



**BAOU**  
Education  
for All

**Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar  
Open University**

(Established by Government of Gujarat)

# CERTIFICATE IN INDIA'S NATIONAL SECURITY



**India's Conventional & Modern Warfare**

**CINS-03**

## Message for Students

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University established in 1994, is the only State Open University of Gujarat. It is a mighty contributor in the State's higher education with cumulative enrolment of 8,00,000+ students. The University impacts the lives of citizens of Gujarat with easy access to higher education without any barriers of age, time and space; for it offers more than 80 programmes of Regular and Vocational-Professional courses comprising of Ph.D., Post-Graduate, Graduate, PG Diploma, Diploma, and Certificate; with 250+ Study Centres and 06 Regional Centres across Gujarat.



In past two years, university has pro-actively implemented innovative student-friendly practices as per the *National Education Policy-2020*, established *Gargi* – Centre for the Holistic Development of Women, *Atri* – Special Learner Support Centre, *Gurukul* – Model Learner Support Centre, *Dronacharya* – Centre for Innovation, Startup and Entrepreneurship, *Eklavya* - Student Support Portal, *Suresh Joshi Gyanpith (Chair)*; and introduced *Tej-Trusha Talent Hunt* – a first-of-its-kind initiative across Indian Open Universities. BAOU has also undertaken noble social initiatives such as providing *free-of-cost education* to Covid-orphaned persons and to war-widows and children of Army martyrs.

Further, university aims to achieve newer milestones in academic, societal, and administrative fields. Plans are ripe for establishing ‘Skill Centre’ at every Regional Centre, certifying local artists, craftsmen, and skilled persons through ‘Recognition of Prior Learning’; we also look forward to offer courses in foreign languages and Indian classical languages. The university intends to collaborate with the best of Open Universities across India and at global level to provide world class knowledge and experience to the students of Gujarat.

This eponymous university strives to fulfill the vision of Bharat Ratna Dr. B. R. Ambedkarji who believed: *"Cultivation of mind should be the ultimate aim of human existence"*.

Today, the Republic of India is the largest democracy in the world. I believe, we as citizens of India are privileged to enjoy our freedom because of the innumerable sacrifices of our great leaders, freedom-fighters, martyrs, and robust Indian Army and Defence Services that are protecting and preserving our security. In the contemporary world, there have emerged a set of non-traditional issues challenging our security along with the traditional ones; and hence ‘National Security’ becomes very vital for the well-being of every nation as well as human-kind at large. Therefore, we have indigenously prepared the present course on ‘India’s National Security’ with the purpose of sensitizing and orienting the citizens this very crucial and significant concept. As per NEP-2020, we have prepared and launched more than a dozen need-based, indigenous programmes encompassing humanities, social sciences, technology, commerce, management fields.

With all these cumulative efforts, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University is marching ahead to fulfill the motto of ‘Education for All’. We invite you to contribute in this *Yajna* of Knowledge and Education.

Best Wishes!



Prof. (Dr.) Ami Upadhyay  
Vice-Chancellor,  
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University,  
Ahmedabad.

*Certificate in India's National Security*  
*CINS-03*  
*India's Conventional & Modern Warfare*

**Editor**

Prof. (Dr.) Ami Upadhyay  
Vice-Chancellor,  
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University, Ahmedabad

**Programme Advisory Committee**

Prof. (Dr.) Ami Upadhyay  
Vice-Chancellor,  
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University, Ahmedabad

Prof. Manish,  
Professor, Centre for International Politics,  
Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.

Dr. Rajiv Gupte,  
Associate Professor – Strategic Management,  
Institute of Management, Mumbai Educational Trust, Mumbai.

Shri Jay Joshi,  
National Secretary,  
Forum for Integrated National Security, Mumbai.

**Content Writer**

Prof. Manish, Professor, Centre for International Politics,  
Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.

**Subject Reviewer**

Commodore S S Chandorkar,  
All India Vice-President, Forum for Integrated National Security, Mumbai,  
Retd. from Indian Navy.

**Language Reviewer**

Dr. Deepak Mashru,  
Assistant Professor - Marwadi Education Foundation,  
Marwadi University, Rajkot.

**Programme Coordinator**

Dr. Jainee Shah  
Assistant Professor – English,  
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University

**Publisher**

Registrar (I/c), Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University, Ahmedabad

**ISBN: 978-93-91468-17-0**

**Year: 2021**

**© 2021 – Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University - Ahmedabad**

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means without permission in writing from Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University, Ahmedabad.



**Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Open University**  
(Established by Government of Gujarat)

**Certificate in India's National Security**  
**CINS-03**

**India's Conventional & Modern Warfare**

**Block**

**3**

---

<b>Unit 1</b>	<b>01</b>
<b>Definition and Typologies Of Warfare</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>Unit 2</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Indo-Pak War 1948, 1965, 1971, 1999 (Kargil)</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>Unit 3</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>India-China War 1962</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>Unit 4</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Sub-Conventional and Proxy Wars</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>Unit 5</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>WMDs and Warfare</b>	
<hr/>	

## UNIT:1

# DEFINITION AND TYPOLOGIES OF WARFARE

### :: STRUCTURE ::

- 1.0 Objectives**
- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Conceptualising Warfare**
- 1.3 India' Conventional Wars**
- 1.4 India's Proxy Wars**
- 1.5 Let Us Sum Up**
- 1.6 Keywords**
- 1.7 Suggested Books**
- Answers**

---

## 1.0 OBJECTIVES

---

### *In this unit we shall:*

- Attain a basic understanding of how definition of wars and typologies
- Understand conventional conflicts in India
- Understand non-conventional conflicts in India

### *On completing this unit, you should be able to:*

- Understand the typologies of wars
- Understand the conventional conflicts in India
- Understand the non-conventional conflicts in India.

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Warfare has always existed since early ages, ever since human beings began to gather themselves in societies and formed kingdoms and empires through kinship. In fact being social animals human beings also take up the same characteristics as exhibited by other animal species when it comes to conflict. The reasons behind conflicts and warfare may be many and at times it may be even difficult to conceptualise them in totality. However, one may very well understand that the desire for resources, identity, attaining supremacy and domination are some of the chief reasons which may provoke wars. Of course there are mechanisms in the modern world to prevent wars despite that wars and conflicts are very much a part and parcel of our lives. When it comes to warfare and conflicts not every type of war may be fought on a large scale, in fact the last war that was really fought on a large scale was the Second World War and after the end of the Cold War, conflicts have become more precise and localised in nature but of course with global repercussions. It

would therefore be important to highlight the typologies of warfare and then move on to the Indian context.

---

## **1.2 CONCEPTUALISING WARFARE**

---

When it comes to conceptualising warfare not only it is a difficult job to attend to but the sheer expression of the term warfare can actually confuse a lot of scholars. Despite that over years of research and after delving into a lot of allied subjects scholars generally tend to agree to certain basis of typologies in order to categorise wars. Before delving into that one has to understand that over the period of time the concept of warfare has itself undergone a change due to the changing nature of international relations and therefore there are numerous types of warfare modes which may be discussed.

According to the Correlation of War by David Singer and Melvin Small discuss that in order to classify a conflict as a war, at least 5 percent of damage must be inflicted on either of the warring parties and the death toll should be around 1000 per year without counting genocide or sporadic killings. However the chief problem with this definition is that it does not take into account asymmetric warfare at all. Historian Spencer Weart disagrees with this definition and considers the killing of 200 combatants per year enough to be called as a conflict that takes the shape of warfare.

Therefore a distinction has to be made between a simple conflict between two or more parties and an organised assault which involves standing or regular armies, auxiliary forces as well as massive mobilisation of troops and armoured units. A conflict may be quite localised and barely noticeable in nature, however warfare takes up a more definite proportion with huge losses on either side. Despite the best intentions of scholars it has indeed become more and more difficult to discuss the terminologies and typologies of warfare and especially in the context of the ever changing nature of armed conflicts. To offer an example warfare during the medieval ages involved large armies massed on the battlefields and the battle was restricted to a certain area with victories and defeats decided on the spot. However of late warfare may be extended, may turn into guerrilla warfare with no decisive conclusions and may even drag on for years. For instance the Iran-Iraq war dragged on for around 8 years without any decisive results. As a result of which it becomes even more difficult to define.

It would also be important to discuss the types of warfare which may offer a better insight into the discussions regarding warfare. Generally warfare may be divided into two main sections, which are Symmetric and Asymmetric warfare. While symmetric warfare means a war or an armed conflict between two organised states the other means a war between one organised state and other non-state actors. Definitions may be to some extent hazy but the chief meaning is well explained. For

instance the wars between the British and the French Empires or the wars between India and Pakistan were fought by two organised states or one may even take the Second World War where the armies were regular troops and the battles were restricted to them. However if one may consider the latter part of the Vietnam war or the war with the Taliban or even India's age old conflict with Pakistan based terrorists in Jammu and Kashmir it may fall under the notion of an asymmetric warfare.

Asymmetric warfare may also be defined into two other sub-categories which are Intra- state conflict in which one state and one non-state actor fights it out within the border of the state and the other is extra-state or extra-systemic conflict in which the state and the non-state actor engages in a conflict outside the state's existing borders. For instance in the first case India's conflict with Pakistan based terrorists may be considered, whereas in the second case American military intervention in Nicaragua or Honduras and its engagement with the rebels may be considered. Therefore, conflicts have to be divided in such a manner or categorised in such a way to offer maximum clarity.

In addition to these broad definitions other sub-categories of warfare have also come up which will be critical to analyse. The most important thing that has to be considered is the changing nature of conflict that has been stated before due to which newer types of conflicts have emerged which has completely altered the way wars may be analysed. For instance the concept of Cold Warfare or Cold War should remind the events that happened after the end of the Second World War, it necessarily means a conflict which may assume psychological, ideological, and economic proportions without actually engaging in physical combat. One may also attempt to understand the difference between a conventional and non-conventional warfare in which the first one deals with states combatting one another in a limited manner without the use of weapons of mass destruction and in the other case states use weapons of mass destruction to attain a quick victory. Other classifications are warfare that sees the use of chemicals (chemical warfare), biological pathogens (biological warfare) or nuclear weapons (nuclear warfare), these again combined fall under the ambit of non-conventional warfare. A total war means the use of all lethal means possible to defeat the enemy disregarding any international law that deals with warfare. Apart from these one must also delve into psychological and economic warfare which may not be violent in nature but deals psychological damage to the enemy by the means of propaganda and also through economic means.

Therefore the classification of warfare in various typologies are massive in nature and with the ever changing nature of warfare it becomes even more cumbersome to classify them.

**Check your Progress - I**

**Answer the following:**

(a) What are the two main categories of warfare?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) What is the concept of a proxy war?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) In what sense is India engaged in a proxy war?

---

---

---

---

---

(d) Armed rebels and insurgents are agents of a proxy war. Agree or Disagree.

---

---

---

---

---

(e) Mention the time frame after which proxy wars became a common part of the strategic culture in India. Post-Independence or Post 1990?

---

---

---

---

---

---

**1.3 INDIA’S CONVENTIONAL WARS**

---

India has always been at wars in order to defend itself from external aggression, ever since the arrival of various invaders and then the British native Indians are no stranger to wars and have a glorious history of fighting against all odds. In fact post-Independence it was speculated



that peace would finally return to the sub-continent even though the partition had left behind a bad taste on both the sides. No sooner did the partition and the creation of two countries India and Pakistan were declared India had to fight a defensive war with Pakistan and thus the saga of wars began with its western neighbour. India also had to fight a war with the PRC in 1962 which caused a lot of damage not only to the Indian military but also to the general psyche of the people. Historically too one has to look behind in our history and see the wars that have been fought on the subcontinent which ranges from the wars of the Mahabharata and the Ramayana to that of the invasions by Ahmad Shah Abdali and the subsequent conquest of India. No one may ignore the brave resistance put up against the British in the first war of independence of 1857 as well. Indeed the knowledge of our past will go in a long way to understand and shape our future. For instance the showcasing of exploits by bravehearts will signify their zeal to protect the nation at all costs, it will also enable the government as well as the armed forces to ensure that mistakes do not repeat and future wars may be prevented by careful planning. It will also enable youngsters to join the military and serve the nation.

To enumerate, India fought conventional wars with Pakistan in 1948, 1965, 1971 and 1999 and in 1984 India occupied the Siachen Glacier after hoodwinking Pakistan and thus attained a very important strategic spot in the Sub-continent. All these wars ended with a decisive victory for India and this section will deal with the notion of symmetric and asymmetric warfare. In all these wars with Pakistan they were symmetric in nature as the wars were fought between the regular armies of India and Pakistan, however the 1999 Kargil war was an exception which will be discussed later on in the section. It is also important to note that the war with the PRC ended in an Indian defeat and unilateral withdrawal by the PRC which actually made the Indian government change its notion on militarisation.

The first war was fought when Pakistani backed tribal warriors attacked the independent army of the then kingdom of Kashmir only for the Indian army to respond effectively once the princely state had acceded to India and became a part of the Union of India. In this war the Indian army fought tooth and nail for Kashmir and managed to retain two thirds of the territory while an international ceasefire allowed Pakistan to retain the remaining. The war of 1965 was also fought in a conventional manner in which there was a stalemate but India managed to capture quite a lot of Pakistani territory and after the Tashkent Agreement a ceasefire was declared. Perhaps the 1971 war deserves a special mention as it was a war that was fought on two fronts which actually led to the formation of Bangladesh and the dismemberment of Pakistan, it saw some of the largest massing of troops the liberal use of the air force and the navy and also the involvement of irregulars and rebels from Bangladesh known as the *mukti bahini* (freedom fighters). In addition the humiliating defeat that

Pakistan received it actually made them understand that they could never win against India in a conventional manner which later on led to a change in the strategic thinking of Pakistan when it came to India.

The 1999 war was strange due to the reason that the initial aggressive gestures were made by Pakistani regulars who were disguised but it later on developed into a full scale war which again ended with the decisive Indian victory and a ceasefire.

