

## HISTORY OF INDO-PAK RELATIONS THROUGH CHINESE PRISM

*Bina Rai*

*Associate Professor & Head, Department of Political Science, Raghunath Girls' P. G. College, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India*

**Received: 25 Mar 2019**

**Accepted: 28 Mar 2019**

**Published: 05 Apr 2019**

### ABSTRACT

*Kashmir is a major water source for India, China, and other neighboring countries. It harnesses in its fold about 15,000 glaciers including the 70 km long Siachen Glacier, on the India–Pakistan border which is the second largest glacier in the world. It is the issue of Kashmir, which Pakistan exploited against India with the help of China. India had a reasonably good case in the UN, but Pakistan managed to subvert the UNSC system and got support for its invalid claim.*

*A Pakistani scholar observed that Pakistan's decision to recognize China was marked by enlightened self-interest because 'in view of Pakistan sponsored militancy in India and passive hostility of the Afghan Government, Pakistan did not want another great neighbor to be its enemy.' Until the late 1950s, Pakistan's relations with China had not entered a 'takeoff' stage, however, when Sino-Indian relations started declining in 1959 culminating in armed skirmishes in October 1962, Pakistan was driven closer to Beijing.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Azad Kashmir, Coffee Club, Gwadar Port, CTBT, NPT, Nuclear Weapons*

### INTRODUCTION

The advent of Pakistan is believed to have started with the first Mongol emperor Babbar's invasion of India. The Hindus were treated as second-class citizens; Aurangzeb the last Muslim ruler amongst other predecessors did try to annihilate Hinduism but failed. The Hindu way of life, symbolized by high moral values of tolerance, truthfulness, and justice was very much part of the multitude's mental and material being. These eternal and moral values of life, which constituted the core of Hinduism, therefore sustained itself for centuries of Mongol, Muslim and British rule.

The inception of the Muslim League in 1906 and the assumption of its leadership by Mohd Ali Jinnah provided a new turning point to the national freedom struggle by demanding a separate State for the Muslims. The resolution adopted by the Muslim League in 1940 for the division of India into Hindu and Muslim States confirmed their earlier stand. Rahmat Ali is generally credited to have coined the term 'Pakistan' a name which was later adopted by the Muslim League and other protagonists who favored the division of India on communal lines. By the time, the Second World War ended, the chances of the Indian sub-continent attaining independence had brightened and so did the carving of the separate state of Pakistan.

With the relinquishment of Britain's Sovereignty in 1947, South Asia, inevitably India and Pakistan became the focus of Super Power interests. A pattern of relations between India and Pakistan was inaugurated in an environment charged with conflict and discord, mutual distrust and suspicion. Both India and Pakistan pursued foreign policy conducive to their

respective national interests. There was an extreme divergence in foreign policies of the two countries. India's foreign policy attracted 'worldwide attention mainly because the large and important country was developing a policy independent of the two power blocs then forming.'<sup>1</sup>Nehru was the main architect of India's foreign policy and his voluminous, wide-ranging and often improvised assessment of international affairs yielded tremendous impact. Nehru wanted India to refuse to play the game of power politics and not to join either bloc, to keep it free from military alliance of the great power groups that dominated the contemporary world politics.<sup>2</sup> However, the case with Pakistan's foreign policy was different. According to a Pakistani scholar Sarwar Hasan, the foreign policy of Pakistan has been 'dominated by considerations of security and independence from its neighbor, India.'<sup>3</sup>

Pakistani leaders, statesmen and even scholars have from time to time tried to project India as the only threat to Pakistan's existence. According to I. H. Qureshi, a renowned Pakistani scholar, 'Pakistan believes that Indian hostility poses a far greater problem to them than Chinese expansion or Soviet threats, neither country having a dispute with Pakistan.'<sup>4</sup> During 1950s and 1960s Pakistan's leadership and media strained every nerve to raise the bogey of 'Indian expansionism' and 'Indian threat to Pakistan's existence' as the main plank of Pakistan's foreign policy for domestic consumption and to plead for arms and economic assistance from the United States, other Western countries and in late 1960s from China. President Ayub Khan wrote in his autobiography; 'could she (India) have any objective other than expansionism? The Indian theoreticians were claiming boundaries from Oxus to the Mekong. We could not attribute everything to imperialists. India was not content with her present sphere of influence'<sup>5</sup> similar stances were reiterated by Pakistan's press. A leading daily, Dawn in an editorial commented: "Having gained their independence late and become immediately obsessed with the idea of joining the rank of the World's Great Powers, the Indian ruling circles began to develop colonial ambitions. The idea 'Vishal Bharat' or Greater India, is an ambition to include Nepal, Ceylon, Burma and other parts of South East Asia, where, according to Hindu political thinker, Hindu culture already exists.'<sup>6</sup>

Mohammed Ayub Khan even lamented that 'had Pakistan not acted as a buffer state, Hindus would have by this time brought about Afghanistan, Iran and other Middle East Countries as well as Indonesia and Malaya under their domination.'<sup>7</sup> Thus while projecting India as a potential threat to the countries of South and Southeast Asia including Pakistan as a compliment to Indian 'expansionism' the Pakistani leaders were never tired of selling the idea of perceived Indian threat to Pakistan's security.

