CHAPTER – VI

INDO-PAK RELATIONS – DIVERGENT ISSUES
The relations between India and Pakistan have never been cordial as history reveals ever since Pakistan birth in 1947. Pakistan is India's closer but the most difficult neighbour. The relations between the two countries have been full of tensions, conflicts and wars. The reasons for this state of permanent hostility could be divided into three broad categories. The first arose out of the Pre-partition controversies between the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League, the two - nation theory and the demand for Pakistan. The rancour and acrimony left by that era has now been passed to the mindset of the leaders of the two countries and colours their vision while looking at one another. The passage of time has failed to wipe out the scare left by that phase of our subcontinents history. The second category of reasons arose out of the way the partition of the subcontinent had been implemented. The subcontinent had evolved into one integrated economic and political unit. The division of such a country on an arbitrary basis could not have been accomplished without leaving imbalances and inequities and grounds for complaints. The third categories of causes are related to the original two and are their direct outcome. They led to conflicts and three wars.

The demand for Pakistan before 1947 was based on the 'two nation theory' which in effect meant that religion alone was the basis of
nationhood to the exclusion of other factors. The Muslim League had advocated this view and had succeeded in mobilizing vast sections of Indian Muslims, particularly the Muslims of the provinces where they were in a minority. The demand for Pakistan actually was for Muslim majority provinces of British India to be carved out into a Muslim homeland. The Muslim League leadership, however, had done very little homework about the implications of the demand for Pakistan. No attention had been paid to the political system or the security or defence of the country which they were demanding.

Once partition took place and Pakistan came into being, the Muslim League leadership had no plans for nation building. In its absence some of the sharper issues of the pre-partition controversies were transferred to Pakistani elites’ programme for mobilizing the people of the new country for national integration. One of the major planks of Pakistan’s ruling classes was the threat posed by its larger neighbor India to the existence and territorial integrity of the country. The pre-independence ideological battle was now transferred to the new successor states of India and Pakistan. The people of Pakistan were told that since India was a secular and democratic state and Pakistan was an Islamic state India had not accepted the two-nation theory. Consequently it had not accepted Pakistan and was therefore, out to undo it.¹
The partition of British India into India and Pakistan was more or less complete. Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru in his message to the press on the Independence day said in very clear terms what India's stand was: 'I want to say to all nations of the world, including our neighbouring country, that we stand for peace and friendship with them.' On the same day in his broadcast speech Governor General Jinnah of Pakistan also declared: 'We want to live peacefully and maintain cordial friendly relations with our immediate neighbours and the world at large.' With regard to Indo-Pak relations unfortunately these have remained expressions of pious sentiments. From the time the two nations came into existence their relations have remained continuously under strain. The history of the relation has remained to this day a history of conflict. The partition of the country and the problems rising in its wake embittered the relations between the two states.

In Pakistan there was a general feeling that India had not reconciled herself to the partition of the country and would make an attempt to destroy her entity. Their political estrangement particularly in the years following partition was due to many and diverse problems created or thrown up by the partition of the Indian sub-continent which embittered in varying degrees the relations between the two nations even in the very formative phase of their relationship. More important
ones among them are: (a) the problem of religious minorities in either nation, communal disturbances and heavy loss of life and large scale migration (b) the problem of evacuee property, both movable and immovable left behind by the people leaving their respective nations, the question of recovery or compensation for it (c) river water disputes (d) the problem of division and distribution of assets and liabilities, debts and military stores at the time of partition (e) boundary disputes and (f) the issue of the Indian Princely States and their integration with either of the newly formed nations and the issue of Kashmir.

The problem of religious minorities in both India and Pakistan is a major one although it is nearly half a century since these two nations came into existence. This problem is very much alive and the wounds the partition caused are yet to be cooled and the scars yet to be erased. Actually the issue began well before the division of United India on the basis of Jinnah’s ‘two-nation theory’. He had more than once suggested (in December 1945, November 1946, and April 1947) that the non-Muslims of Pakistan (Hindus, Sikhs and others) should go to India, and Muslims from India should be allowed to settle in Pakistan. Jinnah himself later as the Governor – General of Pakistan realized how impracticable his suggestion was. However officially such transfer of population did not take place, month before 1947 people in large numbers from both sides had started moving either by choice or under
compulsion and threats. Pakistan viewed these developments as acts perpetrated by India deliberately to undo the process of partition. India regarded the massacre of Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan as a systematic attempt to wipe out the minority communities from that country so to establish an exclusively Muslim state.

More often than not, the influx of refugees from Pakistan sparked of communal violence in India. Apart from this problem, there remained the question of minorities in both countries, those who had stayed on in the places of their birth even after the partition, sometimes at great risk to themselves and their property. Among the Muslims in India who did not migrate, there were some who had supported the creation of Pakistan enthusiastically. In Pakistan there remained a large Number of non-Muslim (mostly Hindus) who had opposed the partition. The determination of the Muslim League to make an Islamic state of Pakistan was the objective of the Two-Nation theory. Their status as citizens, identity and future precarious and uncertain made their existence unpredictable.

About half a million Muslims and Hindus were killed in communal riots following the partition of British India. Millions of Muslims living in India and Hindus and Sikhs living in Pakistan emigrated in one of the most colossal transfers of population in the modern era. Both countries
accused each other of not providing adequate security to the minorities emigrating through their territory. This served to increase tensions between the newly-born countries.

According to the British plan for the partition of British India, all the 680 princely states were allowed to decide which of the two countries to join. With the exception of a few, most of the Muslim-majority princely states acceded to Pakistan while most of the Hindu-majority princely states joined India. However, the decisions of some of the princely states would shape the Pakistan India relationship considerably, in the years to come.5

The problem of evacuee properties, movable and immovable left behind by the people from both countries, their recovery and compensation for them which was a necessary consequence of mass migration, kept the relations between India and Pakistan tense and strained for many years, particularly the years following partition. It was estimated that the refugees to India from Pakistan left behind property (immovable and movable) worth five thousand million rupees, while those who fled to Pakistan from India abandoned property worth one thousand million rupees. Negotiation to solve this problem was initiated immediately after independence (on 29th August 1947) itself and was continued for several years. But the complexity of the problem and the
sharp differences between the governments in their approach to it rendered the negotiations fruitless.

