CHAPTER VI

REGIONAL PROBLEMS
(A) **Terrorism in India**

The Indian *Terrorism and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act 1989* in sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Act defines Terrorism:

'Whoever with intent to overawe the Government as by law established or to strike terror in the people or any section of the people or to alienate any section of the people or to adversely affect the harmony amongst different section of the people or to adversely affect any acts or things by using bombs, dynamite or other explosive substances or inflammable substance or fire arms or other lethal weapons or poisons or noxious gases or other chemicals or by any other substance (whether geological or otherwise) of a hazardous nature in such a manner as to cause or it is likely to cause, death of or injuries to any person or persons or loss of, or damage to or destruction of property or disruption of any supplies or services essential to the life of the community or detains any person and threatens to kill or injure such persons in order to compel the governments or any other person to do or obtain from doing any act commits a terrorist act'.

It is comprehensive definition of terrorism and includes all or most of the acts of violence. Modern terrorism draws inspiration from Nietzsche, popularised by Sartre and his disciplines by identifying certain political situations which justified violent correctives. The impact of Anarchists on the use of violence in society is also highlighted by some writers. Michael Bakunin in, 'The Revolutionary Catechism', 1989, has defined 'Day and Night'
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the terrorists activist must have single thought, one single purpose merciless destruction'. 1 Bakunin has justified terrorism and had said, 'Let us put our trust in the eternally creative source of life. The urge to destroy is also a creative urge.' 2 Walter has said 'Violence may occur without terror, but not terror without violence'. 3 He has defined terrorism, the most flagrant form of defiance of the rule of law, 4 as process of terror is a compound with three elements, the act or threat of violence, the emotional reaction and the social effects. 5 Oleg Zinam has defined terrorism as the 'use of threat of violence by individuals or by organised groups to evoke fear and submission to attain some economic political, socio-psychological or other object.'

Acts of terrorism sponsored and launched by one country against another using violence and lethal force with a view to achieving long term political or strategic objectives is a facet of modern warfare. The aim of the country which sponsors and abets terrorism and insurgency can range from destabilisation and weakening of a government or a central authority to the break up of the existing social and political order, in the targeted country. The state which sponsors terrorism or insurgency is actually waging an unconventional war which terrorists or insurgents are generally used as convenient tools, till a particular stage. 6

---

1. As cited in Robert A. Friedlander, 'Terrorism and Political Violence'.
The country sponsoring terrorism or insurgency provides financial help, often through voluntary organisations or emigrants, weapons, training, safe sanctuaries and other facilities for launching operations. In fact the terrorist or insurgents have a close relationship with sponsors and are substitute for the regular and irregular enemy troops operating inside enemy territory. In words of Ifanle, 'Sponsored Terrorism' which uses surrogated warfare to unleash a reign of terror by using force both at the moral and physical plains, meets these basic requirements and qualify as 'war', because the purpose of such actions is to break the existing physical and psychological ties that bind a country or a people together by applying various asymmetrical pressures on the targeted state'.

Terrorism in Punjab and Jammu Kashmir represents a classical manifestation of sponsored terrorism. It is beyond doubt that Pakistan has launched a well planned surrogate operation with far reaching political and strategical aims. Pakistan has been sponsoring and supporting terrorist and insurgent movement in these states and religious susceptibilities have been exploited to found unrest.

Before independence, Punjab stretched from New Peshwar in the North to just short of Delhi in the South, from the Indus River in the West to the Yamuna in the East. During the period prior to the British leaving, the unionist party held sway in Punjab and its leadership was vested in the hands of the big landed magnates of the Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs.

After independence, the Muslim factor was removed from Punjab. The Hindus and Sikhs came face to face with the adoption of the policy of having Hindi as National language, Urdu was out. In 1949 Sachar formula was
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adopted and made the provision for the language of the majority to be taught. After adoption of democratic system of government, power became the goal of leaders. The Akalis have decisive on SK till 1966, but, could not came to hold power. There was a call for Punjab suba so that Akalis may come to power.

There were so many problems including the capital, boundary, river water allocation between Punjab and Haryana as ripartan states and Rajasthan. None of the issues could find amicable solution. The Akali Party left the political pressure and turned to religious agitation to garner support on these questions.

The Nahar Roko Morcha, which arose out of a lack of basic policy on the sharing of river waters, turned violent and led, to many incidents of killings. In order to cut traditional Akali leaders to size, led to the rise of sant Bhinderan wala, who became out of control soon.

Pakistan is undoubtedly trying its best to increase mischief in India and keep India occupied with slow attrition. Pakistan sponsored terrorists in every possible way. It supplied most sophisticated weapons, provided training and enlarged a line of communication to disrupt the communication links of the security line.

The area of assistance to terrorists was large enough as may be evident from the recoveries of arms made during 1986 to 1993 and the killings.
### Index of terrorist activity from 1986 to 1993

#### Deaths and Arms Recoveries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK Rifle</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Guns</td>
<td>3125</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rifles</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPG-7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMG/GPMG</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Sets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons killed</td>
<td>4937</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police killed</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist killed</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lancer Papers.

Organised assistance to Punjab terrorists by Pakistan began in April 1985. The terrorist man power came from the thousands of youths who had crossed over to Pakistan during the army operation in June-August 1989.  

