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The difference between war and terrorism is subtle. War is a fight between two states, while fringe anarchist fanatic groups often resort to terrorism. However, this distinction has disappeared in recent years. Many states have been supporting, aiding, assisting and sponsoring terrorist activities. Another difference is the glorification of war and a universal condemnation of terrorism. Somehow it has come to be accepted that war is ethical and good, while terrorism is a crime against humanity. There can be no doubt that western media has played its part in creating this moral distinction. In spite of all the noises against terrorism, western nations have never hesitated to use terrorism as and when it suited them. In contrast with the self-interest-centered viewpoint of western powers, India has been adopting a strictly moralist view towards terrorism. Indian leaders have been crying hoarse against Pakistan sponsored terrorism and have been hoping that the rest of the world will come to India's aid. Indian argument is based on the evil nature of Pakistan's acts. India has been pleading with the world powers to act and solve the problem in her backyard. At times this has gone to ridiculous extents. The arguments of ethics, morality, human rights and international order are used to appeal to international community.

State-sponsored terrorism is a form of war that cannot be countered by conventional war. For the past two decades, India has experimented with use of army to fight terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir with no success. It is indeed strange that instead of learning from past experiences, there is a clamour for increased use of army. State sponsored terrorism can be effectively curbed only if a disproportionately higher cost is imposed on the sponsoring state. The key is to act in one's national interests as one would act in times of war. Bleeding the sponsoring state and taking it to the brink of disintegration are perfectly legitimate aims to be pursued by a country under attack. Strategically, it makes better sense to use internal tensions and fissures of the enemy to achieve one's objectives. Sacrificing one's young men must be avoided as far as possible.

Pakistan has been systematically sponsoring terrorism in India and especially in Jammu & Kashmir. It has been calling terrorists as freedom fighters and has been openly
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declaring its support to the militants in Jammu & Kashmir. India's avowed strategic objectives in relation to Pakistan should be as follows:

- Protection of rights of minorities in Pakistan in a truly secular manner.
- Liberation of Sindh and Baluchistan from the tyranny of Punjab dominated army and bureaucracy.
- Protection of human rights in general and in particular protection of rights of women and children.

India to declare the above three as central pillars of its Pakistan policy. Just as Pakistan misses no opportunity to raise Kashmir issue at any international forum, India must raise the above issues. The above ends should be seen as ethical ends that justify all means. Pakistan's espousal of Kashmir's "freedom fighters" can be countered by a similar support to freedom fighters of Sindh and Baluchistan and to soldiers of secularism. It is high time that Indian leaders adopt secularism as a universal value whose application is not limited to domestic politics. The biggest challenge in the war against Pakistan sponsored terrorism is internal. India needs to get over her defensive mindset and assert her true might in a manner free of historical hang-ups. India needs to appreciate that crying about the evil of terrorism is futile. India needs to learn that terrorism can only be countered by a simple old adage - "Tit for Tat". India needs to liberate the people of its neighbouring country from a tyrannical State. India needs to acquire the high moral ground and adopt all possible means to achieve the ethical aims.

The strategic objectives of India is markedly oriented towards emerging as the Sixth Global Power, in the new Geo-economic world order equation, which comprises five crucial actors on the scene - USA, Europe, Japan, China and Russia. That India should fit into the Sixth slot has got the tacit approval of USA, Europe, and Russia. In order to play the newly assumed responsibility, India is quite conscious of the fact that without being a formidable military and economic power, it would not be possible for her to play that role. It is in this context one can see why India, during the next 10 years will
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THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

spend around 25 billion dollars on its armed forces. Moreover, in order to translate its nuclear doctrine into an operational reality, it has earmarked 10 billion dollars. Besides USA, Russia, Israel, and the European Union are also collaborating to facilitate India’s grandiose military ambitions. India is also expected to play the surrogate role to contain China—a western strategic objective to be achieved through what euphemistically is termed ‘constructive engagement’. Taiwan and India are the flanks, which would keep pressurizing China so that it does not have smooth sailing in maintaining its phenomenal economic growth rate. The other contrived dread is Islamic fundamentalism, in the civilizational-conflict-paradigm. The new strategic partners would thus collectively ensure that Islamic resurgence is contained and globalization remains the only ideology for the world to emulate. It is within these parameters that Pakistan has to determine its pragmatic options.

Pakistan must not aspire to achieve military parity with India and as such it must not naively be drawn into the arm race, for which there are no available resources. But at the same time, it is not in the psyche of the nation to play second fiddle to India. In other words, no matter what, Pakistan can never become Bhutan or Sikkim. In dealing with India, therefore, policy has to be congruent to the ‘values’ the nation cherishes. The Kashmiri’s struggle has entered into a perceptible decisive phase. Only a few thousand of Kashmiris freedom fighters, have driven six lakh Indian soldiers practically to the wall, who, Instead of displaying traditional fighting skill and acumen, are displaying acts of wanton killing and ruthless atrocities against hapless civilians. India is seeking devious routes to muster diplomatic support from USA and the European Union as it failed to foil the deadly attacks inspired by the Mujahideen. India is in no mood to engage in dialogue over Kashmir. The Kashmiri Mujahideen, in a way are fighting for Pakistan. India’s massive forces entrenched into Kashmir, cannot venture to launch any major operation against Pakistan. The Mujahideen’s righteous cause sooner or later will stir the world’s conscience. As far as our nuclear capability is concerned, our well-measured policy of
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nuclear restraint adopted in 1989 is still functional and serving our interests. India cannot succeed in its nuclear blackmail policy against Pakistan.