On noticing the wars with Pakistan there are a few observations that need to be made. Primarily Pakistan did not have the conventional superiority when it came to tackling India and as a result of which they depended on the use of locals, militias and on surprise attacks. Both the 1948 and the 1965 wars were surprise attacks in which a large number of irregulars or Pakistani soldiers disguised as irregulars were used. The idea was to take India by surprise which totally failed after attaining some initial success. Both these wars also saw a large use of troops and armoured units as well as auxiliary forces. The 1971 war was the largest combat between both the forces which was the last war fought without the cover of a nuclear shadow as both the states did not possess nuclear weapons. However in this context one thing that has to be mentioned is that rebels also took a part in the conflict dealing a lot of damage to the Pakistani forces on the Eastern Front. The conflict was a large scale conflict akin to a proper conventional war which against resulted in a massive and decisive Indian victory.

The 1999 Kargil war was fought under the nuclear shadow and Pakistan resorted to nuclear blackmail but to no avail as India managed to oust the invading Pakistani forces without much ado. In this context there was a possibility of it turning into a non-conventional warfare but timely intervention, heavy Pakistani losses and an isolated Pakistan did not have the courage to do so. The 1984 Operation Meghdoot may not be classified as a conflict as the sides did not engage but superior military intelligence and planning allowed India to occupy the Siachen Glacier which led to India obtaining a strategic position in the Kashmir region. Additionally apart from engaging Pakistan and the PRC India also engaged Portugal in the defeat of the Portuguese garrison at Goa and the subsequent amalgamation of Goa with India. Goa was a Portuguese colony and despite the wave of anti-colonial feelings, the Portuguese were unwilling to leave Goa and despite repeated requests it fell on the deaf ears of Portugal. Antonio Salazar was even caustic in his remarks and rebuked India on such requests. Therefore in 1961 the objective to liberate Goa was launched in which the Indian navy took active participation after the Portuguese troops fired upon a boat named the Sabarmati and killed a few passengers. The strategy of the Portuguese forces was to hold out as long as possible for an international intervention in favour of Portugal. The INS Betwa and the INS Beas were two ships that were extensively used in the operation that caused the destruction of the Portuguese navy. The

operation was conducted on the 18<sup>th</sup> of December and culminated in the very next day when the Portuguese surrendered without much resistance. After heavy shelling the territory was captured.

The war with the PRC that led to a defeat was a defeat in a conventional warfare with the PRC which raised questions on the efficacy of the Indian administration as the Indian army could have held back the Chinese if the government had planned carefully. Contrasting all these conflicts it may be ascertained that India has had its own share of conventional conflicts with its neighbours in which it has performed exceptionally well. However being a stronger state in comparison to Pakistan it also has to bear the brunt of proxy wars sponsored by Pakistan which will be discussed in the next section.

### **Check your Progress - II**

#### **Answer the following:**

(a) Mention the four wars that India fought with Pakistan?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) Under what circumstances was the Kargil war fought?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) What was the operation Meghdoot all about?

---

---

---

---

---

(d) In which war with Pakistan, India organised massive air raids as a retaliatory measure? 1965 war or 1971 war?

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) In which war did the Indian troops hold back invading Chinese troops inflicting serious casualties on them? 1948 war or 1962 war?

---

---

---

---

---

---

#### **1.4 INDIA'S PROXY WARS**

---

Apart from fighting conventional wars with Pakistan and the PRC India also has to combat extremists, militants and terrorists in the context of a proxy war. Being a large state with a multitude of cultures, religions and other ethnicities there are issues which often play out to foreign hands and as a result of which dissent is quickly fuelled into full blown rebellions sponsored by enemy states. In terms of proxy wars, the context of the 1971 war has to be observed. After a decisive Indian victory and an utter humiliation for Pakistan, the entire state of Pakistan underwent a radical change and they realised that it would be next to impossible to defeat India in the context of a conventional warfare. As a result of which the Pakistani establishment decided to engage India in proxy wars to not only keep it occupied but to bleed it gradually. The concept of a proxy war is interesting as the state that starts it often does not have to incur much losses and on the other hand the defending state incurs losses and the fear of taking in civilian casualties limits its options to engage the enemy.

Classifying the proxy wars, foreign agents or foreign based terrorist outfits organise training, propaganda and inculcation into the groups and launch terror attacks often at the frontlines as one may observe in Kashmir or engage in low intensity bomb blasts throughout the nation to strike terror and panic within the minds of the people. It not only causes panic but also harms the credibility of the government to retaliate or take stock of the situation. In such a situation the options for India is limited as it not only has to prove that states such as Pakistan sponsor terror but to breach the international border and take action also requires careful forethought and planning.

Previously too the use of irregulars was common in the wars with Pakistan especially in the 1948 and the 1965 war but after the defeat of Pakistan in 1971 and after 1988 with the genocide of Kashmiri Pandits, the rise of terror groups effectively supported and sponsored by Pakistan has taken a toll on India. Groups such as Jaish-E-Muhammad, Lashkar-E-Toiba and the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front have exhibited a curious set of warfare where the regular troops of the Indian army faces terrorists in a completely different scenario. In this case, there is a risk of asymmetric casualties as well as civilian casualties. The army in this case has to be very cautious in order to avoid civilian casualties as well

as neutralising terrorists. Besides such proxy wars also take a toll on the military as well on the civilians and the administration. It is indeed difficult to manage such conflicts because it becomes a diplomatic disaster at times to cross the border and destroy terror camps, additionally one has to also deal with the constant propaganda from the other side. Therefore such proxy wars take up alarming proportions as it targets military installations and even the civilian population, the main purpose of which is to strike terror into the hearts of the people and with the help of propaganda, the administration feels constrained and is forced to fight a defensive war.

India also has to engage other groups such as left-wing terror groups which instigate innocent tribals to take up arms against the state, and also receive international help and there are people who support them by the means of a nefarious propaganda. Government strategies to organised village defence committees and deploy the paramilitary has brought in limited success but since these groups are so well entrenched it becomes very difficult to wean them out. Apart from that militancy which is more ethnic based in the Northeast region in India, also assumes the same type of proportion.

In all these cases it has to be understood that even for a large state that is well armed it becomes increasingly difficult to deal with such groups as they have the element of surprise, they launch small scale attacks with devastating results and quickly escape akin to guerrilla warfare. The only solution to deal with such elements is to have a stronger intelligence network to neutralise them before they can launch attacks. Controversially though it would be more apt to uproot them from their bases, as it was done in the Balakot Strike in 2019 in which the terrorist camps were completely decimated. Indeed the Uri and the Pulwama attacks required a befitting response like the Surgical Strikes and the Airstrike which decimated the terror camps. Of course, international repercussions may follow but for a state like India with a massive economy, international prestige and armaments such steps will not only deal with terror and proxy warfare more effectively but will also ensure that Pakistan feels cornered. On the other hand with the PRC it becomes a tad bit difficult to deal with it owing to its economic and military disparity and also due to the fact that the PRC has always used Pakistan to keep India engaged, and also claims large tracts of India's territory. Although the PRC had previously aided rebels in the Northeast and left-wing terror groups weaning away people from joining such groups, calculated strikes and dismantling the propaganda machinery employed to support such groups may work in the longer run.

**Check your Progress – I**

**Answer the following:**

a) How did the Pakistani defeat in 1971 led to the creation of proxy war with India?

---

---

---

---

---

b) Mention two terrorist groups that operate in Kashmir

---

---

---

---

---

c) How can proxy wars cause trouble for India?

---

---

---

---

---

d) Which intelligence agency is involved in supplying proxy agents within and outside India as a part of its campaign to inflict damage to India? CIA or ISI?

---

---

---

---

---

e) Information warfare to some extent can be considered as a means of proxy warfare. Agree or disagree?

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 1.5 LET US SUM UP

---

At first it is important to note the types of conflicts that a state may find itself in such as asymmetric and symmetric warfare. Also such nations may also have to deal with non-conventional warfare which may affect it negatively. When it comes to India it not only has to deal with conventional warfare with Pakistan and one with the PRC but of late under the shadow of the nuclear umbrella it has to constantly engage in a proxy warfare with terror groups especially aided and supported by Pakistan. In the earlier period, India had to fight a defensive battle as terror attacks and Pakistan's denial continued unabated but of late, the response has been more strong due to the fact that India has not only reached a powerful position but careful planning and the diplomatic isolation of Pakistan has allowed more and decisive options for India.

---

## 1.6 Keywords

---

- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| ▪ <b>Auxiliary</b>        | Helping, Support  |
| ▪ <b>Typologies</b>       | Types, a form of classification                               |
| ▪ <b>Pathogens</b>        | Microbes  |
| ▪ <b>Cumbersome</b>       | Difficult   |
| ▪ <b>Saga</b>             | Story   |
| ▪ <b>Mukti Bahini</b>     | Militias made up of Bengalis for the liberation of Bangladesh |
| ▪ <b>Without Much Ado</b> | Without much difficult  |
| ▪ <b>Brunt</b>            | Damage  |

---

## 1.7 SUGGESTED BOOKS

---

- (a) Pandya, A. (2019), "The Future of Indo-Pak Relations after the Pulwama Attack", *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 13(2): 65-68.
- (b) Groh, T.L. (2019). *A Theory of Proxy War. Proxy War; The Least Bad Option*, Stanford University Press.
- (c) Maxwell, N. (1970), "China and India: The Un-Negotiated Dispute", *The China Quarterly*, (43): 47-80.
- (d) Mansingh, S. (1994), "India-China Relations in the Post-Cold War Era", *Asian Survey*, 34(3): 285-300.
- (e) Rani, M. (2007), "Nuclear Issue in Indo-Pakistan Relations", *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, (68): 1204-1214.
- (f) Singh, P.K. (2015), "The India-Pakistan Nuclear Dyad and Regional Nuclear Dynamics", *Asia Policy*, (19): 37-44.
- (g) Pandey, G. (2002), "India and Pakistan, 1947-2002", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(11): 1027-1033.
- (h) Vaish, V. (2011), "Negotiating the India-Pakistan Conflict in Relation to Kashmir", *International Journal on World Peace*, 28(3): 53-80.

- (i) Bajpai, K.S. (2003), “Untangling India and Pakistan”, Foreign Affairs, 82(3): 112-126.
- (j) Cunningham, D.E. & Lemke, D. (2013), “Combining Civil and Interstate Wars”, International Organization, 67(3): 609-627.
- (k) Vasquez, J.A. (1986), “Capability, Types of War, Peace”, The Western Political Quarterly, 39(2): 313-327.
- (l) Speier, H. (1941), “The Social Types of War”, American Psychology of Sociology, 46(4): 445-454.
- (m) Armitage, D. (2017), “Civil War Time: From Grotius to the Global War on Terror”, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, (111): 3-14.
- (n) Pischedda, C. (2020). Wars within Wars. Conflict Among Rebels: Why Insurgent Groups Fight Each Other. Columbia University Press.
- (o) Hauter, J. (2019), “Delegated Interstate War: Introducing an Addition to Armed Conflict Typologies, Journal of Strategic Security, 12(4): 90-103.
- (p) Vasquez, J.A. & Valeriano, B. (2010), “Classification of Interstate Wars”, The Journal of Politics, 72(2): 292-309.

**Answers:**

**Check your Progress - I**

- (a) The two main types of warfare are symmetric and asymmetric warfare.
- (b) In a proxy war regular troops do not fight rather they instigate irregular troops to fight on their behalf.
- (c) India’s constant fighting with terrorist groups in Kashmir, in the Northeast and against left-wing terrorist groups is the reason why India is engaged in a proxy war.
- (d) Agree.
- (e) Post-1990.

**Check your Progress – II**

- (a) The four wars that India fought with Pakistan are the 1948 First Indo-Pak War, 1965 Second Indo-Pak War, 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War and 1999 Kargil War.
- (b) The Kargil war was fought under the conditions of a nuclear shadow or umbrella.
- (c) In 1984 India launched Operation Meghdoot to occupy the Siachen Glacier before Pakistan could do it, thus gaining a tactical advantage.
- (d) 1971
- (e) 1962



### **Check your Progress - III**

- (a) The defeat of the Pakistani army in 1971 completely changed their outlook as they realised that they could not defeat India in a conventional warfare as such they looked for alternatives which then led to proxy wars against India to keep it busy and injured without incurring major damages.
- (b) Two terrorist groups in Kashmir are Lashkar-E-Toiba and Jaish-E-Muhammad.
- (c) In terms of a proxy war the response becomes difficult as there is a risk of civilian casualties as well as larger troop deaths. Also the question of human rights come up and even it is a defensive battle which cannot be won just by neutralising terrorists, thus the options are limited.
- (d) ISI
- (e) Agree

**UNIT: 2****INDO-PAK WAR 1948, 1965, 1971,  
1999 (Kargil)****:: STRUCTURE ::**

- 2.0 Objectives**
- 2.1 Introduction**
- 2.2 The wars of 1948 and 1965**
- 2.3 The 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War**
- 2.4 The 1999 Kargil war**
- 2.5 Let Us Sum Up**
- 2.6 Keywords**
- 2.7 Suggested Books**
- Answers**

---

**2.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

***In this unit we shall:***

- Attain a basic understanding of the first two wars of 1948 and 1965
- Understand the impact of the 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War
- Understand the events of the 1999 Kargil war and its impact *On*

***completing this unit, you should be able to:***

- Understand the impact of the first two wars
- Understand the impact of the Bangladesh Liberation War
- Understand how the Kargil war shaped our strategic thought

---

**2.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

Ever since Independence India had to engage Pakistan in 4 critical wars that would shape the history and the process of strategic thought in the subcontinent. One may even assert that these wars were a test of the mettle of the Indian army as all these wars were unduly provoked by Pakistan which was driven by its intolerance for India and egged on by fundamentalist elements within the ranks of the Pakistani army. The initial two wars were simple, the Pakistani establishment believed that they would be able to defeat a larger Indian force by a surprise attack and help would arrive from the insurgents which were trained and provoked, if at all there was no conclusive results, then the pressure of the international community would enable a stronger Pakistani posturing. The 1971 war would go down as the biggest victory that the Indian armed

forces had in the recent times for it not only managed to subdue the Pakistani forces but also ensured that the international community could not support Pakistan under any circumstances. That war also exhibited the might of the Indian army and the willingness to fight on two fronts. The liberation of Bangladesh would become a strategic asset for India and also dealt a major psychological and military blow to Pakistan. Additionally Pakistan witnessed a terrible political turmoil, the gradual radicalisation of its military and also its decision later on to harass India by means of a proxy and prolonged low intensity conflict. The net result was in the Kargil war where again the Pakistani forces believed that it would be easy for them to seize Kashmir in a sharp and short war under the shadow of the nuclear blackmail which would enable them to either gain access to Kashmir or at least internationalise the issue and get away with it.

