

CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

Chapter-I

Introduction

Relations among nations are the natural outcome of co-existence. Its nature is determined by the internal compulsions of nations and external forces which are at play. Foreign policy's importance can be analyzed in the light of the fact that it is the only policy that proposes interaction among nations. Relations between two countries represent policies of two countries. These policies have direct implications of foreign policy of nation states which decided the course of international politics.

Nations does not exist in vacuum, they exist in a particular environment and have to adopt it, like any other organism. Consequently any change in the environment requires change in the behavior of the nations. No nation is nor can be fully self-sufficient, for the ends that it wishes to achieve always outweigh the resources that it has. Hence the desire to fulfill the national interest and the inability to achieve all the goals of foreign policy independently gives rise to the configuration called interdependence of nations. Interdependence is an incontrovertible fact of international relations and this precisely is the reason why every nation gets involved in the process of establishing bilateral and multilateral relations leading to diplomatic political, economic, cultural and trade relations with other nations.¹ A nation not only has to respond to the new changes but also has to achieve its foreign policy goals by skillful handling of the global milieu.² "A nation follows a policy that is most beneficial to its own national interest, which largely depends on ideology, history and economic requirements".³

The making of foreign policy depends on various issues such as external threat, geographical location, strategic significance political aspirations, economic requirements, ideology, and

personality of the statesmen and over all national interests. The root of tension between the two neighbors lies in their history and a psychology of negativism and bitterness which has developed over the years due to the non resolution of tensions and their exploitation by the ruling elite in their own interest⁴.

India and Pakistan are the core states of South Asia which are culturally similar linguistically unite geographically closed and historically related. But it is strange that despite the geographical, historical and cultural similarity the relations between these two states not so much smooth and peaceful. The demand for Pakistan was itself based on distrust. Roots of this kind of relationship between India-Pakistan can be seen in the colonial history of Indian subcontinent. British colonial rules established a tradition by the partition of this subcontinent that creates a chain of struggles, disputes and instability in the region. Bilateral relations between India and Pakistan are undoubtedly the most important in South Asia and the world also. But relations among both states not at all smooth in nature and has been full of ups and downs. Now the both countries are overtly nuclear powered, they poses greater risk, if the ongoing crisis is not resolved. It is in this background, the study of Indo-Pak relations is an attempt to analyze the Political, Economic, Strategic issues and other related bilateral issues between these two countries. And efforts will be made to suggest methods by which the peace and security can be maintain in the region. The relation between India and Pakistan can be categorized since 1947 in five different phases. These phases are (a) Process of partition and separation (1947-1954), (b) period of Conflicting relations (1955-1971), (c) Period of efforts to make peace and good relationship (1972-1979), (d) Period of ups and downs (1980-1998), and (e) The period of new beginning (since 1999 to till now). This study is related to the last phase which started since 1998 when both countries conducted nuclear tests in May, 1998. India conducted her five nuclear

tests in Pokharn and Pakistan conducted her six nuclear tests in Chhagai.⁵ After these tests the relations between India and Pakistan is changed. Both nations start thinking to establish peace and cooperation in the region. After May, 1998 both nations started conversation and tried to find way to CBMs between themselves. The changed environment of this region shows the new beginning of Indo-Pak relationship.

Historical Background:

The history of Indo-Pak Relations has been mainly a story of conflict and discord, mutual distrust and suspicion. Other than Israel, Pakistan is the only nation in 20th century whose birth resulted from the demand by a religious community for a political structure in which it would be dominant.⁶ In the August, 1947 British India was divided into two parts as decolonization process that was the birth of the two independent nations in the subcontinent namely India and Pakistan. Since, India and Pakistan, became independent it has been rightly stated that Pakistan's foreign policy is made in India but unfortunately India and Pakistan never became good friends and always engaged in conflicts and disputes. There is a fair amount of scholarly agreement that partition occurred not because of Hindus and Muslim could not live together, but because the elite of the two communities could not agree to power sharing. The greatest tragedy was that the deciding feature of this division was religion.⁷ These two nations never come out from the circle of conflicts and disputes since independence. Their relations travel from dispute to peace and peace to dispute subsequently but remain always far from friendship and cooperation. It has resulted from a number of complex factors like legacy, the difference in religion and race, conflicting national interests, ideologies, power struggle.⁸ From the very beginning, the two powers became involved in a conflict ridden relationship over the status of the former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir and forced immigrate of thousands of Hindu and Muslim into the

new countries which affected both emerging countries. The dispute has proved severely opposed to resolution because, at bottom, it is infused with the self-images of the two states. Pakistan deemed its identity as a Muslim homeland incomplete without Kashmir; while India sees its control over this Muslim-majority state as a demonstration of its secular identification. This tense relationship has resulted in three major wars (1947-48, 1965, 1971) and a limited one (1999) and multiple crises⁹ like the question of minorities, evacuee property, sharing of assets, division of military stores, Hyderabad and Junagarh --- the list is endless. A number of promising agreements were made. For instance, the Tashkent and Shimla agreements, and Lahore declaration. Although they resolved the Indus Waters dispute in 1960 and the Rann of Kutch dispute in 1968 through negotiations, there was no agreed mechanism to guide their stable conflicted relationship. After 1971, consequent the liberation of East Pakistan and formation of Bangladesh, India gained legitimate status of being an emerging power in South Asia.¹⁰ In the 1980s the two sides began to talk on the Siachen, Sir Creek and the Tulbul-Wullar disputes and put in place a series of confidence building measures pertaining to conventional and nuclear weapons power. These negotiations had no set time table and were held on a need to meet basis. There was no compulsion on either side to continue their negotiations when their relationship declined in the face of terrorist attack or armed aggression.¹¹

