

# Indian Interference in Balochistan: Analysing the Evidence and Implications for Pakistan

Mir Sherbaz Khetran \*

## Abstract

*An Indian serving naval officer, Kulbhushan Yadav got arrested by the law enforcement agencies of Pakistan in March 2016, when he was trying to enter Pakistan from the Saravan region, located in Balochistan, Pakistan. India's involvement has created serious implications for the national security and economic progress of Pakistan. Furthermore, this may eventually lead to permanent instability in the region. The United Nations (UN) was also provided with the dossiers of the Indian patronage to the insurgent groups in Balochistan by the Government of Pakistan (GoP) regarding terrorist activities being funded and monitored by the Research Analysis Wing (RAW) — the Indian intelligence agency. The paper argues that the Indian interference in the neighbouring countries, particularly in Pakistan, is causing instability. It will try to examine the Indian interference in its neighbourhood in the light of The Arthashastra, a book written by Kautilya during the Chandragupta Maurya's reign. What choices does a resilient Pakistan have in order to counter the consequences of a hegemonic India in the light of Kautilya's theory? Suppression of an immediate neighbour (Pakistan) and friendship with the distant neighbours (Afghanistan and Iran) is what the theory suggests.*

**Keywords:** Indo-Pak Relations, Regional Instability, Indian Interference, CPEC, Gwadar Port, Balochistan, Insurgency, RAW.

## Introduction

India has been interfering in Pakistan's domestic affairs for decades. The dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971, and the making of Bangladesh is a solid precedence already acknowledged by the Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, during his visit to Bangladesh in June 2015. The international community has witnessed the brutalities of Mukti Bahini in

---

\* The author is Research Fellow at the Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad.

East Pakistan which eventually led to an Indo-Pakistan war in 1971. The interference has been unstoppable ever since while keeping the hostilities alive between the two nations.

Since Balochistan has been politically and economically a neglected area, its vulnerabilities provided enough fodder to the foreign involvement once again. GoP has also invariably identified the Indian and foreign interference in Balochistan since past decades.<sup>1</sup> Pakistan has repeatedly brought the issue of foreign involvement in Pakistan's domestic affairs to the international fore. Though, to find an evidence of the interference, particularly by another country to support insurgencies in their rival countries, has always been an uphill task. The Indian history of spying is very old and, even in the ancient times of Kautilya the system of espionage was used for getting information about the neighbouring states and the enemies.<sup>2</sup> India's history of espionage in the neighbouring countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Nepal, Myanmar, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, in the modern times is equally daunting.

*The Arthashastra* dealt with the state affairs, state expansion and how to control the neighbouring states, by coercion or direct use of force.<sup>3</sup> Spies were trained in the special sciences of the interpretation to be proficient in the art of disguises and the secret language of the spies.<sup>4</sup>

India still believes in Kautilya's approach to resolve the territorial disputes. The nature of relationship with the immediate neighbouring countries also follows Kautilya's philosophy. Kautilya's *The Arthashastra* is considered as an ancient treatise on statecraft. Kautilya held the post of Prime Minister to the Indian King Chandragupta Maurya (BC 317-293 BC). He was considered as the first king who ruled over

---

<sup>1</sup> Saleem Mazhar, Umbreen Javaid and Naheed Goraya, "Balochistan: From Strategic Significance to US Involvement," *Journal of Political Studies*, vol. 19, no.1 (2012).