---

## **2.2 THE WARS OF 1948 AND 1965**

---

The process of independence and the subsequent partition of India had left a bad taste in the lives of people from either sides. Although political leadership after a certain amount of hesitancy tried to quell the impending anger and frustration little could be done. While Pakistan was carved out from India in two parts, West and East (currently Bangladesh) Pakistan, India itself was dotted with a lot of independent princely states that had to be amalgamated within the Union of India. The task of doing so fell on the able leader Sardar Vallabhai Patel who gradually took stock of the situation and coaxed the rulers of these independent princely states to join India. Likewise the Pakistanis too tried their hand in this. Whereas after much intervention and military action Hyderabad and Junagadh acceded to India, Kashmir remained a flashpoint. The Pakistanis unable to accept it going to India (where the ruler Maharaja Hari Singh was a Hindu but the majority of the population were Muslims) decided to launch a sudden attack in order to seize it and annex it with Pakistan.

Unfortunately for India, the political hesitancy and the inability to convince the Maharaja to accede to India costed us valuable time, such indecisive nature on the part of the political leadership allowed the Pakistanis to mobilise and launch a surprise attack. Since the Pakistanis were terrified of the idea that Kashmir could go to India, they launched a surprise attack. The plan was to infiltrate the territory with the help of loyalist tribesmen who would lead the frontal charge while the main Pakistani army would enter and within a few week seize the territory. The idea was to capture the areas of Baramulla, Gilgit and Baltistan and cut off Srinagar from India thus leading to its surrender to the Pakistani forces. The state force comprised of only 4 brigades without any artillery and armour support had absolutely no chance against the Pakistani forces. Despite India's offer for help in exchange for acceding to India, the Maharaja waited and only when the Pakistani forces were nearby Srinagar did he sign the Instrument of Accession and the Indian army responded with its full might. The 1<sup>st</sup> Sikh Division was airlifted and in a series of

engagements the invaders were pushed out till the present position of the LOC.

In 1965, the second Indo-Pak war saw more engagements between the two, it also saw massive battles between armoured units and excellent military leadership shown by both the sides. It was also a war in which the Indian forces upped the ante by actually crossing the international border and attacking the Pakistani mainland in order to create a diversion and put pressure on the already beleaguered Pakistani forces. The death of Prime Minister Nehru and the earlier defeat at the hands of the PRC in 1962 boosted the Pakistani morale. Armed with liberal American aid and weaponry they were confident of seizing Kashmir from India. Despite their confidence the Pakistani establishment realised that attacking India openly would invite disaster and therefore they resorted to their usual tactics, which was a sudden, sharp covert warfare that would be surprising in nature and would take some time for the Indians to react which would offer them a head start right from the beginning. The idea evolved with the Pakistanis attacking the Kutch region in India in order to draw away troops from the Punjab frontline, an armed insurrection would be provoked in Kashmir in order to give it the colour of a local rebellion against the Indian rule and to internationalise the issue. After these plans were successful the idea was to also attack Jammu in the Akhnoor sector to substantiate the invasion.

The invasion in the Kutch region saw limited Indian response in order to conserve its main strike force and the Pakistanis could not make much gains, the Operation Gibraltar which was the main Pakistani invasion in Kashmir took India by surprise. The infiltration plan initially worked well but the supposed rebellion by indigenous Kashmiris failed as they were loyal to India and they cooperated with the Indian army offering it valuable information. On being hunted by the Indian troops the Pakistani establishment in desperation initiated Operation Grand Slam which was the main offensive and that led to a full blown war between the two. The war saw massive tank battles between the two with the Indian forces gaining the upper hand, it also witnessed India taking on the Pakistani forces headlong and defeating them in key battles such as the battle of the Haji Pir Pass which denied them access to Kashmir. As a result of which the war gradually turned into a stalemate as the Indian forces had made considerable gains into Pakistani territory. The resulting Tashkent agreement and the ceasefire brought the situation to a status quo.

On analysing both the wars it has to be mentioned that the Indian leadership trusted the Pakistani establishment too much and this led to the enemy taking advantage of the situation which actually offered them a head start. It also shows the superiority of India in terms of conventional arms and deployment which resulted in ultimate Indian victory over Pakistan. Also in both the wars India had to do with limited external help

which shows that India's Non-Aligned Policy was not of much help this later on led to the gradual friendship with the Soviet Union. Both the wars exhibited the desperation on the part of the Pakistanis to capitalise on any situation in order to seize Kashmir, and the indecisiveness on the part of Indian leadership did cause troubles. However, a quicker response by India, the over-confidence of Pakistan and India's superiority and conclusive leadership in the latter part of the wars exhibited its might against Pakistan.

**Check your Progress - I**

**Answer the following:**

(a) What was the main cause of the 1948 war?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) By which agreement was the 1965 war ended?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) What is the similarity between both these wars?

---

---

---

---

---

(d) In which war did Pakistan initiate Operation Gibraltar? 1948 or 1965?

---

---

---

---

---

(e) Which country initiated Operation Grand Slam as a retaliatory measure? India or Pakistan?

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 2.3 THE 1971 BANGLADESH LIBERATION WAR

---

Perhaps nothing can be said about the 1971 war apart from the fact that it was the most decisive victory that the Indian armed forces witnessed against its adversary which also caused territorial, psychological and other changes in the subcontinent. The war again exhibited a stronger Indian response, superiority in terms of planning, weaponry and leadership and also that India's political pragmatism actually aided it in the long run. On the other hand the utter defeat of the Pakistani forces and the subsequent bifurcation of Pakistan with the emergence of newly independent Bangladesh showed the myth of a Pakistani unity, shattering Jinnah's dreams and pushing its leadership into its darkest days.

This was one war which happened due to the changing circumstances in the subcontinent and not due to Pakistani plans of invasion. The invasion did happen later but it was not planned initially. The Pakistani establishment was divided into the two sectors west and East Pakistan where the Western sector was Punjabi dominated and had more political power than the Bengali dominated eastern sector. The racial and ethnic divide was strong even though the religion was common. However that did not stop the west Pakistanis to rile the Eastern Pakistanis regularly to the point of even denying them their fair share in the economy or employment

The diversion of resources, the refusal to address Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's 6 point demand, the failure to address real elections and the utter disregard for the results of the elections in 1970 when the East Pakistani Awami League won but was denied the chance to form the government, Operation Searchlight in which Bengali intellectuals and supporters of the Awami League were witch hunted led to massive resentment against Pakistan. Perhaps nothing could be truer and as the days passed it seemed that martial law that was applied in East Pakistan would very soon create a flashpoint where it could lead to a war.

The continued exploitation of the East Pakistanis and moments of resistance created a lot of issues for India too, as a lot of refugees started flooding India to escape persecution. Additionally there were rumours that India was instigating the East Pakistanis and was instrumental in the creation of the Mukti Bahini. The Pakistanis believed that this was a ripe opportunity to take advantage of the situation and launch a full scale offensive against India and thus stall the tide. On the Indian side the response was cautious and Indira Gandhi calculated well after consulting her generals and diplomats. During that time India still did not have much international diplomatic power and therefore caution was advised. The Americans under Nixon were firmly in favour of West Pakistan turning a blind eye to the human horror that was being carried out in the East while the Soviet Union was still calculating its options and responses despite being a firm backer of India. At that point the refugee crisis had worsened

to the point that India could no longer await for a solution as the massacre in East Pakistan showed no signs of abatement. Also the Bengalis decided to take the matters in their own hands and launched guerrilla and counter attacks on West Pakistani troops. Politically too the atmosphere was quite tense as people in India were clamouring for an Indian intervention.

The build-up to the actual war was quite tense and rife with suspense. The Pakistani air force initiated an early airstrike on Indian airbases on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of December 1971 and India retaliated the next day. The results were devastating for the Pakistanis. Elsewhere the invasion of the western sector was stopped by the combination of the Indian armoured columns, infantry and the air force while on the east the Pakistani army held up for as long as they could. The United States did send its 7<sup>th</sup> fleet to check the Indians but the Soviets also retaliated and hence the war was limited in nature. Within 13 days the Pakistani army in the east realised as to how they would be treated once the war would be over and hence they were compelled to surrender. Around 93000 Pakistani soldiers surrendered and by the means of the Shimla Agreement a peace treaty was drawn up. India also handed over the 93000 troops to Pakistan.

The Bangladesh liberation war would hence go down in the history of India's armed conflicts as the most decisive and important war ever. Not only it gave us a huge psychological and military boost but the leadership of the Indian generals and the political class was undoubtedly what was needed. Despite restrain India did not fire the first shot but waited and when it came to war then it was more than ready to take on the enemy. Pakistan felt betrayed by the international allies that it had and could not do anything about it. Bangladesh was free and an independent country while India after scoring a huge victory would be able to cow down Pakistan. On the other hand, the internal turmoil in Pakistan became even more evident with the military slowly turning more fundamentalist in nature which would then culminate in the thought process of gradually bleeding India with a thousand cuts by the means of a proxy warfare.

### **Check your Progress - II**

#### **Answer the following:**

(a) What was the main cause of the 1971 war?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) What was the American and Soviet positions during the war?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) In what way did the 1971 war affect the subcontinent?

---

---

---

---

(d) Which Pakistani Submarine was dispatched to hunt down the Indian Navy in 1971?

---

---

---

---

(e) How many Pakistani soldiers surrendered to the Indian forces in 1971?

---

---

---

---

---

## **2.4 THE 1999 KARGIL WAR**

---

The end of the 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War ensured a change in the subcontinent. Pakistan was fragmented and was in deep turmoil which has still impacted it. The gross defeat at the hands of India never let them have a moment's peace and as a result of which the radicalisation of Pakistan became the norm. The military too could not digest the defeat and were looking for ways to get back at India. As a result of which when terrorism started in Kashmir, the Pakistani establishment was quick to aid them. By offering them military, logistic, economic and morale support the Pakistani establishment could for the first time keep down india tied in the region, drain away its resources, cause casualties without incurring any and also create a hostile political environment which could possibly lead to internationalisation of the issue and therefore intervention on the behalf of Pakistan. For them, this was a golden opportunity to avenge their earlier defeats. As India and Pakistan went nuclear a new dimension was added in the military context of the subcontinent. Two nuclear powers, armed to the teeth and often at the verge of conflicts was not only a dangerous situation for the region but also for the world. However India has always maintained restraint and believed that the purpose of nuclear



weapons was to deter the enemy and not to actually use it, the Pakistanis on the other hand did not hesitate from saying that they would use the nuclear option if they faced an existential threat.

The Kargil war that occurred actually showed the existential crisis that the Pakistani establishment faced and especially after the defeat in the 1971 war. This ensued that the Pakistanis could never win against India on any normal day and hence they had to resort to clandestine means for the same. For the establishment the acceptance of foreign aid most of which was diverted to the military and hence to the terror groups became a daily routine and as Pakistan descended further into chaos their activities related to terrorism did not stop.

The build-up of the Kargil war was simple, they again believed that in a short sharp war and especially under the cover of a nuclear umbrella where India would not dare cross the LOC, they have a better chance of winning or holding the line and digging in deep and therefore call for international intervention in order to enforce some favourable international consensus on India. However they as usual miscalculated, for diplomatically India has been far superior to Pakistan and due to its dubious nature even major powers do not trust the regime.

The most important aspect of the war was the fact that the Pakistani establishment at first instigated terrorists to infiltrate the high altitude bases and occupy them. After they fired on Indian patrols and the patrols did not respond a thorough reconnaissance was done which revealed that the firing took place from Indian bases which were now occupied. In the ensuing war the Indian forces responded with its full might and even the air force took part which resulted in a decisive Indian victory. Named as operation Vijay India managed to defeat the Pakistani forces who had now come out in the open and engaged in an open battle with the Indian troops. Under massive diplomatic pressure and continuous Indian victories the Pakistani troops had to withdraw.

Unfortunately for Pakistan the short war again exhibited Indian military might but more than that it found itself completely alone and isolated as no one would stand up for it, not even the PRC on which it counted. The U.S. E.U. and the ASEAN condemned Pakistani aggression on a large scale while simultaneously parsing the restraint showed by India in this regard. This of course again raised questions on the efficacy of the Pakistani military and the establishment. Therefore the Pakistanis realised that Kashmir could not be occupied by any means necessary. On the Indian side although the victory was sweet the failure of field intelligence raised questions on the mode of intelligence gathering, the fact that regular Pakistani soldiers could just enter Indian bunkers and occupy them was outrageous. For the first time both the states fought in very high altitudes which resulted in an Indian victory not only in the military sense but in terms of diplomacy.

## Check your Progress - I

### Answer the following:

- (a) What was the Pakistani logic behind the 1999 Kargil war?

---

---

---

---

---

- (b) What was the International position during the Kargil war?

---

---

---

---

---

- (c) What was the operation named as during the Kargil War?

---

---

---

---

---

- (d) Which Pakistani General conceptualised the Kargil War?

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) The 1999 Kargil war was fought under a nuclear umbrella. Agree or disagree.