The unresolved issues during the partition were resolved between both the countries in trying conditions. The issue of Princely state of Junagarh had become contentious, however after trouble erupted within Junagarh, the Dewan of Junagarh asked for armed assistance from India, complying with the request, Indian troops were sent to Junagarh who restored law and order in the state. Subsequently keeping in view the wishes of the local people, Junagarh acceded to India in November 1947. Pakistan tried to raise the issue in the U.N. Security Council but failed. Despite Junagarh's legal accession to India, "Pakistan still considered Junagarh as a part of Pakistan."<sup>8</sup>

The princely state of Hyderabad followed Junagarh after a rapprochement between Nizam and the government of India; the former withdrew its complaint from the Security Council in September 1948. However, in October, November and December 1948, Pakistan tried to revive the question in the Security Council and even tried to participate in it.<sup>9</sup> By 1949, the

question of Hyderabad's accession to India was finally settled but Pakistan made futile attempts to make political capital out of it.

### **History of Jammu & Kashmir**

Hindu belief provides the most exquisite imagery for the origins of Kashmir. It is said that the valley was once a beautiful lake inhabited by the snake people, the Nagas. Legend has it that the sage Kashyap (born from the mind of Brahma, the creator of the universe) prayed for the deliverance of the Nagas from the demon Jaldeo. Answering his penance, Lord Shiva ripped a hole in the side of the mountain, draining the land and delivering the Nagas to safety. This land, in gratitude to the sage, was called Kashyapamar, which became gradually corrupted to Kashmir.

Initially a center of Hinduism, Kashmir was first exposed to Buddhism. The earliest known chronicler of this land, Kalhana, who wrote his *Rajtaringini* in the twelfth century, described his people thus: 'Kashmir may be conquered by the force of spiritual merit but never by the force of soldiers.' It was thus Buddhism, which first conquered Kashmir. Islam first appeared in Kashmir with the armies of Mahmud of Ghazni but did not make an impact. However, the Sufi missionary Bulbul Shah, brought Islam to Kashmir when RENCHANA, a Tibetan prince who took the throne after the sack of Kashmir in 1320 by Dulchu Khan (a descendant of Changez Khan), converted. This was followed by a period of relative prosperity with Islam gaining ground. One of the more famous dynasties, the Saladin's ruled Kashmir for over 200 years from 1343 followed by the Mughals from 1585. In 1753 came the resurgent Afghans who, under Ahmed Shah Abdali, terrorized the land. In 1819 the Sikhs came to the rescue of the Kashmiris and the Valley was absorbed into Maharaja Ranjit Singh's growing empire.

Now into the scene arrived the Dogras with Gulab Singh, an unusually gifted ruler, with his eyes set on Kashmir. Initially, in the service of the Sikhs, Gulab Singh took advantage of the Anglo-Sikh conflict by siding with the British. On the defeat of the Sikhs, being given Kashmir for a paltry sum of Rs. 75 lakhs rewarded Gulab Singh. Thus Kashmir passed on to the hands of the Dogras. The Dogra rule did not do much to improve a lot of the people. To be fair to them, they did not discriminate against the Muslims as such but were guilty of oppression of all people. The rich did everything to ensure that the poor did not prosper. It was only a matter of chance that the majority of the rich were Kashmiri Pundits. This fact was realized by Sheik Abdullah and it influenced his decision of declaring his party as the 'National Conference' as opposed to the 'Muslim Conference'.

Jammu and Kashmir would highlight the geo-strategic importance of the State. It was a natural bulwark against China to the Northeast as also a land-link to China as well as the Central Asian states of the former Soviet Union. It was thus natural that both India and the State-to-be Pakistan would vie for this pristine land. Furthermore, the demography of the State was such that the decision facing the Maharaja would not be easy. Whereas the bulk of the population, nearly 75 percent, was in the Valley and mostly Muslim, one could not forget that the majority in Jammu, which accounted for over 20 percent of the state's population, was Hindu. The rest of the population in Ladakh, Gilgit and Hunza were again Muslim except in Ladakh, which had a Buddhist majority. However, the population was very sparse in these areas.

The question of Kashmir has been the main irritant in Indo- Pakistan relations since 1947. Because of its strategic location, Kashmir occupies immense geopolitical significance. The State of Jammu and Kashmir assumed its present geographic shape in 1846 when Maharaja Gulab Singh who already had Jammu, Ladakh, and Baltistan, also purchased Kashmir Valley from the British.<sup>10</sup>

After partition, Pakistan imposed an economic blockade of Kashmir to compel the Maharaja to accede to Pakistan. The situation deteriorated when a well-organised rioting took place in Poonch area against Maharaja's administration.<sup>11</sup> Major-General Akbar Khan, who was the Director of Weapons and Equipment at the Pakistan Army General Headquarters at the time of the events, has written that the invasion into Kashmir was launched with the connivance of the Pakistan army.<sup>12</sup>

The turn of events forced the Maharaja of Kashmir to flee from Srinagar to Jammu and called for military help from India. Indian leaders and Lord Mountbatten approved indulgence of Indian forces only if the Maharaja acceded to India, which he did on 26 October 1947.<sup>13</sup> Consequently the Indian troops landed in Srinagar and the invasion was ejected. Thus Pakistan's intentions to take Kashmir by force remained unfulfilled. Keeping in view the gravity of the situation, India appealed to the United Nations on 1 January 1948 to call upon Pakistan to respect its international obligations and cease giving support to invaders in Kashmir.<sup>14</sup> Till date, even after more than six decades, the issue remains as fresh as it was then.

