

South Asian Security Compulsions: A Historical Analysis of India-Pakistan Relations

Gulshan Majeed

Abstract

The region of South Asia has always been highly important in the global politics because of its sensitive geographical location. India and Pakistan are two major countries of this region, which came into being as a result of the division of Sub-Continent in the year of 1947. Both India and Pakistan have remained unable to have cordial relationship with each other due to various issues. The relationship between India and Pakistan has been marked by suspicion, hatred and distrust. Tense and hostile situation has been existing between India and Pakistan since 1947, which has resulted in three wars and various crises between them. In May 1998, both India and Pakistan had tested their nuclear devices and the region of South Asia became a nuclear flashpoint. Although India and Pakistan are two traditional rival states but both have also experienced such occasions when they became successful to hold peace talks and conclude various agreements to resolve different issues. But this situation has not been long lasting and suspensions in the peace process further enhanced suspicion and mistrust on both sides. The objective of this paper is to analyze various issues between India and Pakistan in historical perspective and highlight those efforts which have been made by the policy makers of both states to lessen the tension.

Key words: Suspicion, Hostile, Nuclear flashpoint, Suspension

Security studies have always been a significant concern of international relations. New trends regarding interaction between states of the world have emerged after the end of the Cold War. New forms of conflicts have also emerged on the globe under the changing political environment of the world. The new ground realities have accelerated the process of re-evaluation of the old concept of the security. The concept of security is considered a complicated concept. It is necessary to define security to fully comprehend this concept. Security, essentially a negative term, “connotes the absence of real and perceive threats, whether stemming from external sources or internal turmoil or economic disparities or social inequalities to curtail coveted values” (Cheema, 2006). Security is taken as free from threats. States being sovereign independent entities develop themselves economically, politically

*Author is Assistant professor at Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore – Pakistan.

and militarily to deal with different threats. The concept of security can be divided into two categories: traditional concept of security that pays more attention on the state security and for ensuring the security of state to attain maximum military power. During the whole cold war era the traditional concept of security played a dominant role in the global politics. The other category is non-traditional concept of security (Cheema, 2006).

In the present day scenario the concept of security is not confined only to the military threats rather non-military threats have emerged most crucial threats. There are different non- military issues such as economy, trade, terrorism and environment etc. These non-military issues are considered the part of low politics or soft security. Barry Buzan was the eminent scholar who believed in a profound widening of security to non-military issues. There is another approach led by pluralists and social constructionists, which support the idea of human security (Javaid, 2006). In 1990s United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) also played a significant role to popularize the concept of human security.

Here it is deemed necessary to give a brief introduction of the relationship between India and Pakistan before analyzing various issues among them. South Asian region comprises world's 1/5th population. This huge population can have immense opportunities to flourish capabilities but only when the states of the region have peaceful and cooperative relationship with each other. India and Pakistan are two largest nuclear states in South Asian region and security managers of both states show their intention to improve their defensive and offensive capabilities against each other. This intention has severely undermined the socio-economic development of both countries, especially Pakistan, which has a narrow economic base. Both countries have to invest their vast resources in making advanced research in nuclear field because the nuclear and missile programmes of both states are irreversible, in doing so social development has been neglected by India and Pakistan. India and Pakistan have to keep a balance between social security and national security. India and Pakistan share a long border but look upon each other with suspicion, hatred and mistrust. Antagonistic attitude of both states has been escalating tense relationship between them. Geographical location of Pakistan is highly sensitive because Pakistan is located at the crossroads of three ancient civilizations. Pakistan can serve as a bridge between Central Asia and South Asia, the Middle East and Central Asia and the Middle East and South Asia. Pakistan can provide transit facility to its neighbouring countries including India. India can have benefits by using this transit facility because of its growing economic needs. This only can be materialized when there is cordial relationship between India and Pakistan. Since 1947, India and Pakistan have antagonistic approach towards each other. They are arch rival

South Asian Security Compulsions

of each other and this rivalry has involved both countries in an arm race. India and Pakistan are nuclear powers and have huge stockpiles of lethal weapons that can assure mutual destruction. Security paradigm of South Asian region has been facing severe threats by the strategic competition between India and Pakistan. India and Pakistan since 1947 have witnessed various ups and downs in their relations. The war of 1948, 1965 to Tashkent Agreement, the 1971 war, separation of East Pakistan and then Simla Agreement, the 1998 nuclear explosions, and then two prime ministers at Lahore; the Kargil Crisis and then at Agra 2001; high intensity confrontation during 2002 and then handshake at SAARC Summit and different rounds of CBMs (Confidence Building Measures). Little bit progress can be observed on softer and less contentious issues. After defining the concept of security here it is deemed necessary to explain different dimensions of insecurity in South Asian region.

