Chapter III

Energy Politics between India and Its Major Neighbours with Special Reference to Pakistan and Bangladesh

3.1 Introduction

South Asian Region is facing a daunting array of energy challenges. Due to lack of resources, the countries of this region have to force for energy supply not to abroad but search domestic options. I have already discussed in the chapter II of my research work, that energy politics is much more than supply and demand but it is a complex issue of bilateral and multilateral co-operation and conflict including with power politics, geopolitical risk, strategic aspects and policy of appeasement.

There is a close relation between political conflict and foreign relation in context of any co-operation. The confluence of political environment regional and international milieu determines the nature and content to deal with nations at regional level and abroad. Lack of proper liaison among multilateral or bilateral co-operation, may disturb the continuity as the system.

If the neighbouring countries always in entangled in their mutual relation, they cannot harmonizing their national interest and not determine
their role in international arena. Mutual conflict provides the opportunity to super powers to play, balancing game, according to their national interest and then regional policy is much influenced by external power. Energy politics among India, Pakistan and Bangladesh is fine example of this conflict and co-operation.

Since, energy security is indispensable factor for economic growth, so any country wants to preserve it. India and Bangladesh are three major countries of this region, are not exception of energy security norms.

In context of energy security, they have some common interest for energy security not only at home but also other supplies options. Political relation plays a decisive role in long and short term incentives in energy co-operation and conflict. In other word we can say that energy policy is the part of foreign policy of any country.

We cannot imagine better energy co-operation without better political relation. We have to understand political relation among these three countries for understanding energy politics. At first we take Indo-Pak relation after that India-Bangladesh relation.

3.2 India-Pakistan political nexus and role of external powers in bilateral relation
India and Pakistan have been at odds the birth from British Empire in 1947. Both nations originated on the basis of two nation theory which formed the primary source of cultural conflict between Hindu and Muslims. The two nation theory is based on the historical logic that Hindus and Muslim are two different nations in context of culture, customs, religious, and identity etc.

Although Hindus and Muslims had been live together in India before the advent of European colonial power. Some time their hostile relation appeared in the form of religious despotism like Jajiya tax, sabotaging activity in religious temple and other discrimination state rule. But even after this, their relation was able to sustain these ups and down and Indian society was roughly multi-cultural and pluristic society. After the rule of Balban, Firoz Shah Tuglak and Auranzeb, Indian society revived its traditional tendency of its pluralistic and multicultural component.

When British colonial rule established these traditional qualities of Indian society have been suppressed and provoke communal identity through the state sponsored policy of 'divide and rule'. The first expression of this state sponsored was seen when Lord Curzon divided Bengal in 1905. "The partition of Bengal was devised to divide people on the basis of religion and put Muslims against the Hindus". Separate electorate for Muslims, encourage Jinnah and Muslim League, Mac Donald communal
award, accept the Muslim League as a sole representative of Indian Muslims, policy of appeasement which exciting the Hindus’ radical groups; are the blue print of two-nation theory which filled with confusion, chaos, hatred and conflict between two sovereign states.

“The two-nation theory which became a dividing line of India's partition became a dividing line of India's partition and continues to be a principle source of conflict between the Pakistan’s Islamic ideology and India's secular nationalism”\(^2\).

Although, two-nation theory came in light before seven decades ago, but its impact has felt today in Indo-Pak relation with unending conflict. After the independence India and Pakistan established diplomatic relation but the communal ideological partition and numerous territorial and other disputes would over shadow their relation.

Mutual animosity and mistrust led the two neighbouring countries towards three full flagged war and one limited war, several agreements proved to be little their mutual relations.

The Kashmir issue and unending conflict on terrorism are the central theme of Indo- Pak political relation. The issue of Kashmir has many aspect but two aspects are very attentive- first, is tendency of nation state to assert their sovereignty by any means and second, ideology of the state, that
means Kashmir is a concept not a territory. These factors lead both countries toward antidentism and irredentism conflict between India and Pakistan.

For India, one hand Kashmir is the matter of Indian sovereignty as the integral part of its territory and other hand it is the matter of secular identity. In spite of, India knows the strategic significant for connecting China, Afghanistan and central Asia.

For Pakistan, it seems only crucial for its religious ideology of being a protagonist of the Muslim but also useful in raising the external threat of India really to wage an armed conflict for Kashmir and legitimize their government and established their government because it is necessary for its domestic consumption where the people are fed on the basis of anti Indian slogans.

Kashmir issue is a major determinant of the nature bilateral relation between India and Pakistan, all other issues based on this core issue. Main conflict between India and Pakistan, such as-arms race, balance of power game, nuclearisation of South Asian, terrorism and confidence building measures etc. depend upon the peaceful settlement of Kashmir issue.

In Act 1947, by British Parliament had a provision for sovereign princely states that “they had choice of joining any of the two nations by signing an instrument of accession n”³. At the time of independence 562 princely state was in exist, most of the princely states (559) joined to India
and Pakistan on the basis of the provision- of Muslim Majority princely states acceded to Pakistan and Hindu Majority princely states joined India. But three princely states-Hyderabad, Junagarh and Kashmir not decided their opinion at this time. At last Hyderabad and Junagarh occupied by India, but Kashmir could not reconcile with India or Pakistan because "Kashmir pose a particular problem it had a Hindu king Hari Singh and a Muslim majority population abutted both the future India and future Pakistan".

King Hari Singh was in hesitation to join any side and wanted to status quo for some time by assure to both side. In fact, he wanted a independent sovereign state of Kashmir. Pakistan and Muslim League wanted to occupy Kashmir on the basis of two-nation theory- Muslim majority area. India and National congress achieved it on the basis of secular ideology.

Pakistan was not agreed with Hari Singh's policy of appeasement, so Pakistan provoked tribal rebellion to attack on the Kashmir in October 20, 1947. When Hari Singh saw that the Royal Army was not capable of the facing this attack, he called to Indian Government for help. But India had put indispensable condition to sign the instrument of accession on October 27, 1947; King Hari Singh signed to instrument of accession and accepted to
Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of Indian union. In this way first war between India and Pakistan was fought sake of Kashmir.

Meanwhile, when Pandit Nehru decided to take Kashmir issue to UN without thinking cold war politics, made the Kashmir issue more complex.

Pakistan was feeling inferiority towards India with economically and military superiority since independence. So, Pakistan wanted to counter Indian threat by building up its military strength with the help of major powers. When Pakistan entered into a 'Mutual Security Pact' (1954) with the United States, which changed the whole context of the problems existing between India and Pakistan. I have discussed in previous chapter, that in which way Pakistan proved useful to the US in the policy of containment of communism in the Asian region and the US proved useful to Pakistan for favouring its position on Kashmir issue and military support.

'Strategic interest' and sense of common enemy' provide the opportunity for China and Pakistan to become an all weather friend. Involvement of external powers in the bilateral issues as well Kashmir brought towards cold war politics.

The US arms aid to Pakistan became a lasting and irritating issue in Indo- Pak relations, as result India started towards Soviet Union for purchasing arms. Soviet Union also had interest in India because Pakistan was used as tool by the US regime with SEATO and CENTO. U-2 spy plane
was taken off from a Pakistani base, as a result Soviet Union felt great security concern towards Pakistan. This increased the Soviet interest in the South Asian region.

As thus, political stability of South Asia liked with external power politics and Kashmir issue was internationalized through UN Security Council. 5 Cease fire line (designated as line of control after Shimla Agreement) became bone of contention between India and Pakistan and determined the permanent enmity in the bilateral relation.

Pakistan did not want to depend on one supplier, so gradually moved towards China. Indo-China war of 1962 was a dividing line to understand China- Pakistan relation. China's involvement in territorial dispute made the situation worst, 35000 sq km. forcefully occupied and 5000 sq km handed over by Pakistan for Karakoram Highway linking China's Xinkiang province, had turned Kashmir issue so called bilateral to trilateral. Pakistan treated China as a shield to protect itself from any Indian attack.

