CHAPTER-V

SUPER POWERS IN SOUTH ASIA:

➢ INTERESTS IN NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

➢ DISARMAMENT EFFORTS-SINCE 1991

Before we proceed any further it becomes necessary to look at the brief history of nuclear proliferation of the super powers. Research into the development of nuclear weapons was undertaken during World War Second. On July 16, 1945, the United States tested its first nuclear bomb, in Mexico, which is recalled as World’s first nuclear weapon test. On August 6, 1945, the United States dropped an atomic bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima which killed or wounded more than one lac people. Three days latter, the United States dropped another bomb on Nagasaki which also killed masses in huge numbers and injured severals. Thus, Japan surrendered unconditionally in the end of the World War II.¹

The 1950s was a decade of aggressive nuclear weapons investments. The United States fired its hydrogen bomb in 1950. In 1953, the Soviet Union tested its first hydrogen bomb. In 1952, the United Kingdom declared herself a Nuclear-Weapon State and fired her first hydrogen bomb five years later.

In 1958, the US and the Soviet Union agreed on temporary moratorium on nuclear testing. Political and military developments, however, made the moratorium a short one. In 1960, France declared herself the fourth nuclear power by conducting the nuclear test. In 1961, the Soviet Union broke the moratorium and detonated 30

bombs within a short period, including one bomb of 58 megatons (that is, 58,000 KT). The US resumed her nuclear testing in the Pacific.²

Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev and US President John F. Kennedy brought the world closer than ever to a nuclear war through the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. Two years later, China detonated its first atomic bomb. Nuclear testing by these five original Nuclear Weapon States would continue into the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

Between the 1960s and 1980s, an intensive arms race took place between the US and the Soviet Union. In 1986, the arms race reached its peak. At that time, the two super powers together had about 70,500 nuclear weapons in their arsenals, however, this number may vary according to different sources. The total explosive power of these weapons would have been enough to annihilate the world and all its inhabitants approximately 25 times.

The USA and the Soviet Union kept a close eye on each other’s nuclear arsenals. Many a times, one was suspected of having increased its arsenals or acquiring a new kind of nuclear weapon. This suspicion on each other led to growth of nuclear arms race between the US and the Soviet Union. Both these super powers had nuclear weapons targeted directly against each other’s territories, ready to be launched within seconds. In fact, they developed the possibility of “Mutually Assured Destruction” (MAD), (the term generally used by the Nuclear Weapon States), of the both sides.³

In addition to the above, since 1945 super powers have developed a large number of nuclear arsenals. It is very difficult to precisely tally the nuclear weapons

² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
in the World. According to an estimate, more than 1,28,000 nuclear warheads have been produced since 1945. Of these, the US has produced roughly 55 percent and the Soviet Union / Russia roughly 43 percent. In 1986, towards the end of the cold war, there were an estimated 70,500 nuclear warheads in the world. According to another estimate conducted by Stockholm International Peace Research Institute in 2009, the total number of world nuclear arsenal, including deployed weapons and reserves, is 23,300. This equals about 2000 times the total fire power used during World War II.4

After discussing the historical background of nuclear proliferation in the world it seems necessary to briefly review the geo-strategic, economic and political significance of the South Asian sub-continent and some other factors linked with the interests of super powers towards nuclear proliferation in South Asia.

South Asia is a most complex, volatile and politically explosive region and it remains the most enigmatic and baffling in the world. It is also one of the most socially divided and fertile region.5 It is home to about 1.4 billion people, more than 20 percent of the world population. As it is also pointed out earlier that it is the region that lies between the sea routes of the Indian Ocean (Persian Gulf and the Asia-Pacific) and land routes of Central Asia connecting Europe to the East.6 It is a large reservoir of natural and human resources, making it a prime destination for finance capital, a lucrative market and a source of cheap raw material. It also sits at the confluence of the richest sources of oil, gas, rubber, manganese, copper, gold, tea, cotton, rice and jute and is the transit point for most of the resources and manufacturers that criss-cross the world. Moreover, it is the most heavily militarized
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4 Ibid.
and bureaucratic zone in the world and it has a variety of complex and violent primordial ethnic groups. These factors have made the region as a source of attraction and interest for the external powers.

