

Muhammad Farhan Khan*, Iram Khalid**

PM Modi's Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Case Study of Post-Pulwama Situation.

Abstract

The study of foreign policy decision making (FPDM) process is the key to investigate the role of actors, structures, and environment during the decision-making activity. In the Indian context, the role of structures of internal organizations is vital in providing policy alternatives. However, the importunate of leadership cannot be neglected in the context of domestic polity. Since 2014, the BJP's nominated hardliner Prime Minister Narendra Modi transformed the Indian foreign policy objectives and adopted multi-alignment policy to enhance the Indian influence in regional politics. Having a background of right-wing ideological orientation, PM. Modi envisioned India as the next hegemon of the region South-Asia to dictate regional trade and security. In this context he adopted aggressive foreign policy measures by re-joining the already suspended alignments and showing muscles to Pakistan after 2016 Uri- Attacks and 2019 Pulwama incident. The personality cult of PM Modi and his advisors have a critical role in making such policy moves. This research work is intended to investigate the post-Pulwama major foreign policy decisions of PM Modi.

Key Words : Foreign Policy Decision Making (FPDM), Hindutva, Multi-Alignment Policy, Kashmir Policy, Pulwama-Attack, Modi's Ideology .

Introduction

Indian foreign policy has always been criticised as the product of *innenpolitik*, constructed on *Hindutva* oriented ideological grounds. Beginning from the *Nehruvian* non alliance to the transforming *Indira Ghani's* foreign policy objectives, the influence of Hindu-Nationalist agendas had been the corner stone of Indian foreign policy decision-making. However, India's projection as a secular state remained the main question of inquiry for the foreign policy analysts. The subject matter of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) is the direct comprehension of the decision-making process, factors involved in decision making and the role of leadership during the normal and crisis conditions. Derek Beach (Beach, 2012) explains "FPA investigates questions related to the impact of the international system upon foreign policy, the impact of domestic determinants like public opinion and institutions, and how different decision-making processes matter for foreign policy trends or specific actions". The Dawn of 2014 has witnessed a paradigm shift in Indian domestic political affairs viz a viz in foreign policy decision making. The government of BJP (Bhartiya Janata Party) nominated Mr. Narinder Modi as its Prime-Minister. Since his early period of government, Narinder Modi was sceptical towards Pakistan's Geo-strategic and Geo-economic affairs. He took major foreign policy decisions to counter Pakistan in the region South-Asia. Further, Modi Government took wised economic decisions and also prioritized the 'Look east Policy'(Saikia, 2017). The aggressive stance towards Pakistan's role in the elimination of terrorism and its international image was the main target of Indian foreign policy. India's involvement in Afghanistan, cordial relations with Iran, Security and Defence agreements with U.S.A and making more friends in Muslim world unveiled her futuristic foreign policy agendas. It is observed that events happen and resultantly shape the future discourse of a nation-state's foreign policy plans; during cold war many happenings had transformed the economic, military, and diplomatic alliances of USA and Soviet Union. Contrarily, some happenings are destined to manipulate the reality and to obtain political gains in domestic political milieu by projecting jingoism. The same is done in the case of Pulwama attacks. Alex Mintz argues that *Diversionsary Theory* elaborates the use of force by the leadership as a tactic to divert general masses from the real issue(Alex Mintz, Karl DeRouen Jr., 2010). This theory vividly explains the role of leadership to use aggression on foreign front to acquire benefits in the domestic arena and manoeuvre the situation by projecting external factor as a huge threat comparing to internal issues. Similarly, the well-recognized psychobiographer, *James David Barber*, elaborated four types of leaders in his seminal work named as 'The Presidential Character' , in which four types of psyches of leaders are discussed out of which the active-negative leaders are more prone to self-centred decisions to protect their political interests and regime (Hudson, 2014).The foreign policy decision making (FPDM) process involves multiple levels, beginning from the framing of the problem to the consideration of alternatives. The focus of foreign policy analyst is to determine the personality impacts and the role of leadership, internal political culture, economic factors, and the overall mechanism of decision-making process. Therefore, the main