<sup>2</sup> S M Hali, "RAW at War-genesis of Secret, Agencies in Ancient India," *Defence Journal* (February-March 2009), <http://www.defencejournal.com/feb-mar99/raw-at-war.htm>

<sup>3</sup> Ilhan Niaz, "Kautilya's Arthashastra and Governance as an Element of State Power," [http://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/1302497993\\_49710591.pdf](http://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/1302497993_49710591.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

the Indian subcontinent. Kautilya was the exponent of a welfare state but also believed in waging war for preserving the power of the state. This book has defined the governing rule; economic policy; the character of equality; the nature of alliance; inferior and superior kings; forms of agreement made by an inferior king; neutrality after proclaiming war or after concluding a treaty and military strategy as a policy of peace and war.<sup>5</sup> Kautilya was of the view that a defenceless king of a neighbouring state should obey the orders of a conquered king and adopt the policy of a powerful neighbour. Furthermore, he elaborated that when one of the neighbouring states has failed to maintain its territorial integrity it descends into internal instability, and thereby increases the numbers of enemies.<sup>6</sup> In this condition, it becomes very difficult to defend the territorial integrity of the state. Dangers increase more often and an inappropriate king is imposed on them.

Recently, the Indian spying network has been exposed in Pakistan, when eight members of the Indian High Commission in Islamabad got expelled from Pakistan in November 2016. They were found involved in creating trouble and social unrest<sup>7</sup> and were working undercover for their intelligence bureau. Pakistan's Foreign Office claimed that they have contacts with the Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), which is a terrorist organisation in Pakistan. This issue has been raised in almost every meeting between the Indian and Pakistani leadership.<sup>8</sup> They have been, time and again, reminded of their support for the Baloch Separatists and TTP to destabilise Pakistan through India's expanded presence in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is also being named as a facilitator of the Baloch insurgents. It is believed that the training camps, weapons, and money are all being routed through Afghanistan.<sup>9</sup> The arrest of

---

<sup>5</sup> R P Kangle, 2nd ed., trans, *Kautilya, the Arthashastra Part II* (Delhi: Motilal Banaridass, 1992).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> "Secretary Clinton Meets Indian Prime Minister Singh," *Wikileaks*, US Diplomatic Cable, December 4, 2009, [https://wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/09STATE124358\\_a.html](https://wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/09STATE124358_a.html)

<sup>8</sup> "Proof of Raw Involvement in Terror Acts Given to India," *Dawn*, July 22, 2009, <https://www.dawn.com/news/849730>

<sup>9</sup> "Indian Raw Operating Against Pakistan," *Asian Defence*, <http://www.asian-defence.net/2012/06/indian-raw-operating-against-pakistan.html>

Kulbhushan Yadev in Balochistan is yet another evidence of the Indian interference in Pakistan.<sup>10</sup>

In June 2015, the Indian Prime Minister Modi, during his visit to Bangladesh openly admitted that India was involved in the activities to destabilise Pakistan.<sup>11</sup> He expressed his views that India had no regrets for assisting Mukti-Bahini Movement for creating Bangladesh.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, he elaborated that he was one of the young volunteers who came to Delhi in 1971, to participate in the Satyagraha Movement, launched by Jana Sangh, as a volunteer to support Mukti-Bahini.<sup>13</sup>

GoP took a serious notice of this statement. Advisor to the Prime Minister on Foreign Affairs, Sartaj Aziz, stated that the Indian Prime Minister's remarks in Bangladesh that India supported the Mukti-Bahani forces be considered a confessional statement about interference in the internal affairs of the erstwhile East Pakistan.<sup>14</sup> He further stated that Modi's statement had an objective to create anti-Pakistan sentiments in Bangladesh. Furthermore, he called upon the UN to take serious notice of the Indian Prime Minister's statement which is a clear violation of the UN Charter (UNGA 2131XX 1965) on external interference.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the UN, Ambassador Maleeha Lodhi, has also submitted a dossier on India's interference and terrorism in Pakistan to the UN Secretary General, Antonio Guterres. The dossier contains all the information and evidences of the interference of the RAW, and its involvement in the terrorist activities in Balochistan,

---

<sup>10</sup> "Capture of Spy Proves Interference in Pakistan: Army," *Dawn*, March 30, 2016, <https://www.dawn.com/news/1248776>

<sup>11</sup> "Indian Forces Fought Along MuktiBahini: Modi," *News*, June 08, 2015, <https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/12923-indian-forces-fought-along-mukti-bahini-modi>