Impact of Pakistan’s Sponsored Terrorism

INDIA
- Destabilising & sabotaging Indian economy
- Sabotage, destabilize & fragmentation of India
- Destabilize Indian secular polity
- Destabilize politico-economic structure
- Destroys India’s unity and territorial integrity
- Disrupt social order
- Raises cost of governance
- Lost of human lives
- Weaken govt. physically & psychologically
- Malign India’s image
- Create ethnic and sectarian divide
- Ethnic division in the social fabric

CHINA
- Destabilising & sabotaging China’s economy
- Sabotage, destabilize & fragmentation of China
- Fragmentation of territory
- Destroys China’s unity and Territorial integrity
- Disrupt social order
- Raises cost of governance
- Lost of human lives
- Destabilize politico-economic Structure
- Malign China’s image
- Create ethnic and sectarian divide
- Ethnic division in the social fabric
- Disruption of social order

Figure 3.1: Showing impact of Pakistan’s Sponsored Terrorism on India and China

There is a systematic propaganda targeted to creating a sense of helplessness that Pakistan today stands totally isolated. It is a very twisted view of reality. In fact, the collective strength, which is a bulwark against any threat, is the bond of friendship and cordiality which exists with our neighbours - China, Iran and Afghanistan. It is another thing that we have failed to appreciate and value this amity and understanding. The distinctive feature of all the neighbours is that they have withstood the convulsions of great revolutions within their countries and defeated the forces, which were out to nullify
the peoples’ aspirations. USA was tenaciously committed to contain China’s revolution for long twenty-five years, till at least, the futility of the mission induced it to accord China the ‘Most Favoured Nation’ position and extend cooperation in trade. Yet USA is markedly disturbed by the massive economic growth of China. Despite ideological differences, China is a very trusted friend of Pakistan, but it is our folly that we paid no heed to its advice in moments of our crises.

China has always come forward to help Pakistan in moments of crisis. During the decades of sixties, when USA abandoned Pakistan, it was China which met the major defence needs, besides providing economic assistance. During the period, 1965 to 1980, China supplied weapons and equipment worth five billion US dollars on gratis and without strings attached. Pakistan’s relative self-reliance in the field of defence, owes mainly to China’s support and cooperation. It pay back to China in hours of need, Pakistan did wise to provide access to her on its coastal lines. This help ensures the supply of oil to China from the Persian Gulf region without interruption. As China by the year 2010, would depend on the Gulf region in order to meet its 80% energy demand. This development, dovetails China- Pakistan’s security imperatives, in an integrated perspective. Such a cooperative compulsion between China and Pakistan has became all the more important in view of the role assigned to the American 5th Fleet in the Indian Ocean region, as part of “strategic partnership between USA and India”.

There is absolutely no need for Pakistan to enter into a defence pact with China or to amass military hardware. Only by strengthening the ties of regional economic cooperation, the objective could be served, and national security imperatives fortified, as a natural corollary to building a firm economic base.

Pakistan’s ISI Motives and Intentions in India:

Ever since partition, the main objective of Pakistani intelligence has all along been what it calls the liberation of Kashmir. Initially, its main focus was espionage activities and collecting strategic intelligence through short and long-term agents in India.

---

Table: 3.1

Militants Neutralized by the Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Apprehended</th>
<th>Surrendered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3267</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>2973</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>4089</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>3197</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>3541</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7742</td>
<td>24030</td>
<td>1836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Analysis, April 1999.
ISI game plan is to destabilise the secular Indian polity through direct subversive action and to create areas of influence. ISI is increasingly making use of foreign mercenaries to sustain and to re-invigorate the movement. This became clear with the role played by Afghan mercenary Mast Gul in the destruction of charar-e-sharif. It has reportedly instructed militant organisations to appoint more foreign commanders to counter the chances of local militants surrendering. ISI’s involvement in classical intelligence gathering operations in India is understandable in terms of its charter of responsibilities. But its offensive operations through subversive activities aimed at destabilizing the politico-economic structure in the country can only be seen as a result of its deep adversial mindset against India.

According to Yossef Bodansky, Director of the US Congress Task Force on Terrorism and Non-conventional Warfare, Pakistan had started to train Sikh and other Indian separatists to achieve strategic depth against India from early 1970’s. Pakistan adopted the sponsorship of terrorism and subversion as an instrument to substitute for the lack of strategic depth and early warning capabilities. In his report prepared in 1994, Bodansky further observed that during the 80’s, ISI had established a vast training and support infrastructure for the Afghan resistance groups, which was also used for training and support to Indian separatist groups. Since the early 80’s, ISI worked initially on the Sikh groups to create disorder in Punjab and later, from 1986 onwards, Kashmiri groups began to be targeted. The Sikh agitation in Punjab presented a God-sent opportunity to ISI. It not only began supplying Sikh militants with funds but also sophisticated weapons and explosives, diverted from the stock meant for the Afghan rebels. The training facilities available in Pakistan for Afghan rebels were also selectively utilized for training the Kashmiri militants. President Zia and ISI had drawn up a comprehensive plan, code-named Operation Topac, for carrying out low-intensity proxy war against India. The following motives has been highlighted below:

9 Sh; rma. B.L. (1968), Pakistan and China axis, Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
Ultimate motive is to wrest away Kashmir from India, disagreement over territorial division, for subversion, sabotage, destabilization and fragmentation of India.

Destabilizing Indian economy, injecting virus of fundamentalism, to promote separatists outfits in India, create communal conflict, destroying India’s unity and territorial integrity, ultimately destroying and disintegrate Indian state.

To disrupt social order, create chaos and fear among people, raises costs of governance, hamper development projects and processes.

Weaken government physically and psychologically, to dismember India, to avenge the loss of Bangladesh, to isolate people morally and physically from the state.

Compelled government to divert resources and money on counter insurgency operations, goal is to bleed India, affects its integrity as a sovereign state, malign India’s image by accusing it of human rights violation in Kashmir.

Northeast, second front of its proxy war in India, to weaken India’s internal security system and to engage it internally, engage it militarily, to create chasm between communities, to divert from the primary job and constant and heavy burden on the national exchequer.

Portrays India hurting minorities, challenge India’s status of secularity, to create ethnic and sectarian divide and trigger a communal backlash, engage India in internal squabbles, circulation of fake currency notes for the sake of damaging and sabotaging the Indian economy and generating funds for terrorist activities.

It threatens India’s integrity, fundamental government institutions, culture and values to create ethnic division in the social fabric of the country, exploiting religious sentiments and economic backwardness of Indians.

Conflict over Sir Creek in Gujarat, Tulbul Project, Siachen Glacier, entire state of Jammu & Kashmir, Even LoC has not been transcribed on the ground terrain with any certainty, wants to pursue Qurban Ali Doctrine i.e. balkanization of India,
weaken India’s potential strength and will, to prevent it from emerging a strategically dominant power\textsuperscript{12}.