Although the war of 1965 between India and Pakistan on the basically focused on Kashmir. “The 1965 war of India and Pakistan had been fought around the Kashmir issue. Ayub Khan had thought that India hold over Kashmir, had been weakened in the wake of wide spread disturbances in the state after the holy hair at Hazratbal in Srinagar had been mysteriously stolen and equally mysteriously restored.”6
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Pakistani political elite had maintain the Kashmir issue as unfinished agenda of partition as the tool of legitimatize their coup governments and non-democratic regime ruled over Pakistan on the name of Kashmir. This fact we may analyse in the statement of General Pervez Musharraf. "Let us learn to concept harsh facts that Kashmir is at the Center stage of Indo-Pak relations and has to be settled in an equitable and honorable way acceptable of India, Pakistan and Kashmiris".⁷

In this way, historical Kashmir dispute became a bilateral conflict between India and Pakistan and later it developed into an international issue. When Pakistan felt that both military and diplomatic ways to settle Kashmir issue had failed, then Pakistan started the proxy war against India in form of terrorism.

The inter services Intelligence agency of Pakistan has played a crucial role in promoting state sponsored policy of proxy war against India. In 1980s, ISI promoted terrorist activities in Kashmir for destabilize and create fear among the people of Kashmir, and now its activity spread all over the Indian territory.

Nuclearisation of both countries, had added a new concern with Kashmir issue. Now, western analysts is called it as a 'nuclear flush point of South Asia' because bilateral tension over Kashmir territory may turn into danger of nuclear war any time, as seen in Kargil crisis in 1999.
Today, Pakistan has known as a notorious country for supporting terrorism, the US not to support Pakistan to counter India and giving its approval Shimla Agreement (1972) to solve their bilateral relation. After assassination of Osama-bin-Laden in Abottabad on May 2, 2011 the U.S. policy maker clearly accepted that Pakistan is the centre hub of state sponsored terrorism promoting Taliban and Haqqani network is the dual containment of anti-terrorism policy of Pakistan. Now, the US does not want blindly economic and military support to Pakistan, its impact may analyse the present tension in Pak-US relation.

Consequently, Pakistan is giving priority for sheltering, not the US but China. Although China is not supporting openly to Pakistan on Kashmir issue but Chinese involvement in Pak occupied Kashmir in different infrastructure project with its army, obviously supporting Pakistan. China's strategists recognize Indo- Pak enmity in the favour of Beijing’s advantage in the case of countering the US, India, Japan, Vietnam, South Korea and Australian allies.

Now, we take two other territorial disputes between Indo-Pak relation-dispute over the Rann of Kutch and Siachen. The Rann of Kutch is situated at the western border of the India with Pakistan. This region is boggy ground, by this region border could not decided on the time of partition. There is a dispute over the first 104km with the mouth of river Sir Creek.
According to Indian position is that border should be at the median of the navigable channel of river but Pakistan wants to be along the left bank of the river. The war of 1965 was fought for the Rann of Kutch position.

Siachen glacier has a strategic importance, so both countries assert to capture it. Since 1983, army of both side are face to face in this region and India has captured this by its operation Vaccum in 1984 with the claim of security concern. Although, point NJ9842 was decided as the line of control through Shimla Agreement (1972). But India occupied Siachen (higher point than NJ 9842 at Kargil) after the infiltration of Pakistan. Both countries have fought fourth war as Kargil crises (1999) with the position to change the geo-strategic position for their advantage.

Terrorism is playing a major crucial role to determine Indo- Pak relation for three decades. Terrorist activity started in the decade of 1980s. New cold war politics promoted it for countering Soviet army in Afghanistan. When Soviet Invasion came in force in Afghanistan, Pakistan became a favourite for the US regime and they cynically supported Pakistan. When General Zia-ul-Haz introduce Islamic Sharia law, encouraged the development of Madrassa and Islamicised Pakistan army and its intelligence agency ISI. The US, equipped Mujaheddin, ultimately helping to force Soviet Union's withdraw from Afghanistan. Many of these well armed and religious inspired involve into Islamic Jihadist of today, with Taliban, Haqqani Group,
Al-Qaeda associations with different names- Laskha-e-Toiba, Jaish-e-Mohammad, Harkat-ul-Mujahideen etc.

Pakistan's state sponsored strategy of terror seems to change with time to time. In 1980s it was called as 'Pak-trained Pak militant' that means terrorist were trained in Pakistan and sent to India for their activity and ISI guiding and funding them. But ISI has changed its strategy in 1990s and adopted the policy of 'Pak-train- Indian militant'. ISI began training to some Indian misguided youth in the militant camp not only POK but Karachi also.

Today, Pakistani agency ISI has adopted two more dangerous forms of terrorism, first -three stage module and provoking youth for throwing stones and exercised violence against government with the paid of money.\(^8\)

In its module strategy, ISI only provided explosive and money and whole strategy run by different totally unknowing groups in the India. No one module knows who the second is and what is his work. So, if one module has captured by police or intelligence agencies, it is very difficult to search at main source.

It is the short picture of Indo-Pak conflict. It is not true that any attempt was not taken in context of conflict resolution, conflict management or conflict prevention. Many steps has been taken time to time for this purpose but their impact is not long lasting we can seen many confidence

After the facing two great challenges the problem of native states and the problem of displaced minorities, both countries agreed on a settlement to the dispute of Indus water distribution in 1960 with the arbitration of World Bank. The Indus water treaty was the first mile stone in Indo- Pak relations. This treaty divided the six major river of the Indus river system between India and Pakistan.

Three eastern rivers- Sutles, Beas and Ravi was allocated to India and three western rivers- Indus, Jhelum and Chenab allocated to Pakistan. The head water of all these six rivers are situated in Indian territory and the right of limited use (flood, agriculture but not purpose of control water flow) of India to Pakistani sides river, provoked Pakistan's position that it has the victim of Indian strong arm tactics. So, Pakistan always created dispute on India's construction of dam and other project which is related to these rivers like- Kishan Ganga Dam, Wular Barrage etc.
India and Pakistan signed the historical nine points Taskant Agreement on 10 Jan 1966 in the mediation of Soviet Union. In this declaration it was promised to promote good neighbouring relation according to UN charter, peaceful settlement of dispute and no use of force, no interference in domestic affairs, trying to prevent propaganda campaign in their society against each others, to maintain the political, economic, cultural and communicative relation and repatriation of prisoner of war.

“No doubt the Tashkent meet was a historical moment and with Soviet assistance a break through had been achieved. An atmosphere of cautious optimism prevailed and for the first time some hope was entertained that India and Pakistan might be able to turn from the path of conflict and strive to live in amity and peace”. But the optimism of this peace process was derailed due to many factors. At first information report, although 1965 war was ended with any party gain but inherently it proved the relative superiority of Indian military capability over Pakistan, and its reaction Pakistani government attempted for triangular axis among US, China and Pakistan for strengths its military capability.

Meanwhile, Pakistan completed the agreement for a road which join Gilgit to Chinese province Xinxiang. Secondly, Pakistan was always trying to support on Kashmir issue with the help of China, the US and even Soviet Union's political pressure and India could not neglect it. Third, Ganga river
water hearten the relation continue. Fourth, Pakistan constantly promoted the propagandized activity against India. Pakistan media called the Tashkent declaration as 'surrender before India' and even president Ayub Khan who signed the agreement himself called the people that work done according to UN charter, not mean the war never fought, no force use mean only that if the path of peace open then no use of violence. Prime Minister Bhutto also compared it as 'destroyed Islamic Culture by Hindu culture' It was some inherent factor of 1971 war.

