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Introduction

20th century wasn’t fruitful of comprehensive regional security analysis theories. During the Cold War, regional studies were dominated by functionalist and neo-functionalist approaches, their analysis were mostly based on economic and political integration. While theorising about European integration (as benchmark), political scientists interested in prevention of war through creating a socially and politically integrated security communities. After some insights on security communities, regional systems and regional integration (Russet 1967, Nye 1968, Spiegel 1970, Haas 1970, Deutsch 1957, Kaiser 1968, Thompson 1973), scholars turned away from the analysis of regional level. Ideas were put on ice, because of the slowdown in European integration, also due to the failure to adopt European model in other Southern regions (for example in Latin America), and finally regional analysis was discouraged “by the success of theories of neorealism and neoliberalism that arose during 1970’s, eclipsing the regional approach”.

The global overlay of Cold War masked regional variations. Local security systems existed, but they were overshadowed by the ability of external powers to “move directly into the local [security] complex with the effect of suppressing the indigenous security dynamic”. The end of the bipolar conflict has led to renewed interest in regions as fundamental arenas for cooperation and conflict.

Changes in the international system and new security challenges were expected to push the development of regionalism, providing order and stability in the regions. Obviously the new wave of regional studies is strongly associated with transformations in international system after the end of Cold War. In this context, regional powers that arise in regions have new stronger capabilities, growing economies, political will and possibilities to manage regional security.

---

Besides, some regions are increasingly becoming independent and interdependent actors within international system and act as single unite regional powers.

The aim of this paper is, combining theoretical assumptions of few regional security approaches based on English Scholl tradition and constructivism\(^7\) to analyse security dynamics in South Asian region, to find the basic aspects of the interplay between three analysis levels (national, regional and systemic) and to consider which level could be crucial for power transition within the region. Besides, the paper explore the regionalization processes in South Asia, analyse the impact of internal power division and polarity of international system to regional security dynamics. South Asian security analysis combine two perspectives: regional security relations within the region and impact of unipolarity and other great powers from outside.

**Approaches of regional security analysis**

The region is theoretically interesting because it presumes an expression of security needs that is generated “below” the international (system) level but “above” the state level\(^8\). Regional level of analysis is becoming increasingly popular among scholars of international relations. Traditional views concerning the state-centric regional system are being challenged by the concentration of political and military power at the top as well as by transnational networks built around economic ties and cultural identities\(^9\). New wave of regional security theories encounter variation of different forms of regionalism, emergence of new non-state actors, impact of globalization processes that make regions porous, problems with geographical proximity, interaction between political, economic and social spheres, power division within the region, strong interplay between national, regional and systemic levels. As Raimo Vayrynen points out: “with trend toward economic globalization as well as with increasing complexity of international relations, the concept “region” risks becoming an empty idea”\(^10\), encompassing everything and at the same time minimizing the possibility of analysis. Therefore scholars face great challenge to

---

\(^7\) Paper explores Regional security complex theory and approach of New regionalism also paper explore insights of Securitization theory and to a certain level the idea of emergence of security community.


\(^10\) Ibid.
form theoretical model which would be adequate, operational and suitable for analysis of past, present and future of regional security dynamics.

As Marry Farrel pointed out “just there are many models of regionalism around the world, with no dominant paradigm to which all countries and regions subscribe, so too we can find a degree of diversity in how regionalist processes are understood and conceptualized in the literature”. During the last decade of 20th century and in the beginning of 21st century emerged/reemerged a variety of regional security approaches (so called regionalist perspectives): Regional order theory (D.Lake, P.Morgan), New regionalism approach/theory (B.Hettne, F.Soderbaum,), Theory of regional war and peace (B.Miller), K.Deutsch’s security communities idea proceeded by E.Adler and M.Barnet, the peace-stability zone analysis (A.Kacowicz), security regimes (R.Jervis), idea of international concerts (Ch.Kupchan), and many other single – authored studies have come forward proposing distinct theories about regional security but applying the theory only to one or two cases. None of these works has attempted to comprehensively delineate the boundaries of all security regions in the world or to articulate a theoretical approach that helps to understand the relationship among regions or among the various levels of analysis. Only the few succeeded to develop more comprehensive frameworks for analysis: D.Lake’s and P.Morgan’s (1997) approach of regional orders, B.Buzan and O.Weaver (1991, 2003) proposed mixture of Regional security complex and Securitization theories, B.Hettne’s and F.Soderbaum’s approach of New regionalism. None of them succeeded to explain clearly the regional security dynamics, power division inside the regional, transition of power division and the interplay between the national, regional and systemic levels.

Impact of system on regional analysis level (Outside-in vs. Inside-out)

There is highly debated which analysis level has the strongest impact on regional security dynamics. Given the configuration of the international arena as a battlefield for great power politics, realists viewed regions as an “anomaly” i.e. a sort of unwanted formation that could not be accounted for. Realists in the first place put systemic power division and state

---

level, naturally, the opponents from the regionalist corner take into consideration regions, regional actors, and institutions. Regional order theory states that the most important are regional structure and power division inside the region, regional security complex theory look to both (systemic and regional) factors in combined manner.

For a long time studies of security within international relations has been dominated by state- and system-based approaches such as realism and neorealism. The fundamental logic of realism suggests that any discussion of regional order must proceed from an analysis of the global distribution of power. According to those theories – power hierarchy subordinates lower levels of analysis (system->region->state->individual), and there is no difference in type of systemic power polarity (multipolar, bipolar or unipolar system). Fate of regions in realism is primarily defined by the power relations between system-level actors and regional-level actors and the interests the later arouse former. These approaches have typically expresses security interests from the perspective of elite positions, from the “top – down/outside-in” logics. These approaches suggest that it is impossible to understand regional dynamics without focusing on the broader international context within which regional orders are embedded and take into account the influence of external pressures and incentives working vis-à-vis the region.

The neo-realist perspective imparts little in terms of the domestic level and interdependence within the sub-system/regional level. Neo-realists state, that systemic distribution of power has impact on regional processes and regional order: power of systemic actors must be superior to that of regional ones and the regional powers have interest in systemic powers for their own/local purposes. The more region is perceived as adding to the security or relative power of a systemic actor, the more it is valued and the greater the probability that the latter will try to establish control over the whole region or some of its actors.

