CHAPTER-5

CONCLUSION

The Indian nuclear program had begun even before the Independence of India. Our first Prime Minister Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru knew very well about the importance of nuclear power both in civilian and military field. But Nehru favoured nuclear power only in civilian field.

Our first prime-minister knew that atomic energy is a vast source of power that is coming to the world and if we are to remain abreast in the world as a nation which keeps ahead of things we must develop this atomic energy quite apart from war. He emphasized on nuclear power only for peaceful purposes. India, like so many other countries of the world, was an under develop and under powered country in whose future economy, it was our belief, atomic energy would play an important role.

Nehru’s nuclear policy, to use the nuclear power for civilian purposes only, was adopted by Indian government till 1998 with minor changes. Nehru closed the option of nuclear weapons while Lal Bahadur Shastri and Smt. Indira Gandhi however did not favour nuclear weapons but they kept the option open in nuclear weapon field.

Homi J. Bhabha played important role in India’s nuclear programme. Bhabha had worked out the guidelines for India’s nuclear programme prior to the
country’s independence. Bhabha and other Indian scientists persuaded Jawahar Lal Nehru that Nuclear energy was an area where India has a comparative advantage: At Bhabha’s insistence an Atomic energy commission was set up in India in 1948 which developed as a Department at Atomic energy in 1954.

China became a member of the nuclear club in Oct. 1964. China’s growing nuclear capability in the context of its strained relation with India in the wake of the events of 1962 sparked a heated debate on India’s nuclear policy. A strong demand emerged for nuclear weapons. But Lal Bahadur Shastri, the then prime minister of India, did not accept that demand and declared that Government of India had continued to adhere to the decision not to go in for nuclear weapons but to work for their elimination.

When china was preparing to acquire and detonate nuclear weapons, America was ready to provide nuclear technology to India to check china in Asia. But our prime-minister Nehru rejected that idea.

The Chinese atomic bomb affected India’s nuclear policy. Although Lal Bahadur Shastri was opposed nuclear weapons, yet he unlike Nehru, could not, and did not seek to bind future generations to his views. He told that it would change according to the circumstances.

It is clear that both Nehru and Shastri remained committed to the importance of disarmament. But Lal Bahadur Shastri, unlike Nehru, could not, and did not seek to, bind future generations to his views. He told in the Lok Sabha that the government’s policy was not static or rigid and that it would change according to the circumstances.

In enunciating her policy Indira Gandhi brought in the security issue as early as 1967. She maintained that the country’s defence and security would be the paramount consideration in the formulation of the government’s nuclear policy. She was against to close the option of nuclear weapons but she asserted that we would
“keep the option open”. The Indira Gandhi decided in favour of strengthening India’s nuclear option by allowing the Atomic establishment (Atomic Energy Commission) to prepare for an underground nuclear test. In April 1968 Prime-minister Indira Gandhi said in Parliament that India’s nuclear policy is framed after due consideration of the national interest, specifically with regard of national security.

The Janata government under Morarji Desai’s Primeministership declared its commitment to the Nehruvian policy of never making a nuclear bomb. Morarji Desai, an ardent opponent of the nuclear option, considered the Pokharan explosion a mistake and also decided not to conduct any more nuclear explosion. However, Morarji Desai had to modify Nehru’s nuclear policy since a number of developments had taken place since his death which included, relatively sophisticated level of India’s nuclear technology and the momentum it had acquired, the autonomy of India’s nuclear programme; India’s nuclear option; its non-signing of the NPT, and the Pokharan explosion with its adverse international reaction. Consequently, what emerged was a policy based on five negatives: India would not manufacture nuclear weapons; would not carry out any more nuclear explosions unless absolutely necessary; would not sign the NPT unless there was convincing progress towards nuclear disarmament; would not open its nuclear facilities to international inspection except on a reciprocal basis and would not submit to international pressure in respect of its nuclear policy which would hurt the country’s national interest.

The interim government of Charan Singh abandoned the flexibility of Desai’s government. The revelation of Pakistan’s nuclear weapon programme – its efforts to build uranium enrichment and reprocessing facilities and the fast progress towards acquisition of nuclear explosive capability was perceived as a serious threat to India. The Indian government’s attitude now seemed to be becoming more ‘hawkish’. The emerging Pakistan nuclear threat made Indian government adopt a more active defence in support of its nuclear option. C. Subramanian, the Defence minister in Charan Singh
government, hinted at the prospects that India might be compelled to go nuclear before long and identified.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi, after she returned to power in 1980 continued with the policy of nuclear ambiguity. However, Mrs. Gandhi stuck to the earlier position, but it was also made clear that a change or even a resumption of nuclear tests could be undertaken if India’s national security demanded.

