Chapter - 2

External Threats to National Security
Although National Survival is the prime concern of nations, big or small, their national security problems are certainly different. Big powers, particularly nuclear powers, seldom face the danger of their territorial national sovereignty except in the event of a nuclear war. But their security problems are generally affected due to:

I. threats to the position of domination and hegemony they enjoy in the international system.

II. threats to the control and influence they manage over the decision making processes of regional powers and small powers.

III. threats to the ideology/value system they believe in and want to spread among nations in the international domain.

IV. the security problems of their allies and alliance partners are also taken as a threat to their own security.

Where as small nations generally face threats to their survival as independent entities in the international system. because of their size, political instability, dependence on the big powers for economic aid and science and technological help, linguistic religious and ethnic diversities, etc.

The great powers are the major component of the world politics, who not only moderate world politics for their
self interests but also influence the regional politics. In
the course of their political strategic military
superiority, economic, social, scientific and technological
advancement, they dominate the world scenario, and their
attachment towards any specific region varies from time to
time according to the regions geo-political and strategic
importance.

The geo-strategic importance of South Asia, and its
adjoining regions of the strategically crucial oil rich gulf
on the West and the economically burgeoning Asia-Pacific
on the east and the Indian ocean on the South continuously
affected regional politics, but direct and indirect
interventions by the great powers have greatly complicated
intra-regional relations.

During the cold war period both two super powers were
involved in expanding their power and influence in the
Southern Asia. However, the South Asia was not given so
much importance by the United States. But, the expansion of
Communist blocks towards South led the United States and
other capitalist countries to form its defensive alliances
with regional countries like CEATO, CENTO, Baghdad Pact and
ANJOS, etc.

On the other side, it is permanent nature of intra and
inter states military, ethnic, religious conflicts and the
under development of the third world provided opportunities
to the big powers to exploit these situations to protect and
extend their respective political and economic values in the third world.

External threats and interventionary Activities

The real threats to security in South Asia with the changed atmosphere do not arise so much from a direct organised regular inter state war as from other forms of conflict such as proxy war. The fifteen years old Afghan war and cold war dimensions have produced two fall out effects on the security situations which has extended to the whole region: the remarkable growth of drug trafficking and proliferations of small arms and minor weapons.

Both the U.S. and Soviet Union poured huge quantities of weaponry into the region. Other countries including China and Israel also supplied large quantities of weapons. These were Kalashnikov assault rifles, powerful machine guns and rocket launchers, grenades and explosive and land mines, lethal shoulder fired surface to air missiles (SAMs) like Stingers, strella and Blowdices. A large proportion of these weapons have found their way into the hand of non-state actors in Pakistan and Afghanistan which is generally referred as Kalashnikov culture1. Whatever the US, Pakistan and their allies were doing in regard to Afghanistan has now

been adopted by Pakistan as its strategy to destabilize India, through trans border training, infiltration and support of militancy, violence and terrorism through the use of these weapons. The threat to the security of the state and civil society has been further aggravated by the linkages of weapons proliferations with drug trafficking, money and patronage.

Majority of the Third World countries became victims, directly or indirectly of the U.S. and Soviet domination in the international politics. And their Cold War struggle gave the birth of a process which initiated, encouraged and contributed to the arms build-up activities in the Indian sub-continent. The permanent conflicting nature of the region has given support to the armament activities and opportunities to the great powers to extend their powers and influence in South Asia. The arms sale and assistance became the permanent instrument of their foreign Policies. Other major powers like France, Britain, Israel and China are also involved in arms build up activities in the region.

Both the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union deliberately initiated an arms race in the region by providing the large quantity of sophisticated weapons to the main protagonists of the region, providing military aid to Pakistan had been the principal instrument of U.S. policy in the region. Not

only this, the U.S.A. also sought Pakistan to join military alliances as part of its global struggle to restrain the expansion of Soviet influence in the region. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979 and the same time Iranian revolution led to the U.S. Soviet competition in the region, thereby creating not only an acute sense of insecurity, tension, mutual suspicion among the countries of South Asia, but also to the proliferation of military hardware in the region.

Whereas the United States pursued the policy of military aid and alliance with Pakistan, it also endeavored for establishing its military bases in the region. The U.S. established a military base at Peshawar in West Pakistan for military intelligence operations, particularly to monitor the Soviet nuclear and missile testing. Though the base was closed down in late 1960s the U.S. desire for establishing bases in the region continued. Sri Lanka’s strategic locations in the Indian ocean especially its natural harbour Trincomalee became the part of U.S. Strategic manoeuvring in the region. It already had a broad casting facilities in Sri Lanka.

For Soviet Union the South Asia is one of the most important region is third world. India played an important political and economic role in Soviet’s considerations.

While there has been some reservations in the enthusiasm of the Indo-Soviet connections, it remains important and has been the subject of more attentions than any other third world tie. The Soviets also had important interest in Pakistan. Even during the Afghanistan crises, Moscow was careful to keep channels open to Islamabad. On the authorized. Pakistan also recognizes the value of good relations with Russia and expected to respond to new Soviet overtures in the post fighting in Afghanistan. No doubt Russia will remain an important presence. Probably the most important external security presence in South Asia.

The China presence in this sub-continent as a military power is another threat to the security to the South Asia, especially for India. After 1962. Sino-Indo war, China started support to neighboring countries against India. The external regional powers have not directly threatened or intervened military against the security of SAARC countries. But they have intervened indirectly: providing assistance to the separatist movements in the regions, collaborating in coup deetates and some times through the demonstrative use of armed forces against the action of a hostile country or to assure support to a friendly country for its action.