However, with the coming in of the BJP government in 1998, and the nuclear tests by both states give status of nuclear power to these. The period between 1999 and 2002 witnessed a high level of tension between India and Pakistan.¹² Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpai started a bus service between Delhi and Lahore on 20 Feb, 1999 by a great journey through this bus. At the time of this journey the Prime Minister signed a MOU (Memorandums of Understanding) with their Pakistani counterpart on 21 Feb, 1999. This MOU known as the Lahore Declaration. In this

declaration the focused was given on co-operations, to fight against terrorism, to give respect to human rights, to don't interfere in their internal issues and to behave like good neighbors. But unfortunately Pakistan started war against India in May, 1999 in the Kargil but this become a great tensions between these nations. After Kargil conflict and attacks on J&K legislative assembly and Indian Parliament in 2001 there was tensions on border across LOC and the ceasefire declared. The Prime Minister of India Atal Bihari Vajpayee extending "the hand of friendship" towards Pakistan. Pakistan responded large number of CBMs including announcement of the ceasefire on the LOC.¹³ Thus there is many ups and downs between these nations in the last century.

The peace process launched in January 2004 had been one of the most productive and sustained in the history of a dismal bilateral relationship. This process has seen significant expansion of bilateral trade, improved people to people contact, a ceasefire on their borders, the implementation of number of confidence-building measures in disputed Kashmir, and above all serious back channel negotiation on the Kashmir question. While its policy makers have increasingly talked about the urgent need to construct a 'peaceful periphery' for many of its leader an integrated North West region of the subcontinent was a living memory. None exemplifies this better than Prime Minister Man Mohan Singh of India, whose family lived in the North West part of what is now Pakistan and migrated to India after partition. In early 2007, speaking on India's relations with its neighbors, Singh mused on his aspirations for restoring these historic connections:

"I sincerely believe... that the destiny of the people of South Asia is interlinked. It is not just our past that links us, but our future too. India cannot be a prosperous, dynamic economy and a stable polity if our neighborhood as a whole is also not economically prosperous and politically

stable. Similarly, our neighbors cannot prosper if India does not do so as well. There are enormous opportunities for promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in South Asia. To exploit these opportunities, the nations of South Asia have to work sincerely to control the scourge of terrorism and extremism... I dream of a day, while retaining our respective national identities, one can have breakfast in Amritsar, lunch in Lahore and dinner in Kabul. That is how my forefathers lived. That is how I want to our grandchildren to live.”¹⁴

Today, more than sixty five years after independence, the common people as well as the elite of India and Pakistan are concerning towards establishing condition for permanent peace. But unfortunately the situation is not so much better for India and Pakistan which it should be but the power of the old mindset is declining and the momentum for peace is growing.

Relevance of the Study:

It is well documented that in contrast to India, Pakistan started its journey as an independent state without the political infrastructure around which democracy could grow and develop. This institutional deficit created the space for the early rise of the military as an autonomous and powerful actor in domestic politics in Pakistan¹⁵ but in India, civil authority is supreme. Therefore if democracy succeeds in Pakistan then peaceful environment can be harvested in South Asia. India is very much alive to this and has made considerable efforts in this direction and wanting a stable neighbor at peace with itself. Yet, the Indian Strategy has not been able to translate the intent into reality.¹⁶ There is no doubt that people on both sides want contact, not distance. In 2006, the year of writing, it had to be seen to be believed. A huge number of people gathered at the same border nearly 500,000 people had only one slogan on their lips: ‘Hindustan Pakistan Dosti Zindabad’ (long live India-Pakistan friendship’)¹⁷. This shows that people of both

states want always live together, then why government of both states cannot engage for permanent peace of the subcontinent. In this row foreign secretary Nirupama Rao and her Pakistani counterpart Salman Bashir in Thimphu on the sidelines of a South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC,2010) meeting and agreed to hold talks on traditional issues as well as talks incorporating a new subject Afghanistan and came up with new ideas and said that “why should we be just struck with discussing these issues, why cannot we discuss more issues? Why cannot we discuss the situation in our region?.”¹⁸ Further Indian foreign Minister S M Krishna and his Pakistani counterpart Hina Rabbani Khar announced new Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) and expected that these will expand the scope of people to people contacts and humanitarian issues. The CBMs include increasing cross-LOC trading days and expanding travel to include tourism and religious aspects, apart from relaxing permit conditions for travel by people of Jammu and Kashmir to the other side of LOC by having a system of Six month multiple entry.¹⁹

Both countries had tried everything including war and mobilization of troops to force the other to accept its version of Kashmir Settlement. They failed in this. Secondly, nuclear parity in South Asia made war almost impossible. Thirdly, the economies of both the countries were doing very well at this time and the rising middle classes in both countries desired peace for continued growth. Pakistan has at realized that it will be a gained by according the most favored nation status to India in matters of trade and commerce. India took such a decision in the case of Pakistan a few years back. Pakistan’s community has made a strong recommendation for MFN status to India, saying that it changed scenario.²⁰ This necessitated an alternative strategy for a solution of the Kashmir dispute which would satisfy the people of Kashmir, India, Pakistan. That being the case, it was clear that any solution we found would not be an ideal one from the

perspective of all Kashmiri's, Pakistani's, and Indians. It could only be the best under the circumstances.²¹

Despite all this it was convinced that we were on the wrong track as far as neighborhood management was concerned. We needed a new approach to convert the traditional confrontation and conflict approach to one of cooperation and convergence. People in South Asia, home to a vast majority of the world's poor, need the availability of employment opportunities more than anything else. This is essential so that no one takes interest in destructive activities like terrorism. If there is cooperation between India and Pakistan and not conflict, vast opportunities will open up for trade, travel and development that will create prosperity in both nations.

