

## **India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan**

**Farhat Nasreen**

*Govt. College for Women, Faisalabad, Pakistan.*

### **ABSTRACT**

The events of Russian disintegration and terrorist attacks of 9/11 have cast grave implications on the globe. The terrorist attacks of 9/11 originated terrorism that led US to seize upon Afghanistan and from the womb of Russian collapse there emerged a unipolar world. The emergence of India backed by US has serious repercussion on the region in general and Pakistan in particular. The US finds itself with an unrivalled, uni-polar military and political power after the disintegration of the Soviet Union in the post-cold war. The short-term US-strategic interests and demands do not restrict the policy makers from long-term priorities. The long-term US policy seems to sustain a preeminent position in South Asia. The U.S.-India relationship has undergone a transformation over the past decade. The improvement in bilateral ties and multilateral cooperation has been supported by presidents of both parties in Washington. This article will examine and cover all the aspects of Indo-US strategic partnership and its implications for Pakistan.

**Key Words** Cold War, India, nuclear program, strategic relations, threat

### **Introduction**

Long considered a “strategic backwater” from Washington’s perspective, South Asia has emerged in the 21st century as increasingly vital to core U.S. foreign policy interests. India, the region’s dominant actor with more than one billion citizens, is often characterized as a nascent major power and “natural partner” of the United States, one that many analysts view as a potential counterweight to China’s growing clout (Kronstadt, January 30, 2009). The United States, as the preeminent global power, matters crucially to India’s rise as a great power. America remains the critical stabilizing force in Asia through its military and diplomatic power projection and commitments to the region. The United States and India have a shared vital national interest in preventing a unipolar Asia. (Blackwill et al., September, 2011)

Two incidents rousing in the end of twentieth century and the beginning of twenty-first century cast very dire consequences on the world in general and South Asia in particular. One of the incidents was disintegration of Soviet Union in 1991. Before breakdown of Soviet Union, the world was divided into two blocs:

American bloc and Russian bloc, and a cold war was going on between two blocs. The cold war influenced the world politics and international affairs for many years that started after World War II.

World Politics rising from the womb and ashes of two World wars was, in fact the picture of damage of beaten nations: Germany and Japan when as two dominant powers of America and Russia also came out of that scenario who intoxicated with their supremacy established the situation of Cold War during fifty years (1945–1995) due to their mutual tension and they went on increasing military pressure.

Therefore, all states of the world attached themselves to either of them for amity and security. In this mutual tension of two world powers, the communist countries of Eastern Europe and their organization (COMECON) and two American friends who partook in First World War; Britain and France have also been accompanying them and then all the three countries; America, Britain and France tied the warp and woof of mutual relations and steps were taken about nations and countries of the world. Veto power in Security Council revealed the objective of New World Order that because of the charter and other steps of UNO, now, apparently colonialism will not be imposed as before, neither there will imperialism of prewar time, but practically, the economic and military hegemony of Europe will be increased through economic devices, economic aid and economic requirements. This approach and strategy established and reinforced the tradition of political, economic and cultural slavery that became a duress of the new countries who found a place on world's map after Second World War. These are countries which were labeled as 'Third World'. Their preamble is that these countries had newly or recently got their freedom from the colonialism of British or French imperialism and now they were economically impoverished and needed to be helped. Among these countries, only Afghanistan never became a colony of any other imperial state but her economic penury included her also in Third World. Consequently, for previous sixty years in this outlook and ambience of cold war, the poor nations which were in economic, political or mental tension and atmosphere of Cold War considered UNO to be shelter for their defense. For this reason League of Nations was reborn in the form of UNO, which was the necessity of the time and a wise step.

In fact "the Cold War (approx. 1945 – 1991) was a continuing state of political and military tension between the powers of the Western World, led by the United States and its NATO allies, and the communist world, led by the Soviet Union, its satellite states and allies. The Soviet Union formed the Eastern Bloc with the eastern European countries it occupied, maintaining these as satellite states. The post-war recovery of Western Europe was aided by the United States' Marshall Plan, while the Soviet Union, wary of the conditions attached, declined and set up COMECON with its Eastern allies. The United States forged NATO, a military alliance using containment of communism as a main policy through the Truman Doctrine, in 1949, while the Soviet bloc formed the Warsaw pact in 1955.

### *India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan*

Some countries aligned with one of the two powers, whilst others chose to remain neutral with the Non-Aligned Movement” (<http://en.wikipedia.org/coldwar>).

Both the world powers never wanted to take a directed military action against each other because both had very dangerous nuclear armaments against each other and it would have resulted in sure demolition of the both. To cheek the risk of such a destructive nuclear war, both the countries sought detente in the 1970s to alleviate their mutual stress.