India since, partition wanted to dominate the political scenario of South Asia and considered Pakistan as a major obstacle in the way of achieving its hegemonic designs. Security scenario could not be achieved due to divergent relationship between India and Pakistan. India wanted to destabilize Pakistan in order to reverse partition. For weakening Pakistan India opted delaying tactics to provide Pakistan's share in economic and military assets, which were to be given to Pakistan according to the principle of partition. The conflict in Kashmir in 1948 created a great security threat for Pakistan's survival. Pakistan since its inception considered the atmosphere of peace and security as most important for achieving its national interests rather pursuing a policy of confrontation with India. Pakistan due to Indian hegemonic designs wanted to strengthen its security. Misperception developed in the minds of policy makers of both states regarding different issues. By having distrust and suspicion, policy makers remained unable to evolve a policy through which they would be able to resolve their problems. Element of suspicion has pulleted the environment, which has been successfully misguiding the policy makers of both countries. South Asia has become the most insecure region of the world. There have been many variables which are contributing towards it but the arm race between India and Pakistan has particularly put this region in the whirlpool of insecurity. There are different issues which are necessary to be analyzed to highlight the relationship between India and Pakistan.

Dominant and Dominated Relationship

One of the most important dimensions of insecurity in the South Asian region is the dominant and dominated relationship between India and Pakistan. The dominating behavior of India in the past and present did not provide an opportunity to both states to create an environment of security. India started to deter, coerce or influence Pakistan. The attitude of India before and after

partition confirms that India would not reconcile with the creation of Pakistan. India did not accept the division of land into two pieces rather considered land as her mother. India considered Pakistan as an illegal creation, a tragic mistake. Many Indians felt that the creation of Pakistan is a tragic mistake which might be corrected at least as far as East-Pakistan is concerned (Callard, 1975). Most of the Indian leaders emphatically asserted that Pakistan will disintegrate and will join again India. This has been embedded a sense of insecurity in the mind of Pakistanis. Since partition the steps, which India has been taking at the political, diplomatic and in various agencies at international and regional level fostered more fear in the minds of leaders and the people of Pakistan. This fear has put them in cognitive mass. The border clashes, the war, the anti-Muslim Propaganda and statements have confirmed this fear and doubts. The dominating attitude of India created mistrust in the minds of leaders of Pakistan. The divergent nature of relationship did not create security scenario. The Pakistan's leaders always feel that India has not reconciled to the creation and existence of Pakistan and will never give secure breathing space. Soon after the partition there were different issues between India and Pakistan such as refugee problem and issue of evacuee property, distribution of military and financial assets. These issues created mistrust on both sides.

Arm Race

Another important dimension of insecurity in the South Asian region is the arm race between India and Pakistan. The arm race has particularly put this region in the whirlpool of insecurity. Arm race, deployment of forces at the borders and anti-propaganda against each other have contaminated the environment with insecurity and deterrence. The deployment of nuclear weapons and capabilities along with deterrence-security continuum has emerged as a dynamics of world politics. The example of South Asia is different with the regard of arm race because the countries involved in arm race as competitors, Indian nuclear policy has major objectives to become as a hegemonic state in the region. The nuclear weapon capability of a state, particularly those states who have a history of aggressive policies, constitute the ultimate threat (Gupta, 2005). India considered that she has a greater threat towards her security from China. On the other hand, Pakistan has experienced three wars with India and many border clashes. For that, Pakistan will go on nuclear to counter the threat of India. In 1974, India exploded her first nuclear device and India termed the test a "Peaceful Nuclear Explosion" and India launched a campaign to convince the international community that it was indeed peaceful (Ramana, 2013). http://www.geocities.ws/m_v_ramana/nucleararticles/precis98.pdf. Pakistan considered the explosion of 1974 by India as an act of aggression and a threat against her security. Pakistan tried to counter Indian