Another problem which kept the relations between India and Pakistan tense and strained for a couple of years was the issue of the division of assets and liabilities as well as of military stores inherited from the previous government. At the time of partition the cash balances stood at around 4000 million rupees of which Pakistan demanded 1000 million for its share. The Arbitrary Tribunal, to which the matter was referred, fixed 750 million rupees at Pakistan's share. As an interim measure pending the Tribunals decision it had been agreed that 200 million rupees were to be paid to Pakistan towards its share of cash balances. Meanwhile Pakistan began its thinly disguised and wholly unjustified attack of Kashmir, which had already acceded to India. Vallabhai Patel, India's Deputy Prime Minister, declared in December 1947 that the agreement to pay Pakistan 200 million rupees as an interim arrangement would be implemented simultaneously with Pakistan settling the Kashmir issue. Therefore all Pakistan's demands for payment were not accepted. The Indian stand precipitated a crisis to strain further the relations between them. However Mahatma Gandhi, in whose judgments India's decision was morally wrong, went on an indefinite fast ostensibly to bring about a reunion of the estranged communities and promote good will. In actuality the fast was Gandhi's
protest against ‘wrong done’ by the Indian government. To honour his sentiment and to save his valuable life, India decided to pay Pakistan 500 million rupees outright. Regarding the debts, it was agreed that India should assume the entire responsibility for their repayment and Pakistan was to pay seventeen percent of the amount to India in fifty annual installments from 1952 onwards. There is no indication at all that Pakistan has made even a beginning to repay.

At the time of partition a Joint Defence Council was set up with its Headquarters at Delhi to supervise the fair divisions of armed forces and military stores between the two countries. Field Marshall Auchinleck was placed in charge of administrative control of the India armed forces, under the Joint Defence Council (JDC) to supervise the division. It was expected that the work would be completed by 1st April, 1948 when the JDC would be wound up. In view of the increasing and widening fissures in Indo-Pak relations due to the Punjab disturbances, the developments in Junagadh, Kashmir and Hyderabad, the task of the Supreme command became increasingly difficult. Sardar Patel, India’s Deputy Prime Minister insisted on the closure of the supreme command headquarters well before April 1948, on the ground that the reconstitution of the army was already complete. Accordingly it was closed down on 30th November 1947 and deliberately demanded the winding up of the Supreme Court, even before it had completed its
assignments only to withhold the supply of military stores due to her and thereby keep her permanently weak. Later Pakistan used this argument to justify her acceptance of military aid from the USA. It is possible that there is some truth in Pakistan’s complaint that India withheld military supplies to her. If so, what India did is understandable in view of the aggression that Pakistan had unabashedly launched on Kashmir, where the military stores received were probably used during the conflict.

An issue which led to numerous controversies, frequent armed clashes and skirmishes; and even a three-week war in April 1965 (which could have become a major war) between India and Pakistan is concerned with the borders or boundaries between them. Had the boundaries been drawn along natural frontiers rather than on the basis of Jinnah’s ‘two-nation’ theory, most of the irritants regarding the borders could have been avoided. Demarcating the boundaries, which ran through not only provinces, districts, tehsils and thanas but also through rice fields, grazing grounds, fishing ponds, small rivers and forests, was indeed a herculean task requiring a lot of patience and understanding and the will to resolve disputes peacefully. Two border commissions have been set up under the chairmanship of Sir Cyril Radcliffe with nominees of the Congress and the Muslim league to assist him in drawing the borders between India and the two wings of Pakistan. The nominees differed with each other so much that
Radcliffe, who had little knowledge of the relief’s of the area, had to do everything himself. Therefore his award had a number of discrepancies which added to the already existing disputes and confusion between the two countries. After a series of agreements (in 1948, 1958, 1959 and 1960) to avoid border incidents and border disputes, all except the dispute relating to the Rann of Kutch, were resolved.

**Junagadh dispute**

Junagadh is one of the modern districts of Saurastra, Gujarat. Junagadh was a state on the southwestern end of Gujarat with the principalities of Manavadar, Mangrol and Babriawad. The Arabian Sea stood between it and Pakistan. The state had an overwhelming Hindu population which constituted more than 80% of its citizens, while the ruler of the state was a Muslim. On August 15th, 1947 the ruler of the state, Nawab of Junagadh Mahabat Khan acceded to Pakistan. Pakistan confirmed the acceptance of the accession in September 1947. India did not accept the accession as legitimate.

The Indian point of view was that since Junagadh was a state with a predominantly Hindu population it should be a part of India. Additionally since the state was encircled by Indian territory it should have been a part of India. Indian politicians also stated that by giving
Pakistan a predominantly Hindu region to govern, the basis of the two
nation theory was contradicted.

The Pakistani point of view was that since Junagadh had a ruler
and governing body who chose to accede to Pakistan, they should be
allowed to do so. Junagadh having a coastline could have maintained
maritime links with Pakistan. Additionally Pakistanis stated that the two-
nation theory did not necessarily mean a clear division of land and
absolute transfer of populations as the sheer magnitude of such a
proceeding would wreak havoc upon millions.

Neither of the ten states were able to resolve this issue amicably
and it only added fuel to an already charged environment.

Sardar Patel, India’s then Home Minister felt that if Junagadh was
permitted to go to Pakistan, it would create communal unrest across
Gujarat. The government of India gave Pakistan time to void the
accession and hold a plebiscite in Junagadh to pre empt any violence in
Gujarat. Samaldas Gandhi formed a government-in-exile, the Arzi
Hukumat (in Urdu: Transitional Hukumat: Government) of the people of
Junagadh. Patel ordered the annexation of Junagadh’s three
principalities).\textsuperscript{7}
The most difficult problem in relations between India and Pakistan since partition in August 1947 has been their dispute over Kashmir. Pakistan’s leaders did not accept the legality of the Instrument of Accession of Kashmir to India and undeclared war broke out in October 1947. It was the first of three conflicts between the two countries. Pakistan’s representatives ever since have argued that the people of Kashmir should be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination through a plebiscite, as promised by Nehru and required by UN Security Council resolution in 1948 and 1949. The inclusive fighting led to a UN arranged cease fire starting on January 1st, 1949. On July 18th 1949, the two sides signed the Karachi Agreement establishing a cease fire line that was to be supervised by the UN. The demarcation left Srinagar and almost 139,000 square kilometers under Indian control and 83807 squares Kilometers under Pakistani control. Of these two areas, China occupied 37,555 square kilometers in India’s Ladakh District (part of which is known as Akasai Chin) in 1962 and Pakistan ceded, in effect. 5198 square kilometers in the Karakoram area to China when the two countries demarcated their common border in 1961-65, leaving India with 101,387 square Kilometers and Pakistan with 78,387 square kilometers. Starting in January 1949 the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan was tasked with supervising the cease fire in Kashmir.
Indo–Pak War 1965:

Armed infiltrators from Pakistan crossed the cease fire line and the number of skirmishes between Indian and Pakistani troops increased in the summer of 1965. Starting on August 5th, 1965, India alleged that Pakistani forces began to infiltrate the Indian–controlled portion of Jammu and Kashmir. India made a countermove in late August and by September 1st, 1965, the second conflict had fully erupted as Pakistani launched an attack across the international line of control in Southwest Jammu and Kashmir. Indian forces retaliated on September 6th in Pakistani Punjab Province and prevailed over Pakistan’s apparent superiority in tanks and aircraft. A cease fire called by the UN Security Council on September 23rd was observed by both sides. At Tashkent, Uzbekistan, in January 1966, the belligerents agreed to restore the status quo ante and to resolve outstanding issues by negotiation.8

Other Territorial Disputes:

Pakistan is locked in other territorial disputes with India such as the Siachen Glacier and Kori Creek. Pakistan is also currently having dialogue with India regarding the Baglihar Dam being built over the River Chenab in Jammu and Kashmir.
Bengal refugee crisis

In 1949, India recorded close to one million Hindu refugees who flooded into West Bengal and other States from East Pakistan (Now Bangladesh), owing to communal violence, intimidation and repression from authorities. The plight of the refugees outraged Hindus and Indian nationalists, and the refugee population drained the resources of Indian states, which were unable to absorb them. While not ruling out war, Prime Minister Nehru and Sardar Patel invited Liaquat Alikhan for talks in Delhi. Although many Indians termed this appeasement, Nehru signed a pact with Liaquat Alikhan that pledged both nations to the protection of minorities and creation of minority commissions. Although opposed to the principle, Patel decided to back this pact for the sake of peace, and played a critical role in garnering support from West Bengal and across India, and enforcing the provisions of the pact. Khan and Nehru also signed a trade agreement, and committed to resolving bilateral disputes through peaceful means. Steadily, hundreds of thousands of Hindus returned to East Pakistan, but the thaw in relations did not last long, primarily owing to the Kashmir dispute.9

Pakistan and Western Military Alliances:

India from her inception adopted the policy of non-alignment keeping aloof from military alliances of both the blocs. USA made
frantile efforts to win over India to her side and gave liberal economic and technical aid to her. However, India refused to join the Western military alliance. Failing to secure an alliance with India, USA and her western allies naturally turned their attention to Pakistan. Though Pakistan was initially reluctant to enter into these alliances, US announcement of 622 million dollars worth of wheat as gift impressed her. Further, she thought that the membership of these alliances would strengthen her position vis-à-vis India. As a result Pakistan joined as a member of Baghdad Pact and the S.E.A.T.O. Commenting on the impact of Pakistan's entry in these military alliances Mr. Nehru said: "Whatever the motive may be the mere fact that large seek rearmament and military expansion takes place in Pakistan must necessitate for reaching repercussions in India". Though these military alliances were primarily meant to check the Communist danger, the later experience of 1965 and 1971 war shows that these arms were actually used against India and USA could not and did not prevent Pakistan from using these arms against India in spite of an understanding given to India that these arms would never be used against her.

Sino–Pakistan Agreement:

The relations between Pakistan and China were not cordial to begin with because China could not trust Pakistan because she was a
member of the military alliances directed against her. However, when
the relations between India and China took a turn for the worse after the
Tibet Uprising of 1959 and the Sino-Indian conflict of 1962, the two
countries came closer. In March, 1963 Pakistan and China signed a
treaty by which Pakistan handed over a large slice of Indian Territory in
Kashmir under her illegal possession, to China. The leaders of China
and Pakistan paid visits to each other and cemented the friendship. In
the subsequent years China advanced huge loans to Pakistan free of
interest and helped her in building heavy engineering industrial
project at Taxila. She also supplied large quantities of arms, aircrafts,
tanks and other weapons to Pakistan. Thus the two countries in spite of
their ideological differences (China being Communist and Pakistan an
authoritarian state and a member of SEATO) were able to form an
alliance. This proved the truth in the old proverb which says “Politics
makes strange bed fellows”. During the two Indo-Pak conflicts of 1965
and 1971 China openly condemned India and supported the cause of
Pakistan. In the last conflict of December, 1971 she even served India
with an ultimatum. However, she was prevented from interfering by a
warning of the Soviet Union that the third parties must abstain from
interference in the affairs of the sub-continent. Even after the war China
has supplied huge quantities of arms, tanks etc. to Pakistan to make
good the losses suffered by her in the war. All this has stood in the way of developing cordial and friendly relations between India and Pakistan.

**Canal Water Dispute:** The Canal water dispute arose between the two countries over the use of *Indus* waters. Six tributaries of *Indus* flow from Indian side of Punjab into Pakistan. Purely on humanitarian ground India agreed in 1948 to allow Pakistan to use the water from *Sutlej, Ravi* and *Beas* for the time being so that Pakistan got the time to make alternative arrangements and might not suffer any loss pending these alternative arrangements. It may be noted that this arrangement was not permanent and was envisaged to allow Pakistan some time to construct link canals to join up her irrigation works with the tributaries allotted to her. Pakistan did not construct these link canals. As a result when India opened the Bhakra Nangal Dam, she raised objection to the project. Ultimately an Agreement was signed in 1960 through the World Bank. Under this agreement water of the *Indus*, the *Jhelum* and the *Chenab* (except for minor uses in Jammu and Kashmir) were conceded to Pakistan and those of *Sutlej, Ravi* and *Beas* were given to India. Pakistan was to receive contribution from India and other countries for the construction of canals for link purpose. In 1968 Pakistan objected to the construction of Farakka barrage to control the water of the Ganges. However, later on the question was settled by mutual agreement.10
The Kashmir Dispute: The Kashmir problem has been the most important factor which has strained the relations between two countries. Under Indian Independence Act of 1947 Kashmir like other states was given the choice to join either India or Pakistan or to retain an independent status. The king of Kashmir (Hari Singh) decided not to accede to either country. Pakistan, however, was not happy with this decision and started applying pressure no Kashmir to gain its accession. Failing economic pressure Pakistan allowed armed tribes to invade Kashmir. These tribesmen were assisted by regular troops of Pakistan army. In October 1947, failing to check the raiders, the Maharaja asked for India’s assistance. Government of India, however, refused to give any assistance unless Kashmir acceded to India. After the king signed the accession letters, the Indian troops were sent to Kashmir on October 27th, 1947. The Indian Army drove back the raiders. In December 1947, India took the case to the United Nations complaining against Pakistan for aiding and abetting in the raid on Kashmir. However, Pakistan took the stand that while according the Maharaja of Kashmir (Hari Singh) had specially promised plebiscite. According to the letter “as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and its soil cleared of the invade the question of states accession should be settled by a reference to the people.” This according to Government of India did not imply plebiscite. In 1951
Kashmir elected its Constituent Assembly, which confirmed the accession to India in 1954. It declared Kashmir as a self-governing state within the Republic of India.