Third Party Factor:

Bilateralism in Indo-Pak relations remains the fundamental principle of conflict resolution initiatives. The 1972 Simla agreement signed following the 1971 war provided that both parties will settle their pending disputes through bilateral negotiations or through any other means mutually agreed upon between them. This agreement ruled out the possibility of any third party involvement in Indo-Pakistan affairs, especially on the disputes which are being negotiated within the rubric of the eight baskets mechanism. But here is not to deny the influence of the third party indirect influence, particularly the United States, in Indo-Pak relations. In the 1990s, after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan, there was a discernible plunge in US interest in Pakistan on the one hand and growing warmth in relations with India on the other. Such a paradigm shift in US foreign policy added to Pakistan's insecurity, driving it to establish a mechanism for engagement with India to address its security interests, independent of US support. The need for Pakistan to engage India in dialogue continues today. Likewise, the

rapprochement with China with both sides bolstering their trade relations and engaging in talks to resolve their boundary disputes indicated India's increasing control over its foreign relations with neighbors, who also had good relations with Pakistan. As a result Pakistan was slowly coming to terms with the new realities in which, like India and China, it needed to move away from a confrontationist approach towards a policy of engagement and address pending disputes in a peaceful and negotiated manner. The conventional wisdom that one cannot choose neighbours and therefore must learn to live with them had begun to shape India and Pakistan's foreign policy formulations, irrespective of the challenges and difficulties such an approach entailed.²²

Theoretical Perspective:

Since the independence and partition of India and Pakistan in 1947 the relationship between these two states has been the most intractable and the most dangerous political standoff in South Asia. Since the end of the cold war it is perhaps the most dangerous and unpredictable region in international politics. There are several reasons for this continuing tension like the hostility between the Indian National Congress (INC) and the Muslim League prior to independence, hostility that carried over into the post 1947 period, the bloodletting that occurred at partition, served even further to entrench hostility between them leading both to question the justification and legitimacy of each other and within weeks of independence Kashmir became and remains a continued source of political, ideological and military friction between them. Barry Buzan suggests, "Their historical, geographic and cultural ties do not allow them to ignore each other...but their organization principles pose a permanent threat to each other."²³ India and Pakistan were founded on two very different ideological foundations. India constituted a secular state, whereby religion would play no part in the body politic. Pakistan founded as a Muslim

state, a home for the Muslims of South Asia. The crux of these antagonisms has manifested itself in a conflict of self and other with both states questioning the legitimacy of the other. This complex relationship should be subject to a method of theorization that seeks a greater understanding of the nature or culture of violence between them. Such an approach has been lacking in accounts of relations in South Asia.²⁴

This section will begin with a brief outline of where the theoretical approach being used here fits into the international relations theory literature. This is important because IR struggles to account for Indo-Pakistan relations due to the unique structural and ideational position of these two states after 1947.²⁵ India and Pakistan born out of the same struggle for independence share these contradictions between the very old and the very new. Very old given the ancient civilization from where they came and very new given that they both entered the international system as sovereign states, a system that was unfamiliar to the experience of both. Maya Chadda points to the difficulties IR theory has in grappling with this problem when she suggests it might be more useful to imagine South Asia not as a region or subcontinent of separate sovereign states, “but as one of graded ethnic differences.”²⁶ This too brings us back to bridging the gap between primordial’s arguments of ethnic kin set against the modern theatre of nation states and realist debates about states being unitary actors and the balance of power.

Stephen Cohen brings this problem into sharp relief by what he terms the, ‘realism-idealism conundrum.’²⁷ This description gives a good insight into the India Pakistan relations poses for international relations theorists due to its uncomfortable sovereign structure in 1947. The answer to these problematic theoretical and policy issues is found in Alexander Wendt’s constructivist approach because it has elements of foundationalism and also contains a degree of relativism.

Moreover, Wendt occasionally refers to his theoretical approach as 'structural ideation' which again shows the attempt at establishing a via media between positivist structure and post positivist ideation. If we are to get to grips with the methodological and theoretical problems that India - Pakistan relations presents then a method whereby a structural idealism approach can be developed and deployed is essential. Moreover constructivism contends that individuals and states act differently towards objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meaning they attach to them. It is to say that actors react differently to objects or other actors in a manner that is preordained by meaning, not materialism. Wendt writes, "US military power has a different meaning for Canada than for Cuba, despite their 'structural' positions, just as British missiles have a different significance for the United States than do Soviet missiles. The distribution of power may always affect states' calculations, but how it does so depends on the, inter subjective understandings and expectations on the distribution of knowledge, that constitute their conceptions of Self and Other."²⁸ If Wendt is right and power politics is socially constructed by a process of inter-subjective modes of behavior, then India Pakistan relations is replete with examples. Not least the sectarianism born out of partition, both states claim to be nuclear weapon states and both have prosecuted war against one another since 1947. Indian missiles do not threaten Sri Lanka and Pakistani missiles do not threaten the security of Nepal. Therefore it can be argued that there are other reductionist dynamics at work. Anarchy is not a given as structural realists argue, at a reductionist level, inter subjective knowledge is playing a causal role in informing what meaning states attach to the other states military capability. This for constructivism is not a structural or material dynamic purely about power politics, but a dynamic that is informed by knowledge and informed by the way states take each other into account.

Power politics then is, 'produced causally by processes of interaction between states in which anarchy plays only a permissive role.'²⁹ Within this theoretical remit the power of the structural realist suggestion that wars occur because there is nothing to prevent it becomes less persuasive and is demoted as a causal mechanism to one of, war occurs because war occurs. Or perhaps, war occurs because *states* let them occur. The systemic explanation as to the cause of war moves away from a systemic anarchy towards a more state identity or reductionist explanation that allows states to interact between each other as opposed to being given a purely reactionary role within the self-help system. Constructivism argues therefore that states act differently toward enemies than they do toward friends because enemies are threatening and friends are not. 'Anarchy and the distribution of power are insufficient to tell us which. US military power has a different significance for Canada than for Cuba, despite their similar 'structural' position.' Wendt conceptualizes this role of anarchy in its rump form as an empty vessel that has no intrinsic logic or specific form and that anarchies only acquire logics as a function of what states put inside them. In parlance with the empty vessel metaphor, the international structure is the empty vessel and interests and identity need to be given greater theoretical power in accounting for the nature of anarchies because what states put into the vessel, in terms of ideas of culture and interests, is international politics.³⁰

Cultures of Anarchy

The two cultures of anarchy are adopted from two different philosophical and theoretical approaches that reflect the different understandings as to the state of nature and the subsequent role of the state and the structural debates about what the role of the state is and to what extent the behavior of states is determined. In Hobbesian culture it is 'enemy' and in a Lockean culture

it is 'rival.' Both involve a different posture or orientation of the self and other with respect to the use of violence and levels of violence.