South Asian Security Compulsions

action. Former Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto declared, "We will never let Pakistan be a victim of nuclear black mail" (Albright & Zamora, 1989). http://books.google.com.pk/books?id=2gUAAAAAMBAJ&pg=PA20&lpg=PA20&dq=albright+and+tom+zamora+india+and+pakistan+nuclear+weapons+b&source=bl&ots=4h3G_OHxrW&sig=7r2flsKx9q1Mi07fC6dvlhKcE0E&hl=en&sa=X&ei=kAp6UcmdLdHHrQfLo4GoBA&ved=0CDEQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q&f=false

In 1987, Zia-Ul-Haq declared that Pakistan was capable of developing nuclear weapons (but has chosen not to do). In 1990s India and Pakistan's relations were strained because of nuclear policy. In May 1998, India and Pakistan conducted a series of nuclear tests. Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee proudly proclaimed that India has become the sixth nuclear weapon state and should be treated as such by other five (The Nation, 1998). This statement indicated that India whenever gets a chance would use her nuclear capability against her enemy states in the name of security.

Pakistani leadership stated that Pakistan could do every thing to counter the threat of India towards her security and Pakistan defense would be made impregnable against any Indian threat may it would be nuclear or conventional. India by conducting nuclear tests in May 1998, started an arm race in the South Asian region. This action of India was perceived by Pakistan a major threat towards her security. The then Prime Minister of Pakistan Nawaz Sharif said in May 1998 that Pakistan government would take any necessary step to protect the national security of Pakistan (The Nation, 1998). The government Pakistan was under severe pressure from the foreign powers not to give tit for tat reply to India. President of USA and British Prime Minister tried to put pressure over Nawaz Sharif government not to conduct nuclear explosions (The Nation, 1998). But the statements of Indian's leaders such as, Pakistan should roll back her nuclear programme, change her Indian policy and vacate Azad Kashmir, compelled Pakistan to respond it. Pakistan conducted nuclear tests on May 28, 1998 in Chagai Hills, in order to achieve parity with India on the nuclear issue (Gupta, 2005). After 28th explosions, Pakistan gave argument that Pakistan now is in a position to defend herself from the attack of India if it has to happen. Pakistan after 1998 was in a position to liberate herself from the feelings of threat from India. Both India and Pakistan perceive their nuclear devices as minimum credible nuclear deterrence. Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee stated "The nuclear weapon is not an offensive weapon. It is a weapon of self-defence. It is the kind of weapon that helps in preserving the peace. If in the days of the Cold War there was no use of force, it was because of the balance of terror" (Gupta, 2005).s

Mutual distrust between India and Pakistan has risen to new heights after the nuclear test of May, 1998. Both India and Pakistan face what the superpowers have faced since the early fifties: the risk of a conventional conflict escalating to a nuclear one (Chander, 2003). Within a year of May, 1998 tests; two countries were embroiled in their violent clash over Kargil. They did not stop here, the allegation for different actions and developments within the countries compelled to test new nuclear devices, as India tested pithvi missile and as a response Pakistan experienced abdal and still the race is going on.