South Asia has been a region of great importance to the super powers. The region has always been an arena where great powers competition has been played and managed. It is, of course, possible to argue that the primary significance of the states of South Asia lies in their role in the competition between the United States, the Soviet Union and China for global and regional influence. The region has been recognized as a geographical area of major strategic significance through which passes the routes connecting Europe, Africa and Asia. The region of South Asia is important because of its connection with the vital sea-lanes of communication in the Indian Ocean and is sandwiched between two politically volatile and economically critical regions i.e., the Persian Gulf and South-east Asia.

The major actors of this region, India and Pakistan, were divided in terms of polarization between the USA, the Soviet Union and China. In this context, India has functioned as an important ally of the Soviet Union and Pakistan has functioned as a broker for the West in relation to moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East and the Gulf areas and in relation to China.

In course of cold war politics between the USA and the Soviet Union, both have struggled with each other for gaining a foothold in the South Asian region. India and Pakistan in course of their foreign policy utilized the super power rivalry to their advantage. As Pakistan’s willingness to accommodate the American interests not only
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brought the external powers into the sub-continent but also strengthened its confrontationist anti-India stance. Eventually, the Indian act to seek aid from the Soviet Union brought both protagonists of the cold war into the region. The super powers have played a major role in South Asia – in its political as well as economic development. They have created tensions here, and have helped in resolving some tensions; they have created problems but have kept them from escalating into unmanageable propositions.¹⁰

In 1948, Pakistan invaded Kashmir, in the Indian Territory, which resulted in break out of War between the two countries. However, both sides agreed to the ceasefire line in 1949.¹¹

Nevertheless, Pakistan wanted to counter the Indian threat by building up its military strength and hence tried to maintain relations with the super powers. This was evident in 1954 when it entered into a Mutual Security Pact with the US.¹²

For the US, it was a golden opportunity in its policy of Containment of Commission in South Asia and Pakistan proved very useful for it in this regard.¹³ The former gave the latter the first high performance jet aircraft, including F-86 Sabres and 12 F-104 Interceptors and hundred of World War I Korean War vintage tanks.¹⁴

In fact, the American external interests were to preclude a hostile power from dominating South Asia. In order to build a global alliance system to contain the Soviet Union during the cold war era, and wanted India, the dominant state in South Asia, to join it. However, India adopted a non-alignment policy, hence, the US was forced to

¹⁰ Tikoo, op. cit., p. 220.
¹³ Ibid., pp. 25-26.
¹⁴ Ibid.
choose Pakistan as an ally for containing the Soviet Union in South Asia. The US-Pakistan relations fluctuated according to the rise and fall of Pakistan’s strategic value to the US.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1947, Britain helped India to build 15 ordinance factories. She also supplied weapons to India and later France helped India in this regard. Nevertheless, Britain also helped India, in 1955, in the field of civil uses of atomic energy for its first Apsara Research Reactor. In the same year, it provided India enriched uranium and other technical know-how for the construction of the ‘Swimming Pool’ research reactor under construction at Trombay.\textsuperscript{16} However, such a sort of assistance, in civil uses of atomic energy, indicates the economic interests of the super powers. From time to time super powers have been providing such kind of assistance to India and Pakistan which has been also mentioned in the first two chapters.

In 1950s, the super powers—the UK, the USA and France (including Canada) tried to cooperate with India in its atomic energy programme and they also concluded agreements with India in this regard. The Soviet Union also shared its atomic technology with India. In 1961, it reached an agreement with India in the field of civil uses of atomic energy with reference to research purposes.\textsuperscript{17}

Further, till the 1960s, Canada was the principal supplier of atomic fuel and reactor technology to India. The Canadian help led India close to its goal of self-sufficiency in nuclear fuel. This factor freed India from its dependence on the US. During this period, the US strongly advocated the 1968 NNPT which India refused to

\textsuperscript{17} Giri Deshingkar, “Indian Politics and Arms Control: Recent Reversals and New Reasons for Optimism”, in Eric Arnett (ed.), Nuclear Weapons and Arms Control in South Asia after the Test Ban, Oxford University Press, 1988, p. 31.
sign. Also, the US and the USSR showed a rare cooperation in the 1961 Ireland proposal of stopping the spread of nuclear power, into the 1968 NNPT. In fact, Ireland had made this proposal when Indian dependence on the US nuclear fuel was reduced. It reveals the interests of super powers, particularly the US, towards the nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia.\(^\text{18}\) In 1959, the Soviet Union provided to India transport planes and helicopters. In 1960, it finalized with India the deal for the sale of Soviet aircraft and communication equipment to India. It is obvious that Soviet Union provided this aid to India due to its cold war inter-rivalry with the US. In fact, the Indo-Soviet relations coincided with the deteriorating Sino-Soviet and Sino-India relations.\(^\text{19}\)