The posture of a Hobbesian 'enemy' culture is one of survival where the use of violence has no limitation. In a Lockean 'rival' culture the use of violence is considered for the purpose of advancing an interest or to secure a specific objective. These two cultures of anarchy will be outlined below and it will be suggested that the two levels or cultures are needed to take into account the unique structure or contours of the relationship which after 1947 has shown signs of both Hobbesian and Lockean cultures of anarchy. The culture of anarchy between India and Pakistan is one where ideas and identity prevail over structure. It has not only been Kashmir it has been Bangladesh, Punjab, or Baluchistan, knowledge is partial and amorphous and has always prevailed over structure.³¹

In a Hobbesian culture of anarchy survival is the key and the amount of violence one is prepared to inflict on the other reflects a kill or be killed attitude. Enemies are representations of the other as an actor who, (1) does not recognize the right of the self to exist as an actor to exist as an autonomous being and therefore (2) will not willingly limit its violence toward the self. It is the emphasis on survival that gives the Hobbesian culture its hard edge and why it is the most extreme and dangerous of the two anarchies. This limitless recourse to violence is explained by the fundamental of survival, it moves beyond conflict whereby violence might be gauged to meet a limited objective into a sphere where an enemy does not recognize the right of the other to exist. This is the Hobbesian view of the state of nature, or where the use of violence is limited only by material exhaustion.³²

Treating the other in terms of a Hobbesian enemy has several implications for a state's foreign policy posture and the history of India Pakistan relations is replete with examples. First, a state

being treated as other in the Hobbesian sense will try to respond in kind or by pre-emption and in so doing, move away from what might have been a status quo position to being forced into a kill or be killed mode. Second, the decision - making process moves to a worst case scenario where the possibilities rather than probabilities will dominate the process, thus negating any chance of rapprochement and relegating the chances of a third party successfully intervenes to prevent further escalation. Third, and critically in the case of India and Pakistan, relative military capabilities become crucial and become the benchmark used to predict the behavior of an enemy. In other words, under a Hobbesian anarchy, military capability becomes the mechanism used to predict the behavior of an adversary because the other has already been established and is known as the enemy. Thus any political process has been usurped by military and relative military power of the enemy is used to predict the behavior of that enemy.³³

Moreover, once a Hobbesian anarchy is created (or socially constructed) states will behave in a manner that makes them an existential threat to the other. That is to say that it is the social construction between states that is resistant to change, far more than the system itself and that states which construct others as the enemy through shared ideas will be far more resistant to change. All sovereign states invent their traditions and history but given the political and cultural proximity of India and Pakistan prior to 1947 these two states have been forced to invent their traditions more than most other states in international politics. This has been a problem for security in the region given that one state identifies itself as being what the other is not.

The Lockean culture moves away from the kill or be killed Hobbesian emphasis of survival, to one of protection. The concept of rival has a very different meaning to both self and other and suggests the element of competition where violence is used in limited measure to secure an objective. Under a Lockean anarchy, states live within a status quo remit of live and let live

whilst recognizing the intrinsic right of other states to do the same. Sovereignty becomes a property, but becomes a right, only when other states recognize it as such and here is a key difference between the Hobbesian culture with its emphasis on survival and a Lockean culture which resides in the social recognition of sovereignty of one state to another. The units do not live in an international system of self-help and the units against the system, but share a greater amount of unit construction, the recognition of sovereignty being an important normative construct of states relations with each other. Thus sovereignty of the self allows for the recognition of the sovereign right of the other and this sustains the status quo position.³⁴

Despite the absence of a centralized authority or Leviathan most states adhere to this Lockean anarchy most of the time despite the major inequalities of material power and inequalities of economic and military capability. The Lockean system negates the realist imperative on the maximization of power because the 'rump materialism' of anarchy is controlled by the self, recognizing the sovereign right and legitimacy of the other. States by viewing each other as rivals, as opposed to enemies expect others to use limited violence to achieve a political objective but limit the use of violence to a limited set objective. An example of the use of limited violence is the 1982 Falklands conflict between Britain and Argentina where violence was limited to the sovereign ownership of the Islands. At no time during the conflict did Britain or Argentina question the right of the other to exist as sovereign entities. This is the key difference between an unlimited Hobbesian conflict of kill or be killed and a Lockean conflict limited to a specific objective, in this case the sovereign ownership of the Falkland Islands.

There are several implications coming out of the Lockean culture of anarchy for India Pakistan relations. The first is that this anarchy changes the meaning of military force and capability of the other. Whereas in a Hobbesian anarchy the rump materialism effect abounds, forcing states

into a kill or be killed mode, under a Lockean anarchy there is more room for manoeuvre because the *meaning* of military power changes. In other words it is the type of anarchy states live under that gives meaning to military capability, thus the risk-aversion that states face with regard to their security, the threshold of risk is greatly reduced because states have more options given that they are not preoccupied with survival as under a Hobbesian culture.³⁵

When states accept and internalize the Lockean system, recognition of sovereignty of the other greatly reduces the explanatory power of international anarchy and the self-help system because the system itself becomes less important than the recognition of the others sovereignty. Thus survival via recognition as opposed to the survival of the fittest becomes the norm in state relations and therefore it becomes in the interest of the self to recognize the other.