Kashmir Issue

Another dimension of insecurity in the region is Kashmir issue. Kashmir issue is perceived the most irritating issue between India and Pakistan. Kashmir issue is a legacy of British partition plan and that issue is going on in its original form. British India was divided in 1947. According to partition plan Muslim majority areas were to go to Pakistan, and Hindu majority areas to India. The state of Jammu and Kashmir was one important princely states of British India. Muslims population was in majority in this state and it was ruled by Hindu Maharaja. Maharaja concluded an agreement with Pakistan but implemented coercive measures against those Muslims, who revolted against Maharaja. Maharaja was more interested to save his personal rule; he inclined towards India to get control over the situation. India became ready to assist Maharaja but under certain conditions such as Maharaja first had to sign an instrument of accession with India. Maharaja did it against the wishes of the people of Kashmir. It is also a known fact that both India and Pakistan have totally different perception about the Kashmir issue. Pakistan during the whole cold war era stated that Kashmirs should be given an opportunity to decide their destiny themselves according to UNO resolutions. India regards Kashmir issue as its territorial issue. India asserts that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. India occupied two thirds of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan administering one-third, with a United Nations recognized ceasefire line separating them (Hussain, 2006). Both India and Pakistan accepted the UNCIP (United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan), resolutions of 13 August, 1948 and 5th January 1949 and these resolutions have potential to provide an opportunity to kashmiris to decide their destiny themselves. Both India and Pakistan accepted that the future status of Jammu and Kashmir should be determined according to the will of the Kashmiries. It was also declared through these resolutions that the Question of accession of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan will be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite (Hussain, 2006). The government of India adopted a dual policy on the issue of Kashmir. It expressed its intention that Kashmir dispute should be resolved according to expectations of Kashmiries through a free and impartial

South Asian Security Compulsions

plebiscite, but in practice Indian leaders declared Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of India. In 1957 India implemented a new state constitution which incorporated the state into the Indian Union. India has been controlling the people of Kashmir by coercive means.

The United Nations deployed the United Nations Military Observe Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) to monitor the cease fire line between Azad Kashmir area and the Indian held Kashmir. From 1953 to 1956 Pakistan and India tried to resolve the problem through direct negotiations. But when Pakistan joined military pacts of US, the attitude of India had changed. She blamed that Pakistan was responsible for inviting the external powers in the matters and issues of the region. Commenting to Indian attitude G.W Chaudry said “so far India’s inability to hold the plebiscite had a disagreement over demilitarization; now began the second excuse; Pakistan’s new militant strength” (Chaudry, 1968). Pakistan did not ready to accept Indian arguments. After 1971 war, Pakistan faced debacle of East-Pakistan and after that both India and Pakistan mutually decided through Simla Agreement to transform the UN arranged cease fire line into a line of control. It was also decided by both of them that they would solve their problems including Kashmir through direct negotiations.

But after that India continued her illegal occupation of the large part of the Jammue and Kashmir and refused to allow the kashmiries to decide their own destiny. India continued brutal suppression in the territory. Indian policy makers were not ready to recognize the Kashmir problem and this attitude of Indians compelled Kashmiri youth to take up arms for their right of self determination and for keeping the issue alive. The number of armed separatists grew from hundreds to thousands; the Hizbul-Mujahideen and the Jammu & Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) were very prominent groups to support pro-independence stance. Different other groups joined Hurriyat Conference which peacefully making struggle for the rights of Kashmiri people. Since 1989, more than 80,000 Kashmiries have been killed in their quest for freedom. Since the tragic events of 9/11 Indian forces have been using all kind of coercive means for suppressing kashmiris and declaring them terrorist and continuously accusing Pakistan for supporting cross border terrorism. Although both have fought three wars and both came in to conflict with each other over Kargil in 1999 but they did not learn lessons from the effects of these wars. International community in general and major powers particularly are interested to defuse tension between Pakistan and India due to the following reasons such as, firstly, conflicting situation between India and Pakistan can enhance chances of nuclear confrontation, secondly such a confrontation will influence the long term plans of the on going campaign

against international terrorism by the US-led coalition and thirdly it will affect the stability of governments of both Pakistan and India (Dixit, 2004).

For the sake of durable peace between India and Pakistan, resolution of Kashmir issue is highly important. India has accepted Kashmir as a bilateral issue and this issue should be resolved through peaceful means. The twelfth SAARC Summit provided a platform to both India and Pakistan to start discussion for resolving the Kashmir issue, which is a bone of contention between India and Pakistan. The best approach is to encourage both states to remain engaged in a process that would eventually lead to peaceful solution of the Kashmir dispute according to the expectations of Kashmiri people. The role of the third party can be very effective in convincing both India and Pakistan to start dialogue to resolve Kashmir issue (Dixit, 2004).

It is imperative to mention here that in order to arrive at some peaceful solution, infiltration of terrorists into India must stop and transgression of human rights by Indian troops and the police must also stop (Hussain, 2006).

