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Abstract

The US-India deal on civilian nuclear cooperation is far from to pursue its idealistic third worldlist causes. The present study focuses on to highlight India's Janus-faced foreign policy. This strategy was reflected strongly in 2005 when India supported IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) resolution against Iran's nuclear activities; India ended siding with the US camp, and several leaps away from its traditional adherence to positions of non-alignment. India focused on specific states from strategic and military perspectives where some states are viewed in terms of trading matter. India views that maximum level of participation in regional organization will make path for acquiring more influential role in regional and global politics.

Geography, historical factors, political culture and time oriented internal and external policies of the respective Indian governments have given unique features to India not only in Asian regional politics but also in global matters. The historical readings of Asia continent introduced diverse imperial legacies but as far as the cultural identification is concerned, Asian political matters cannot be studied as separate intensified thinking. One of the most important features of Asia in the prevailing scenario is its influence over global politics. Effects of regional changes would leave impact over global challenges and opportunities. Power relations among the regional members established a different psychological posture for international community. Indian place in South Asia Region is in mood of accepting challenges and further to enhance national interests on ground realities by readjustment and re-orientation on multidimensional aspects.

Indian foreign policy, backed by strong democratic strengthened institutions, has always shown potential to provide space and to access space. For example, India without joining any ideological group e.g. communist bloc and capitalist bloc enjoyed all channels and maintained its mandate.

During the Cold War era, India signed a 20 years Treaty of Friendship, Peace and Co-operation with the Soviet Union in August 1971 but Indian Prime Minister Indra Gandhi stated that Moscow leadership would not be given privileges as concerned to Naval Bases in Indian ports¹. In 1965 war, Indian leadership successfully convinced or pressurized Washington on issue of providing military assistance to Pakistan. It is keenly observed that Indian foreign policy has continuity on all major concerned issues. In the parliamentary election of March 1977, Indra Gandhi was defeated but while addressing the nation, Janta Party leader Morarji Desai as Prime Minister stressed to follow
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same policy on external issues. Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee delivered a speech on 30th March 1977, stating that new government would maintain Non-Alignment features in more balanced way. In addition, he stressed that no immediate fundamental changes on external policy matters should be expected because India has no need to do so. On the issue of Red Army’s invasion into Afghanistan in 1979, India initially hesitated to condemn invasion despite of having good relationship with the Afghan government. By keeping international political scenario in mind, India stated that interference in the internal matters of a state should be considered as serious violation of international law on sovereignty. The Indian government issued this statement without mentioning the name of Soviet Union. On issue of Israel recognition, New Delhi simply denied because it did not want to keep the Muslim community in the lap of Pakistan. India recognized Israel in 1992 when the Cold War ended and Washington established global supremacy. After the Soviet Union collapsed, Indian leadership always treated Moscow as second super power, maintained its relationship in balanced respectable manners. New Delhi strengthened relationship with America but decisions on foreign affairs are approached not of Pro-US posture.

Indian Policy towards the Region

September 26, 1946, Mr. Nehru delivered speech on foreign policy in which he stated that “It is necessary that with the attainment of her full international status, India showed estuaries contact with all great nations of the world and that her relations with neighboring countries in Asia should become still closer.” The leadership of India approached events with special efforts for establishing constructive and long term strategic relations. Political observers argued that Indian leadership treated regions in separate thinking. For example, the external policy towards South Asia was unlike South East Asia, India approached hostile relationships with Pakistan and Sri Lank but having of deep connections with Indonesia, countries on Bay of Bengal from Burma to Singapore. India supported the Indonesian Independence Movement against Netherlands for attaining a special status in South East Asia Region. India as first country recognized China and encouraged the South Asian Countries to follow Mao’s vision which could be sound thinking to eliminate the resource capturing thinking of imperialists. With Sri Lanka, New Delhi leadership, Jawaharlal Nehru and Indra Gandhi negotiated on Tamil issue for reducing tension between the Tamil-speaking Hindu minority and the Sinhala-speaking Buddhist majority. On various occasions, the Sri Lankan leadership stated that Tamil insurgency has been promoted by the Indians. In case of Nepal, India has always advocated to pro-Indian government which would oppose to the Chinese, influence in Nepal. Nepal as landlocked state has buffer zone status and its imports and exports are totally dependent upon India. Geo-strategic location of Nepal and Bhutan has attraction for India in terms of its military strategy. Both India and China prefer to neither maintain Nepal’s status as entire buffer zone nor vacuum to any party. India has intense strife with...
Pakistan and has always shown unparalleled prestige to its existence because Hinduism and Islam were the root cause of struggle between India and Pakistan. The West projected Pakistan’s independence as a result of militant, exclusive and dogmatic struggle whereas the Hinduism was called as absorptive and tolerant.