### **China Prism**

Kashmir is a major water source for India, China, and other neighboring countries. It harnesses in its fold about 15,000 glaciers including the 70 km long Siachen Glacier, on the India-Pakistan border which is the second largest glacier in the world. It is the issue of Kashmir, which Pakistan exploited against India with the help of China. India had a reasonably good case in the UN, but Pakistan managed to subvert the UNSC system and got support for its invalid claim.

A Pakistani scholar observed that Pakistan's decision to recognize China was marked by enlightened self-interest because 'in view of Pakistan sponsored militancy in India and passive hostility of the Afghan Government, Pakistan did not want another great neighbor to be its enemy.'<sup>15</sup> Until the late 1950s, Pakistan's relations with China had not entered a 'takeoff' stage, however, when Sino-Indian relations started declining in 1959 culminating in armed skirmishes in October 1962, Pakistan was driven closer to Beijing.

The Sino-Indian War proved a watershed in the Sino-Pakistan relations. With a view to winning Chinese favors, the Pakistani press started blaming India for the confrontation.<sup>16</sup> In the aftermath of Chinese invasion on India, Pakistan was convinced that split between New Delhi and Beijing had come full circle. Hence the circumstances allowed 'Enemy's enemy is my friend' to perpetuate as the mode of discourse and decks cleared for future Sino-Pakistani entente-cordiale.

Taking advantage of this discourse, Pakistan under a border agreement on 2 March 1963 ceded a portion of "Azad Kashmir" to China.<sup>17</sup> India protested to both China and Pakistan stating its position that it would not agree to any arrangements or agreements on Indian territory which was under 'illegal occupation of Pakistan.'<sup>18</sup> The Indian Government alleged that Pakistan had not given away 2050 square miles but 11,000 square miles of territory according to the data of the Survey of Pakistan.<sup>19</sup>

This agreement signified serious strategic implications for India and helped China to have direct access and attack capability on Kashmir by land via the KaraKoram pass and by air via direct Chinese air link to the Gilgit airfield, thereby reinforcing the morale of Pakistan. Islamabad presumed that any attack by India on Pakistan would bring China to its rescue. Pakistan's then Foreign Minister, Z. A. Bhutto declared on 17 July 1963; "An attack from India on Pakistan is no longer confined to the security and territorial integrity of Pakistan; it now involves the territorial integrity and security of the largest state in Asia as well."<sup>20</sup>

The limits within which Pakistan's relations with China were developing were the remote possibility of India and China coming to an understanding. In this context Pakistan did not foresee the restoration of 'Bhai, Bhai' situation between India and China in the near future for several reasons: firstly, Pakistan conceived that the Chinese could not trust the Indians in a hurry, as India had joined a mutual friendship and cooperation treaty with Russia and which has military stipulations in case of war with either of the signatories. Secondly, Pakistan often felt that India and China would always remain at a distance because they were competitively advancing themselves for the leadership of Asia. Thirdly, Pakistan's perception about India was that she would never offer any real challenge to China because they felt that India had a slower pace of economic development, 'population explosion', less mechanized armament industry, multifarious socio-economic problems, and absence of national cohesion.

### **India and China**

According to the veteran politician of Pakistan, Mumtaz Daultana; "The Sino-Indian dispute ultimately affected the drawing of Pakistan foreign policy". On the other hand, Chinese tried and cultivated Pakistan for two main factors; firstly, Pakistan was looked upon as a link to the Middle East and secondly in the regional initiatives, Chinese strategy was to forge closer links with South Asian countries to create a sub-regional balance to counter the Indian pre-eminence in South Asia.

Pakistan sought precisely the kind of countervailing authority that China had willingly provided<sup>21</sup> i.e, convince its special friends, that despite its potential resources, China would never behave like a superpower and within the regional context it was able to project an image of a weighty neighbor, particularly in South Asia.

Taking advantage of the situation Pakistan enticed China to extend its highway through the Karakoram. The KKH in Pakistan is called as N-35 and in China as China National Highway 314 (G-314). It was built by Pakistan and China together, starting from 1959; completed in 1979 and opened to the public in 1986. It runs from Kashgar in China to Abbottabad, Pakistan for 1300 km. An extension to southwest meets the Grand Trunk Road, at Hassanabdal, further connected to Gwadar port and the city of Rawalpindi in Pakistan.

In case of hostilities between India and China, the PLA Navy would find Gwadar port most convenient logistic location on the Indian Ocean. The strategic use of this highway in the prior stocking of the port to avoid interdiction by air during active operations and due to the closure of the road in winters would help both China and Pakistan to enhance their operational capabilities.

