CHAPTER - III

ASIA
Asia

Asia is in the process of emerging into the modern era and establishing new pattern of relationship with rest of the world. The continent's shifting from neo-colonialism to nationalism is symptomatic of a new order of affairs. Although the revolution for national independence in Asia is over, the more deep rooted "revolution of rising expectations" is proceeding. The masses of the people are beginning to be articulture - a development that has revolutionary implications for the world. Asia will play a more active role in world politics, a role more commensurate with its size, its population, and its might. Robert Payne rightly observed, "the major task of our generation is the understanding of Asia, for Asia represents potentially the mastery of the world in manpower and resources". 1

Asia is geographically divided into six major land regions, separated from one another by mountains - Northern Asia, Central Asia, Eastern Asia, South-East Asia, South-West Asia and South Asia.

South Asia

South Asia consists of India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan and Maldives. 2 This region lies South of Himalayan mountains. It is rich in natural resources. It is bounded on the North by Asiatic Russia and China, on the South by the Arabian sea, the bay of Bengal, and the Indian Ocean. On the West by Iran and on the East by Thailand and Laos. The most important of the states is India, with which Pakistan forms an enormous

---

2. See Annexure 1 to 7 for details about the countries.
peninsula commonly referred to as a sub-continent. This peninsula is joined to the great land mass of Asia ring of smaller states and is separated from the South China Sea by Burma and the Malaya Peninsula. The region contains vast human and material resources several regioned countries possess impressive political skills and military establishments to back them up. The demarcation of South Asia as a region has been achieved through South Asian Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Forum. India covers the largest area with a population of 847.1 million and Maldives islands having the highest per capita GNP of 470 US dollars. The comparative figures are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Area Sq.kms.</th>
<th>Population 1990 est.</th>
<th>GNP percentage (US dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td>1,43,999</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Thimphu</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>3,287,263</td>
<td>847.1</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Kathmandu</td>
<td>147,181</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>976,096</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>66,610</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In whole of the world there is no other region forming such natural boundaries as this sub-continent. In the North four thousand kilometers stands Himalays and

Hindu Kush ranges. The mountains separating the sub-continent from Iran, Afghanistan and the Islamic world to the West are less impressive, but are butterressed by extensive semi-arid winter lands on both sides of the frontier. South Asia is comprised of a rich mosaic of religions, languages, races and cultures and is heterogeneous in nature. Hindus are the majority community in India and Nepal, Muslims are in majority in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Maldives and in minority in India and Nepal. The distribution of linguistic ethnic communities across the state system in South Asia makes harder the problems caused by religious heterogeneity. Bengalis, both Hindus and Muslims constitute about 98% of the populations of Bangladesh, large number of people in West Bengal and Tripura in India, and a good number in Assam, Punjabi speakers form about two-thirds of this population in Pakistan and Punjab and Haryana states of India. Urdu the national language of Pakistan is the home language of more families in India than in Pakistan. There are Hindi speakers in Nepal, Nepali speakers in India and Bhutan, Tamil speakers in Sri Lanka, and English is used as a common language even after forty six years of independence.

It was India's status the principal enterpor in a complicated but, highly profitable oceanic trade structure that made the Western and Southern coastal areas of South Asia, so vital to a succession of maritime empires, from the West Asian Muslims Commercial entities in the eleventh to fourteenth centuries to the Portuguese, Dutch, French and British colonial powers in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. India became the jewel in the crown of the British Empire in Asia due to its role as the fulcrum, upon which the British Imperial and commercial system in Asia was balanced, with the result that external world dares to intrude upon South Asia.
At least 23 major languages and several hundred minor languages and dialects are spoken throughout the region and the foreign policies of each region in South Asia are separate.

Nationalism in South Asia

The power equilibrium which prevailed throughout most of the Asia at the turn of century was shattered due to the national consciousness of the Asian people and weakness of the colonial powers. Invasion of Manchuria by Japan in 1931 inaugurated a campaign of expansion in Asia and created the opportunities which culminated world war II. Japanese slogan "Asia for the Asians" had explosive effects which lasted long after the sun of Nippon had set in the waters of the pacific. The defeat of Japan created a vacuum in the international balance of power in the Far East and United States and Soviet Union rushed to fill the vacuum. Howsoever, US could not raise its suitability in Asian continent and reservoir of goodwill has reached a new low. Besides, the United States has never before been so deeply involved in Asian affairs; her influence is considerable, even if her objective and intentions are often misunderstood and her policies and action widely criticized. The Asian nationalism which confronts the world today is, ideologically and emotionally considered, not an internal dynamic springing from the older pre-modern Asian cultures. It is, instead, an entirely valid response to massive Western emotional and spiritual demands. ¹ Japan for instance, was the first of the Asian countries to be influenced by modern nationalism.

---

strongly flavoured by traditional practices and beliefs. What happened under Mac Arthur in Japan has paved the way for the insurgance of Japanese, Ultra nationalism. In addition, the growth of modern nationalism in China has been very great. The concept of one nation among many was foreign to Chinese tradition. Positive Chinese nationalism however, goes back to the late years of Manchu Rule and from the Revolution of 1911-12. Its greatest leader was Dr. Sun Yat Sen the father of the Chinese Republic. Chiang-Kai-Shek also promoted the ideology of Nationalism. He said, "In order to enable to pass from instability to safety it is necessary that education throughout the country focus on the concept of state hood, and place the ideology of nationalism before anything else".