* Mr. Muhammad Farhan Khan Abbasi is a PhD Scholar of International Relations in the Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab-Lahore. He is also a visiting faculty member of the Department of political

** Prof. Dr. Iram Khalid is the Chairperson of the Department of Political Science University of the Punjab-Lahore

objective of this research work is to explore all such factors in the post Pulwama decision making process. To make this work more appropriate to the foreign policy circles the theoretical framework is designed to comprehend the psychological aspects of Indian Prime Minister Modi's personality, the internal politico-economic and cultural factors, and the role of leadership to influence the foreign policy decision making (FPDM) process. Additionally, the explanandum and explanans of Modi's FPDM have been evaluated and state response to the Pulwama attacks and post Pulwama policy measures are discussed in this piece of writing.

Theoretical Framework

Foreign policy decision making (FPDM) process is the key to understand the roles of organizational process, bureaucratic culture, group think dynamics and the influence of leadership in choosing policy alternatives. Therefore, foreign policy analyst performs three levels of analysis to comprehend the whole process of decision-making and evaluates the outcomes of the decisions. These levels include individual level, group level and state level analysis respectively. Further a theory is applied to determine the pros and cons of the decision-making process and roles of multiple actors. Thus, the actors, structures and environment in foreign policy decision making are the major areas to be explored to reach pragmatic conclusions. The Seminal work of *Graham T. Allison* 'Essence of Decision-Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis' explains three important variants of decision-making process which include Rational Actor Model (RAM), Organizational Process Model and Bureaucratic Politics Model (BPM), here the actors and structures involving decision making process are examined in great detail. Likewise, the Bounded Rationality theory of Herbert A. Simon examines the same process by evaluating the limitation of leader's cognitive and mental abilities to choose among multiple policy alternatives. Additionally, the Cybernetic model of John D. Steinbruner provides more appropriation in analysing decision-making process by avoiding the uncertainty in decision making process through the utilization of information feedback loop. Alex Mintz argues that the cybernetic paradigm prohibits the necessity to compute best possible procedures and choices on the basis of desired results by removing alternatives and disregarding the environment and the issue of diversity. The decision-maker recognizes the decision as a simple one that does not require detailed mental dispensation. There is no need to settle on the estimate of likelihood of all potential results because there is not expected to be a large range of outcomes. The cybernetic decision maker cleans out irrelevant information and therefore is only centred on a thin range of incoming information. (Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen Jr, 2010, p. 69). Steinbruner claims that while playing the game of tennis; the tennis player uses a feedback loop already present in his thought process and performs the hitting the ball task repeatedly without making hundreds of conscious calculations (Steinbruner, 25th august 2002).

In this piece of writing the researcher will focus on the psychological aspects of Modi's personality, his influence on decision making process and the roles of other actors on post-Pulwama period. Therefore, Poliheuristic model of decision making is adopted to analyse the post-Pulwama decision making process, prospect and diversionary theories are applied to examine the personality of PM Modi.

Poliheuristic Theory by Alex Mintz

The term Poliheuristic is projected by Alex Mintz to provide alternative foreign policy decision making paradigm. In other words, it is the extension of the bounded rationality prescribed by Herbert A. Simon. In this model of decision making, executives or political leaders avoid long term analysis of multiple policy alternatives and adopt simplest way of dividing the given problem into two stages described by Alex Mintz that Poliheuristic theory hypothesises when making decisions, policy makers employ a two stage decision process consisting of (a) refusing substitutes that are undesirable to the policy maker on a serious measurement or dimensions and (b) selecting an alternative from the subset of residual substitutes while enlarging benefits and curtailing hazards (Mintz, 1, February 2004). The major features of Poliheuristic decision making include importance of domestic politics, avoidance of non-compensatory loss, satisfying, non-holistic and political survival is considered as prime interest. The term Poliheuristic can be divided into 'Poly' means many and heuristic 'shortcuts' that is used as a foreign policy decision making model in crisis or when decisions are needed with precise alternatives. In this way both the bounded rationality and rationality can be objectively adhered. At first stage the complex foreign policy issues are simplified by rejecting irrelevant or unacceptable alternatives according to the situation. Later, among the already finalized alternatives a few are picked up rationally by keeping the factor of optimal result generation or maximization of benefits and limiting the losses (Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen Jr, 2010). However, all other theories of foreign policy decision making are initiated from economics and public administration, whereas Poliheuristic model is purely political as it is deep rooted in the psychological paradigm of political leadership which prevent domestic political loss on the cost of foreign policy decision. Alex Mintz elaborates Poliheuristic theory by exemplifying the Turkish government's decision to withdraw support to US-troops in 2003 against Iraq. The Turkish government at first stage negotiated with US officials to have \$6 billion as aid and \$24 billion as loans but when the Turkish parliament disapproved this deal due to heavy domestic pressure the government came out of the deal with American and