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 2.5 LET US SUM UP

---

On seeing these major conflicts with Pakistan one has to understand that Pakistan is the arch nemesis of India, a state that was created due to unfettered demands but unable to survive on their own the Pakistani establishment has always been home to not only terrorists but also any kind of anti-Indian thought. The wars are nothing but an evil manifestation of the Pakistani establishment. Unfortunately peace between both the states is hard to come unless Pakistan mends its ways. The first two wars showed the eagerness of the Pakistani army to engage a larger and better Indian troops in an unequal conflict aided by their own

ideas of martial superiority which ultimately failed in the battlefield. These two wars exhibited again the willingness of the Indian army and the administration to fight against all odds. On the other hand, the 1971 war was perhaps the most devastating for Pakistan as not only it lost a huge part of its territory but the very idea of Pakistan was under question. Also the timely Soviet help boosted Indo-Soviet relations while Indo-U.S relations took a downturn. It also exhibited India's military superiority on the battlefield but after this war the Pakistani establishment realised that it would be impossible for them to defeat India in a conventional warfare. As a result of which, the Pakistani establishment unable to mend its way again launched a surprise attack on Indian positions in Kargil in 1999, still believing that they could dislodge the Indian troops or at least internationalise the issue. Once again the military might of India proved to be greater and not only were the Pakistanis pushed back but it again lost face in the international world and lost its grace, whereas India emerged superior and won a hard moral and military victory.

---

## 2.6 KEYWORDS

---

- **Impending**            waiting to occur
- **Accede**                accept
- **Covert**                secret
- **Beleaguered**        fatigued, hurt, injured
- **Bifurcation**        divided
- **Martial Law**        Army rule
- **Clandestine**        Secret
- **Dubious**             Suspicious

---

## 2.7 SUGGESTED BOOKS

---

- (a) Bajpai, K.S. (2003), "Untangling India and Pakistan", *Foreign Affairs*, 83(2): 112-126
- (b) Malik, M.S (2019), "Pakistan-India Relations:An Analytical Perspective of Peace Efforts", *Strategic Studies*, 39(1): 59-76.
- (c) Ganguly, S. (2008), "Nuclear Stability in South Asia", *International Security*, 33(2): 45-70.
- (d) Bell, M.S. & Miller, N.J. (2015), "Questioning the Effect of Nuclear Weapons on Conflict", *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59(1): 74-92.
- (e) Kamath, P.M. (2000), "Pakistan after the Kargil Crisis: Implications for India", *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*, 13(1/2): 123-132.
- (f) Krolkowski, H. (2016), "Indo-Pakistani 'Hybrid War' for Kargil", *Politeja*, (40): 395-414.
- (g) Jha, S. (2004), "US Perception of the Indo-Pak Wars of 1965 and 1971", *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, (65): 1003-1008.

- (h) Abraham, I. (2005), "South Asian Events of 1971: New Revelations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(28): 2994-2995.
- (i) Burke, S.M.(1973), " The Postwar Diplomacy of the Indo-Pakistani War of 1971", *Asian Survey*, 13(11): 1036-1049.
- (j) Hollen, C.V. (1980), "The Tilt Policy Revisited: Nixon-Kissinger Geopolitics and South Asia", *Asian Survey*, 20(4): 339-361.
- (k) Kumar, S. (1975), "The Evolution of India's Policy towards Bangladesh in 1971", *Asian Survey*, 15(6): 488-498.
- (l) Ganguly, S. (1995), "Wars without End: The Indo-Pakistani Conflict", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (541): 167-178.
- (m) Rani, M. (2007), "Nuclear Issue in Indo-Pakistan Relations", *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, (68): 1204-1214.
- (n) Rege, P.S.& Dharwadaker, V. (2008), "Hands after the battle at Oodi-Poonch, the India-Pakistan War, September 1965", *Indian Literature*, 52(5): 89-90
- (o) Agarwal, A. (2014), "The United States and the Indo-Pakistani War of 1971: A Critical Inquiry", *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*, 27(1/2): 21-42.
- (p) Bose, S. (2005), "Anatomy of Violence: Analysis of Civil War in East Pakistan in 1971", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(41): 4463-4471.

## Answers

### Check your Progress - I

- (a) The main cause of the 1948 war was Pakistan's intention to seize the then independent princely state of Kashmir and its sudden invasion of the territory.
- (b) By the Tashkent Agreement the 1965 war was officially ended.
- (c) In both the wars the Pakistani establishment extensively used irregulars by provoking them to subdue the others, it also saw massive armoured battles and infantry combat. The Navy as well as the Air force were used extensively.
- (d) 1965
- (e) Pakistan

### Check your Progress – II

- (a) The main cause of the 1971 war was the ill-treatment of East Pakistanis on the grounds of ethnicity and culture which caused resentment, furthermore Operation Searchlight which was an instrument of harassment and mass murder and the subsequent attack on India were responsible.
- (b) The Americans clearly supported Pakistan and even tried to intimidate India whereas the Soviets supported India.

- (c) The war led to the creation of Bangladesh, it was a strategic and psychological victory for India and also caused further political turmoil in Pakistan pushing it more towards fundamentalism.
- (d) PNS Gazi
- (e) 93,000

### **Check your Progress - III**

- (a) The logic was to initiate a surprise attack, deny involvement and seize Kashmir or to at least internationalise the issue and seek foreign intervention for a favourable result.
- (b) All the major states of the world condemned Pakistan while showing support for India and even the PRC asked Pakistan to withdraw and sort out the Kashmir issue bilaterally.
- (c) Operation Vijay was the name given to the entire operation during the Kargil War.
- (d) Gen. Pervez Musharraf.
- (e) Agree.

**UNIT:3****INDIA-CHINA WAR 1962****:: STRUCTURE ::****3.0 Objectives****3.1 Introduction****3.2 India-China Relations prior to the War****3.3 The 1962 War****3.4 The Aftermath of the War****3.5 Let Us Sum Up****3.6 Keywords****3.7 Suggested Books****Answers**

---

**3.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

***In this unit we shall:***

- Attain a basic understanding of India-China Relations prior to the war.
- Understand the 1962 war
- Understand the aftermath of the war

***On completing this unit, you should be able to:***

- Understand the relations between India and China
- Critically evaluate the 1962 war
- Critically analyze the aftermath of the 1962 war

---

**3.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

The 1962 India-China war or (Sino-India War, India-PRC war) would go down as one of the most defining moments in post-Independent India's history. Militarily it was a defeat with sporadic tales of bravery that have often been brushed underneath the carpet. Politically, it exposed the fault lines in our leadership and strategically it exhibited as to how many shortcomings were there when it came to dealing with a state that was a communist dictatorship and did not play by the rules and norms that govern bilateral relations.

Although both the ancient Indian and Chinese civilisations have had a lot of generous contacts, the period of colonialism decimated all those contacts when India was turned into a British Colony and the

Chinese were compelled to be subservient to the Europeans. Subsequent Japanese invasions and occupation and the infamous Open Door Policy led to centuries of humiliation in China. In the post-independence and period of the Cold War, the victory of the communists in China and the subsequent proclamation of the Peoples' Republic of China in 1949 completely changed the thought process of that state. While India was quick to extend diplomatic recognition to the PRC and that too in the face of opposition by the Western Powers, it also clamoured for the inclusion of the PRC into the UNSC. In addition to that in the initial years both India and the PRC seemed to get along well with one another, but the subsequent occupation of Tibet and the souring of relations between both the countries led to the attack on India in 1962.

Unprepared, disorganised and poorly armed, the Indian troops put up a brave fight against the hordes of Chinese troops. The lack of fortitude and leadership of the Indian political class led to an utter strategic failure. The defeat in 1962 would hence be etched permanently in the minds of generations of Indians only to be erased by the Indian army's heroism in the Galwan Valley clash when over-confident Chinese troops were befittingly pushed back which has now made the PRC realise that the days of 1962 are over and India is no longer a pushover.

---

### **3.2 INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS PRIOR TO THE WAR**

---

During the period of Colonialism there were enough stories of Indian troops fighting in the opium wars in China, and the colonial masters did not treat either of the nations in a humane fashion. The subsequent occupation of China by Japan and the Chinese Civil War were two defining moments in Chinese history. The final victory of the communists under the leadership of Mao Zedong and the establishment of the PRC in 1949 heralded a new chapter in the history of Sino-Indian relations. Ostensibly, the Western powers did not take the creation of the PRC kindly and were hesitant in according international recognition to it. Nevertheless, the Indian leadership under Prime Minister Nehru accorded diplomatic recognition and India became the first Non-communist state to offer diplomatic recognition to communist China. This should have been seen kindly by the Chinese, but being power hungry and eager to demolish centuries of shame and humiliation the Chinese at first accepted this diplomatic recognition with grace only to turn back and stab India in the back later on.

India being a beacon of civilization and having suffered at the hands of British colonialism was also eager to demolish all edifices of colonialism, heralding in a new Pan-Asian and Pan-Third World solidarity. Hence after much discussions the Indian side invited the PRC to enter into a new relationship under the idea of the Panchsheel or five principles of coexistence which were:

- 1 Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.
- 2 Mutual Non-Aggression.
- 3 Mutual Non-interference in each other's internal affairs.
- 4 Equality and mutual benefit
- 5 Peaceful co-existence.

These principles were heralded as the new guiding principles between the two nations and it was believed by Nehru and his associates that with these principles in mind both the states would actually grow together and learn to live in peace and prosperity. While India started to deal with its internal issues and an ever pressing problem of Pakistan in addition to its economic and social reconstruction, the Chinese also began to develop their state and under the leadership of Mao Zedong things began to take a rapid turn. The Chinese leadership under Mao began to claim territories to the east and especially Tibet. Tibet had always been an independent country under the leadership of the Dalai Lama who is not only the spiritual but also the political leader of the Tibetans. Like China, India always had a historic and special relationship with Tibet and anxiously viewed Chinese claims and growing ambitions in Tibet. Tibet being a pacifist state had no chance against the might of the PRC and India too had no means by which it could defend Tibet from being captured by the PRC. In 1950 after much deliberations the Chinese army attacked Tibet and swiftly captured it. The Battle of Kham and Chamdo in the same year sealed the fate of the Tibetans. The Dalai Lama had no chance but to accept Chinese suzerainty over Tibet and hence Tibet became a part of China.

In 1959 after tense 9 years under the PRC the Tibetans became more restive and believed that the Chinese would arrest the Dalai Lama and as a result of which there were protests in Lhasa the capital of Tibet which led to clashes, after some initial Tibetan successes reinforcements arrived from China which quickly quelled the Tibetan uprising and made the entire Tibetan leadership flee the region to India. The Dalai Lama was compelled under the circumstances and aided by his allies to escape Tibet and take a long and torturous route to India to safety.

During that time, the Chinese were obviously angry with the Indian position on Tibet, although India had recognised Tibet as a part of China and did nothing to aid the rebellions the very fact that India had given shelter to the Tibetan leadership and that to on humanitarian grounds was enough to provoke them. In addition the Chinese began to make territorial claims on Indian territory such as in Ladakh, in Arunachal Pradesh and at times also had an their sights on the then independent state of Sikkim. The Chinese refused to recognise the McMahon line which is the border between India and the PRC. The Indian side did not react much apart from protesting against this illegal territorial claims.

Very soon the PRC started to publish official maps which marked Indian Territory as parts of China and this caused serious tensions



between both the sides. There were instances of armed clashes between the two and also some sporadic fighting during the 1960-61 period. The main argument placed by the PRC was the non-recognition of the Shimla agreement which demarcated the border between India, Tibet and the then Chinese empire. All the sides including the Indian administration under the British agreed to this, however communist China did not see eye to eye and believed that this was nothing but a tool of imperialism and sought to unilaterally change the ground situation. They also argued that since Tawang and parts of Arunachal Pradesh were parts of Tibet and since Tibet belongs to China therefore these territories also belonged to China.

The Indian side despite being cautious protested and also resisted the Chinese claims to the best of their ability but this ultimately led to a short and brief war with the PRC.

**Check your Progress - I**

**Answer the following:**

(a) When did the Tibetan Uprising occur?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) Which two areas that belong to India did the PRC claim?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) What was the main cause that provoked the Chinese to attack India in 1962?

---

---

---

---

---

(d) Which side was hesitant in using the Air Force in the war?

---

---

---

---

---

(e) In which battle did the Indian troops crush the Chinese and push them back?

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **3.3 THE 1962 WAR**

---

Prior to the conflict as explained the Chinese made some claims on Indian territory, obviously this was not the only reason why the war started, they were also angry at India for aiding the Dalai Lama by offering him refuge and letting him stay in India. Accusing India of aiding Tibetan rebels the Chinese actually wanted to teach India a lesson. After rejecting all boundary agreements and taking a very obstinate position the Chinese suddenly attacked an unprepared and shocked India. The war resulted in a Chinese victory and unilateral withdrawal to their own territory.

The Chinese initially played a clandestine game of creating a misunderstanding and said that they had no territorial ambitions in India, but their actions proved otherwise. The Chinese actually claimed Indian Territory and also made forward posts on the disputed areas such as in the Chusul sector in Ladakh and also engaged in a vicious diplomatic and propaganda warfare to tie down India. The Indian leadership on the other hand could not deal with these things properly and were left confused. In 1960 after months of tiring negotiations the Chinese made one final offer that it should let Aksai Chin become a part of China in return for Arunachal Pradesh. The Indian side sternly told the Chinese that neither of these territories belonged to them and hence the question of exchange of territories did not even arise. The Chinese did not appreciate the gesture and believed that India and the international community had larger interests in China and began to prepare for the attack. Indian intelligence was caught napping and the slow political leadership was left without much options in case of an impending attack.

In turn the Indian side started to follow a policy known as Forward Policy which was the act of establishing forward posts in the so called disputed areas and to aggressively patrol these areas to deter the Chinese, in the previous year in 1961 India had also ousted the Portuguese from Goa which made it a bit more confident against the Chinese. The policy of establishing forward posts and patrolling coincided with the Chinese side also patrolling the same regions. Both the sides claimed that they were patrolling their own areas and had not transgressed upon each other's territories. However this caused considerable tensions between both the sides.

The policy of establishing forward posts was paying well initially, the idea was to allow the Indian side to be more experimental and advance even further and the Chinese held their fire. However skirmishes did occur which actually led to initial Chinese casualties on a larger scale. The Chinese act of charging headlong to the Indian lines was foolhardy enough to be cut down by the Indian response. The Chinese were also afraid of the Soviets backing India or the western nations taking a sympathetic note towards India and thus held their actions on a larger scale.

In September 1962 the Chinese began to supply their troops on a larger scale stockpiling ammunition and fuel preparing for a long war, the Indian side still insisted on the forward policy without much reinforcements.