In 1962, the Chinese attacked India; however, this placed the US in a delicate position as it was difficult for it not to support a communist state. In fact, India’s importance in American global security reached its climax when Sino-Indian war started. Thus, the US sent twelve C-130 Hercules transport planes with the crew to help India. In 1963, the US assisted India in its atomic energy programme. It signed with India an Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy. It seems that the US provided this assistance to India because of its inter-rivalry with communist China.\(^\text{20}\)

Pakistan, on the other hand, in 1962, had foreseen the utility of developing relations with China, and treated China as a shield to protect itself from any possible Indian attack.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 32.

\(^{19}\) Ibid.

Historically, Sino-Indian relations remained peaceful in the beginning. However, in the late 1950s, the dispute over Tibet between the two countries and border demarcation came into the open. These disputes were intensified by the intervention of the USA and the USSR, and finally resulted in the 1962 border conflict, which left lasting hostility between China and India that took three decades to recover from.\(^\text{21}\)

As it naturally follows from the above that it was due to these factors that China has been assisting Pakistan in its nuclear weapons programme and providing other military assistance which has always been a major source of concern for the United States. This threat perception of China along with its 1964 nuclear explosion compelled India to opt for a nuclear weapons programme as this factor has been also pointed out earlier. During the 1965 war between India and Pakistan, the superpowers, taking deep interest, fully involved themselves in South Asia. The US got the information from India that Pakistan had used the American weapons which it was not supposed to use under a mutual agreement with the US.\(^\text{22}\) This led the US to impose an arms embargo on both the belligerents on September 8, 1965.\(^\text{23}\) On the next day the US declared its neutrality in the Indo-Pak conflict. This can be compared with the US interests in the 1962 Sino-India war when the US provided military and nuclear assistance to India.\(^\text{24}\)

China provided military assistance to Pakistan and supported it in 1965 war as the latter had moved towards the former, in order to avoid dependence on one supplier of arms. The interest shown by China in South Asia became a matter of concern to the

\(^{21}\) Huo Han, Sino-Indian Relations and Nuclear Arms Control, pp. 39-40, [http://www.wn.com/sino-indian-relations](http://www.wn.com/sino-indian-relations)

\(^{22}\) Tikoo, op. cit., pp. 27-28.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 28.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
USA. Therefore, the USA lifted the arms embargo, particularly in 1967 and agreed to sell non-lethal weapons to both India and Pakistan.\(^{25}\)

“During the mid 1960s, when the US was escalating the Vietnam war and US-China relations remained tense, top policy makers defined Pakistan as a problem” in this regard. Not only were the Pakistani’s lessening security ties with the US and keeping their distance from US Vietnam policy, the US believed that they were getting too close to China…. Well before the US was concerned about Chinese nuclear sharing with Pakistan, US government officials worried about the close China-Pakistan relationship”.\(^{26}\)

Also in 1968, the US was troubled by signs of close and highly secret cooperation between China and Pakistan. The border and military cooperation was growing between China and Pakistan and the latter military had given the former access to the US F-104 supersonic fighter aircraft, in violation of the acceptance of agreement with Pentagon.\(^{27}\)

The Soviet Union, in 1965 war, adopted a neutral stand and offered its offices for a peaceful settlement between India and Pakistan. In August 1971, it signed with India the Treaty of Peace, Cooperation and Friendship. Thus, the 1965 war factor also influenced the nuclear policies of the super powers towards South Asia.

The super powers were deeply involved in South Asia during Indo-Pak war of December 1971. The US sent its Task Force 74 headed by the nuclear powered carrier enterprise and a half dozen other ships into the Bay of Bengal through the Straits of

\(^{25}\) Hua Han, No. 21, p. 30.