In India Revolt of 1857 was the first organised expression of anti-foreign sentiments. The birth of nationalism may be dated back to the formation of Indian National Congress in 1885. The congress soon became the dynamic, consolidated expression of Indian nationalism. In 1920 Gandhi launched a campaign of non-violence and force were resorted to by some of his non-followers. Both Gandhi and Tagore subordinated the idea of Nationalisms', as representing the political power and economic mastery of the state, to the less materialistic and more spiritual conception

1. Yoshide Shoin and a few of his disciples who became leaders of Melji Japan exposed views which might be described as nationalistic or even ultranationalistic in the mid nineteenth century. Japanese Nationalism and Expansionism. The American Historical Review, LX (July 1955), pp. 820-821.


that nationalism means the well-being development and unity of its people. While addressing the joint session of congress in May 17, 1956, Sukarno, President of Indonesia declared that, "Nationalism may be an out of date doctrine for many in this world, for us of Asia and Africa, it is the main-spring of our efforts understand that, and you have the key to much of post-War history".

Thus, nationalism has proved a dynamic force in Asia. It played an important part in the independence of the Asian countries. It was the importation from abroad. The origin of nationalisms in Asia was in the nature of a rebound from the European imperialism of the last century.

India achieved the freedom in 1947 but, at the cost of partition the Chinese attack on India in 1962 was a threat to India's security which, however glorious, India acquired through the war, results of 1971 with Pakistan, Nehru said that "Nationalism has a place in each country and should be fostered, but, it need not be allowed to become aggressive and come in the way of International developments".

(C) The Security of South Asia

The strategic importance of South Asia lies in its geographical location as also its political, cultural and ethnic structure. South Asia lies in the center of two volatile regions of West Asia and South-East Asia and dominates the vital Sea Communication between the West and

East. A nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war. Stanley Hoffman has defined national security as the "protection of a nation from physical attack and safeguarding its economic activities from devastating outside blows." Arnold Wolters pleaded the security as a value of which a nation can aspire to have in greater or lesser measures. It has much in common in this respect with power or wealth, two other values of great importance in international affairs. But, while wealth measures amount of a nation's material possession and power its ability to control the actions of others, security in an objective sense measures the absence of threats that such values will be attacked.

The meaning and nature of security differs from nation to nation as each of them face a distinct type of threat. The nations which are strong though, their security surrounds towards protecting the external threat. The nations which are weak, they had to face a generated threat in their domestic sphere. The third world nations fall under the latter conditions which don't have or have failed to generate a domestically strong political and social consensus to eliminate large scale use of force as a major and continuing element in the domestic political and social life

Speculation about the future of South Asian security, says Thomas P. Thoranton, can be discouraging because the range of this future seems to be between the desirable and unacceptable. Despite its lack of formal institutions or even the objectives South Asia definitely constitutes a system. With the cold war having shifted to the Asian sub-continent, South Asia and South East Asia fall as a region of interest to the super powers. Most of the maritime sea routes pass through the hemisphere and admittedly this industrially under-developed region is rich in manpower, natural resources and therefore a good market to the foreign powers and have increased the importance of the sub-continent from strategic point of view.

The Soviet intervention and presence in the Asian region has proved to be more effective and durable than those of its two rivals, the United States and China. After the demise of USSR, the Chinese policy of "no peace no war" has affected the balance of power in the region. The Chinese view of the external world has designed the complex historical geographical and other factors that have constituted to a military doctrine emphasizing a strategy for defence against invasion by superior enemy forces. China is following it through large conventional forces capable of fighting a protected war and a credible nuclear retaliatory capability. China's nuclear forces and the doctrine of peoples

war are pillars of Chinese deterrence. China's primary strategic area lies in its neighbouring region, with which it shares common boundaries.

The cold war between the East and the West, principally between United States and Soviet Union was fought on many fronts, such as monolithic communist block one side and the containment of communism on the other. It went through a period of rivalry and confrontation between NATO and Warsaw Pact. In 1985 Gorbachev declaring the policy said that our Asia-Pacific platform is originally linked with our programme of stopping the arms race and liquidating the nuclear threat to man kind.¹ In terms of India's security concerns, the Soviet Union played a dual role as a direct supplier of arms and a licensor of certain classes of military hardware produced in India.

Both the United States and the USSR regarded India as the preponderant power in South Asia, but, Chinese stake in some South Asian countries precluded it from considering India in the same light. Japan too began to take interest in South Asia. The Japanese Prime Minister in May 1979 expressed that the development of friendly relations between Japan and China as between the United States and China have broadened the foundation for our Asian policies. Japan will act in close concert with United States and Western Europe to extend appropriate cooperation to China's economic development efforts.²

---


Robert H. Donaldson observed, "The 1971 Indo-Soviet Treaty was perceived by Moscow not simply as a guarantor of India's preponderance over Pakistan but as a symbol of 'a special relationship' between itself and the New Delhi aimed at jointly balancing the regional influences of Peking and Moscow.¹ In the changing world order, the Indo-Soviet Treaty and Pakistan alliance with US have lost their importance. Pakistan's value as a strategic ally of the US has too been reduced due to end of Afghanistan war and has come within the ambit of the Pressler Amendment.

