and police jointly. These killings made the people of East Pakistan so furious that they began to defy the curfew and began to destroy the Government's property and that of the collaborators of the Ayub's regime. In the funeral prayer of sergeant Jahurul Haque, Maulana Bhasani, the veteran leader of the NAP and once supporter of Ayub's regime turned his back to Ayub and supported the student's movements and called for a violent movement for independence of East Pakistan.54 At this stage, the popularity of Skeikh Mujib was rising to its highest peak. The people of East Pakistan were anxious about the life of Skeikh Mujib who might be killed in the military custody. The people got so infuriated that they set the residence of a pro-Pakistani Minister and also the residence Mr. S.A. Rahman, the Chief justice of Agartala Conspiracy Case on fire. The Chief Justice, a West Pakistani, somehow saved his life. All the documents of the case were thrown to fire.55

The Govt. of Ayub Khan totally failed to curb the spontaneous and violent mass-movement in East Pakistan which created tension in West Pakistan also. The Ayub Govt. called a Round Table Conference (RTC) on Feb. 17, 1969, to discuss the situation with political leaders. But this conference was a failure as Skeikh Mujibur Rahman could not participate in the RTC due to the case. He was under Govt. custody and declined to be released on bail under pay-roll. The second attempt for RTC was another failure for the same reason. Meanwhile, the people of East Pakistan stood in favour of Skeikh Mujib and others. They began to realize that the conspiracy case was actually a conspiracy of Pakistan Government to deny the legitimate demands of the Bengalis.
Under unprecedented pressure, the Pak. Govt. declared 21 February as the National holiday which came to be known as the famous Language Martyrs’ Day. This historic day was enthusiastically observed throughout East Pakistan with new determination for self-reliance of Bengalis of Pakistan.56

So, the Govt. of Ayub Khan was on a back foot and he declared that he would not contest the presidential election in future. He also confessed the failure of his Government.57 On 22 February 1969, the Pakistan Government had no other way but to withdraw the Conspiracy Case and release Skeikh Mujib and other accused of the case. The case proved abortive and a boomerang to Pakistan Government.58

**Skeikh Mujibur Rahman- "The Bangabandhu"**

Immediately after his release, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman emerged as symbol of Bengali nationalism. On 23 February, 1969, in a massive rally of about 10 lakhs of people at Race Course Maidan, Skeikh Mujibur Rahman was declared *the Bangabandhu* by Tufayel Ahmed, the leader of the SAC (the Students' Action Committee), and the people admitted the declaration with raising hands towards sky and with huge clap.59 The Bangabandhu then took the leadership in almost all the movements that followed and secured massive mass support in the nationwide election and secured absolute majority.

**Sheikh Mujib and Agartala**

It is a matter of research whether Sheikh Mujibur Rahman had come to Agartala or not; if he had come over to Agartala, then what was the reason? Surprisingly enough, the Govt. of Pakistan did not make any allegation in the Charge sheet filed to the Court in 1968 that Mujib had gone to Agartala to hatch a conspiracy against Pakistan. His name was inserted in the second thought of the case and the Ayub Khan administration utterly failed to prove that Mujib went to Agartala; on the contrary, people of East Pakistan used to believe in that time that it was the conspiracy of the Pak Government to harass Sheikh Mujib and his popular Awami party so that the Autonomy movement on the 6-point demands could be nipped in the bud. So, unprecedented people upsurge arose against the Pak government leading to the unconditional release of Sheikh Mujib. This leads us to believe that the Pakistan Intelligence failed to unearth a secessionist movement in time.60 Lt. General A. A. K. Niazi, Former Commander, Eastern Command, is of the opinion that in 1966 the
Agartala Conspiracy was unearthed. Sheikh Mijib, in connivance with civil and junior army officers, had conspired with Indian agencies to bring about a revolt in East Pakistan. The meetings had taken place at Agartala, India, hence the name of the case i.e. Agartala Conspiracy Case. Mujib and other conspirators were arrested. Lt. General Niazi continues to argue that the Agartala Conspiracy was not a fabricated story created to implicate Sheikh Mujib. Indian intelligence activities in East Pakistan had started with the inception of East Pakistan. They were actively aided by the Hindus settled in East Pakistan. To prove this theory, Mr. Niazi referred to the book Inside RAW: The Story of India's Secret Service of Mr. Ashok Raina in which Mr. Raina, as claimed by Mr. Niazi, had highlighted the meetings which took place between pro-Mujib factions and the Indian Intelligent Bureau Operation (IIBO).61