Furthermore the first clashes at Thag La in the region was the first call for the war, the Indian positions were entrenched and surrounded by the Chinese, after waves of invading Chinese soldiers were cut down the Indian side had to withdraw as they had no artillery support and were in no position to continue defending the area any longer.

The main war happened in October 1962 which commenced with two attacks on the Indian territories to the west and the East, the Indian resistance was ferocious in nature. They advanced as far as Arunachal Pradesh and already controlled parts of Ladakh. However in the battle of Rezang La, Indian forces bravely held back and repelled a Chinese attack much to the surprise of the Chinese troops who did not dare attack any further.

However the war ended with an Indian defeat and after a lull in the fighting the Chinese withdrew to their previous positions. The main reason for the defeat was not the credibility of the Indian armed forces, but the incorrect and lackadaisical political decisions that were taken at that time. The Indian troops were not supplied properly, their communication lines stretched too long and were vulnerable, and the logistical issues were another problem as Indian troops had to carry their weapons and artillery in a very cumbersome fashion. In contrast the Chinese actually had prepared for a war and were well prepared, also they had the upper hand as they initiated the attack but again had not anticipated that the Indian side would react so ferociously. Reports even suggested that in Rezang La the Chinese were fed up with the ferocity of the Indian resistance and believed that reinforcements from the India side would very soon make its way. Questions were also raised on the political leadership and the forward policy without much preparation the non-use of air assets and the fact that India's famed Non-Alignment policy had failed as it had failed to garner much international support.

## Check your Progress - II

### Answer the following:

(a) What was India's Forward Policy?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) What was the main reason for the Indian defeat?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) In which sector of the war did the Indian troops manage to push back the Chinese effectively?

---

---

---

---

---

(d) Scholars suggest that India made a huge mistake by trusting the Chinese blindly. Agree or disagree?

---

---

---

---

---

(e) On which policy did Indian security experts cast their aspersions after the end of the war?

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **3.4 THE AFTERMATH OF THE WAR**

---

The initial Chinese claims, the fact that India had good relations with both the Soviet Union and the United States, India's Non-Alignment policy and its rising prestige in the world as well as its support for the Tibetans and shielding them all led to the war. The Chinese were more concerned about these things than the territorial changes or claims and that was only the flashpoint. No war can start in a vacuum and for the

Chinese it was the right time in the backdrop of the Cuban Missile Crisis to challenge India, dent its prestige and to cause serious disruptions in its internal affairs as well. To some extent the Chinese were indeed successful but then it lost the favour of the Soviet Union and also made other states wary of the Chinese intentions as by now they had also realised that the PRC was a bully that would never accept anything mutual in nature.

During the war also the Chinese did not have good relations with the two superpowers and besides there were offers from them to aid India in its defence of its territory against the Chinese. India had bet on the weak Chinese resolve, they were a tad bit more confident regarding their own defences and also made mistakes in taking quick and effective decisions. On the Chinese side, the war was termed as a quick and much needed victory over India, it not only stunned India but also made them realise the foolishness of dealing aggressively with the PRC and hence a lesson taught would go down in the minds of generations of India quite badly. Although it did give the Chinese a morale boost its international image deteriorating further. Primarily the Soviet Union and the United States did not look at the PRC kindly, the same negative sentiments were echoed all over the world especially in the Southeast Asian states where they viewed the PRC more suspiciously for attacking an unprepared India. The PRC also controlled Aksai Chin as India had not been able to dislodge it from there and unfortunately for India the war would go down as one of the biggest mistakes made by its political leadership. In a couple of years Prime Minister Nehru passed away and commentators often described him as heart-broken in nature unable to believe that the Chinese would engage in such a vicious conflict after years of friendship.

There were political ramifications in India too, the Indian leadership under Prime Minister Nehru and particularly the then Defence Minister Krishna Menon faced a lot of criticisms for their failure to anticipate the Chinese attacks. Questions were raised on their policies towards the PRC and the practice of India's unilateral friendship with the PRC was also criticised. Opposition leaders and the intelligentsia were particularly concerned about the single-handedness of Prime Minister Nehru and his defence minister in handling the crisis a lot of questions were also raised on the quality of intelligence reports which were fairly poor in nature. There was a remarkable shift in the policy too. The defence sector was awarded much needed funds, modernisation and importance as it was now observed that India's poor defence preparations had given the Chinese a much needed psychological boost prior to the war, India thus lacked credible deterrence when it came to the PRC. On the other hand, questions were also raised on the non-use of the air force as during that time the Indian air force had a much needed superiority vis-a-vis the Chinese air force. There was a surge in patriotism in India, and people from all walks of life were in no mood to tolerate the age old unilateral friendship with the Chinese. In a few years, the Indian military

underwent massive modernisation and with the death of Prime Minister Nehru India gradually started to lose interest in the Non-Aligned policy realising that India would have to choose sides when it came to international politics. It grew closer to the Soviet Union and began to solicit advice, armaments and aid from Moscow which also made the Chinese nervous. On the other hand in the same decade the defeat of Pakistan in 1965 and in 1971 further cemented India's military success and boosted its morale giving it the much needed boost that it needed.

Also in 1967 the Indian army bravely pushed back another Chinese invasion in the then independent kingdom of Sikkim which also made the Chinese realise the steeled resolve of the Indian troops, also India got the much required revenge after its defeat in 1962, further clashes with the PRC were more of skirmishes in which both the sides sustained injuries and casualties but exercised caution as well. The recent clashes in 2020 also exhibited India's resolve to disallow the Chinese from again engaging in such nefarious activities with the and with the Chinese troops sustaining heavy casualties it dawned upon them that the present Indian administration and military is no pushover.

### **Check your Progress - III**

#### **Answer the following:**

- (a) How was the PRC viewed by the international community after the war?

---

---

---

---

---

- (b) How did India react after the war?

---

---

---

---

---

- (c) Mention two clashes after the war with the PRC in which India managed to successfully defend itself

---

---

---

---

---

- (d) Which was the only NAM nation that supported India?

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) In which year did the Indian troops push back Chinese incursions in the Galwan Valley?

---

---

---

---

---

### 3.5 LET US SUM UP

---

The conflict with the PRC was one of the most devastating conflicts that happened in the region. India never expected that the Chinese would ever attack India in this way. India's unilateral friendship with the PRC and its silence on Tibet costed it dearly in terms of taking a stance. The Chinese despite India's silence falsely thought that it was instigating Tibetan settlers in organising rebellions and after a heavy crackdown on them in occupied Tibet they set their eyes on India claiming its territory as its own. India by then was not that well prepared for a war with the PRC and as a result of which it faced a defeat in a short sharp war. However, India managed to quickly bounce back and began to modernise its military as well as resisted future Chinese aggressions which made the PRC realise that India was no longer a pushover.

---

### 3.6 KEYWORDS

---

- **Ostensibly**            Obviously
- **Pushover**             Someone weak
- **Edifices**              structures
- **Transgressed**        Cross over
- **Foolhardy**            foolish
- **Lull**                    Stop
- **Lackadaisical**        lazy
- **Cumbersome**         Difficult

---

### 3.7 SUGGESTED BOOKS

---

- (a) Chubb, A. (2018). *Peripheral Trouble: The Sino-Indian Standoff*. Prosperity. ANU Press.
- (b) Panda, S. (2003), "India- China Cooperation: Major Determinants", *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 64(1/2): 45-59.
- (c) Kumar, M. (1963), "Sino-Indian Relations: A Case Study in the Crystallization of Conflict", *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 24(2): 102-116.

- (d) Guha, K.D. (2012), "Sino-Indian Relations: History, Problems and Prospects", Harvard International Review, 34(2): 26-29.
- (e) The Sino-Indian Border Dispute: Overcoming Nationalist Myopia", Economic and Political Weekly, 47(39): 38-41.
- (f) Qaddos, M. (2018) ,"Sino-Indian Border Conflict and Implications for Bilateral Relations", Policy Perspectives, 15(2): 57-69.
- (g) Norbu, D. (1997), "Tibet in Sino-Indian Relations: The Centrality of Marginality", Asian Survey, 37(11): 1078-1095.
- (i) Sen, S. (2014), "Sino-Indian Border Dispute", Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, (75): 1307-1316.
- (j) Hussain, T.K. (1971), "Sino-Indian Relations", Economic and Political Weekly, 6(38): 2017-2022.
- (k) Maxwell, N. (1999), "Sino-Indian Border Dispute Reconsidered", Economic and Political Weekly, 34(15): 905-918.
- (l) Indumurthy, R. (2016), "India and China: conflict, competition, cooperation and prospects for peace", International Journal on World Peace, 33(1): 43-108.
- (m) Bajpae, C. (2015), "China-India: Regional Dimensions of the Bilateral Relationship", Strategic Studies Quarterly, 9(4): 108-145.
- (n) Mansingh, S. (1994), "India-China Relations in the Post-Cold War Era", Asian Survey, 34(3): 285-300.
- (o) Devereux, D.R. (2009), "The Sino-Indian War of 1962 in Anglo-American Relations", Journal of Contemporary History, 44(1): 71-87.

## Answers

### Check your Progress - I

- (a) The Tibetan Uprising occurred in March 1959.
- (b) The PRC claimed Aksai Chin in Ladakh and Arunachal Pradesh.
- (c) The PRC was upset that India had allowed the Dalai Lama to settle in India and as a result of which this was the main reason why they attacked India.
- (d) India
- (e) Battle of Rezangla 1963

### Check your Progress - II

- (a) The Forward Policy by India was to establish forward bases and to continue patrol the disputed areas and check the Chinese.
- (b) Poor planning, poor administration and lack of military upgradation are some of the reasons for the Indian defeat.
- (c) In Rezang La, the Indian troops valiant pushed back the Chinese.
- (d) Agree
- (e) Panchsheel



### **Check your Progress - III**

- (a) After the war the PRC was viewed negatively by the rest of the international community due to its unnecessary aggression.
- (b) After the war India began to modernise its military and also began to establish better relations with the rest of the world to seek allies.
- (c) India managed to defend itself against the Chinese in two clashes in Nathula and Cho-La in Sikkim in 1967.
- (d) Egypt
- (e) 2020

## UNIT:4

## SUB-CONVENTIONAL AND PROXY WARS

### :: STRUCTURE ::

#### 4.0 Objectives

#### 4.1 Introduction

#### 4.2 India's Campaign in Kashmir

#### 4.3 India and its Eternal War against Left-Wing Terrorism

#### 4.4 Insurgency in the Northeast

#### 4.5 Let Us Sum Up

#### 4.6 Keywords

#### 4.7 Suggested Books

#### Answers

---

### 4.0 OBJECTIVES

---

#### *In this unit we shall:*

- Attain a basic understanding of India's counter terrorism campaign in Kashmir
- Understand the Indian efforts against Left-Wing terrorism in India
- Understand India's response to insurgency in the Northeast

#### *On completing this unit, you should be able to:*

- Understand the scenario in Kashmir
- Understand the war against Left-Wing terrorism
- Understand the Insurgency and efforts of India to quell it

---

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

---

When it comes to proxy warfare which are sub-conventional in nature it is important to understand that the very integration of India has been a difficult phase right after independence and as a result of which there have been many contestations from all the sides. The task itself was so arduous that a lot of effort had to be given and even then certain regions were not willing to join India. As a result of which a war occurred between Pakistan and India in which Kashmiri became the flash point and after which the Kashmir issue has been the most important bone of contention between both the states. The region saw rising trends of terrorism over the past few years only to find the government take stock

measures to bring it down. Elsewhere the regions of Northeast as well as in terms of ideology Left-Wing terrorism has also led a massive impact in the internal security mechanism of India. All these regions suffer from varying degree and types of terrorism and insurgency and as a result of which the solutions taken also have to be different in nature for better results.

India hence had to deal with a lot of issues that directly impacted its internal security mechanisms and this is dangerous in the sense that, all these issues related to insurgency can very well play into the hands of the enemy states which already have a history of supporting and sponsoring them in the past and states like Pakistan do not shy away from protecting or supporting them. Furthermore it also slows down the process of integration, development while making the region instable in the region. As a result of which the administration not only has to neutralise these insurgent groups but also has to make sure that those who are willing to surrender are allowed honourably to do so as well as special mechanisms should be employed to rehabilitate them.

---

## **4.2 INDIA'S CAMPAIGN IN KASHMIR**

---

The insurgency in Kashmir perhaps is one of the longest running insurgencies in the world with much casualties and other events that have taken a toll on the administration as well as on the common citizens. Briefly speaking, the roots of the insurgency lie in Pakistan's never ending ambition to harass India by any means at their disposal. For instance after the defeat at the hands of India in 1971, the Pakistani establishment understood that due to the raging disparity in terms of military prowess they could never defeat India in a conventional warfare, and the situation in Kashmir gradually turned grim due to administrative failures and increasing radicalisation in the region which offered Islamabad a chance to get back at India. Indeed, insurgency or terrorism in Kashmir has always been supported by Pakistan and India has always found itself fighting a defensive asymmetric war with these terrorists.

The roots of the conflict would go back in 1948 when the Pakistani army that had attacked the region were pushed back by the Indian forces after the then Maharaja requested for Indian assistance and acceded to India willingly. The fact that the UN had intervened and called for a ceasefire would go down as the biggest challenge to peace in the region. The Pakistanis which now held a large portion of the territory were unwilling to adhere to the UN resolution that explicitly called for the withdrawal of the Pakistani forces. Instead they focussed on building terror training camps and sending armed terrorists to India to carry out suicide attacks or engage the Indian forces in an asymmetric warfare.

The strategy was simple, to keep India bogged down and divert a large part of its military resources and logistics and since India would be fighting a defensive asymmetric war in a civilian zone the chances of

takin civilian casualties and also casualties to its own soldiers would be high. This would not only keep India busy in defending the territory but could also led to deteriorating peace in the region and hence the Pakistani establishment would then request for international intervention in order to gain out of it.