The Indian National Congress stated that the British, strategy of “Divide and Rule” was the designed feature of the new form of imperialism, having the objective of snatching the natural resources of the third world countries\(^5\). India’s Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru stated that “India without Kashmir would cease to occupy a pivotal position on the political map of Central Asia. Strategically, Kashmir is vital to the security of India.”\(^6\). On the other side, Liaquat Ali Khan the Prime Minister of Pakistan said that “Kashmir is very important, it is vital to Pakistan. Kashmir as you will see from the map is like a cap on the head of Pakistan. If I allow India to have this cap on our head, then I am always at the mercy of India”\(^7\). On October 26, 1947, Lord Mountbatten stated that “It is my government’s wish that as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and her soil cleared of the invaders, the question of the state’s accession should be settled by reference to the people”\(^8\). Because of insecure feeling, Pakistan finally decided to join CEATO and CENTO, American sponsored regional alliance. The U.S Secretary of State Marshall commented that “although both Nehru and Liaquat Ali Khan stressed the need for solidarity, they did not seem to be willing to suit action to their words”\(^9\).

On the Eastern borders, confrontation between India and Pakistan continued. In the meanwhile, the Indian government attempted to sabotage the Durand Line status as international boundary between Pakistan and Afghanistan by promoting Pushtunistan Issue. Next troubling issue was Soviet Union inclination towards India and Afghanistan due to Pakistan’s joining the Western camp. Foreign Minister Sir Zafar-ullah Khan and Pakistan’s spokesman at the United Nations Ch. Mohammad Ali met Assistant Secretary of State McGee and urged to go beyond limits as to accept Durand Line officially as international border. Ch. Mohammad Ali stated that talks between Pakistan and America would remain fruitless unless the Durand Line is recognized as international border, “Blackmailers from Kabul would raise the question of Pashtun’s Independence”\(^11\). In line to these directions, Washington’s attitude towards India was not offensive because India was being treated as important partner in future US interests. The only objective of Washington Administration was to refrain India from the Communist bloc. On the Ran of Kutch conflict, the Western media stated that stability of the region depends upon the willingness of both states, Pakistan and India, how much they are psychologically prepared to provide space to each other. The British Prime Minister Harold Wilson’s effort to mediate between the both states, finally agreed to a mutual withdrawal of forces\(^12\). “The Rann of Kutch encounter left Pakistan dangerously overconfident
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and India dangerously frustrated. The Pakistani Media openly viewed that the Rann of Kutch prescription should be applied on Kashmir front". The Pakistan Times stated that “In the event of war with India, Pakistani troops would march up to Delhi, would occupy the Red Fort and hoist the Pakistani flag on it”. On the other hand The Times of India warned that “Pakistan has put the fire into the water to measure the temperature and one fine morning Pakistan will present the world with a faith-accompli-the occupation of Kashmir”. Generally, the India leadership attempted to convince the US and the USSR that Pakistan is interfering in Kashmir. The political observers argued that Pakistan’s attempt to seek West’s favor generally and Washington’s favor especially on Kashmir issue remained unsuccessful and the scale of insecurity was marked with great pain. In 1962 war with China and in 1965 war with Pakistan the Indian leadership obtained a neutral attitude from Moscow in first case, Russian Premier viewed ground realities to deter China and in second case, India was approached on cease fire line in collaboration with America. India benefited between 1971 to 1976 era from the Soviet Union when it became the largest trading partner of Moscow, along with maximum privileges in 1971 episode with Pakistan. Soviet Premier Aleksey N. Kosygin played good offices role at Tashkent, and later on offered military sales to India. Indian acquisition of Soviet military equipment was important in a sense that all purchases were made against deferred rupee payments, a