gave preference to their public opinion. In this way the application of Poliheuristic theory enables us to simplify the complex situations and opt for the best available alternative to avoid domestic political uncertainty. This objectivity in determining the best alternative in minimal time can only be observed in Poliheuristic paradigm. Alex Mintz (2004) suggests that the non-compensatory political loss abhorrence variable in Poliheuristic theory can be utilized in several ways as follows:

- Danger to a leaders’ subsistence
- Substantial drop-in public assistance for a policy
- The chances for an electoral setback
- Domestic hostility
- Threat to government endurance
- Intraparty competition
- Internal or external contest to the government
- Impending crisis of the coalition, government, or regime
- Danger to political Authority, dignity, honour, or legality of a leader
- Protest, riots and so forth
- The presence of veto players (e.g., pivotal parties in parliamentary government) (Mintz, 1, February 2004, p. 9)”.

Thus, Poliheuristic theory, of foreign policy decision making, having such set of traits makes it different from other theories like cybernetic, prospect theory and expected utility theory. Additionally, it can be the best theory to explain complex foreign policy issues in a simplest way as it is inherently a combination of short cuts, rationality, multidimensional and multiplayer. Alex Mintz provides a critical examination of this theory in a tabulation form and describes major foreign policy dictions took by multiple leaders in Middle east. The table ‘A’ is given below.

Table No. A: Poliheuristic Studies of Decisions by Leaders in the Middle East¹

<i>Leader</i>	<i>Country/ Entity</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Author</i>
Hafez al-Assad	Syria	Syria’s peace and war decisions Viz a viz Israel	Astorino-Courtois (2000)
Yasser Arafat	Palestinian Authority	Patterns of conflictual and cooperative interactions with Israel	Clare (2003)
Yasser Arafat (2003)	Palestinian Authority	Decision during the Palestinian intifada of 2000-2002	Mintz and Mishal
Saddam Hussein	Iraq	Gulf War 1991	Mintz (2000)
Netanyahu, Peres, Rabin	Israel	Decisions before and after the Oslo Accord 1993	Clare (2003)
Yitzchak Shamir	Israel	Decision on Coalition formation In 1992, 1994	Mintz (1995)
Nawaz Sharif	Pakistan	Pakistan’s Decision to test the Bomb in 1998	Sathasivam (2003)
Ariel Sheron (2003)	Israel	Decision during the intifada	Mintz and Mishal

¹ How Do Leaders Make Decisions? A Poliheuristic Perspective by Alex Mintz, Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2004, page no. 6, table no. 3. (Accessed June 2020).

Therefore, the Poliheuristic theory holds reasonable position among the scholars of International Relations and Conflict Studies.

Prospect Theory and the role of Individual Leader in Decision-Making

Greg Cashman (2014) identifies the important role of leader's personality as risk biasness propounded by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in their "Prospect Theory". He evaluated five important situational models of the "*Prospect Theory*" given below.