(d) Internal Security Dimensions:

There are winds of change, blowing across South Asia, but some of these are having effect of reviving old traditions and of giving new importance to old institutions like caste, community and religion. The extent of separation of powers, the freedom of mass media, individual rights of expression and conscience, the standards of living of the masses, geographical and social mobility are some of the participatory characters of political system. The countries of South Asia have mixed boundaries like Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, Nepal and Pakistan having common border with India separately and individually in terms of their cultural identities, economic patterns, philosophical trends and historical experience. Conversely there is a bit of India in every other country of South Asia.² Pakistani leaders tend to forget that - India - a much larger country has common border not only with Pakistan, but also with a number of


The genesis of regional cooperation in South Asia can be traced to 1945 when Jawahar Lal Nehru had advocated the need to establish South Asian federation for unity, peace and progress in the region. The initial conference was convened in New Delhi in March 1947. Nehru emphasized the need of cooperation to find solution for the common problems, and said:

"The countries of Asia, we must remember, are very backward and the standards of living are appallingly low. These economic problems demand urgent solution or else crisis and disaster may overwhelm us. We have therefore, to think in terms of the common man and fashion our political, social and economic structure so that the burdens that have crushed him may be removed and may have full opportunities for growth".1

Substantial progress was made in this regard because the Asian continent was denied against itself. The growth of militarization in various parts of the world also contributed to undermining the process of regional cooperation. The political and social structure of newly emerging nations also began to disintegrate due to their internal weaknesses and external intervention.2

One of the most significant facets of contemporary international politics has been the proliferation of regional groups whereby most of the regions of the globe have been covered. In fact the whole of Europe (East and West), America (both North and South) Africa and the Arab world and South East Asia have been covered by distinct regional groups. The NATO, the EEC, the OAU, the ASEAN

1. Nehru, Jawahar Lal, India's Foreign Policy, Selected Speeches, September, 1946 - April 1961, New Delhi, p.29.
2. Professor Rajni Kothari perceptively observes that due to "a growing permeation of the super powers tempo of militarization has accentuated a sense of insecurity and mutual suspicion compelled them to choose to encircle the global, Rajni Kothari, State and Nation Building in the Third World, Bombay, 1976, p. 8.
and LAFTA are some of the important regional organisations which emerged after the second world war. The progress of SAARC is based upon the proximity of ASEAN and the general influence of the cautious approach of the ECAFE/ESCAP philosophy of regionalism that has influenced the general thinking of the Asian bureaucrats. Regional cooperation has emerged as an important factor during the post second world war period. Post colonial countries tended together in many groups. There are forty five such groupings among the developing and less developed nations, five in Asia, eleven in Latin America and Caribbean, nineteen in Africa and ten of inter-regional nature.

In the regional and inter regional cooperation the main force lies in the urge to ensure the participants and to create confidence about their interest and safety. Although in the intra-regional and inter-regional cooperation the states are the dominant participants, but the interaction process, to a great extent, is influenced by the "intrusive forces". The external powers play a great part in shaping the nature of the cooperation.

South Asian countries have many problems of mass poverty, hunger, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy and dogmatism. On the other hand, the high level of inflation and the increasing rate of unemployment have accentuated domestic problems.¹ The reluctance on the part of the developed world to increase Official Development Assistance (ODA) on liberal terms have led Third World leaders to believe that greater south-south cooperation is essential despite their inherent handicaps and limitations.²

¹. Jackson, A. Robert, South Asian Crisis : India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, New Delhi, 1978, p. 103.
The acronym SAARC was adopted only after the first summit of heads of state and government held in Dhaka on 7–8 December 1985. The proposal for establishing a regional forum of seven South Asian States—Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka—was originally made by President Ziaur Rahman of Bangladesh in May 1980 and was followed by working paper circulated by his country entitled "The proposal for Regional Cooperation in South Asia" in November 1980. The modus operandi for South Asian regionalism was eventually worked out through the meetings held up at foreign Secretariat level, beginning on April 1981. In August 1983, President Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan observed "It would be benificial for us all to make a collective pledge, renouncing the threat or use of force against one another."¹

At the same occasion Jigme Singyene Wangchuk King of Bhutan reiterated that,

"In the geo-political realities of our region, it would be unrealistic to ignore the primary of the political factor, as, in the final analysis, it would be political environment of the region, which will determine the shape and scope of the regional cooperation in South Asia. The main obstacle is not only to overcome the psychological and emotional barriers of the past but the fears, anxieties and apprehensions of the present."²

The foreign ministers of the seven countries issued a Declaration on South Asian regional cooperation (SARC) which defined objectives and principles and the institutional and financial arrangements for the new organization.

¹. Address by General Mohammed Zia ul Haq, President Islamic Republic of Pakistan at SAARC Summit Meeting December 7, 1985, p. 7.
². Address of His Majesty Jigme Singye Wangchuk, King of Bhutan to the First SAARC Summit Meeting, Dhaka, 7–8 December 1985.
In the Second Summit Meeting Rajiv Gandhi putting emphasis on regional cooperation summarised -

"The important statements made by each one of you yesterday, and the discussions that followed at Nandi Hills, showed that you at the mechanisms of regional cooperation and meshing into gear, matters of grave national import, have impinged upon and permeated our deliberations - peace, stability and security, confidence building and nuclear threat, non-violent and co-existence, the un-mitigated evil of terrorism. The lesson to be drawn is that the pertinent building of regional cooperation in identified areas of cooperation must take place in an atmosphere of good neighbourliness and responsible international behaviour".