The Security Council appointed a Commission to arrange for cease fire in Kashmir. The Commission proposed cease fire, demilitarization and plebiscite. In February, 1950 Sir Owen Dixon, an Australian, was appointed as a Mediator. But soon he admitted his failure and resigned. He was followed by Frank D. Graham of USA who also could not achieve much success. India insisted on vacation of aggression by Pakistan as a pre-condition for holding of plebiscite, which was not accepted by Pakistan.

In 1954 Pakistan joined the SEATO and in 1955 the Baghdad Pact. Pakistan got lot of military assistance under the pacts. During this period India made an offer of 'no war pact' with Pakistan which was rejected by her. As a result, India became suspicious of Pakistan's designs.

In the light of these developments India made slight changes in her stand on Kashmir. In March 1956 Nehru said that the first essential step was for Pakistani troops to withdraw but they are still there. Hence, "all talks of Plebiscite was completely beside the point". Secondly, India could not ignore the constitutional developments and economic
progress in Kashmir. Thirdly, plebiscite would mean “uprooting of things that have become fixed—legally, constitutionally and practically”. This obviously meant that India was not keen to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir.

In November, 1956 Kashmir Constituent Assembly adopted a Constitution for the State which was modelled on the Indian Constitution. Pakistan was not at all happy with all these developments. In 1965 (August) following the Kutch dispute, Pakistan sent organized groups of infiltrators across the cease fire line, and later mounted large scale attack in the Chhamb – Jaurian area, violating the international border. Thereby she threatened the communication line of India in Kashmir. The Indian troops went into action and foiled the Pakistani designs. On September 2nd, 1965 the U.N Secretary General U. Thant appealed for cease fire. Two days later the Council met and called upon the two countries to withdraw their forces to the old cease fire line. This appeal was again repeated on September 9th. The council authorized U. Thant, the Secretary General to visit the two countries and bring about an unconditional cease fire but Pakistan wanted a ‘Purposeful’ cease fire based on an ‘honourable settlement of the Kashmir problem’.

Revolt in East Pakistan: Pakistan since independence was geopolitically divided into two major regions viz, West – Pakistan and East – Pakistan. East Pakistan was mostly occupied by Bengali people. India’s
relations with Pakistan were once again strained following revolt by the Bengalis of East Pakistan against the domination of the West Pakistan. This resentment grew bitter after the Awami league of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman secured an absolute majority in the provincial Assembly of East Pakistan and a majority at the national level but was not invited to form the government. Sheikh Mujibur Rehman launched a civil disobedience against the high-handed policy of President Yahya Khan and formed ‘Mukti Bahini’ to achieve freedom. However, on account of oppression of the military leadership a large number of Bengali refugees fled to India, thereby causing a great strain on India’s economy. This naturally resulted in greater tension between India and Pakistan.

1971 Bangladesh Liberation War: Pakistan started accusing India of instigating the East Bengalis and actively helping them against Pakistan. However, India denied all these charges. Ultimately Pakistan mounted an attack on India in December 1971 in the Western sector. The government of India acted promptly and gave a befitting reply. China came in support of Pakistan and gave an ultimatum to India. However, Soviet Union warned the third parties to abstain from interference in the sub-continent of Pakistan. She also condemned the attitude of USA when she ordered the Seventh Fleet to move towards the Bay of Bengal. After the surrender of the Pakistani force at Decca
before the Joint Command of Muktibahini and the Indian forces, India declared a unilateral cease-fire.

**Simla Summit:** At the end of the war a Summit meeting was arranged at Simla from June 28th to July 2nd, 1972 where the famous Simla Agreement was signed. By this agreement the two countries agreed to settle their differences peacefully through bilateral negotiations without resorting to force. Both the countries also agreed to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of each other. They expressed their faith in the principle of peaceful co-existence and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. For further normalization of their relations the two countries pledged to resume communications, promote travel facilities, co-operate in economic and allied matters, and have exchanges in the fields of culture and science. Finally they also agreed to withdraw their forces to their respective international border in Punjab and Rajasthan. However, in Jammu and Kashmir, the position that obtained after the 1971 cease-fire was to continue and neither of the parties was to make efforts to alter it unilaterally or by force.

After the Simla Summit it was expected that the relations between the two countries would become normal but the relations between the two countries could not improve on account of reluctance of Prime Minister Bhutto of Pakistan to accord recognition to Bangladesh. in
terms of the pact. There after the relations between two countries continued to be tense.

Afghanistan Crisis

After the 1979 Soviet war in Afghanistan where Soviet Union military Occupied Afghanistan, new strains appeared in Indo-Pakistani relations. Pakistan actively supported the Afghan resistance against the Soviet Union, which was a close ally of India, which brought opposing political opinions. The Taliban regime in Afghanistan was strongly supported by Pakistan – one of the few countries to do so before the September 11, 2008 attacks. India on the other hand, firmly opposed the Taliban.

Pakistan’s Support to Insurgency Movement in India:

Meanwhile, Pakistan continued supporting insurgency movement and now in North Eastern India. Inter-State Intelligence (ISI) premier intelligence agency of Pakistan actively supported different terrorist outfits in a host of ways ranging from training to the supply of men, material and money.

These acts of Pakistan led to the downturn in Indo-Pak ties; China merely supported the Pakistan moves. In Jammu and Kashmir having failed to annex it by force. Pakistan moved on to hatch a conspiracy by waging a proxy war against India. Military outfits like
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A rising spiral of unrest, demonstrations, armed attacks by Kahmiri separatists, and armed suppression by Indian security forces started in 1988 and was still occurring in the mid 1990s. New Delhi charged Islamabad (Pakistan’s Capital) with assisting insurgents in Jammu and Kashmir, and Prime Minister V.P. Singh warned that India should be psychologically prepared for a war. In Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto stated that Pakistan was willing to fight a “thousand year war” for control of Kashmir. Under pressure from the United States, the Soviet union, and China to avoid a military conflict and solve their dispute under the terms of the Simla accord, India and Pakistan backed off in May 1990 and engaged in a series of talks on confidence building measures for the rest of the year. Tensions reached new heights in the early and mid – 1990s with increasing internal unrest in Jammu and Kashmir, charges of human rights abuses, and repeated clashes between Indian paramilitary forces and Kashmiri militants, allegedly armed with Pakistani supplied weapons.
A concurrent irritant related to the Kashmir dispute was the confrontation over the Siachen Glacier near the Karakoram pass which is located in North-East Jammu and Kashmir. In 1984, Indian officials, citing Pakistani’s “cartographic aggression” extending the line of control northeast toward the Karakoram pass, contended that Pakistan intended to occupy the Siachen Glacier in order to stage an attack into Indian-controlled Kashmir. After New Delhi airdropped troops into the Western parts of the Saltoro Mountains, Islamabad deployed troops opposite them. Both sides maintained 5,000 troops in temperatures averaging 40°C. The estimated cost for India was about 10 percent of the annual defense budget for 1992 Financial Year.