The year 1992 brought a turn around for the situation in India's troubled Punjab which had been recked by a decade long militant movement demanding a separate nation for India's 17 million sikhs. Between the year 1986 and 1989 the situation went precipitously down hill with killings, extortion and assault becoming more and more common. By the beginning of 1990 things were desperate in the state. In December 1990 army was sent to retrieve the situation. The aborted Rakshak operation led to a

---

1. The Times of India, New Delhi, May 19, 1988.
resurgence of terrorism, now across the length and breath of Punjab.

The source of the Punjab terrorist movement always lay outside India. Sikhs settled in Canada helped Punjab's terrorists with motivation and money with the active collaboration of Pakistan's intelligence agencies. Besides providing regular financial help to the terrorists, these foreign Sikhs have been giving fund for the purchase of arms and ammunitions. In March 1987 the Daljit Singh Sethon arrived in Pakistan from Canada with sizeable funds for buying arms for the terrorists.\(^1\) Infiltrators apprehended by the BSF revealed that the top Sikhs extremists Gurjit Singh of AISSF, Nirwair Singh and Jagir Singh, spokesman of the Panthak Committee Malkant Singh Ajnalo of the Khalistan commando Force and Ajaib Singh of Daudami Taksal received training in Pakistan for which Pakistan has opened several training centres near border area.

The biggest achievement of Rakhrak 11 lies in the feet that not a single case of army high handedness or st rocity was reported in the state. The army concentrated on winning the hearts and minds of the people through civic action.

The Army's role RAKSHAK 111 or the use of the army post RAKSHAK 11, since the installation of the Beant Singh government is likely to be a more broad based one. In the rural areas this will translate into suppressing militancy and an executive administrative load. In urban areas it will mean visible presence and a decisive say in the anti terrorist security. The action by army has changed the vernacular of the terrorism and is at setback to Pakistan

---

which was considering to built a separate nation on the lines of Bangladesh.

The situation in Punjab and J & K bear a close resemblance to each other. Another element common to both is Pakistan's support and atention of the terrorists. The immediate and long terms objectives and actions of terrorists in Punjab and J & K appears similar at first sight, but, these differ vastly in scope and long term objectives. The main motivation for terrorist violence in Punjab stems from an urge for vengeance. This urge singles with vague dreams of a separate state in Kashmir the main motivation comes from religious affinity with Pakistan and a definite aim to secede from the Indian union.
(B) Kashmir Issue

The cold war came to an end by crumbling of the Berlin wall, collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and disappearance of the Soviet Union from the political map of the world. But the Kashmir question is still unresolved and is getting extraordinary recognition as a long standing issue in the world's most volatile region of South Asia. It is the immediate cause of continuing mutual suspicions, distrust and ceaseless acrimony between India and Pakistan. Both countries have a highly emotional involvement in Kashmir and the relation between India and Pakistan have become increasingly bitter as a result of the unsettled Kashmir dispute.

The present time global situation has altered while the tension resulting from Kashmir remains the same. The United States and to a certain extent, China share common interests in ensuring that the two belligerent nations of South Asia do not inadvertently stumble into a major conflagration that neither India nor Pakistan could afford, and that could even lead to the escalation of nuclear race.1

The state of Jammu and Kashmir came into being in its modern form as a result of that ignominious "Sale deed" commonly known as the "Treaty of Amritsar". The sale deed was signed on the 16th of March, 1846, when the British Government had sold the state of Jammu and Kashmir to Gulab Singh for a sum of Rs. 75 million.2 It is pertinent that Henry Montgomery, Lawrence who had signed the 'Sale deed' referred to it as a very questionable stroke of policy,

which had been arranged beforehand and which had brought woes innumerable on the happy Kashmiris. Eversince we handed it over to the Dongra Rajput, Gulab Singh, who paid us down at once in hard cash, which he had stolen from the Lahore Derbar.  

Pakistan always argued for Kashmir's economic and strategic importance for it. Prime Minister Liyakat Ali Khan asserted the Kashmir...... is like a cap on the head of Pakistan. If I allow India to have this cap off our head than I am always at the mercy of India. Kashmir became of even greater value for Pakistan. Zafrullah Khan once said,

"The possession of Kashmir can add nothing to the economy of India, or to the strategic security of India. On the other hand, it is vital to Pakistan, should Kashmir accede to India, Pakistan might as well from both the economic and the strategic point of view, become a feudatory of India or cease to exist as an independent sovereign state."

Kashmir has a character of its own. Its location on the rings of Sino-Tibetan plateau, Central Asian Highland and Indo-Gangetic Plain, gives it considerable strategic significance in the South Asian Subcontinent. However, Jammu and Kashmir were the nucleus of the "Mandala" doctrine around which revolved Nehru's foreign and security

policy and India's relations with regional and external powers of all sizes. The Kashmir issue was the product of the partition and has been lingering on for the honourable solution acceptable to both India and Pakistan since 1947. The Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan exchanged correspondence of the issue but, the American military aid to Pakistan changed the climate of the subcontinent so much that the bilateral negotiations became unthinkable.