Malacca. Among other US military support to Pakistan included three guided missiles and a nuclear attack submarine. Subsequently, the Soviets dispatched a force of six vessels to the Indian Ocean.\textsuperscript{28} At one time, it looked as if a direct confrontation between the two external powers would take place in South Asia. It was for the first time, that the two super powers were directly involved in the Indian Ocean over the Indo-Pak conflict. As the US had deployed the nuclear submarine and missiles in the sub-continent, hence, there was a danger of a nuclear war between the two super powers in South Asia which, obviously, might have destroyed the sub-continent.\textsuperscript{29} In fact, it may be argued at this point of discussion that the super powers wanted to become the dominant power over the South Asian region and enjoy greater influence in this regard. Hence, these were playing their game in the Indo-Pak conflicts. These interests have greatly determined and moulded their nuclear, arms proliferation and disarmament policies towards South Asia as it is also evident from the below.

The Indo-Pak sub-continent experienced a rise in defence expenditure soon after the 1971 war. Both India and Pakistan tried to achieve self-reliance on armaments.\textsuperscript{30} In 1973, the US decided to modify its policy of arms embargo on Pakistan by permitting the sale of non-lethal equipment and spare parts.\textsuperscript{31}

In 1974, India conducted the nuclear test which was defined by India as Peaceful Nuclear Explosion. This raised serious concerns for the super powers.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., pp. 32-34.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., p. 34.
Meanwhile, the US stopped the supply of fuel to India (immediately after the 1974 Pokhran test).\textsuperscript{32}

In July 1976, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission held up a consignment of 12 tonnes of nuclear fuel to India. India upheld opposition to it. The US saw this stand as a threat to the security of South Asia and attempted to pressurize India by threatening a termination of fuel supplies and an abortion of 30 years agreement on nuclear cooperation with India.

In fact, the Pokhran test and subsequent Pakistan intentions to go nuclear forced the US administration to take interest in the region and to prevent nuclear proliferation also. But, the advent of the Iranian revolution and the Soviet adventurism in Afghanistan fuelled the long-standing Western fear of Soviet expansionism and gave an acute sense of urgency to the need to retaliate and stop the advancement of the communists. The US regional and global interests compelled it to re-establish with Pakistan.\textsuperscript{33}

Thus, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 restored Pakistan’s strategic value to the United States which was downgraded because of détente and cooperation with the Soviet Union earlier. Hence, the US renewed its interests in Pakistan and it offered to renew economic and military aid to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{34} As in 1981, the US passed the special law waiving the Symington Amendment and provided economic and military aid to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{35} Nonetheless, when the Soviet


\textsuperscript{33} Jhan, op. cit., pp. 50-54.

\textsuperscript{34} A.Z. Hilali, Cold War Politics of the Super Powers in South Asia, \url{http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/1_24_Mr%20Hilalipdf}.

\textsuperscript{35} Deter Brown, op. cit., pp. 32-33.
Union withdrew its troops from Afghanistan in 1988 Pakistan again lost its importance to the United States.

During 1980s both the USSR and the USA were busy in their cold war politics. The US was in great need of Pakistan for its support in the Afghanistan issue. On the other hand, the nuclear weapons programmes of India and Pakistan were developing onwards. But the Pakistan’s nuclear weapons programme in the 1980s was developing on greater scale the full detail of which are mentioned in Chapter-II. The nuclear non-proliferation policy of the US was demanding to check this growth. However, Pakistan was having great strategic value for the US during this period. Hence, under the strong pressure of non-proliferation lobby in the US Senate, in 1985, the Pressler Amendment was passed under which the US President had to certify that Pakistan did not have any sort of nuclear weapons and this was essential to provide military cooperation to it.36

Simultaneously, Pakistan was pursuing a nuclear weapons programme about which the US was having strong evidences. But the US did not want to make its relations hostile with Pakistan due to Afghan war.37 Hence, under such tight corners the US passed this amendment.

Thus, it fulfilled the interest of the US as it could check continued cooperation of the Pakistan in its fight to expel the troops of the Soviet Union from Afghanistan. On the other hand, Pakistan’s nuclear ambitions were also not given a free hand.38

Further, from 1985 to 1989, as there are several reports about Pakistan’s nuclear weapons programme for instance in 1985 ABC News reported that US believed that Pakistan had successfully tested a firing mechanism of an atomic bomb

36 Saista Tabasam, op. cit., pp. 143-145.
37 Ibid., pp. 145-146.
38 Ibid., p. 107.
by means of a non-nuclear explosion and that US Kryton had been acquired by it.\textsuperscript{39} Still the American President certified that Pakistan was not pursuing any nuclear weapons programme. It indicates that it was in the interests of the US to avoid confrontation with Pakistan in this regard.