Review of the literature:

There are number of books and articles on India and Pakistan most of it has become history specially in the context of the changed world scenario but this literature cannot be ignored as international relations do not exist in vacuum, they are based on history, legacy, changing environment etc. Thus this literature helped in understanding the background of their relations and the factors contributing to tensions and development on the bilateral front.

Jivanta Schottli and Seigfried O. Wolf³⁶ in their book, State and Foreign policy in South Asia works brilliantly and describes rich theoretical insights, with first rate empirical analysis and bold academic arguments which would not only be useful for students of South Asian international Politics but also policy makers of the region. However the book also suffers from the number of shortcomings. **Kalim Bhadur**³⁷ in his article, Pakistan, India's Neighbor: so near ,but so far describe India-Pakistan relations in historical perspective. He talks how India-Pakistan became separate from the two nation theory. He also talks that how disputes begins between

these two countries since their formation. These disputes today seem endless. He also talks that why Pakistan Joined the South East Asian Treaty Organization(SEATO) instead of joining the Nonaligned group. He also describe that why Pakistan's foreign policy is India centric in every respect and how Pakistan give more priority to Kashmir issues and how Pakistan inspired by China's success in war against India in 1962 and start war against India in 1965. He also talks about the formation of Bangladesh and India's role in it. He also describes the different steps taken by the government of India and government of Pakistan to improve their relationship in different phases. He also talks about the use of SAARC and benefits of the SAFTA (South Asian Free Trade Agreement) to resolve dispute between India and Pakistan. **Latha A. Pandit**³⁸ in his article, India and her Neighbours changing perceptions, talks about foreign policy towards her neighbouring country and describes that why India should given highest priority to her neighbours in her foreign policy. He also talks that how India's neighbourhood policy changes under different government since 1947. He also describes the major issues and concern of India with her neighbor countries like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Srilanka, Nepal, Afghanistan, Bhutan and Maldives. **T.V Paul**³⁹ in his works South Asia's Weak States: Understanding The Regional Insecurity Predicament gives a rich scholarly literature on weak/failed states in regions outside the African continent is a welcome addition. The principal aim of the book is to assess the perennial insecurity, both domestic and regional within South Asia. Paul contends that South Asia's multifaceted insecurity predicament can be explicated by two important factors--- the presence of weak states and weak cooperative interstate norms. This book has a fair mix of the theoretical and empirical. It devotes substantial space to both, the conceptual analysis of state weakness and regional insecurity in South Asia, and individual country case studies. It is well researched and well argued, and is a valuable contribution to the growing body of scholarly

literature on failed/weak states and South Asian security. It will be of much interest to scholars, policy analysts and students. **R.S. Yadav**⁴⁰ in his article Changing contours of India's Neighbourhood Policy, talks about the India's foreign policy towards her neighbours like SAARC, ASEAN, BIMSTEC, and East Asian nations etc. He also describes that how China and Pakistan are India's core neighbours and what are the basic reasons behind their complexity of bilateral and regional ties between India and these states. He divided India's neighbourhood policy in five phases like (i) Nehruvian Idealism, (ii) Indira Gandhi's Real Politik, (iii) Policy of Adhocism, (iv) Gujral Doctrine and (v) Look East policy to extended neighbourhood. He also explain that how India's foreign policy change form NAM, Panchsheel to Look East policy and from there now a day's why India extended her neighbourhood policy towards trade, energy, security and strategic issues from political and Economic issues. **Mohor Chakraborty**⁴¹ in his article India and Pakistan: Chasing the Horizon of concord and discord deals with the present milieu between India-Pakistan. He describes that how India start talks with Pakistan from the platform of cricket after 2008. How the cricket world cup 2011 match of India and Pakistan became a platform of talks between the prime minister of the both the country. He also deals with the different issues from where both the country can take benefits and move ahead and set a solid platform for peace process. These issues are related to prisoners, diplomatic encounters on issues related to sanitation in South Asia, increase visiting period across LOC for the people of Kashmir etc. He also deals with issues of lake of agreement between these countries. These issues are terrorism, nuclear energy, hydropower dispute where India and Pakistan are unable to set a good platform. The assassination of Osama Been Laden is also affected the peace process talks of these countries. But also tells that both the nations go ahead for talks to peace process. **David Malone**⁴² tries to express the symbol of modern India but the imagery of the dancing

elephant has been used in other contexts as well. The work, he notes, is not based on theoretical framework but is historical and empirical in its roots and enquiring in its aims. It also describe three distinct periods of Indian foreign policy. It also tells that Pakistan has been the major factor in Indian foreign policy. India's relationship with Pakistan is a challenging area for western scholars but also one where they are ever willing to enter in search of the magic bullet. He tells that terrorism is the main concern for India, Kashmir for Pakistan and nuclear proliferation for the rest of the world. **Priyanka Singh**⁴³ in her work *Militant Training Camps in Pakistan – Occupied Kashmir: An Existential Threat* and analyzed the situation in POK (Pakistan Occupied Kashmir) and describes how different terrorist groups like Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT), Hizbul Mujahideen, Jamat-ud-Dawa (JuD), Al Queda and etc poses threat. She also describes how these terrorist groups running different training camps in the regions like POK and NWFP (North West Frontier Province). She explain that these terrorist camps recruit women cadres to disturbs the security in the region. She concluded that the poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and absence the socio - economic development, misguided the people in the region. **V.P.Dutt**,⁴⁴ **R.S.Yadav**,⁴⁵ **V.N.Khanna's**⁴⁶ and **C.Rajamohan**⁴⁷ tries to understand Indias foreign policy and its determinants and objectives. There authors tell about India's relations with other countries like U.S., Russia, China, and Neighboring countries also. V.P.Dutt in his works deals with the political and strategic relations of India and Pakistan, R.S.Yadav examines the objection and compulsion of Pakistan in Kargil and also defines the Kashmir dispute, V.N.Khanna deals with India's role with her neighboring countries and C.Raja Mohan examines the reworking of India's relation in the turn of twenty first century. There authors also deals with the developments of India's foreign policy in different phases and also deals with the role of super power in this region. **C.W.Chaudhary's**⁴⁸ work on the political thinking in Pakistan no doubt the bad test of