Regionalists agree on impact of system level during the Cold War, when superpower competition was clearly reflected in regional level. All regional conflicts around the world were strongly supported by struggle of super powers, regional conflicts mirrored superpower
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15 Walt, Hansen discuss regional level empirically without considering its theoretical standing or implications except as an offshoot of the global level.
19 Miller, Benjamin. The Sources of Regional War and Peace: Integrating the Effects of Nationalism, Liberalism and the International system, www.yale.edu/irspeakers/Miller.doc (accessed 2007-04-21)
competition not in straight manner, but by backing rival sides. During the Cold War existed local security systems, but at the same time they were overshadowed by the ability of external powers to move directly into the local security complex with the effect of suppressing the indigenous security dynamics\textsuperscript{22}. The end of Cold War dramatically changed the nature of regional conflicts around the world by ending patronage of local combatants\textsuperscript{23}.

Some authors (R.Vayrynen, D.Lake) perceive that the collapse of bipolarity “has reduced the effects of the global system on regional security dynamics and national decisions”\textsuperscript{24}. That argument is followed by assumption that “there is a high degree of autonomy of regional security dynamics from global developments”\textsuperscript{25}. In globalised, interconnected world there can be no wholly self-contained regions, immune from outside inputs\textsuperscript{26}. At the same time, as points out B.Miller, external great powers are able and willing at most to mitigate, rather than resolve, the nation-to-state problems in the region, and thus they may only affect lower level cold outcomes, which do not demand the resolution of these problems\textsuperscript{27}. Global polarity is among the conditions that enable or constrain various possible polarities regionally, but within the regional level, whether the region is bipolar, multipolar or unipolar generally tells one more about regional security than does global polarity in which it is embedded\textsuperscript{28}.

“Inside-out” (regionalist) approaches state that regional actors respond first of all to local factors and developments because the region is the most important environment that affects their security interests. The Regional environment creates the most direct external threats and opportunities for states\textsuperscript{29}.

Summing up, so called regionalist perspective (D.Lake, P.Morgan, B.Buzan) is rooted in two assumptions: first, that the decline of superpower rivalry reduce the penetrative quality of global power interest in the rest of the world, and second, that most of the great powers in the post-Cold War international system are now “light powers”, meaning that their domestic dynamics pull them away from military engagement and the strategic competition in the trouble

\textsuperscript{25} Benjamin Miller. The Sources of Regional War and Peace: Integrating the Effects of Nationalism, Liberalism and the International system, www.yale.edu/irspeakers/Miller.doc (accesssed 2007-04-21)  
\textsuperscript{27} Miller. Op.cit.  
\textsuperscript{29} Miller. Op.cit.
sports of the world. This statement is questionable, because even being a “light/benign power” US strongly interfere in the regional security dynamics especially in Middle East, Asia-Pacific region, mostly using arguments of fight against nontraditional security threats.

In fact, with lower competition and lower constraints on great power behaviour, multipolarity and unipolarity can allow more or less scope for the regional level than bipolarity. We can presume that global power will be strongly interested in region/regional security and stability if it will have strategic interests there. Obviously the systemic impact do not disappear from regions, just it obtain different forms of interference. Complete autonomy of regional interstate dynamics from global forces has largely remained an illusion both during the Cold War as well as the subsequent period. The great powers are superior to regional states in overall resources. The local actors have, however superior stakes in a conflict in which they are direct participants and in which their key interests, or even their survival, are engaged, while only non-vital interests of great powers are usually involved in remote regional conflicts.

Analysing power division within regions, David Lake define three possible regional structures: unipolar, bipolar and multipolar. Structural constraints only influence the expected range of behavior; they seldom dictate a particular response. Unipolar regional security systems - autonomous and easily manage positive security externalities, in multipolar regions (Asia-Pacific, Middle East) due to appear the competition among poles, those regions are autonomous but plagued by problems of conflict management. Bipolar regional systems will be relatively competitive, security concerns may thwart cooperation. The poles (as it obvious in South Asia) will be more likely to appeal to outside powers for assistance, thereby inciting intervention and reducing autonomy of the regional system.

Neorealist and regionalist approaches are both rooted in territoriality and security, their relationship is potentially complementary. Regionalist perspective should be able to incorporate neorealism’s understanding of the global level into its own multi-level [analysis]

---

34 Ibid, p.60-61.
scheme\textsuperscript{37}, this idea was implemented by B.Buzan and O.Waever in Regional security complex theory (RSCT). Regionalism is best captured by a perspective that combines both sets of relationships, within and beyond the region\textsuperscript{38}.

**Regional security complex theory (NSCT)**

RSCT uses a mixture of constructivist and materialist approaches. On the materialist side it forms ideas of bounded territoriality and distribution of power that are close to those in neorealism\textsuperscript{39}. But it contradicts the tendency of most neorealist analysis to concentrate heavily on the global/system level superiority. B.Buzan challenges conventional neorealism and persuasively argues that power theorists underplay the importance of the regional level in international relations\textsuperscript{40}. According to Buzan’s and Weaver’s criticism, orthodox Waltzian’s often make the error of explaining developments in a given region directly from the global power distribution, but the relevant power structure for the main actors in a region is the regional one\textsuperscript{41}. Authors stress the significance of regional level for security analysis, in this level “the extremes of national and global security interplay, and most of the action occurs”\textsuperscript{42}. Both the security of the separate units and the process of global power intervention can be grasped only through understanding the regional security dynamics\textsuperscript{43}. The relative autonomy of regional security is constructing a pattern of international security relations radically different from the rigid structure of superpower bipolarity that defined the Col War.

RSCT combine “outside –in” and “inside-out” analysis by distinguishing between superpowers, great powers which transcend two or more regions and regional powers whose sphere of action largely contained within a single RSC. RSCT focus on security interdependence negative (conflict formation) or positive (security regime, security community). It uses structure at the regional level (boundaries, anarchy-hierarchy, power polarity, discourses of amity and enmity- securitization and desecritization) both as a benchmark to assess significant change, and as a basis for identifying the most likely pattern of evolution\textsuperscript{44}. Regional dynamics are shaped by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Katzenstein. 1996. Op.cit.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Soderbaum, Frederik. 2002. *Rethinking the New Regionalism*. XIII Nordic Political Science Association meeting, Aalborg 15-17 August, Workshop Session 23: Regions and Regionalisation.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Ibid, p.43.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
patterns of relations among regional states (amity or enmity), by the nature of regional conflicts and by domestic attributes of local states. An important point is that external actors have a much lesser impact on the historical patterns of amity and enmity than they do on distribution of power.