The Kashmir issue is more an ideological conflict than a territorial dispute. For Pakistan, the Kashmir issue is a continuation of the Pakistan movement on the basis of two nations theory. For India, Kashmir is a reaffirmation of its commitment to secularism and democracy.

With a sizeable Muslim population, it was but natural that the Muslim League should have the princely state of Kashmir in its character of demands for a separate Islamic state. The congress party decried such moves on the part of Jinnah and the Muslim League and stressed that the country should not be merely divided on religious lines. History, however took a different course and the country was partitioned in 1947 amidst one of history's most tragic holocausts. It goes to the credit of Jawahar Lal Nehru for handling Kashmir issue with so much of diplomatic and political dexterity. He made it clear that India will not be a willing pawn in any body's power game.

3. "Year Book On India's Foreign Policy", edited by Satish Kumar, Sage Publications, New Delhi, p. 35.
The wars of 1965 and 1971 succeeded in freezing the problem of Kashmir in the time frame of 1947-48. The Simla Agreement of 1972 accepted that cease-fire line of December 17, 1971 shall be respected by both sides without prejudice.\(^1\) Pakistan continued to raise the issue of Kashmir at various international forums. In Jakarta, the two leaders, Nawaz Sharif and Nersimha Rao tried to solve the Kashmir problem and hoped to make some headway in this regard.\(^2\) But, could not reach to any conclusion. In the heat and passion of political polemics and religious fanaticism, the real issue of Kashmir has been side-tracked.\(^3\) The concept of secular democracy, which is the foundation of independent India, is forgotten and Pakistan is presented as muslim majority area. This theory of religious state hood can not be accepted because the same question mark the fate of 100 million Muslims staying in India willingly and honourably. The J.K.L.F. is altogether with Pakistan and has not appreciated any move on these grounds. Hashim Qureshi, the exiled leader of JKLF has criticised the policy of Pakistan based on Islamic Fundamentalism and asserted that "This is rubbish Why isn't Pakistan doing anything about Bosnia or the 400 Muslims deported from Israel or the Kurds in Turkey - whom are they trying to fool".\(^4\) The position in Kashmir has become more critical. A more powerful Ladakh Buddhist Association (LBA) has come forward and have pressed that "An attempt to impose a solution to the Kashmir problem without taking into account the aspirations of the people of Laddakh will be opposed tooth and nail by the Ladakhis".\(^5\)

1. The Times of India, New Delhi, February 20, 1990.
2. The Indian Express, New Delhi, September 4, 1992.
4. The Indian Express, New Delhi, March 8, 1993.
5. The Indian Express, New Delhi, March 15, 1993.
The uprising in occupied Kashmir presents the first serious possibility of altering the political status quo in South Asia since the emergence of Bangladesh in 1971. The Kashmir uprising, coupled with a virtual state of insurgency among the Sikhs in East Punjab, provides a situation where two regions under Indian control, both having a non-Hindu majority are in revolt. The uprising in Kashmir can be viewed from three different perspectives. First Pakistanis are pleased that unlike 1965, this time around, it is a purely indigenous upsurge rooted in decades of deprivation, despotism and alienation by the rulers in Delhi. Second, in this age of self determination, which has recently been manifested in Eastern Europe and even in the Soviet Union, Pakistan feels that its case for a plebiscite in Kashmir, which has the endorsement of the United Nations, is legally and morally strong. Pakistan bases its case for self determination of the people of

1. Apart from holding joint demonstrations in places like London, supporters of the Khalistan movement and Kashmiri freedom fighters tend to derive moral and psychological sustenance from each other's struggle. When the threat of war against Pakistan was invoked early in the Kashmir uprising, the All India Sikh Students Federation (AISSF) passed a resolution in support for the Kashmiris while also urging Sikhs to support Pakistan in the event of a war with India. See "AISSF faction for support to Pakistan". The Times of India, March 1, 1990; Singh, Rahul*. Two festering sores of India: Kashmir and Punjab back to centre stage", Dialogue, July 26, 1991.

2. It is generally accepted that Pakistan tried and failed to foment an uprising in Kashmir in August 1965, an event that provided the curtain-raiser for India's attack on Lahore on September 6, 1954, sparking the second Pakistan-India war on Kashmir - For an appraisal of Pakistani motivations for the action in Kashmir and implications for Pakistan of the 1965 war, see : Hussain, Mushahid, Pakistan's Politics: The Zia Years, Progressive Publishers, Lahore: 1990, p. 5-11.
Jammu and Kashmir on the successive UN Resolutions calling for, "a free and impartial plebiscite". These resolutions were passed on August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, resolutions which India initially accepted but, later reversed on the plea that Pakistan, by entering into a military alliance with US, had altered the region's security environment. Third, the ferment in Kashmir needs to be viewed in the context of the general unrest that is evident in the strategic "Islamic crescent of Conflict" which begins at Israel and goes through India with the Intifida in Palestine, the struggle in Lebanon and Afghanistan, the stirrings in Azerbaijan and the uprising in Kashmir. Additionally, with the unravelling of the post world war II status quo in East Europe, a similar process in underway in South Asia. The situation in occupied

1. In August 1953, when Indian Prime Minister Nehru and Pakistan Prime Minister Mohammad Ali met in New Delhi, it was reported that "Nehru had told Mohammad Ali that it should be possible to hold the plebiscite in Kashmir in April 1955 or at least between April and October 1955. The plebiscite administrator was to be appointed by the end of April 1954", as stated in Noorani, A.G., India, The Superpowers and the Neighbours, South Asian Publishers, New Delhi : 1985, Chapter on Nehru and his Diplomacy" p. 12; Nehru finally reneged on commitment to a plebiscite on Kashmir in a policy speech to the Indian Parliament on March 29, 1956 when he asserted that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir. On the basis of the document of accession signed by the Ruler of the State, was "legal and constitutional".