In the earlier days, Pakistan took Chinese protection on the issue of Kashmir, be it in UN or giving moral support. However in the early 90's there was a change in the Chinese approach, it advocated peaceful means of negotiations.<sup>22</sup> The

major concern for Pakistan is China adopting a position of careful neutrality on Kashmir.<sup>23</sup> During Chinese President Jiang Zemin visit to India and Pakistan in late 1996, he advocated a direct dialogue between the two countries on Kashmir as well as progress towards better bilateral relations.<sup>24</sup> Speaking at a press conference, Mr. Zhu, said 'China had neither any intention nor will it play any mediatory role between the two countries.'<sup>25</sup>

During the 1965 Indo-Pak war, when China sent an ultimatum calling for the immediate dismantling of Indian posts allegedly violating the Chinese border, angered the Soviets, since the timing of such ultimatum showed China's aim to help Pakistan in the war, coerce and put pressure on India. China even threatened to strike at India and started referring to issues, which had already been settled earlier. China pledged its full support to Pakistan, terming India as an aggressor and expansionist.

China was against such moral help by the Soviets to India and therefore as a counter, instigated Pakistan in its resolve to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir, which India was against. This old issue was again taken up with the UNSC by Pakistan, this time with a new angle of theft of a Muslim religious relic in Hazratbal shrine in Kashmir. However in the 1965 Indo-Pakistan war, in spite of all assurances to help Pakistan China did not make any physical moves and only gave verbal warnings to India. Between 1965 and 1971 Pakistan received USD 200 million worth arms aid from China and of this, USD 45 million worth of arms were supplied in 1971 alone.<sup>26</sup>

In March 1971, the American press while giving wide coverage to events in erstwhile East Pakistan generally concluded that a civil war leading to the breakup of Pakistan seemed unavoidable.<sup>27</sup> In the wake of this development, Beijing seized the opportunity to launch a veiled attack on New Delhi to win the sympathy of Islamabad. An article published in People's Daily, on 11 April 1971 justified the action of West Pakistan's military crackdown in East Pakistan as an appropriate measure undertaken by President Yahya Khan. It charged India for making 'inflammatory' statements over the situation inside Pakistan. It accused India of plotting international intervention against Pakistan and reiterated Chinese support to Islamabad.

China even condemned USSR for instigating India to resort to aggressive posture against Pakistan. China supported Pakistan for the following reasons. Firstly India's success would be considered a success of the Indo-Soviet treaty that would have enhanced the Soviet image and influence in the region thus undermining the Chinese stakes. Secondly, despite a friendly posture by India, which could be regarded as the outcome of tactical considerations on the part of New Delhi in the context of explosive and seriousness of Bangladesh problem, the fundamental contradiction and competition between China and India persisted. Thus any increase in India's prestige and strength resulting from Islamabad's defeat was not regarded by Beijing as conducive for its interests.<sup>28</sup>

Thirdly, Pakistan was also vital as an outlet for Chinese goods to IOR. Lastly, Pakistan was a vital link in Beijing's strategy towards the Arab and Muslim world with which Islamabad had cordial relations. It was also reported that during the war hundreds of lorries loaded with military supplies for the ordnance depots of Peshawar and Rawalpindi were arriving daily in Gilgit from Sinkiang.

## **The U.S. Role**

The events in East Pakistan were going out of hands and posing a problem for India at a time when relations with the US were not very friendly. According to Surjit Mansingh, 'Nixon-Kissinger's South Asian policies were also moulded by their antipathy towards India in general and Mrs. Indira Gandhi in particular.' The high headedness of Yahya Khan seeking a political settlement in East Pakistan and his inhumane actions, forced millions of refugees to enter India and create demographic insecurity and shortage of food of which India was already a victim. When all diplomatic efforts had failed, India turned towards the international community including the US. The initial foreign reaction was an expression of hope that Pakistan would resolve it in a constitutional way and respect human rights.

There was no reaction from US whose military aid meant to be used against communists was being used to commit genocide in East Pakistan and affecting the Indian economy through the 'grand design' of the US. The 2.3 million refugees were costing India USD 200 million a month whereas the 1965 war had cost the only USD 70 million. The American opinion was reasonably aroused but the White House remained silent. There were secret meetings carried out between Chinese and the Americans on this issue and India was warned that China would interfere if India attacked Pakistan. Moreover, the Chinese and Americans had secretly made an understanding that in case Russia intervened in response to China, then the US would help China. India was also told by the US, that in the case of Chinese intervention, the US would remain neutral. What was this, if it was not a 'grand design'?

Pravda while reporting about the Chinese role in Indo-Pak war wrote in December 1971: International observers paid attention to the fact that Pakistan's 10-day notice on a possible beginning of the war with India coincided with the stay in Pakistan of a Chinese delegation led by the Minister of Machine-Building Industry, Li Sheu-Ching. The notice expired on December 3 and on the same day the Pakistani Air Force made a bombing strike on Indian Airfields.<sup>29</sup> In spite of all cooperative measures India gave a decisive blow to Pakistan-US-China nexus and enhanced its supremacy in South Asia.