Shimla agreement was signed between India and Pakistan on July 2, 1972. India had finished the 1971 war as decisive task and Pakistan not only accepted his defeat but its territorial sovereignty has broken. Pakistan also bewared blackmailing with India by 5000 sq miles of its territory of western sector and near about 93000 soldiers who were captured by India as prisoners of war. Meanwhile, Pakistan's domestic politics was at the edge of upheaval and new elected president Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, had to promise that he would joint Bangladesh in Pakistan as soon as possible.

The government of India and Government of Pakistan agreed put an end the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto married their relation and ready for promoting friendly and harmonious relation for sake of peace in subcontinent. In order to achieve this objective both government agreed on 10. UN charter shall govern their relation, to settle their difference by
peaceful mean and prevent any acts of detrimental to maintenance of peace and harmonious relation, committed for peaceful co-existence and non interference in internal affairs with the respect of territorial integrity and sovereignty any conflict shall be resolved by peaceful means, prevent hostile propaganda, and promoting friendly relation like communications, travel, trade, economic, science and cultural co-operation. Both sides also agreed to reaffirm the ceasefire line of 1948 recognized as 'line of control' and they accepted it as 'de facto' international border. Both countries also agreed on their heads meeting for peace and normalization of relation.

Although, Bhutto promised in the Shimla accord, peaceful settlement of bilateral disputed but he repeatedly put up Kashmir issue on any forum where any possibility remains. At this juncture two events, fainted the Shimla spirit-first was Indian nuclear test at Pokhran in 1974 and second was coup in Pakistan and military dictatorship with General Zia-ul-Haq.

India's so-called 'peaceful purpose' nuclear test at Pokhran in 1974 not only proved India as a 'threshold power' but also started the process of nuclearisation of Pakistan. Bhutto called that this test finished the agreement of 'no war between India and Pakistan' and promised to his people for Islamic bomb.

General Zia, not only promoted Islamic fundamentalist for terrorist activity but also defined the close relation with China for nuclear umbrella.
At this period Indian and Pakistan signed two agreement for conflict management and conflict prevention first, no attack on atomic research centre and atomic reactor with exchange its information (1987) second, no use of chemical weapons (1992)

After a long time of dictatorship, when democratic rule was restored, a new hope of harmonious relation did not success because of terrorism and bigoted civil society in Pakistan which was the result of General Zia's Islamisation of Pakistan. In male SAARC summit 1997, both countries agreed on the composite dialogue with including eight issues- Kashmir, Siachen, Tulbul Project, Sir Creek, Terrorism and drugs trafficking, economic and trade, peace and security and promoting friendly co-operation in the different areas. But this dialogue continues faced many barricades time to time and the dialogue has been restricted time to time (1998, 2001, and 2008).

Nuclear test of India and Pakistan in 1998 has brought further the complexity in bilateral relation and created a great challenge of nuclear war which was obviously seen in Kargil crises in 1999.

9/11 event and America's intervention in Afghanistan promoted anti-terrorist feelings all over the world and it was hoped that Pakistan had to destroy terrorist activity towards India and their bilateral relationship might be free from terrorist fear. By this reason India gave fully support to this
anti-terrorist campaign of west regime and Pakistan supported this campaign for legitimizing his military Junta from the west and saw a great opportunity for economic aids and military support from the U.S.

Today, the US destroyed Al-Qaeda chief Osama-bin-Laden (2 May, 2011) but Al-Qaeda and Taliban could not destroy because of Pakistani secret support. In terrorist perspective 9/11 could promote only the US interest, not promote Indian interest of destroying terrorism in Pakistan. Today, the US campaign in Afghanistan took over with incomplete task without defeated terrorist since 2014, terrorist activity may be strong not only Afghanistan but Pakistan also. The US declaration of withdraw from Afghanistan is making gesture of powerful terrorism that, how much affected bilateral relation of Indo- Pak? It can not utter with certainty but its impact surely negative.

The peace process between India and Pakistan is derailed when any terrorist attack fall on Indian territory overthrown the bus or cricket diplomacy. The validity of these diplomacies depends on the duration of time how long any terrorist attacks are not imposing on India. We have seen Lahore Declaration's (1999) sprit has followed only few months till Kargil infiltration has not came in light. Terrorist attack on Jammu and Kashmir's legislature and Indian parliament (2001) has changed the peace process, as the same we can see at the time of 26/11 Mumbai attack in 2008. Although
both side has agreed on cease fire at the border but many skirmish event came in light time to time because Pak army is the supporter of terrorist and its volleys of gun fire helps the terrorist to entry in Indian Territory.

Although, peace process has been restored after Mumbai attack but its long lasting validity no one can predict. As thus, the Indo- Pak political relation has been paused by hostility and suspicion. Today, Indo- Pak relation is based on two points first information report how much Pakistan involve in power balancing game with China and the US and second, how much haunt indiscriminately their bilateral relation.

3.3 Political Nexus between India and Bangladesh

As Pakistan, Bangladesh was the part of British India; Indo-Bangladesh bilateral political relation has been also haunted by some common problem like Indo- Pak relation- border dispute, anti Indian regime, military or non-democratic rule, Islamic fundamentalism and some exported inherent threat.

Bangladesh was the part of Pakistan on the basis of two nation theory at the time of partition. The origin of new state as Bangladesh was the result of ups and downs of internal politics of Pakistan. It is no doubt, Indian decisive role and cold war and global alliance system also had a role. East Pakistan (Bangladesh) which was the result of religion partition put more
population but political control was in the hand of West Pakistan, Both sides of Pakistan different language, different culture and different tradition.

There was no similarity between both sides of Pakistan except religion. Pakistan government, especially military rule of Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan, started political suppression in spite of emotional rapprochement. In spite of majority in general election of National Assembly, Awami League was deprived from government and its leader Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was captured. As the result, civil war started in the East Pakistan and the question of refugees and internal interference in domestic affairs had led toward war of 1971 between India and Pakistan and birth of Bangladesh.

India could not never mind the violence near its border and more than one crore refugees was over burden on its economic and political strength. So, India decided for declared war and supporting anti- Pakistan ' Mukti Vahini' with economically and military.

I have already discussed that Pakistan had become a perennial security concern for India since independence by the help of western alliance’s tool of CENTO and SEATO and entente with China. The crisis of 1971 war “provide a golden opportunity for India to deal a coup degrade to the Pakistani counter weight and emerge as the pre-eminent power in South Asia.”
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In the behind of emergence of Bangladesh was much affected by cold war politics. For its protection, Pakistan associated with SEATO. China and the US, were compelled for their strategic interest to contain Soviet hegemony in South Asia. China and the US openly support to Pakistan while India allied with Soviet Union for balance of power politics. The Soviet Union was taking Bangladesh as another political link in the chain of states stretching from Afghanistan to Japan which might counter tool of China and the US strategy to encircle Soviet Union. Indo- Soviet treaty of friendship and co-operation in 1971, was the Part of Soviet policy of consolidation of third world with friendship treaties like Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Vietnam and Afghanistan.¹²

India played a important decisive role in liberation of Bangladesh, so the relation of both countries was very harmonious in initial stage. After only three months of 'Victory Day' (16 Dec 1971), both countries signed a treaty 'Indo- Bangladesh treaty of friendship and peace' on 19 March 1972, which was twenty five year plan with the provision of renewable by mutual agreement.

After signing the treaty, Prime Ministers of both countries- Sheik Mujibur Rahman and Indira Gandhi at Dhaka, told in Joint statement that both countries signed the treaty for expression of similarity in 'thoughts,
ideas and interest' and ideals of peace democracy, secularism, socialism and nationalism were impetus for treaty.

India gave its full support to Bangladesh in the membership of UNO and both countries agreed on the endeavor of declaration of Indian Ocean as a free from atomic weapons and big power rivalry and committed on Joint commission for the Ganga river.