Since very beginning the United States is involved in such activities, but its level of involvement could not be confirmed authentically because their covert activity are not well recorded.
The strategic importance of Pakistan during the cold war and after that hardly went down in the eye of Pentagon. Pakistan is more important to check any development in central Asia and the Persian Gulf zone against to United States. And within Pakistan, it is the military Junta which in Washington’s perceptions provides both stability and reliability. The offer to release a fresh fleet of F-16 along with other equipment to upgrade the Pak. Air Force serves the double purpose of pacifying America’s most trusted and durable element with Pakistan and also strengthening a very important watch tower for the US strategy in this important region. The supply of sophisticated weapons and financial aid to Pakistan by the U.S. has threatened the security of the region.

The external regional involvement in India’s ever troubled north eastern region came on the surface with the publication of some reports. A report on the Western involvement in India’s north-eastern region and a circular from the US Information Agency on the same theme indicate that there were efforts to create a United and Independent Bengal comprising East Pakistan, West Bengal, Assam, Nagaland, Manipur, Tripura, Sikkim and Bhutan. According to the report "the Separatists were counting upon the United States and other western powers to give them necessary assistance. They were confident that these powers would be interested in establishing an independent state in South East Asia, which could help to normalize situation their and
would provide a shield against the Chinese aggression. The circular entitled "Project Brahmaputra", issued by the United States International communication Agency stated that the special research cell of the George Washington University with the approval of the State Department had detailed a number of teams of investigations to conduct research in North Eastern India, Sikkim, Bhutan with the aim of throwing light on the public opinion in these regions to establish in what measures, the present status of these regions remain acceptable or whether they are indications that the formation of a new state is a current problem. Whatever be the authenticity of these reports, it would not be ruled out that the United States was not that isolated in involving in the conflict of India's north eastern region.

India in her white paper, issued on Punjab problem, blamed Pakistan and other unnamed external powers for aiding and abetting to the militants in Punjab. Some of the leaders of Sikh separatist organisations who were operating abroad claimed the support of the United states for separatist cause in Punjab. Once, the U.S. Ambassador in India, Harry Bames equated the Sikh terrorist demand for Khalistan with the freedom struggle of the people of Puerto
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Recently, in 1994 the U.S. President Mr. Bill Clinton expressed his anxiety in response to American Parliamentarian Pick Folseleio and Garry Codit's letter on human rights violence in Punjab. All these reports are the indication of U.S. support in Punjab crisis.

On Kashmir issue, a programme titled "Seed of Terror" brought out by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation some time ago, in 1994, clearly linked terrorism in the Kashmir state with the U.S., dealing with the ISI (Inter Services Intelligence) to intensify the Afghan war. The programme had the U.S. ambassador, Mr. Edward Feck stating that the CIA knew a fair amount of details regarding Pakistan's terrorist activities. The former Deputy Director of CIA and later, its Director, Mr. Robert Gates, disclosed that in 1990, the Pakistan President was asked to close camps providing training to people for carrying out operations in Kashmir and Punjab. In same programme a former US commando trainer revealed some informations regarding Sikh's terrorist plans. The above mentioned matter are enough to indicate that the Americans who were aware of the ISI's terrorist activities were prepared to overlook these as long as Pakistan ISI served the US interest in the Afghan war.

The Clinton administration's view that the J & K State is a disputed area, as US Assistant Secretary of state for
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South Asia. Ms. Robin Raphel has equated that Kashmir is a disputed area and King Hari Singh's "Instrument of accession" has no relevance; and also linking the Kashmir problem with Afghanistan and Bosnia, confirmed that she has invited to international community to interfere in Kashmir. Not only Ms. Raphel expressed her view on Kashmir, but US President Mr. Bill Clinton has also declared Kashmir problem among world major problems. and in his response to a Kashmiri leader Gulam Nabi Furd's letter he said that the showed much anxiety over the "violation of rights to Kashmiries by the security forces. The Clinton administration's comments on the Kashmir issue have, encouraged the terrorists in the valley, and hurt the cause of human rights in India. By failing to criticize Pakistan for its support to terrorism in the state, the US seems to have given Pakistan a clean chit as well.

Other than these covert U.S. involvement it has used its armed forces two times in the region first in 1962, the nuclear air craft carrier U.S.S. Enterprise was dispatched to the Bay of Bengal to demonstrate support for India in its war with China. Just after nine years in 1971, the enterprise again reached into the Bay of Bengal but this time it was against India and in support of Pakistan as well as to impress upon China that the U.S. would support its allies. In the ethnic conflict of Sri Lanka, besides

the involvement of the U.S.A., it's important ally Israel helps ethnic groups through its intelligence agencies Mossad and Shinbeth. The former members of the Britain's elite special Air Service Regiment are also involved.

A secessionist movement was instigated by Britain in 1960's in Maldives. A plot was organised to overthrow the government of Maldives in 1989 coup, in which some opposition groups supported by some external agencies were involved.

The covert interventionary activities by the Soviet Union is not as much as that of U.S.A.'s involvement in South Asia. But its involvement Afghanistan and presence in Indian ocean has threaten South Asian security. The Soviet Union's attitude regarding the Baluch and Pakhtoon separatist movements in Pakistan is not much incorrigible. Its close allies Afghanistan and Iraq were provided both economic and military support for the Pakistani separatist Pakhtoon and Baluchi movement. In the Bangladesh crisis of 1971, the Soviet Union supported India against Pakistan.
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China’s interest in South Asia is determined by its global tactical and strategic considerations in context of its relations with the U.S.A., Russia and India.