**Operation Brass Tacks:**

Between November 1986 and February 1987, first India, then Pakistan conducted provocative military maneuvers along their border that raised tensions considerably. India’s “Operation Brass Tacks” took place in Rajasthan, across from Pakistan’s troubled Sindh Province, and Pakistan’s maneuvers were located close to India’s state of Punjab. The crisis atmosphere was heightened when Pakistan’s premier nuclear scientist Abdul Qadir Khan revealed in a March 1987 interview that Pakistan had manufactured a nuclear bomb. Although Khan later retracted his statement, India stated that the disclosure was “forcing us to review our option”. The tensions created by the military exercise
and the nuclear issue were defused following talks at the foreign secretary level in New Delhi (January 31st – February 4) and Islamabad (February 27th – March 2nd) during which the two sides agreed to a phased troop withdrawal to peacetime positions.

Twenty four years after its first and only “Peaceful Nuclear Explosion”, India decisively moved towards exercising the nuclear option by conducting three underground tests, including that of a thermonuclear device in the Pokhran Range of Rajasthan, on May 11th, 1998. With this move, India has risked potential global repercussions. However, the government officially justified the action in the light of the “Dangerous Nuclear Environment” claiming that the people of India had a “Credible Nuclear Deterrent”.

Undeterred by sanctions, India on Wednesday on 13th May, 1998 conducted two more underground nuclear tests at the Pokhran Range, completing its planned exercise, which began on Monday, 11th May, 1998 and offered to negotiate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on its own terms.

The then Prime Minister of India, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, giving a official statement in the Parliament on May 27th, 1998 said “I rise to inform the house of momentous developments that have taken place while we were in recess. On May 11th, India successfully
carried out three underground nuclear tests two more underground tests on May 13th, completed the planned series of tests”.13

REACTIONS OF INDIA’S NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Pakistan

Pakistan blamed the international community for what it said encouraging India to conduct the tests and vowed to reserves its rights to take all appropriate steps to safeguard its security. “The responsibility for dealing a deathblow to the global efforts of nuclear non-proliferation rests squarely with India”, Pakistani Foreign Minister Mr. Gauhar Ayub Khan said in Parliament reacting to the three implosions conducted by India in Pokhran Range of Rajasthan. Pakistan reserves the right to take all appropriate measures for its security, he declared in the statement which he made after an emergency meeting with the top officials of the foreign ministry. He said, “The news of the resumption of nuclear testing by India has not come as surprise to us, for the past 24 years, Pakistan has been consistently drawn the attention of the international community to India’s nuclear aspirations we have also pointed out the duplicity surrounding India’s political pronouncements and its clandestine nuclear weapons programme”, he said.14
In his statement Gauhar Ayub Khan said, "Mr. Shariff, who is currently in Alamattty attending an economic conference, he assured the people that, Pakistan’s defence would made impregnable against any Indian threat".15

PAKISTAN RETALIATES: PAK NUCLEAR TESTS OF CHAGAI HILLS

Pakistan Conducts Five Nuclear Tests

Pakistan, long suspected to have had a clandestine nuclear weapons programme carried out five “successful” nuclear tests on May 28th, 1998 declaring that ‘it had evented the account with India’.

In a statement that followed the testing, Pakistan said, it was ready to fit nuclear warhead to its newly tested long range Ghauri Missile. “The long-range Ghauri Missile is already being capped with the nuclear warhead to give a befitting reply to any misadventure by the enemy”. The statement added.

On his address to the nation, Pakistani Prime Minster Mr. Sharif said, “India’s detonation two weeks ago of five nuclear devices violently tilted the balance of power in the region, India’s deployment of long-range Prithvi Missile against Pakistan coupled with the detonation by New Delhi of nuclear devices seriously threatened Pakistan’s security” Mr. Sharif added. From the industrialized world Mr.
Shariff said, Pakistan received no offer of assistance. Mr. Shariff did not offer any information about the type of strength of the five devices Pakistan exploded in the Chagai Hills of Baluchistan province.16

A day after Pakistan matched its neighbor India with five nuclear detonations, Foreign Minister Mr. Gauhar Ayub Khan on Friday declared his nation a nuclear weapon state and vowed to retaliate to any attack from its neighbour with a “Vengeance”.17

Pakistan's Another Test:

Pakistan on 30th, May 1998 conducted one more test and offered to have talks with India for “Mutual Restraint” on the nuclear issue, declaring its series of nuclear tests stood completed as the “bare minimum response” to the five tests to New Delhi this month. “Pakistan is prepared to enter into discussion with India for talking all steps that are necessary to ensure mutual restraint” Foreign Secretary Shamshad Ahmed told the newspapers while country the latest tests.18

Nuclear Explosions by India and Pakistan:

Indo-Pak interaction acquired a new context with the nuclear tests of May 1998 when relations hit a new low. Pakistan tried to project the South Asian region as a nuclear flashpoint in the aftermath of the tests and sensitized the Kashmir question by linking with the nuclear tests. The extreme bitterness and tension between India and Pakistan in the
period after the nuclear tests did bring with it the realization on both sides that things could not continue in the same manner indefinitely and that a meeting ground had to be found.\textsuperscript{19}

Kargil Conflict:

In May 1999 large number infiltrators had sneaked in and occupied areas in the Kargil sector. In May when Canberra aircraft of India was dispatched on the mission of surveying the border, after having some doubts over the activities there, it reported that up to right helipad could be seen on the Indian side of the LOC. And there were number of pockets of intrusion. Then the apex cabinet committee on security of India met and decided to launch operation Vijay and use air power to evict the intruders.\textsuperscript{20}

The political objectives of Pakistan to launch activities were manifold. First of all, to show Kashmiri people about Pakistan’s commitments to a proxy war in the valley. Second, to show that foreign mercenaries were ready to scarified for the cause of Kashmiri people. Third, to spread the insurgency around Chorbat la, Turtuk and Challunka in the Shyok Valley. Fourth, questioning the validity of Simla Agreement to make Kashmiri issue an international issue.
The planning for Kargil started soon after General Musharraff took over as Chief of Army Staff in October 1998. The main ingredient of the plan was to occupy the dominating heights overlooking the Srinagar-Kargil Leh road which were left unheld by the Indians during the winter period and thereafter, cutting communication line to the Ladakh sector, so as to make infiltration process easy.