Nixon Administration's tilt towards Pakistan and its bias against India in 1971 war were first exposed by columnist Jack Anderson. During the 1971 crises of East Pakistan, the Chinese in the exuberance of opposing India passed remarks contrary to its global outlook. It sided with Pakistan by encouraging Yahya Khan for a dictatorial attitude on a constitutionally elected government.

After India initiated its nuclear programme in 1944 under Homi Bhaba, United States helped India develop nuclear energy under the "Atoms for Peace" programme in 1950s. The US simultaneously constructed the nuclear non-proliferation order on the foundations of the NPT, which was concluded and signed on 1 July 1968 by sixty-two nations. India believed that the treaty carried serious flaws, was discriminatory and refused to sign it.

India conducted its first peaceful nuclear explosion on 18 May 1974 at Pokhran in Rajasthan. It was an underground explosion; a spin-off of India's peaceful nuclear programme. Mrs. Indira Gandhi had said on 27 May 1974 that a country of India's size could not be technologically dependent on other countries. Pakistan's reaction to India's nuclear explosion of 18 May 1974, both by its leaders and the media, was sharp, critical and full of doubts about India's 'sincerity.' Pakistan's representative to the Disarmament Commission said on 19 May 1974 that: "his country was not surprised at India's nuclear test. We have been warning the United Nations particularly the nuclear weapon powers and the international community for a

decade that India's ambitions of the nuclear programme aimed at equipping itself with a nuclear option was being undertaken to carry out a nuclear weapon explosion and stake a claim to the status of nuclear weapon power."<sup>30</sup>

On the other hand, India exposed Pakistan's duplicity in warmly applauding Chinese nuclear weapon tests while decrying and distorting India's PNE. India also refuted Pakistan's contention that India's PNE was a threat to the detente which had emerged on the Indian sub-continent.

There was no strong Chinese reaction to India's PNE of 18 May 1974. The Chinese Vice-Premier Deng Xiao-ping was quoted as having said that China would not make an issue of India's recent nuclear test which was regarded as being discouraged by the Soviet Union. The Chinese Vice-Premier to show solidarity further added that the Indian test would not be able to intimidate its neighbors or people of Pakistan. As there was no immediate Chinese reaction to India's PNE, Bhutto personally called on the Chinese Ambassador in Pakistan twice and through him solicited Chinese leader's immediate condemnation of India on the PNE issue.<sup>31</sup> When the CTBT negotiations came to an end in 1996, India became its firm opponent as it found that the treaty was neither "comprehensive" nor did it favor a "test ban". India rejected the CTBT essentially on two basic grounds; first, that it was not a nuclear disarmament measure, and second, that it was against India's national security interests. India further stated that the CTBT should be non-discriminatory with all countries assuming equal obligations; the nuclear weapon states must undertake not to hold any nuclear weapon tests and also subject their nuclear facilities to international monitoring and inspections. By doing this India projected to the world its determination and will for disarmament and to be rightly considered as an important country of Asia to solve the problems of this region.

### **China-Pakistan Nexus**

India is wary of the China-Pakistan nexus and growing assertiveness of China tested another series of nuclear weapons in 1998 code-named 'Op Shakti'. Having no other option but to move closer to New Delhi the United States in 2000 initiated a 'strategic partnership' with India. In pursuance of this partnership, in July 2005 President George Bush and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh signed a deal, lifting a three-decade U.S. moratorium on nuclear trade with India and provided U.S. assistance to India's civilian nuclear energy programme, expanding the cooperation in energy and satellite technology.

According to McGeorge Bundy, Chinese nuclear weapons were "the greatest single threat to the status quo over the next few years." President Kennedy agreed and believed that China's nuclear programme was "the whole reason for having a test ban. There was a general feeling that a nuclear-armed PRC would become even more aggressive and harder to deter. China, on the other hand, appeared "determined to eject the United States from Asia" and was now sure to "exploit their nuclear weapons for this end."

However, the most important aspect of the China-US nuclear cooperation agreement was extraneous provisions like China's ties with Pakistan and its own non-proliferation record. An important aspect of the Chinese mindset is that they strive to coerce opponents to follow a line of reasoning that they craft. Li Bingyan, one of the most brilliant and respected contemporary Chinese strategists says, they work to entice technologically superior opponents into unwittingly adopting a

strategy that will lead to their defeat.

Sino-Pak nuclear nexus came to be known when intelligence reports of CIA claimed that Pakistan had acquired designs for nuclear test and ultra-centrifuge technology at Kahuta from China. The suspicion that China is helping Pakistan to reach nuclear capability can be traced back to June 30, 1966, when the two countries for 'economic and technical assistance' signed an agreement. Arms-control advocate Gary Milhollin aptly noted, "If you subtract China's help from Pakistan's nuclear programme, there is no nuclear programme."