Terrorism in Kashmir and Punjab: India Paying a High Price:

The Army’s relentless effort in conducting counter-insurgency operations under the most trying circumstances, while resolutely adhering to the application of the principle of ‘minimum force’, is indeed commendable and possibly unparalleled. "In contrast to similar situations elsewhere in the world, where tanks, aircraft, artillery and mortars have been freely used with attendant non-combatant casualties, the Indian Army has conducted no more than a police operation in Kashmir. Table show the enormity of the task involved in bringing about normalcy in Jammu & Kashmir. The large numbers of militants, who have been killed, apprehended or have surrendered and, the huge quantity of weapons, ammunition and explosives recovered, point both to the scale and viciousness of the campaign launched by Pakistan by proxy against India and the magnitude of the immense effort expended in successfully defeating that campaign\textsuperscript{13}.

Weapons such as RPGs (rocket propelled grenade launchers), infantry mortars and anti-aircraft missiles, have been recovered in smaller numbers. In addition, 1,403 radio sets, most of them extremely sophisticated, have also been recovered\textsuperscript{14}. On May 28 1998, the Defence Minister, Mr. George Fernandes in the Lok Sabha stated the following:

- At present, 72,000 defence personnel are directly deployed in counter-insurgency/internal security in Jammu & Kashmir, while about 47,000 are deployed in north-eastern states. In addition, there are also personnel of supervisory and other formations who are involved in supervisory roles. Prolonged employment of army for such duties, besides adversely affecting the army's preparation for its main task also imposes an extra burden on the defence budget which, in turn, affects army's modernisation programmes. In addition,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Samiuddin, Abida (1997), “Fundamentalism and Rise of Terrorism in South Asia: Economic Political Factors”, \textit{Philosophy and Social Action}, vol.23, no.3, pp.5-16
\item \textsuperscript{13} Kaul, Kapil (2002), “Growth of radical Islam in Pakistan”, \textit{India Quarterly}: pp. 89-101
\end{itemize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Type of Weapon/Equipment</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assault Rifle AK-47/56</td>
<td>13675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Light/Universal Machine Gun</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sniper Rifles</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sten Guns</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pistols</td>
<td>4891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anti-personnel Mines</td>
<td>5422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anti-tank Mines</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hand Grenades</td>
<td>35557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Explosives (kgs)</td>
<td>11865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ammunition (rounds)</td>
<td>2,693,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Strategic Analysis, April 1999.*
casualties suffered by the army in peacetime affect the morale of the army personnel.

- The maintenance of law and order is basically the responsibility of the State Governments and the defence forces are deployed for counter-insurgency/internal security duties only against a specific requisition by the State administration and/or when they are statutorily required to render such duties under the provisions of the relevant laws such as Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958, etc.

- The consistent policy of the Government in this regard has been that the defence forces should be deployed for internal security duties very sparingly and only if the State government is not in a position to handle the situation and the deployment of defence forces becomes absolutely necessary. The Rashtriya Rifles was sanctioned by the Government to relieve the Army, to the extent possible, from counter-insurgency duties. This has, however, helped only to a limited extent in view of the increased commitment of the army in counter-insurgency operations.

It emerges from the Defence Minister's statement that a total of 119,000 Army personnel were deployed for counter-insurgency and internal security duties in Jammu & Kashmir and the north eastern states of India in May 1998. Since the number of supervisory and supporting personnel is over and above this figure, it could be concluded that approximately 132 infantry battalions were committed for such duties. (The approximate strength of an infantry battalion may be taken as 900 personnel.) Of these units, 36 battalions are of the Rashtriya Rifles. Hence, about 96 infantry battalions were employed for such duties. As the situation has not changed substantially since 1993-94, it could be assumed that about 90 to 95 battalions are being employed continuously for counter-insurgency/internal security duties. 15

In addition, for the last five years, five to eight infantry battalions of the territorial army and about 25 battalions of the Assam Rifles, a para-military force funded by the Ministry of Home Affairs but officered by and under the operational control of the army, have also been employed for active operations within the country. Hence, overall 162 to 15
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15 Tara, Karthi (1999), "Transnational Terrorism and Radical Extremism", AKROSH.
165 regular army and army-led para-military battalions are actively engaged in counter-insurgency/internal security operations and duties. To this list, details of the units of Central Police Organisations (CPOs) which are being employed for similar tasks need to be added to get an overview of the enormity of the effort involved in combating militancy which is mainly Pakistan-sponsored, aided and abetted\textsuperscript{16}.

Table: 3.3
Units of CPO Forces Employed for Counter-Insurgency/Internal Security Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Force</th>
<th>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</th>
<th>North Eastern States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border Security Force (BSF)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITBP)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammu and Kashmir Armed Police</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Strategic Analysis, April 1999.*

As the level of violence has been consistently high throughout the last ten years of militancy in Jammu & Kashmir, the casualty rates were bound to be high. Table 3.4 shows the casualties suffered by army personnel and innocent civilian citizens in Jammu & Kashmir during 1990-98.

\textsuperscript{16} Raza, Maroof (1999), "Pakistan-Sponsored Insurgency in Kashmir: A Case Study" AAKROSH, vol.7, no.4: pp.31-56
### Table: 3.4


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Civilians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killed</td>
<td>Wounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>2878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Strategic Analysis, April 1999.*

Till end-June 1998, the Army and CPOs together had lost 1442 men, compared with 1103 soldiers killed during the entire 1947-48 conflict with Pakistan in Jammu & Kashmir. The nation is indeed paying a high price in combating Pakistan's proxy war in Jammu & Kashmir to maintain its territorial integrity.
## Table: 3.5

Recovery of Arms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK-47 rifles &amp; pistols</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>32,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMGs</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocket launchers</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. *Up to February 2002*
Pakistan-sponsored terrorism in India has claimed the lives of 29,151 civilians and 5,101 security forces personnel. 2, 78,601 persons have been rendered homeless. The loss to public and private property is estimated at Rs.2,000 crores. The cost of compensation paid to victims, for border fencing and the amount expended on the raising of local anti-terrorist force, works out to Rs.18,500 crores. The expenditure on the army and Para-military forces is approximately Rs.46,000 crores.\textsuperscript{17}

Besides the casualties being suffered almost on a daily basis and their adverse impact on morale, the army's prolonged involvement in counter-insurgency operations has several other major disadvantages. The financial costs of sustaining a successful counter-insurgency campaign are staggering. It has been estimated that the army spends approximately Rs.2,500 crores (US $600 million) out of its annual budget on counter-insurgency operations. This is about 13 per cent of the army's 1997-98 budget of Rs.19,000 crores approximately.\textsuperscript{18} The outcome is that the army spends almost 57 per cent of its budget on pay and allowances, about 40 percent on the maintenance of equipment and the replenishment of ammunition and other essential stores being consumed for counter-insurgency operations, and is left with only three percent for modernisation, including capital acquisitions. Even the expenditure on the Rashtriya Rifles, amounting to approximately Rs 500 crores annually, is incurred from the army's budget. It is obvious that the army can ill afford an expenditure of 13 per cent on counter-insurgency operations from its budget without its operational efficiency for its primary task being significantly impaired.\textsuperscript{19}