Siachen Dispute

Siachen dispute is another factor behind the insecurity of the region. The Siachen Glacier is located in an area where both the cease fire line and Line of Control are ill-defined. India and Pakistan had battled over a 2,500-square-km triangle of contested territory nearly two decades. Siachen Glacier strategically is very important not only for India and Pakistan but also for China (Gehlot & Satsangi, n.d.). Right from the independence of India and Pakistan from 1947 to 1983, this glacier had remained under the control of Pakistan. All the regional as well as international actors accepted the control of Pakistan over Siachen. The foreign expedition, which passed through the area on their way to K.2, always sought permission from Pakistan (Zakir, 1990). Many maps issued by the United States, United Nations and Atlas prepared by encyclopedia Britannica showed the glacier on the part of Pakistan. India has strategic interests to capture the snow-bound land. Indian leaders wanted to reach towards Kara Koram highway through Siachen glacier. By keeping this dream in mind, India in 1984 started deploying her forces towards the territory to capture the whole glacier. In response Pakistan did the same. The deployment of forces resulted in human loss on both sides. Both countries were not able to continue the tension at that glacier. Both governments decided to solve the issue. Talk processes started between India and Pakistan but no solution was come out of them. The deployment of the forces of both states at Siachen still can be observed. Military units of both India and Pakistan fire artillery rounds at each other on the Siachen Glacier, a small uninhabited Himalayan Plateau (Chander, 2003). India and Pakistan

South Asian Security Compulsions

have been paying a heavy cost in terms of troop's casualty and economics. For example, the cost of fighting conservatively estimated at \$200 million annually for India and at least half that amount for Pakistan with its easier lines of communication and access (Jaspal, 2006). India and Pakistan had not their permanent troops presence at Siachen Glacier prior to 1984. Now the troops of both states have been posing threat to each other. Status quo on Siachen Glacier would not serve the interests of Pakistan. This issue is lingering on between India and Pakistan and it has potential to generate misperceptions in the minds of policy makers of both sides and this thing will affect India and Pakistan relations.

Kargil Crisis

After May 1998 nuclear explosions by both India and Pakistan Kashmir issue became a nuclear flash point and probability of Kashmir emerging as nuclear flash point in South Asia almost came true when two nuclear states of South Asian region came into violent conflicting situation over the Kargil heights in the disputed state (Shakoor, 2013). <http://www.istor.org/stable/41394429>

The Kargil clash in May, 1999 pushed the region in an environment of insecurity. Violent conflicting situation erupted in Kargil sector after a couple of months of Lahore declaration, which was signed between Vajpayee and Nawaz Sharif. Kargil conflict was the part of Kashmir and that issue is considered the main driving force behind the arm race of South Asia. Kashmiri Mujhadeen took a current turn in the first week of May 1999, when it was reported by the India that approximately 500 to 800 so-called infiltrators crossed the Line of Control on the Indian side. Kargil and Drass along LOC (Line of Control) provided to the Mujahideen a strategically important position to choke the Indian army movement from Sirinagar to Leh. India called it a proxy war, which was controlled by Pakistan forces. India claimed during this conflict that LOC should be considered as the permanent border between India and Pakistan but Pakistan considered that Line of Control is a temporary line between them. Pakistani leadership held talks with USA and reached an agreement under which, would order Mujahideen to withdraw from Kargil and Line of Control would be respected by both India and Pakistan. Kargil issue proved that Kashmir issue is a nuclear flash point and needs urgent resolution. Kargil crisis was a reminder that conventional hostilities have potential to push both India and Pakistan into a nuclear exchange. During Kargil crisis the presence of nuclear weapons influenced the actions of India and Pakistan. India and Pakistani officials and leaders did not hesitate to exchange direct or indirect nuclear threats during the Kargil crisis. This crisis is considered sufficient to make US realize that its involvement in the region

has become inevitable to facilitate both India and Pakistan to resolve their issues including the core issue of Kashmir (Javaid P. D., 2012).