major concession to India. In addition, Soviet military assistance to India was without any demand for restricted deployments, adjustment according to Indian strategic design, or any kind of Soviets willingness to favor its policies at global level. In matter of this deal, India enjoyed absolute autonomy, not to be compromised and not to be conditional. On Pakistan side, it was observed that Pakistan had given assurance to Washington that received military assistance will not be used against India. The observers argued that Tashkent Agreement was staged by the Soviet leadership not only to exert pressure on Pakistan but also to deter China. Edward Crenshaw, who was in Tashkent stated that “Mr. Kosygin, whose ideology demand the fostering of chaos and disruption in non-communist lands, finds himself doing his level best to calm down a Hindu under direct threat from China and a Moslem supposed to be on friendly terms with Peking, embroiled in a quarrel over the possession of the mountain playground of the late British Raj. And except for China, nobody minds”. In 1971 episode, the Indian parliament approved ‘hit and run’ strategy in East Pakistan and finally called on General Jagjit Singh Aurora for designing military operational plan to play final round. In meanwhile, Washington pressurized India by blocking arms shipment but it was not enough in Pakistan’s interest. Indra Gandhi stated that “If any country thinks that by calling us aggressions it can pressure us to forget our rational interests, then that country is living in its own paradise and is welcome to it. The times have gone when any nation sitting three or four thousand miles away could give orders to Indians on the basis of their color superiority. India has changed and she is no more a country of natives.”
End of Cold War-New Priorities
The end of Cold War introduced outward-looking economic policies, Washington became more important for India and both shared long term ties in technology and investment sectors. Washington welcomed Indian students in America in area of science and technology. The political observers argued that India-U.S have clashes over some important specific issues e.g. human rights, nuclear program and economic reforms but the common interests of both states evolved economic and strategic alliance environment. It was assumed that Indian policy makers were pressurized to follow pro-US policy in the region. As a result, Bush senior Administration officially declared India as strategic-partner in South Asia as contrary to China, as being treated strategic-competitor. On the Indian side, the policy makers focused not only to deal regional matters in new dimensions but also to treat America in new way by keeping economic-strategic ties for facing regional challenges. It is worth noticing that after the demise of Soviet Union, George W. Bush and Clinton Administration focused negatively onto Pakistan’s nuclear proliferation and finally under George W. Bush where Pakistan participation was approached in war on terrorism.

Challenges for Indian security
Indian region is marked with confused thinking as its ongoing conflicts with neighboring states, along with internally emerging separatist movements and continuously increasing poverty level. On the foreign front, Indian diplomacy involved Indian policy makers to develop balancing relationship with neighboring states but few hardliner refer Pakistan-China strategic relationship as serious challenging threat to Indian security. This school of thought perceived Pakistan China relations as competing alliance against India, recently the former Indian Army Chief stated that Indian army has potential to fight against China and Pakistan within same time. The Indian hawkish policy makers viewed that Indian strategic design must be patronized on Cold Start Doctrine. Whereas, the moderate Indian policy makers viewed that healthy environment in sense of confidence building measures should be given first and foremost priority to deal challenges in an open environment. China’s emergence as regional power is not only a threat for India but also Washington perceived it as a possible challenging state against U.S. interests in entire south Asia and Central Asia Regions. The growing economic challenges in context of competing energy requirements for strengthening economic growth rate are forcefully deriving factor to develop India-US strategic/economic relations “need of Time” to balance regional leverage against China.