Some of the terror groups that operate in the region are Harkat-ul-Jihad-al-Islami (HUJI), Lashkar-e-Toiba (LET), Jaish-e-Muhammad (JEM), Hizbul-Mujahidin (HM), Al-Badr and Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front. Interestingly the JKLF was the first separatist group that was founded in the region that has lost much of its power in the coming years after more radical and dangerous groups have been founded. The 1987 election fiasco led to massive unrest in the valley and the Pakistanis quickly took advantage of it, various terror groups sprang up and there were mass protests, the idea of these groups would be to attack prominent politicians and personalities and create chaos in the state, the paramilitary was called in to stop these activities but to no avail as for the first time they were dealing with stone-pelters like in the Middle East. Furthermore in 1989 the growing radicalisation of the people in the region intensified which led to massive protests every now and then and even though the AFSPA was imposed it was quite difficult to rein in the situation. During that period many Kashmiri Pandits (Hindus) were brutally murdered and forced into exile, and the demands of these groups was to wipe out any traces of unwanted influence that could damage the Islamic nature of Kashmir, the situation turned from bad to worse as Pakistan provoked these groups gleefully. The year 1989 was perhaps the turning point in the history of the region as before that even if there was some sort of unrest and issues no one should forget that it was the very Kashmiri civilians who had repeatedly sided with India against Pakistan in all the wars such as in 1948 and in 1965. However in 1989 the degree of radicalisation was so heavy that these terror groups had virtually held the entire region to hostage which then culminated in the Kashmiri Pandit genocide and the virtual declaration of war on India.

Even though certain Pakistani intellectuals have called out Pakistan's complicity in supporting the terrorists in Kashmir, the ISI of Pakistan has a huge hand in it. From offering training, arms and ammunition to even shelter they have also ensured that they are recruited at an early age where it becomes even easier to motivate them. Thus the psychological and economic motivation factors are quite dominant. In addition to that the use of religion or religious ideas are quite prevalent in motivating these people to join the terror groups. On the other hand, there are issues such as stone-pelting which is a very simple and yet effective means of combat as the defence forces are restrained in their approach even if they sustain serious injuries.

The situation was very grim till a certain point of time in Kashmir as the Indian defence forces were at a loss to fight against armed terrorists

who would often make sneak attacks under the cover of the darkness, target civilians or military installations and escape across the LOC. The active support of Pakistan also complicated things. There were again human rights violations in the region from both the sides and terrorists were notably dangerous and infamous for murdering even Kashmiri civilians for being suspected informers for the military. The policy till the period of 2012 was to deploy a heavy military presence in the region as a means of deterrence however it was quickly noted that the terrorists that came from the other side of the LOC were specifically instructed to engage in an asymmetric warfare, damage as much as possible to the point of even laying down their own lives. The motivation for being called a martyr for the religion and for the cause was enough to send many of these youth who had not become terrorists to fight till the last breath.

However of late the instances of terror has considerably gone down. With a waning Pakistani influence due to its own bad economic and political situation and with the realisation dawning upon many regarding the futility of such conflicts many Kashmir youth have instead opted for joining the Indian defence forces and leading normal lives. India's strikes across the borders such as the Surgical Strike and the Balakot strikes also made Islamabad realise that being a failed state it cannot do much to instigate terror and the response from New Delhi would be tougher as time passes.

**Check your Progress - I**

**Answer the following:**

(a) How is Pakistan related to the insurgency in Kashmir?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) What was the Kashmiri Pandit Genocide all about?

---

---

---

---

---

(c) Mention two strikes carried out by India across the LOC to decimate terrorist camps

---

---

---

---

---

(d) Since which year did terrorism rear its ugly head in Kashmir?

---

---

---

---

---

(e) Mention one home grown terrorist outfit in Kashmir?

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **4.3 INDIA AND ITS ETERNAL WAR AGAINST LEFT-WING TERRORISM**

---

Home to democracy and many ideologies India has always allowed as a democratic nation to allow many ideologies and thoughts to flourish in its democratic setup. Indeed, even prior to the independence socialist, communist or leftist thoughts were prevalent in India. Post independent India saw the political scenario dominated by the INC with other parties taking up minor roles,

The subsequent split in the Communist Party of India (CPI) and the further splitting of factions led the infighting within the communist ranks, each accusing the other of being reactionary and compromising with the ideology of Marxism. While the CPI and the CPI (M) decided to adhere to the constitution processes and contest elections, the CPI(ML) and others decided to go on a rampage accusing not only their formed comrades of compromising on the ideology but also vowing to continue an armed insurrection in order to install a communist state by any means possible.

Initially the Naxalite or the Maoist movement started in West Bengal when certain intellectuals and people decided to overthrow the government in west Bengal and later on in India in order to establish a communist government. After engaging in violence and carrying out attacks on civilians and armed police personnel the state was swift to react and ended the insurrection. However they intensified their operations years later and spread to other areas as well such as in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chattisgarh etc.

Since 2000, the groups such as the Peoples' War Group (PWG) and the Maoist Communist Centre (MCC) have been engaged in an asymmetric warfare with the Indian forces, their tactics are varied given the nature of their insurgency and even more dangerous than other groups. Apart from ideological motivation, the Maoists are known to target young, underprivileged, tribal and scheduled caste people who are often discriminated and denied legitimate opportunities. Even though a lot of efforts have been given to integrate these people into the mainstream due to constrain the integration has been difficult in nature. The Maoists at first make a survey of the region and instigate people to join their cause. The ideological indoctrination is not just limited to communism and its ideas but also to the extent exploitation is carried out in the region by outside forces and by the corporates. Thus they use a curious mixture of communism, anti-corporate issues and tribalism in order to create the perfect combination to recruit them. Since most of those who join the Naxalites are poor it becomes far easier for them to recruit them.

The terror attacks carried out by the Maoists are not just aimed at military personnel, but also attacking infrastructure, extortion and also kidnapping for ransom. Brutal in their methods they also run Peoples' courts in order to dispense 'justice' to traitors and those who they consider to be an enemy of the people. Also it must be noted that they do carry sophisticated arms and ammunition and have been found to even have claymore mines and C4 charges which are highly dangerous explosives. It is also established that they also receive support and assistance from other states notably from Pakistan and the PRC.

The Maoists have been termed as the single biggest internal security challenges of our recent times as not only do they use guerrilla tactics but also stop any process of development in the region. Extortion and drug trafficking is another way by which they fund themselves and there is a slew of so called intellectuals who defend them in the academic thus lending credentials to their violence. The insurgents are also well armed as said earlier, with around 20,000 regular cadre of the Peoples' Liberation Guerrilla army and around 30,000 cadres of the PWG they do pose a serious security challenge to India.

Some of the most gruesome killings are done after they receive intelligence reports of patrols and they hunt them down often surrounding them engaging the security forces in hours of gun battles and finally beat a retreat once reinforcements arrive.

The state's response in turn has been varied from the laying of the state led Counter Insurgency Strategy (COIN) which uses military tactics, flushing them out of their strongholds, receiving intel reports and then organising counter attacks and also motivating the villagers in those areas to stay away from them and form their own civil defence groups. Such groups known as the *Salwa Judum* are effective to some extent in countering the Maoists. For instance Andhra Pradesh is a success story as

the Maoists had not only succeeded in eliminating some senior politicians and also had attacked the then chief minister, but the counter response has been brilliant. It began with the modernisation of the police force and also in tandem with the paramilitary units a full scale counter insurgency operation was carried out that saw the elimination of top Maoist commanders and their sympathisers. In another instance a new strategy was employed to carry out development works in order to address the genuine grievances of the people so as to stop them from falling into the hands of the Maoists. This strategy also known as ‘winning hearts and minds’ focusses on a softer approach which includes not only developmental works, but good governance, speedy redressal of issues and also surrender and rehabilitation packages.

When dealing with the Maoists it has to be understood that they are an unseen enemy and skilful fighters who depend a lot on local support, they often suppress the local people by either threatening them or killing a few of them to set an example. They also have various front organisations which defend their actions and take it up on the national media and academia to show solidarity with them. However, these Maoist factions are nothing but terrorists who do not have faith in democracy and seek to wrest power using all violent means at their disposal. The state’s response has been so far quite remarkable after the initial setback as now they have a concrete strategy to not only counter them in their strongholds but are also able to choke their funding and intellectual support to some extent.

### **Check your Progress - II**

#### **Answer the following:**

(a) What major reason caused the rise of the Maoists?

---

---

---

---

---

(b) Mention two Maoist organisations which are involved in terror attacks

---

---

---

---

---

(c) What is the Salwa Judum all about?

---

---

---



- 
- 
- (d) Maoists often get intellectual support for their activities from non-combatants. Agree or Disagree?

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) Mention the faction that split from the mainstream Maoists to form their own group.

---

---

---

---

---

---

#### **4.4 INSURGENCY IN THE NORTHEAST**

---

Another sector where the Indian defence forces and the administration had to deal with insurgency is the pristine northeast region of India which is otherwise known for its pristine beauty. The entire region is difficult to traverse and also there is a hindrance to development due to the unsuitable geographical conditions in the area. To complicate matters only a thin stretch of corridor attaches Northeast with the rest of the mainland which is known as the Siliguri corridor. This is a location that is a bustling business hub and is quite strategically important for the rest of the nation. As a result of which insurgencies in the Northeast can also destabilise this region which may prove fatal in the long run.

There are various motivation towards terrorism such as ideology, religion, race and ethnicity as well as economic reasons. For instance when it comes to terrorism in Kashmir then religion and external influences may be the main reasons for it and when it comes to Left wing terrorism then ideology and economic exploitation are some of the main reasons for it. Similarly in the Northeast the difficult process of integration with the mainland, ethnic factors, destabilised communities, the porous borders, interference from external actors and dissatisfaction with the administration and economic reasons are some of the most important factors that caused the rise of terrorism in the first place.

The region has been witnessing insurgency since the start 1950, and during that time the newly independent Union of India had to integrate various princely and semi-independent states with the Union. Historically the Ahom kings from Assam had sought help from the British

administration for assistance and in return Assam became a part of the British ruled India. Later on the Northeast region was made up of Assam, NEFA (present day Arunachal Pradesh), Manipur and Tripura which joined India in 1949 while Mizoram, Nagaland and Mizoram were carved into separate states later on. Sikkim joined India in 1975. As a result of which the entire region was firmly placed within the ambit of the Union of India like any other federal state.

There are several reasons for the rise of insurgency in Northeast India, such as, its multi-ethnic nature where each tribe has its own pattern and the government's skewed methods of integrating them often cause hostile reactions to defend themselves against the perceived onslaught. Underdevelopment is another factor which causes lack of jobs and other opportunities and as a result of which many of the youth they join armed groups. In the same manner lack of economic assistance and development is one of the biggest reasons as to why many join armed groups to make a living. Another main reason is the sense of isolation and deprivation, as these states have a minimal presence in the parliament and hence they are unable to raise many important issues which should find its place in the national discourse. This sense of political and social deprivation is another reason why the people end up being frustrated and can be easily lured towards militancy.

Demographic changes are also a factor, and as explained earlier this region is quite small in terms of geography and also in terms of economic opportunities not much is present there and hence there is always a resentment against those who are illegal migrants who come and take away jobs. Ironically the external support cannot be discounted. Right from the 1950s and till the late 1960s the Naga army as well as other armed groups have received support from East Pakistan as well as from the PRC. Many were also trained in former East Pakistan by the Pakistani Special Services Groups. This was done by the enemy states to destabilise the region and call for secession from India.

In 2011 nine insurgent groups mainly the NSCN (K), PLA, ULFA, KLO, NDFB and other formed the United National Liberation Front of South West Asia. The idea was to launch a joint struggle against the Indian administration and their main goals were complete independence and economic progress in the region. There were renewed attacks on security forces and even civilians for that matter. These attacks include targeting civilian informers, police stations, civilians, armed security personnel and even at times military installations. The tactics employed are the simple hit and run and other forms of guerrilla tactics which are difficult to detect and interpret.

Apart from these terrorist factions, Islamic groups also operate in the area such as Jamaat-ul-Mujahidin Bangladesh (JMB) which is a cause of concern. Some solutions that are suggested to bring peace to the region are regular talks with the outfits where they must be made to understand

the futility of their actions and to make them surrender peacefully. Rehabilitation packages and other economic activities must be scaled up in the region. Also the administration must not in the pursuit of integration try to enforce cultural assimilation or mainstream them, their distinct identity and culture must be allowed to flourish. Also those groups which refuse to surrender and still engage in violence must be brought down by any means necessary. Since the region is quite known for its pristine beauty small economic projects that are related to tourism, homestays and even small scale industries must be set up so that the youth do not fall prey to petty politics and join armed groups.

**Check your Progress - III**

**Answer the following:**

(a) Mention a couple of factors as to why terrorism emerged in Northeast India.

---

---

---

---

---

(b) Mention two terror groups active in Northeast.

---

---

---

---

---

(c) Mention a couple of solutions for the issue of insurgency in Northeast.

---

---

---

---

---

(d) Mention the military law that was applied to control insurgency in the North East?

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) Mention one neighbouring country where the insurgent groups made their base to launch attacks.

---

---

---

---

---

---

#### 4.5 LET US SUM UP

---

When it comes to insurgency and terrorism in India we need to look broadly in three areas which are in Kashmir, in the Northeast as well as in terms of ideology which is the Left-Wing groups. All these areas and groups have different motivation and hence the reasons for joining terror groups also matter. As a result of which even the response should be different. Apart from that terrorism in Kashmir has a strong support of Pakistan which sees it as a cheap proxy war by which it can harass India. On the other hand left-wing terror is more dangerous in the sense that there is a strong pseudo intellectual support for it and it also controls vast swathes of land which is quite risky to administer and hence the response here has been a combination of offer rehabilitation packages as well as eliminating top Maoist commanders in order to decimate such groups. On the other hand terrorism in Northeast, is more ethnic based which requires a softer approach in the sense that the administration has to take steps to bring in economic development as well as integrate these areas while maintaining their distinct culture.

Hence even though all these groups fall under the category of terrorism, the approaches taken by the state need to be different.