Actually, Indo- Bangladesh treaty was based on some common interest of both countries. For Bangladesh, which surrounded on three sides by Indian territory and more than 90% its border with India and only small boundary linked with Myanmar and Indian navy controlled the Bay of Bengal in southern coast. It was indispensable for Bangladesh to go under the Indian defence umbrella for peace and security. Without harmonious relation with India, Bangladesh required strong military force with navy which was not sustainable for new born country.

For India, it was the interest of strategic and internal security concern. It was not in favour of another pro-China regime like Pakistan and India also afraid of future alliance of Bangladesh and Pakistan on the basis of Islamic fundamentalism which would weaken the Indian hegemony in Indian ocean and South Asian region, separatist.

Movement in North- East could not counter without the help of neighbouring country. So, India promoted Awami League regime and
supported Bangladesh army through military aids and training in order to combat not only anti Bangladesh forces and anti-India feelings but also combated the naxalites internal threats.

Mostly provision of Indo- Bangladesh treaty was like the Indo- Soviet treaty of 1971. For example, article 8 which states that the two countries "shall not entered into or participate in any military alliance direct against the other party…… shall not allow the use of its territory for committing any act that may cause military damage to or constitute a threat to the security of other high contracting party" and article 10 says that both countries" shall not undertake any commitment, secret or open, towards one or more states which may be incompatible with the present treaty" and Article 11 states that "the present treaty is signed for term of twenty five years" and "subject to renewable by mutual agreement". ¹³

In Mujib era, foreign policy of Bangladesh was based on four pillars of nationalism, secularism, democracy and socialism which were Pro-Indian. Although, anti-Indian groups were trying to protest Indo- Bangladesh entente, but anti-India feelings was not effective in order to pro Indian government and public support in Bangladesh.

Mujibur Rahman also believed in mostly principles of Indian foreign policy like-non-alignment, anti-colonialism or anti-imperialism, anti racism, peaceful co-existence and supporting UNO. So, the foreign policy of
Bangladesh and its constitution adopted these ideas and Awami League government officially declared that “friendship with India is a cornerstone of the foreign policy of Bangladesh.” The Mujib government banned all the political parties which had played anti-Bangladesh role in 1971 war and controlled anti Indian groups like Maulana Bhasani group.

In contrast Mujib, Maulana Bhasani advocated anti Indian policy, so he criticized the ‘Indo- Bangladesh friendship treaty’ for having traded the political and economic sovereignty of Bangladesh to India. He wanted to Islamic identity and closed relation with Islamic world as well as Pakistan. He always attempted for uniting extremist to counter secular Awami League and his ultimately aim for creation of a new sovereign state ' Bangassam' which included Bengali speaking areas of Eastern India and Bangladesh.

Harmonious period of Mujib era led the bilateral relation at new height. Both countries signed a short trade agreement with provision of duty free zone of 16 km, India consulted Bangladesh before Shimla agreement and put condition for prisoners of war as recognition of Bangladesh before Pakistan and a agreement also had done for sharing of the Ganga water.

Many anti Indian forces worked in Bangladesh since independence. So, they used the laxity of administration for promoting anti-India feelings. When Mujib felt that his government was stumbling on economically and politically, then the declared emergency on 24 Dec 1974 for handling the
situation. Some military officers murdered Mujib and his family in a coup on 15 August 1975. This was not only the murder at political leader but also the murder of Indo-Bangladesh harmonious relation. We can see that post Mujib era especially military rule and thereafter two different regime of pro-Indian (Awami League) and anti-Indian (Bangladesh Nationalist Party BNP) openly is exercised their tactics in Indo-Bangladesh relation.

At the time of coup anti Indian tendency and Islamic fundamentalism was increased at highest point. After a short duration of power conflict General Zia-ur- Rahman came in power and four pillars at Bangladesh foreign policy had been dismissed by military rule and adopted pro Islamic and pro Pakistan policy. The Military rule promoted extremist for legitimacy of its government, as the result concept of ‘Bangassam’ reborn in Bhasani’s successors’ view. After this entire North-East India had gone under the threat of insurgencies which provided a opportunity for China and Pakistan to unstable India. General Zia adopted the secularism in the favour of Islam and coloured the army with Islamic norms. General Zia also tried to internationalise bilateral issues like the Ganga water dispute.

After the assassination of General Zia in 1981, his civilian successor government overthrew by a bloodless coup and the second military regime under the leadership of General H.M. Ersad came to power. General Ershad followed the policies of General Zia and declared Islam as state religion,
promoted anti India feelings and treated with Indo- Bangladesh treaty of 1972 as 'imposed on Mujib and Bangladesh'. At this time China emerged as an important economic and trade partner and largest supplier of military hardware. Although, two memoranda of understanding on the Ganga water sharing were signed in 1982 and 1987 but the proper solution could not coined.

When democracy restored in Bangladesh in 1991, Bangladesh Nationalist party (BNP) came to power in the leadership at Begaum Khaleda Zia. In fact, BNP is the successor of the view of Maulana Bhasani and General Ershad with anti India feelings. BNP and Begaum Khaleda Zia wants to strength its power on the base of co-operation with extremist and religious political groups and always has used the anti Indian emotion in election. So, India Bangladesh treaty friendship and peace which was ended in 1997 could not renewal.

In spite of BNP, Awami League which is led by Sheikh Hasina, promotes his father's policy of pro Indian. So, Indo-Bangladesh relation has qualitative changed during both regimes. We can see that important developments between India and Bangladesh have formed during the Awami League's government. Thirty years Ganga water treaty (1996) agreement with Shanti Bahini (1996), bus service from Kolkata to Dhaka (1996), and present border dispute agreement on many enclaves (2011) have been led by
this regime. Sheikh Hasina already has assured India not to use its territory for countering India. The Prime Minister's visit of both country in Dhaka in Sep 2011, proved a landmark in bilateral relation in which both countries agreed on the historical border disputed of enclaves and continued for dialogue on the water sharing of the river Teesta and Feny.

Indo-Bangladesh political relation does not haunt only anti-Indian regime but trade deficit, refugee migration, maritime border disputes, water sharing disputes, drug trafficking, China and Pakistan's involvement in Bangladesh also the important case of haunt.

Many Indian ethnic radical organizations are used the border’s complexity and promoting their transnational activities by the help of Pakistani ISI and Chinese support and border complexity with Bangladesh proved to them as haven. It is good for India that Sheikh Hasina government hand over the ULFA chief Arvinda Rajkowa to India who is the great concern of Indian internal security concern.

Today, Bangladesh also seems to play 'China card' like Pakistan for bargaining with China and India. Bangladesh sought Chinese help in construction a highway passing through Yunnan province to China and a rail network passing through the same route. China has already involved in developing Chittagong and develops a deep sea port at Sonadia Island. This Chinese activity has haunted India because Coco Island (Myanmar) and
Sonaida Island (Bangladesh) have encircled Indian Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Chinese Arms export to Bangladesh and agreement of peaceful usage of nuclear energy in 2005 and a defence co-operation agreement (2002) with China, may create a another Pakistan to Counter India.¹⁶

3.4 Energy Politics: Challenges and Possibilities

There was an expectation of regional identity, shared values and new ascendancy with SAARC which could provide best way to resolve the bilateral and multilateral issue but political relation block the suitable path of SAARC. These nexus has coloured the energy politics at both domestic and foreign level. In energy context, due lack of resources these countries should go for co-operation but their political relation flush out the co-operation. The economy of Pakistan and Bangladesh has dominated by natural gas and Indian economy by coal. Knowing the limitation at fossil fuel they are also trying for renewal energy source and nuclear energy but they do not like to co-operate with neighbour due to political relation. One side they are not co-operating on domestic resources and other side external options are nettled in their political milieu. If we want analyse energy politics among India, Bangladesh and Pakistan we should focus on three main points-

1. Hydro electric power and water disputes

2. IPI and TAPI gas pipe lines
3. Nuclear energy and nuclearisation of South Asia.

3.4.1 Water Resources and Hydro-power

India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are situated in the lap of the Hindkush Himalayan region which is the source of three main Himalayan river systems- Indus, Brahmaputra and Ganga. “Together, these three rivers are estimate to carry an average of 1200 cubic kilometers of water every day. When combined with Meghana (Barak), a non Himalayan river which has an average annual flow of 100 cubic kilometers the Ganga- Barhmaputra Meghna becomes the world's third largest river system.”