During Rajiv Gandhi’s period the same policy continued the policy of nuclear ambivalence, criticism of the non-proliferation regime on almost the same lines. However, the nuclear warnings became more frequent and amongst the positive steps, India under Rajiv Gandhi suggested a time bound action plan to rid the world of nuclear weapons by the first decade of the 21st century.

At the U.N.O. and other international platforms India spoke against nuclear weapons and favoured a nuclear weapon free world. The views of India and USA were different on nuclear proliferation issue. USA and other nuclear weapon states were in favour to close the nuclear option for non-nuclear weapon states forever. And along this they also wanted that their own answer of nuclear weapons remained as it is. India was against the nuclear weapons in any form, in any country. India was in favour of complete nuclear disarmament. India offered many proposals for nuclear disarmament as comprehensive test ban. But all these proposals could not get due consideration from USA and other nuclear weapon states.

On Nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT), 1968, both India and USA were against each other. India expressed its opposition to the treaty due to its biased nature. India said that this treaty neither assured equality between nuclear and non-nuclear weapon states nor conceded equal rights to all countries to tame the atom. The treaty would deprive the non-nuclear countries of the benefits of the development of peaceful nuclear technology and it only stopped the dissemination
of weapons for non-nuclear weapon states without imposing any restriction on nuclear weapon states.

India opposed the NPT due to the following reasons:

- The treaty did not ensure the Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but only stopped the dissemination of weapons for non-nuclear weapon states without imposing any restriction on the continued manufacture, stockpiling and sophistication of nuclear weapons by existing nuclear weapon powers.
- The treaty did not do away with the special states of superiority associated with power and prestige confined to these powers, which possessed nuclear weapons.
- The treaty did not provide a balance of obligation and responsibilities between nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states.
- The treaty did not constitute a step-by-step approach towards nuclear disarmament.
- The treaty did not prohibit nuclear weapon state from assisting another nuclear weapon state by providing technical aid.
- Article V of the treaty appears to legitimise the present state of affairs and legalise if not encourage an unrestricted vertical proliferation by present nuclear weapon powers.
- Article VI did not create a judicial obligation in regard to cessation of nuclear arms race at an early date. The treaty imputed a false sense of security to the world.

It was discriminatory in regard to safeguards and control, which were all imposed on non-nuclear weapon states, which the nuclear states had not accepted any. The security assurances could not be quid pro-quo for acceptance of the treaty. These safeguards must be obligatory for nuclear weapon states.
India opposed the NPT for security reasons also. China is India’s largest neighbour and there were differences between two nations on border issue. India could not close its nuclear weapon option because China had become nuclear weapon state in 1964.

Since 1968, when the NPT was passed by UN General Assembly, USA continuously put pressure on India to sign the NPT. But India always rejected the plea and pressure of USA, due to the discriminatory nature of NPT and for its security concerns.

India-USA nuclear relations again strained on comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which was adopted by the UN General Assembly on 10 September 1996. India opposed the CTBT because it was not a measure for nuclear disarmament and it did not include a time bound framework for nuclear disarmament and it was not truly comprehensive, there were many loopholes. This treaty banned any nuclear test in future but it did not contain any provision for elimination of exist nuclear arms stockpile in nuclear weapon states. Nuclear weapon states had exploded thousand of nuclear weapon test. They had collected much more arms and data for nuclear weapons. Now they need not any test. So this treaty was produced by Nuclear weapon states, to stop the progress of non-nuclear states in this field.

India clearly declared that it would never sign this unequal treaty not now, not ever. For our security we never accepted this treaty because by this India would become dependent on nuclear power nations for her security and nuclear energy. When US pressured on India for signing to CTBT, nationalism was arise in India against USA. Later, the CTBT was also rejected by US Senate, this weaken US position on CTBT.

India’s opposition to the proposed CTBT created very considerable beat is Washington and when it became clear that there was no way India would go along
without, Washington asked India to get out of the way and let the draft be adopted. Washington did not really believe that India would muster the will to veto its adoption under the consensus rule and the use of the Indian veto on 20 August 1996 sent shock waves in Washington and other western capitals. The US pressure on signing the CTBT become a rallying cry for renewed nationalism in India and a strong insurance against external pressures on the testing of nuclear weapons.

After the rejection of CTBT by US Senate, the US is now on a weaker wicket to pressurise India on signing the CTBT, the US Senate having shelved the treaty by non-ratification.