Because of this, the confidence and trust always remain a wishful thinking between them. The clash over Kargil has been formally ended, but the aggressive attitude has not been stopped. The feeling of intense hate and belligerence that overpowered the people not only in speeches, writings but it also showed in actions by attacking enemy across the Line of Control. Pakistan expressed the basic assumption that Indian hostility and hegemonic ambitions would remain a continuing feature of India's foreign policy in the coming years. The Indian factor has become the main concern of Pakistan's foreign policy and security perception. After the end of the Kargil episode, the terrorist attacks on the Indian Parliament on 13th December 2001 provided an opportunity to India to opt a hard stance towards Pakistan. Through most of 2002 Indian government mobilized its armed forces. Pakistan was forced to respond on same lines. For many months armed forces of both sides were ready for war. This military standoff between India and Pakistan posed a major threat to peace of South Asian region.

Water Dispute

Water dispute between India and Pakistan started right after the partition of India, which created a great sense of insecurity in the South Asian region. No dispute generated so much tension and confusion as over the waters of Indus River Basin between India and Pakistan. The dispute was related with the distribution of canal water for irrigation. The Indus River system consists of Indus River itself and various tributaries notably the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej and the Beas. The last three flow from Indian Territory and enter in West Pakistan (Chaudry, 1968). India enjoys the status of upper riparian state while Pakistan is lower riparian state. India enjoys a strategic advantage because it can divert the flow of water.

In 1947, an agreement was signed between West Pakistan and East Punjab for a continuous of the normal water supplies to canal in Pakistan from the head works of India. The Madhopur and Ferozpur head works both lay in India, which provided the irrigation facilities to Pakistan. India planned to control those head works to damage the irrigation system of Pakistan. This step not only jolted Pakistan's trust on India but also exposed her vulnerability. It generated an environment of insecurity. Most high level meetings held to discuss this issue but no permanent solution can be evolved regarding this issue Pakistani policy makers were interested to refer this to International Court of Justice but India did not show its consent in this regard.. In September 1951, the president of World Bank, Mr. Eugene Black offered good

South Asian Security Compulsions

offices for the resolution of the water dispute between India and Pakistan. Both countries agreed on it and in 1960; Indus Basin Treaty was concluded between Nehru and Ayub Khan. According to this treaty the waters of three eastern rivers-Ravi, Sutlej and Beas were awarded to India and Pakistan was allocated water from the western rivers- Indus, Jhelum and Chenab (Hussain, 2006). under this treaty Pakistan got a legitimate right to construct a system of replacement canals to convey water from the western rivers into those areas in West Pakistan and these were those areas which previously had to depend for their irrigation supplies on water from eastern rivers. India and Pakistan for ensuring the implementation of the treaty formed Indo-Pakistan Indus commission. But there are different confusions over the water distribution. India constructed a controversial dam on Chenab at Baglihar to generate electricity (Javaid P. D., 2012). Construction of Baglihar dam is highly sensitive to Pakistan. According to Indus Water Treaty of 1960 India is not supposed to limit the flow of water the three western rivers. The government of Pakistan demanded that government of India alter design, storage capacity, height and the gates of the spillway structure of this project. Both India and Pakistan held different round of talks to discuss various technical aspects of this project. But no fruitful results can be secured through different negotiations. Pakistan has referred this issue to the World Bank for peaceful solution.

Conclusion

South Asian region is perceived very important in world politics because of its sensitive geographical location. In 1998 the region of South Asia became nuclear flash point because India and Pakistan successfully conducted their nuclear tests. The region of South Asia had played a significant role during the Cold War era. Particularly the role of Pakistan was very important because it fought against Soviet forces in Afghanistan. USA after 9/11 terrorist attacks decided to fight against terrorism. When War on Terror started in Afghanistan Pakistan again became a frontline state and South Asian region once again gained crucial position at the global level. The importance of South Asian region will increase in future because of number of factors such as; India has emerged as a stable regional power and it is interested very much to play a significant role in the global politics, China emerging global power is located near South Asian region, the role of Pakistan can not be ignored in this region and South Asian region also has potential to play a significant role to exploit rich resources of Central Asian Republics. But the other side of the picture presents altogether a different scenario of the South Asian region. India and Pakistan two arch rivals have different tensions, conflicts and even do not hesitate to wage war to settle their scores. It is necessary to initiate various peaceful measures to resolve different disputes between India and Pakistan