One of the successful achievements the Indian policy makers achieved was 123 Agreement which signed between New Delhi and Washington. It was simply given expression Indians Recognitions as a major power and further US acknowledgement of India as responsible state, heeding of strong Non-
Proliferation Record. President Bush stated “Indio-US Deal on 8th October 2008, the law now titled “United State-India Nuclear Co-operation Approval and Non-Proliferation Enhancement Act” is a product of the March 2006 Agreement between India and US on civic Nuclear co-operation based on Joint statement between President Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh on 18th July 2005”. The agreement is the result of “India’s strong Non-Proliferation Record despite not being a ‘Party’ to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty (NPT)”24. In addition, the analysis’s viewed that the Indo-US deal should be taken as India’s recognition as ‘De-facto Nuclear Weapon state’ 25. Senator Dodd highlighted, compelling Geo-political reasons” like India’s Geographic proximity to China, Pakistan and Afghanistan as reasons to strengthen this relationship26 while senator Lugar stated that U.S partnership with India in important in region and India has place in US policy parameters due to its shared domestic values and its strengthened economic market, can be influential to execute decisions, what suit to deal27. The former deputy secretary of state, Strobe Talbot under Clinton Presidency stated that US needs India to balance region, it is a known fact but it is no more secret now that Bush Administration reached far away from NPT Treaty to conclude things with India. In addition he stated that US has left no room for NPT and the deal would encourage international community to be beneficial in terms of nuclear deals with friends or allies. Former Assistant secretary of state for Non proliferation said “acquiring the ability to import uranium and nuclear reactor technology, obtaining recognition for India’s status as a nuclear power and preserving all of India’s strategic options, particularly the ability to increase substantially its production of plutonium for nuclear weapons”28. Daryl Kimhace, Executive Director of the Arms control association called U.S. Deal as non-proliferation disaster America has given specific exemption to India on non-proliferation, where Washington set stage after a long period ‘tiring efforts’29. Howard Berman, US congressman stated “having intention to introduce amendments to the deal, stating in unambiguous terms that the US would terminate nuclear trade with India if the later resumed nuclear testing and that the President would be required to review and implement applicable export control authorities for US Nuclear exports to another nuclear supplier nations that continue nuclear trade with India”30. Senator Byron Dorgan stated New Delhi was living rewarded for warm behavior.31. It is observed that Bush administration not only influenced US Congress to alter US policy on Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty but also nuclear supplier Group was also approached to path Deal for concluding remarks. The Pakistani media openly state that US marginalized Pakistan’s role only to War on Terrorism whereas India was being given spate status by signing 123 Agreements. Former US foreign secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice stated that Indo-US deal in the ultimate social reality of showing long terror U.S India strategic relations, reflection of need of time to balance region, not to be perceived as sign of instability in region. As for as Islamabad is concerned, Washington cannot do like Indo-US deal in case of Pakistan because of Dr. Abdul Qadir network issue, it means Pakistan has no
clean certificate on nuclear proliferation issue. Different treatment to Pakistan and India is respectively understood because both states have different backgrounds and different strategic measures to him placed in region. On foreign front, the Indian leadership has convinced to Washington but on domestic front, the Congress political party had been remained failed absolutely faced to convince communist Indian party which is a major part of New Delhi coalition government. One Indian school of thought, especially the communist Indian leadership, stated that US-India deal is unique feature but it would encourage regional instability and India would be treated as frontline enemy by China. The BJP opposition party stated that no doubt India needs strategic alliance/relationship with US is a time factor reality but the deal has put a cap on India’s strategic nuclear arsenal. The fact is that India has sufficient indigenous uranium reserves (78,000 metric tons of Uranium (MTU)) to pursue its strategic weapons programme, hence the deal would not hamper Indian military nuclear program. Apart from these criticisms, the Indo-US deal 123 agreement was also examined in context of issue of Indian’s foreign policy autonomy. The critics argued that Indo-US deal is a march towards Washington, acceptance of U.S pro-policy and absolutely stated good bye Nehruism on foreign front. One same ground, it is also observed that despite of facing U.S pressure on Iran, New Delhi did not change its stance over the Iranian Nuclear program. New Delhi argued that NPT has itself given right to Iran for establishing its nuclear programme for peaceful purpose but as far as IPI gas pipeline project is concerned, reservations on security front from Islamabad side are a main obstacle that is why it has yet has not finalized Gas pipeline project. New Delhi needs