partition coupled with riots. He also advocated integrated approach towards other countries. He has the view that Kashmir dispute has conditioned the foreign policies of both the countries, particularly that of Pakistan. More over various countries exploited Indo-Pak sensitivity over the dispute to their advantage. **S. Akbar Zaidi**⁴⁹ in his book works on the relationship between the military civil society and political parties in Pakistan even while focusing on these issues Akbar Zaidi's book is perhaps the first publication written by an eminent Pakistani analyst and social scientist, which call into question the popularly held belief that 'liberals' and 'civil society' are strong supporters and advocates of democracy and elected governments in the country. The book is must read for all Indians who often use value judgments and experiences of Pakistani elite and 'civil society' while seeking to analyze developments in Pakistan. The concluding chapters contain an outstanding analysis of how politicians and civil society in Pakistan view military takeovers in their country and even collude and collaborate with military rulers. **R.S.Yadav**⁵⁰ analyses India's foreign policy in futuristic sense. It is a collection of articles covering different aspects of India's foreign policy in his other work with Suresh Dhanda. **R.S.Yadav**⁵¹ examined the India's foreign policy in contemporary trends an describe the changing Dynamics of India's foreign Policy in 21st century in his own article and the article written by **Savita Pande**⁵² in the same book. Analyze the India Pakistan relations in respect of Kashmir dispute, Kargil war and Nuclear Issue and tries to find out a way for establishment of peace and security in this region. **William J. Barnds**⁵³ concentrates on the relationships of the key state India, Pakistan, China and United State, **Ramesh Thakur**⁵⁴ concerned with the political, economic policy of India towards other nation and India's foreign policy agenda for 21st century⁵⁵ by foreign service Institute, New Delhi deals with the major issues between both countries. It also talks about the issues of India's foreign policy in the new world order. It is basically futuristic study of these works are the

analysis of bilateral relations of India with other countries. **S.D.Muni**⁵⁶ examine the India's foreign policy in respect of democracy dimensions with special reference to Neighbors and describes the historical perspectives of India's relation with Nepal, Myanmar, Afghanistan, Pakistan and other neighbors countries. The author also talks about the India's neighborhood policy and its relation with Pakistan in Nehru's time. **Tobias F.Engelmeier**⁵⁷ analyze the nation building and international relation theory and describes the idealism and global mission in Nehru's foreign policy and talks about the National identity in 21st century in respect of foreign policy. It also deals with the historical perspective of India's foreign policy and her relation with Pakistan. **C.Raja Mohan**⁵⁸ in his article describes India-Pakistan dialogue as a complete theatre. And tries to understanding the difficulties inherent in the process is critical in assessing its durability raised here basic question on the structure of these negotiations and try to explore the way of peace process. **Sunil Das Gupta and Stephen Philip Cohen**⁵⁹ examine the military modernization in India and talks about the rapid economic growth and new military technology of India and Its impact on Pakistan and his reaction on it. **Johan Briso**⁶⁰ deals with the water dispute between Indian and Pakistan and talks about the Indus water treaty and tells the attitude and role of the government of the both countries and try to make a bridge over the Indus water treaty which could become a catalyst for cooperation between India and Pakistan. **Poonam Mann**⁶¹ in her works talks about the India's foreign policy in the post cold war era and deals with the political and nuclear issues of South Asia and also describes the India Pakistan relations in this perspective. **Satyabrat Sinha**⁶² in his article deals with India Pakistan Peace process and talks about the economic relation of both countries and also explains process of peace and security and tells about the steps which can creates confidence building measures (CBMs) talk in different ways between India and Pakistan. **Smruti S. Pattanik**⁶³ in her book South Asia:

Envisioning a Regional Future gives the flavor of different issues and challenges the region facing and at the same time puts across the ways and means to overcome them. Pattanik's book lucidly manages to capture the regional cooperation and security aspects as well as the murky domestic politics that the region as embedded in. Focusing on the positive developments in the region, the book points to the path that the region must follow to ensure regional cooperation and integration. **Rajesh M.Bassur**⁶⁴ in his article describes India Pakistan Relations between war and peace and its historical perspective. The author also tries to make a futuristic vision for India-Pakistan Relation. **Gyanendra Pandey**⁶⁵ in his article talks of India-Pakistan Relations between 1947-2002 and try to explore the religious conflict and violence in the subcontinent and what are our criteria for classifying particular events as 'historical and consequential?' The Author deals with historical perspective of India Pakistan Relations. **R.S.Yadav**⁶⁶ in his article deals with the India-Pakistan peace process, and defines the CBM's steps in different way and tells that with these steps those India and Pakistan maintain peace in their region and establish good and healthy relationship. **Mohor Chakraborty**⁶⁷ in his articles talks about the bilateral relation of India and Pakistan in 21st century and deals with different types of political and historical issues of these countries.

Hypothesis

India and Pakistan are major states in South Asia. The peace, security, growth and sustainability of the region depend on the relations of these two South Asian countries.

H1 Political stability in Pakistan is helpful to continue the dialogue with India which established peace and increase people to people contact in the region.

H2 The nuclear power status of India-Pakistan changed the security dynamics in South Asia that lead stability in the region on the base of threat perception and balance of power theory.

H3 There are very vast opportunity of trade and investment in the region for both the nations that make them economic power and helpful in the growth of the nation which leads towards permanent peace in India and Pakistan.