South Asia represents one of the largest contiguous geographical unity of strategic importance with a vast population. Each country of the region has its own fears and apprehensions. The region has a tormented and Iranmatic history of conflicts and clavages. Between India and Pakistan three wars have been fought. Besides several border clashes, the region is prone to ethnic tensions and troubles. Any step by the small countries for any regional cooperation may be a cause of countervailing mechanism and the same on the part of India "runs the risk of being instantly perceived by others particularly Pakistan, as yet another manifestation of India's hegemonism".

In fact, India, which commands more than 70 per cent of the land area population and national income of the region, does not need any regional cooperation when it has the capacity to act alone independently and any move by India for regional cooperation is understandable. In

1. Pande, Raja Ram, "Recent Development in South Asia", Asia Pacific Community, A Quarterly Review, Spring 1984, No. 24, Tokyo, p. 54.
fact, it was a widespread opinion that India should be generous towards his neighbour countries. Selig Harrison suggested,

"India should begin to show a spirit of large heartedness and magnanimity that it has rarely displayed in dealing with its smaller neighbours. Indeed, in the absence of such a spirit, New Delhi is unlikely to win enduring acceptance of its regional preponderance regardless of the degree of military superiority it achieves."

The process of South Asian Regional Cooperation was initiated by the late President Zia-ur-Rehman of Bangladesh in 1980. The South Asian countries were of the view that they are being exploited of the "Unholy alliance" of power, privilege and technology. The initiative of a regional cooperation may be traced to the developments of late seventies when the international economic situation had become difficult for South Asian and there was much enthusiasm to explore South Asian cooperation. The position of Bangladesh at that time was complex due to Gangawater dispute between India and Bangladesh. King Birendra endorsed the idea of regional cooperation in his inaugural address to the Colombo Plan. In a consultative meeting he asked for cooperation among Asian countries such as India, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh and China. The western elite also supported the idea of regional cooperation when they visited South Asia in 1978. South Asian academia also undertook studies of various dimensions of cooperation for development in South Asia with the financial backing of

international agencies including Western foundations. The defeat of Mrs. Gandhi in the elections and overthrow of ZA Bhutto in Pakistan also encouraged formation of an institution for regional cooperation. The Carter Doctrine in January 1980 for cooperative regional security framework gave birth to the SAARC in South Asia and GCC (Gulf Cooperative Council) in Persian Gulf.

**Indias Support for the SAARC**

The Indian ruling elite have planned foreign policy of the country with clear-cut objectives viz. national security, friendship with neighbours, development and world peace. SAARC can be considered as an offspring of NAM because it gave a major thrust to South-South cooperation and Economic Cooperation and Development Countries (ECDC).

India's rulers have reiterated on many occasions that they respect the independence, autonomy and sovereignty of other South Asian countries. India has tried to assuage fears of the smaller nations that it does not want to harbour ulterior motives. India agreed to exchange scientific and technical knowledge with its neighbours in fields of health and population control. It also assured to cooperate curb chronic diseases and agreed to formulate research prospects to conduct in-depth studies so that impending natural disasters could be avoided. On a non-governmental basis India has agreed to expend cooperation in Trade and Industry. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi reiterated "Indians commitment to "search for peaceful and cooperative relations" with the neighbours, India also gave assurance to other nations of the sub-continent that India will settle bilateral problems through friendly and peaceful negotiations. However, South Asia bears a unique psycho-politics.

---

1. Committee in studies for cooperation in Development in South Asia (CSCD) has set up at Colombo.
Pran Chopra has rightly observed "Far from facilitating regional cooperation the overhang of history has cast a shadow upon South Asia, creating a fog of mistrust in which the problems of the centrality of India and the disparity between India and its neighbours form even larger than life". Chopra further states that "although nature has created the Indian sub-continent as a single strategic whole, and although relevant parts of the subcontinent have been single strategic area for long periods in the past, during the past four decades inter-country relations throughout South Asia have been poisoned by conflicting perceptions of threat".

There are four types of conflicting perceptions of perceived threat in South Asia. In the first type, a South Asian country feels threatened by another directly and believes itself to be the victim of actual or potential aggression by the latter. In the second type a South Asian country under threat from a country outside South Asia suspects the latter has an accomplice or a proxy within South Asia. The third type is the intrusive of super powers rivalries into South Asia which make or are seen to move one South Asia country an enemy of another. The fourth the most pernicious types interest with each other and reinforce all of them.

India is the lynchpin of South Asian cooperation. India has not made clear its role in regional affairs and this is because the other member nations of the SAARC consider India as "prudent for a functional approach to regional cooperation". In order to face their past boldly and

2. Ibid.
tackle the present with sincere mutual understanding and trust under-writing one another's sovereignty and independence, regional cooperation is essential. The external powers are powerful only due to our past failures and bickerings.

SAARC cannot remain a closed system to impervious to external influence. Therefore, it should effectively use the positive elements for the common interest while trying to shield it from the negative ones. External actors which can have an influence on the functioning of the organization include foreign governments, regional and international organizations and transnational corporations. On the negative side these forces have been blamed for either attempting to undermine the process of cooperation, itself or using it for their own purpose. On the positive side these actors offer incentives which regional organizations in the third world need the most for an effective operation funds, talented manpower and ideas. In a nutshell it will be necessary to search for a broad based system which will be less dependent on the political structure of relations among the member countries for continued viability.