On the other hand, till the 1980s, the US and India held the fundamentally divergent conceptions of the world order and the cold war politics drew them apart. American proximity with Indian adversaries – Pakistan and China – also led to the estrangement of the two democracies. However, also during this period the US instead of containing Soviet influence in South Asia became more anxious about containing the growing influence of China, both economically and militarily, in East Asia.

In fact, China developed hostility with the Soviet Union during 1970s and was already having intense rivalry with India. Hence, China developed close relations with Pakistan, especially during 1980s, and aided Pakistan’s nuclear weapons programme as there are several reports and evidences in this regard. However, both China and Pakistan had been denying these reports and putting their own argument in support of their defence.

Significantly, since 1981 to 1984 the Sino-Pak nuclear cooperation remained a matter of concern for the US. As in 1981, it was due to Sino-Pak nuclear cooperation that the US sought to discourage Chinese nuclear sharing with Pakistan.\textsuperscript{40} However, at the same time, the US intensified cooperation with Pakistan against the Soviet presence in Afghanistan and, like its predecessor, gave a pass on suspect nuclear activities so that it could funnel support for Afghan rebels through Pakistan. In 1982, the US suspected that China was aiding Pakistan’s nuclear weapons programme, but

\textsuperscript{39} Pakistan Nuclear Weapon – A Chronology, is available at the website http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/Pakistan/nuke/chron.html.

the later denied that it was assisting any country in developing nuclear weapons. In 1983, the US claimed that China had played a significant role in Pakistan’s efforts to build a bomb. In the next year also, China cooperated with Pakistan in this regard which was alleged by the US as ‘Sino-Pak nuclear weapon cooperation’. In 1986, China signed with Pakistan a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement which was explained by both as “peaceful nature of Sino-Pakistan nuclear cooperation”. In 1986, the former assisted the latter in its Hataf series of missiles. At the same time, the US was worried about “Chinese missiles sales with respect to Pakistan” and reiterated that China had assisted Pakistan in its nuclear weapons programme. But China again denied these allegations. In fact, Sino-Pak nuclear cooperation continued throughout the 1990s.\textsuperscript{41}

In 1989, the cold war was drawing to an end and the Soviet Union was in the process of disintegration. Uncertain of the changing international relations, the US refrained from making fundamental changes in its policy towards South Asia. Consequently, there was more continuity than change.

During the cold war era, the US efforts to improve its relations with India were hindered by its strategic goal of containing the Soviet Union, because India would not improve its relations with Washington at the expense of its relations with Moscow. However, end of the US containment policy towards Moscow freed both the US and India from the Moscow factor and enabled them to improve bilateral security relations. On the other hand, Russian policy also underwent some fundamental changes towards South Asia as it made efforts to develop relations with Pakistan.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} David S. Chou, U.S. Policy Towards India and Pakistan in the Post-Cold War Era, \url{http://www.2.tku.edu.tw/~journal/8-3/832.pdf}.
In 1990, USSR collapsed, and thereafter cold war came to an end. Some writers believe that world has reduced to a uni-polar world while others suggested the idea of a multi-polar world. In fact, the global scenario changed, since 1991, and super powers began to play a greater role towards disarmament and arms control.

Various efforts for disarmament and arms control have been made at the global levels which are discussed in Chapter-III. Further, efforts towards disarmament and arms control by India and Pakistan are discussed in Chapter-IV, along with Presslor and Symington Amendments. Hence, there is a need and necessity to explain whatever role the super powers have played after the end of cold war towards disarmament and arms control.

In 1991, the super powers focused on the Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (NWFZ) in South Asia. In June, the same year, after several rounds of talks with Pakistan, the US proposed that Russia, China, India and Pakistan should hold a conference to discuss a NWFZ in South Asia.43 The historical background about NWFZ is discussed earlier.

In November, the same year, the US held talks with India in New Delhi on nuclear non-proliferation. At the same time, Pakistan sponsored proposal for the NWFZ in the region. The US was in favour of finding some ways to accommodate India in the “non-proliferation arrangement” and accept the IAEA safeguard arrangements.