---

#### 4.6 KEYWORDS

---

- |                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| ▪ <b>Prowess</b>     | Power               |
| ▪ <b>Pristine</b>    | beautiful           |
| ▪ <b>Fiasco</b>      | mistake             |
| ▪ <b>Explicitly</b>  | clearly             |
| ▪ <b>Adhere</b>      | accept              |
| ▪ <b>Bogged down</b> | fatigued            |
| ▪ <b>Ceasefire</b>   | stopping a conflict |
| ▪ <b>Complicity</b>  | in cooperation      |

---

## 4.7 SUGGESTED BOOKS

---

- (a) Balakrishnan, R. (2018), "India and the Crime-Terrorism Nexus", *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses*, 10(9): 11-17.
- (b) Purushottam, R.W. & Prasad, V.R. (2009), "Addressing Frontier-Terrorism-India needs Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy", *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 70(2): 553-568.
- (c) Patgiri, R.& Hazarika, O.B. (2016), "Locating Northeast in India's Neighbourhood Policy: Transnational Solutions to the Problems of a Periphery", *India Quartely*, 72(3): 235-249.
- (d) Kaura, V. (2017), "India's Counter-Terrorism Policy against Jihadist Terror: Challenges and Prospects", *Connections*, 16(4): 51-67.
- (e) Basit, S.H.(2018), "India-Myanmar Relations and the Management of Transnational Militant Threats", *Journal of Strategic Security*, 11(2): 73-92.
- (f) Hussain,W. (2016). *Security Situation in Northeast India. IPCS Forecast 2016.*
- (g) Prabhakara, M.S. (2007), "Separatist Movements in the North-East: Rhetoric and Reality", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(9): 728-730.
- (h) Bhambri, C.P. (2015), "Maoism: Responses of the State", *Social Scientist*, 43(7/8): 15-23.
- (i) Rawat, N. (2019), "Naxalite Insurgency in India and Need for Holistic Counter Responses", *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analysis*, 11(5): 13-19.
- (j) Chakrabarty, B. (2014), "Maoism, a Recalcitrant Citizenry and Counterinsurgency Measures in India", *Journal of Asian and International Affairs*, 1(3): 289-318.
- (k) Rao, V.V. (1975), "North East India: Problems and Prospects", *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 36(1): 1-12.
- (l) Miller, G.D. (2019), "Seeing Political Violence through Different Lenses", *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 13(2): 75-78.
- (m) Narain, A. (2016), "Revival of Violence in Kashmir: The Threat to India's Security", *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses*, 8(7): 15-20.
- (n) Pandya, A. (2020), "The Threat of Transnational Terrorist Groups in Kashmir", *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 14(1): 14-25.
- (o) Zutshi, C. (2012), "Whither Kashmir Studies? A Review", *Modern Asian Studies*, 46(4): 1033-1048.
- (p) Mohanty, J.N. & Mohanty, S.K. (2007), "Pakistan's Kashmir Policy: The Smokescreen of Fundamentalist Agenda? The Indian Journal of Political Science", 68(1): 137-144.

## **Answers :**

### **Check your Progress - I**

- (a) Pakistan has always been an active supporter of the insurgency in Kashmir and by the means of a proxy and asymmetric war it hopes to destabilise India, keep it occupied in the region and also to internationalise the issue for its own benefits.
- (b) On January 19<sup>th</sup> 1990 the Kashmiri Pandits (Hindus) were forced by mobs of Islamic radicals to either leave the valley or convert or die. They went on a rampage killing a lot of them in cold blood and even killed some Muslims who were in support of their Hindu brothers. This resulted in a vast exodus of the Kashmiri Pandits and also a massive genocide and marked the start of insurgency in Kashmir which then took a far more religious turn.
- (c) Two counter strikes that were carried out by India was the 2016 Surgical strikes across the LOC in response to the Uri attacks and the 2019 Balakot Air Strike that was carried out in response to the Pathankot attacks.
- (d) 1990
- (e) Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF)

### **Check your Progress - II**

- (a) The primary reason that caused the rise of the Maoists was the split in the communist party and the formation of the CPI (Maoists) which then declared that they would fight the Indian state with all means possible to establish a communist state. The leaders of this movement believed in violence against the state and all its agencies. Notably the movement started in a place in West Bengal called Naxalbari where farmers seized the crops and granaries and started attacking villagers and landlords mercilessly while many so called intellectuals supported their actions.
- (b) The Peoples' War Group (PWG) and the Maoist Communist Center (MCC) are two such groups that are involved in a series of terror attacks.
- (c) In response to the Maoist violence the state decided to arm the villagers who were troubled by them to organise themselves as self-defence forces in order to combat the Maoists. As a result of which the Salwa Judum was born.
- (d) Agree
- (e) Peoples' War Group (PWG)

### **Check your Progress - III**

- (a) A couple of factors that are responsible for the rise of terrorism are lack of economic development and mainstreaming of their culture in the name of assimilation.

- (b) The NSCN(K) and the ULFA are two groups that are active in the region.
- (c) A couple of possible solutions may be bringing economic development in the region as well as protecting the region from illegal immigrants so as to avoid disturbing the demography of the region.
- (d) Armed Forces Special Power Act (AFSPA)
- (e) Myanmar

## UNIT:5

## WMDs AND WARFARE

### :: STRUCTURE ::

#### 5.0 Objectives

#### 5.1 Introduction

#### 5.2 India's position on Nuclear Weapons

#### 5.3 India's position on Chemical and Biological weapons

#### 5.4 India's WMD defence preparedness

#### 5.5 Let Us Sum Up

#### 5.6 Keywords

#### 5.7 Suggested Books

#### Answers

---

### 5.0 OBJECTIVES

---

#### *In this unit we shall:*

- Attain a basic understanding India's position on Nuclear Weapons
- Understand India's position on Chemical and Biological Weapons
- Understand the defence preparedness of India regarding the WMDs.

#### *On completing this unit, you should be able to:*

- Understand the Nuclear policies of India
- Understand the Chemical and Biological weapons policies of India
- Understand the defence preparedness of India with regards to WMDs

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

When it comes to non-conventional weapons India has a clear position of adhering to international norms and conventions which include not supplying, selling or exporting such weapons or any technology associated with them. It also has no plans to develop chemical and biological weapons but when it comes to nuclear weapons it has because of its own security issues. In this context one has to understand that its two neighbours with whom it has fought wars and with whom it has issues possess nuclear weapons and as a result of which a situation



may arise where India may be subjected to nuclear blackmailing and therefore the possession of nuclear weapons is well justified. Despite that, India has not been associated with any form of transfer of such weapons and even any technology associated with them. India is also well prepared to handle a crisis that may arise out of such weapons and even with regards to the nuclear weapons it of late has upgraded its status to a first strike use due to the complicated scenario in the subcontinent.

---

## **5.2 INDIA'S POSITION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

---

Post-Independence India took a pacifist stance and decided to maintain good relations with all its neighbours and walk on the path of peace, but successive wars with both Pakistan and the PRC completely changed the mind-set of the leadership. Furthermore Pakistan's incessant ranting against India and its clandestine support to separatist groups within India and the PRC's clandestine warfare further cemented the desire to go nuclear. Although India at first did not wish to invest in such weapons very soon it realised that it has to, in order to create a proper deterrence against its two enemy states which constantly threaten it. Therefore the question of deterrence comes into play. The concept of deterrence is simply, it's an act to deter or to ensure that an enemy state is in a condition of fear and that it cannot harm the origin state under any circumstances. In addition to that when it comes to power symmetry between a nuclear weapon state and a non-nuclear weapon state, then the former has an unquestionable advantage with the help of which it can blackmail the latter and put undue pressure. Hence deterrence is a matter of importance in this aspect.

In this aspect India possesses nuclear weapons and also fuel cycle capacities since it tested its first device in 1974, however it remains outside the purview of the Non-Proliferation treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) for its own reasons. The logic that India has given so far and which is quite sound in nature is the context of the region in which both Pakistan and the PRC have nuclear weapons and may threaten India, that the treaties are discriminatory in nature as it does not allow other states to develop nuclear weapons while those who had it prior to the NPT have an undue advantage and that India has an excellent track record of non-proliferation and denial of access to its weapons programme. As a result of which it also has these safety measures which are in tandem with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG).

India has around 130-140 warheads which are mainly based on weapons grade plutonium and highly enriched uranium. As far as the administration is concerned this is more than enough to provide a minimum credible deterrence against external threats.

The history of India's nuclear weapons date back to the scientist Dr. Homi Bhabha who first conceptualised the creation of a nuclear

deterrence and even the former prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru decided to go ahead with the purpose of civilian use, there was a debate also if India should develop nuclear weapons or not but later on due to external factors such as the Chinese testing in 1964 it was decided that India should go nuclear. Despite the ongoing debate in the country a consensus was arrived that India should not sign the NPT unless the signatory states decided to make it a level playing field. Later on Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri decided to authorise the work on the Subterranean Nuclear Explosion for Peaceful Purposes (SNEPP) IN 1964 and ten years later in 1974 India tested its first fission device.

Due to the 1974 tests, there was widespread international condemnation especially from the PRC which had in 1964 exploded and weaponised its nuclear devices and as a result of which fearing international repercussions India did not pursue its tests neither did it weaponize the nuclear devices. Later on India overcame the hesitation due to the deteriorating situation in the neighbourhood and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi authorised further testing in 1986 which later on led to the submission of the Action Plan for a Nuclear Weapons Free and Non-Violent World Order in the United Nations. Furthermore the pressurising tendencies of the already nuclear powers in the form of the NPT and the CTBT further steered the resolve of the administration to go ahead with the nuclear testing, in 1995 under the leadership of Prime Minister Narasimha Rao India decided to go ahead with a test but being detected by the US agencies it had to stop it. in 1998 under the able leadership of Prime Minister Vajpayee and with the expertise of former President A.P.J. Abdul Kalam India decided to go ahead with the test in the month of May and India took the bold step to declare itself as a nuclear power. Very soon the Nuclear Doctrine of 1999 was established which called for a no-first use but the fears of an arms race between India and Pakistan was still there. In addition to that India also outlined that even in the case of a CBW attack India would not hesitate to use nuclear weapons as a response, and also the nuclear weapons are under the control of a civilian command or the Nuclear Command Authority (NCA).

Presently the world powers and the other members of the international community have no choice but to accept India as a de-facto nuclear power state, which is important in the face of recognition. The journey has been quite difficult and replete with obstacles but in order to create a minimum deterrence and to ensure that foreign states do not take advantage of the absence of nuclear weapons. India thus has not only maintained a minimum deterrence that is required but given its excellent track record of non-proliferation and export of nuclear technology it has earned accolades in the world. Hence the possession of nuclear weapons go in a long way to defend the national interest of the state especially in the conditions of an asymmetry in the sub-continent.

## Check your Progress - I

### Answer the following:

- (a) What made India change its initial stance of not going nuclear to actually developing nuclear weapons?

---

---

---

---

---

- (b) Why did the 1995 nuclear tests fail?

---

---

---

---

---

- (c) What was the 1998 nuclear tests all about?

---

---

---

---

---

- (d) Mention one state that imposed sanctions over India in the aftermath of the 1998 nuclear tests?

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) Mention one missile of India which has the capacity to carry a nuclear warhead.

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 5.3 INDIA'S POSITION ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

---

The issue with chemical and biological weapons is that not only are they very dangerous to say but it may also last for a long time spreading wider and may cause unprecedented havoc. Indeed the sheer dangers these weapons pose is non-negotiable in nature and the after effects may also cause an entire state or region to get tied down in trying to find solutions to it.

India has always been a state that has complied with the international statutes on chemical and biological weapons to the point of even opposing their creation, stockpiling and also sale of such dangerous weapons. In 2000 India's candidature for the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) and the Australian Group (AG) was endorsed in a meeting between the United States and India. The AG group is all about chemical and biological weapons and it was formed in the year 1985 in a bid to ensure that such dangerous weapons are regulated and does not fall into the wrong hands. The group like any other group in a multilateral setting seeks to control the spread of such weapons of mass destruction knowing very well the dangers they pose. A joint statement was released in the year 2000 which stated "The evolution of regime membership criteria, consistent with maintaining the core principles of these regimes" it also at the same time seeks commitment from the Indian administration to gully adopt to the export and control requirements.

After accepting the guidelines for the NSG and the MTCR in 2005, India may have to adopt to certain new guidelines which are crucial for being a member in the AG which are, the commitment to prevent the spread and use of CBW (Chemical and Biological weapons) proliferation which also includes accepting the Biological and Toxins Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention. As a manufacturer it has to also follow the guidelines related to export and export ban of CBWs. It must also adopt and implement the AG guidelines which discusses the transfers of sensitive chemicals and biological items that may be further sharpened for the purpose of making the lethal or weaponing them. It also as to ensure a proper licencing system of such materials which may find in the hands of spurious agents which may misuse them. Enforcing legal penalties and sanction for violating the acts of the convention. Also it has to create proper channels for the purpose of sharing information which are subject to confidentiality as well, and it must also participate in the AG in such a way so as to ensure the smooth functioning of the group.

India's position in this case has been of offering strong and unprecedented support as it realised the futility of the spread of such weapons or their proliferation which may find itself in the wrong hands and may cause a lot of problems in the world. India on a number of occasions has offered its support in the forms of statements or memorandums regarding the proliferation, creation, and sale and

stockpiling of CBWs. It is also well known for its positive contribution to the international community regarding such issues despite the fact that it is not a permanent member of the United Nations.

When it comes to CBWs, India already has a strong framework to put up its stance for instance it has a proper institutional and legal as well as regulatory frameworks to deal with the issues that may arise due to the presence of such CBWs. The Directorate General of Foreign Trade of the Indian Ministry of Commerce and Industry is the main department that deals with this thing in addition to that there are some other groups which deal in the same manner. The licensing applications for biological and chemical materials go to the inter-departmental coordinating agencies. The Custom as well as different intelligence and security agencies also maintain an over watch over the transfer of such materials for industrial and research operations. Therefore strong intelligence and chain of command are very important when it comes to the enforcement of regulating the sale or transfer of chemical and biological materials.