Circumstantial evidences also lead to believe that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman came to Agartala in January, 1963. Journalist Fayez Ahmed, the Chief Reporter of the Dainik Azad published from Dacca, in his book, Agartala Mamla, Sheikh Mujib O Bangler Bidroha, (The Agartala Case, Sheikh Mujib and the Revolt of Bengal), published a letter in his book written by Shri Sachindra Lal Singh, the Chief of TTC (the Tripura Territorial Council). Shri Singh testified that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman along with 10 other people came to Tripura through Khowai Subdivision and reached his quarters at 12 o' clock at night. Shri Umesh Chandra Singh, his brother, accompanied him. He was then taken to a house of Hemangini Devi, one and half km. away from the CM's residence. On his request, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was taken to Delhi to meet Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India. But the PM did not permit him to stay in Tripura for political purpose.62 The attitude of the Prime Minister of India is explained by Sohrab Hasan, a veteran journalist of Bangladesh. He gives his impression that in view of India's defeat in the Sino-Indian War of 1962 and Pakistan's warm friendship with China debarred Sri Nehru to be negative about Skeikh Mujib.63 To testify the Agartala thesis, Mr. Sohrab Hasan mentions the statement of Maminul Haque Khoka, the causin of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who gave an affirmative view that Skeikh Mujib had gone to Agartala. Mr. Sohrab also cites the statement of journalist Abdul Matin of London who stated that though Skeikh Mujib went to Agartala in 1962-63, he planned for the trip long before his arrival at Agartala. Mr. Matin recalled that by 1960, Skeikh Mujib was just released from the jail and he was under the scan of the detectives of the Pak Government. So, Matin tried to avoid Skeikh Mujib while he was walking through the road passing in front of Skeikh Mujib's Residence at Dacca. But he could not avoid the loud call of Sheikh Mujib and while they met, Mujib affirmed that he would use Agartala for fighting against the tyrannical Government of Mr. Ayub Khan. Skeikh Mujib made him understand that he was thinking about armed rebellion.
to achieve his goal of liberation of East Pakistan. Mr. Matin had stated that Skeikh Mujib aimed at attracting the attention of the Leftists and to study the mind of the Leftists in his secret plan. After that Skeikh Mujib went to London and met Tasadduk Ahmed, the leader of the Bengali community in London, and discussed about the liberation of East Bengal. Mr. Matin became very favourite of Mujib after the liberation movement and during medical checkup of Skeikh Mujib in Geneva and London, Matin attended him very closely and he tried to read the mind of Mujib regarding his Agartala mission. Skeikh Mujib admitted that he did not hatch any conspiracy against the Pak Government but he went to Agartala as per plan of anti-Ayub movement.64

Mr. Sohrab Hasan mentions another important fact of Mujib's arrival at Agartala; he contends that in the early 60s Sheikh Mujib went to Agartala for the help and support of India in achieving the liberation of Bangladesh. He failed twice at the early stage. Sheikh Mujib possibly went to Agartala in 1962 before being Bangabandhu. The Border Security Force (BSF) could not identify him and he was not arrested. He went back after preliminary talks with the Indian authorities. Sheikh Mujib went to Agartala for the second time in January, 1963. He wanted to test the nerve of Indian Government in the liberation movement of East Pakistan. He was then arrested by the BSF (Border Security Force). But while he was identified, the BSF made contact with the Superintendent of Tripura Police, Mr. Bhikshu Thakur and Mr. Thakur, in his turn, went to the Border to receive Skeikh Mujib to the capital. He made contact to various possible corners but nobody came forward to help Skeikh Mujib; Delhi was also silent on the issue; the police Super made contact with Mr. Sachindra Lal Singh, the Chief of the TTC and then it was decided to let Skeikh Mujib to go back to East Pakistan. But it was not possible at the fag end of the day; on the advice of the Chief of the TTC, he was taken to the Agartala Central jail by Mr. Bhikshu Thakur. Mr. Nani Kar Bhowmik, the Jail Super, received him warmly in his drawing room while Mr. Thakur left for his own work informing that he would come back early in the morning next day. The Jail Super arranged coffee for the VIP prisoner and passed time in conversation about the motherland the jail Super left behind in 1947. His motherland was situated in the Titas basin of East Pakistan; so, the prisoner was not really a prisoner but a very close relative. The two men passed time in remembering the past days coming out of the partition of the Indian sub-Continent. At 4 am came the Police Super to take him to let him go back to his own country. The Jail Super hugged the VIP and said, good-bye. The police Super then drove the car himself towards the Indo-Pak border.65

Jail Super Nani Kar Bhowmik is no more today; he died on 25 October, 1998 and the
Dainik Sambad reported with the heading: *Death of the last Witness of Agartala Conspiracy Case*. Sheikh Hasina, the then Prime Minister of Bangladesh, sent a message to the family members of Nani Kar Bhowmik expressing her deep gratitude towards the family of Nani Kar Bhowmik. The family members often recalls the memoirs of the Jail Super on the VIP prisoner; the chair used by Sheikh Mujib is kept till today by the family members of the Jail Super while the People of Bangladesh had almost forgotten the Jail Super, Nani Kar Choudhury, asserts Mr. Sohrab Hasan.

So, it is obvious from the above that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman came to Agartala escaping the eyes of the Intelligence Agency of Pakistan Government. But the Pakistan Government could not utilize the conspiracy thesis to belittle Sheikh Mujib and his party, the Awami League. That was a turning point in the history of Pakistan which at least partially led to the emergence of Bangladesh in the history of South-East Asia. The bitter Indo-Pakistan relationship from the very birth of Pakistan and India in 1947 underwent more strain with the opening of Agartala Conspiracy Case in 1968-69. That historic incident paved the way for an internal Governmental change i.e. the fall of the Ayub Khan government, a Martial Law Administration and the rise of another Martial Law Administration under Yahya Khan and ultimately paved the way for Liberation movement of Bangladesh.

The trend of liberation movement was discernible in Pakistan especially in East Pakistan in the later part of 1960s and its impact was found in the mind of the intelligentsia and politically conscious people of Tripura. The people of Tripura moved with any kind of development in East Pakistan because East Pakistan was the motherland of the majority people of Tripura. They were aspirant to see their motherland free from any kind of mal-administration from the Pak military Junta. That Military Junta did not offer any opportunity to the people of Pakistan to choose their government democratically. The election result of the 1954 general election in which the Muslim League lost dramatically to the democratic and secular forces with a minimum tally could not be assimilated by the Pak Military Junta and that Junta played a very nasty game with the people of East Bengal and that Government did not hesitate to run the Government on the military spirit. But that spirit could not be approved by the people of East Bengal as well as the people of Tripura. Reference is already made to the statement of the Chief of the Tripura Territorial Assembly (TLA) who spoke of the democratic value of the people of India and he declared in the TLA that the people of this country would fight for the democratic and secular right of the people living in any part of the world.
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