The US wanted India to accept China’s participation in the scheme envisaged by the Pakistan-sponsored NWFZ proposal, which had since been backed by the Soviet Union also. On the other hand, India’s main objection was that “the application

43 Ibid.
of the safeguards provision would be discriminatory, considering that China being nuclear power, would seek exemption of its military installations from the inspection”.

Further, the US urged India to enter into multilateral consultations if it did not want to commit itself to NPT or Pakistan’s proposal of NWFZ.44

In 1992, the US made efforts to curb Indo-Pak nuclear programme. In fact, in July the same year, the US authorized the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to “set up surveillance and carry out covert action against the weapons programmes- conventional and non-conventional’-of India and Pakistan, including Iran, Libya and North Korea.45

In the same month, India tested Agni missile. The US stated that it believed that ballistic missiles in areas where there was chronic tension were not conducive to peace in the region.46

On the other hand, China’s role towards disarmament was not positive as it exploded one of the most powerful underground nuclear bomb of “1000 kiloton”, in May. China, on the one hand supported the NWFZ proposal of Pakistan and was expected to take part in the proposed talks on NWFZ in South Asia, on the other hand, “by exploding the nuclear bomb had told India that it could be pushed around only as long as it is willing to be”, and made a mockery of the nuclear non-proliferation efforts in South Asia.47 However, China adopted Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) with India and proposed for a mutual troop reduction on the Sino-Indian

44 Asian Recorder; A Weekly Digest of Asian Events, New Delhi, January 1-7, 1992, Volume XXXVIII, Number 1, p. 22082.
45 Asian Recorder; A Weekly Digest of Asian Events, 1992, Volume XXXVIII, Number-29, July 15-17, p. 22449.
47 Ibid., p. 22401.
border. In 1993 and 1994, China also signed an Agreement for Substantial Troops Reductions with India.

In May 1993, the US urged Pakistan to end its nuclear weapon programme. In fact, the proliferation of nuclear weapons was a source of tension for the US with respect to Pakistan. The US intelligence alleged that Pakistan had received M-11 missiles from China; however, the latter had denied these allegations.

In August, the US announced to have imposed economic sanctions on China, prohibiting the sale of some technological advanced equipment, the former claimed that the latter had breached the NNPT by selling missile technology to Pakistan. On the other hand, China while not denying these allegations described the action as entirely unjustifiable and denied that it had breached the NNPT. Moreover, in August, the US imposed sanctions on Pakistan after the US intelligence reported that Pakistan was importing medium range missiles from China.

In the same month, Russia in its efforts towards non-proliferation of rocket technology froze a contract to supply cryogenic rocket booster to the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO). This Russian move seems to have come due to the reason that India had tested, in June 1993, Prithvi missile. Further, a rocket technology may be used to manufacture long-range nuclear capable missiles. However, in 1994, Russia agreed to supply Cryogenic rocket in India.

53 Ibid., p. 39619.
Also in 1993, France suspended the supply of enriched uranium for India’s reactors on grounds of poor safety standards. However, some reports in January 1995, suggest that this decision of France was taken after India refused to open its nuclear installations to inspection by the IAEA.\textsuperscript{54}

Nevertheless, from 1992 to 1998, France remained busy in armaments deal with Pakistan, for instance in 1992, it negotiated with Pakistan a submarine deal but the delivery was made in 1998.\textsuperscript{55}

In 1994, the US made significant progress in nuclear disarmament and arms control efforts towards South Asia. As it is evident from the US Deputy Secretary, Strobe Talbott’s visit to India and Pakistan, in April 1994, when he focused on the issue of disarmament in South Asia and the prospects of India’s accession to the NNPT. Further, in the same month, the US “requested” India to halt the testing of the Agni Intermediate-Range Ballistic missile. In fact, India had tested this missile in February, the same year. Consequently, India accepted the US proposal\textsuperscript{56} and temporarily halted the development of Agni missile (in April).\textsuperscript{57} In March of the same year, the UK also held talks with India and, among other things, urged India to follow the path of nuclear non-proliferation.\textsuperscript{58}

In late August 1994, the US sponsored a meeting of International Mediators in New Delhi, in which UK also participated. Both the super powers appealed to India and Pakistan to halt the missile testing and spread of nuclear weapons. They also