Indian army launched a massive attack to remove the infiltrators from the Indian Territory. By the first week of July Indian army succeeded in its efforts and reconsolidated its recaptured areas and restored the sanctity of LOC. On July 14th 1999, the Prime Minister declared the operation Vijay a success.21

Hijacking;

Apart from this, the most notable was the hijacking of Indian Airlines Flight IC 814 en route New Delhi from Kathmandu, Nepal. The plane was hijacked on December 24th, 1999 approximately one hour after takeoff and was taken to Amritsar airport and then to Lahore in Pakistan. After refueling, the plane took off for Dubai and then finally landed the Kandahar, Afghanistan. Under intense media pressure, New Delhi complied with the hijackers demand and freed Maulana Masood Azhar from its captivity in return for the freedom of the Indian passengers on the flight. The decision however, cost New Delhi...
dearly, Maulana, who is believed to be hiding in Karachi, later became the leader of Jaish-e Mohammad an organisation which has carried out several terrorist acts against Indian Security Forces in Kashmir.22

**Attack on Red Fort:**

On December 22nd, 2000, a group of terrorists belonging to the Lashkar-e-Toiba stormed the famous Red Fort in New Delhi. The Fort housed an Indian military unit and a high-security interrogation cell used both by the Central Bureau of Investigation and the Indian Army. The terrorists successfully breached the security cover around the Red Fort and opened fire at the Indian military personnel on duty killing two of them on the spot. The attack was significant because it was carried out just two days after the declaration of the cease fire between India and Pakistan.23

**Attack on Indian Parliament:**

When Pak supported militants attacked Indian Parliament in December 2001, once again Indo – Pak relations reached to a new low that a war looked inevitable accordingly. India mobilized its troops on the India and Pakistan border to demonstrate its resolve to fight the war against terrorism at all cost. Being a mature and responsible nation, having understanding of the implications of a war between two nuclear armed neighbours and its international ramifications, New Delhi,
however decided to give diplomacy one more chance even while preparing for the last option i.e. war. That is why even readying its defense forces give military actions after the attack on Parliament, New Delhi gave priority to diplomatic offensive including recalling its High Commissioner from Islamabad, slicing down the presence of Pakistan staff from High Commission in New Delhi, terminating the New Delhi Lahore bus service as well as Samjhuta express, withdrawing the permission to Pakistan to fly its aircraft through Indian Sky and demanding the extradition of 20 persons accused of committing various terrorist acts in India.24

**Attack on Temples in India:**

Two Kashmiri terrorists belonging to Jaish-e-Mohammad raided the Swami Narayan Temple complex in Ahmedabad Gujarat killing 30 people, including 18 women and five children. The attack was carried out on September 25th, 2002 just few days after state elections were held in Jammu and Kashmir. Two identical letters were found and both the terrorists claimed that the attack was done in retaliation for the deaths of thousands of Muslims during the Gujarat riots.

In an unsuccessful attempt, six terrorist belonging to Lashkar -e-thoiba stormed the Ayodhya Ram janmabhumi Complex on July 5th 2005. Before the terrorists could reach the main disputed site, they were
shot down by Indian security forces. One Hindu worshipper and two policemen were injured during the incident.25

Two car bombs exploded in South Mumbai on August 25th, 2003; one near the Gateway of India and the other at the famous Zaveri Bazaar. Killing at least 48 and injuring 150 people. Though no terrorist group claimed responsibility for the attacks. Mumbai police and RAW suspected Lashkar-e-Toiba’s hand in the twin blasts.26

2007 Samjhauta Express bombings:

The 2007 Samjhauta Express bombings was a terrorist attack targeted on the Samjhauta Express train on the 18th of February. The Samjhauta Express is an international train runs from New Delhi, India to Lahore, Pakistan, and is one of two trains to cross the India – Pakistan border.

Terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir:

Terrorist attacks of Jammu and Kashmir State Assembly: A car bomb exploded near the Jammu and Kashmir State Assembly on October 1, 2001, killing 27 people on an attack that was blamed on Kashmir separatists. It was one of the most prominent attacks against India apart from one on the Indian parliament in December 2001. The dead bodies of the terrorists and the data recovered from them revealed that Pakistan was solely responsible for the activity.
• 1997 Sangrampora massacre: On March 21st, 1997, seven Kashmiri Pandits were killed in Sangrampora village in the Budgam district.

• Wandhama Massacre: In January 1998, 24 Kashmiri Pandits living in the city Wandhama were killed by Islamic terrorists.

• Qasim Nagar Attack: On July 13th, 2003 armed men believed to be a part of the Lashkar - e- Toiba threw hand grenades at the Qasim Nagar market in Srinagar and then fired on civilians standing nearby killing twenty -seven and injuring many more.

• Assassination of Abdul Ghani Lone: Abdul Ghani Lone, a prominent All party Hurriyat Conference leader, was assassinated by an unidentified gunmen during a memorial rally in Srinagar. The assassination resulted in wide – scale demonstrations against the Indian occupied – forces for failing to provide enough security cover for Mr. Lone.

• July 20th, 2005 Srinagar Bombing: A car bomb exploded near an armoured Indian Army vehicle in the famous Church Lane area in Srinagar killing four Indian Army personnel, one civilian and the suicide bomber. Terrorist group Hizbul Mujahideen, claimed responsibility for the attack.

• Budsha Chowk attack: A terrorist attack on July 29th, 2005 at Srinagar’s city centre, Budhshah Chowk killed two and left more
than 17 people injured. Most of those injured were media journalists.

- Murder of Ghulam Nabi Lone: On October 18th, 2005 suspected Army man killed Jammu and Kashmir’s then education minister Ghulam Nabi Lone. No Terrorist group claimed responsibility for the attack.

India’s Border Security Force blamed the Pakistani military for providing cover – fire for the terrorists whenever they infiltrated into Indian Territory from Pakistan. Pakistan has in turn had also blamed India for providing support for terrorist groups inside Pakistan such as MOM.28

The 2008 Mumbai attacks (often referred to as November 26th or 26/11) were more than 10 coordinated shooting and bombing attacks across Mumbai, India’s largest city, by Islamic terrorists from Pakistan. The attacks, which drew widespread global condemnation, began on 26th November 2008 and lasted until 29th November, killing at least 175 people and wounding at least 308.