- People develop a subjective reference point to choose among different situations, and such alternatives are adopted in terms of gains and losses rather than objectivity. The tendency to avert the risk made people to become more cantered to their already developed reference point. So, they relate the relative gains or losses to the reference point and take decision as per their subjective approach rather than acquiring the real output.
- People are more loss averting then gaining new things. Therefore, they calculate things before taking decisions to avert loss rather indulge into any critical situation to gain something. This is called the endowment effect.
- In terms of risk aversion there are two situations; (i) when people feel to gain something they avert risky situation to retain their status quo and (ii) when the loss is inevitable then people take risks to reduce the losses.
- There is an important aspect of reference point while framing the problem, when the problem is framed towards securing the status quo as reference point, leaders take risks, however when the problem is framed in a way to maintain the status quo leaders avert risks.
- Finally, the way how leaders acknowledge gains and losses in making decisions. Psychologists believe that people accommodate gains more than losses. This is called instant endowment effect. So instant endowment effect made leaders to take decisions towards gains (GregCashman, 2014, p. 77).

Resultantly, it can be said that individual leaders take foreign policy decisions by keeping all the aforesaid points in mind as they are human being. So, the political psychology determines the behaviour of leadership while taking foreign policy decisions. Therefore, the individual level of analysis in FPDM enables the scholars of FPA to identify the impacts of environment on leader's personality, the situations in which leader takes decisions, the endowment effect, the way problem is framed viz a viz expected outcomes.

Diversionary Theory and Individual Decision Making

George Simmel and Lewis Coser are the two prominent sociologists who propounded the 'Ingroup-Outgroup hypothesis' in which they explained the behaviour of leaders who divert the public attention towards the external enemy and avoid conflict within the domestic arena. In such diversionary behaviour the internal political volatility can be reduced, and the attention of domestic issues is relocated to the external adversary. Usually, the politically weak leaders do such acts and before taking such measures they calculate the overall expected outcomes of their decisions. DeRouen Jr. examined diversionary dynamics and concludes that force is more expected when unemployment is elevated, and that power leads to jump in approval. Thus, military force overseas diverts public mind away from a vulnerable economy (Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen Jr, 2010, p. 130). Alistair Smith argues that this diversionary behaviour occurs when the popularity of a leader is declining or the leader is suffering from a scandal, so those states which hold strong strategic position their leaders can go for an attack on their weaker counterpart without providing any justification (Alex Mintz, Karl DeRouen Jr., 2010). The similar behaviour of leaders can be seen during domestic political campaigns of general elections when they want to show their strength and acquire maximum public favour. Therefore, the diversionary theory occupies an important place to assess the individual leader's decision-making behaviour after evaluating the domestic political concerns (Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen Jr, 2010).

Thus, all three theories mentioned above adhere to the single rationale that leaders take decisions on foreign policy issues to protect their domestic political legitimacy by keeping in mind the following aspects.

- Avoidance of Non compensatory political loss
- Maximizing benefits and minimizing risks
- Importance of domestic politics

- Political survival
- Decision making as per subjective approach rather than objectivity
- Self-cantered policy making to avert political losses
- Protection of instant endowment effect
- Diversionsary behaviour to averts domestic losses

Pulwama Attack and Indian-State Response

On 14th February 2019 (Thursday) a terrorist attack occurred on Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) by an explosive led vehicle at Latoomode near Awantipora in Pulwama(the district of Illegally Indian occupied Kashmir, IIOK). Since 1998, it was the worst attack on paramilitary force in Illegally Indian Occupied Kashmir (IIOK), in which 44 CRPF personnel were killed, and many were injured (The Economic Times E-Paper, 2020). After few hours of the news of the Pulwama attack, Indian media started criticising Pakistan as the perpetrator of this attack. The Indian national security meeting was conducted and Delhi declared to withdraw the Most Favourite Nation (MFN) status for Pakistan, Prime Minister Modi conducted emergency meeting on Friday with his national security advisor and stated that “ our security forces are given full freedom to respond” and the finance minister Arun Jaitley warned Pakistan to be isolated in global community (Maria Abi-Habib, Sameer Yasir and Hari Kumar, 2019). In the streets of Delhi hundreds of supporters of Hindu-Nationalist Party ,the BJP and RSS, protested against Pakistan and demanded retaliation and crushing of enemy. The white House showed her concerns by supporting the narrative of Modi government and demanded Pakistan to end its support to terrorism. This stance of India and USA was denied by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) of Pakistan and the information minister Fawad Chaudhary offered a joined investigation of this terrorist activity that was vetoed by Indian authorities (Jamal, 2019). Unfortunately, the attacker; Adil Ahmed Dar was a young Kashmiri student who had been severely tortured and humiliated by Indian military and paramilitary forces many times in the past (HALL, 2019). Since 2016, the aggressive policies of Modi government in illegally Indian Occupied Kashmir (IIOK) fortified violence as a common factor among the youth of Kashmir (IIOK) (Dawn Editorial, 2019).