energy resources and it will be competing Gas Pipeline project options like sea route or via Qatar route. The observers argued that security issue on IPI Gas pipeline project’ will be no doubt a serious matter for Iran. Washington finally staged huge political, economic and strategic advantages. Bill Clinton as US president described India as indispensable nation. The Indian policy makers argued the in depth study of changing regional study has derived them to introduce some modification in foreign policy. The Bush administration assisted India on military front between 2003 and 2008 approximately 2.1 trillion. While commenting on Indo-US deal, former British Prime Minister, Tony Blair said that arrangements can be a noteworthy input to energy, security, development economic and environment objectives for New Delhi and the international community as well as representing a net gain for Non-proliferation regime. The U.S administration justified 123 Agreement on growing needs of energy of India for meeting future challenges and as well as the assurance was given to new Delhi to explore new parallel resources of energy e.g. technological assistance to Indian coal industry, and to improve efficiency level of India’s electricity grid. It further said that deal will enhance level of strategic relations and co-operations, should be considered a pragmatic attempt for opening Indian potential economic market for the US business community, in future a serving source for seeking common
strategic and economic interests. Side by side these optimistic views, the US congressmen have shown reservations or some fears about deal. Tom Lantos, session Democrat on the house of representative international relation committee stated in Washington on September 08, 2005 that a clear fresh Indo-US deal is at risk if India does not make efforts with Washington to penalize Iran for its nuclear weapons related activities. In addition Lantos stated that deal still bring two state in more ties but nobody can deny their reality that now it would depend on India how to deal Iran in light of new dimensional strategic ties with Washington. Jon S. Wolf, former Assistant secretary of states for Non-Proliferation Affairs stated “It is betting down that we have offered something to New Delhi and no obtained something considered in return and this accord is not easy to living together with the global standards proceed by the US for the last 40 years." Known fact for the analyst’s is that visible transformation between US-India relation on strategic issues appeared in post cold war era, both states realized convergence of interests gradually and both power viewed that their common interests are driving force elements, leading to high level discussions and negotiations on military and economic fronts. After Soviet forces with draw from Afghanistan, Washington tilted toward India but without ignoring the Russia’s strategic importance in region. Even after Soviet Union disintegration, New Delhi took global changing scenario on multi polarity. Whereas Washington has taken India as sole important strategic partner which has potential to secure US interests from Europe to South East Asia. In 1992, the both states conducted Joint Naval Exercise for improving strategic co-operation level and later on in 1993; American Congress approved Washington’s advice to introduce new categories for assisting India on military and economic fronts, so to build up confidence level, between both states. In January 1995, US-India signed “Agreed Minute on Defense Relations” biding to make path for signing “Vision Document” during Clinton visit to India. The vision document (signed between Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Clinton) declared a resolve to create a closer and qualitatively new relationship between the US and India on the basis of common interests in and complementary responsibility for ensuring regional and international security. The analyst’s argued that regional changing features played vital role to be in close ties between Washington and New Delhi US policy in Asia is surrounded by one centric factor, called China as emerging regional super power. In this view U.S, already having good developed relationships with Japan in South East Asia, needs India to counter China in entire region. In same sine of thinking, Japan has shown serious reservations about China’s increasing economic power or influence in regional politics and along with a nuclear armed North Korea, having diplomatic support of China. It is a known fact that North Koreas total economy depends upon China and whenever Washington attempted to pressurize North Korea, China handled situation through negotiations among regional members. On April 17, 2002, US-India conducted a weapon Deal, in result of this deal, India received 8 Raytheon Co-long Range weapon, locating radars to India $146 million worthwhile radar system potentially improved Indian military standard because
it can now easily trace long range mortars, artillery and rocket launcher of regional surrounded enemies\textsuperscript{44}. A senior US official stated “the works outcome for the US in Asia from which we are excluded and the key challenge for the US over the past 100 years has been to remain engaged everywhere and not allow any other industrial power to dominate a given region”\textsuperscript{45}. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a think-tank in US presented a report and a senior associate Ashley J. Telis briefed in House committee on International relations on June 15, 2004 to align with India, the Carnegie report pointed out five steps.