2. For variations of this theme, see : Charles Kranthammer "This Islamic 'arc of crisis' Traces a Global Intifida" in The Washington Post reproduced in International Harald Tribune (IHT), February 17-18, 1990; Mushanid Hussain "From Israel to India : Contours of a changing world" The Nation, August 12, 1990; Pakistan's success in internationalizing Kashmir is evident from the fact that the 20th Islamic conference of foreign Ministers, meeting in Islamabad, Turkey, during August 4-8, 1991, unanimously expressed "concern at the alarming increase in the indiscriminate use of force and gross violations of human rights committed against innocent Kashmiris" and the 48 Foreign Ministers of the organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) also called for "the respect of their (Kashmir) human rights including the right of self-determination".
Kashmir today is actually "India's Bangladesh". Kashmir and the recent election in India in 1989 had no locus standi in occupied Kashmir since there was hardly a 2% turnout. Pakistan Army eventually ended up as army of occupation would behave. United States was not very helpful to the Kashmiris or to Pakistan. The US position can be summed up as follows: The US accepts that "Kashmir is a disputed territory and that Pakistan and India should resolve the issue between them as agreed in Simla in 1972"; the US had privately conveyed to Pakistan that it is opposed to raising the Kashmir issue in the UN security council or even internationalizing it via such forums as the DIC; The US even threatened during April-May 1990 to cut aid to Pakistan if, Islamabad was found to be supporting Kashmiri freedom fighters, as such Pakistani assistance, in the US view would to "aiding and abetting state terrorism". In July 1991 for the first time international conference on the Kashmir issue was organised in the United States. The organisers were the Washington based Kashmiri, American council and the members of London based world Kashmir Freedom movement. The small but, affluent Kashmiri-American community, mostly enterprising professionals, were enthusiastic supporters of this conference. The conference was


not just significant because it was the first such successful gathering in US, but, it also brought into focus a new perspective and fresh insight into the Kashmir issue, with even Lord Anebury, Chairman of the British Parliamentary Human Rights Committee, suggesting that "the Kashmir issue should be placed before the UN decolonization committee." An important aspect brought to light in the historical context of Kashmir was a reference to the book being written on the subject by the eminent British historian, Alastair Lamb, he said to have made two key revelations, among others, in his study. One, that the instrument of Accession, which India treated as the legal basis of its occupation of Kashmir, was signed, post dated, by the Hindu ruler of Kashmir after the Indian Army landing in Srinagar, as the Indians have always made it out to be.

Alike, Punjab, Pakistan sponsored terrorists in Jammu and Kashmir, the general mass considered Pakistan responsible for all terrorist activities in Kashmir. A international symposium on terrorism appealed to the United States to take stern action, against Pakistan in order to force it to desist from supporting terrorists in Kashmir, and condemned state sponsored terrorism. American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) pointed out that the Pakistan's

2. Alastair Lamb also provided this perspective during his presentation at the Seminar on Kashmir Organized at Oxford University on June 23-24, 1990 which was attended by participants from Pakistan, India, UK, USA and USSR. For an evaluation of Mountbatten's role, see also: Khan Zaman Mirza, "Lord Mountbatten and the Tragedy of Kashmir", The Muslim, August 4, 1991.
3. The Indian Express, New Delhi, May 19, 1992.
military intelligence used narcotics profits to fund separatist movement in India. The paper asserted that Zia's two pilots used presidential aircraft to smuggle heroin - one to the United States during state visit. He did have man in his entourage who used their position to promote criminal interests including narcotics. The CIA director testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee said - Pakistan has supported the Kashmiri and Sikhs groups, which have been waging long running insurgencies against India's central government. Indian government complained to the UN Commission on human rights that Pakistan was officially sponsoring terrorists and subversion in Jammu and Kashmir.

An important aspect brought to light in the historical context of Kashmir was a reference to the new book being written on the subject by the eminent British historian, Alastair Lamb he said to have made two key revelations, among others, in his study. One, that the instrument of Accession, which India treated as the legal basis of its occupation of Kashmir, was signed, post dated, by the Hindu ruler of Kashmir after the Indian Army landing in Srinagar, as the Indians have always made it out to be, alike Punjab, Pakistan sponsored terrorists in Jammu and Kashmir. General mass considered Pakistan responsible for all terrorist activities in Kashmir. A international symposium on terrorism appealed to the United States to take stern action against Pakistan in order to force it to desist from supporting terrorists in Kashmir and condemned state