If any extra-regional power has threatened the national security of South Asia, that is China. After Sino-Indo war of 1962, China started intervening in the affairs of South Asian countries, especially against India. The Sino-Indian hostility for boundary dispute is one of the constant features of the global scene.

The Chinese threat to India’s national security is manifested in three broad patterns:

a) the acquisition of nuclear capability followed by conventional military strength.

b) building up a network of roads and communication systems in the strategic Tibet-Zinkiano region, placing missiles and deployment of troops in Tibet and construction of the strategic Karakoram Highway linking it with Pakistan through occupied Kashmir(FOK) region.

c) and, finally, the formation of a strategic relationship with Pakistan. The Pak-Sino boundary treaty of 1963, the support to Pakistan in the Indo-Pak conflicts of 1965, and 1971 and arms transfers to Pakistan.

17. P.S. Javaramu. "India’s National Security and Foreign Policy".
The Nuclear threat:— Humiliation of India at the hands of the Chinese in 1962 developed a strong sense of insecurity in the minds of its leaders, that increased much by the acquisition of nuclear capability by China. But the Chinese government’s statement that the development of the nuclear weapon was intended to protect itself from the dangers of a nuclear war posed by the United States and Soviet Union.18. The growing conventional military strength in comparison to India is also a major threat to the security of India. India’s former Defence Minister Swaran Singh told the Parliament that the main threat to India from China continued to be not so much from her nuclear development as from her conventional weapons and army.19. The border clashes that took place between India and China in the post-Nehru period, pointed to serious danger that India faced from a militarily powerful China.

The Chinese threat reached at a greater extent in the Seventies when China advanced her nuclear arms and deployed some of them in Tibet. Reports of installation of a radar complex in Western Tibet in Te enthung Village, an area which constituted a security belt for India along the Tibet Nepal border, setting up of a large number of bases with missile carrying capabilities, and the construction of the
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strategic Konglaka bridge across the Brahmaputra river, only eight miles from the Indian border of Arunachal Pradesh, were some of the developments which affected India's environment in the region.

Another development in the seventies in which affected India's security was the completion of the Karakoram highway by China linking it with Pakistan passing through the Pak Occupied Kashmir.

The boundary problem constitutes a major dispute between India and China. The two sides have been giving divergent views regarding the boundary. The Indian side insisted on the Mc Mohan line as its boundary in the eastern sector. The Chinese claimed the foot of the hills as their boundary. Instead of all these problems, China started helping to the separatist movements in the north-eastern region of India. China established its relation with Naga separatists in mid 1960s and provided them military training especially the art of guerrilla tactics against the modern weaponry. It was reported in 1983 about Nagors military training camp at Yunan in China. During the Bangladesh crisis in 1971, China provided extensive diplomatic, economic and military support and even threatened to intervene military the crisis in favour of Pakistan.

Another major security problem to South Asia since the sixties is the impact of big power rivalry in Indian ocean on India's security Strategic environment. Traditionally Indian ocean constituted the passage for India's trade and other its neighbors with the external worlds but its importance increased after the oil crisis of 1973. when import of the crude oil from the Gulf region ranged to two thirds of nations total oil imports. The Indian security also came into focus in 1965, when Indonesia offered to Pakistan to carry out diversionary naval attacks on the Indian territories of Andamans and Nicobar islands. A dominant U.S.A. presence in the Indian ocean, sympathetic to Pakistan adversely affected India's security. The U.S.A. decision to move its naval aircraft carrier, Enterprise into Bay of Bengal in December 1971 in favour of Pakistan confirmed Indian fears, that led India to play active role for converting the Indian ocean into a Zone of Peace.

The security of the South Asian countries is also threatened due to economic exploitation by the big powers. As Chester Bowles observed, the US economic aid to Third World countries, since the Second World War, had been given for the legitimate purpose of defence but in effect as a bribe to persuade the recipient government to support U.S. foreign policy. He points out the incident of India's
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food crisis of 1965-66, when the U.S. President Johnson used wheat shipments as a leverage to pressurise India to take a tolerant view of the U.S. military activities in Vietnam. Mrs. Indira Gandhi once said that "although originally conceived of as external assistance for supplementing the self help measures of developing countries we have found that it is often used by some donor governments as an instrument to enforce their short term policy objectives and to secure political and economic concessions unrelated to our development." The U.S.A. has also attempted to coerce Sri Lanka to abrogate its rubber for rice. Fact of 1952 with China.

Other than the use of economic assistance for political objectives, the U.S. on many occasions has applied economic sanctions openly to put pressure on the target states to effect changes in their policies in accordance with the U.S. foreign policy objectives. In the 1960s the U.S. economic leverage was brought to bear against Sri Lanka to force compensation for the expropriation of assets of U.S. petroleum. The economic sanctions were also imposed on India. (1978-82), Pakistan (1979-80) for their refusal to sign the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) again in
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1990 Pakistan faced such joint under Pressley Act. In 1992 the U.S. imposed sanctions against India under Super 301 and special 301 which was eased in 1994, but sanctions relating to duty free imports under the Generalized Special Preference (GSP) law imposed earlier on about 80 million worth of goods per year will remain.