Pakistan's Commerce Minister Ghulam Tariq told reporters that an atomic power station would be built at Ruper in Panna district of East Pakistan with Chinese help. This was the first hint of the nuclear collaboration in the nuclear field; China agreed to supply heavy water to Pakistan. Cooperation between the two countries in plutonium reprocessing and collaboration on uranium enrichment through the centrifuge method was also reported. When the French government informed the Zia government in 1978 that it was unable to proceed with the Chashma deal unless Pakistan agreed to revise the original agreement providing for co-processing of spent fuel, Pakistan looked towards Chinese for rescue.

Stephen Cohen observed, 'Pakistan had successfully operated the world's biggest nuclear espionage ring.' In June 1984, the New York Times quoted US officials as saying that the US was in possession of some evidence to show that Pakistan had acquired a bomb design from China in 1983, similar to that of Chinese fourth type of bomb.<sup>32</sup>

In 1989 China built a 27 MW nuclear research reactor in Pakistan and Pakistani scientists were being trained in China. In the early 1990's China built an un-safeguarded plutonium reprocessing facility at Chashma, which was the chief source of Pakistan's weapon grade Plutonium. In 1995 China build another un-safeguarded reactor at Khushab. In 1995 China transferred 5000 ring magnets to Pakistan, after which it got exposed and there was a worldwide condemnation of China after which it promised to stop all proliferation activity. In 1996 China transferred an industrial furnace with a casting surface in which the bomb core is cast and helps Pakistani engineers install it in Khushab. The commitment and involvement of China in Pakistan's nuclear programme leads one to believe that in the event of an Indo-Pak conflict, Chinese would align with Pakistan, so long as it remained convinced that neither the US nor the USSR would intervene.

Various contingencies of this alignment could be; a military threat from Pakistan in conjunction with some collusion from China; a politico-military threat from China in conjunction with some collusion from Pakistan; a combined military attack from China and Pakistan or a nuclear blackmail threat by China through her missiles, located in the mountainous terrain of Xizang. Chinese troops themselves intervening through Aksai Chin and the area ceded to China by Pakistan and threatening the Siachen Glacier area to relieve pressure on Pakistan. China may use the Karakoram all-weather high way to resupply Pakistan with military hardware.

Pakistan succinctly followed India's design by going nuclear in May 1998. However, regarding its nuclear policy, it followed neither China nor India with regards to 'no-first-use' pledge but pledged to refrain from targeting each other's nuclear installations. In 2005 Pakistan had not received a similar deal on nuclear energy from Washington as India. Some experts say that this apparent U.S. favoritism toward India could increase the nuclear rivalry between the passionately competitive nations, and potentially raise tensions in the already dangerous region. However, in her opening remarks before the Senate CFR on Indo-US civilian nuclear deal, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice on 5 April 2006 remarked; "this cooperation will

not lead to an arms race since nothing under this initiative is being provided which will enhance Indian military capability.”

As Blackwill said, “My impression is that Pakistan is worried this will feed the Indian nuclear weapons programme and therefore weakens deterrence.” Other experts say the two countries, both admittedly now nuclear, could be forced to deal more cautiously with each other.

Further caution has to be imposed keeping in mind Pakistan’s proliferation risk; the point in case is the Pakistani scientist A. Q. Khan’s Illicit nuclear network revealed in 2004 shocked the world with its brazen trade of nuclear technology. Some experts worry the U.S.-India deal could prompt Pakistan to go elsewhere, for instance to China, for similar terms.

Against this background of Sino-Pak collaboration, it is hardly surprising that India has to contemplate the exigencies of both war and peace by evaluating risks, costs, and benefits of alternative strategic paradigms. It was evident that India’s credible nuclear deterrent was against China’s nuclear dilemma in a situation of continued transfer of nuclear and missile technology by China to Pakistan.

Pakistan supported China in its bid to get a seat in the United Nations. Nur Khan was shrewd enough to assure the Chinese leadership of Islamabad’s support for Beijing’s induction into the United Nations. He said that Pakistan had firmly supported and would continue its efforts "for the right of the People’s Republic of China for a seat in the UN”. Admission of the PRC into the United Nations in 1971 was a force multiplier and further strengthened the anti-India stance of China and Pakistan.

India has been working hard for its bid to the UNSC permanent membership, after it stood for elections in 1995 and lost heavily to Japan.<sup>33</sup> Keeping in mind its clout in the international arena, the growing importance of India cannot be over emphasised in wake of its size, world’s largest liberal democracy, second most populated nation having the third largest army, worlds tenth largest GDP in nominal terms and third largest in terms of PPP, large contributor of troops to the UN for the last 50 years and most importantly having galvanised support of most of the nations including the permanent members for securing its seat.

However, an informal "coffee club", comprising 40-odd member states including Pakistan, has been instrumental in holding back reforms to the United Nations Security Council over the past six years. Most members of the club are middle-sized states who oppose bigger regional powers grabbing permanent seats in the UN Security. Pakistan openly opposes a permanent seat for India.<sup>34</sup>

Pakistan in connivance with China has a unanimous stance that India should not be given the permanent member status of the United Nations Security Council, as it would disturb the balance of power in the region. Breaking away from its traditional backstage diplomacy to thwart India’s attempts to secure a permanent seat in the UNSC, China went ahead and attended a closed-door meeting of the 'Coffee Club' countries to oppose recent efforts by the UNGA president to forge a consensus on UNSC expansion. This contradicted the Chinese commitment in the joint vision statement issued during Manmohan Singh’s bilateral visit to Beijing where China had stated: ‘The Chinese side understands and supports India’s aspirations to play a greater role in the United Nations, including the Security Council.’