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> "PM Narendra Modi Blames Pakistan for Creating 'Nuisance' and 'Promoting' Terrorism," *Indian Express*, June 08, 2015, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/899666/indian-pm-modi-accuses-pakistan-of-promoting-terrorism/>

<sup>14</sup> "Modi Remarks in Bangladesh to Sour our Ties with Bangladesh: Pak Hits out at India," *First Post*, July 14, 2017, <http://www.firstpost.com/world/modis-remarks-bangladesh-sour-ties-bangladesh-pakistan-hits-india-2289254.html>

<sup>15</sup> "Modi's Remarks in Bangladesh Aimed at Fanning Hatred against Pakistan," *Times of India*, June 10, 2015.

Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and Karachi.<sup>16</sup> The terrorist activities, being carried out by India are a clear violation of the UN Charter, the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) on counter-terrorism and international conventions on terrorism.

### **United Nations Charter on External Interference: Legal Implications**

There is no doubt that the principle of non-intervention remains a well-settled part of the International Law based on a state's right to sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence. The 'Friendly Relations Declaration' includes an entire section on the principle concerning the duties of a state not to interfere in the matters as within the domestic jurisdiction of another state, in accordance with the UN Charter.<sup>17</sup> The charter suggests that no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason, whatsoever, in the internal or external affairs of any state. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against a state or against its political, economic and cultural elements have been condemned in the charter. No state may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another state in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure its advantages of any kind. Furthermore, no state shall organise, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist, or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another state, or interfere in civil strife in another state. In 1965, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted a Declaration on the Inadmissibility of the Intervention and Interference in the Domestic Affairs of States (UNGA resolution 2131 (XX) 1965).<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> "Pakistan Submits Proofs of India's Involvement in Cross Border Terrorism to UN Chief," *Dawn*, January 06, 2017.

<sup>17</sup> Edward McWhinney, "General Assembly Resolution 2131 (XX) of December 1965 Declaration of the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of the State and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty," December 21, 1965, [http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ha/ga/ga\\_2131-xx/ga\\_2131-xx\\_e.pdf](http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ha/ga/ga_2131-xx/ga_2131-xx_e.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> United Nations General Assembly, "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty — UN Documents: Gathering a body of global agreements," United Nations Documents, A/RES/20/2131, <http://www.un-documents.net/a20r2131.htm>.

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) on existence of the principle in the Nicaragua case decided that the US, by training, arming, equipping, financing and providing the rival forces or otherwise encouraging, supporting and aiding military and paramilitary activities against Nicaragua has acted against the Republic of Nicaragua, in breach of its obligation under customary international law not to intervene in the affairs of another state.<sup>19</sup>

## **Theoretical Framework**

Nation-states are constantly undergoing change. The relations between the states, however, are premised on the fundamental principle of avoiding interference in domestic affairs and respecting territorial boundaries. The adversarial relations between the states mean that the states will engage in a foreign policy designed to gain advantage of vulnerabilities of their opponent. Kautilya has been credited with the first known instance of statecraft designed to interfere in domestic affairs of the neighbouring states.

The common understanding, Kautilya propounded in his theory that:

- i An immediate neighbouring state is an enemy and;
- ii A neighbour's neighbour, separated from oneself by the intervening enemy, is a friend.<sup>20</sup>

In today's world, the emerging significance of geo-economics rather than the geo-politics has been playing a vital role in promoting bilateral and multilateral relations. The territorial integrity of the states has faced constant challenges from their adversaries. It has, over centuries, become a permanent feature of the international system. This idea has challenged the theory of non-interference and marks it invalid. More and more interventions have been seen which have violated the UN Charter of the sovereign states because the states are forced to live with the interference while combating the intervention. Non-interference does not allow the equal sovereign states to intervene in each other's internal affairs.