Modi’s Foreign Policy Decisions in Post-Pulwama Situation

All the major foreign policy decisions of Prime Minister Modi, after Pulwama incident, are the clear reflection of his Hindutva oriented ideology and self-cantered behaviour to retain his political authority in the domestic political environment. His security policy in the region South-Asia demonstrated offensive military behaviour to undermine the peace of the region. Additionally, his loyalty towards the RSS agenda of the purification of India from non-Hindu masses has been surfaced by his domestic policies. On the Kashmir(IIOK) front his act of denouncing the status of Jammu and Kashmir by the annulment of Article 370 and 35a from Indian constitution unveiled his vague gesture of promoting India as secular democracy. In this work his few foreign policy decisions after the Pulwama incident are evaluated in detail.

Strengthening Security and Military Cooperation with USA

Since 2014, Indian Ministry of external affairs (MEA) and Ministry of Defence were consistently engaged in concluding security cooperation and defence agreements with USA. In August 2016 India and USA signed a defence agreement called LEMOA (Logistic Exchange Memorandum of Agreement) that allowed both countries to monitor China’s military activity and enhancing influence in the region and to counter terrorism. LEMOA enabled both countries to share each other’s military, air, and naval bases in case of emergency and US Navy has planned to deploy her 60 percent navy in Indo-Pacific region to closely monitor the Chines Sea-born trade and Sino-Pak Sea-lines of communication. In the same moth the Forbes magazine warned Pakistan and China to be in great stress after the conclusion of this agreement and the other two in the pipeline (Iqbal, 2016).

On September 6,2018 India and USA signed COMCASA (Communication Compatibility and Security Agreement) in New Delhi during the 2+2 ministerial meeting. Since 2002 it’s the third most significant defence agreement after GSOMIA (General Security of Military Agreement) and LEMOA (Logistic Exchange Memorandum of Agreement). This agreement enabled India to use American military communication of CENTRIX (Combined Enterprise Regional Information Exchange). The major feature of COMCASA is the utilization of American defence technology as Major Defence Partner (Panda, 2018). Additionally, after this agreement India is eligible to acquire the communication interoperability with the military of USA and it can procure transfer specialized equipment for encrypted communication (Peri, 2018).

Last week of October 2020 was marked with a successful finalization of long-awaited defence agreement BECA (Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement) between USA and India. Before this, India was much dependent on Russia for her military hardware. Now India can use American military assistance in geospatial intelligence to gain more optimal results in automated missile and armed drone technology. Similarly, both countries will share classified satellite data and critical information of Chinese military mobilization and naval communication. BECA will enhance Indian military capability to access topographical and aeronautical data that will help in navigation and pointing the adversary (Hali, 2020). The dominated Hindu right wing party BJP was critical to conclude strategic partnership with USA to enhance her role in the region and dominate Pakistan's missile superiority (Rej, 2020). The foreign office of Pakistan showed acute concerns by identifying Modi's aggression in IIOK and the situation at Line of Actual Control (LAC) between China and India. Further, Pakistan registered her protest on creating strategic imbalance, by USA, in the region that will certainly undermine the peace of South-Asia and would lead to severe security consequences (Reporter, 2020). Jagannath Panday Argues that "Washington has swiftly made India a linchpin of its Asia strategy, considering it a critical partner for maintaining long-term stability in Asia- directed first toward terrorism and now primarily toward China's growing aggressiveness" (PANDA, 2020).