Both China and Pakistan have a negative historic past with India, and the cause of this negativity has yet not been resolved. China may not want India to occupy a similar seat next to it simply because India is a competitor and US would

like India to be its partner in favoring or vetoing UN motions.

Not talking about the effects of Pakistan sponsored terrorism, which has affected India for the last three decades; China fears its sensitive Xinjiang region becoming an object of the external power play. Since 1991 China has applied all instruments of its power to quell the Uyghur unrest. In essence, China ultimately gained a bit of land, nixed the Uyghur issue, and pushed its economic agenda by making Xinjiang a pivotal link to the Eurasian markets. The success gave birth to a self-serving SCO, lauded as an exemplary multilateral cooperation mechanism, essentially meant to blunt any US-led Asian alliance in Eurasia. When Pakistan is under intense scrutiny about its role in fighting extremism and terrorism, the world has been watching to see how Beijing decides to deal with Islamabad. Despite Pakistan's growing diplomatic isolation, China's support has been steadfast. Its obstructionist stance in bringing the terror masterminds of the November 2008 attack in Mumbai to justice has further strained the ties. Both China and India do not want Pakistan to remain a base for AL Qaeda and its affiliates.

China is considered a more reliable ally who has always come to Pakistan's aid when India has been on the rise, even to an extent that China has conveniently turned a blind eye to Pakistan's strategy of using terror as an instrument of State policy against India. Not surprisingly, Pakistan has given China a "blank cheque" to intervene in India-Pakistan peace talks.<sup>35</sup> There are reports of China going the Pakistan way and extending financial and moral help to the Pakistan based terrorists to infiltrate into India for subversive activities.

Kashgar authorities had reported provision of training facilities in Pakistan to one of the terrorists involved in blasts in China. Chinese officials have for years avoided accusing Pakistan in spite of clear evidence that the separatist movement in Xinjiang was fueled by ideological and arms support of terrorists based in Pakistan. Pan Zhiping, director at the Institute of Central Asia at the Xinjiang Academy of Social Sciences, in a state-run Global Times referred to the role of Pakistan in Xinjiang riots after the July 18 clashes in Hotan. China has, however, expressed growing concern over the safety of its personnel and investments in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and has also claimed that groups in its far-western Xinjiang region had links to terror groups in Pakistan.

The fast deteriorating situation in Pakistan and its long-term consequences for regional stability might, some suggest, result in greater cooperation between Beijing and New Delhi to stabilize the shared periphery between the two nations. Turbulence in Xinjiang, such as the riots between Han Chinese and the Muslim Uighurs in 2009, is indeed forcing Beijing to pay greater attention to the sources of international terrorism in Pakistan, given the prospect of Islamist extremism spilling over from Afghanistan and Pakistan into the autonomous regions of western China.

The relationship with Pakistan was that of inherent historical baggage of religious division, territorial claims, and proxy war. For too long after independence, our northern frontier policy rather remained confined to the action-reaction syndrome in our overall policy towards China and Pakistan. Kargil gave a realization to Pakistan that without China as the third actor in the great game over the Himalayan heights, it may not be possible to dislodge India from her present position. Pakistan opened up its Gilgit-Baltistan region to the substantial presence of Chinese military and civilians under the preface of skilled workmen engaged in building infrastructure. Pakistan killed two birds with one stone and it helped China to somewhat become a third party to Kashmir dispute also somewhat legitimize Pakistan's status in occupied Kashmir.

Pakistan backed trans-border terrorism in the Indian state of Kashmir and the spillover effect of the same in China has had both political and economic drain on the resources of the nation. The predominantly Muslim province of Xinjiang; China has not been left far behind in being affected by the same Islamic fundamentals groomed in Pakistan. Besides this, the geostrategic and geopolitical interests of all three converge in the region of Pamirs and Hindukush chain of mountains.

## CONCLUSIONS

It is a world in which power; economic, political and military is completely fragmented. Germany and Japan are economic giants but are strategic pygmies. Russia is a military nuclear power but without economic clout. China is an economic power but not a compatible nuclear power with Russia or US and still building its conventional military balance with the US. The United States is certainly the most balanced of all the great powers, but it is in no position unilaterally to determine the structure of new world order. It needs widespread international support even to lead, let alone dominate.

The structure and linkage in South Asian security reflected the mutual increase in Super-power engagement in the Indo-Pakistan conflict and the ramifications of India's security concerns with China. The Sino-US detente, the Indo-Pak and the Sino-Indian normalization would eventually have some positive impact in the region by removing the external stimuli for regional conflicts but the sources of tension are essentially indigenous. Security threat perceived by Pakistan is a product of hostility and quest for parity. Often "identity crisis" bedevils Pakistan, which turns to the Islamic countries of West Asia, but remains India-oriented and geographically in South Asia. A typical example of this: forget-me-not approach was to point out that Pakistan 'possesses a pivotal position in the four sub-territorial systems; South Asia, Central Asia, West Asia and the Arab littoral states on the Asian continent.'