---

<sup>19</sup> "Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America), 1986 Judgement," *International Court of Justice*, <http://www.icj-cij.org/files/case-related/70/070-19860627-JUD-01-00-EN.pdf>.

<sup>20</sup> L N Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra* (London: Penguin 1987),109-110.

However, some states have found it advantageous to intervene in the affairs of others to grind their own axe.<sup>21</sup>

Nevertheless, Kautilya has assumed that every nation sought power maximisation for gaining more influence and therefore, moral principles have no force in actions among interstate relations. Furthermore, it is perceived good to have a friend and making the alliance as long as it protects one's own self-interest. As a political realist, he believed that an alliance is very important for securing a state's own interests as well as balancing the growth of its enemy's power.<sup>22</sup> *The Arthashastra* described two objectives:

- i The administrative matters of the state and;
- ii The role of king in the acquisition of territory and expansion of the state to create good relations with the extended neighbours and wage a war for peace with its immediate neighbouring states.<sup>23</sup>

This approach identifies the concept of hegemony over the neighbouring and regional countries that lead to confrontation. According to Kautilya's approach, the state's immediate neighbours are to be considered its enemies and the extended neighbours have to be considered as friends. Perhaps in modern time, this approach looks very vague. Today, the states are involved in regional integration, whereas India is already obstructing the idea and still operating in the context of hostility towards its neighbours.

### **Indian Interest in Balochistan**

China and Pakistan have enjoyed friendly and multi-dimensional relations since the beginning of their diplomatic relations in 1951. This mutual relationship has always remained warm and has been termed as "all weather

---

<sup>21</sup> Kohn Agnew, "The Territorial Trap: The Geographic Assumptions of International Relations Theory," *Review of International Political Economy*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring 1994).

<sup>22</sup> Roger Boesche, "Arthashastra on War and Diplomacy in Ancient India," *The Journal of Military History*, vol. 67, no. 1 (January 2003), <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/40432/summary>

<sup>23</sup> Kangle. *Kautilya, the Arthashastra Part II*.

or time-tested friendship.”<sup>24</sup> China and Pakistan also enjoy strong military relations and this has been particularly true in terms of growing military cooperation.<sup>25</sup> The significant geo-strategic location of Pakistan in the South Asian region compels both countries to come closer. The main reason for their ever growing military relations is primarily to balance the Indian influence in the region. To safeguard the national interests with respect to India, it has remained a matter of concern for Pakistan’s foreign policy. The economic and strategic significance of Pakistan has brought it to centre of the regional geopolitics. Beijing, on its part, seeks stability in Pakistan and in Southern Asia and Afghanistan, too. By supporting the build-up of Pakistan defence capabilities, China is addressing Pakistan’s security concerns so that it can play a constructive role in the regional peace and stability.

India has raised various concerns over the Chinese investment in Pakistan,<sup>26</sup> and it also feels threatened by the Chinese growing military modernisation and her special military relationships with Pakistan. It keeps a close eye on China’s economic rise, energy and geo-political interests as well as its growing military presence for securing the sea lanes of communication in the region.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, China’s maritime and energy requirements have motivated its leadership to expand relationship with Pakistan. India fears that China has been expanding its footprints in Southern Asia, which will prove detrimental to the Indian interests. China has established cordial relations with the South Asian sates. China has also constructed a seaport in Hambantota, Sri Lanka, and offered to construct a seaport in Chittagong, Bangladesh that will pose serious threats for the Indian maritime security. During a press conference on February 06, 2013, Defence Minister of India, A K

---

<sup>24</sup> Andrew Small, *The China-Pakistan Axis: Asia’s New Geopolitics* (London: Hurst Publishers, 2015).