The GSP benefits affect Indian drugs and chemicals and they would continue to be costlier in the U.S., putting Indian manufacturers at a disadvantage. On May 11, 1992, the U.S. imposed sanctions for two years against Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) and the Russian Space agency Glavkosmos for their refusal to comply with the U.S. demands to cancel a deal involving the sale of Russian advanced cryogenic rocket motor technology to India, and put pressure on India not to deploy the short range Prithvi missile and also stop all further development of the medium range Aon1 missile. The U.S. also took the lead in urging other Western powers to call on India to give up its missile programme. Other punitive steps undertaken by the U.S. in the last few years against India were its opposition to the sale of Indian rice to Cuba, sale of nuclear research reactor to Iran and erection of barriers against the entry of Indian pharmaceutical and chemical products and sionon cloth into the U.S. market.

The U.S. sanctions against ISSOS Glovkosmos and against China and Pakistan on M-11 issue are in consonance with its global strategy for denying technologies to the third world countries in order to keep them under developed and within control of the developed first world. They are also in tune with its desire to rule over the globe to shape the world according to its liking and to assume the role of a global cop to protect and promote its interests in the world.\(^{36}\)

The economic weakness of the Soviet Union and China probably restrained them to use economic assistance as a means for coercing the SAARC countries. But the interventionary activities by these two countries in economic affairs of SAARC could not be ruled out. The Soviet Union provided economic assistance largely to India, and China to Pakistan to keep them under their respective influence.

The South Asian countries, at one time or the other, have also faced the problems while seeking loans from the IME, World Bank and other world financial agencies. The conditions which are imposed directly or indirectly and which lead to the curtailment of loan seeking country's

\(^{36}\) It was with this intention that the Western Countries led by the U.S. established a COCOM in 1949 in order to restrict the export of a large number of materials and technologies to the third world countries. The Bretton Wood GATT MTTR etc. were also established keeping in view the same intentions. See the Third World Resurgence, No. 9, 1991, Chark ravarthi Raghavan op.cit.
economic independence are clearly interventionary activities as the elements of coercion and compulsion which they exert fall within the realm of economic intervention.

The IMF loans to India in 1974 and 1981 were subject to conditions relating to the introduction of liberalization in Indian economy. The new exchange rate policy, trade policy, industrial policy and budget for 1991-92 were the documents drafted at the instance of the IMF for getting loans from MAF under the structural adjustment programme to meet balance of payment crisis. The devaluation of Indian currency is also attributable to the pressure exerted by the IMF and the World Bank. Sri Lanka also reeling under the impact of the IMF conditionalities displacing all subsidies on food, fuel, fertilizer and wealth service. It was forced by the IMF and the World Bank combined to liberalize its economic policy.

The existence of World Trade Organization (WTO) changed form of GATT. (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs for a Fair International System of Trade) has been signed. There is a strong feeling of insecurity and uncertainty about the nature of the system set of emerage. It is no hidden that a hand full of WTO's rich members have much of a say in its
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decision making and dominating its proceedings. With the rest of its members will always mute listeners who end up accepting the decisions and deals favored by the rich minority. South Asian countries also will not be free from its impact.

If the liberalizations of economy does not show an upshowing in the immediate futures, that could have serious repercussions. The cut in public expenditure could lead to a worsening of the unemployment problem. The fall in the real income of the people in the poorer strata could lead to serious agitations culminating in riots. So it is great need to follow a suitable economic policy that can lead to all SAARC members countries towards developmental activities.

Drug trafficking is a new phenomenon that has threatened South Asian security. Being one of the world’s three largest drug growing areas, the Golden Crescent (Pakistan Afghanistan, Iran border) and second the Golden Triangle (Myanmar, Thailand, Laos border) has created problem. Drug cultivations and trafficking expanded dramatically in Pakistan - Afghanistan region since the late 1970’s. Drug money issued by Pakistan’s inter Services Intelligence (ISI) to finance terrorism in Kashmir, provide weapons to the anti Robbaini factions in Afghanistan and also to acquire weapons for three services. According to a report of U.S. Drug Control Programme, the most problem level of narcotics production is about 2200 tonnes a year.
and the number of manufacturing units near about 50, locate mostly in Pakistan. It is an alarming view of the problem and need to take immediate action.

Other than external threats and the interventionary activities undertaken by the extra-regional powers in SAARC, the member countries are themselves involved in such type of activities. Now it has become a common phenomenon to blame each other for their internal troubles and problems.

The geo-political importance has provided a predominant status to India, followed by Pakistan, while others remained like the peripheral countries in the region. Pakistan with all its animosity towards India was very keen from the very beginning in disturbing the regional status quo in which the balance of power was in favour of India. In doing so Pakistan sought the external assistance (U.S. & China) for compensating its inferiority in regional balance of power. It also got involved in India's internal problems by encouraging, instigating and providing assistance to the cessionist forces.

On the authorized India's interest is in preserving and perpetuating the regional status quo. So the strengthening of its preponderant placement in the region became a major

foreign policy objective. For doing so it cherished the goal of keeping the region free from extra regional influence and interference. In order to keep the region free from external powers, India conceived the parameters of defence not actually living at its own boundaries but at the boundaries of its neighbors.  