Region refers to the level where states or other units link together sufficiently closely that their securities cannot be considered separate from each other. RSC is defined as “a set of units whose major processes of securitization, desecuritization, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analysed or resolved apart from one another.” The formation of regional security complexes derives from interplay between on the one hand, the anarchic structure and its balance of power consequences, and on the other the pressures of local geographical proximity. Adjacency is potent for security because many threats travel more easily over short distances than long ones. Processes of securitization, and thus the degree of security interdependence, is more intense between the actors inside such complexes than it is between actors inside a complex and those outside it.

RSCs are defined by durable patterns of amity and enmity taking the form of subglobal geographically coherent patterns of security interdependence. Each regional security complex forms its own security pattern by which develops security relations among states in RSC. The basic feature of regional security complex is indifference towards actors which do not belong to security complex. So here quite important role play geographical proximity and historical roots. South Asia provides a clear example where the wars and rivalries of the subcontinent constitute a distinctive pattern that has been little affected by events in Gulf or Southeast Asia.

RSCT provide deepened and widened security perception. Security complexes can be analysed by taking into consideration four levels: domestic, regional, super-regional and global, for example, India can be analysed at four levels: India (as state), as member of South Asian region, in wider context South Asia plus China plus Southeastern Asia, and in global level as in relations with US. Besides interconnectivity among the various levels RSCT shape intersectoral security analysis.

---

48 Ibid. p.45.
49 Ibid.
52 Ibid, p. 46.
First of all, this theory is criticized because of its state-centrism – it can complicate non-state-centric security situation (as transnational terrorism, environmental threats, transnational organized crimes etc.). RSCT critics are not satisfied with security traditionalism, RSCT pay not enough attention to new, asymmetrical, transnational challenges that can easily cross the regional borders. RSCT explain their focus on very traditional security issues by pointing to the broad scope of the *Regions and Powers* book, as territorial proximity is defining feature of regions, deterritorialized security issues like economic security, terrorism, which are often raised from globalist perspectives, do not override territorial security considerations, and in such a way limit the analysis of regional security dynamics. RSCT critics also find the drawbacks in security sectorization, territoriality of analysis, not clear identification of RSC boundaries and boundary transition, not clearly developed idea of regional actorness. Critics are also not satisfied that according RSC theory the powers that are not located within region are not considered a part of the regional security complex.

In conclusion, paying more attention to state – international system interplay, RSCT do not provide theoretical explanation of security dynamics and power division within the region, “the RSCT misses dynamism of a region as level of analysis”. Obviously, B.Buzan and O.Waever have ensured that regions are little more than the sum of their parts, but that is not enough for though analysis of regional security. By the way, RSCT reveal characteristics of regional security analyse, theory provide framework for empirical analysis and by analyzing the interplay between different analysis levels, try to predict the future of regional security complexes.

**Complementation with New regionalism approach (NRA)**

Regions are not formed in vacuum, NRA take into consideration changes in system level and globalization processes, that shape the emerging world order. Regionalism is a heterogeneous, comprehensive, multidimensional phenomenon, taking place in several sectors and often “pushed” by variety of state, market, society and external actors, both inside and outside the region. Regionalisation is seen as a complex process of change taking place simultaneously at three levels: the structure of the world system as a whole, the level of inter-

---

54 Ibid.
regional relations, and the internal pattern of the single region\textsuperscript{57}, this approach trying to avoid state-centristic analysis, do not give meaningful attention to state analysis level. NRA suggests by no means that regions will be unitary, homogenous or discrete units\textsuperscript{58}. B.Hettne and F.Soderbaum make reference to Alexander Wendt’s notion that structure has no existence or causal power apart form the process\textsuperscript{59}. NRA represents a clear break with conventional regional analysis theories. NRT seek to create global comprehensive social theory, which abandons state–centrism in an ontologically fundamental sense.

The basic analysis object of RSCT is state, this theory do not analyse how regions obtain features of actorness. RSCT exclude – European Union as security community, as ideal type of desecuritization, when regional actors do not presume each other as potential threats when region forms as entity with common threat perception, but the actorness of EU RSC theory do not analyse. At the same time, New regionalism forms more subjective understanding of the region. B.Hettne in New regionalism approach (NRA) provides thorough analysis of regional evolution from region as analysis subject to region as single actor in international system.

B.Hettne and F.Soderbaum view to regionalism as primarily a social construct and not necessarily subject to geographic contiguity limitations\textsuperscript{60}. Regions are social constructions and to “observe and describe regionalization is also to participate in the construction of a region”\textsuperscript{61}. For NRA prime movers in new regionalism are agency, actors, visions and strategies more than structure. It is pointed out that regions are not obvious but are a result of shared interests and identities, which are shaped in the process of interaction and intersubjective understanding\textsuperscript{62}. Regions are dynamic configurations open to change and adaptation\textsuperscript{63}.

New Regionalism theory is formed under the umbrella of English School theory, “that regards state behavior as a potential product of binding association among states that manifests itself in the society of states”\textsuperscript{64}. A society of states exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid, p. 114.
the working of common institutions\textsuperscript{65}. Idea of Society of states is explored for formation theoretical levels of regionness, which according to NRA is the basic notion which define region.

In contrast to atomistic RSCT analysis of regional level, NRA introducing five levels of regionness (regional space, regional complex, regional society, regional community and regional institutionalized polity), that “enables to look to regionalism in a holistic perspective\textsuperscript{66}”. Theory presumes that with increasing levels of regionnes the region becomes an actor in its own right, it is being transformed from object to subject\textsuperscript{67}. The crucial criterion for assessing the coherence of a region is therefore its capacity for autonomous conflict management and conflict resolution. Regional objectivity or subjectivity depends on levels of regionness (see Table No.1). Moving through the different levels of regionness, the process of integration and cooperation becomes more complex, heterogeneous and multidimensional\textsuperscript{68}, that makes analysis of security dynamics within regions more complicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.1</th>
<th>Levels of Regionness (NRA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional space</td>
<td>Identify geographical natural physical barriers, mark ecological characteristics (territory, translocal relations developed by people).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional complex</td>
<td>Starting point for regionalization process, emerge through increased social contacts and transactions between previously more isolated groups, dominant role play states. The constituent unites become dependent on each other as on the overall stability of the regional system. Contacts between actors within regional complex are more likely conducted by patterns of enmity than cooperation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional society</th>
<th>De jure – formal region is characterized by the appearance of a number of different actors apart from the states that move towards transcendence of national space, making use of a more rule-based pattern of relations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional community</td>
<td>Active subject with distinctive regional collective identity and institutionalised or informal actor capabilities. Characterized by a mutually reinforcing relationship between the formal region (the community of states) and the real region in which a transnationalised regional society also has a role to play. Cognitive assumption that people in the same region are enveloped by similar principles of identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region – state or regional institutionalized polity</td>
<td>Or regional institutionalized polity is a hypothetical entity constituted out of voluntary evolution of a group of formerly sovereign national communities into a new form of political entity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRA look into regional security dynamics including non-state actors, normative, identity features, also NRA avoid territoriality limits, encompass more different security threats which easily transcend state boundaries, and forms a possibility to analyse region as single actor in international system. This approach is highly criticized because of its euro-centrism, besides this model can not clearly define regions as actors and regions as areas. Also this approach find difficulties in assessing impact of unipolar power on regional level, they presumed that international system after Cold War is becoming multipolar, with emerging a range of regional powers. They do not take into consideration the impact of unipolarity of global system. RSCT have problems in regional security dynamics within the region, NRA – in analysis of outside power impact on regional dynamics.