First, Washington helps India to grow its military and economic power to prevent China’s dominance in Asia. Second, there should be end of illusory idea of military balance between India and Pakistan and India should be provided more military and economic aid. Third, US should endorse India’s membership in UN Security Council, G-8, APEC and international energy agency. Fourth, the US should allow the sale of dual use of technology, including nuclear safety equipment to India\textsuperscript{46}. While visiting New Delhi, farmer US secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice said” President Bush values to enhance the relationship between the US and India, the fact that we are becoming in many ways important global as well as regional partners\textsuperscript{47}. Fifth, on 28\textsuperscript{th} June, 2005 Washington-New Delhi signed a 10 year Defense pact, resulted in providing military assistance and to facilitate joint weapons production, co-operation on mini defense and transfer of civil and military technology to India.

The \textit{New York Times} wrote “weapon supply to Pakistan and India strengthen the American presence in region. The deal will open the new markets for US throughout the Asian Region for military contractors which are looking for the foreign layer as the Pentagon Budget comes under pressure”\textsuperscript{48}. The Indian express stated “Path breaking Defense Agreement” That will make out mutual goals on which collaboration between armed services of both countries can be identified. This agreement is being witnessed as noteworthy because it has determined to advance defense tie with New Delhi\textsuperscript{49}.

\textbf{Policy of Adjustments and readjustment}

In post Cold War era, Indo-US relations became mature but not at the expense of Russia and China. Recently, New Delhi attempted to resolve boundary conflict with China and finally decision was taken on both sides to open ‘skim trade link’ for exchange of goods and people to people contact. On Afghanistan issue, New Delhi has strong collaboration with China and Russia to eliminate terrorism and Al-Qaeda Network, taken a serious challenge threat to all regional states. From 1979 to 1990, India had remained out of Afghanistan but it had developed strong relations with Afghan Mujahideen as soon as Najeebullah Regime in Afghanistan collapsed. India advocated all Afghan ethnic groups and Pakistan’s Taliban Policy was severely criticized. Through diplomatic influence,
India successfully convinced to Afghan Northern Alliance and later on Iran, China and Russia that Taliban’s rising power will promote Indian Military in entire region. It is a known fact that China has shown serious concern over Taliban’s policies in Afghanistan and across region. In same letter of spirit, Iran favored Afghan Northern Alliance against Taliban government due to its interference in its internal matters. India has no geographical or ideological attachment with Afghanistan; its objective in Afghanistan is to marginalize Islamabad’s interests in Afghanistan. In presence of Pro-Indian government in Afghanistan, it will be a different task for Islamabad to find out strategic depth and to access Central Asian states'. Afghanistan and Central Asian state’s internal political dynamics have been taken serious security threats to India by the Indian policy makers.