H4 Cultural engagement between India and Pakistan changes the mindset of the people of both the nations that enlighten the path of sustainable peace between both states.

Methodology

In this research work, the historical- analytical and comparative method is used. The problem is evaluated in a holistic manner by using all the dimensions relating to the issues. The data has been collected from different sources. But the study mainly depends on secondary source. Primary sources also has been used for support like, foreign affairs records, annual reports, government documents, statement and speeches of various leaders of both states etc. has been consulted. All the secondary sources available in the form of books and articles published in various journals, newspapers, magazines and internet services has been used. The research methods used for the study have been descriptive and analytical. For this purpose both primary sources and secondary sources have been used. Primary sources included India-Pakistan Document Reports, Charters/Declarations, Joint Press Releases, Foreign Affairs Records, Annual Reports, Statements by Indian or Foreign Leaders/Ministers and unpublished materials, etc.

Structure of Thesis

Thesis is concerned with the issue of India- Pakistan's bilateral relations and has been divided into following chapters:

1. Introduction
2. Political Relations
3. Strategic Dimensions
4. Economic Relations
5. Cultural Relations
6. Conclusion

The first chapter discusses about importance of the bilateral relations in the international relations. It described the historical background, how third party factor impact on India-Pakistan relation and what are the theoretical perspective between these two South Asian states. Moreover it gives an idea about the relevance of the study, the hypothesis and methodology used for writing the thesis.

The second chapter deals with the political relations of India- Pakistan it discusses why India-Pakistan partitioned and what are the regional order in South Asia and the efforts of the government to make National Identity and Nation building and the dialogue in different phases between the New Delhi and Islamabad to establish peace in the region.

The third chapter is related to the strategic dimensions between India and Pakistan that deals with major issues like Kashmir, Nuclear, Terrorism, Drug trafficking and also describes major disputes like Siachin, Sir Creek, Water dispute, wullar Barrage and tubul navigation

dispute, it also compares Missile Programme between India and Pakistan, and describes the CBMs between both the states for improvement of relations .

The fourth chapter comes with the discussion of India-Pakistan Economic relations and tries to explore the opportunities of trade and investment in each other states to economic growth of the people of both the nations and bring them closer to each other.

The Fifth Chapter narrates the cultural relations of both the nations and try to explore that how culture engagement between these states can play an important role in changing mind set of the people in both states and establish permanent peace in this region with the help of cinema, media, text books, cricket, peace activities.

The last chapter concludes whole thesis, with the suggestions for the betterment of India-Pakistan relations. There are a number of areas in which both can cooperate with each other like, trade and investment, hospitality and tourism, infrastructure, science and technology, education etc. The areas of cooperation should be looked into so that regional integration gets a new thrust. Pakistan should think about affirmative action vis-à-vis India and important gaps should be filled up to balance the situation.

End Notes:

- ¹ Poonam Mann, *Indias Foreign Policy in the Post Cold War era*, Harman Publishing House, New Delhi, 2000, P. 1.
- ² R.S.Yadav, and Suresh Dhanda (eds.) *Indias Foreign Policy, Contemporary Trends*, Shipra, Delhi, 2009, p.1.
- ³ Johan P.Lovell, *Foreign Policy in Perspective*, Richard Winston, New York, 1970.
- ⁴ M.G. Chitkara, *Indo-Pak Relations: Challenges Before New Millenium*, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi, pp. 2-3.
- ⁵ R.S.Yadav, *Bharat Ki Videsh Niti, Ek Vislashan*, Kitab Mahal, Delhi, 2005, p.205.
- ⁶ Kapil Kak, “Pakistan: A Geo-Political Appriaaisal”, *Strategic Analysis*, vol.22, n.8, November 1998, p. 1124.
- ⁷ Laxminaryan Ramdas, “Sustaining India-Pakistan peace: Challenges for Civil Society and the Military”, Smitu Kothari and Zia Mian with others, *Bridging Partition, People’s Initiatives for Peace between India and Pakistan*, Orient Black Swan, New Delhi, 2010,p.316.
- ⁸ Rajesh Rajagopalan, “Neorealist Theory and the India-Pakistan Conflict*-I”, *Strategic Analysis*, vol.22, n.9, December 1998, p. 1269.
- ⁹ Gitika Commuri, *Indian Identity Narratives and Politics of Security*, Sage publication, New Delhi, 2010, p.152.
- ¹⁰ Jugal Kishore Misra, “Indo-Pak Relations: A Relook”, *World Focus*, Vol.33, no.11, November,2012, p.62.
- ¹¹ Ashutosh Misra, “An audit of India-Pakistan peace process” *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 61, no.4, December, 2007, p.506.
- ¹² *The Times of India*, February 17, 2011.
- ¹³ *The Times of India*, February 17, 2011.
- ¹⁴ C. Raja Mohan, “How Obama Can Get South Asia Right” *The Washigaton Quarterly*, vol.32, no.2, April, 2009,p. 179.
- ¹⁵ Aquil Shah, “Security, Soldiers, and the State in Pakistan”, *Seminar*, 611, July, 2010, p.23.
- ¹⁶ Ali Ahmed, “India-Pakistan Relations: Military Diplomacy Vs Strategic Engagement”, *Journal of Defence Studies and Analyses*, vol.5, no.1, January,2011.