1. The Indian Express, New Delhi, February 25, 1992.
2. The Indian Express, New Delhi, April 23, 1992.
3. The Indian Express, New Delhi, January 1, 1992.
4. The Indian Express, New Delhi, May 19, 1992.
sponsored terrorism. American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) pointed out that Pakistan military intelligence used narcotics profits to fund separatists movement in India.\footnote{The Indian Express, New Delhi, February 25, 1992.}
The paper asserted that Zia's two pilots used presidential aircraft to smuggle heroin - one to the United States during state visit. He did have man in his entourage who used their position to promote criminal interests including narcotics.\footnote{The Indian Express, New Delhi, April 25, 1992.}
The CIA director testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee said - Pakistan has supported the Kashmiri and Sikhs groups which have been waging long - running insur­gencies against India's central government.\footnote{The Indian Express, New Delhi, January 1, 1992.} Indian Govern­ment complained to the UN Commission on human rights that Pakistan was officially sponsoring terrorists and subversion in Jammu and Kashmir.

The United States has changed its verdict now on Kashmir. In rejecting the Instrument of Accession, which binds the state of Jammu and Kashmir with India, Washington has come out of the closet to openly state its long cherished inclinations only the language was more courtly when secretary of State Dean Acheson asked the embassy in New Delhi in a secret message back in 1949 to convey the Indian Government that its insistence on the legal position was not serving its interests and it should be more flexible to facilitate a solution of the problem.\footnote{Bidyut Sarker,'Kashmir : India's Bleeding Sore', The Economic Times, New Delhi, November 6, 1993.} The 'problem' as the State Department saw it, was not the withdrawal of Pakistani invaders which was the basis of New Delhi's complaint to the Security Council, but, the balancing of
of claims by both countries to the former princely state. Even to this day, it is treated as a dispute about territory. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, ambassador at the UN, advised the State Department in the mid 1950s that acceptance of the original Pakistan aggression would 'unfairly reverse situation in favour of India'.

Pakistan has reasons to feel greatful the Pakistan more than any other country subserved US interests in Afghanistan where Soviet troops had to make a retreat followed by the downfall of the Marxist regime. Pakistan's past help and future usefulness hold appeal for the Security establishments of the western world which has sought special exemption for it from the list of terrorist states. The frightening aspect of its regular army firing machine guns into Somali demonstrators and killing 23 people in the name of UN Peace keeping force is unforgettable.

The consistency of US policy on Kashmir over the years may no longer be justified in the present circumstances. The facts narrated by Alastair Lamb in the Seminar about instrument of accession on June 23-24, 1990 at Oxford University have no legal bearing, after 46 years of accession of state in India, the instrument can not be challenged.
(D) The Siachen Glacier Dispute

The Siachen Glacier boundary dispute was added to the roster of major issues in Indo-Pakistan relations for the first time in April 1984. (i) The name of Siachen signifies, A robe of garden’. The area which is an ideal mountaineering ground, is the largest glacier region in the world outside the polar region.  

The Siachen glacier is hemmed in by the Saltoro Ridge line, an offshoot of the Kara Korams, to the West and the main Kakakoram range to the West and the main Kakakoram range to the East. The Saltoro ridge line originates from Sia Kaugri at a height of 24500 feet and has an attitude bracket of 19,000 to 24,000 feet. The major passes on this line are Siala at 20,000 feet and Bilefond La at 18,500 feet. It forms a watershed and is the focal point of the current conflict in the area. The Siachen glacier is 76.4 km long. It is the second largest glacier in the world. It originates from India Col. The Nubre river originates from its snout and flows south till it meets the Shyok river. To the West of the Saltoro Ridge line lies Pak occupied Baltistan sprawling in the Karakoram under whose shadow lie the Gilgit and Skardu areas. In the North East lies the Shakesgam Valley, an area of 5,000 sq. km. ceded illegally by Pakistan to China in 1963. To the East of Karakorams lies Aksai chin under Chinese control.


The root cause of the problem is the non-demarcation of the line of control (LC). After the Karachi Agreement in 1949, the Cease Fire Line was demarcated only to N/9842. Pakistan claims the LC to be in a direct straight line joining N/9842 to Karakoram Pass North of the Indian Dault Bag Ouldi outpost. The Indian understanding of the LC is based on Terrain Configuration which runs along saltoro Ridge Line upto Sia Kaugri. India claimed that its resort to military action had been prompted by intelligence reports of an imminent move by Pakistan army. Logistical operations mounted under conditions virtually without precedent anywhere in the world, were a constant nightmare for both countries. The struggle over Siachen was linked with long fastering conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. The first war over the territory had culminated in July 1949. Karachi Agreement providing for the establishment of UN supervised cease fire line drawn between the two armies. The controversy later erupted over the wording of the agreement, specifically over the nebulous statement that the CFL from the last named location (Khor) given in the summary. Verbal description of it, moved "thence North to the Glaciers." Pakistan rejected this version and held

2. Pakistan's Forward Lines were accessible, hence its logistics were easier. Pakistan's Army Chief reported in 1989 that the cost of supporting India's Troops on the Siachen was 9 or 10 times as great as Pakistan's. The Muslim, Karachi, September 14, 1989, See also A Run checks, The High Price of Siachen, The Indian Express, New Delhi, July 2, 1989.
Area of detailed map  The Slachen Glacier and the surrounding areas.
that 1949 delimitation agreement contained no reference to to the CFL beyond No. 9842. Neither of the two wars that India and Pakistan fought in 1965 and 1971 resolved the issue, but, resorted to force of arms in 1980's. The two countries are involved in more complicate question of boundary dispute and none is ready to take smallest step towards settlement of the Siachen sector boundary conflict and the question has involved the Kashmir problem as a whole.