The Indian policy makers viewed that emergence of Central Asian states as Islamic block, if ruled by the fundamentalists, would be a serious security concerns in case of Kashmir. Second, the central Asian states have no profound foreign policies, mostly influenced by China, Russia and America. American’s presence in Afghanistan is strategically good for India only for time being but long term plan to stay in Afghanistan means to have eye-watch over India’s door. Another question in raised in India, if America leaves Afghanistan, how much the possibility exist that Taliban’s would not be in position to rule Afghanistan again. In addition, China’s rising influence in SCO is also a serious question for India because China followed compromised strategy with Russia in SCO, instead of influencing to keep on making efforts for adjustments. China preferred to concentrate central Asian economy and the same strategy it has in Afghanistan. Like China, India invested huge capital in Afghanistan for constructing infrastructure so that Karzai Government should be in position to response positively in future. By now, the Indian policy makers are worried that US and NATO troops are located only 1000 Km away located from Jammu and Kashmir, what would be future dialogue process over Kashmir with Pakistan if US and NATO influences Indian Parliament. The New Delhi security analyst’s argued that central Asia has strong Islamic cultural manifestation and Islamic militant groups are actively engaged to sabotage secular minded ruling elites in these states. Instability in Afghanistan and rapidly emerging Islamic militant organizations would encourage extremism and its flame lead to Kashmir. On various accessions Indian government blamed that Islamic militant organizations in Central Asian States and in Afghanistan are actively engaged to promote terrorist activities in Kashmir. No doubt officially not a single central Asian state favored Pakistan on Kashmir issue but it is also a known fact that generally majority people of these states have ideological and emotional sympathies with the Kashmiris. The students of these states are informed by religious scholars and academic institutions professor/ intellectuals about Kashmiri people and independence of Kashmir. The central Asian states media, on various occasion, made reference on Kashmir in context of Pakistan’s moral support and fate of the innocent Kashmiris. These realities
compel to Indian policy makers to locate India in central Asian region in presence of Islamic fundamental forces, if they dominate governmental policies.

India’s security requirements are not only associated with only Washington but also with regional members of South Asia and central Asia. In present scenario, Sino-central Asian states, relations on economic front alarmed India because China begun to extract maximum benefits from these less technological and weak economy states.

An agreement was signed between China and Kazakhstan to build a pipeline from western Kazakhstan to western China, length approximately 3008 Km, of which 270 Km will be within China’s borders. The pipeline cost will be approximately US $2 million and it will carry 20 million tons of oil\textsuperscript{53}. Another pipeline project “Alashankou Druzba Oil Pipeline’ is under consideration between China and Kazakhstan, 4000 Kilometers gas pipeline will be constructed by China itself. In addition, China and Kazakhstan agreed to build a road connecting the southern Bank of lake Issyk-Kul in northern Kyrgyzstan and Aksu district of China’s Xingjian-Uyghur region\textsuperscript{54}. To counter China’s strategy, India focused on developing state to state bilateral relations in central Asia Region on maximum trading front instead of military ties. Apart from this, Indian policy makers begun to focus on SCO utilization at maximum level, that possibility is calculated if Indian government maintains its relations with all ethnic groups of central Asian states. Beside this, the Indian policy makers argued that one favorable point for India is that China has border conflicts with Central Asian States. In Kyrgyzstan border concession to China has become main cause of internal instability as opposition parties in Kazakhstan strictly opposed to ruling party to approve a border settlement in favor of China\textsuperscript{55}. Besides this favorable point, India had long term historical traditional relations with Moscow; recently agreement between both states was signed on civil nuclear reactor programme. The old ties will facilitate New Delhi, interests in Central Asia Region.

**India and Israel strategic collaboration**

Flourishing Indo-Israel-US strategic alliance alarmed to Muslim world especially Pakistan. It is a known fact that Israel always opposed Iran’s Nuclear Programme but on this issue New Delhi never advocated Israeli doctrine because an attack on Iran will leave absolute negative impacts over the Indian economy. But in case of Pakistan, India knows the gravity of situation and has in depth understanding for attaining matching role in desterilizing India. On various occasions, the Pakistani officials stated that they have ample evidence regarding India and Israel’s secret intelligence network involvement in Baluchistan. In addition, it is stated that Indian consulates in Afghanistan are actively engaged to promote Bloch Liberation Movement in Baluchistan most of
the Bloch leaders and workers are financially assisted and trained in Afghanistan and India by the Israeli and Indian intelligence officers.