Eight of the attacks occurred in South Mumbai; at Chhatrapathi Shivaji Terminus, the Oberoi Trident the Taj Mahal Palace & Tower, Leopold Café, Cama Hospital (a women and children’s hospital) Nariman House, the Metro Cinema, and a lane behind the Times of
India buildings and St. Xavier's College. There was also an explosion at Mazagaon, in Mumbai port, area, and in a taxi at Vile Parle. By the early morning of 28 November, all sites except for the Taj hostel had been secured by Mumbai Police and security forces. An action by India's National Security Guards (NSG) on 29th November (the action is officially named Operation Black Tornado) resulted in the death of the last remaining attackers at the Taj hotel, ending all fighting in the attacks.28

Ajmal Kasab, the only attacker who was captured alive, disclosed that the attackers were members of Lashkar-e-Taiba, the Pakistan-based militant organisation considered a terrorist organisation by India, Pakistan the United States, the United Kingdom and the United Nations, among others. The Indian government said that the attackers came from Pakistan and their controllers were in Pakistan.29

On 7th January 2009 after more than a month of denying the nationality of the attackers, Pakistan's Information Minister Sherry Rehman officially accepted Ajmal Kasab's nationality as Pakistan. On 12th February 2009 Pakistani Interior Minister Rehman Malik, in a televised news briefing, confirmed that parts of the attack had been planned in Pakistan and said that six people, including the alleged
mastermind, were being held in connection with the attacks. A trial court on 6th May 2010 sentenced Ajmal Kasab to death on five counts.  

Post 26/11 Indo – Pak Relations

However the improving relations between the two neighbours could not afford to get a run. The dark night of the 26th of November, 2008 changed everything.

The severity of the attacks was unprecedented. And the popular reactions and sentiments that were witnessed were still more unprecedented. Bilatera relations between the neighbours immediately changed from sweet to sour. Cross – border terrorism was always a major concern for India and the terrorist camps operating in Pakistan occupied Kashmir (PoK) worsened the matters. The Mumbai attacks are being considered as the last mail on the coffin. There is no way India can leave Pak terror groups get away with such a gruesome and dastardly attack on the financial capital of our country. This has in effect severely jeopardized the improving Indo-Pak bilateral relationships.

1. The CBMs and other positive initiatives to bring peace to sub continent have gone in vain. Even after India’s repeated requests to Pakistan to close down all terrorist camps operating there. it has fallen deaf ears. Pakistani Presidents comment that terrorist are non-state actors and that the government of Pakistan has no
role to play in it despite concrete evidence against them added fuel to the fire. The sudden reaction from the Indian Government to snap all the trade ties with Pakistan was a result of this immature stand of the Pakistani government.

2. As the future course of action, India has got many options before them. But there is a fear that the tensed situation may lead into a fully fledged war. The development of war like condition between the two nuclear states is the worst fall out of the present impasse.

3. Before signing at Egypt, the secretary level talks between both sides on important matters like foreign policy, commerce certain clauses in Simla agreement, dispute in water sharing treaty had been put off indefinitely unless and until some concrete and stern step is taken by Pakistan to curb the menace of terrorism.

4. Pakistan has banned JUD, a terrorist organization linked with LeT. It is surely a positive step but a long road lay in front of them in gaining confidence of India and other nations of the world.

**India's Approach towards dealing with the Mumbai Attacks:** India and its establishments were badly shaken by the terrorist attacks on Mumbai. The public outrage it generated is also unparallel in the post independence history of India. Allegations are also being raised about India’s soft approach to terrorism related issues. The political establishments also stand bewildered. It is in this context that the need
for tackling the problem head-on was seriously felt. The Indian Government seriously felt the need to see through the issue to its logical end. India had before itself two alternatives to redress the problem.

**War:** As many in the country suggested, India needs to shed its soft approach and go on a hot pursuit against the terror installations in Pakistan and PoK, as the USA had done in Afghanistan post 9/11. This would invariably result in a war with Pakistan, with its own side – effects for both the countries.31

**ISSUE THAT MATTER ON SIACHEN**

The Stachen Glacier is located in the eastern Karakoram Range in the Himalaya Mountains at about 35°30’ N 77°00’E/35.50N77.00E, just east of the Line of Control between India – Pakistan. India controls all the Siachen Glacier itself including all tributary glaciers. At 70km (43 mi) long, it is the longest glacier in the Karakoram and second longest in the world’s no polar areas. The Siachen Glacier boasts the world’s highest helipad, built by India.

India has categorically certified that in the case of the dispute over the Siachen glacier, also known as the world’s highest battlefield, there was ‘no change’ in India’s position on the Siachen issue and that
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Pakistan would have to first authenticate the Indian positions at the 6,300 metre – high glacier. In actual position. India wants Pakistan to accept the actual ground position line on Siachen where its troops have been in position since 1984. Pakistan wants India to pull back to the position it occupied in 1972. Indian troops currently occupy advantageous positions along the 76 km long glacier. India says Islamabad must accept the actual ground position line (AGPL) before pulling back its forces that have been on station on the glacier since 1984. There is no flight in this area since 2003.

While both India and Pakistan agree that demilitarization of Siachen is essential, they strongly differ on the subsistence of such a deal. In particular, New Dehi has demanded that Pakistan authenticate currently held positions on the Saltoro Ridge as a guarantee against any future invasion. While Pakistan has refused to do so. The competing positions on both sides are also hardened by their desire for a settlement that would take into account the sacrifice of thousands on each side.

The problem reoccurred since September 2007, when India opened up mountaineering and trekking expeditions to the forbidding glacial heights. The first groups included cadets from Chail Military
Pakistan has protested against the trekking.\textsuperscript{32}

**IPI Pipe line**

The project was conceptualized in 1989 by Rajendra K. Pachauri in partnership with Ali Shams Ardekani, former Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran. Dr. Pachauri proposed the plan to both Iranian and Indian governments in 1990. The Iran - Pakistan - India gas pipe line, also known as the IPI pipeline or the Peace pipeline, is a proposed 2775 kilometer (1,724 miles) pipeline to deliver natural gas from Iran to Pakistan and India. In Pakistan territory, an 800 km pipeline will be carrying gas for both Pakistan and India.