\textsuperscript{55} Keesing’s Record of World Events, Cartermill Publishing, Washington D.C., Volume-41, No. 9, p. 40185.
insisted on India and Pakistan to abide by the rules of Missile Technology Control Regime which forbade the export of the missiles.\(^{59}\)

In 1995, the US received information that India was preparing for a nuclear test in Rajasthan. The US officials privately warned India not to hold any test and threatened to cut off economic assistance to India. However, this information was perhaps a false alarm, because India did not hold any nuclear test in that year. Nevertheless, the US became increasingly concerned with the Janata Party that advocated for turning India into a nuclear country.\(^{60}\)

In February 1996, the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) reported that China had shipped 5,000 ring magnets to Pakistan in 1995, which could be used in nuclear weapons. Hence, the US delayed the export loans to China over these sales.\(^{61}\) Nevertheless, at the same time, China insisted that “the sales amounted only legitimate peaceful nuclear cooperation. Further, China in the Conference on Disarmament attacked the US position in February, stating that “the country with the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals was not qualified to lecture China”.\(^{62}\)

At the same time, the UK deported a Pakistani national resident in UK, (Junior Clerk at the Pakistan High Commission in London), Mohammed Saleem, because of his involvement in matters relating to security and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. However, Pakistan denied Saleem’s involvement in nuclear proliferation and stated that its nuclear programme was peaceful.\(^{63}\)

\(^{60}\) Chou, op. cit. (No. 41).
\(^{61}\) Ibid.
In the same year, CTBT negotiations were also conducted in Geneva where India blocked the treaty which was strongly condemned by the P5. The details in this regard have been mentioned in the Chapter 3 and 4.

In 1998, both India and Pakistan conducted nuclear weapon tests. In the aftermath of these tests the international community made concerted efforts to defuse the tensions which had escalated between Pakistan and India.

On June 4, 1998, the USA, the UK, China, France and Russia met in Geneva and condemned the nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan, and pledged to maintain pressure on the two countries to reverse their nuclear programmes.

The P5 at the end of the meeting issued a joint communiqué in which they agreed to take a series of immediate steps in order to prevent the escalation of tension in South Asia. These steps included an immediate halt to nuclear tests, a decision not to deploy nuclear weapons and an end to the production of fissile material.\(^64\)

The super powers in this joint communiqué urged India and Pakistan to adhere immediately and unconditionally to the CTBT and to pledge not to export nuclear weapons technology.\(^65\)

It may be argued that it was due to these efforts of the P5 that in June, Pakistan declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests that was followed by a similar moratorium declaration by India also. In respect to this the US stated in June, that India and Pakistan moratorium were encouraging but not sufficient. Further, in the

\(^65\) Ibid., p. 42343
same month, the US imposed economic and military sanctions on both India and Pakistan.\textsuperscript{66}

Moreover, in the same month, a Summit of G8 countries was held in London in which both the UK and China participated. This summit was aimed to bring pressure of several kinds on India and Pakistan to halt their nuclear weapons programme. Further, notably, G8 countries also decided to implement economic sanctions on India and Pakistan by blocking all loans except humanitarian loan.\textsuperscript{67}

In January 1999, the US maintained its earlier position and reiterated that both India and Pakistan should refrain from testing ballistic missiles to avoid heightening tensions and fuelling a missile arms race in South Asia. It was also due to the reason that the US had got the news that both India and Pakistan were planning further testing.\textsuperscript{68}

In the same month, American President Bill Clinton stated that “The US would step up its efforts to restrain India and Pakistan from expanding their nuclear weapons and missiles arms race. The US will increase its efforts to restraint the spread of nuclear weapons and missiles from North Korea to India and Pakistan”.\textsuperscript{69}

At the same time, the US economic sanctions against India without insisting on full compliance with the earlier American demand on signing the CTBT and banning of missile tests. US Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott, addressing a conference at Stanford University, stated that “it might backfire if the US pays heed only to a few experts who suggest strict action against India and Pakistan for conducting nuclear tests”. He further added that “India and Pakistan exercised the

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., pp. 42343-42344.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., pp. 42344-42345.
\textsuperscript{69} Data India: A Weekly Digest of Indian News (11/1999), January 17 – January 23, 1999, p. 34.
nuclear option and became party to global proliferation”, but hoped “they can, in 1999, if they so choose, move back in the direction of being part of the solution (i.e. CTBT) and they can do so while enhancing their own security at the same time”.70

Nevertheless, the US in February, stated that the sanctions against India were lifted very early and it tried to link them with India’s signing of CTBT but India made it clear that this small step could not be linked to its stand on the CTBT. However, both sides announced a work plan for continuing the Indo-US dialogue on the four identified issues of CTBT, Fissile Material Cutt-off Treaty (FMCT), export control regimes and defence postures. But no specific dates were fixed.