From January 1986 and June 1989, India and Pakistan held many rounds of talks over Siachen Glacier. The talks were started when Rajiv Gandhi was in power on Indian side and Zia ul Haq was on Pakistan's side. In India, Rajiv Gandhi was assassinated and in Pakistan Zia had been killed in an air crash but, the problem could not be solved. The face to face talks of the two on 17 December 1985 but, could not reach to definite results except the regions first nuclear confidence-building measure - not to attack each others nuclear installation.

The talks held in this connection could not prove fruitful. But, both India and Pakistan reached to the conclusion that the costs on continued military confrontation on the Glacier outstripped the pulative benefits of possession and expect to reach some emicable solution.

1. The Tashkent negotiation resulted in an agreement by the two sides to withdraw all armed forces to the position both countries held in before outbreak of hostilities, thus reaffirming CFL. The July 1972 Simla Agreement following in 1971 conflict, did not reaffirm the 1949 CFL. Accordingly a New Line of control was drawn up on a series of maps and were signed by Senior military representatives of the two countries on 11 December, 1972. Because there were no troops beyond No. 9842, the line was not further dragn.
The water dispute between India and Pakistan arose after the partition of India. Sir Radcliffe's award was basically responsible for it. The Indus-water system has six rivers, the Indus, the Jhelu, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej. Five of the six rivers have their upper reaches in India. Radcliff line cuts across the Sutlej and the Ravi while the boundary between Pakistan and Kashmir crosses the remaining three. Indus is reached by the remaining five at Punjab in West Pakistan. These rivers are so interlinked with each other by a series of canals that in case there is shortage of water in one, a main link canal can draw water from another. Before the partition, the irrigation system was treated as a whole. In 1947, when the line dividing the former province of Punjab was drawn it cut right across this system and India was given control over the headworks of the canals. The Ferozpur weir on the Sutlej river from which the Dipalpur canal takes its start is on the border in Indian territory. The sulemanki weir in the Montgomery district has its important eastern training works in Ferozpur. The headworks of the upper Bari Doad canal which irrigates both Indians and Pakistani soil are with India at Madhopur on the river Ravi. The dispute over the distribution of water arose when after the partition, India desired that the Government of Pakistan should use river water by building link canals from the western rivers. Pakistan did not like the suggestion of India and was not prepared to agree to any diminution of supplies from these and claimed her right as the lower riparian under international law.

An agreement was reached between India and Pakistan in May 1948 under which in due course Pakistan was to tap alternative source for the waters of the eastern rivers. Pakistan considered the canal waters dispute more graver than that about Kashmir, because it involved the possibility that splendidly fertile large portion of West Pakistan would be reconverted to desert and her industrious cultivators made beggars.

On April 1, 1948 India decided to close the canals crossing the border between the two countries Keith Callard described except malice.\(^1\) While discussing the impact of the dispute on the Indo-Pak relations Eugens R. Black, President of the World Bank wrote that the relations between the two along the border intermittently throughout the decade that followed Five Years after partition India and Pakistan troops were still facing each other behind sand bags and barbed wire at irrigation headworks along the frontier..... this was most likely to lead to all out war.\(^2\)

---

1. Keith Callard, Pakistan: A Political Study (London, 1957) p. 312. Also see, No war Declaration and Canal Water Dispute; Correspondence Between the Prime Minister of India and Pakistan, Karachi; Government of Pakistan, n.d., For the Indian case, see Indus-Water dispute: Facts and Figure, New Delhi, Government of India, July 1954.

A group of experts studied the problem after a tour of the Indus basin and submitted a plan in 1954. After six years of hard work the World Bank succeeded in convincing the two countries to accept a draft treaty. It was formally signed on September 19, 1960 at Rawalpindi by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan. The crux of the agreement was that India should for irrigation purposes use the three easterly stream in the basin Sutlej Beas and Ravi and Pakistan the three westerly - Chenab, Jhelum and Indus. ¹

Both the countries had made various attempts to solve the problem of the construction of a barrage by India at Farrakka. The matter is still alive.