The wear and tear caused to first line weapons (small arms and light crew-served weapons), equipment, vehicles, extreme cold clothing (ECC) and camp items such as tentage due to excessive usage in counter-insurgency/internal security operations, results in a reduction in their life cycles. As it is not always possible to procure replacements due to the inadequacy of funds, replacements have to be provided from the available war


reserves which results in their depletion\textsuperscript{20}. The Rashtriya Rifles force was raised to act as the army's counter-insurgency strike force so that regular infantry battalions would remain available to train and prepare for their primary task even during periods when the army's employment for counter insurgency/internal security operations is unavoidable. However, under the present circumstances, 36 Rashtriya Rifles battalions have proved to be grossly inadequate for the purpose as the requirement appears to have stabilised at approximately 130 to 135 battalions, including the Rashtriya Rifles battalions. It is imperative that the employment of regular infantry battalions of the army for counter-insurgency operations be reduced to not more than 30 to 40 at a time so as to overcome the drawbacks of prolonged employment, if it cannot be stopped altogether\textsuperscript{21}.

\textbf{Table: 3.6}

\textbf{Recovery of Explosive Materials}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RDX (in kgs.)</th>
<th>Explosives</th>
<th>IED (improved explosive device)</th>
<th>Grenades</th>
<th>Rockets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>6,448</td>
<td>1020+13 boxes</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4,152</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,366</td>
<td>23,511</td>
<td>4,616</td>
<td>45,031</td>
<td>4,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. \*Up to February 2002

\textsuperscript{20} Kanwal, Gurmeet (1999), "Proxy War in Kashmir: Jihad or State Sponsored Terrorism", \textit{Strategic Analysis}, vol.23, no.1: pp. 55-83

India's patience has been stretched almost to the limit and the strain is now showing. Demands for a more pro-active Kashmir policy are becoming vociferous. The country has exercised restraint against Pakistan's proxy war and shown enough tolerance. India must make the costs unbearable for Pakistan. But it is our nation shying away from exercising its military option. In a sharply critical article in September 1998, Mr. K. Subrahmanyam wrote: "It would appear that the Government of India has no policy about a possible solution to the Kashmir issue but hopes that so long as the issue is kept out of international attention and the insurgency and terrorism are contained through attrition, the problem will go away." Mr. Farooq Abdullah, the Chief Minister of Jammu & Kashmir, a long-standing advocate for recognising the LoC as the international border between India and Pakistan, is now of the view that the Kashmir issue should be frozen for 25 years and that the two countries should build bridges on other aspects like trade, tourism and cultural exchanges. Mr. K.P.S Gill, former Director General of Punjab Police, is critical of the country's reliance on 'the niceties of diplomacy' to resolve the Kashmir problem and says that, "No nation in the world would have displayed the restraint and the patience that we have in the face of the scale and intensity of violence that has been unleashed upon us.

It is axiomatic that there can be no military solution to an insurgency. The security forces can only restore functional normalcy so that the law and order situation is under control and the writ of the civil administration runs in the state. The level of violence can be curtailed to a large extent and the number of incidents can be considerably reduced by co-ordinated operations. However, the security forces cannot eliminate the insurgency. To do that, the root causes of the insurgency have to be identified and tackled and the people's perceived grievances redressed. The security forces can assist by carrying out 'civic action' on behalf of the civil administration, 'show the flag' by virtue of their presence in the area, particularly the villages in the interior, and

---


provide security cover to civil officials to enable them to perform their duties without fear.24

A lasting solution to the Kashmir issue can only be found if both the external and the internal dimensions of the problem are successfully addressed, as both are inextricably interlinked. Unless Pakistan 'turns off the tap' of infiltration, no amount of effort, both military and civilian, will succeed in eliminating militancy from Jammu & Kashmir. By now it should be clear to Pakistan that its proxy war will not succeed under any circumstances and that it would be in its own interest to renounce this path and seek mutually beneficial co-operation with India.

It is difficult to believe that the Pakistani Government does not understand that its sponsorship of insurgencies and its support to virulently fundamentalist organisations such as the Taliban militia will eventually boomerang on Pakistan itself. It does not require great prescience to predict that the Taliban backlash is eventually bound to create unmanageable problems for Pakistan. Perhaps, having created a Frankenstein monster, the Pakistanis now find it difficult to regain control; or, they have deluded themselves into believing that they can get away with it lightly. Either way, Pakistan is apparently set on a course of self-destruction25.

In case the present proxy war leads to conventional or, even the unthinkable, nuclear war, it should be obvious to the Pakistanis that they will suffer much more than India. During an address to the National Defence College, New Delhi, then General V. P. Malik, the COAS, warned that, "Pakistan's proxy war is dangerous not only for India but for the entire region. If militancy grows too big, both the initiator and the affected nation are tempted to use conventional means of war. Perhaps, the civilian rulers of Pakistan have already gone too far with the latitude given to the ISI and the Pakistani army to wage a proxy war against India and are now unable to control the Frankenstein monster26.

Nevertheless, India should continue to strive to achieve normalcy in its relations with Pakistan and must keep all channels of communications open. Mr. K

Subrahmanyam recommends that: "India should put forward a whole series of confidence building measures (CBMs) to reduce tension and restore peace in Jammu and Kashmir to enable meaningful negotiations between India and Pakistan. This should include an open skies plan along the border, international observers to check on Pakistani camps of terrorist organisations and agreed mining and fencing of borders." However, as long as Pakistan remains intransigent and believes that holding bilateral talks with India is futile, as advocated by the former Foreign Minister, Mr. Gohar Ayub Khan, prior to the Colombo Summit meeting between the two Prime Ministers in July 1998, India should remain aware that not much is likely to be achieved by India's continued pursuance of the diplomatic option. Pakistan's efforts to secure third party mediation are irreconcilable with India's approach that the problems between the two countries be resolved bilaterally in the spirit of the Shimla agreement.