As thus, these countries have a lot of possibility of hydro electric source of energy with their domestic resources but their political relation and seasonal flowing of water (about 80% of total annual flow between June to September and only 20% flow during the other months) are threatening the concern of sharing and managing this resource. It has also fuelled the conflict between sharing countries. The inherent indirect China factor includes in the water resources sharing and managing which may irritate in any attempts the peace and co-operation in the region.

Although, the Ganga originates inside the Himalayas (Gangotri glacier) but the Indus and Brahmaputra originate from Tibet region (Mansarowar). So, China is the indispensable part of the Indus and the Brahmaputra river system. Today China's many eastern provinces are facing
the problem of drought, so China has proposed many dams at the Brahmaputra and China's attempt to turn the natural flow of this river system. China is also playing dangerous, dam’s love game' not only Africa, Latin America region but South Asia region also. China is involve in the dam and other strategic project in Pak occupied Kashmir (POK) and its thousands People Liberation Army has created a new challenge to India.

Water resources of energy among these countries paste the notion of security and insecurity. Who has the right over the river and their resources-one whose territory originates the river or whose territory ends the rivers; is the basis question? It is the question of all trans boundary rivers like- Nile, Zaire,Niger, Amazon Danube, Rhine etc. Water disputed exists all over the world but South Asia especially Indo- Pak and Indo- Bangladesh are very complicated issue. Time has provided many water sharing treaties among these countries but their operating nature turn slowly in technical term and lack of political consent lead towards suspicion.

Water sharing disputes have been haunted the Indian continent since British rule but the partition of India and Pakistan and later birth of Bangladesh created ' mental borders' of suspicion and mistrust in water sharing- and co-operative approach in managing. Although these countries is divided by man made artificial border but rivers know no artificial boundary and flow naturally across these countries and bind the landscape into
composite whole. For example India and Pakistan is related to the Indus Basin and India and Bangladesh closed with Brahmaputra- Meghana basin. At first, we take water resources co-operation and conflict between India and Pakistan.

The partition of India and Pakistan was not only partition of land but it was the partition of the Indus and Ganga water basin also. During the partition, borders were drawn with little consideration to water resources. The Radcliffe line cut the Indus water system, headquarters were in India and irrigation area was lying under the territory of Pakistan. Controlling the headquater by India, Pakistan as lower riparian, felt insecurity because the Indus water disruption could destroy the cultivable land of Pakistan. At the same, it divided the Ganga basis, which led to water disputes immediately after partition. Water dispute for controlling of the Indus water heads, became another dimension of Kashmir issue.

More than one decade of negotiations to resolve the dispute over the use for irrigation and hydro-power of the Indus water system. India and Pakistan signed the Indus Water Treaty (Sep 1960) with the mediation of World Bank. The Indus water Treaty divided the six major rivers of Indus water system between India and Pakistan. Three eastern rivers- Ravi, Beas and Sutles allotted to India and three western rivers, Indus, Jhelum and Chenab allotted to Pakistan.
Although Pakistan has right to complete unrestricted use of Indus, Chenab and Jhelum, however India as a upper riparian state is allowed limited use of these rivers for the purpose such as domestic use, non-consumptive use, agricultural use (as set out in Annexure D)\textsuperscript{19}. But India has no right to store or divert the water. This treaty also has a provision of permanent Indus commission to resolve the any question of water sharing. If the commission fails to settle the dispute the issue will referred to a natural expert appointed by World Bank, whose decision will be binding for both countries. It is also the provision in the treaty to refer the dispute to a court of arbitration or appeal to the International court of Justice (Article IX)

Although Indus water treaty has governed water resources share with legal frame work but India and Pakistan continued to feud over interpretation of the agreement, with different dam project often serving as a flash point for tensions which is base on political relation. The Baglihar Dam, Tulbul Navigation (Wular Barrage), The Kishan Ganga Dam and Indian retention of water from Ravi, Beas, and Sutlej river are highlighted as dispute of water sharing time to time. Since, it is the matter of public emotion because of agriculture for irrigation easily can provoke the false rumors for political gain. Pakistani leader has used it always in their political campaign." In the most cases, Pakistan believes it has been the victim of Indian strong arm tactics."\textsuperscript{20}
India began Baglihar dam on Chenab river of Indus system with 450 megawatt hydroelectric plant in 1992, Pakistan opposed it on the basis of violating Indus water treaty because in view of Pakistan this dam stores the water of river Chenab. Both countries started their bilateral dialogue in 2000 but no solution could not found in formal official talks by the reason of obstinate explanation of the Indus water Treaty in own favour.

On 15 January 2005, the matter referred to World Bank's neutral arbitration. Dr. Raymond Lafitte was appointed as neutral arbitrator by the World Bank with the mutual consent of both countries. Dr Lafitte tried to negotiate with several rounds talk with both side and after observing the reality of ground position of the project, he recommended the reduction of storage capacity 37.5 million cubic meters to 32.45 million cubic meters and dam height was recommended 1.5 meters less than which India planed. Both countries accepted the recommendation. India has got the permission to continue the project and Pakistan has got success to diminish the height of dam. As thus, Baglihar dam dispute has solved with proper solution with the help of third party mediation.

Tulbul navigation or wular Barrage is another dispute based on Indus water treaty, which is constructed by India on the Jhelum to improve water flow for navigation between Sopore and Baramula. Pakistan is opposing it since 1984, when India has started the construction. Pakistan is opposing by
saying that this construction would change the volume of daily water flow which may harm Pakistan's three canal system down stream and provision of water storage which would violate the Indus water treaty. But India has refused all these arguments and says this project not for storage but only for regulate the flow of river which has provided as privilege to limited use by the provision of the Indus water Treaty. Both countries are negotiating to solve the dispute but the solution is delay today.

The Jhelum river has also two unresolved dispute of dams- Kishenganga dam of India and Neelhum- Jhelum Dam of Pakistan. India's decision to build a 330 megawatt hydroelectric plant, is opposed by Pakistan by claim of violation of the Indus water treaty with argue that the project may “submerse vast tracts of land in the Gurez area and displace local residents.” India has also opposed on Pakistan's Neelhum- Jhelum hydroelectric plant but this opposition is mainly based on political and strategic scenario.

India does not want that Pakistan build any dam or construction in POK region because it is the legally part of India and India can not bear more influence of China in Jammu and Kashmir. Today China, is playing a 'dangerous dam love game' not only in South Asia but other Asian, African, Latin American region also. China has no hesitation to build the dam project
in disputed areas. China is applying this policy in Indo- Pak pungent relation.

China is not only investing in dam project in POK region but posted its People's Liberation Army in other strategic project run by the assistance of China. Military presence in POK by China has created fear to India for encircling east to west both front. In this condition, during war period with Pakistan or China may open the dual battle front against India.

So, India is forced to talk not only with Pakistan but China also. One side India, is talking several rounds of negotiation with Pakistan and other side raised the matter of involvement of China in POK in high level meetings with China. But no solution can be found. In March 2009, Pakistan commission of Indus water proposed India to request a World Bank's neutral arbitrator to resolve the conflict but decision is waited.

This is the short picture of water resources of energy politics between India and Pakistan which is totally netted in suspicion and dissent. This picture is some different within Indo- Bangladesh because there is no everlasting any legal water sharing treaty like Indus water Treaty in bilateral relation. All the treaties between India and Bangladesh are time limited (adhoc).