---

For analysis of security dynamics within the South Asian region and impact of system level and outside powers, this paper provide analysis based on combination of RSCT and NRA. Regional security complex theory (RSCT) helps to divide certain regional security complexes, to analyse their structure, security dynamics, which depend on power division within the region as well as impact of systemic power division. Securitization theory divides certain security threats and finds subjective causes of those threats. Theory of New Regionalism helps to bring into analysis impact of globalization processes, the normative aspect, take into consideration non-state actors, transnational security threats, and forms possibility to look at the region not only as level of analysis but as analysis object. By combination of those theoretical approaches (avoiding the basic drawbacks of each approach) appears a possibility to analyse more thorough regional security dynamics.

**Power division within South Asian region**

South Asian region at the same time is a single subcontinent which is separated from other parts of Asia by mountains in the North and water (Arabian Sea, Bay of Bengal and Indian Ocean) in the South. This region/regional security complex was formed on the basis of unique civilization, after the end of British colonial raj. South Asian region comprises seven countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. This region is important center for Hinduism, Sikhism, Jainism, Buddhism and Islam.

Former President of United States Bill Clinton described South Asia as the most dangerous place on Earth. Over half a century after independence, the nations of South Asia remain mired in vicious cycle of poverty, deprivation and underdevelopment. The region represents one and a half billion people or one quarter of the world’s population, almost half of whom live in extreme poverty and are classified as falling below the World Bank’s 1$ a day poverty line. Those countries remain at the bottom of world social and human development indicators (see Table No.2, p.30).

The region is comprised by huge variety of ethnic, linguistic groups, state boundaries usually do not match linguistic, ethnic lines. Partly because of linguistic, religious, ethnic, cultural variety, this region never was politically unite. That determined the high number of conflicts within the region. Virtually all the countries of the region are subject to myriad inter-

---

group conflicts, the majority of which are peacefully negotiated, but in many occasions they have spilled over into violent riots, insurgencies and even civil war.

South Asia during the Cold War had turbulent and often violent domestic politics fuelled by ethnic and religious differences and, since ethnic and religious affiliations often crossed national borders, there was strong interplay between the domestic and regional levels in South Asian insecurity. In region the dissolution of Europe’s empires and the competition of the superpowers to sponsor statehood for these developing peoples produced multiple centers of power and conflict.

This region is highly involved in various inter-state, intra-state and extra-regional conflicts (see Map No.1, p.32). Pakistan remains subject to serious Sunni-Shia violence and from the violent repercussions of the instability in Afghanistan since the late 1970s. Nepal has since 1996 been in the throes of a full-fledged civil war. Sri Lanka is in an unstable peace after 20 years of civil war. India has internal insurgencies in Kashmir, Punjab, Assam. Many studies analyse the causes of those Southern Asian conflicts, most of them define problems of nation building, multiplicity of actors with diverse objectives.

South Asian conflicts very often are followed by flows of refugees. Region has 14 percent of the world's refugee population and is the principal source and host of refugees. Mostly destination of refugee flows are India and Nepal, refugee generating countries: Sri Lanka, Bhutan, Pakistan, Bangladesh. In 1971 after the separation of Bangladesh from Pakistan, 10 million refugees flowed to India. 800 000 displaced people from Sri Lanka are Tamils, Kashmiris constitute most of 200 000 internally displaced persons in India. The basic causes behind the displacement - political instability, armed conflict, lack of resources, those refugee flows are increasing tensions between states of the region. There also exist extra-regional refugee flows: refugees from Tibet come to India, from Afghanistan – to Pakistan, from Burma – to Bangladesh, certainly that incite extra-regional tensions.

South Asia, according to NRA is regional security complex – Which is characterized by the dominance of India, inherited from British geopolitical outlook, but also the deep distrust

---

73 Regional security complex in NRA and regional security complex in RSCT are not the same theoretical constructions. In NRA regional complex is the level of regionness, RSCT regional complex is theoretical construction of regional security entity, which can vary subject to impact of outside great/super powers, amity-enmity within the region.
between great/regional power and second largest state – Pakistan. In regional complex level of regionness, security dynamics in region are state-centric, peace is approached in negative way. Dominant position in management of regional security is held by state (India), other actors as regional institutions or economic actors South Asia besides have some minor signs of regional society, where appear some regional cooperation forms, responsibilities in conflict management (Gujral doctrine), germs of economic cooperation (SAARC, SAFTA). The potential of an inherent regional civil society remains largely unrealistic, due to a dysfunctional Cold War-like political rationality in region.

According RSCT classification, South Asia is standard regional security complex moving towards centered regional security complex, it means that the region moves from closed inter regional power division towards the centralization of power based on great power emergence. This movement towards centered region depends on India’s shift from regional power to great power. But India’s claim of great power status still has not been accepted because Pakistan still defines a regional pole of power. In region exist clearly expressed patterns of enmity, countries have securitized each other as potential security threats, therefore the movement to security community were countries have desecuritized each other is still impossible.

Internal power division in South Asian region,

South Asian regional security is subordinated to (declining but still persisting) bipolar power division within the region, all regional security is dependant on India Pakistan confrontation. Apparently issue of conflicts, instability and lack of cooperation in South Asia is widely associated with tensions between India and Pakistan. Conflicts between India and Pakistan include the Kashmir dispute, territorial disputes such as Siachen, a nuclear arms race, and water disputes. These countries since their independence in 1947 have gone to war three

---


times (1947, 1965, 1971, two of those wars were in Kashmir) in their short history as independent states and have existed amidst a succession of crises in an uneasy peace\textsuperscript{77}.