India must project the Kashmir issue as one of international fundamentalist Islamic terrorism with widespread adverse ramifications, including for the western nations. Osama Bin Laden's terrorist training bases in Afghanistan which were hit by US cruise missiles in August 1998, were also training terrorists for operations in Jammu & Kashmir. Mr. Naresh Chandra, then India's Ambassador to the US, recently highlighted the convergence of Indian and US interests on terrorism: "Both India and the United States have been victims of terrorism perpetrated by individuals trained and equipped in the same schools of crime near India's borders." It would be in India's interest to further highlight through diplomatic channels and by launching a concerted public information/awareness campaign that Pakistan is the 'mother nation' of Islamic fundamentalist terrorism. The US State Department has so far been reluctant to list Pakistan as a sponsor of international terrorism "because of warnings by Pakistani Prime Ministers that such action would unravel the country's fledgling democracy and drive it into the hands of the virulently anti-American extremists." The US needs to be convinced that turning a blind eye to Pakistan's sponsorship of terrorism neither augurs well for peace and stability in the southern Asian region, nor is it in the US own long-term interest.

---

It is difficult to see any light at the end of the tunnel, as there are no easy answers to this intractable problem. The most pragmatic way ahead appears to be to further synergise counter-insurgency operation in Jammu & Kashmir so as to bring about functional normalcy all over the state as early as possible, while simultaneously stepping up the industrial development of the State and the socio-economic upliftment of the people. The creation of employment opportunities for the youth, including schemes for self-employment, should be a high priority point for action. The Sufi tradition of tolerance and liberalism, for which Kashmir is well known, should be encouraged to bloom unhindered by the diktats of radical Islam.

A sustained political campaign must be immediately launched to win the 'hearts and minds' of the Kashmiri people, assuage their feelings of hurt and neglect and restore their bruised and battered dignity. The people of Jammu & Kashmir need to be convinced that their future lies with India. However, Jammu & Kashmir will need to be given a large measure of autonomy; indeed, this demand is entirely in keeping with the federal structure of the Indian Constitution and has been recommended strongly for all the states by the Sarkaria Commission. The hands of Kashmiri government administration should be strengthened so that the Kashmir Government can further enhance the quality of its battle against militancy on all fronts. The Government must launch a sustained media campaign, both within the country and abroad, to highlight Pakistan's deep-rooted involvement in fostering terrorism and insurgency in Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab and other parts of India. International pressure must be brought to bear on Pakistan to desist from its nefarious interference in India's internal affairs and to stop sponsoring Islamic fundamentalist terrorism in the southern Asian region and other parts of the world. Above all, public opinion must be mobilised to express the nation's solidarity with the Kashmiri people in their long drawn out and courageous struggle against Pakistan-sponsored proxy war.

---

It is clear that if India has had considerable political space to implement its political strategies of making peace in the Kashmir policy. It is a reflection of the current geopolitical realities. Pakistan’s military coup, the continued evidence of a nexus between its military establishment and the terrorist Mujahideen groups. Cross border terrorism is a major cause of the continuing unrest in the valley, it becomes all the more imperative to engage Islamabad and make this issue a key condition to be adhered on or core principle to be respected if the peace process is to work.

India has been the object of state sponsored, cross border terrorism, in its most inhuman manifestations for more than a decade. Terrorism is an assault of human decency, a violation of the basic percepts of democracy and the very anti thesis of what the United Nations represents and stands for.... It constitutes a crime against humanity. It is also a threat to international peace and security, especially when terrorist are armed, financed and backed by governments or their agencies. Pakistan’s has no desire to respect any bilateral agreements with India, nor is it interested in any serious peace process. Its approach is rooted in the belief that a total victory in Kashmir is possible through a low cost campaign of terrorism and destabilization. India’s strategy has been to cope with cross border terrorism and ignore Pakistan. The recognition that a passive strategy is no longer credible is at the heart of the latest political effort to engage the militants in Kashmir who are interested in finding a peaceful and negotiated solution to the problem. To be successful, the new pro-active strategy in Kashmir needs an external diplomatic component that compels Pakistan to accept a reasonable agreement. Given Kashmir strategic placement – it borders China, Russia and Pakistan- U.S. imperialism has always entertained an interest. After the liberation of Bangladesh, Pakistan intensified its intervention in Kashmir. U.S. imperialism from the beginning has been seeking to make Kashmir independent so that it can have a strategic base.31

Pakistan’s believes that it can continue to vacillate on terrorism in Kashmir since the U.S. desperately needs him as its satrap in the region. Pakistan’s army, because of the long history of praetorian rule, is unarguably the most powerful institution in the country but it is also the organisation threat has the greatest vested interest in the continuing

conflict with India. Its belief that the strategy of bleeding India “through a thousand cuts” has worked is still finding expression in the statements of important voices within the armed forces, so it continues to support the forces of terror in Kashmir.\(^2\)

Over 60% of the militants are foreigners, including foreigners from Pakistan, Sudan, Afghanistan, Yemen, Iran, Iraq, Algeria, and some other countries. Organizations such as Lashkar-a-Toiba, Harkat-ul-Mujahideen and the Jaish-a-Mohammed identifies themselves with the brand of struggle the Taliban was pursuing in Afghanistan. Osama bin laden’s al-Qaeda and groups such as Palestine Hamas were supposedly the inspiration for young people taking to the gun in Kashmir. Pakistan’s ISI provided the outfits with material support and facilitated the entry of its cadres in to Kashmir. The ouster of the Taliban is seen as a psychological setback to the militancy in Kashmir. It will demoralize the militants who had been looking towards the Taliban as a pillar of Islamic movements.\(^3\)

In 1947 India failed to counter the falsehood start the country was partitioned on the basis of the religion. It wasn’t partitioned as a result of territorial referendum which were held on the basis of the Indian Independence Act of the British Parliament which made not a single reference to religion. That is why referendums were held directly or indirectly even in territories in which Muslims were in overwhelming majority. Pakistan got away with the falsehood that because India was partitioned on the basis of religion, Kashmir should have acceded to Pakistan because of its Muslim majority. The world could not digest the constitutional complexity that the Indian independence act left it to the rules of all princely states including Kashmir to decide whether to accede to India or Pakistan and the ruler of Jammu & Kashmir acceded to India only when Pakistan impatient to grab Kashmir. India was branded for not implementing U.N. Resolutions, which called for a plebiscite in Kashmir, it was Pakistan, which nullified the resolutions by refusing to meet the obligations, which it was required to before India could be asked to hold a plebiscite.\(^4\)

In Pakistan the extremist religious organisations such as the Jamaat-I-Islami and the Deoband and feudal tribal forces which are in league with the defence establishment.