Indo-Pak. War

Since partitions, both countries have fought three wars, two on Kashmir issue in 1947-48 and another in 1965 and third in 1971 on East Pakistan issue. Within a few months after partition, India and Pakistan were locked in a conflict resulting from an invasion of the Kashmir valley in October 1947, by the armed tribesmen with the support of Pakistan government. The then Maharaja requested for help from India. India responded to his request and sent troops to save Kashmir. Because of its geographical position with its frontiers with three countries—the Soviet Union, China and Afghanistan, Kashmir is intimately connected with security and the international contracts of India. Security

42. See, J.C.L. Nehru's Broadcast to the nation on 2 Nov., 1947 his statement to the constituent Assembly. New Delhi. 25 Nov., 1947 and 7 Sep. 1948, where in he referred to the belated admission by Pakistan of its role in the raiders’ invasion in Nehru. No. 24, FF. 157-58 and 191-200. The Times (London) reported on 13 January 1948. "That Pakistan is unofficially involved in aiding the raiders is certain. Our correspondent has first hand evidence that arms, ammunition and supplies are being made valuable to the Azad Kashmir Forces". Quoted in SLS or Gupta. Kashmir - A Study in India - Pakistan Relations (Bombay, 1960) P. 116.
and economic interests led the process of Kashmir’s accession to India and Kashmir is an integral part of India. When in 1948 crisis ended, Pakistan occupied about 5000 sq miles of Indian territory, that came to be known as “Azad Kashmir. Accession of Kashmir, according to Pakistan, is illegal and she demands for self determinations of the people of J & K on the basis of successive UN resolutions calling for a free and impartial plebiscite. After 1971 war, which fought by India against Pakistan was in favour of Bangladesh. After end of war. The 1972 Shimla Agreement was signed, that committed India and Pakistan to put an end to the confrontation between them and to work towards a durable peace. It bound them to refrain from the threat or use of force in violations of the new line of control (LOC) in Jammu and Kashmir, and to meet and discuss to settle their dispute bilateral with out support of any third party and Kashmir issue will not be internationalized. But Pakistan always raises Kashmir issue on international forum such as UN security council, General Assembly, Human Rights Commission meetings, OIC, Islamic Summit etc., but she has failed to get international support. Recently, Pakistan Prime Minister Mrs. Benazir Bhutto issued a threat to India to unleash a third war to annex Kashmir. Her statement to London, based Alwasat, is an attempt to boost the sagging morale of the militants in Kashmir.\footnote{The Hindustan Times - New Delhi. 7 Jan. 1995.}
Since 1984, India and Pakistan have engaged in sporadic battles over the control of the Siachen Glacier in Kashmir. In December 1987, poor communications and mutual misperception almost led to war, and by the spring of 1990 many expected a subcontinental nuclear war between the two.

The most important issue at present facing South Asia is the nuclear proliferation in the region and its impact on the security environment. The Southern Asian region has nuclearized since 1964 when China became a nuclear weapon state, another development towards nuclearization started when both U.S. & U.S.S.R. started their military bases in the Indian ocean loaded with nuclear weapons in missiles, but after dissolution of U.S.S.R., nuclear threat to Southern Asian Security increased because some independent states of U.S.S.R. located in Central Asia having nuclear potential, and their linkages with Islamic World has given boosting to go to have nuclear weapon. As far as South Asia is concerned, its two giants Pakistan & India, both have acquired the technological capability to produce nuclear weapons. India tested an atomic device in 1974, but refrained there after from proceeding with a nuclear weapons programme. Its nuclear programme is for peaceful purposes.

On the other hand, Pakistan has acquired nuclear capability
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as well as nuclear weapons as it was revealed by the former Pakistani Prime Minister Mr. Nawaz Sharif and other high nuclear scientists like Dr. Qudir Khan that Pakistan is having nuclear bomb, but Pakistan government says, it is baseless report and Pakistan is not having any nuclear weapon. If it is true, then a question arises that why US has cut down military aid to Pakistan under Pressler Act of 1990?

Although there is no real basis for affirming that either Pakistan is close to developing and testing a bomb or India is well on its way to nuclear weapons acquisition, many high priests of non-proliferation have already convicted both of them for endangering the world. Neither government has ever admitted any plans to tread on the forbidden path. Yet both countries accuse each other for advancing towards the eventual weapons acquisition.

In South Asian regional political dynamics, it has become quite common among the countries to accuse one another for their respective internal problems. Pakistan from time to time blamed India for its internal problems saying that assistance is being provided by India to Baluch, Pakhtoons, Sindhis and Muhajirs disintegrative forces in Pakistan. The most recent instance the then Sindh Chief 46. On many occasions Pakistan has blamed India for its problems in north West frontier province. Baluchistan Sindh. In 1987 the regime of Gen Ila accused India of instigating dissidence in Sindh by among other things, housing 37 military training camps for separatist in neighbouring Rajasthan. Far Eastern Economic Review, 12 March 1987, p. 36.
Minister Abdullah Shah accused RAW's (An Indian intelligence Agency) involvement in Sindh disturbances, and also once powerful MOM's of being involved with the RAW. Kamran Khan a noted investigative journalist has listed innumerable instance and given a graphic account of Pakistan's obsession with India's RAW. Recently, Pakistan's government failure in tackling Karachi violence, it accused India and announced its decision to close down the Indian consulate. General in Karachi with immediate effect. The Pakistan foreign secretary Mr. Najmuddin Shaikh alleged that they cannot allow a centre for sabotage, subversion and terrorism to continue to operate within Pakistan. He again said that Pakistan desired "Peaceful and Normal relations with India on the basis of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and non interference in internal affairs." But these allegations have been totally rejected by India as baseless.