Wars over territory were based on religious hostility between Muslims and Hindus and they reflected the competition for dominance in South Asia. As E. Kolodziej pointed out this conflict between India and Pakistan is rooted in different notions of state legitimacy. Dispute between those South Asian states pits two contradictory principles of political authority and sovereignty - a secular India vs. a Muslim Pakistan\textsuperscript{78}. Not only do the two countries have long-standing dispute over Kashmir, but this could even be seen as a conflict over the very \textit{raison d’
être} of two countries\textsuperscript{79}. More recently, the original nationalist/territorial struggle has been transformed into an international jihad, making it possible target of the global war against terrorism\textsuperscript{80}.

According to B.Buzan, territorial disputes such as Kahmir are not just territorial but reflect political tension derived from the history and very principles of Partition in 1947 fits with M.Ayoob’s subaltern realist emphasis on state-making processes as a source of conflict\textsuperscript{81}. Similarly Pakistani president Farooq Leghari described Kashmir as the last remaining item on the agenda of Partition. But unfortunately this item remains unsolved for 60 years.

During the Cold War, power division in South Asia was apparently based on systemic bipolar struggle for power. Ending bipolarity created no dramatic transformations in the security dynamics of this region\textsuperscript{82}. Cold War ended in global level, but not in South Asian region, where bipolar confrontation lasts for about 60 years. In region since the very Partition of Pakistan from India remains \textit{status quo} situation. Wars between those countries were not so devastating; they couldn’t disrupt bipolarity within the region. No one of inside regional or outside systemic powers had significant impact for the change in bipolar situation within South Asia.

Changes inside the region, including the division of Pakistan in 1971, did not changed the bipolar situation within the region, just strengthened India’s positions, but did not eliminated Pakistan as regional power, when Pakistan lost nearly half of its territory and 55 percent of its population. It should be noted, that Pakistan’s ability to challenge India’s regional predominance during the Cold War has been largely the result of Islamabad’s success in “borrowing power”

from abroad, especially from the US and China\textsuperscript{83}. India’s aggressive military modernization program, Pakistan’s willingness to use armed Islamic groups as an instrument of foreign policy (evident in its ongoing support of the Taliban in Afghanistan)\textsuperscript{84} expressed the rivalry and the growing tension between those two states after the Cold War.

Besides, South Asia, as in 1998 noticed J.Key, is obviously “most moribund” region\textsuperscript{85}. The persistence of the conflict is a consequence of the persistence of this imbalance and of Pakistan’s attempts to correct it. Because Pakistan has been, and is the weaker power, constraints have been more severe for Pakistan than for India\textsuperscript{86}. Pakistan’s strategic choices reflect a mix of the balancing options: it used as much of its domestic resources as possible—probably more than was prudent—towards its defence budget, and, whenever such option was available, supplemented it with alliances with other powers, mainly the United States and China\textsuperscript{87}. Pakistan now is playing the role of regional challenger rather than [role of] aspiring hegemon\textsuperscript{88}. The existence of Pakistan as challenger and, India’s perception, “regional spoiler”, has detracted both from the efficacy and legitimacy of India’s role as security manager of South Asian region\textsuperscript{89}.

Forces of conflict have historically been rather intense and are further aggravated by the presence of "imbalance of military power" that exists between these two countries. The military superiority of India over Pakistan and the two third of Kashmir controlled by India will provide continuing stimulus and the need for Pakistan to maintain the Kashmir agenda sizzling in the region\textsuperscript{90}. The stability requires a sense of caution, maturity, and responsibility on both sides.

India’s geographic centrality, its military capabilities (See Diagram No.1), the size of its population and territory and, therefore, of its market, its large industrial base, and its possession of sophisticated civilian technology far superior to the rest of the region provide it with capacity to act as the recognized security manager in the rest of South Asia barring Pakistan\textsuperscript{91}. India by any index is undoubtedly the preeminent\textsuperscript{92} and pivotal power in South Asia.

with a corresponding interest in maintaining the stability of regional order\textsuperscript{93}. Apparently two South Asian poles are not equal, but it is possible for India to ignore absolutely Pakistan because of nuclear threats.

Diagram No.1. India’s and Pakistan’s military expenditures (In bln. USD)

![Diagram of India and Pakistan's military expenditures](chart.png)

Pakistan needed a nuclear capability to counter India’s overwhelming conventional military superiority. Possessing nuclear weapons gives Pakistan a rough parity with India that can never be achieved through conventional means\textsuperscript{94}. India’s main reason for possessing nuclear weapons was nuclear and conventional threat from China. Origins of the perceived threat from China lie in the brief border war fought between the two countries in 1962. Since then, New Delhi’s paranoia about Beijing’s intentions toward India has shaped its defence and security
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policy. China’s response to India’s nuclear test and India’s response to Pakistan’s are strikingly parallel: the smaller power sought to measure itself against its larger neighbour, with bigger power doing its best to ignore or downplay the challenge. Obviously possession of nuclear weapons did not change the bipolar situation in region, “achievement of nuclear parity equips Pakistan with great equalizer, and therefore confirms the bipolar power structure in South Asia.”

The period since 1998, after the nuclear tests, has been marked by fragile nuclear deterrence that has been the periodic crisis, particularly the Kargil Conflict of May-July 1999 and ten-month full mobilization on the border between the end of 2001 and October 2002, following the terrorist attack on the Indian parliament by armed militants. As far as key survival issue of deterrence stability is concerned, stable deterrence would be expected from a relationship in which both sides had survivable second-strike capabilities.