The reason as to why such stringent induction has been made when it comes to such materials is due to the fact that there may be clandestine and unwanted groups which may be able to lay their hands on such materials and hence cause havoc all over the world. In addition to the surveillance mechanisms enforced in place it also has a slew of legal mechanisms to enforce the same. For instance the Indian Environmental (Protection) Act of 1986, Rules for the Manufacture, Use/Import/Export and Storage of Hazardous, Microorganisms/ Genetically Engineered Organisms or Cells 1989, Recombinant DNA Guidelines, and the Drug Policy of 2002 are some of the legal mechanisms.

Regarding Chemical weapons in 1992 it signed the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and therefor became one of the original signatories of the convention as it declared that it did not have the means to procure or produce or stockpile such weapons. This of course helped India's chemical industry to grow exponentially and since it is already in possession of nuclear weapons it has explicitly stated that it does not need chemical weapons to override even in the UN Disarmament Conference in 1988 it stated that the next step towards comprehensive disarmament would be to halt the production of chemical weapons and therefore Indian diplomats responded that it had no such weapons at their disposal. India also set up the Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) warfare directorates in the Services in addition to an inter-services coordination committee to coordinate the programme. The Army also established a NBC cell in their Headquarters to study such materials and the hazards associated with it. Therefore India has been quite transparent when it comes to CBWs.

## Check your Progress - II

### Answer the following:

(a) What is the purpose of the Australian Group (AG)?

---

---

---

---

(b) What has been India's position on CBWs?

---

---

---

---

(c) What is the purpose of the Nuclear, Biological and Chemical warfare directorates?

---

---

---

---

(d) Mention one Biological weapon pathogen?

---

---

---

---

(e) Mention one Chemical weapon pathogen?

---

---

---

---

---

## 5.4 INDIA'S WMD DEFENCE PREPAREDNESS

---

When it comes to a possible attack by WMDs India is firmly of the view that it will take all necessary countermeasures to reply in a befitting manner. It states: "However, in the event of a major attack against India, or Indian forces anywhere, by biological or chemical weapons, India will retain the option of retaliating with nuclear weapons". The fact that initially India had no upgraded its no-first use status made it

look benign in front of its enemies. Also when it comes to such weapons one must bear in mind that time and again Pakistan has not only retracted to the first use of nuclear weapons if required but has repeatedly threatened India with it. The surgical strikes and the air strikes in Balakot did send shivers in the Pakistani camp and as a result of which India too changed its position vis-à-vis Pakistan when it comes to nuclear weapon to act more in the form of a strong deterrence.

India's position can be ascertained in a way that it won't use them in the event of any war and prefers to fight a war in the conventional manner but then in the event of a strike that seriously undermines the security of India, it would not hesitate to retaliate in the same manner. In the case of a CBW attack there is a problem as in the case of an attack by a non-nuclear weapon state there would be a contradiction, as on one hand India has explicitly stated that it would not resort to the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons state but in the case of a major CBW attack it would do so. Thus there appears to be a confusion regarding this scenario. India fully understands the conditions under which it fights a war, as it has a lot of experience in fighting conventional wars as well as proxy wars and it very well understands the complexities related to warfare which may take an ugly turn any moment. With its many proxy wars and the constant support of Pakistan it has long ago realised the ferocity of such conflicts and has taken adequate preparations for such unfortunate events if they do occur. The Army Doctrine of 2044 states that India has the right to retaliate with nuclear weapons against her enemies in the case a strike by enemy forces which uses WMDs, although the doctrine clearly states that India would never use chemical or biological weapons that however does not entail that enemy states may not resort to the use of such weapons. The issue that stands out clearly is that enemy states often engage in asymmetric and low intensity warfare in which there is a high propensity for enemy states to use such weapons. The trust issue that emerges from enemy states is something that India needs to think about when officiating such doctrines.

The threat emanating from non-state actors that may end up using CBWs or even lay their hands on a nuclear device is ever present, and as explained earlier non-state actors are irrational in nature, not bound by international legal or any moral obligations and as a result of which, while states may to some extent still adhere to international norms (unless in the sense of an existential crisis as in the case of Pakistan), non-state actors may not obey such commandments. Therefore there is a small gap as to how India should react in case of a CBW or a nuclear strike from non-state actors, the threat is quite high and the stakes are even higher in this possible scenario.

Regarding Biological weapons the threat is even higher as there is a critical difference with chemical weapons. In the case of chemical weapons the effect is no doubt deadly, but the effect is also limited to the

area where the weapon is discharged and as a result of which containment is far easier. In the case of biological weapons not only the threat is even larger but the area of effect, spread capacity and the damage caused is even more deadly. As a result of which biological weapons pose a larger threat as they use live pathogens.

One may also take the example of the Covid pandemic where there are strong evidences to suggest that the virus is a modified pathogen from the family of the Covid viruses which was modified in a bio-warfare and military controlled lab in Wuhan (PRC). The sheer magnitude of destruction that the virus has left is enough to cause concern in the entire world. If this is taken as a bio warfare then preparations must be made accordingly. When it comes to bio warfare India must be prepared on a larger scale right from tracing the origins of the launch to the possible effects and the means to contain the spread of the pathogen.

In this regard the Indian administration along with the rest of the world have to pool in their resources and also make proper investments for the creation of proper devices which can detect pathogens in the environment. As a result of which proper investments need to be made in the proper direction. Vaccines for known pathogens which are dangerous in nature should be made and administered and the most important aspect is to have a sound intelligence system in action which can actually detect the evil intentions of any state or non-state actor that chooses to deploy such weapons.

The National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) has developed a set of guidelines to counter any biological attack, primarily it understands that the purpose of such an attack is to spread chaos and panic, to engage in intense propaganda warfare as well and to ensure that the entire system collapse, there are internal turmoil and political instability so as to affect the economy as well as the general population. In addition to that the Ministry of Family Welfare (MoH FW) is one of the agencies that deals with epidemics especially. Also the Ministry of Defence manages the crisis related to a bio warfare, while the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) engages in the development of countermeasures to a biological attack. The Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate change is tasked with the responsibility to evaluate the long and short term consequences of such attacks. While the National Disaster Response Force (NDRF) and the National Crisis Management Committee (NCMC) are tasked with the job to ensure a quick and sharp response. The first response to an attack in case there is an intelligence gap is to ensure containment and quick responses which also calls for isolation and prevention of the spread, the government goes into an overdrive and ensures that there is no panic among the citizens, sanitation drives are carried out and the samples collected are then sent for analysis to find out a quick solution. The focus hence is on stopping



the spread, containing the region affected and to ensure speedy recovery of all those affected and collection of samples for analysis.

Although it must be said that India still has a lot to learn and engage when it comes to tackling such an asymmetric sense of warfare, much has already been done which does test our resolve.

### Check your Progress - III

#### Answer the following:

- (a) What are the main concerns of India when it comes to a WMD strike from a rogue state like Pakistan?

---

---

---

---

---

- (b) What is the complication of a possible strike using WMDs from non-state actors?

---

---

---

---

---

- (c) Mention two agencies that deal with WMDs

---

---

---

---

---

- (d) India takes the threat of a WMD strike very seriously and has a dedicated chain of command to deal with such a plausible attack. Agree or Disagree

---

---

---

---

---

- (e) Is India a signatory of the Chemical Weapons Convention?

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 5.5 LET US SUM UP

---

India has a long standing tradition of not supporting the use, sale of technology or proliferation of nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction. It has always taken a humane approach but also understands the pragmatic considerations to which it is subjected to. For instance even though it has clarified that it has no intention to pursue WMDs but its own security concerns are enough to offer it no choice to do so. While India does not possess chemical or biological weapons even though it has a robust research in this field for scientific purposes, it does have nuclear weapons which offer it a sense of security especially in a region where it faces two enemy states. Also India's position on the NPT and the CTBT are justified as these treaties are discriminatory in nature and does not take into account the asymmetric conditions of the region. With regards to nuclear weapons it has already ensured that it would not allow them to be proliferated. In terms of preparedness a lot more needs to be done but research is still in progress despite that India has managed to develop a robust defence system when it comes to defence against WMDs.

---

## 5.6 KEYWORDS

---

▪ <b>Havoc</b>	Danger
▪ <b>Spurious</b>	fake
▪ <b>Confidentiality</b>	Secrecy
▪ <b>Surveillance</b>	Over Watch
▪ <b>Slew</b>	Many
▪ <b>Benign</b>	Simple
▪ <b>Entail</b>	Mean
▪ <b>Propensity</b>	tendency

---

## 5.7 SUGGESTED BOOKS

---

- (a) Rath, J. et. al. (1998), "Biological Weapons Control", Science, New Series, 282(5397): 2194.
- (b) Meselson, M. (1970), "Chemical and Biological Weapons", Scientific American, 222(5): 15-25.
- (c) Fenn, E.A. (2000), "Biological Warfare in Eighteen-Century North America: Beyond Jeffery Amherst", The Journal of American History, 86(4): 1552-1580.
- (d) Meselson, M. (1999), "The Problem of Biological Weapons", Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 52(5): 46-58.
- (e) Littlewood, J. (2012). The Biological Weapons Convention. Unfinished Business: Why International Negotiations Fail. University of Georgia Press.

- (f) Koblentz, G. (2004), "Pathogens as Weapons: The International Security Implications of Biological Warfare", *International Security*, 28(3): 84-122.
- (g) Steinburner, J.D.(1998), " Biological Weapons: A Plague upon All Houses", *Foreign Policy*, (109): 85-96.
- (h) Leitenberg, M. (2002),"Biological Weapons and Bioterrorism in the First Years of the Twenty-First Century", *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 21(2): 3-27.
- (i) Sagan, S.D. (1997), "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb", *International Security*, 21(3): 53-86.
- (j) Mueller, J. (2010), "Nuclear Weapons", *Foreign Policy*, (177): 38-44.
- (k) Barkenbus, J.N. (1989), "Devaluating Nuclear Weapons", *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 14(4): 425-440.
- (l) Mearsheimer, J.J. (1984), "Nuclear Weapons and Deterrence in Europe", *International Security*, 9(3): 19-46.
- (m) Kaysen,C. (1991), "Nuclear Weapons after the Cold War", *Foreign Affairs*, 70(4): 95-110.
- (n) Martin, B.E. (2016), "Weapons of Mass Destruction: Nuclear Terrorism and Nuclear Proliferation", *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses*, 8(2): 17-23.
- (o) Suri, J. (2008), "Nuclear Weapons and the Escalation of Global Conflict since 1945", *International Journal*, 63(4): 1013-1029.

## Answers

### Check your Progress - I

- (a) While initially India maintained that it would not go nuclear the changing situation in the neighbourhood made it rethink on its decision. It fought wars with Pakistan and the PRC and also noticed how the Chinese developed their first nuclear device, it also saw the looming threat of the discriminatory NPT and the CTBT and hence decided to go nuclear for its security.
- (b) In 1995 India decided to test its nuclear devices but the American intelligence detected it and pressurised India to end it or face serious consequences and as a result of which it had to end it.
- (c) In 1998 there were enough intel reports that Pakistan was either in possession of nuclear devices or were in the process of making one, this made the Indian administration jittery and hence to deter Pakistan and also to be self-sufficient it decided to go ahead with the tests at Pokhran and declare itself as a nuclear weapons state.
- (d) USA
- (e) Agni Missile

### **Check your Progress - II**

- (a) The Australian group or the AG group was formed in 1985 and its purpose to see the non-proliferation of dangerous chemical or biological weapons or their raw materials.
- (b) India takes a very strong stance on CBWs considering them as a threat to humanity and adheres to established international norms and concepts regarding their proliferation. It does not possess such weapons nor does it endorse the production or proliferation of such hazardous materials.
- (c) The purpose of the directorates is to ensure the studies of dangerous chemical and biological weapons, their raw materials, the production process and the hazards which they pose.
- (d) Anthrax
- (e) Sarin Gas

### **Check your Progress - III**

- (a) With regards to Pakistan, the main concern is its existential threat and the fact that the control over their WMDs is very hazy and as a result of which in the case of a prolonged conflict in which the Pakistani state feels threatened it may resort to such weapons as a last ditch effort which may cause a lot of problems.
- (b) Non-state actors do not adhere to international norms and treaties or even confirm to morality and ethics and in the case of an asymmetric warfare a strike by such entities may be not only devastating but it will be difficult to target them given the covert nature of their operations and positions.
- (c) The National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) and the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) are two agencies that deal with WMDs.
- (d) Agree
- (e) Yes

\*\*\*\*\*

યુનિવર્સિટી ગીત

સ્વાધ્યાય: પરમં તપ:

સ્વાધ્યાય: પરમં તપ:

સ્વાધ્યાય: પરમં તપ:

શિક્ષણ, સંસ્કૃતિ, સદ્ભાવ, દિવ્યબોધનું ધામ  
ડૉ. બાબાસાહેબ આંબેડકર ઓપન યુનિવર્સિટી નામ;  
સૌને સૌની પાંખ મળે, ને સૌને સૌનું આભ,  
દશે દિશામાં સ્મિત વહે હો દશે દિશે શુભ-લાભ.

અભણ રહી અજ્ઞાનના શાને, અંધકારને પીવો ?  
કહે બુદ્ધ આંબેડકર કહે, તું થા તારો દીવો;  
શારદીય અજવાળા પહોંચ્યાં ગુર્જર ગામે ગામ  
ધ્રુવ તારકની જેમ ઝળહળે એકલવ્યની શાન.

સરસ્વતીના મયૂર તમારે ફળિયે આવી ગહેકે  
અંધકારને હડસેલીને ઉજાસના ફૂલ મહેકે;  
બંધન નહીં કો સ્થાન સમયના જવું ન ઘરથી દૂર  
ઘર આવી મા હરે શારદા દૈન્ય તિમિરના પૂર.

સંસ્કારોની સુગંધ મહેકે, મન મંદિરને ધામે  
સુખની ટપાલ પહોંચે સૌને પોતાને સરનામે;  
સમાજ કેરે દરિયે હાંકી શિક્ષણ કેરું વહાણ,  
આવો કરીયે આપણ સૌ  
ભવ્ય રાષ્ટ્ર નિર્માણ...  
દિવ્ય રાષ્ટ્ર નિર્માણ...  
ભવ્ય રાષ્ટ્ર નિર્માણ