India and Bangladesh shares 54 transboundry rivers including main three rivers Ganga, Meghana and Brahmaputra. As with Pakistan, India has
suffered water sharing and management problem with Bangladesh. This problem has been continuing before the birth of Bangladesh.

The Ganga water dispute has become tremendous, when India's proposal to build the Farraka Barrage in West Bengal in decade of 1950 (but it was finally built between 1962-1971). The main reason behind the Ganga water dispute is matter of dividing of water during lean season. In lean season January to May (especially March to May) the water flow of the Ganga determines its lowest level of 55000 cusecs. India has minimum requirement of 44000 cusecs water for Kolkata port activation and remain 15000 cusecs water, is entirely trifile for need of Bangladesh.

The Ganga divides into branch in Murshidabad district of West Bengal, one branch named; Bhagirathi- Hugli flows in lower areas of West Bengal and other Branch named Padma flows with India- Bangladesh border and combined with Brahmaputra then known as Meghana. Main reason of Farraka Barrage was to free from siltation and maintenance of Kolkata port and provided the navigation amenity in Bhagirathi Hugli river. This dam not only provided a due water flow for security and maintenance of Kolkata part by water diversion of Ganga river but dam also created the everlasting dispute with two neighbouring countries.

Ten meetings regarding the Farraka dam were held between 1960 and 1970 but no proper solution could find, only a committee on water delivery
could establish and decided that Farraka would remain the point of entry for water distribution into East Pakistan.23

After the birth of Bangladesh, on the basis of Indo- Bangladesh Treaty of Friendship and Peace (1972) a joint river commission was established as forum for discussion and negotiation. During Mujib visit to Delhi in 1974, India and Bangladesh agreed a temporary division of water of the Ganga in which India committed 80% water flow to free to Bangladesh during the six week of lean season. But after the assassination of Mujib and coup in Bangladesh, derailed the negotiation on water sharing and temporary agreement ended in 1975.

Two years during 1975-77 there was no agreement of water sharing and India was continue taking its part according to its needs, as the result, Bangladesh faced many problem of irrigation and desertification. Anti Indian regime (headed by Maulana Bhasani) took the advantage of this feeling and promoted anti Indian emotion in Bangladesh that it was only India destroying Bangladesh.

In 1977, India and Bangladesh signed a five year water sharing agreement in the period of General Zia. But this agreement has also a temporary the provision of conflict management because this agreement had only provision to lean season (January to May) water sharing. The Ganga water flow had been divided in each ten days control limit. It had provision
in lowest lean season (during 21 April to 30 April), India share only 20500 cusecs and Bangladesh with 34000 Cusecs. It was the provision of pro Bangladesh interest so it was the matter of criticized in India.

The agreement of 1977 was renewed in 1982 with the new provision of proportional division of water during the lean season that means there was no fix share of water of any side. It would determine on the basis of ups and downs of water flow. At last this agreement ended in 1986 and India provide the water to Bangladesh on voluntary.

Both countries signed a thirty year water sharing agreement on 12 December 1996 with mechanism of each five year reconsideration of treaty (it necessary this reconsideration could put on after two years) and could renew after thirty years with mutual consent. This treaty has provided the schedules of division of water during lean season according to ten days average availability of water at Farraka Barrage like the past treaty of 1977. It is determined by this treaty each year 1 January to 31 May, 15 time period of ten days limit. The allocation formula is bases on a forty year average, taken between 1949 to 1988, and provides country with equal share of water when the Ganga flow is less than 70000 cusecs (cusec is a measurement of water flow, 1 cusec= 450 gallons/min, and 1 gallons=159 liters) when the water flow is on the level of 70000 to 75000 cusecs, Bangladesh has right on 35000 cusecs and India has remain but if flow exceeds 75000 cusecs, then
division process has become opposite that means India share 40000 cusecs and Bangladesh remain. Article IX of this treaty has provision of the Joint committee of experts for negotiating other common river disputes. Although, committee has formed but it could not provide effective frame work for other river dispute.

Tista and Feni are another main river of conflict between India and Bangladesh. Tista has become matter of conflict with the Gazoldoba Barrage (60 Km north of Bangladesh border in West Bengal) and Feni with Tipaimukh Dam (in Tripura). Although, both countries expressing their commitment to solve the dispute but during the visit of Indian Prime Minister Man Mohan Singh on 6-7 Sep 2011, Bangladesh put the condition of Tista in relation to Feni, India has refused agreement on Tista in case of opposition of West Bengal government who was not agree on water sharing formula. In this case, Bangladesh has done its veto on Feni.

Bangladesh also has opposed the proposal of India's River Linking project which is announced in 2002. This project would link water flow from northern section of the Gangas and Brahmaputra rivers in the east to Godavari, Krishna and Kaveri in the South. In the view of Bangladesh this project is a massive undertaking in water transfer which would lead to Bangladesh in flood and drought.
In sum up, we can say that" long-standing disputes over the diversions by Farraka and Tista barrages, plus soil solemnization caused by Tipaimukh dam, remain ongoing sources of contention between India and Bangladesh. The Indian River Linking project, which is in the planning stage, is a potential area of greater discord between India and Bangladesh". India and Bangladesh may face the common problem with China's plan to divert the Brahmaputra water flow because India and Bangladesh has not bilateral water- sharing agreement.

3.4.2 Coal

Coal is another lucrative option for energy co-operation among these countries because India is the fourth largest producer of coal in the world. It is true Indian coal is not high quality for thermal power production but it can use in other domestic consumption like cooking, and industrial use but political suspicion has forced to Pakistan and Bangladesh to purchase coal from abroad at high rate.

3.4.3 Transnational Pipelines

To know their limitation of energy needs India and Pakistan forced for talking on two attractive proposals of transnational gas pipelines which was proposed in 1980s and 1990s. Iran- Pakistan-India (IPI) and Turkmenistan- Afghanistan (TAPI) gas pipe lines are very futuristic plans for this region for long term supply for gas. Liquid natural gas (LNG) is called the fuel of 21st
Century not only efficiency and cost effectiveness compare to any other hydrocarbons but its carbon commission also cause of preferring. IPI was proposed in 1987 and TAPI was proposed in 1997.

Unfortunately, both pipelines are facing a large number of diplomatic risk and hurdles like host relation of Indo-Pakistan, price, contractual structure security and other external influence. TAPI is facing more hurdle than IPI because it is doubt of Turkmenistan that adequate reserve may fulfill the need for stakeholders, security aspect also a big question because it will travel through not only unstable region of Afghanistan but through Pakistan also. In this case supply guarantee will be required to each country, on the ground reality which is not certain.

Indo-Pak hostile relation faltered the pipeline negotiations Indian leadership did not want to leave their long term energy security depend on Pakistan, which always in unpredictable turmoil condition. But the Gulf war in 1991, forced to India to diversity its energy supply. In 1993, India not only signed a memorandum of understanding with Iran but began to investigate other pipelines option. Pakistan also in hesitation about IPI because Pakistan army, intelligence agency and anti India regime of civil society worried about the pipeline’s long term benefits to India. So, Benazir Bhutto’s government had to refuse the proposal of IPI.
In 1997, Pakistan supported Turkmenistan Afghanistan-Pakistan (TAPI) pipelines, proposal of Asian Development Bank as a alternative option of IPI but India’s response was not position. Meanwhile India began to search the possibility of deep water and shallow water pipeline from Iran, which was not practical in terms of technology and finance.

Pakistan's protesting policy over IPI seems to change during Musharraf era. Musharraf took the IPI not only a tool of economic gain which came from transit revenues and gas import but provided the opportunity of political bargaining with India. IPI jumped forward in 2005, when Iran gave the guarantee for undisrupted supply to India, as the result India agreed to take part not only bilateral talks between India- Iran and India – Pakistan but trilateral talks also, among Iran Pakistan and India which is facing two main hurdle-price and security norms.