Pakistan–India peace process

Indo-Pakistani relations have improved since early 2003, when Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vaypayee extended a “hand of friendship” to Pakistan. The peace process between India and Pakistan started on 2004. The aim of diplomatic interchange – is an attempt to lessen military conflict and reduce the pressure in Kashmir. A number of measures have been taken to stabilize the ceasefire including a commitment to refrain from developing new posts and defence work along Line of Control, established the dial-up hotline between the directors general of military operations, agreements on the pre-notification of ballistic missile flight tests, agreements to enhance economic cooperation etc. Undaunted by the February 2007 bomb attack on Samjhauta Express where were killed 68 people, India and Pakistan extended a bilateral agreement to run passenger train and freight services between the two countries till 2010. Besides all those measures, Pakistan’s official position on Kashmir remains unchanged: India is in unlawful occupation of Jammu and Kashmir, at the same time, India see Jammu and Kashmir as integral part of Indian Union and the areas under Pakistan’s control are illegally occupied. So those positions show that despite the dialogue between India and Pakistan, under peace process there is no significant change in state positions on the basic regional conflict.
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Besides, peace process increases India’s freedom to pursue great-power status and to maneuver elsewhere in South Asia, the region (Indian Ocean region) and (as a great power) in the world. Basic national interests of India and Pakistan clearly differ. Pakistan is interested in balancing India’s domination in region to solve Kashmir conflict. India at the time has more ambitious priorities this country seeks to counterweigh China, to become a permanent member of UN Security Council, to strengthen welfare, economic development within the country and control political situation in South Asia. Also India seeks to get great power ranking by becoming permanent member in United Nations Security Council. Differences in national interests between those two countries, show possible tension, India forms more ambitious interests than Pakistan. But here appear a vicious cycle despite Pakistan is not the basic priority of Indian declared national politics, India cannot become a full-fledged great power and realize the other objectives, while exist regional tensions with Pakistan. Here enter the stage systemic actor United States and neighbouring great power – China.

**System level impact on South Asian security dynamics**

In South Asia exists evident interplay between regional and global levels, regional confrontations during the Cold War called for global powers interference into region’s security issues (but super powers were not able to solve regional key conflict in Kashmir), and in beginning of 21st unipolar superpower became interested in South Asian region because of its own interests and attempt to counterweight the emerging China as the greatest challenger. During the Cold War US had a problem with formation of the idea what role South Asia should play in America’s view of the world. During the Cold War and even after it this region never was a serious concern to American policy-makers, in 1971 Pakistan partition war US and China supported Pakistan it was like counterbalance for Soviet Union- Indian domination in region. In bipolar system, by interference in the region superpowers were seeking their strategic objectives, such as domination in region, resolution of certain regional conflict was not their priority.

During the 42 (years of diplomatic relations between US, India and Pakistan, there have been only two presidential trips to the region – in 1949 and 1978. U.S. activities in the region were devoted to the twin tasks of promoting economic development and limiting Soviet
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influence. South Asia was of minor strategic interest to the US before Soviet invasion to Afghanistan. United States policy took attention to this region during the Secession of Bangladesh from Pakistan in 1971. In the 1970s, the US was relatively distant with India and Pakistan countries until the increase in Soviet naval activity in the Indian Ocean, the falloff Iran and Soviet occupation of Afghanistan raised the political stakes, and the United States returned to their policy of strong support for Pakistan. After beginning of Iranian revolution and Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, U.S. strengthened its interest in Pakistan. Pakistan suddenly became a key geostrategic player as it served as a buffer between the Soviet Union and the Persian Gulf.

Through military supplies US de facto strengthened Pakistan against India. With disappearance of Soviet threat in Afganistan, US – Pakistan relations assumed negative features. Washington’s subsequent “abandonment” caused Islamabad to redouble its nuclear efforts in the 1990s. On 1985 issued Pressler Amendment (Pressler Amendment took effect on 1990), stated that countries, developing nuclear weapons may not receive aid of any sort from US, hereby Washington have turned form Pakistan. In such a way US cut off military and economic aid to Pakistan.

After the end of Cold War India, Pakistan, Bangladesh all supported US during the Gulf War, despite internal dissension on this issue. The situation have drastically changed after the 2001 09 11. Events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent war against terrorism have generated an increased US willingness to maintain a sustained diplomatic engagement with South Asia as whole and with India- Pakistan relations in particular. India and Pakistan helps US to fight terrorism. Washington today has generally solid relations with both New Delhi and Islamabad, another unprecedented state of affairs, besides US pay more attention to conflicts within other smaller South Asian states. The US is called upon to be a key intermediary in stopping the brutal civil war in Sri Lanka; in encouraging the people and leaders of Bangladesh.
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to resist violent extremists and Islamists; in helping to arrange in Nepal a true and sustained transition to democracy.\textsuperscript{111} As declared US under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns:

> South Asia is now a central focus of U.S. Foreign Policy. For the first time in decades the United States views this region as increasingly vital to our core foreign policy interests. We have better strategic relations with the major powers of the region than we have ever had before. (US Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns, 27 November, 2006)

India – US relations after the 9/11 has made it easier for India to enter into close political and security cooperation with America’s friend’s and allies in the Asia-Pacific\textsuperscript{112}. Those relations can be defined as pragmatic cooperation.

As I. Berlin noted, any decrease in the level of US involvement in the region, also would increase pressure from China. In the first decades of the new century there are five areas that figure, or are likely to figure, prominently in foreign and security agenda of the United States: countering terrorism, fostering regional security and stability, promoting democracy, preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and containing China\textsuperscript{113}. India and all South Asian region brilliantly fits to all this menu. Those US interests were definitely revealed:

> The U.S. and India share a common view of how the world should be organized. Respect and support for democratic institutions; fighting the war on terrorism; the globalization of supply and demand; the communications revolution-these trends and many others have pushed us towards one another\textsuperscript{114}. (US Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns, 27 November, 2006)

Indian – US cooperation is improving, increased US military export to India, states are changing visits of civilian and military officials. July 2005 India and the US upgraded their ties by signing ten years agreement that envisages stepped-up military cooperation in various fields, including joint weapons production, technology transfer and collaboration on missile defense. December 2006 United States Congress approved the United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act that was cemented during President Bush's visit to India earlier in the year. The legislation allows for transfer of civilian nuclear material to India despite its status


outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on the basis of its clean proliferation record and that country's voracious appetite for energy fueled by its rapid industrialization and a billion-plus population. Obviously underpinning historic defence ties the US aim is to preserve US preeminence in Asia by balancing China with India. Through increasing Indo-US economic, geopolitical and military linkages India can be transformed into a viable counterweight to China\textsuperscript{115}.

Through American power, New Delhi is trying to achieve its own regional goals. The region in where India would like to dominate is much wider than the South Asia. Indian foreign policy is subordinated to US backing at last for its single-minded drive to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council\textsuperscript{116}. US are promoting broad anti-China Alliance idea. The Bush Administration has reinforced these trends: prior to September 11, 2001, the United States pursued a neo-Bismarckian Asia strategy aimed at isolating China.\textsuperscript{117}

**Afghanistan - the key**

US now attempt to expand relations with both India and Pakistan, but US tries to do that in different ways. There exist Indian suspicion that any American efforts to assist Pakistan to become a successful state will represent means potential or actual, of limiting Indian power in South Asia and the Indian Ocean\textsuperscript{118}. After September 11, 2001, Pakistan’s president was prompt in extending full support to America in the ensuring war against terrorism\textsuperscript{119}. There was a danger that through the hands of Pakistani the nuclear weapons may fall in hands of Islamic extremists. His Pakistan’s positive response exceeded expectations. US facilitated Pakistan’s negotiations with the IMF, removed all sanctions imposed on Pakistan. Pakistan's status has been upgraded to a "major non-NATO ally" because of its central role in serving as a staging point for the invasion of Afghanistan, providing intelligence on Al-Qaeda operations in the region, and leading the hunt on Osama bin Laden, believed to still be in the region as of 2005\textsuperscript{120}.