The countries of the South Asian region share the same ecology, governed by the mighty Himalayan and same life style originating from the same cultural heritage. Based on ethnic, religious, political and other factors, the political map of the countries of this region has been drawn, but ecology remained the same. Therefore, development activities of every single division of this unit which are done on the basis of their own need is bound to put their relationship. Bangladesh, situated in a delicate region is the lower riparian of the common rivers, like deforestation and their impact on the environment, agriculture and economy of Bangladesh very much determine the relationship among the co-riparian states. It has an area of 35.85 million acres, of which about 22.85 million acres (65.77%) are cultivable. The population exceeds 110 million which makes Bangladesh one of the most densely populated regions of the world. 1

The river Ganga has highly seasonable flows. Eighty per cent of its annual flow takes place during the four months of July to October. Nearly 82% of the rainfall in the Ganges plain also occurs from June to September. Therefore, the monsoon flow is enough to meet the requirements of both the riparian. More acute problem is faced during the dry season when the flow is insufficient to meet the need of both the countries. Hence any major harnessing of the Ganges water during dry season upsets its natural equilibrium and bring about a whole chain of important and interrelated repercussion. The problem has become critical after

the diversion of its water by India from Farakka. The Farakka Barrage Project, sanctioned by the Indian government in April 1960, was to divert the water of Ganges through a feeder canal into the Bhagirathi-Hooghly river for the improvement of navigation for Calcutta port. Siltation of the Hooghly river has always been a headache for the Indian government. But, the experts, international as well as national, never considered the project a solution to this problem. M. Abbas, an expert on Ganges-water problem said, that the real purpose of the barrage is to control the river for supplying Ganges water to the Indian states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The barrage also provides a communication link across the river. More important factor is that the barrage offers to India, a political leverage in her dealings with Bangladesh.1

By 1970, the construction of the Farakka barrage was complete except the feeder canal. After the liberation war and independence of Bangladesh, some positive developments took place, viz., the creation of 'Indo-Bangladesh joint river commission' to develop the waters of the common rivers but not the question of water. Sharing and a joint declaration at the Ministerial level to augment the dry season flow, became ready for operation of Ganges by 1974 the feeder canal of the barrage.

In November, 1977, the parties entered into an interim agreement on the sharing of the Ganges dry season flow at Farakka as a short term solution to the dispute. The 1977 agreement expired on November 1982. In October 1982, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between

the countries as an interim arrangement for the sharing of
the Ganges water for the next two dry seasons instead of
renewing of 1977 agreement. The MOU also expired in May
1984. India and Bangladesh signed a fresh accord in 1985
and reiterated that the basic problems of inadequate flows
of water in the Ganga/Ganges available at Farakka during
the dry season imposes sacrificed on both countries and
that the long term solution lies in augmenting these flows.
However, the agreement was asserted by both countries.
India and Bangladesh again had talks on sharing water of
the four main rivers. Bangladesh made it clear that an
enormous amount of good political will was required to
resolve the vexed problem. The present position is that
there has been a deadlock. In pursuance of the provision
of the 1977 agreement, both India and Bangladesh came up
with their respective versions of long term solution of
the problem, neither of which is acceptable to the other.
Bangladesh rejected India’s proposal on the ground that
the link canal would divide Bangladesh, it would take away
much of her precious land and also dislocate and disrupt
a huge population and the life and will also cause a damage
to the ecological balance of the country. A huge chunk
of the land will be isolated from the main land since both
the ends of the link canal will be within the territory
of India. On the other hand, India rejected the Bangladesh
proposal on the ground that India, as a matter of policy,
would not accept the inclusion of third party in this
case, Nepal.

2. The Bangladesh Times, Dhaka, November 11, 1985, Holiday
3. The Times of India, New Delhi, November 22, 1985, Dawn
Karachi, October 19, 1985 and National Herald (New Delhi,
October 19, 1985.
4. The Indian Express, New Delhi, February 3, 1992.
Impacts

On Environment:

Change in hydrology: Due to the diversion of the Ganges there has been a change in hydrology in Bangladesh. The water level of Hardenge Bridge fell below the minimum ever recorded, i.e. 23,000 cusecs as compared to a historical average of 64,430 cusecs. The water level registered at 17 feet compared to 22 feet while the ground water level fell by 5 feet. The off take of the river Gorai, the main distributory of the Ganges is at the point of extinction due to heavy siltation.

Flood: Apart from deforestation and melting of ice in the upper region, the barrage contributed to a great extent to the flood in Bangladesh. Diversion of the silt free water into the upstream pushes a large volume of silt into the rivers down stream, thereby decrease the carrying capacity of the rivers. It has been shown in a study that 30% of the country is subject to flood due to spill over from major rivers while the flood small rivers cover about 40% area of the country.

On Socio-Political Life:

Ganges issue always played an important role in socio-political life of Bangladesh. The issue has political implication too. Government's failure to resolve the problem with India is always a matter of public resentment. Solution of Farakka barrage problem is one of the common issues in the political activities in Bangladesh.

2. Ibid.
The Boundary Dispute

"Nothing in my long political career" wrote Prime Minister Nehru to Premier Chou En-lai on October 27, 1962 "has hurt and grieved me more than the fact that the hopes and aspirations for peaceful and friendly neighbourly relations which we entertained and to promote which my colleagues in the Government of India and myself worked so hard, ever since the establishment of the Peoples Republic of China, should have been shattered by the hostile and unfriendly twist given on India-China relations during the past two years". India was astonished on the sudden unfriendly action of China to whom it went out of way to plead the cause of China in the United Nations and all along opposed all parts which were set up to isolate China.