Pakistan wanted nuclear weapons because India had them, India because China had them, China because the Soviet Union had them; and the Soviet Union because the United States had them. India, however, is unlikely to deploy nuclear weapons against Pakistan, because India considers China to be its nuclear competitor. Still, Pakistan is more likely to direct nuclear weapons against India than against any other country. Should India and Pakistan eliminate their mutual fear, at least the latter may not feel it needs nuclear weapons if India is no longer a threat.

Those who celebrated the demise of superpower rivalry must be wondering whether the world in its revised shape is a better place to live in. Hopefully, the future will someday bring about a realization in Peking, New Delhi, and Islamabad that permanent interests of each in Asia can be furthered best in conciliatory settlements of unresolved problems and not in the perpetuation of coalitions and intrigues.

## REFERENCES

1. *Jawaharlal Nehru's India's Foreign Policy: Selected Speeches, September 1946 - April 1961 (New Delhi, 1961) p. 102.*
2. *Qureshi H.I., "The Foreign Hand" K. W. Thompson, ed., (New York, 1963), p. 153.*

3. Ayub Khan Mohd, "Friends, Not Masters a Political Autobiography" (Lahore, 1967), p. 172.
4. Dawn (Karachi), 1 March 1962
5. Singh Sangat, "Pakistan's Foreign Policy", (Bombay, 1970), p. 47.
6. Pakistan National Assembly Debates (Islamabad), 15th March 1966, p. 496.
7. Chaudhary G.W., "Pakistan Relations with India, 1947-1966", (London, 1968), p. 75.
8. Gupta Sisir, "Kashmir: A study on India-Pakistan Relations", (Bombay, 1966), pp. 3-4.
9. Panikkar K.M., "The Founding of the Kashmir State: A Biography of Maharaja Gulab Singh 1792-1858", (London, 1953), pp. 99-100.
10. Khan Akbar, "Raiders in Kashmir", (Karachi, 1970), p. 22.
11. J.Barnds William, "India, Pakistan and Great Powers", (New York, 1972), p. 40.
12. Security Council Official Records, Third Year, Supplement, S/628. November 1948, p. 139.
13. The Hindu (Madras), 13 November 1962.
14. The New York Times, (New York), 18 November 1962.
15. The New York Times, (New York), 18 August, 1954.
16. For texts of Indian protest notes sent to the Government of China and Pakistan, see R.J.Jain,ed., China, Pakistan and Bangladesh, Basic Documents 1950-1975, New Delhi, Vol. 3, 1977, pp. 65.
17. Government of India, Sino-Pakistan Agreement, and 2March, 1963: some facts, New Delhi: Ministry of External Affairs, 1963, pp. 32-34.
18. Pakistan, National Assembly Debates (Islamabad), part II, 17 July, 1963, p. 1666.
19. Mahajan Harpreet, "Arms Transfer to India, Pakistan and the Third World", New Delhi, 1982, p. 264.
20. See "Jinnah's Fading Dream" Time (New York), 15 March 1971. &also see "Pakistan coming apart", Newsweek, and (New York) 15 March 1971.
21. Kaul Ravi, "India's Nuclear Spin off", Allahabad, 1974, p. 66.
22. Ahmad Bhatti Maqbool, "China's Emerging Role in the World", as given in "Sino-Pakistani Strategic Co-operation", Peace Initiatives, Vol. V, No. III-VI, May -December 1999, p. 163
23. The Hindu, 14th Jan, 2002.
24. Kissing Contemporary Archives, (London, 1949)1 pp. 104.
25. Aziz Qutubuddin, "Relations between Pakistan and People's Republic of China", in Ahmed Sherwani Latif, ed., "Foreign Policy of Pakistan", (Karachi, 1964), p. 82.
26. Cited in Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis, (IDSA) Journal, News Review on China (New Delhi), April 1971, p. 19.

27. Cited in *Survey of China Mainland Press (SCM P)* (Beijing), no. 4985, n.d, pp. 290-92.
28. Ali Tariq, "Pakistan and Bangladesh: Results and Prospects" in Robin Blackburn, ed., "Explosion in subcontinent", (London, 1975), p. 323.
29. Dixit Aabha, "Sino-Pak Relations and their Implications for India", *Strategic Analysis, New Delhi*, Vol. II, No. 9, December 1987, p. 1069.
30. *Foreign Affairs Record (New Delhi)*, vol.20, no.6, June 1974, p. 194.
31. *Commentary of People's Daily* reproduced in *Peking Review*, 5 July 1974, pp. 26-27
32. Gupta Hari R., "China and the Peace of Asia", (New Delhi, 1985), p. 35.
33. PTI in *Hindustan Times* 24 Nov., 2003.
34. *The Economic Times*, 13 Nov., 2010.
35. Rasgotra & Chopra V.D, "India's Relations with Russia and China: A New Phase", (New Delhi, Gyan Publications), p. 61.