The SAARC countries have entered into a South Asian Preferential Trade Agreement at Dhaka on April 11, 1993. The trade blocs in the world like EEC, ASEAN, NAFTA are functioning according to their plan despite all sort of conflicts but SAARC has not moved even a few paces forward despite its 7 years old existence.

---

All the seven countries - Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka continue to remain in the same positions they enjoyed seven years back. The clear anti-India stance of the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC) at Karachi on April 27-29, 1993 Pakistan continued to promote cross-border terrorism and violence in Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and other parts of India.

The South Asian region has a total population of 130 crores people. SAARC enjoys 22% of the world’s fossil and fuel deposits, 460 cubic kilometers of renewable water resource, 86 million hectares of the forest cover, 250 million hectares of the farm land, largest Animal population and abundance of milk. The total import by SAARC countries was around US $ 38 billion in 1990.¹

The members of the South Asian countries have many commonalities - cultural heritage social habits and religions equity. There are vast possibility of cooperation on many fronts. India produces 15 per cent of the Iron ore and exports major part of it while Pakistan imports Iran from Australia, Canada, Brazil and Liberia at a higher price. Similarly, Sri Lanka exports 120000 tonnes of natural rubber every year and India imports nearly 40000 tonnes of rubber from Malaysia and a deal may pave good foreign currency. Pakistan imports tea from Kenya, China and Indonesia while Indian tea will prove less costly and of better quality. India exports coffee and Sri Lanka imports coffee from Ivory coast but the both countries could not come to terms.

THE SAARC has failed a economic front to achieve any fruitful results as well as have failed totally on political front.

¹. Hindustan Times, June 20, 1993.
There was a time when, except India and Vietnam, the Soviet Union had no friends in Asia. Now, there is no Soviet Union, as friends to fall back to. With the end of ideologiation of international relations, the Russians are not seen as adversaries or even a threat, by anyone in Asia. Regional security in South Asia to be based on multilateral de-escalation of military confrontation than collective security has to envisage full participation by extra-regional actors of the multipolar world. ¹ Jawahar Lal Nehru's dream for independent India was to keep it out of maelstrom of power play, tension and conflict that had affected the history of nations. ²

Neither of the so-called superpowers were able to use their overwhelming military and economic resources for purposes of effectively projecting power or controlling developments in regional conflict situations in the third world. Neither superpower was able to dictate terms to its allies or clients. Although both could provide assistance in ways which exacerbated local or regional tensions, neither was really able to resolve those tensions in ways favourable to its own objectives. At the same time bilateral relations of the US and the Soviet Union were restricted because of the dangers of nuclear confrontation which was recognised by President Mikhail Gorbachev and his advisors and lay, in part at least, at the base of the shift in Soviet Policy.

---

While new thinking in Soviet policy was resulting in rather dramatic shifts in Soviet foreign policy behaviour, the US began to reassess its own position. Prior to the end of the superpower confrontation and of the cold war, US policy throughout the third world, for example, had been influenced to a substantial degree by a concern for Soviet expansion and of its influence in regions viewed as important or essential for overall US interests. This "zero sum" approach to relationship in the Third World had characterized both US and Soviet policy until the late 1980s.

By the summer of 1991, even prior to the aborted coup in Moscow, the US-Soviet relationship had changed dramatically. Soviet policy was committed to expanding economic and political relationships with the US and its western allies as an essential component of economic and political rehabilitation at home. Rather than competing with the US for influence across the Third World something which had characterized Soviet policy for more than three decades - the Soviet leadership increasingly sought to cooperate with the US in resolving regional conflicts. This was most evident in Soviet political support for the US and UN, in the Persian Gulf crisis of 1990-91.¹

The year 1989 proved to be a watershed, in terms of the transformation of the global scene, with major changes taking place in many parts of the world. The Soviet Union completed the withdrawal of its forces from Afghanistan in February 1989. By the middle of the year, Eastern Europe

was in ferment, with communist regimes tottering and collapsing in the Warsaw Pact countries as the democratic movement gained a hold on countries no longer afraid of Soviet-backed repression. The collapse of the Berlin-Wall became a milestone in European history and the reunification of Germany which had looked a distant dream, materialised in 1990 with the acquiescence of Moscow. The effects of the democratic movement were felt also in China, where demonstrations by students and young workers were tolerated in major cities till they became violent and destructive, and were suppressed in June in the Tiananmen Square of Beijing in a manner that attracted Western sanctions.

The Bush-Gorbachev summit towards the end of the year proclaimed the end of the cold war, and public opinion in the United States, deeply agitated over massive budgetary deficits and neglect of domestic economic issues, vociferously demanded a scaling down of U.S. commitments and expenditures abroad. As the decade of the 1990s began, a significant reordering of policies and priorities by the US came into evidence. Following the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, the relevance and purpose of the NATO alliance came into question. However, it was felt by all the members that the plans and structures achieved over four decades should not be abandoned, particularly as the world order was in a state of flux, and possible future threats to peace and stability could not be ignored.

With the communist bloc in disarray, and the Soviet model of political and economic management discredited, Western analysts and policy-makers saw the need to reassess future threats to the interests of the capitalist world. With a substantial input by powerful Jewish and Indian lobbies which are specially influential in the media and in centres of learning (there being an estimated 800,000
Indian scholars and scientists in the US alone), Islamic fundamentalism was identified as the main ideological challenge, taking the clue from the rhetoric used in Iran after the Islamic revolution of 1979.