On January 23, 1959, Chou En-lai wrote to Nehru about the 50,000 squire miles of Indian territory and claim it. In 1954, when Indian Prime Minister visited China, he mentioned to Chinese leaders that he has seen some maps showing wrong boundary between the two countries. The Chinese Prime Minister took it easy but, in 1956 when he visited India, accepted the Mc Mohon Line as the border between India and China (Map No. 4). But, on January 23, 1959 Chou En-lai wrote to Nehru, "It was true that the border question was not raised in 1954. When negotiations were being held between Chinese and Indian sides for the agreement on trade and intercourse between Tibet region of China and India. This was because conditions were not yet ripe for its settlement". In fact China obtained effective control over Tibet by that time and Chinese army was well entrenched across the border of India. China waited till his incursions into remote areas occupied parts of Indian territory. In 1957 China constructed a road across the Aksai Chin area of India and stopped
India patrolling in the occupied areas. In view of the deterioration in relations between the two countries India wrote to Chou En-lai on February 8, 1960 suggesting a meeting between the two. The meeting held on April 1960 only confirmed serious differences, but, could not be of much value.

In 1962 Chinese troops stepped up their forward patrolling in the Western sectors. In July 1962, Chinese troops encircled an Indian post in the Galwan Valley. Suddenly on September 8, 1962, Chinese troops marched across the Eastern sector which followed on October 20, 1962 by massive attack by China on western and Eastern sectors of the border, overwhelming the limited Indian Frontier Posts. Chinese attack was preplanned. Klaus Mehnert has asserted, "we must assume that the C.C. Senior also approved the plan for attacking India in Himalayas, for on October 20, 1962, less than a month after its conclusion, war broke out on the Sino-Indian border". The decision to use against India was taken at the highest level. Peoples daily came out within a week of Chinese action justifying the military action. India considered China like an aggressive power determined to humiliate its neighbour, while for China, India was a deserter from the anti Imperialist Camp.

On October 24, Prime Minister Chou En-lai put forward his three point proposal for cease fire and disengagement. However,

the net result of the Chinese invasion was a serious blow to what Soviet had gained in India. It was obvious that she (China) lost the sympathy even of the Asian people. The attack on China's newly emerging friendship with Pakistan. Her neighbour (Pakistan) a member of the aggressive SEATO pact. But with this appendage of the capitalists the CPR is now negotiating pact of friendship. Dramatically, on November 21, 1962 they announced their unilateral cease fire and withdraw 20 k.m. behind the Mc Mahon Line "the 1959 Line of actual control" in Eastern sector and 20 km. behind the line of their latest aggression in Ladakh which called "1959 line of actual control" in Western sector. The Chinese took illegal possession of 14500 sq.miles in Indian territory. Speaking about the Sino-Indian war Harold Hinton said, "India precipitated war with stronger enemy on whose disposition it had no adequate intelligence, and who had evidently made considerable effort from the autumn of 1959 to the spring of 1962 to avoid hostilities, but, who had watched the steady advance of India troops in the Western sector with growing concern". Professor John K. Galbraith took a similar view of Chinese action and said, "During the proceeding summer, there had been evidence of increasing pressure and support from various sources in India for military action do more the Chinese out of the area which they claimed. In the light of this, one can immagine the

1. It should be interesting to end this appraisal of the Sino-Indian border war with the following reflections by Galbraith on its consequence for India relations with the out side world "As a result of this episode, there has been a radical change in Indian foreign policy". This greater cautions has inevitably resulted in a considerable loss of influence. The Indians in the future will be a good deal more popular but, a good deal less powerful. Bulletin, pp. 3-4.

Chinese coming up with the notion of a major military
demonstration to show the Indian that this kind of military
policy had no future.¹

In order to break the stalemate and to provide a basis
for agreed cease-fire arrangements, the representative of
the six Afro-Asian countries (Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia,
Cambodia, UAR and Ghana) met at Colombo between 10th and 12th
December 1962 and adopted, "That these proposal which could
help in consolidating the cease-fire, once implemented
should pave the way for discussion between representatives
of both parties for the purpose of solving problems entail-
ed in the cease-fire position. India accepted the proposal
in toto but, China placed reservations. Nevertheless, some
progress was made in 1989 in the boundary dispute when both
sides agreed in the joint communique to create a favourable
climate and condition for a fair and reasonable settlement
through peaceful and friendly co-operation.² A joint
working group was set up at Vice Ministerial level which
met for first time in 1989 and it was resolved, "Not to
dwell on past differences but to look to the future in a
practice, workman like and realistic manner in order to
reach a fair, reasonable and mutually acceptable settlement
of the boundary question. Peace and Tranquility should be
main aim. Need for confidence building was recognised.³

¹ Alexeyev, A. "The Political Situation in India",
New Times, October 31, 1951.
² Lal, John, India and China : Need for give and Take",
The Times of India, January 9, 1989.
³ Ministry of External Affair, Annual Report, 1989-90,
p. 18.
After an interval of nearly 31 years, India and China agreed on September 7, 1993 on reduction of military forces along the border and leaving it to their experts to determine the alignment of the Line of Actual Control (LAC) wherever, there were differences. The agreement which laid down the framework for maintaining peace and tranquility along the LAC said the "extent, depth, timing and nature of reduction of military forces will be worked out through mutual consultations". It further asserted that "India and China will continue their search for a fair, reasonable and mutually acceptable settlement of the boundary question."  

1. The Indian Express, September 8, 1993.