\(^3\) ibid.
The Taliban control of Afghanistan gave further rise to militancy in Kashmir and the newly independent, oil rich Muslim countries of Central Asia which was earlier part of Soviet Russia. Islamabad's policy of jihads and the Jamaat-Deoband support to its have caused tensions in Kashmir, Xinjiang, Central Asia and the Caucasus region. If Pakistan is not checked then all Muslim countries of the region will meet with the same fate as that suffered by Afghanistan and Chechnya. These entire religious organisations will and are continuing to play important role in the religio-political set up of the country.

In Washington global strategic interest Kashmir as a vital position for U.S. Imperialism. Imperialism has always cherished the ideas of making Kashmir and independent state as this will help it in maneuvering in the region for U.S. imperialism, therefore, Kashmir is not, as India maintains an integral part of the country but the disputed territory. It is clear military action by India will have to face an international reaction led by the U.S. accusing it of irresponsibility. It will also inevitably, further encourage Pakistan's leadership to travel further down the terrorism road. The diplomatic, political, economic and social instruments would all have to be used to force a change in the behaviour of Pakistan’s leadership. International support and the coalition against terrorism will help India after, and not before India begins to help itself. The choices India makes will define its future in the coming decades.

Musharraf’s objectives are clearly the following:

- First, he is conveying a message to India that in any emerging conflict situation between the two countries, Pakistan will not be inhibited in using its nuclear weapons in the lights of its declared option of first use.
- Second, the same message is continued to the international community with the additional objective of generating pressure on the major powers to restrain India through diplomatic, political and economic means.
- Third, he is assuring his domestic audience that despite his falling inline with the US against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda has not changed his firm anti-Indian

---

policies particularly on the Kashmir front. He assured that he could sustain this policy due to Pakistan’s nuclear weapons capacities.

The massive military deployment under operation Prakaram only resulted in some piecemeal cosmetic public pronouncements by Musharraf. It neither translated in to any reduction of cross border terrorism engineered from Pakistan nor did the various political and military steps that we took lead to any change in Musharraf’s subversive anti-India policies. There was no parallel operation pressure on Pakistan to control the ISI and its cohorts from acting against India. Pakistan’s primary interest will centre on Kashmir and the nuclear arms question and sponsoring terrorist organisations across the border in to the Indian state. Pakistan’s own geostrategic status, proven by its role in the past decades as a variable ally of the U.S., is a reality that may yet stand in its favour. A reality is that the U.S. is pursuing its own geostrategic agenda that does not arguably meet the expectations of either India or Pakistan. Islamabad should guarantee a sustainable curb on the movement of terrorists into and out of Pakistan.

Washington insisted on an immediate, unconditional and unambiguous withdrawal of Pakistani troops from across the LoC. This was the first time ever in the history of the Indo-Pakistan conflicts that the U.S. so strongly supported New Delhi. In all previous wars between the two regional rivals the U.S. was either neutral or had tilted towards Pakistan. The changed geopolitical setting of South Asia after the cold war has something to do with the transformed American approach, so did the Americans concerns about a nuclear flashpoint in the subcontinents. Pakistan had expected support not only from China but also the Islamic world that it has nurtured as an ideological constituency.

The annual report of the Ministry of Defence for the relevant year costed in 1965 conflict at Rs.50 Crores. In 1971 war, the cost was around Rs.3500 crores, the cost of Kargil conflict Rs.2000 crores. The cost of a nuclear conflict due to the ensuing destruction of lives and property would be virtually impossible to calculate. Washington has decided to avail itself of a new opportunity to capitalize on Islamabad’s geopolitical activism. The U.S. has now taken advantage of Pakistan’s leverage with the Taliban in

---

\[\text{ibid.}\]

\[\text{ibid.}\]
Afghanistan. The centrality of Pakistan to central Asia and China as a strategic neighbour seems to entice the U.S. which now has begun to consider Islamabad for the role of a strategic ally in a largely undefined sphere.\footnote{Kalim, Bahadur (2002). “Is Pakistan a Terrorist State”, World Focus, vol.23, no.1: pp. 6-8.}

**Pakistan’s Strategies and Aspirations in India:**

- Strategies considerations, religious affinities, it quest for ideological and strategic space towards east and west.
- Unfinished agenda of partition, strategic is to wrest away Kashmir from India, promoting the cause of Islam.
- To challenge Indian hegemony in the region.
- To avenge the loss of Bangladesh in 1971.

**Table: 3.7**

**Economic Costs due to Pakistan’s State Sponsored Terrorism in India**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Financial losses in crores of rupees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965 conflict cost</td>
<td>Rs. 50 crores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 war</td>
<td>Rs. 3500 crores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Kargil war</td>
<td>Rs. 2000 crores approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 build up troops along the border</td>
<td>$ 8 billion approx.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Times of India, July 2003
Table: 3.8
State-Sponsored Terrorism in India, 1990-1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lives claimed</th>
<th>Security forces personnel</th>
<th>Persons rendered homeless</th>
<th>Loss of public and private property</th>
<th>Cost of compensation paid to victims and raising local anti terrorist force</th>
<th>Expenditure on Army &amp; Para-military Forces approx.</th>
<th>Army spends on counter-insurgency operations</th>
<th>The army 1997-98 budget of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29,151 civilians killed</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>2,78,601</td>
<td>Rs.2000 crores</td>
<td>Rs.18,500 crores</td>
<td>Rs.46,000 crores</td>
<td>Rs.2,500 crores</td>
<td>Rs.19000 crores approx.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Strategic Analysis, April 1999.*

The biggest challenge in the war against Pakistan sponsored terrorism is internal. India needs to get over her defensive mindset and assert her true might in a manner free of historical hang-ups. India needs to appreciate that crying about the evil of terrorism is futile. India needs to learn that terrorism can only be countered by a simple old adage - "Tit for Tat". India needs to liberate the people of its neighbouring country from a tyrannical State. India needs to acquire the high moral ground and adopt all possible means to achieve the ethical aims.