Today, Pakistan has signed the IPI on 13 July 2010, but India has not, why India has backed its steps towards IPI? It is matter inherent diplomatic risk base on Indo- US emerging relation. The US has entangled with Iran for a long time on Iranian nuclear programme.

It was a complex challenge before India that support to the US for 123 civil nuclear deal or support to Iran for IPI. The US does not want the IPI which will deposit millions of dollar into Iranian economy, change the economic sanction over Iran into null and void. We can feel it very clearly.
when American ambassador in India, David Mulford warned India that voting with Iran at IAEA would "be devastating to the future of nuclear deal." It may a reason of India's voting against Iran in IAEA.

Today, America has decided to role back from Afghanistan till 2014, India is showing new movement for IPI because security challenge of TAPI project seems to more dangerous than past. China and Russia are also showing their interest with IPI. If, China associates with IPI in future which may dangerous alarm for Indian energy security.

Finally, we take most controversial source of energy- nuclear energy. It is no doubt that nuclear energy is better option than any fossil fuel in term of pollution and efficiency but it is totally different in term of supply. It can not purchase directly from origin, without going through tight observation of IAEA or without any support of nuclear power. Nuclear energy consumption among these countries is only about 2% but its little part has played a major role in political suspicion and arms race especially India and Pakistan. There is a hair line difference between nuclear energy use for peaceful purpose and use for weapons. Although, nuclear energy comes in the region for peaceful use but gradually it turns in the form of arms race and ultimately lead to South Asian region toward insecurity and other barricade of balance of power, in spite of security and equilibrium.
3.4.4 Nuclear Energy

Nuclear option has become more strategic tool than energy security. In initial stage India and Pakistan both started their research on nuclear energy with the help of international co-operation but cold war politics changed their direction. Today, when India and Pakistan are declared nuclear power state, are used as balancer. China takes Pakistan as 'its own Israel' with blindly support and India is promoted as counter of China by the USA. At first I have discussed the some theoretical aspect of nuclearisation of the region and then discussed the nuclear energy as peaceful use to nuclear weapons.

Why any state wants to acquire nuclear capability?, there is many approaches to identify the decision but nonrealistic approach gives its more better explanation to analyses the decision of state which wants to acquire the nuclear capability. Neo-realistic theory based on some assumption-s like-power is used in term of end and means, offensive and defensive and international relation can not move the role of power (but power means no only military power but economic power also combined.)

Neo-realism is adopted the international order with hierarchy form where the state has different capacity to influence the structure of world politics. Although, state accepts the order and co-operate with other state in different areas but state gives priority to protect its national security and
sovereignty by self help. Power and hegemony are also using by state in modern era, as the result state has go to in security dilemma and in this case nuclear capability becomes infallible tool of security.

Since, state has capacity to influence to world order but influence capacities of different state are not same. Although, decision of becoming nuclear state has only determined by state but security scenario, balance of power arrangement, national prestige domestic pressure and leadership may formulate the state policy. Kenneth Waltz identifies the seven main security-concerning motives for state of acquire nuclear capability-28

1. Great power's rivalry of countering new weapons of other great power, provoke the desire for nuclear weapon for hegemony.

2. As the protection tool for any military attack of great power ally.

3. To counter its adversary.

4. Doubt in its conventional military strength.

5. For cheaper and safer alternative

6. For offensive purpose

7. To enhance its international standing.

The problem of nuclearisation not only the problem of South Asian region but it can be seen a chain reaction where if one state adopts the
nuclear weapons, its neighbors are haunted by insecurity and this situation leads to force nuclear capability to protect them. When we see the problem of nuclearisation of South Asia, we find the same fact:

I. Nuclearisation has put by Indo-Pak rivalry. The race of military superiority and nuclear blackmailing are other factor.

II. The role of the USA and China and China-Pak secret military co-operation creates the policy of appeasement which provides the opportunity for nuclearisation.

III. Domestic pressure, national prestige, minimum deterrence, leadership and no signature on NPT; are other motivation for nuclearisation.

Why did nuclear energy change to peaceful use to strategic and arms race? This question can not understand without the development of nuclearisation.

The Indian nuclear programme's foundation was established with the nuclear energy law of 1948 and the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (AEC) moved it forward which provided the infrastructure for nuclear energy. India had setup three stages nuclear policy of self-sufficiency in the achieve on its own strive. In the first stage, it was planned to energy by natural uranium with pressurized heavy water reactor and second stage including with
reprocessing plant and the last stage was about to bases on thorium which was sufficient in Indian territory.

Indian leadership under the Jawaharlal Nehru, were always in side of peaceful use of nuclear energy. He also said in the constitutional assemble that there was struggle between humanity and atom bomb. India would choose the path of humanity. But Nehru was the person of scientific approach so he had well understanding of material progress of India, as the result he supported Homi Bhabha, father of Indian nuclear Programme.

In 1956, India established its first research atomic reactor named as 'Apsara' in Trombay (Maharastra). At the occasion of inauguration of this reactor Nehru declared that India would use the nuclear energy for only peaceful power production not for destruction. There was not sign of military use of nuclear energy before the Indo-China war of 1962.

But the direction of Indian nuclear policy seems to change after India-China war of 1962 and first Chinese nuclear test in 1964 and first Chinese nuclear missile test in 1966. In this case, India forced to dilute the policy of Nehru's only peaceful use'. Chinese explosion was proved to a mile stone in the context of nuclearisation of South Asian region because tensioned relation between India and China created the fear of national insecurity in the mind of Indian people.
Nehru's successor Lal Bahadur Shastri first time favoured the nuclear weapons and stated in parliament "I can not say that the present policy ( of nuclear pacifism), is deep-rooted, that it cannot be set aside and that it would not be changed." It is also said that Shastri urged for nuclear umbrella to western countries but he could not get any position response.

As thus, Indian anxiety not only with Pakistan's arm race but Chinese nuclear programme also forced to India leadership to follow decisive for nuclear weapons. China- Pak- US triangular relation in 1970s and Indian victory over Pakistan in 1971, gave a final touch encouragement for nuclear capability to India and its result of India peaceful nuclear explosion of 1974 as Pokhran I.

In contrast of India, Pakistani nuclear programme was not based on self sufficiency Pakistan nuclear programme was given a practical shape in mid 1950s when its energy commission was set up under the headship to Nazir Ahmad. After the American proposal of 'Atom for peace' in 1953, Pakistan took seriously the potential of nuclear energy and nuclear technology in favour of national progress and development. Pakistan Government set up a committee for the promotion of nuclear energy. In 1956, an Atomic Energy council was set up according to recommendation of a committee set for using the peaceful nuclear energy.
Pakistan's actual nuclear programme moved forward in the rule of General Ayub Khan and Zulifical Ali Bhutto. The Pakistan Institute of science and Technology at Nilore (in Rawalpindi) established in 1965 and Pakistan started its first atomic reactor in 1965 with the help of the US.\(^{33}\) As thus, nuclear programme of Pakistan also based on peaceful use before the war of 1971.

Peaceful nuclear test by India in May 1974, gave the decisive lead over Pakistan, so it was natural Pakistan would react immediately. Mr. Bhutto recognized the Indian nuclear test directed against Pakistan and advocated for nuclear weapons as a defensive measure to counter blackmailing and hegemony of India.\(^{34}\) He declared "If India developed an atomic bomb, we too will develop one, even if we have to eat grass or leaves or to remain hungry, because there is no conventional alternative to the atomic bomb."\(^{35}\)

Pakistan provoked the feelings of 'Islamic Bomb' ideology of Jihadist to protect the Islamic identity and counter not only India but Israel also. Propaganda of Islamic identity helped Pakistan to finance for nuclear weapons with the help of Arab Countries like Saudi Arabia and Libya. In 1973, a agreement was signed between Libya and Pakistan to finance for acquisition of nuclear weapon.\(^{36}\)
As thus, Pakistan's nuclear programme was molded and influenced in 1970s by only single factor of Pakistan’s security threat perception to India with the financially support of Arab Countries and technically support by China which was also silently consent of the USA. The US could not stop to Pakistan in sake of Chinese relation because president Yahya Khan was playing a crucial mediator role in emerging US- China ally against Soviet Union; by this reason the US was mutely seeing the Sino-Pak nuclear ally.