<sup>25</sup> “Transfers of Major Weapons: Deals with Deliveries or Orders Made for 2001 to 2016 (From China to Pakistan),” *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute*, July 14, 2017, [http://armstrade.sipri.org/armstrade/page/trade\\_register.php](http://armstrade.sipri.org/armstrade/page/trade_register.php)

<sup>26</sup> Official spokesperson’s response to a query on participation of India in OBOR/BRI Forum, Ministry of External Affairs, May 13, 2017, <http://mea.gov.in/media-briefings.htm?dtl/28463/Official+Spokespersons+response+to+a+query+on+participation+of+India+in+OBORBRI+Forum>

<sup>27</sup> Andrew S Erickson, “The Growth of China’s Navy: Implications for Indian Ocean Security,” *Strategic Analysis*, vol. 32, no. 4 (July-2008).



Antony, stated that “it is a matter of concern for India” that China is taking control of Gwadar port in the Arabian Sea.<sup>28</sup> The Gwadar port<sup>29</sup> can be strategically important for different reasons such as its proximity to the strategic Strait of Hormuz and the Persian Gulf.

The consecutive statements of the Indian National Security Advisor and Prime Minister Modi on Balochistan manifested their concerns on the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). On the pretext of the 2008 Mumbai Attacks,<sup>30</sup> both Modi and Ajit Davol have been trying to justify the interference of RAW in Balochistan.<sup>31</sup> Soon after the statement of Davol, Yadav was arrested by the law enforcement agencies of Pakistan in March 2016, in Balochistan. Yadav further revealed that “my purpose was to hold meetings with the Baloch insurgents and carry out terrorist activities with their collaboration.”<sup>32</sup>

## **History of Indian Interference in the Neighbouring Countries**

India has a history of interference in the domestic affairs of its neighbouring countries. With the goal to establish hegemony in South Asia and the Indian Ocean Region, India has adopted an Indo-centric strategy.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, from the beginning in 1950s and 1960s, India indulged in conflicts with China (1962 war), Pakistan (three wars), Nepal (India interfered in the internal

---

<sup>28</sup> “India ‘Concerned’ over China Running Gwadar Port,” *Express Tribune*, February 6, 2013, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/503373/india-concerned-over-china-running-gwadar-port/>

<sup>29</sup> Gwadar port has great prospects of transforming not only the economy of Pakistan but also the region. Gwadar port offers numerous economic opportunities to China and its geo-strategic location can provide a position where China can easily secure its interest and sea lanes of communications in the India Ocean. Gwadar port is the shortest and most feasible route to sea for Afghanistan and most Central Asia states, and for the parts of Russia, especially during winter when most of its ports are closed.

<sup>30</sup> In November 2008, Pakistan-based militants launched coordinated attacks on various sites in Mumbai, leading to an Indo-Pak crisis. India blamed Pakistani security agencies for supporting militant attacks. Pakistan denied it.

<sup>31</sup> “Transcript of RAW Agent Kulbhushan’s Confessional Statement,” *Dawn*, March 30, 2016, <http://www.dawn.com/news/1248786>

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> Rohan Mukharjee and David M Malone, “Indian Foreign Policy and Contemporary Security Challenges,” *International Affairs*, vol. 87, no.1 (January 2011): 87-88.

affairs of the royal family) and Sri Lanka (India supported the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (LTTE) in the Sri Lankan civil war). The aims of pursuing such policies of interference are meant to destabilise the neighbouring states and influence their foreign policy. Although India has not been successful yet her increasing hostility with the neighbouring countries will disturb the regional peace. India always promoted and supported the sub-nationalism, secessionist movements, and insurgencies, which aim to undermine the regional peace and stability. India aspires to be the police man of the region but Pakistan has become a main obstacle in the Indian way for controlling the affairs of the South Asian region.