-
- ¹⁷ Kuldip Nayar “People to People Contact” *op. cit*, no.4, pp.88-89.
- ¹⁸ *The Hindu*, February 11, 2011.
- ¹⁹ *The Indian Express*, July 28, 2011.
- ²⁰ *The Tribune*, October 5, 2011.
- ²¹ The Times of India, February 17, 2011.
- ²² Ashutosh Misra, “An audit of India-Pakistan peace process” *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 61, no.4, December, 2007, p.506.
- ²³ Duncan Mcleod, “India Pakistan. Friends, Rivals or Enemies?” Pakistan Security Research Unit, Brief 45, November,2008 at <http://spaces.brad.ac.uk:8080/display/ssispsru/Home>.
- ²⁴ *Ibid*.
- ²⁵ Rudolph and Rudolph. *In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The Political economy of the Indian State*. p. 1.
- ²⁶ Maya Chadda, ‘International Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict,’ in Devin T Hagerty eds *South Asia in World Politics*, 2005, p. 187.
- ²⁷ Stephen Cohen, *India Emerging Power*, 2001, P. 308.
- ²⁸ Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics” *International Organisation*, 1992, 41. pp. 391-425.
- ²⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 395-425.
- ³⁰ Duncan Mcleod, *Opcit*, no.23.
- ³¹ *Ibid*.
- ³² *Ibid*.
- ³³ *Ibid*.
- ³⁴ *Ibid*.
- ³⁵ *Ibid*.
- ³⁶ Jivanta Schottli and Siedfried O. Wolf (eds), *State and Foreign Policy in South Asia*, Samskriti Press, New Delhi, 2010.
- ³⁷ Kalim Bahadur, “Pakistan, India’s Neighbour: So Near but So Far”, *World focus*, vol. XXXII, no.6, June, 2011.

-
- ³⁸ Latha A. Pandit, “India and Her Neighbours: Changing Preception”, *World focus*, vol. XXXII, no.6, June, 2011.
- ³⁹ T.V. Paul, *South Asia’s Week States: Understanding The Regional Insecurity Predicament*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011.
- ⁴⁰ R.S. Yadav, “Changing Contours of India’s Neighbourhood Policy”, *world focus*, vol. XXXII, no.6, June, 2011.
- ⁴¹ Mohor Chakraborty, “India and Pakistan: Chasing the Horizon of Concord and Discord”, *world focus*, vol. XXXII, no.5, May, 2011.
- ⁴² David Malone, *Does The Elephant Dance? Contemporary Indian Foreign Policy*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011.
- ⁴³ Priyanka Singh, “Militant Training Camps in Pakistan – Occupied Kashmir: An Existential Threat”, *Strategic Analysis*, vol. 33, no. 3, May, 2009.
- ⁴⁴ V.P.Dutt, *India’s foreign Policy in Changing World*, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, 1999.
- ⁴⁵ R.S.Yadav, *Bharat Ki Videsh Niti, Ek Vislashan*, Kitab Mahal, Delhi, 2005.
- ⁴⁶ V.N.Khanna, *Foreign Policy of India*, Vikas Publication, New Delhi, 2003.
- ⁴⁷ C.Raja Mohan, *Crossing the Rubicon : The Shaping of India’s New Foreign Policy*, Viking Publications, New Delhi, 2003.
- ⁴⁸ C.W.Chaudhary, *Pakitans Relation with India – 1947-1966*, Pall Mall Press, London, 1968.
- ⁴⁹ S. Akbar Zaidi, *Military Civil Society and Democratization in Pakistan*, Vanguard Books, Lahore, 2011.
- ⁵⁰ R.S.Yadav (ed.), *India’s Foreign Policy towards 2000 A.D.*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi, 1993.
- ⁵¹ R.S.Yadav and Suresh Dhanda (eds.), *India’s Foreign Policy : Contemporary trends*, Shipra Publicatins, Delhi, 2009.
- ⁵² Savita Pande, “India – Pakistan Imborglio”, in R.S.Yadav and Suresh Dhanbda (eds.), *India’ foreign policy : Contemporary trends*, Shipra Publications, Delhi, 2009.
- ⁵³ William J. Brands, *India, Pakistan and the great powers*, New Delhi, 1993.
- ⁵⁴ Ramesh Thakur, *The Politics and Economics of India’s Foreign Policy*, New Delhi, 1984.
- ⁵⁵ *Indian Foreign Policy Agenda for the 21st Century*, Foreign Service Institute, New Delhi, 1998.
- ⁵⁶ S.D.Muni, *India’s Foreign Policy : The Democracy Dimension (with special Reference to Neighbouts)*, Foundation Books, Delhi, 2009.

-
- ⁵⁷ Tobias F.Engelmeier, *Nation-Building and Foreign Policy in India, An Identity. Strategy conflict*, foundation, Books, Delhi, 2009.
- ⁵⁸ C.RajaMohan, “Ten Questionas on Peace Process”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. XXXIX, no. 28, July 10, 2004.
- ⁵⁹ Sunil Das Gupta and Stephen Philip Cohen, “Military Modernization in India,” *Seminar*, 611, July. 2010.
- ⁶⁰ John Briscoe, “Troubled Waters: Can a bridge be built over the Indus?,” *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol. XLV, no. 50, December, 11, 2010.
- ⁶¹ Poonam Mann, *India’s Foreign Policy in the post cold war era*, Harman Publishing House, New Delhi, 2000.
- ⁶² Satyabrat Sina, “The India-Pakistan Peace Proces : Incremental Progress?”. In Anjali Ghosh and others (eds.), *India’s foreign Policy*, Pearson Publication, Delhi, 2009.
- ⁶³ Smruti S. Pattanik, *South Asia: Envisioning A Regional Future*, Pantagon Security International, New Delhi, 2011.
- ⁶⁴ Rajesh M.Basrur, “India-Pakistan Relations, Between war and Peace”, in Sumit Ganguly (ed.), *India’s Foreign Policy : Retrospect & Prospect*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2010.
- ⁶⁵ Gyanendra Pandey, “India and Pakistan 1947-2002”, in *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXVII, March , 2002.
- ⁶⁶ R.S.Yadav, “India, Pakistan Peace Process, A Study of CBMs,” in *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 43, no. 1, January-December, 2008.
- ⁶⁷ Mohor Chakraborty, “India and Pakistan in 2010 : Reviewing the state of Bilateral Relations”, in *World Focus*, Vol. XXXI, no. 11-12, Nov-Dec. 2010.