A second potential threat centred on the spread of military technology to developing countries, notably those in the West and South Asia. When this strand of thinking is linked to the first one, concerning the Islamic fundamentalist threat, the Muslim countries are perceived as being the greater potential menace. This explains why pressure was built up against Pakistan to conform to nuclear safeguards while India had demonstrated its nuclear capability in 1974, began to be seen as a potential partner. A suspicion persisted among influential segments of US and European intelligentsia that the Islamic countries might pass high-technology secrets to each other, whereas such a risk hardly existed in the case of India, so that it had to be viewed as an aspiring regional-hegemony whose perceptions could be harmonised with those of the United States.

Some Asian countries are now faced both by challenges and opportunities and, consequently, their incertitude is not surprising. There are potential sources of instability in the changing international relations and unpredictability may generate destabilization and various ethnic identities which are now going to be a major international security problem for the countries of South Asia.¹

Most of the South Asian elites have frequently ascribed their regional problems to the cold war. The South Asian states inherited problem peculiar to decolonized societies. These included disputed borders and backward economies. The brutal nature of the birth of some of these countries made conflict an inherent part of regional relationships. The initial years of the cold war confused the priorities of these states. The exaggerated claims of capitalism and communism made them dependent on the mechanism of nonalignment. Conflict in South Asia was never generic to the cold war but became subject to alignment.

There were a series of conflicts at regional level. The conflicts arising out of disputed areas, "lines of control" instead of international borders, nationalities with multiple loyalties, and religions, cutting across international boundaries of hostile and not so friendly states, were irrespective of the cold war. Though the cold war has ended as a model of relationship between the US and the former USSR, it remains valid elsewhere both as an academic concept and an international strategy.

The bipolar division of the world had been harmful to the interests of the new states. A mutual rivalry of big powers was anticipated by Nehru, Long before the advent of the cold war when he was at the helm of affairs. Nehru perceived this before the advent of the cold war and the birth of Pakistan which is indicative of a theoretical awareness that conflict elsewhere would imply peace in the region. After independence the ruling elite of South Asia did lament about bipolar divisions and the cold war more as a rhetoric. This included the concept of nonalignment which frequently became an instrument and a technique for

1. Jawaher Lal Nehru, Young India, September, 1936.
gaining moral stature and material benefits. In times of peace it sheltered them from partisan politics and fetched economic and military aid from both Washington and Moscow; a more realistic idea in regional relations needed to be evolved independent of cliches of neo-imperialism ideological hegemonies and political exploitation.

Brief, all the South Asian states, face problems of ethnic, religious and linguistic character that posed challenges of their national political order and integration and further hinder the process of cooperation among them. In the case of China despite her conventional superiority India can tackle a conventional threat, if the conflict reaches the plains in the northeast as happened by the possession of nuclear weapon. Second, it would condition Chinese conventional options. As for Pakistan, conventional superiority as well as the possession of a nuclear weapon is deterrent enough. The unintended fallout of this, could be that Pakistan would desist from aiding the terrorists across the border. Even if their stance is demonstrated as a peace move, India's nuclear weapons would have done more good than the critics would have imagined. But, if we are not a nuclear power, Pakistan can attack India with the confidence that it has a nuclear weapon. Since all the wars between India and Pakistan have been started by Pakistan, an Indian nuclear weapon will deter Pakistan, what a massive conventional superiority could not be attained in the past, a small nuclear weapon could do in the future.

There have been five powers affecting the events in South Asia. Various ethnic identities are now going to be a major international security problem for the countries of South Asia.¹ A security doctrine for India will need to

---

spell out the threats to her security and the appropriate Indian responses. The two main adversaries China and Pakistan and their respective strength would determine its broad parameters.

**Implications for India-Pakistan Relations**

South Asia assumed importance as an international sub-system with the withdrawal of the British and a number of new states emerged which were either parts of the British empire or were its protectorates. India's problem with Pakistan is different from its problem with other states. The present state of tension in South Asia may be viewed against the background of India-Pakistan relations. These are the two major countries which account for most of South Asian policy. The Kashmir problem became more and more complicated due to the cold war between USA and USSR. However, of late, with its end, no major player in international politics at the moment follows original political and military strategic interest in the region. The end of the cold war, thus, not only changed relations between the West and East, but virtually the whole nature of international relations with implication for US and South Asia. Recently a Clinton administration official said, "The issue of Kashmir is complex and multifaceted and "we urge both India and Pakistan to get to business" in resolving it in line with the Simla Accord. "We cannot, however, solve the Kashmir problem for them, just as we cannot solve the Arab-Israeli problem".
In the past few years the world has changed and a cloud of uncertainty and antiquity has arisen. The easing of the super powers and the crumbling of the communist order has widely changed the world strategy but the main demographic trends are unchanged and in terms of the geography of the world panes of communications, continents and ocean look the same as at the height of the cold war. The cold war thaw has generated regional power centres in the third world that have increased the risk of conflict and also generated arms race based on the dynamics of action-reaction. This trend is disturbing enough for the peace of the region in case of sophisticated conventional weapons. It is extremely worrisome for the world and South Asia is one such theatre where the chronic problems still persist.\(^1\)