The other countries like Bangladesh and Sri Lanka have also blamed India for its involvement in their internal troubles. While it is true that India has a concern for its own security arising from development in these countries the accusations of its neighbors could not be authenticated.
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The conflict began in East Pakistan in 1969s. At that time it was limited to the demands of regional autonomy within the federal structure of Pakistan. The Indian government press and the public opinion were sympathetic to East Pakistan in its struggle for autonomy. With the intensification of the conflict accompanied by Pakistan's military repression in 1971, refugees and political activists were bound to flee into India for help and sanctuary, keeping in view the geographical locations of East Pakistan which is almost like an enclave surrounded by India on three sides. It was estimated that from late March to early December 1971, about 9.5 million refugees crossed into India to escape the genocidal fighting in East Pakistan. India's involvement in the conflict of East Pakistan which became separatist from autonomist in 1971 has been divided into four phases by Urmila Phadnis. a) expressions of concern and moral support, b) augmentation of moral support with military training to East Pakistanis, c) diplomatic initiative with the intensification of military activities and d) the Indo-Pakistani war leading to the emergence of Bangladesh.

During the first phase the Indian Parliament on March 31, 1971 expressed its sympathy and solidarity with the people of East Pakistan in their struggle for the democratic
Finally around the middle of April 1971, when the leaders of East Pakistani movement declared independence of Bangladesh forming a government in exile in India, a close interactions began between the members of government in exile and Indian government. Both military training and equipments which Indian government provided to the separatist forces in East Pakistan was an interventionary activity in the internal affairs of Pakistan. India's involvement in the Bangladesh crisis was largely motivated by the objective of overcoming the economic consequences of the refugees influx into its territories. Besides this, there were some other factors like putting an end to the Pakistani support to the disintegrative forces in north-eastern region, creating a friendly Bangladesh which would become an strategic asset, utilizing the opportunity to shape the subcontinent's balance of power in its favour and belting the two nation theory which governed India's behaviour towards the crisis.

Though India played a vital role in the independence of Bangladesh and their relations started on a cordial note, certain conflicting situations appeared in the course of
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time and produced strains in their relations. The main issues which strained relations between the two countries were clashes over borders, the dispute over sharing of Ganges water and sovereignty over the Moore Island and Goral river and the Teen Bina issue, now that has given to Bangladesh on lease for 999 years.

In the first place the border dispute has greatly strained their relations. The two countries were reached amicable to settle their border and other disputed territories in May 1974, but border incidents continued in Garo Hill area, because of Chackma tribes.

Another dispute is the question of Farakka Barrage and Sharing of Ganges water. Though both two countries concluded an interim agreement in April 1975 regarding sharing of water, Bangladesh leadership of ten inquired in misleading campaign about the adverse effects of the agreement on Bangladesh with a view to divert the attention of the people from the short comings and losses in the domestic field. They tried to project that India was trying to ruin their economy by diverting the Ganga water. They also internationalized this issue by raising at the United Nations. Present Bangladesh Prime Minister Mrs Khaleda Zia also has raised the issue at the United Nations and the Commonwealth Summit. This met with great resentment from Bangladesh.

In 1977, a Joint Rivers Commission was set to find out a long term solution, and now some now this dispute has settled.

The possession of a new island in the Bay of Bengal called New Moore by India and South Talpatty Island by Bangladesh has created tension. This island is located in the estuary of the River Hasibhanga and midstream of the main channel, which formed the border between India and Bangladesh.

In May 1981, when Indian naval ship Sandhyvak orchard on the Island and the Indian Personnels landed there the government of Bangladesh protested and alleged that the ship was in Bangladesh territorial waters. India justified the presence of Sandhyvak in the area of pointing out that the ship was updating the data which Bangladesh had sought, and collecting necessary statistics for a joint survey which the two governments had agreed to undertake. But Bangladesh was not satisfied and sent certain Gum Boats which threatened Sandhyvak. As a result India also sent a frigate to rescue its ship. The anti-India feeling in Bangladesh was demonstrated outside the office of Indian Joint Commission in Dacca. The demonstrators also attacked the Indian Air lines office at Dacca, and caused serious damaged. In Calcutta also demonstrations were held outside the Office of Bangaladesh Deputy High Commissioner’s Office. In the midst of all these developments the Bangla Parliament adopted a resolutions on 20 May, 1981. Demanding immediate withdrawal
of all Indian personnel from the island. India made a bid to reduce tension by an invitations to Bangladesh Foreign Minister to remove the misgivings, but this dispute still remain unsolved.

It is thus evident that the relations between India and Bangladesh were disturbed due to certain confrontations but they did not assume serious dimensions at any stage.

India's perceived involvement in Sri Lanka is also a major factor of disturbance in South Asia. After the communal frenzy of July 1983 in Sri Lanka, the Tamils of Sri Lanka started pouring into India as refugees. The intra-Tamil affinity between the Tamils of the two countries invoked a sharp reaction in India especially in Tamil Nadu. India's denials, it was believed that the Tamil militants were enjoying the patronage and support of various parties including the ruling AIADMK in Tamil Nadu and were being given training and other military facilities. Regarding India's involvement in military training and arming to Tamil militants on its territory, Sri Lanka Foreign Minister ACS Hameed speaking before the UN general assembly in Nov., 1994 said that the communal disturbances of July 1983 were a tragic development in the life of his country. It is a sad commentary in international relations that the aberrations