During the course of the intense domestic debate over the CTBT and nuclear issues, a section of the people in India did advocate India’s de facto entry into the nuclear club. Another section of the populace was vehemently opposed to nuclear weapons on moral and environmental grounds. And then there were those who believed and supported the policy of keeping the option open. There was another debate about whether the policy of keeping the option open had served the national interests. A section of India’s strategic community strongly believed that the policy had created a certain amount of ambiguity and had served the national strategic objective well at a lesser financial and political cost. Except for a microscopic minority of intellectuals and analysts, none wanted the Government of India to sign on the dated line of the CTBT draft.

Amidst all these developments the Government of India kept reiterating its policy of keeping the nuclear option open. India ultimately rejected the draft CTBT on the ground that the treaty did not respect India’s sovereignty.

After the 1971 war Indira Gandhi decided to favour of strengthening India’s nuclear option by allowing the Atomic Energy Commission to prepare for an underground nuclear test.
India decided for nuclear explosion in 1974 because during the Indo-Pak war, China tilted toward Pakistan and Indo-china relations were also strained on border issue. During the Indo-Pak war in 1971 Nixon administration also deployed its nuclear arsenal in Bay of Bengal to threaten India.

By this explosion we demonstrated our nuclear capability. India proved her capability in the field of nuclear weapons, but Indian government declared that this explosion was for peaceful purposes and not for the weapons.

This nuclear test of India was only for peaceful purposes. India’s intention was not to become a nuclear weapon state. It was clearly stated and forcefully maintained by Indira Gandhi that Pokhran test was a peaceful and fully controlled explosion conducted to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes for development of mines, construction of dams, harbours and search of minerals etc.

India’s first peaceful nuclear explosion attracted reactions from the US, Canada, France, Soviet Union, Pakistan and Non-aligned countries. While the non-aligned and developing countries did not openly support India’s action they expressed their pride and happiness to such a success. The reaction from the US to India’s PNE was that of disgust and anger. The official in the state department could not conceive of India being the sixth member of the exclusive nuclear club. It was alleged that India was attempting to build its own independent centre of power and harbouring the ambitions of a system builder in South Asia. They also had the apprehension that this would further reduce Washington leverage over New Delhi.

This nuclear explosion was bitterly criticised by USA. She imposed many economic sanctions on India. Fuel supply for Tarapur reactor was cancelled and to check the nuclear proliferation, Nuclear weapon states established ‘London Club’ which evolved in ‘Nuclear Supplier Group’ (NSG). By this only NPT member could get uranium form Nuclear Supplier Group members.
Although at many occasions India clarified that this nuclear explosion was only for peaceful purpose. But USA did not agree with India’s agreement. She thought it as a nuclear weapon test. And Indo-US nuclear relations in civilian field almost closed for next three decades till India and USA signed civil nuclear cooperation agreement in 2005.

On 11 and 13 May 1998, five nuclear explosion took place at Pokharan under operation “Shakti.” After the test India declared herself as a nuclear weapon state. This test changed the nuclear policy of India. This time there was absolutely no reference to any peaceful nature of the nuclear tests as it declared at the time of first nuclear explosion in 1974. The bomb tested at Pokharan was purely for defensive purposes.

After May 1998 India redefined its nuclear policy and changed the view that it would use nuclear energy only for civilian purposes. She decided to use nuclear power for nuclear weapons also. But in her nuclear policy she declared that it would not use nuclear state and it would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear state and it would not also use nuclear weapons first. India decided that nuclear arsenal would be remained under democratically elected leadership.

India adopted ‘no first we’ policy. India declared that it will not use the nuclear weapons first. BJP lead NDA government’s policy of ‘no-first use’ was also accepted and continues by congress lead UPA government.

The United States bitterly criticised the Indian’s nuclear test and imposed sanctions on India. The Clinton administration terminate at new commitments of the united state governments, credits and credit guarantees for export financing and ban on export of all nuclear or missile related duel use items. US President Bill Clinton blamed that these test would halt the US efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation.

The Indian government pointed out that the tests are not directed to the USA, as the USA would like to secure its interests, so would the people of India.
After the nuclear explosion of 1998 Indian government declared the nuclear policy of India. Basic Principles of India’s nuclear policy after 1998 are:

- First and the foremost, India has pledged not to use nuclear weapons against states which do not possess nuclear weapons or are not aligned with other nuclear weapon states.

- Second, for the doctrine to be reliable and effective, if activated, must remain under adequate command and control. MIND ensures civilian control of nuclear warheads by a democratically elected leadership through a system of command and control the ultimate decision to use the nuclear weapons in any conflict will rest with the Prime-minister.

- Third, the doctrine stresses the government intention to acquire necessary protective safety systems for nuclear weapons.

- Fourth, “to raise the threshold of outbreak of both conventional military conflict as well as that of threat of use of nuclear weapon India will maintain “highly effective conventional military capabilities.”

- Fifth, it also assures Indian nuclear establishment that it will continue to “step up efforts in research and development to keep up with the technological development in this field.”