**Strategic and Geopolitical Characteristics: Kashmir Region**

The region of Kashmir that forms a part of Pamir has geostrategical and geopolitical characteristics that increase its strategical importance. Pakistan, China, Afghanistan and India are its direct neighbours. As a part of Pamir Plateau, Kashmir over look, the lowland around it namely the Deccan Plateau. India Eastern Iranian Plateau and Afghanistan, Punjab plain in Pakistan, Tajikistan in Central Asia, Tibet Plateau and
Sinkiang in West China are lower than Kashmir region and Pamir. These region therefore sense danger from Kashmir region from military point of view and 36 presence or control of Kashmir by any neighbour in the region, considered as a source of temporary or permanent threat. The region of Kashmir serves as very important position, as it severs the link between South Asia with Central Asia and Tibet West China and Sinkiang East China. The region of Kashmir and northern part of India and west of Tibet form a watershed basin of five rivers, Sind, Jhelum, Chenab, Ravi and Sutleuj and also form a topographic unit, and also its valley passes and course of its water direction are important from strategic point of view. So, control of whole of it or part of it by any neighbours considered as a permanent source of danger by others to their national security and vital interests. After the collapse of the USSR, one of the four went out of competition. In the new geopolitical model after the collapse of USSR, therefore have remained only three powers.40

Geopolitical Significance of Kashmir

Kashmir’s total area is 218,780 sq kms, in a central Asia position, it share borders with India in south, Pakistan in the west, Afghanistan in the Northwest, China in the north and east and Tibet to the east. Kashmir accommodates three religious groups along with minorities. The Kashmir problem crisis, after India and Pakistan were created an independent entity in 1947. Since then, India and Pakistan fought three wars over Kashmir and low intensity proxy war continued in Kashmir since 1980’s onwards. India occupied Kashmir has claimed many lives and also caused destruction to economy and society, community health has been crippled due to prevalence of military in this region. Education system has been collapsed, since me urgency began government services, administration and criminal justice system all have been collapsed. Income earning activities, tourism and cottage industries, handicrafts etc. all have been shattered. Kashmir symbolizes the major flashpoint between India and Pakistan. Even this time,

Pakistan threatened India with first use of nuclear weapons if tension continued to escalate in Kashmir.  

Geopolitical Significance of Kashmir for India, Pakistan & China:  
Most important is the preservation of India’s territorial integrity as India comprises of number of states, based on secular lines based on multiplicity of identities and associations. The religious make up of Kashmir exemplifies the secular principles upon which India was founded and India is keen to ensure that this situation continues. Kashmir separation from India considered as a challenge to the principles underlying India’s existence and to India’s secular and socio-political fabric. So, there is a fear, separation of one state will have knock-on-effects, other states in a similar way encouraged by successful succession elsewhere, to express their dissatisfaction with central rule in a similar way. So, India will never allow Jammu and Kashmir to be either merged or become independent. Many views may conflict in Kashmir as being beneficial to all Indian as it shows a desire on the part of the Indian government to uphold the Union. The conflict benefits the defence industrial sector. The arms and nuclear industries receive a great deal of investment as a result of high defence expenditure, as investment in the military industry enables India to advance technologically and to earn valuable foreign exchange through military sales.

The Pakistani government and its people see India as a major constraint to their nation. So, in this context, conflict in Kashmir is viewed as the most important. Security concern for Pakistan if Pakistan loses Kashmir, it would be difficult for him to contain its own unity, as separatist in Sindh and Baluchistan are trying their best to declare themselves independent. If Indian controlled Kashmir acceded to Pakistan, then this would reverse the humiliation of 1971 war and also it may challenge Indian territorial integrity. Pakistan feels, if India maintains its grip on Kashmir, through military terms,

than a prolonged conflict would cause substantial political damage, in addition to
economic and military costs to India. Any cost to India, whether diplomatic, economic, or
territorial is perceived as a benefit to Pakistan. The investment in the defence industry
have served to increase jobs and technological advance, self sufficiency would enable
Pakistan to maintain a consistently strong position against India over Kashmir.

China fears the instability in Kashmir may spill over to its Muslim province,
Xinjiang in northern China. It may create unrest among Islamic fundamentalist in
Xinjiang and also threaten important Chinese routes. Longer the conflict, greater will be
threat to China’s own internal security. Chinese benefit from Aksai Chin are largely
strategic because of its comprehensive road network and the trade routes crosses it.
Karakoram highway provides China’s access to the Indian Ocean. This is the reason why
China wanted Pakistan to preserve Kashmir problem as status quo. Still, it is not in China
interests to abandon Pakistan, as there are internal security concerns and it need to keep
open its roads links though Aksai Chin and the Karakoram highway. China is wary of an
independent Kashmir, as it may become an American surrogate on its southern borders.

**China’s Strategic & Geopolitical Interest in Kashmir and Xinjiang Region:**

During the Cold War Era, China’s policy towards south Asia was shaped by two
main considerations:

- Opposing Soviet social imperialism and hegemonism.
- Opposing Indian ‘Expansionism’ in the region by supporting smaller sub-
continental powers.

India due to its size, location, and non-aligned policy, drew more benefits than
other during cold war era. That’s why smaller countries had the opportunity and at times,
compulsion to forge relations with China, which at times, act as a counter balance against
Indian dominance⁴¹. Sino-Indian relations has been discussed under following heads:

- If we look in to historical records, cultural and commercial relations were
continuous, political relations sporadic and less significant.

---

20-22.
China’s abiding concern has been its western borders and also its southern borders with south Asian states. Tibet became strategically important for both countries India and China because of its 4000 km long common border. China till date claims Arunachal Pradesh as disputed territory, while India’s claims to Aksai Chin and also the North East Frontier Agency (NEFA) region.

China is also sensitive about Tibet. To China, south Asian countries are the biggest hidden threat to its security especially, the big brother, India.

China’s interest mainly in the region is strategic and defensive and is devoid of cultural or ethnic affinity and without much scope for political penetration. China special relationship with south Asian military regimes especially with Pakistan, moulds the south Asian security profile and tried to tie down India in south Asia by building friendship with all its neighbours.

Beijing’s strategic vision of emerging as the Asian leader. This is the reason why it had a direct bearings on south Asian security; so, with times, Beijing continues to mould its south Asian policy objectives to suits its national objectives.