of small states are sensationalized and blown up to a massive proportions. "With out naming India specifically he pointed out that the terrorist groups find refugee training, sympathy and encouragement in foreign territory posing threat of destabilization in the country."59. Moreover, the Sri Lankan authorities have pinpointed Tamil training camps in Coimbatore, Mettanopevan and Coonoor in Tamil Nadu and transportation of Tamil arms, ammunition and explosives from South India across the Palk - straits.60. The Intra-Tamil affinity between the Tamils of India and Sri Lanka was probably the motivating force behind India's involvement in Sri Lankan ethnic crisis. India's objectives were basically two folds: first to find Nave and means to avoid the possibility of the involvement of external forces in Sri Lankan conflict and second to settle the problems through negotiations which would entail due autonomy to the Tamils of Sri Lanka within the Sri Lankan system. With these objectives, India initiated the peace process in Sri Lanka in 1987, by bringing the parties in conflict to the negotiating table. However Sri Lanka alleged that India was pursuing a two pronged policy, mediatary and militant supportive, there by harassing it to reach an agreement acceptable to India.61.
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The Tamil militant continued operating from Tamil Nadu. But the situation slightly changed after Mrs. Indira Gandhi's assassinations. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi became Prime Minister and took some steps to curb the activities of Tamil militants in India. When in 1987, the situations got worsened. Sri Lanka imposed an economic embargo on Jaffna presumably to forestall the proposed unilateral declarations for the formations of independence. Tamil homeland by the Tamil militants on January 1st, 1987. The economic embargo led to the acute scarcity of essential commodities in the war ravaged Jaffna area. These developments invoked sharp reactions in India. India offered food and medical supplies under the seal of Red Cross, but was refused by Sri Lankan government. India, in protest, air dropped these supplies by overnight Eagle operation in Jaffna in June 198762. The action of air dropping was a violation of the sovereignty of Sri Lankan air space, while India defended her action arguing that it was deemed necessary because the innocent people were in dire need of relief supplies. The hidden message was just to pass the signal that India should not be treated as just another uninterested country. In the wake of India's action a peace accord was signed among the two countries and LTTE. Even after signing the accord, the Tamil militants continued receiving patronage in India. But the peace accord failed to be implemented due to refusal of
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LTTE. The Indian Peace keeping Force (IPKF) was sent to maintain peace in the region. The IPKF presence in Sri Lanka irritated to LTTE. The assassination of Rajiv Gandhi in 1991 committed by LTTE was the result of their suppression by IPKF. Here is to be noted that the assistance in the form of military training equipment and finances which the Tamil militants received whether at the behest of Indian Government or not, was an international activity.

Activity, India's support for the representative governments in its neighborhood has also caused suspicion among the SAARC members countries, especially Pakistan and Nepal. India supported democratic movement against military rule in Pakistan in 1983. Furthermore, India's Operations Cactus of November in 1988 in Maldives was also viewed by some as interventionary, which may described so, but it was not a coercive measure directed to change internal or external policies of Maldives. India's Maldives operations created a feeling that India would not have any hesitations in intervening in the internal developments of a South Asian country if such intervention was regarded as within India's means and promoting its interests.

Due to such type of India's prompt and eminently successful military interventions in Maldives to fail a coup attempt has focused attention on an important strategic issue: Does India seek to ensure regional hegemony in South Asia and does it regard the region as one from which outside powers should keep off?

By virtue of its geographical distinction as the largest democracy in South Asia, India is entitled to exercise regional hegemony. While this country has no territorial ambitions, it certainly does not wish to allow outside powers to exercise undue influence over any independents country in the region. Since its emergence as a sovereign country in 1947, India has made it a policy to keep a more than customary watch on political developments in the region. And its eminent position in the NAM and effort in negotiations over the NIEO and membership of the Antarctic club her success in 1971 war against Pak. her military "Exercise Brasstocks" in 1986, her intervention in Sri Lanka and the Maldives, the acquisition of a nuclear submarine from the Soviet Union, and the Aon1 missile her political and economic stability and industrial progress and her technological achievement it posed as a strong nations in South Asia as to supposedly present a threat to other members of SAARC. So they desire to delink from India and to avoid any dependence upon India, each one them seeks extra regional political, economic and military linkages. Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Nepal have linked up
with the USA AND CHINA.

These misunderstandings of Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh have made them look unto Pakistan to counter the Indian hegemony and Pakistan has already wanted to take its revenge against India. At the time of Indo Nepalese difference on Trade and Transit Treaty, Pakistan provided goods to Nepal. Mrs. Bhutto supported Premdasa the then President of Sri Lanka for the demand of withdrawal of IPKF from Sri Lanka.

While on the other side, India wants regional stability and believes that foreign interventions never guarantees regional stability. And we have example of Soviet involvement in Afghanistan and Americans in Vietnam, but India does not want to coopt the either, in South Asia.

Pakistan's interventionary activities the South Asian region: Pakistan from the partition has been interested in providing covert support to the disintegrative forces in India. in order to weaken and destabilize its giant regional neighbour India, with which it maintains hostile relations. Besides the covert support to the secessionist forces, Pakistan always used the Islamic card to embarrass India by unsuccessfully claiming the role of the Guardian of the Indian Muslims especially on the occasions of communal disturbances in India. After the demolition of Babri Mosque, these activities increased.
Before the creation of Bangladesh, the territory of East Pakistan was a safe sanctuary for the separatist forces of north eastern regions of India, supported by Pakistan.

The members of Mizo National Front (MNF) were provided military training and other facilities in the east Pakistan.