Obviously India is systemically targeting states that will bring India specific and tangible security and economic benefits\textsuperscript{121}. Now Afghanistan is the key to the trade routes and energy pipelines of Central Asia, so, if the United States is going to reverse this sad decline in

\textsuperscript{119} http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geostrategy_in_Central_Asia
Afghanistan, it will need the support of both India and Pakistan. Potentially this situation tied the US into South Asia as a ring holder between India and Pakistan for the long time. It became clear during 1990s that the US, as the preeminent global power, had a paramount interest in maintaining a legitimate and stable world order that would provide an environment conductive to its pursuit of other goals.

There is no good reason to believe that the war on terrorism, as currently constituted, provides a “window of opportunity” for bridging India - Pakistan differences. There are no obvious steps towards Kashmir conflict resolution, both sides remain hold their grounds. US incite the dialogue between those countries, but peace process between India and Pakistan takes not enough time for valuable evaluation. At the moment there are no significant changes in solution the basic conflict among those two countries. And doubtfully the shift towards regional society with deeper cooperation would help to reduce these tensions between India and Pakistan. Those counties during the 60 years of conflict already used to live in reality of long lasting conflict and no one is going to give up the taken position. Besides, solution of conflict can complicate Pakistan’s position as regional power’s position.

**South Asia – China relations**

With the communist victory in China’s civil war in 1950, China became steadily more influential in the security dynamics of South Asia. In the 1950s Sino-Indian relations were strained mainly due to the territorial issue and the Chinese annexation of Tibet. China’s – India’s border demarcation war – 1962, and the tension on issue of Tibet formed tension in relations between India and China. Till the end of Cold War, China essentially maintained a pro-Pakistan policy in its wider South Asian policy this country was on the Pakistan’s side, during 1965, 1971 wars, and contributed to Pakistan military support. In the post-Cold War era, China hasn’t been freed from its triangular politics with US and the USSR. After the Cold War, despite existing distrust between China and India, their relations became warmer. Besides, China followed a more balanced approach towards India and Pakistan. During the Kagril war in
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1999 China remained neutral, did not support neither India nor Pakistan. This country tries to balance between India and Pakistan – keeping bilateral relations separately with both countries.

Facing changes in international environment: the growth of US presence in the Asia-Pacific region, the rise of nationalism in Japan, and rise of India in the Indian Ocean region and South Asia, China rethink its Asian policy and approach toward India. The new approach calls for on the one hand, a reiteration of a balanced stance in the regional affairs, especially in the India-Pakistan equation and on the other hand, recognition of India as an emerging power. China is also scared by the military presence of the US in South Asia through Pakistan, India has therefore become strategically important for China, because India could be a reliable partner in its endeavor to denounce hemispheric dominance by any one power.

Today India and China are trying to identify new areas for partnership. While agreeing to disagree on certain issues, the two countries are willing to identify new areas for partnership. First, Indian prime minister who visited China was Atal Behari Vajpayee this visit was held on June 2003, during the visit was laid down the road map for a comprehensive relationship between those two countries. A return visit of Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao was held in April 2005, during this visit two sides agreed to, among various other steps the establishment of a strategic and “Cooperative Partnership for Peace and Prosperity,” countries also opened a new chapter of friendly relations and cooperation, both sides agreed to solve the border issue on the basis of mutual respect. Obviously after those visits Sino–Indian relations have faced many developments. Most of engagements are primarily of an economic nature. Chinese and Indian Naval units took part in common exercises in December 2005 off the Kochi coast in the Arabian Sea. Also India has observer status in Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), China in SAARC (South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation).

Besides dialogue with India, in order to advance its influence in South Asian region China is building the strategic important Gwadar port in Southwest Pakistan, building up ties with Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal. Suspicious of India’s great power ambitions and to retain role as a sole Asian representative in the United Nations Security Council, China has most recently blocked India’s efforts to gain membership in the UNSC. Despite the attempt for

dialogue, China and India likely will remain long term rivals, vying for the same strategic space in Asia\textsuperscript{134}. Beijing according to former Indian external affairs minister Jaswant Singh, is the “principle variable in the calculus of Indian foreign and defence policy”\textsuperscript{135}. Chinas foreign policy is dominated by “contain India” theory, India inched its way towards great power standing by creating a complex centered on itself, but had not at the time of writing yet succeeded in breaking the bipolar pattern with Pakistan in South Asian region\textsuperscript{136}. India’s and China’s relations can be defined as prolonged containment, “essentially remains a correct but cool relationship\textsuperscript{137}”. India try to contain China and \textit{vise versa}. U.S. use India for Chinas Containment, India uses US. Apparently between those neighbor countries and world great power emerged the net of post-Cold War containment. What are the causes of such a situation? Historical memory is not enough, the basic are the rivalry between India and China for domination in wider Asian region or even Indian Ocean Region.

\textbf{Possibilities and barriers for cooperation in South Asia}

South Asia is encompassed by bipolar “Cold War” situation within the region that is one of the reasons why this region was one of “the last regions to wake up to the challenge of the new regionalism” (regional integration)\textsuperscript{138}. And this basic instability is exacerbated by the lack of regional organizations to defuse tensions, as SAARC (South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation) is simply too weak to play any significant role in matters of national security\textsuperscript{139}. SAARC is used more like forum for officials of South Asian states. Cooperation between South Asian countries is based more on bilateral agreements than on multilateral ones. Doubtfully this organization will have a chance to become stronger until India and Pakistan will not be interested in deeper development of it. The primary concerns of regional powers are to orient regional actors and institutions around their interests and ambitions and to avoid the domination of restrictions that could be imposed on them by major powers\textsuperscript{140}.