As a result of the pressure of domestic public opinion in the West, and Russia to reduce nuclear stock piles, and, partly as a result of the momentum of arms control efforts, Washington and Moscow signed a series of agreements reducing their nuclear stock piles. The first Bush, Yeltsin Summit in Washington in June 1992 advanced the process of army control. The Charter was signed on June 17, 1992 and was the landmark in controlling strategic weapons and prescribed a deeper cut to reduce warheads 3500 US and Russia 3000 i.e. a reduction of 70 percent was considered to be implemented by 2003. The Bush-Gorbachev and Bush-Yeltsin initiatives concerning nuclear weapons in the autumn of 1991/winter of 1992 potentially are a great boost to the world disarmament process. Not only do they represent a move towards a substantial denuclearization of the former Soviet Union and the United States ground forces and surface navies, curtailment of armed forces and decreasing military

---

efforts, Washington and Moscow signed a series of agreements reducing their nuclear stockpiles. The first Bush, Yeltsin Summit in Washington in June 1992 advanced the process of army control. The Charter was signed on June 17, 1992 and was the landmark in controlling strategic weapons and prescribed a deeper cut to reduce warheads 3500 US and Russia 3000 i.e. a reduction of 70 percent was considered to be implemented by 2003. The Bush-Gorbachev and Bush-Yeltsin initiatives concerning nuclear weapons in the autumn of 1991/winter of 1992 potentially are a great boost to the world disarmament process. Not only do they represent a move towards a substantial denuclearization of the former Soviet Union and the United States ground forces and surface navies, curtailment of armed forces and decreasing military budgets, they signify a radical twin form the arms competition between the two sides to effective cooperation and even partnership in disarmament.¹

President Bush also announced that all tactical nuclear weapons outside the United States have been finally withdrawn. The withdrawal of 2400 war-heads and missiles weapons was part of the START Agreement signed in 1990, but, its implementation was delayed due to disintegration of Soviet Union. These arms control and disarmament measures aimed at reducing nuclear stockpiles, eroded a objection of the non-NPT states, against the treaty. Joseph S. Nye Jr. a former White House official, observed that Nuclear proliferation, if not contained would have a dissolvent effect on international relations and increase the prospects of terrorist nuclear attack".

The older proliferation problem between the two edge of Asia lies in South Asia and the continuing competition between India and Pakistan. In testimony before the Congress, reported by the New York Times of 21 January 1991, CIA Director Robert Gates made the following assessment.

"We see South Asia at the precipice of a nuclear weapons race. Within the next five years, both sides will have medium-range missiles. Each side will have to resume the worst of each other. And this is destabilizing because of the hair-trigger nature of these missiles in times of tension... not only do both countries have nuclear weapon and ballistic missile programme; they have recently pursued chemical weapons as well. These programmes are particularly worrisome because of constant tension and conflict in Kashmir."

The implications of Director Gates assessment are clear. Imagine the following scenario by General K. Sunderjii in the 30 November, 1990 edition of India Today.

"Pakistan has escalated its efforts at subversion and guerrilla warfare in Jammu and Kashmir to a high pitch. Though technically still covert, its involvement is almost open. Pakistan has also threatened that if India goes through with its declared conventional strategy of carrying the war into Pakistan territory in the plains, all means would be used to defeat implying the use of nuclear weapons. Will through with its conventional counter offensive in the plains? Will Pakistans nuclear bluff be called?"

Since 1985, the provisions of United States assistance to Pakistan has depended on a Presidential certification to congress that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear
explosive device. The certificate for fiscal year 1991 was not given. As a result since October 1990, the United States has provided no new economic or military assistance to Pakistan which amounted to some $600 million annually.

The then Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri while refusing to change from the Nehru path of using atomic energy for peaceful purpose in a subtle departure from the earlier position stated at his party's conference in Durgapur, in January 1965, that "I can not say anything about the future but, our present policy is not to manufacture the atom bomb, but to develop nuclear energy for constructive purposes". 1 Evolution for India's first nuclear power station took place in 1961 and the legal instrument for the most tangible demonstration of Indo-US nuclear cooperation was the "Agreement of the Tarapur Atomic Station (TAPS), signed on 8th August 1963." 2

The Sino-Indian conflict of 1962 and the subsequent Chinese explosion in 1974 generated a strong desire in India to obtain nuclear weapon capability. During this period relations of India and Pakistan were harsh because of the Chinese Border Agreement 1963. This also forced India to undertake changes in its defence policy. Indian nuclear aspirations and modernization programme brought India and Pakistan to a cross road. Simultaneously, Pakistan also made up its mind to consider possibility of nuclear weapon

programme. The dis-integration of Pakistan and India's peaceful nuclear explosion in 1974 characterized the emergence of India as a dominant force in Asia. After three weeks of the Indian explosion, Z.A. Bhutto said that "Pakistan would eat grass" if necessary, to acquire its nuclear deterrence. Bhutto was the first to think about an Islamic bomb and emphasized that the Christian, Jewish and Hindu civilization have their nuclear capabilities, the Islamic civilization alone was without it."

Pakistan along with some Western powers charged India for violation of the solemn agreement made with Canada for the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only. She maintained that India had misused its atomic power plants under the very nose of their foreign benefactors. Pakistans Foreign Secretary told a 25 nation disarmament conference held at Geneva on 23rd May 1974 that the Indian explosion has given a death blow to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and the road has been thrown open for emergence of more nuclear powers. Speaking in favour of Pakistan, New York Times propagated that Pakistan is under great pressure from the Soviet Union a sharply increased in recent months and needs outside support to continue to resist this pressure.