China does not want to see an independent Kashmiri state, hence any conflict which ensures Kashmir independent does not favour Chinese interests. China’s benefits from its administration of the eastern part of Kashmir (Aksai Chin) are largely strategic. Chinese involvement rests first on the perception that its border with India occupied Kashmir in an area of instability and thus danger to the Chinese mainland and secondly, with its belief that Aksai Chin has vital strategic importance because of its comprehensive road network and the trade routes that cross it. After 1962 war with India, China found a strategic ally in Pakistan. “China was the chief instrument by which Pakistan got its bomb, provides critical knowledge and technology, design data, training and even nuclear materials”45. With the construction of the Karakoram highway an all-weather motorway stretching from China in to Pakistan administered Kashmir through the Karakoram pass, further stabilize the links between the two countries. This highway

provides China’s access to the Indian Ocean. By creating this important trade and transport link, China has given Pakistan a reason to preserve the status-quo. Since the Cold war ended, there has been a slight warming of relations between China and India. So, China is sensible in making stable relations with India and Pakistan both, as still there is internal security concerns and the country needs to keep open its roads links through Aksai Chin and the Karakoram highway. Now, China is interested in maintaining its immediate economic interests with India against Pakistan. China is motivated by pragmatic national interest which in relation with a country are judged on its merits without ideological basis.

China economic policies in central Asia are broadly linked to its larger strategic and geopolitical interests in changing circumstances after the gradual Russian withdrawal from the region it is also largely based on its energy security needs and search for markets for finished goods. But there is also fear among the Chinese policy makers with regard to the policy of opening up of its north western frontiers towards the Muslim Republics of Central Asia as it invites the risk of Islamic fundamentalism and cross-border ethnic separatism which are grave threats to Chinese national security.

The Chinese government intensified its campaigns against the Islamisation process in Xinjiang by promoting in-depth atheist education. Thus, many mosques and Koranic schools were closed down and the use of Arabic script was stopped with tight controls on Islamic clergy and religious leaders. Muslims working in government offices and other official institutions were prohibited from practicing their religion failing which they lost their jobs. Even the denial of access to higher education has resulted in their relative economic deprivation and unemployment. On the other hand, Beijing has maintained a strong control over Uighur publishing and printing activities and it has seriously neglected the Uighur monuments and architecture. With limitations imposed on building of mosques, restrictions on child bearing and denial of certain cultural freedoms, the Chinese communist rule today not only prevents Uighurs from developing their culture and civilization but also tries to assimilate and sinicize the Uighurs.46

The Uighurs nationalists on their part have mobilized strong support from Kazakhstan and certain Islamic countries in west Asia, particularly Egypt. Turkey.

Afghanistan and Pakistan to carry forward their separatist movement. So the demand for an independent Uighurstan has been voiced by many self-exiled Uighurs in Turkey, Kazakhstan, Kyrghyzstan and Afghanistan. The activities going on in Afghanistan and Pakistan has encouraged the forces of Islamic extremism and separatism among the Uighurs in Xinjiang. Even it has impact on younger more aggressive generation of better educated youth drawing inspiration from the international Islamic reassertion and a culture of jihad has emerged to displace the older generation of nationalists secular-minded exiles.

The Chinese government on its part believes that many Uighurs militants are trained in Afghanistan and Pakistan and they have been for long, students in the madarsas of Pakistan, China has closed the Karakoram highway very often and maintained strict vigil on its border with Pakistan in order to stop the flow of arms and drugs to Xinjiang. Moreover for China, the Xinjiang region is strategically important constituting one-sixth of the landmasses of China which has nuclear testing sites and vast areas for military manoeuvres. In geo-political context, Xinjiang extends China's reach to the borders of Middle East with the new CARs lying in between. Historically, the region has served as buffer against external invasion and ideological influence on inner China. So, it is found that "instability in the buffer zone itself has often drained China's resources or threatened China with contagion or conquest," the Chinese authorities are well aware that the northwestern borders are porous and there are cross-border ethno-religious ties among its minorities. Through the past centuries, China has felt threatened with separatist unrest among the Manchus, Mongols, Uighurs, Kazakhs, Kyrghizhs and Tibetans.

So, the present Chinese policy in central Asia is governed by strategic and economic considerations, which have strong linkage with the geopolitics of Xinjiang. The rising threat of ethno-nationalism in the neighbouring CARs will concern China in various ways. So it wants the present status quo to continue in central Asia because it ensures tranquility on its border and good relations with its neighbours. So, it has sought for a co-operative security framework with Russia for peace and stability in central Asia. But the rise of Islamic forces in its neighborhood may be a cause for grave concern to

---


126
India and China: Partnership Relations

At present, both India and China are in a favour to work together to evolve their common ideas and also to evolve the new world order for the 21st century. Both are in favour of a multi-polar world and are interested in resolving their boundary disputes peacefully. According to Chinese experts, despite fast changing realities of geo-strategy and geo-economics, the China’s connection to south Asian security continued to be integral, even in the coming years. So, taking into consideration, the post cold war era and its increasing global interests and steady movements towards becoming the next global power of the 21st century. So, China-South Asian security connection is very likely to persists in the coming decades as well.

According to Chinese South Asian expert, what he says is after the end of the Cold War, every country wants to go for partnership relations. There are no ideological enemies – only neighbours, close neighbours and distant partners; who gets the advantage depends on who can use the opportunity to develop economic relations. Presently, China is in the throes of modernizing it’s economy and keen on getting foreign funds, investment and technology. In future, China plays a meaningful role in conflict-resolution in south Asia since its policy hinges on maintaining good relations with all neighbours. So, in this case, its traditional friend Pakistan expects that China will be able to dissuade India from any future military adventure against it. However, China has been emphasizing that the Kashmir dispute should be settled through “dialogue and discussion.” It has also given friendly advice to India and Pakistan not to raise the issue in international forums. So, China has no intention to mediate in the dispute. So, Pakistan was advised to exercise self-control and solve conflict through peaceful means and avoid worsening the situation, as China also feared danger to its western Muslim

region of Xinjiang autonomous province. China also condemned supporting and abetting cross border terrorism against other country’s interest\textsuperscript{52}. While it can be said that the present division of Kashmir suits China but China fears the instability in Kashmir and what China government thinks it no longer confined to the valley, may also spills over to unstable Muslim populated province of Xinjiang (China’s province); also Chinese fear that independent Kashmir may create unrest among Islamic fundamentalists in Xinjiang and also threaten important Chinese trade routes. So, therefore, regional insecurity is not in Chinese interests, as side by side it also fears the knock on effect of the Kashmir conflict in Xinjiang could be exploited by a foreign power. So, this could be the main reason that China urges Pakistan government to restrain itself and stops abetting and supporting cross border terrorism, as conflict in Kashmir could trigger instability in Xinjiang province (China).