### *Indian Interference in Bangladesh and Sri Lanka*

The wrangles between the two major political parties of Pakistan, the Awami League and the Peoples Party (PPP), were started in the 1970s which effectively represented the individual wings of Pakistan that further widen the gap and ended up with Pakistan's eventual breakup. The Awami League branded itself as the political saviour of Bangladesh. Subsequently, after separation from Pakistan, Sheikh Mujeebur Rahman became the Prime Minister of Bangladesh. He announced a five years development plan to stabilise Bangladesh from the destructions of the 1971 war. After four years of independence, on August 15, 1975, he was assassinated along with his family and advisors by a group of junior officers of the Bangladesh Army. India tried to control Bangladesh and the current government of Prime Minister, Sheikh Hasina Wazed, is closely aligned with India. The death sentences awarded to senior Jamat-e-Islami members in Bangladesh were the clear message that the pro-Pakistani sentiments will be treated with iron hands. This is the reflection of the Indian policies in Bangladesh.<sup>34</sup>

Similarly, India also tried to destabilise Sri Lanka, a relatively small country. India provided financial and material support to LTTE.<sup>35</sup> This ethnic conflict lasted for nearly three decades leaving drastic

---

<sup>34</sup> Amna Mahmood, Sadaf Farooq and Nadia Awan, "Bangladesh Pakistan Relations: A Hostage to History," *International Journal of Contemporary Research*, vol. 5, no. 2 (April 2015): 66-67.

<sup>35</sup> "Funding Terror: The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam and their Criminal Activities in Canada and the Western World," *Mackenzie Institute*, March 17, 2000, <http://www.lankalibrary.com/pol/funding%20LTTE.htm>

consequences for the region and highlighted the Indian hostile policy towards its neighbouring countries. The Indian government acquiesced the brutal killings in Sri Lanka as an armed tactics for influencing the Sri Lankan government. It is the reflection of India's long-standing policy of involvement in the neighbouring states. The Indian military and foreign policy towards the regional states is too interventionist and the India's paramount concern is to create disturbances in the region for establishing its regional hegemony.

India's hegemonic programme and its aspirations to create threat perceptions for the smaller neighbouring states has become an issue of security concern for them. Other members of the South Asian region see India's growing military power as a warning signal for future military interventions in the neighbouring states. India's military involvement in the Sri Lankan conflict suggests that India's growing military will become a danger for the regional states and India will be able to influence directly in the domestic affairs of other countries. Although, it was the violation of the international law but India claimed that the action was taken for securing the economic and humanitarian interests along with Sri Lanka in the Indian Ocean region. India is a signatory to the UN Charter and has made significant contributions to its peacekeeping efforts. Its critical policies towards the regional states, however, contradicts the stance of regional connectivity and manifests its preferences for hegemonic policies.

### *Indian Interference in Pakistan*

India's continuous interference in Pakistan's affairs can be traced back to the times of independence from the British rule. India and Pakistan have fought three major wars on the Kashmir issue. Unfortunately, the issue remains unsettled till today. India's military involvement in East Pakistan (currently Bangladesh) in 1971, was an example of the illegal use of force for the accomplishment of political and security objectives as stated by Subrahmaniyam, the then Director of Indian Institute of Defence Studies, said that "what India must realise that the breakup of Pakistan is in our interest and an opportunity which will never come again,"<sup>36</sup> while addressing a symposium on March 31, 1971.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ikram Rabbani, *Comprehensive Pakistan Studies* (Lahore: Caravan Book, 2005), 154.

After the election in 1970, an unfortunate political scenario emerged when East and West Pakistan were represented by the two different political parties with none of them securing any representation in the other part of the country. This extreme polarisation, coupled with the excessive demands put forward by Sheikh Mujeeb Rahman, made the transfer of power difficult. Resultantly, riots and large scale protest started against President General Yahya Khan.

On the other hand, Yahya Khan found it difficult to immediately accept those demands because of the political unrest, and the heavy military presence in East Pakistan. President Yahya Khan refused to accept Mujeeb's demands. Eventually, civil disobedience started in East Pakistan. As the situation in East Pakistan deteriorated, the Indian government took advantage by supporting and arming Mukti Bahini, a militant rebel group for creating social and political chaos.<sup>37</sup> The speech of Subrahmaniyam referenced above clearly supports the argument.