On July 18, 2005 India and USA signed a nuclear agreement under which India agreed to separate its civil and military nuclear facilities and place all its civil nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and in exchange, the unite states agreed to work towards full civil nuclear Cooperation with India.
This deal or 123 agreement is very important for India in the field of nuclear energy. This agreement also dramatically changed the Indo-US nuclear relations. India and USA had cooperated in nuclear energy field in 1963, when Tarapur Nuclear power plant was established with US Assistance. USA, than had promised for fuel supply to this plant till 1994. But after the peaceful nuclear test of India in 1974, USA stopped the nuclear supply to Tarapur plant. After that USA did not Cooperate with India in nuclear field. After more than there decades USA and India have decided to cooperate in nuclear energy field through this nuclear agreement again.

The Indo-US civilian nuclear agreement was met with stiff opposition by some political parties and scientists in India. CPI (M) alleged that the deal would undermine the sovereignty of India’s foreign policy and 123 agreement would be governed by the Hyde Act.

Some Nuclear scientists, P.K. Iyengar, A.N. Prasad, M.R. Sirinivasan, Criticised the deal and shared the view that in this agreement Washington is treating India not as an equal partner and not as a sovereign, responsive nuclear power. They blamed that this agreement indirectly makes India party to the NPT, FMCT and CTBT, even though India has always refused to sign then.

On the basis of the views of critics we can concluded the drawbacks of nuclear agreement for India –

- Through this agreement India has accepted the provision of NPT and CTBT Indirectly.
- USA will try to affect the foreign policy of India.
- India mutely accepted the ban on nuclear test.
- It will be costly for India to recreate nuclear reactor in civilian and military.
- Our research programme in nuclear field will be negatively affected.
But this deal is also beneficial in many ways –

- USA will provide the nuclear fuel and nuclear technology to India.
- India can get raw material for its nuclear reactors from other nations of nuclear Supplier group.
- India could meet the demand of energy in future.
- This deal would end the nuclear apartied of India.
- India could stock the nuclear fuel for future need of nuclear reactors.
- India could continue its nuclear weapon programme.
- Without signing the NPT and CTBT, India would able to get nuclear fuel and technology from NPT members.

So this deal would be proving a landmark in the field of nuclear energy for India and for nation’s economic development.

Although Indian government and American government assured the uninterrupted supply of fuel and technology to people of India. Yet if India will does conduct any nuclear test in future, then USA will continue the supply of nuclear fuel, it is not sure.

India has always opposed the weapons of mass destruction. It remains a great advocate of nuclear weapon-free world. It should be the policy of India in future. Because nuclear weapons would be the cause of mass destruction.

India should continue to resist the NPT and CTBT because these treaties are discriminatory and are against Indian national interest. India could not close its nuclear test option. USA, Russia and France have conducted many tests to improve the quality and quantity of their nuclear arsenal. In future India may need for more nuclear explosion to improve the quality of nuclear weapons. So If India’s nuclear test option closes it will be against India’s national interest.
But if NPT and CTBT do accept India as a nuclear weapon state the India should sign these treaties. Because these treaties do not impose any restriction and obligation on nuclear weapons states. Now India has become a nuclear weapon state. India should put pressure on nuclear weapon states – USA, Russia, U.K., France and China – to accept it as a nuclear weapon state. And it should be the pre-condition of India to sign the NPT and CTBT.

For India, Nuclear Energy has become critical in meeting its needs in the medium term. Right now, the country is heaving dependent on oil imported from west Asia and the increased use of coal would seen up against the issue of green house gases and global warming. It would need to expand its nuclear energy programme from 2400 MW to 40,000 MW in the medium term. So, to take the advantage of nuclear deal, India should establish much more nuclear power plants to meet its energy demand.

For nuclear supply we should not rely only on USA but we should secure the nuclear fuel supply from other nations which are rich in nuclear fuel. We should also have a stockpile of nuclear fuel for future. In the adverse circumstances this stock-pile can be use in nuclear power plants.

According to the Hyde act, if India conducts a nuclear test then all cooperation with India in nuclear field would be ceased. But in 123 agreement no such provision is included. USA will proceed with Hyde act as 123 agreement, it will be decided by future. But we have a bitter experience of Tarapur. So before conduct any nuclear explosion we must be prepared for cessation of nuclear cooperation from USA.

To sum up we can say that Indo-US nuclear relation has been established after more than three decades in a better way. Through Nuclear deal bath countries have been agreed to cooperate in civil nuclear field. India should take advantage of this deal. But along this India’s nuclear weapon programme should not
halted. Nuclear energy would play important role in the development of nation. And we can hope that India will be a developed nation.
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