Focusing On Multi-Alignment Strategy

BJP led government of Narendra Modi advocates the shift from non-alignment to multi-alignment policy to maintain her position in regional politics even having worse relationship with China. The membership of BRICS, RIC, and SCO enabled India to develop a non-western security cooperation and share mutual economic benefits. Secondly, India is eager to project her security policy to counter terrorism by avoiding FIGOs² (Formal Intergovernmental organizations) alignment Structure and adhering to forum shopping policy. This forum-shopping policy enabled India to minimize the impacts of her failure of policy agendas among different regional organizations and soft balancing to constraints antagonistic powers (Frank O'Donnell & Mihaela Papa, 2021).

India's role in 'Quad' (officially Quadrilateral Security Dialogue) enables her to counter China's superiority in the region and promote American agendas of inclusiveness. On 6 October, 2020 the in-person meeting of Quad was organized in Tokyo. The plan was to counter the effects of non-traditional security threats, develop a huge security alliance and to curtail the exploitative and coercive role of China in Indo-pacific region. The purpose of Modi government is to enhance her influence in the Indo-pacific region through informal platform of Quad to accommodate country's economic and strategic needs, because the growth of Indian Ocean as a strategic trade corridor for more than two-third of global oil shipments and third of bulk cargo attracts regional stakeholders to gain maximum benefits (Jash, 2021).

Adopting Aggressive Kashmir Policy

Modi's Kashmir (IIOK) policy is the product of hard-line right wing RSS ideology, who consider, Hindu Nationalism as the core of the independence of India. Modi not only acted on his hawkish agendas of 2014 election campaigns but also showed his muscles after 2016 by claiming to eliminate the Jaish e Muhammad (JeM) strong network in IIOK and surgical attacks in the Pakistani state of Azad-Kashmir. However, after Pulwama incident India attempted to invade in Pakistani territory and lost her two pilots and three aircrafts by the retaliatory actions of Pakistan's Air force. Later Modi adopted the policy of provoking national sentiments in Indian parliament and repealed the Article 370 and 35a of Indian constitution to revoke the privileges of native Kashmiris and enforced lockdown in the territory (IIOK) (Bagwe, 2019).

Modi's Post-Pulwama foreign policy decisions are the outcome of his ideological orientation of greater India and psychological reflection of active-negative personality with the political behaviour of averting non compensatory domestic political losses.

Explanandum and Explanans of Modi's Foreign Policy Decisions in Post-Pulwama Situation

The term explanandum denotes "which is to be explained or the decisions taken by human decision makers". In other words, all the decisions made during the exhaustive foreign policy decision making process, either by individual leader or by group or by bureaucracies, all come under the purview of explanandum (Hudson, 2014). These decisions include recognition of the problem, framing of the problem, sequencing of alternatives, finalization of one or more than one alternative, goal prioritization and sometime nothing is decided due to

² FIGOs : Organization without delegation ; informal intergovernmental organizations (IIGOs) and spectrum of intergovernmental arrangements : India's multi-alignment management and the Russia-India-China (RIC) triangle BY Frank O'Donnell and Mihaela , International Affairs 97: 3 (2021) 801-822; doi:10.1093/ia/iab036Papa P. 803