Although, the USA tried to check the nuclear proliferation through the Symington Amendment of 1977, and stopped the military and economic aid of $ 90 million to Pakistan in 1979 but Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan created the situation to no use of Symington law for Pakistan. After this, Pakistan was taken as a frontline state for western and American interest. So Symington restriction was removed in 1981 for six year and against in 1987 for two years. Regan's administration did not take steps even the well knowing the critical Chinese technology transfer to Pakistan.

Meanwhile, China signed a formal nuclear co-operation in 1986 which encourage to Pakistan's president to advocate " it is our right to obtain technology and when we acquire this technology the Islamic world will posses it with us." In 1980s. Pakistan had threaten to India many time that its had super nuclear weapon over India and Pakistan occupied decisive lead over India. It was only Chinese nuclear and missile shield to Pakistan during
1980s, and 1990s which encouraged to Pakistan for proxy war without any fear against India.

It was always matter of concern for India that China always used Pakistan as a regional balancer in South Asia and supported Pakistan's nuclear programme. Secret letters of A.Q Khan revealed the fact that China not only transferred the technology of heavy water and reprocessing plant but also transferred the technology of enrichment of uranium for bomb.\textsuperscript{39} Kahuta, Khushab, Kanupp, Chasma etc plant was built by Chinese help, delivery system m-9(Ghaznavi/ Haft), M-11(Shaheen) and a number of Dong Feng -21 (Ghauri), ballistic missiles and hydrozen bomb technology also produce of Chinese help.\textsuperscript{40} Pressalor Amendment of the US could not capable to check these transfer.

After the end to cold war, new strategic and political scenario comes in exist: Soviet Union's break up, Chinese policy to counter India and western endeavor to check the nuclear proliferation, created the complex security challenge to India. In such serious security concern condition, India decided to become nuclear power state Indian leadership did not want that any non-proliferation treaty created its security threat so they always denied to NPT or CTBT, Narsimha Rao tried also that India could get nuclear capability before signing NPT or TCBT but he could not so. Indian policy of
'open option' since 1980s totally changed with Vajpayee leadership in 1998 when he decided for nuclear test as Pokharan II.

The year at 1998 was the very crucial period for south Asian region for nuclear capability through openly explosion. On 11 and 13th May India tested a total of five nuclear devices at Pokharan and its reaction Pakistan also conducted total of six nuclear devices on 28 and 30th of May 1998 at Changai in Baluchistan.

India tried to validate its second nuclear testing by saying Sino-Pak nuclear nexus compelled to break its nuclear restraint promised after the first peaceful nuclear testing in 1974. Indian administration made a diplomatic counter for reduce nuclear testing pressure to many heads of states through its letters, especially to the US president Clinton; in which it was explained the fact that the openly nuclearised. China and the disguised nuclearised Pakistan were the main reason for testing and India forced to acquire minimum nuclear deterrence through its test.

Pakistan tried to prove its validity for its nuclear test on the basis of Indian explosion. Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif claimed after the nuclear test of Pakistan “the decision was taken in the interest of national security and integrity and in this way, now Pakistan had settled the score of strategic imbalance with India.”

---
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New century begins with power balance game in Indo- Pak relation, one side growing the US- India entente and the talk of India as a balancer of China and other hand announcement of China- Pak all weather friendship notions. Clinton's visit to Indian in 2000 proved a mile stone in Indo-US relation and Musharraf's visit to China in 2001 proved to be the same in China- Pak relation. At this time, a secret' Futuristic arms development co-operation' agreement was signed between China and Pakistan. Shaheen III with the range of 3500-4000 km and other advance technology weapons are the part of this Indian feelings over China - Pak co-operation, we can understand by the statement of Indian Defence Minister Fernandis, when Pakistan tested its nuclear capable medium range ballistic missile, he said "Every one know what Pakistan will be without China. It ego is boosted purely by the support its gets from China."\textsuperscript{42}

Although both countries declared a moratorium on further nuclear test but we can not forget that both countries are out of NPT. India is not attaching with NPT on the basis of discrimination and Pakistan on the basis of India. So, it is natural that India and Pakistan involved in nuclear and missile arms race which has security dilemma in the region and other neighbouring countries are always under the suspicion. This opportunity of suspicion takes over by China with its economic and military support.
Today, in economic domination age, each country wants to maintain not only its economic growth rate but maintain its energy supply also. It is well known that India is the second fastest growing economy in the world. Planning commission of India has predicted if India is to sustain with 8% of GDP growth, then it will need to increase its primary energy need supply at least 3 or 4 times and electric supply has to increase 5 to 7 times by 2031-2032. India's economic growth is increasing its political influence in the world, 123 civil nuclear deal (2008) between India and the United States is the well known example of it.

This treaty, not only get acquittal from NPT but provide the validity to Indian nuclear programme. It has given the guarantee of forty year for nuclear fuels and other nuclear technology from the USA and same convenience to other fuel richer and technology richer countries. With the help of this agreement India may acquire 20000 megawatt additional electric power generation till 2020. It is only positive aspect of 123 Agreement but it has some negative aspect also.

This treaty may provoke the nuclear rivalry between India and Pakistan (disguise China also) and may create new nuclear states in the region (with the help of China). We have seen that China provided four new atomic reactors to Pakistan in 2008, in spite of international objection. China argues that the reactor sales agreement with Pakistan based on the agreement
of 1986 when China was not member of NSG. China signed NSG charter in 2004, so rules and regulations of it could not apply on past agreement.\textsuperscript{43} China also argued that China is not building any new nuclear plants; it is only part of Pakistan’s Chasma-2 power plant. China also favoured Pakistan's ambition that Pakistan also given NSG exemption like India to fulfill its growing energy demand.

China has already signed a peaceful usage of nuclear energy agreement with Bangladesh in 2005 and its close relation with Bangladesh and Myanmar is creating apprehension of nuclear proliferation. China-US rivalry for balance of power and Indo-China competition are the main hurdle to use the peaceful nuclear energy China does not want that India increase its influence and status in South Asia and India also wants the same in context of China. For this strategy, China is deep rooted with Pakistan and India with the USA, Japan and Vietnam.

China is also using Pakistan for its energy supply from Persian Gulf to Malacca strait as well as a shield against the US and other its ally. Nuclear proliferation policy of China seems to as a tool of balancing power game and Pakistan is used as mediator. The role of Pakistan has proved for transfer of nuclear technology to Libya, North Korea, and Iran, can not possible without Chinese consent.
3.5 Conclusion

In sum up, we can say, energy politics among India, Pakistan and Bangladesh always has inspired with political relation of suspicion and mistrust. As the result, they are neither co-operating with common domestic resources nor different option of external supply. It is compulsory to co-operate India and Pakistan to use Central Asian and Middle East Energy reserves and co-operation between India and Bangladesh to use Myanmar and other South East Asian reserves. Their economic growth will not get continuous flow until they will not set up their energy need through different sources.

References


22. Ibid.


27. Supra no.25, p-36.


30. Ibid.
### Chapter III

**Energy Politics between India and Its Major Neighbours with special reference to Pakistan and Bangladesh**


33. Ibid.


39. Deepak V Ganpathy, “Hissing Dragon, squirming Tiger-China's successful strategy encirclement of India", *South Asia Analysis Group,*

40. Ibid.


*******