Recognition of Israel has been remained important matter for both states e.g. Pakistan and India Although Pakistan joined West camp yet ideological attachment with Islamic cause and fear of negation from rest of the Muslim world restricted Pakistan to recognize Israel. In case of India, India-Muslim world relations on trading front and fear of Anti-Muslim community within India and outside India were important factors which marginalized scope of convergence of interests between Israel and India. After Soviet Union disintegration, India realized the need of emerging Delhi-Jerusalem-Washington strategic alliance for maintaining of regional and global security challenges. Harsh Pant stated "Israel also never hesitant to come to India’s defense, publicly and vigorously in most of India’s major conflicts. While India got tacit help and support from Israel during its 1962 war with China and 1965 war with Pakistan. Indian relations with Israel went down-hill in the early seventies with the worsening of the Arab-Israel dispute after the 1967 war." In recent scenario, the Indian policy makers viewed that strategic orientation of Indo-Israel ambitious design has common path, leading to common goals. First, issue of counter-strategy terrorism as faced by India in Kashmir from Pakistan, sponsored Islamic militants and as Israel is facing from the Palestinians. Second, naval joint exercises, weapons upgradation programme, weapons technology transformation, and counter-strategy to restrict Islamic militancy regional political spectrum. Third, Israel-India-America strategic alliance has natural outlook, designed for long term wider strategic co-operation and stronger economic ties with India. Fourth, identifying Islam as common for emergence of Indo-Israel strategic and trading alliance will be in maximum interests of Washington.

Munir Akram commented “The states which are suppressing the right of peoples to self-determination in the Middle East and South Asia are now joining together in what is advertised as an alliance against terrorism but which is more likely to emerge as an axis of oppression. While commenting on Indo-Israel-US strategic alliance in context of security threats to Pakistan, the analyst viewed, “As the US-India-Israel strategic partnership becomes institutionalized Pakistan’s threat perception regarding India’s heightened military proficiency stemming from military to military contacts and joint exercises between India, Israel and US Air Forces and Navies—also heightens thereby further widening the gap between the armed forces of the two south Asian Rivals. It is frustrating for Pakistan that it is going all the way in ameliorating America’s threat perceptions related to Al-Qaeda. While addressing annual dinner of the American Jewish committee, former Indian National security Adviser Brejesh Mishra stated that India-Israel-America are facing common threat, modern day terrorism, so the alliance should be further strengthened on political will for taking bold decisions as morality base building feature.
Conclusion
Indian foreign policy analysis penetrated that beginning of Non-Alignment foreign policy during cold war era was, in fact a state craft effort to be in position of bargaining with either America or Soviet Union. In 1950 and 1960 phases, the Indian policy makers bargained with America but in late 1970s phase they tilted towards Soviet Union. In the post Cold War era, period of transition was observed and they decided to provide more space to Washington in understanding ground realities, based on common interest’s initiatives. By keeping initiatives on foreign front the policy maker focused on Look East Asia Policy and opened scope and range of bold decisions. The Indian policy makers attempted efforts to improve ties with China, Russia, European Union (especially, Germany and France). It is a known fact that after President Bush statement to treat China as strategic competitor and India as strategic partner, and then time former Indian Defense Minister George Fernandez visited China for identifying state-to-state level relationship as to consider necessary for both states in maintaining regional stability. The foreign policy analyst’s argued that time will prove whether Fernandez had been remained successful or not. In fact, the Indian policy makers treated ground realities in different context, taken America in Post-Cold War era as exponent of imperialist globalization in identifying Russia and China as regional players, having potential to influence changing scenario.

The developments were taken place e.g. China-India economic co-operation and on two way trade registered a phenomenal growth during 1990s phase. Second, day to day tranquility transition for establishing China-India military to military contacts. Third, the realization by both states to resolve the boundary dispute through dialogue instead of any kind of confrontation.

In following Look East Policy, Indian policy makers vigorously made efforts to establish bilateral, multilateral or through ASEAN forum. Diplomatic engagement with ASEAN introduced ‘India as good image and larger economic market’ in south East Asia. As a result, India introduced 2005 vision East Asia, Challenges-Perspectives to deal East Asian countries in keeping level of importance for India. India focused on specific states in East Asia from strategic and military perspectives whereas some states are viewed in terms of trading matters. Indian viewed that maximum level participation in regional organizations like ASEAN, SCO and European Union will make path for acquiring more influential role in regional and global politics.
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