uncertain circumstances. However, those things in this process that have never been inspected are accidents or mistakes or sometime such decisions that have never been hypothesized. Therefore, the whole process (of foreign policy decision making) from the beginning to the end is called explanandum (Hudson, 2014). The explanandum of Modi's foreign policy decision making comes under the domain of Poliheuristic model which determines that the decisions taken after Pulwama attacks were subjective to the Hindu-Nationalism , domestic political culture, regional security, multi-alignment, and economic opportunities . Secondly, these decisions were the outcome of the aversion of non-compensatory political losses, military alternatives were adopted to maintain the status quo and to avoid internal clashes rather than objectivity. The psychological aspects of Modi's personality being a negative active leader has affected his decision-making ability. His self-centred politics, adherence to the Ideology of Hindutva and long-term relationship with hawkish Hindu-segments of RSS have also paved the way to decide aggressive stance reflecting in post-Pulwama period. Additionally, India's decision to revive the lost RIC (Russia-India-China Triangle) in 2018, even having acute boarder tension with China, signifies Modi's cross-national agenda to counter the growing economic initiative of CPEC (China Pakistan Economic Corridor). RIC alignment could be among the best alternatives to SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization) and BRICS (Brazil Russia India China and South Africa) where India remained unsuccessful to promote her counter terrorism agenda (Frank O'Donnell & Mihaela Papa, 2021). After LEMOA (Logistic Exchange Memorandum of Agreement) and COMCASA (Communications Compatibility and Security Agreement) India has signed BECA (Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement). The first agreement (LEMOA) was signed in august 2016 based on logistic exchange from the military and air bases during the time of emergency. Likewise, LEMOA is beneficial for both countries (USA and India) to support each other's navy in Indo-Pacific region. The second agreement named as COMCASA was signed in September 2018 after 2+2 ministerial meeting in Delhi. This agreement envisages coordination of both countries' militaries by highly advanced communication system that is mutually shared, and secure networks are built to ensure harmonisation during the time of peace and war. Lastly the agreement named as BECA was signed in October 2020 after the 2+2 ministerial meeting in Delhi. It has enhanced Indian military capacity to get real-time geospatial intelligence surveillance and accuracy of automated missile and drone vehicles. These foreign policy decisions and conclusion of security agreements with USA unveiled Modi's aggressive plans in the region (Roy, 2020).The rejuvenated Quad: a losing grouping, rather than a formal alliance (officially Quadrilateral Security Dialogue) among United States, Australia, India, and Japan, conducted virtual meetings in 2020 and 2021 where newly elected President Joe Biden of USA, PM Narendra Modi of India, Australian PM Scott Morrison, and Japanese Prime Minister Yoshihide Suga shared their concerns about China's assertiveness in the regional and global political arenas (Smith, 2021). On 6th august 2019 the Indian parliamentary decision, to repeal article 370 and 35a, established that Modi's political campaign during 2019 election was reflecting his original mentality of hardliner towards non-Hindu minorities. Conclusively, the post-Pulwama foreign policy decisions were the result of instant endowment effects to accommodate political gains more than losses in domestic political milieu.

The Explanans of the Post-Pulwama Modi's foreign policy decision making includes the domestic political factors, public opinion , cultural and ideological orientation, and role of indigenous media.

Limitations

The applicability of Poliheuristic theory has certain limitations in Indian context. There is no access to the classified data or minutes of the meeting of Indian Prime Minister's cabinet where foreign policy decision making meetings held. Secondly, the group think dynamics during crisis decision making is also hidden in Indian context. All the available literature and other electronic resources are insufficient to identify the role of actors, structures, and environment of Indian foreign policy decision-making. Lastly, insufficient data to trace the cognitive and psychological orientation of PM Modi made this work limited to be examined critically.

Conclusion

To epitomize the whole discussion the researcher finds some critical factors involved in post-Pulwama foreign policy decision-making.

- PM Narendra Modi used Pulwama attack as a diversionary tactic to deceive his nation by diverting public attention from domestic economic and political issues to external enemy and took hard-line in his election campaign against Pakistan to gain emotional affiliations.
- His policy of strengthening security and defence cooperation with U.S.A is to balance Chine's role in Indo-Pacific region.
- His Multi-Alignment policy of invigorating RIC (Russia India China Triangle) is to create new space for the projection of counter terrorism narrative that was unattended in SCO and BRICS.

- His aggregative Kashmir (IIOK) policy is the outcome of his negative active psychological orientation and diehard association with RSS agenda of Hindu Nationalism.