Recent reports show that the Pakistani ISI is very active in the North Eastern States and giving every assistance including training to insurgent groups there. Talking to newsmen at the Fort William, GOC-in C. Eastern command, Lt. Gen. R.N. Batra, said that the ISI had been providing training to the NSCN in Nagaland, the ULFA in Assam and PLA in Manipur as well as to certain elements in lower Assam in some neighbouring countries.

Pakistan got involved in the Punjab problems where the Sikh separatists were demanding Khalistan. They not only got shelter but also facilities for military training and supply of arms. But recent BSF sources revealed that eleven training camps for terrorists are still in operations in Pakistan and ISI is making desperate attempts to revive terrorism in Punjab. The CIA and Pakistan intelligence (ISI) were actively involved in the training of anti-India terrorists in specialized camps in Pakistan, for example in
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Preliminary interrogations of an extremist arrested by the army from the Golden Temple revealed that he was a Pakistani who had supplied specialized detonators to the extremists positioned inside the temple, disclosed Lt. Gen. K. Sundari - GOC - in Western command at a press conference after operators Blue Star.

Another sources and said Punjab militants were training together with Kashmir militants in the camps, some of which are located at Lahore, Farukhabad, Dera Ismail Khan, Chuno, Sajjowal, Okara, Gujranwala, Multan and Banadouran, situated south of Kasur.

The sources said militants who had fled Punjab and gone to western countries on forged documents, are also being trapped by Pakistan's ISI and sent back to Punjab with the direction to set up hide outs and review old contacts with militants inside and outside the state.

Other than Punjab, Pakistan is also providing all kinds of support from diplomatic to military training and arms supply to Kashmiri militants for the demands of independence.
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of Kashmir from India. It has consistently been working for soliciting the support of international community by raising the issue of Kashmir in United Nations as well as the support of Muslims countries and their organization OIC (Organization of Islamic countries) for the self determinations of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It has not covertly involved itself in Kashmir problem especially since 1987.

There are believed to be about thirty subversive groups operative in Kashmir valley. These are part of the separatists movement which has gained strength as a result of financial and other support given by Pakistan and Kashmiris settled abroad. With some available information to BSF, there are forty battle hardened Afghan "Mujahideen" in the valley imparting training to the Kashmir militants and fighting along with them. Besides, there are Sudanese, Bahrainis, Pakistani's and Saudi Nations etc. 72.

Pakistan's Islamic Democratic Alliance (IDA) acting in cooperations with the Pakistan based Kashmir Liberation Front (KLF). Like IDA other organisations train Kashmiri Youths in the use of arms. Pakistan's Field Intelligence Unit (FIU) and Pakistan Inter service Intelligence (ISI) have been supplying arms to militants.
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Former Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's admission that while in office, he had funded the fundamentalist Jamat-e-Islami in a big way for training and arming terrorists for separations in Kashmir has exposed Islamabad's sinister plans to provide material support to militants despite official denials.73

Present Prime Minister Ms. Benazir Bhutto has become more bellicose in her utterances and promised full support to terrorists to end Indian rule in Jammu & Kashmir, not only this she has gone one more step by threatening to India to face third war for Kashmir rule.74 The aiding and abetting of separatist forces in Indian states by Pakistan are the interventionary activities in the internal affairs of India.

Bombay Blasts  With the arrest Menons brother it has cleared that Pakistan was fully involved in Bombay Blasts case. The Menons brother accepted that they were given shelter in Pakistan by the ISI agents. The mine members of the Menon family travelled to Karachi from Dubai on March 17 and March 20, with in ten days of the blasts being executed in Bombay on PIA flight PK 214.
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The explosives used in Bombay originated from Pakistan. The boxes used to transport the RDX, when chemically analyzed were found to bear Pakistani markings of "Explosive, class 6, Division B, Wash Nobel Pvt. Ltd., "Wahcantt".

Yakub has given page numbers of register in which the property deed for their Karachi house, C 201, Karachi Development scheme was registered under the Resettlement of Witness Act. Yakub has also handed over the business partnership deed along with income tax clearance to the CBI. All these are pointers to Pakistan's involvement in Bombay blasts.

In case of India and Bangladesh were both the countries allege involvement of one another is providing assistance to the separatist movements going on both side of borders for years. the separatists themselves develop linkages across the borders. The cross-border tribal affinities make the interaction of separatist groups feasible. Since 1983, the Tripura Government has been alleging that tribal from Bangladesh are linking up with a tribal rebel group in Tripura to destabilize the Indian states.75

It has been reported that the separatist forces of Mizo National Front and the Tribal National Volunteers are based

in the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh and are being
aided and abetted by Bangladesh.\footnote{76}

In South Asia due to the fact that the countries are
locked in a hostile relationship of blaming and counter-
blaming each other for their respective troubles, there have
been certain occasions when they have actually provided
support both covertly and openly to the disintegrative
forces in the region. While India aided and the
secessionist forces of East Pakistan, Pakistan has
consistently been involved in India's internal affairs.
Besides diplomatic support to the Kashmir problem it has
been providing support to the separatists both in Punjab and
Kashmir. Bangladesh involvement in the internal affairs of
India has been comparatively at low ebb.

The other countries of the SAARC like Nepal, Bhutan,
Sri Lanka and Maldives have not any border disputes and have
not resorted to interventionary activities in the region.

\footnote{76} F.N. Kothalia. "Internal Security and C.I. operations
in Urban Areas". Indian Defence Review. Vol. 11. Jan