\begin{footnotesize}
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For cooperation in security field in region significant role play Gujral doctrine (1996-1998) – by which India since 1990’s seek increase regional economic cooperation, to pacify smaller neighbour countries, by making bilateral agreements. This policy is considered quite successful. The idea of Gujral doctrine was that cooperation between India and small states of the region (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Maldives) in order to counterweigh Pakistan. This doctrine aspire India to act as the security manager in the region despite of benevolent fashion of the doctrine. The Gujral doctrine has helped improve considerably India’s relations with Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka during the 1990s. The Farakka Waters agreement with Bangladesh; the revisited Transit Treaty with Nepal; trade agreement with Sri Lanka. Gujral Doctrine can be successful only in a specific environment whereby the neighbours too perceive them as being beneficial to their country and the region as a whole. In essence, this policy of non-reciprocity is an important step in legitimizing India’s preeminent status in the region, demonstrating its willingness and capacity to act as the benevolent provider of public goods in South Asia. Merely with closer relations with US India is supposed to take less attention to this Doctrine. India by providing public goods for the region gradually gains the legitimacy of its superiority in region, despite the negative reactions from smaller states towards Indian ambitious politics.

Small states of the regions have substantial interests in enhancing multilateralist arrangements within their region, for two reasons: first, to promulgate norms of sovereignty and noninterference, and second to acquire assurances that aggression against them will provoke a responsible by order more powerful states. It is the paradox, that the biggest advantages from regional agreements are getting regional powers in security and economic terms. What small state by individual memberships and the commitments can make is largely symbolic.

R.Tavares as NRA representative states, that regionalization must have impact for peace in region and for formation of security society, as a peace actor/peace instrument SAARC could be particularly important in peace building in South Asia. This region according NRA/T – is regional security complex, it is characterized by the dominance of India, which inherited British geopolitical outlook, but also the deep distrust between great/regional power and second
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largest state – Pakistan\textsuperscript{146}. South Asia also have some regional society features. As regional complex South Asia is based on countries which take dominating position in region by formation of political ties and by restricting of other potential actors such as regional institutions, non-state actors. There are some aspects which hamper shift from regional complex to regional society: unsolved Kashmir conflict, boundary problems between regional states, China-India, India-Pakistan confrontations, internal conflicts and crises, low level of development (see Table No.2). Formation of regional society depends on interaction between social, cultural, economic and political spheres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.2</th>
<th>Position of South Asian states in Human Development Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possibilities for change and conclusions**

In South Asia the dissolution of Europe’s empires and the competition of the superpowers to sponsor statehood for region’s developing peoples produced multiple centers of power and conflict\textsuperscript{147}. South Asia during the Cold War had turbulent and often violent domestic politics fuelled by ethnic and religious differences and, since ethnic and religious affiliations often crossed national borders, there was strong interplay between the domestic and regional levels in South Asian insecurity\textsuperscript{148}. South Asian security complex is characterized by the dominance of India, which inherited the British geopolitical outlook (‘forward defence’) and a rather legalistic view on political frontiers\textsuperscript{149}. The trump card that holds Pakistan in South Asian

region for balancing bipolarity - is nuclear weapons and unresolved Kashmir conflict, which lasts for more than half of the century.

New regionalism approach states that changes in regionness strongly depend on cooperation between regional states, on interaction among them and appearance of non-state actors. This argument is complementary with RSCT which states that changes in regional security complex depend of power division and systemic power influence in the region. RSCT do not exclude security community in which all threats from regional countries are desecuritized, and countries as regional type, can pay more attention to threats coming from outside of the region or transnational security threats. In the standard security complex the basic threats for states remain are traditional that arise from the neighbor states, those threats are basic for survival and standard region is far away from desecuritized security community.

According to NRA model, regional cooperation in economic, political spheres can start to form common values, institutions which turn regional complex towards regional society. In South Asia people live under the conflicts for a long time, in great poverty, and here is hardly possible to adjust Eurocentric model to different South Asian reality. South Asian region is based more on amity – enmity relations between regional states, which all have securitized each other as potential sources of security threats. Dominant position in management of regional security is held by states, other actors as regional institutions or economic actors South Asia besides have some minor signs of regional society, where appear some regional cooperation forms, responsibilities in conflict management (Gujral doctrine), germs of economic cooperation (SAARC, SAFTA). The potential of an inherent regional civil society remains largely unrealistic, due to a dysfunctional Cold War-like political rationality in region\(^{150}\).

According RSCT classification, South Asia is standard regional security complex moving towards centered regional security complex, that means from closed inter-regional power division this region moves towards the centralization of power. Movement towards centered region - depend on India’s shift from regional power to great power. The most obvious possibility for power transition in South Asian region –is India’s rising into great power status. India’s nuclear tests were clearly intended to reinforce its claim to great power standing\(^{151}\). Prospect of economic growth and rising military capability may put India in a position where both China and US have to take it seriously\(^{152}\). Key actor – systemic – US expects that India

\(^{150}\)Ibid.
\(^{152}\)Ibid, p. 120.
would be able to counterweight (balance) China. But India’s claim of great power status still has not been accepted because Pakistan still defines a regional pole of power\textsuperscript{153}.

The weakness of Pakistan and growing gap between Pakistan and India (economy, military development), shows, that all the time there is a possibility for internal regional power transformation. But until the rivalry exists; until countries have securitized each other as potential threats, the transition from bipolar system is unlikely. India no longer feels strategically threatened from within South Asia, at least no severely\textsuperscript{154}, especially because of strong US backing, but nuclear capabilities, possibility of nuclear threat help Pakistan to balance India.

There is no good reason to believe that the war on terrorism, as currently constituted, provides a “window of opportunity” for bridging India - Pakistan differences\textsuperscript{155}. There are no obvious steps towards Kashmir conflict resolution, both sides remain hold their grounds. US incite the dialogue between those countries, but peace process between India and Pakistan takes not enough time for valuable evaluation. At the moment there are no significant changes in solution the basic conflict among those two countries. And doubtfully the shift towards regional society with deeper cooperation would help to reduce these tensions between India and Pakistan. Those counties during the 60 years of conflict already used to live in reality of long lasting tension and no one is going to give up the position taken.

Apparently in the near future shift from regional complex to regional society and from standard region to centered is impossible. Basic factors that hamper shift from regional complex to regional society and from standard to centered region are regional bipolarity, unsolved Kashmir conflict, boundary problems between regional states, China-India, India-Pakistan confrontations, internal conflicts and crises, low level of development, low level of cooperation initiatives.

\textsuperscript{153} Ibid, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{154} Ibid, p. 121.
Map No.1  South Asian conflicts in 2003
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