References

- Maria Abi-Habib, Sameer Yasir and Hari Kumar. (2019, February 15). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from nytimes.com: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/15/world/asia/kashmir-attack-pulwama.html>
- Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen Jr. (2010). *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Edinburgh : Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Alex Mintz, Karl DeRouen Jr. (2010). *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*. (First, Ed.) New York: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
- Bagwe, A. (2019, September 13). Modi's Grand Strategy in Kashmir? Delhi. Retrieved July 12, 2021, from <https://www.fpri.org/article/2019/09/modis-grand-strategy-in-kashmir/>
- Beach, D. (2012). *Analyzing Foreign Policy* (First ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved 2018
- Dawn Editorial. (2019, February 16). Pulwama attack. Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Retrieved August 5, 2021, from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1464153/pulwama-attack>
- Frank O'Donnell & Mihaela Papa. (2021). India's multi-alignment management and the Russia–India–China (RIC) triangle. *International Affairs*, 97, 801–822.
- GregCashman. (2014). *What Causes War? An Introduction to Theories of International Conflict* (second edition ed.). New York, Toronto, Boulder, Lanham, Poly Mouth, UK: Rowman&Littlefield.
- Hali, S. (2020, November 2). BECA — a new Indo-US bilateral agreement. Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan: The News . Retrieved 7 6, 2021, from <https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/737917-beca-a-new-indo-us-bilateral-agreement>
- HALL, I. (2019, February 21). Pulwama terrorist attack: Modi under pressure. Sydney, Australia. Retrieved August 07, 2021, from <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/pulwama-terrorist-attack-modi-under-pressure>
- Hudson, V. M. (2014). *Foreign Policy Analysis : Classic and Contemporary Theory*. (Second, Ed.) New York: ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD.
- Iqbal, A. (2016, Published August 30,). US-India defence pact to impact Pakistan, China. Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan: Dawn. Retrieved 07 11, 2021, from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1280873>
- Jamal, U. (2019, February 16). *The Diplomat*. Retrieved from thediplomat.com: <https://thediplomat.com/2019/02/understanding-the-origins-of-the-pulwama-attack-inside-pakistan/>
- Jash, D. A. (2021, March 08). The Quad Factor in the Indo-Pacific and the Role of India. Alabama, USA. Retrieved July 10, 2021, from <https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/JIPA/Display/Article/2528182/the-quad-factor-in-the-indo-pacific-and-the-role-of-india/>
- Mintz, A. (1, February 2004). How Do Leaders Make Decisions? : A Poliheuristic Perspective. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 48 , 3-13.
- Panda, A. (2018, September 09). What the Recently Concluded US-India COMCASA Means. Arlington, USA. Retrieved 7 9, 2021, from <https://thediplomat.com/2018/09/what-the-recently-concluded-us-india-comcasa-means/>
- PANDA, J. (2020, OCTOBER 28). How the US and India became brothers in arms. Hong kong, Hong Kong. Retrieved July 30, 2021, from <https://asiatimes.com/2020/10/how-the-us-and-india-became-brothers-in-arms/>
- Peri, D. (2018, September 16). What is COMCASA? Delhi: The Hindu. Retrieved 7 9, 2021, from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/what-is-comcasa/article24881039.ece>
- Rej, A. (2020, August 24). India and US Likely to Sign Geospatial Intelligence Pact. Arlington, USA. Retrieved 7 28, 2021, from <https://thediplomat.com/2020/08/india-and-us-likely-to-sign-geospatial-intelligence-pact/>
- Reporter, D. S. (2020, October 28). US move to share military data with India alarms FO. Islamabad, Capital Territory, Pakistan. Retrieved July 29, 2021, from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1587335>
- Roy, S. (2020, November 3). Explained: BECA, and the importance of 3 foundational pacts of India-US defence cooperation. New Delhi, India: The Indian Express. Retrieved August 6, 2021, from <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/beca-india-us-trade-agreements-rajnath-singh-mike-pompeo-6906637/>
- Smith, S. A. (2021, May 27). *The Quad in the Indo-Pacific: What to Know*. Retrieved 08 06, 2021, from cfr.org: <https://www.cfr.org/in-brief/quad-indo-pacific-what-know>
- Steinbruner, J. D. (25th august 2002). *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision: New Dimensions of Political Analysis*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. Retrieved June 2020
- The Economic Times E-Paper. (2020, February 14). Pulwama terror attack: What happened on Feb 14 and how India responded. Delhi.