Both India and Pakistan had resolved several outstanding issues on the $7.5 billion Iran - Pakistan - India (IPI) gas pipeline project and predicted it would start supplying natural gas by 2012. Construction work on the project was to begin in 2009. The project would supply 2.46 billion cubic feet of natural gas every day from the South Paras gas field in Iran on a 50-50 sharing basis between India and Pakistan. This 7.5 billion – dollar project to transport Iranian gas across the subcontinent while making a short stopover in Islamabad on the first leg of a whirlwind tour of South Asia was discussed. Talks on the 2,600 kilometer (1,615 mile) Iran – Pakistan – India pipeline began
in 1994 but have been stalled by tensions between India and Pakistan and disagreements over transit fees. One can recall that Iran has the world’s second largest gas reserves of 26 trillion cubic meters and 130 billion barrels of oil after Russia and Saudi Arabia respectively.

Recent problems:

Since India is reluctant to be a part of any further negotiation on the issue, Pakistani is learnt to have offered to buy the Indian share of the gas from Iran. India has not attended tri-lateral talks with Iran and Pakistan in the last one year. New Delhi and Islamabad had almost reached a broad understanding on the transportation tariff payable to Pakistan for wheeling natural gas through the 1,035 km pipeline segment in that country.

But the two nations have not yet arrived at an agreement on a transit fee payable to Pakistan for allowing usage of its territory for usage of the pipeline to India. Islamabad is seeking $0.493 per mBtu, while India had offered $0.20 dollars mBtu.

The government has asserted that India would not bow to external pressure, including from the United States, in deciding on its participation in the $7.4 billion Iran – Pakistan – India (IPI) gas pipeline project. India wanted guaranteed supply of gas and to take delivery at
its border with Pakistan, but Tehran and Islamabad had agreed on handing over custody of gas at the Iran – Pakistan border.

**Water sharing problem with Pakistan**

Government has seen reports regarding the remarks made by Adviser to Prime Minster of Pakistan on Education, Sardar Aseff Ali, stating inter alia that India will have to stop ‘stealing’ Pakistan’s water as Pakistan will not hesitate to wage war with New Delhi if it does not stop doing so, that the distribution of water is a sensitive issue and it may trigger a war between India and Pakistan and that Pakistan might seek international arbitration on the water issue by taking it up with the International Court of Justice (ICI) or the United Nations Security Council if India tried to construct any more dams that affect Pakistan’s share of water.

The allegation that India has denied Pakistan the share of water it is entitled to under the Indus Water Treaty (IWT) signed in 1960 between India and Pakistan, is completely baseless and has been categorically rejected. The Government is in full compliance with the Treaty. All issues regarding the implementation of the Treaty should be resolved through the existing mechanisms under the IWT.

The joint statement signed by Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Pakistani’s Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani in Shahram el –
Sheikh in July 16th, 2009 has rocked the Indian Politics. The joint statement mentions threats Pakistan faces in Balochistan. The opposition leaders have blamed the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh of accepting that India is guilty of exporting terror to Balochistan and other areas of Pakistan. This is the first time that the insurgent activities and the possibility of an Indian hand in the province of Balochistan have ever been acknowledged by India despite repeated accusations from Pakistan. India's position, therefore, has made a significant transition from flat denial to "discussion". It has also been felt the province will give Pakistan a trump card over India when it comes to matters pertaining to terrorism. This apprehension has been corroborated by the Pakistani PMs remarks two days after the controversial Indo-Pakistan print statement. Gilani had blamed India for interference in Balochistan and other areas and said that this document reflected Pakistani's concerns over composite dialogue process, which was a reversal of his earlier stand. L.K. Advani said delinking of terrorism from composite dialogue has been the demand of Pakistani and that 'we have conceded" seven months after the Mumbai attacks and this will have serious repercussions. 33

An Overview:

India and Pakistan relations are grounded in the political, geographic, Cultural and economic links between the Republic of India
and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The two countries share much of their common geographic location but differ starkly in religious demographics. Diplomatic relations between two are defined by the history of the violent partition of British India into these two states and numerous military conflicts and territorial disputes thereafter. India and Pakistan have fought three wars in Kashmir and their conflict now contains the seeds of a nuclear holocaust.

Perhaps the biggest hindrance to bilateral relations is the baggage of history. Partition left behind two mutually hostile nations and bitter memories. Wars have been fought in 1947–48, 1965, 1971. The Kargil conflict took place in 1999. The two nations came to the brink of nuclear war in 2001. The thorny issue of Kashmir separates the countries. Pakistan claims Kashmir to be the core issue. Pakistan has often tied progress in bilateral relations to progress made on Kashmir. Presently, differences over the questions of demilitarization and self-governance in Kashmir persist. Despite the joint declaration, the ‘K’ is not going to be overlooked in course of time. Cross-border terrorism is another major problem. India has accused Pakistan of aiding and abetting cross-border terrorism in India, especially in Kashmir. Pakistan has said that whatever is happening in Kashmir is a ‘freedom struggle’ which Pakistan morally supports. Bilateral talks have often been stalled due to terrorist attacks. Pakistan has denied that it
supports terrorism. Despite Pakistani promises that it is not allowing terrorist groups to operate from its territory, India has claimed that the terror infrastructure in Pakistan remains intact. The fact that both countries have nuclear weapons and has increased the threat perception in South Asia. There are other bilateral disputes like the Tulbul project Sir Creek Stachen etc. Pakistan’s ISI is reputedly setting up new bases in Nepal, Bangladesh etc. to carry out anti-India organizations like ULFA. The dominant role of the military in Pakistan is a hindrance. Despite the fact that democracy has been installed the influence of the army has remained intact. The influence of military has certainly contributed a lot to the war mania in Pakistan. The increasing Islamization of Pakistan as was evident from the happenings in Lal Masjid is a cause for concern for India. Extremist ideologies in Pakistan are spilling over to India. The use of international forum by Pakistan to raise bilateral disputes is on irritant. Pakistan is a prominent member of the Coffee Club which has opposed India’s bid for a permanent seat in the UN Security Council. India was accused Pakistan of not properly implementing SAFTA and discriminating against Indian goods. Many criminals who are wanted in India have taken shelter in Pakistan e.g. Dawood Ibrahim. India wants them back whereas Pakistan denies their presence on its soil. There are differences in values between the two countries. One is a theocracy and often totalitarian where as the other
is secular and democratic. These differences may hamper progress towards better relations. Pakistan has remained an important part of the Chinese game plan. The growing interference of Pakistan in Nepal and Sri Lanka indicates that Pakistan has decided outrightly to undermine Indian presence in its neighbouring countries.

In the light of above divergent issues and disputes, efforts have been made since the beginning of the issue to normalize cordial and friendly relations between these two neighbouring countries both at national and international levels, both in one way, two way and multiple ways and efforts were also made to build confidence and mutual trust between these countries. The succeeding chapter dealt with the process of normalization of relations between these two countries and confidence building measures built from both sides to have peaceful co-existence.
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