In view of the sentiments, present nuclear policy has benefited Pakistan. Pakistan has deliberately maintained ambiguity regarding its nuclear weapons programme although it can build a bomb whenever it wishes. It is also clear

that if Pakistan declares its nuclear option, India will also use its option and a Pakistani Bomb will not only legitimate Indian bomb but, will accelerate an arma race which will destabilize, the strategic balance of the subcontinent.

In February 1993, Pakistan officially admitted that it possessed requisite components to assemble at least one nuclear device. Russian Foreign intelligence service placed before the US Senate Committee that "Pakistan is at presente" estimated to possess four to seven nuclear bombs. The report further added that, "India may be classified as being among the countries which unofficially possessed nuclear weapons."

Pakistan's military nuclear programme was started in the middle of the seventies and was initially oriented towards uranium as a means. The uranium enrichment plant at Kahuta can produce high quality uranium to manufacture 122 nuclear bombs every year. But, Pakistan's Foreign Secretary claimed that Pakistan's nuclear programme had been frozen on the level of 1989 and not 1990. Pakistan entered the nuclear field much later and its programme is much smaller compared to India. India was the first among the developing countries to launch a long range atomic development programme, soon after independence in 1947. Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission was established in 1958 and got low priority until 1972. India acquired its first

---

1. The Indian Express, New Delhi, February 26, 1993.
2. Ibid.
3. The Indian Express, New Delhi, February 26, 1993.
research reactor Apsara in Trombay in 1956, while Pakistan got it in 1965. On 30 March, 1987 General Zia told Times Magazine "You can virtually write today that Pakistan can build a nuclear bomb whenever it wishes to what is difficult about the bomb? Once you have, the technology which Pakistan has, you can do what ever you like." 1 In December 1990 the former Vice Chief of Army Staff K.M. Arif told BBC, "Nuclear proliferation has already occurred in South Asia. The atomic weapon are there, you can't deny their existence because you refuse to look at them". 2

It may be in view of the "limits of nuclear power" that India has not exploded the another nuclear device since 1974, and Pakistan during the last 20 years had made a number of proposals to win over the nuclear game, including establishing a Nuclear weapons Free Zone (NWFZ) in South Asia which India has bluntly refused on the ground that proliferation is a global problem.

Russia also wanted India to cooperate in accepting the Missile. Technology Control Regime (MTCR) guidelines to allay fears in the West about New Delhi's missile programme. The Prime Minister, Mr. Rao reiterated, "India's known stand on this subject - that the MTCR, like NPT was discriminatory in character and compromised with national sovereignty. India had made it known many times that it was interested in discussing nuclear as well as missile proliferation on a global basis and stood for complex abolition of nuclear weapons". 3

There is no possibility of any future limited nuclear war between India and Pakistan. In context of South Asia, both India and Pakistan have embarked upon nuclear programmes. South Asia in any case is not committed to existing non-proliferation regime. India gives up its weapon option as a potential political and diplomatic if not military, deterrent against NWS and against China in particular. It is therefore unlikely that India would relinquish that option entirely, unless it is a deal including at least China.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Plant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reactor Type</th>
<th>Power (MWe)</th>
<th>Date of Commissioning</th>
<th>Safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspara</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td>LWR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirus</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td>HWR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerlina</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td>HWR</td>
<td>400 wt</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnima I</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>100 wt</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnima II</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
<td>5 wt</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhruva (R-5)</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td>HWR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBTR</td>
<td>Kalpakkam</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamini</td>
<td>Kalpakkam</td>
<td>KWe</td>
<td>100 KWe</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnima III</td>
<td>Trombay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Power Output</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Safeguards</th>
<th>(Dismantled in 1990)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARR-1</td>
<td>Nilore</td>
<td>5 MWt</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARR-2</td>
<td>Nilore</td>
<td>27 KWt</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARR-3</td>
<td>Nilore</td>
<td>10 MWt</td>
<td>End 1991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACE Annual Reports.
### TABLE - 3

NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS (INDIA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.</th>
<th>Name of Plant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reactor Type</th>
<th>Design Gross</th>
<th>Date of Commissioning</th>
<th>Safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tarapur-1</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>BWR</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>11/1969</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tarapur-2</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>BWR</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>11/1969</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Raps-1</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>12/1973</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Maps-1</td>
<td>Kalpakkam</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>7/1983</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Napp-1</td>
<td>Narora</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10/1989</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Napp-2</td>
<td>Narora</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kaps-1</td>
<td>Kakrapar</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-12 Raps-3,4</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>Kaiga-1,2</td>
<td>Kaiga</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>2x235</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>Kaiga-3 to 6</td>
<td>Kaiga</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>4x235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Taps-3,4</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>2x500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Raps 5-8</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>4x500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>Kundankulam 1,2</td>
<td>Kundankulam (VVER)</td>
<td>2x1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>Six Units</td>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>6x500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indian Department of Atomic Energy, Annual Reports.
# TABLE - 4

NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Power Output</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KANUPP</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>150 MWe</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASHNUPP-1</td>
<td>Chashma</td>
<td>300 MWe</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASHNUPP-2</td>
<td>Chashma</td>
<td>900 MWe</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Yes <em>(France has since backed out)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAEC Publications.