The US, however, asserted that “it has not softened its stand on nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia saying that although there was some movement on the timing of India signing the CTBT no such progress has been made with Pakistan”.71

In February 1999, China held talks with India in which, among other things, China said that it still firmly opposes the South Asian 1998 nuclear tests. It further demanded that Pakistan and India should implement the UN Security Council Resolution 1172 concerning the tests and sign the CTBT and NPT unconditionally.72 India’s stand has already been analyzed in Chapter III.

In December 1998, Russia signed with India a defence agreement extending bilateral defence cooperation by 10 years which included weapons sales to India and joint arms production projects. This shows a deviation from Russian arms control and disarmament measures towards South Asia. In fact, throughout the 1999 and also in 2000 Russia had been supplying arms to India.73

70 Ibid., p. 35.
73 Data India, A Weekly Digest of Indian News, (10/1999), March 7 – March 14, New Delhi, p. 157.
However, taking a step towards nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia, the Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, on March 30, asked India and Pakistan to sign the NPT and CTBT.\textsuperscript{74}

In March 2000, the US President Clinton, during his tour to South Asia, visited India and Pakistan and discussed various issues with these countries including Kashmir and Kargil issues. Particularly, during Clinton’s visit to India, the US focused on the nuclear issue and agreed to further relaxations of the sanctions imposed on India, because of its 1998 tests. India pledged not to conduct further nuclear weapon tests but made no commitment to sign the CTBT. Moreover, the US tried to improve the relations with India which were strained because of its friendship with the Soviet Union during the Cold War.\textsuperscript{75}

On June 5, the US held talks with Pakistan in Washington D.C. on the issue of nuclear security. These were the first such talks between the two countries for 16 months. The US insisted on Pakistan to sign the CTBT but Pakistan reiterated that it would sign the CTBT only after achieving a national consensus on this issue.\textsuperscript{76}

In the same year (April-May), 187 state parties to the 1968 NNPT met in New York, USA, for the Sixth Review of NNPT Treaty. The P5 also participated in this conference. Significantly, this conference also included a call for Nuclear Weapons Free Zone to be established in South Asia and criticized India and Pakistan for their refusal to sign the NNPT.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{74} See for example, Data India, A Weekly Digest of Indian News, (27/1999), July 5 – July 11, 1999, p. 419.
\textsuperscript{75} Keesing’s Record of World events, Keesing’s Worldwide, Washington D.C., 2000, Volume 46, No. 3, p. 43467.
\textsuperscript{77} Keesing’s Record of World events, Keesing’s Worldwide, Washington D.C., 2000, Volume 46, No. 5, p. 43603.
Moreover, on September 8-18, the US held talks with India and issued a joint statement (during Indian Prime Minister, A.B. Vajpayee’s visit to the USA). Notably during these talks, the US noted India’s unilateral moratorium on further nuclear testing. However, the former did not put pressure on the latter to sign the CTBT.78

After discussing the above all it may be said that the super powers were having several geo-strategic, political and economic interests towards nuclear proliferation in South Asia. Cold war politics between the two super powers – the USA and the Soviet Union – largely determined and influenced their interests in this regard, including the Indo-Pak and Sino-Pak wars.

On the other hand, it is true that super powers made various efforts towards nuclear disarmament and arms control in South Asia, particularly, since the end of the cold war. But these efforts, in reality, met with a fiasco when India and Pakistan conducted nuclear tests in 1998. However, these efforts remained active and continue despite of these tests. Further, it reveals from the above study that, on the one hand, the super powers were making disarmament efforts in South Asia, on the other hand, they were also exporting arms in the region. This raises a question mark on their disarmament and arms control efforts in South Asia.