Furthermore, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs deliberately played a damaging role in promoting the propaganda against Pakistan. The Indian officials visited Moscow, London, New York, Washington D.C., Ottawa, Paris and Bonn. The main objectives of the visits were to create anti-Pakistan sentiments at the international forums. They tried to get the international support against Pakistan. At the same time, the Nixon administration was staunchly pro-Pakistan. However, despite its support, the disintegration of Pakistan could not be averted. India portrayed Pakistan very negatively in the case of East Pakistan. The Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace and Friendship in August 1971, was signed. The Indian ambition of a military adventure in East Pakistan was, hence, clearly displayed and this treaty increased security anxieties of Pakistan. This treaty can be analysed as Kautilya's policy of peace and war.

The political uprising was planned. It was started by the Indian intelligence agencies in East Pakistan, which led to the disintegration of Pakistan.<sup>38</sup> There were many reasons that why the Indian military intervention was supported in East Pakistan:

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Liaqat Bokhari, "An Eye Witness to India's Role in East Pakistan," *Hilal*, September 2015 <http://hilal.gov.pk/index.php/layouts/item/1590-an-eyewitness-to-india-s-role-in-east-pakistan>

- i An independent Bangladesh would mean the weakening of Pakistan and it would be beneficial for India to maintain its hegemony in the region;
- ii A secular, friendly Bangladesh will greatly strengthen the Indian secularism and also weaken Pakistani case on the Kashmir issue, and ultimately bury the “Two-Nation Theory” forever;
- iii A friendly Bangladesh will provide a natural market for the Indian goods.<sup>39</sup>

Since 1947 to date, the Indian authorities continue to believe that a fragile Pakistan is in the interests of India, therefore, RAW started its atrocious activities to disintegrate Pakistan. India has also been patronising the insurgency in Balochistan since 1948.<sup>40</sup> This has undermined Pakistan’s security and economic progress. The Indian security officials have been maintaining close contacts with the Baloch rebels. The Indian officials have held meetings with the Baloch rebels in London to keep track of the events. It speaks volumes of its support to the Baloch insurgents.<sup>41</sup> However, with reference to the commencement of the CPEC, India started feeling uncomfortable since the visit of the Chinese President, Xi Jinping, in April 2015. The Chinese presence in Gwadar has been perceived as a threat to Indian ambitions of regional hegemony as Gwadar holds immense strategic and economic significance for Pakistan.

## Conclusion

India’s ambition to gain hegemony in the region, old grievances against Pakistan and the game-changer project of CEPC are the factors which compel India to adopt an aggressive and unlawful approach towards Pakistan. The Indian involvement in Balochistan and other parts of Pakistan is the witness that India does not want Pakistan as an economically

---

<sup>39</sup> Onkar Marwah, “India’s Military Intervention in East Pakistan, 1971-1972,” *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 13, no. 04:14.

<sup>40</sup> Ann Wilkans, “The Crowded-out Conflict: Pakistan’s Balochistan’s in its Fifth Round of Insurgency,” *Afghanistan Analysts Network*, November 16, 2015, <https://www.afghanistan-analysts.org/the-crowded-out-conflict-pakistans-balochistan-in-its-fifth-round-of-insurgency/>

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

and militarily powerful country. The Indian spying network is also involved in promoting terrorist activities in Pakistan, which aim to destabilise Pakistan and label it as a failed state. Pakistan keeps a vigilant eye on the turbulent situation of the region and assured China that Pakistan Army will ensure security of the CPEC. However, India's strong presence in Afghanistan is creating security challenges for Pakistan. Pakistan's civilian and military leadership are well aware of the Indian interference in Pakistan, therefore, a dossier on the Indian involvement in Pakistan's internal affairs was sent to the UN. The Indian interference in the domestic affairs of the regional countries is a blatant violation of the international law and the UN Charter. The UN is strongly urged to sanction India based on the dossier submitted by Pakistan so that India could be deterred in future from interfering in the internal affairs of its neighbouring states.