including the core issue of Kashmir. It is imperative to mention here different initiatives which were taken by both India and Pakistan after May 1998 nuclear explosions for normalizing relationship with each other. First major development took place in form of Lahore Agreement which was signed between the then Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Nawaz Sharif. The governments of both states showed their intention to work for the welfare of the people and to resolve their problems through dialogue process including the Kashmir issue. The process of cooperation was halted by the Kargil Crisis. After this crisis Agra Summit in 2001 is considered very positive development between India and Pakistan though it was not a successful summit because of presence of area of disagreement over Kashmir issue. But different issues like trade, visa issues, and different other issues related to security of both states were discussed in detail. The terrorist attacks on Indian Parliament in 13 December 2001 changed the whole scenario of relationship between India and Pakistan. India considered Pakistan responsible for supporting these acts of terrorism. India pressurized Pakistan after this terrorist incident through various measures such as military build up on borders, to recall its High Commissioner from Islamabad and to terminate all road and air links. The tense relationship started to become normalize after the incident of 9/11; When Pakistan became a close ally of US in war against terror. Policy makers of both states showed their intention to initiate a sustained and productive dialogue to resolve different issues and to develop good relations with each other. During 2004 and 2005 the process of composite dialogue and various confidence building measures were started between India and Pakistan and it was an encouraging trend to resolve different issues. There are different steps which are necessary for securing durable peace between India and Pakistan such as: the most significant step in this regard is resolution of Kashmir issue through involving the people of Kashmir, people to people contact can contribute positively to mitigate sense of hatred on both sides, to establish strong economic ties with each other and through constructive and effective use of regional forums such as effective role of SAARC can play a dominant role to normalize relationship between India and Pakistan.

South Asian Security Compulsions

End Notes

Albright, D., & Zamora, T. (1989). Retrieved 04 26, 2013, from http://books.google.com.pk/books?id=2gUAAAAAMBAJ&pg=PA20&lpg=PA20&dq=albright+and+tom+zamora+india+and+pakistan+nuclear+weapons+b&source=bl&ots=4h3G_OHxrW&sig=7r2flsKx9q1Mi07fC6dvlhKcE0E&hl=en&sa=X&ei=kAp6UcmdLDHrQfLo4GoBA&ved=0CDEQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q&f=f.

Callard, K. (1975). *Pakistan Foreign Policy: Interpretation*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations.

Chander, P. (2003). *India and Pakistan under Conflict Partition and After*. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.

Chaudry, G. W. (1968). *Pakistan Relation with India 1947-1966*. London: Pall Mall.

Cheema, D. P. (2006). *Changing Nature of Security Concepts in Peace and Security in South Asia: Issue and Challenges*. (P. D. Javaid, Ed.) Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre.

Dixit, J. (2004). *India and Regional Developments through the Prism of Indo-Pak Relations*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.

Gehlot, N., & Satsangi, A. *Indo-Pak Relations*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.

Gupta, A. (2005). *India and Paksitan The Conflict Peace Syndrome*. Delhi: Kalinga publication.

Hussain, D. N. (2006). *Resolution of Kashmir Issue: A Factor for Peace and Stability in South Asia in Peace and Security in South Asia: Issue and Challanges*. (P. D. Javaid, Ed.) Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre.

Jaspal, Z. N. (2006). *Nuclear Risks in South Asian in Peace and Security in South Asia: Issur and Challenges*. Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre.

Javaid, P. D. (Ed.). (2006). *Introduction: Transformation of Security Paradigm and South Asia in Peace and Security in South Asia: Issue and Challenges*. Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre.

Gulshan Majeed

Javaid, P. D. (2012). peace building in South Asia Limitations and Prospects. Lahore: Centre for South Asian Studies.

Javaid, P. D. (2012). Peace Building in South Asia Limitations and Prospects. Lahore: Centre for South Asian Studies.

Ramana, M. (2013, 04 26). The India Nuclear Bomb-Long in The Making. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.ws/m_v_ramana/nucleararticles/precis98.pdf.

Shakoor, F. (2013, 04 26). The Kargil Crisis: An Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41394429> .

The Nation. (1998, 05 12).

The Nation. (1998, 05 19).

Zakir, C. M. (1990). Siachen Glaciar World's Highest War Front (Urdu) . Sakardo: Balistan Academy.