However “in the 1980s, the United States increased diplomatic, military, and economic pressures on the Soviet Union at a time when the nation was already suffering economic stagnation. In the late 1980s, This opened the country and its satellite states to a mostly peaceful wave of revolutions which culminated in the fall apart of the Soviet Union in 1991, parting the United States as the dominant military power. The Cold War and its events have left a significant legacy, and it is often referred to in popular culture, especially in media featuring themes of espionage and the threat of nuclear warfare” (Openness:1985).

The end of the Cold war and fall down of Soviet Union was resulted in the emergence of the US as a sole super power and thus bipolar world was turned in to unipolar world. This raised the hopes and expectations of a new world order based on justice and fair play under the charter of the United Nations. But “later events belied these naïve hopes” says Javid Hussain (2010: 1). He regrets that “freed from the checks and balances of bipolarity the certainties of the Cold War were replaced by an unpredictable environment by the domination of power over principles, the US taking advantage of its dominant global position and with the aim of strong thinking it further tried to bend the UN to its will or simply by passed it where the UN resisted its command” (Hussain, 2010). This hegemonic attitude of US resulted in to multifarious international reactions. It gave rise to upheaval and disappointment in the 3<sup>rd</sup> world countries that further led to terrorism.

The other terrible incident having far reaching effects on international scenario took place on September 11, 2001, when Pentagon and World Trade Centre, two symbols of US military and economic powers were hit by the severe terrorist attacks. The Jihadi Terrorist organization, Al-Qaeda was blamed. “Nineteen terrorists of this organization”, it is said “hijacked four passenger planes and crashed them into the twin towers in the New York City, the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia and a field near Shanksille, Pennsylvania. The Twin Towers warped killing thousands of people” (Hussain, 2010).

Whole of the world was actually shocked at this utmost inhuman activity and resultantly the western countries decided, as a response to “launch a war on Terror to hunt out individuals responsible for this tragic happening” (Hussain, 2010). Osama bin Laden the founding member of Al Qaeda was considered the “mastermind” behind the incident. He also claimed the responsibility who later took shelter in Afghanistan therefore, US forces launched a war in Afghanistan. “The US attack on Afghanistan”, says Hussain “was projected as a legitimate act of self-defense to defeat Al-Qaeda and to over throw the Taliban government which was accused of providing sanctuary to Al-Qaeda” (2010: 9). Concluding the

Post 9/11 International Scenario 'Javid Hussain' writes: "The post 9/11 international scenario is undergoing a gradual but definite transformation. While the US by far remains the most powerful nation in the world militarily, economically and culturally, its 'unipolar moment'" has already passed. It is facing growing challenges from rising powers in different parts of the world, the most important being China. The international trend is, therefore from a unipolar to a multi-polar world in which the US, China, Japan, EU, Russia, India, Brazil, Mexico, ASEAN, South Korea, Turkey, Australia, South Africa and Nigeria will play a dominant role in international affairs. The rise of China and India will also transform the strategic scene in Asia" (Hussain: 11-12).

Ever rising economic growth of China is an alarming threat for America. Moreover, China needs steady, reliable and cheap energy supplies while peace and stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan would ensure faster, stable and easier access to Eurasian energy resources (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>). On the other hand Russia also supports the export of energy resources by the Central Asian states to China and South Asian countries (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com>).

However, the concern of US and its allies is to; impede any eastward flow of the Eurasian energy without involving and the NATO countries would like to use Afghanistan to export the Central Asian energy to the West via the Arabian Sea ports" (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>). However, the race to access and capture energy has been proved to be one of the major reasons for growing terrorism and instability in Pakistan and Afghanistan and "one of the aims of the 'war on terror' baloney could be to obstruct energy supplies to the Asian economic giants and discourage any efforts for cooperation and integration in Asia" (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>). This war is considered the war of deception and the intelligence operatives of several countries pursue their own agendas through violent means" and "where all sides could be sponsoring terrorist groups to fight proxy wars on their behalf" (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>).

US is not only scared of China as a rising economic competitor, but China as a rising economic super power, has now become an opponent of US in Space Science also, by recently using a 'ground based' ballistic missile to demolish an old weather satellite. It is also continuously modernizing its nuclear potential. Calling for 'construction of a strong Chinese navy, one with "blue-water" capabilities is also a step ahead. In fact China has been acquiring Russian weaponry including submarines and anti-ship missiles' (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>).

Therefore Pentagon considers that "Of the major emerging powers, China has the greatest potential to compete militarily with the US and field disorderly military technologies that over time offset traditional US military advantages missing US Counter strategies" (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>). That is why US is fearful of Chinese advancement. Bandow confirms the point with his observation that "Rapid" economic growth, global trading ties and expanding diplomatic cooperation have pushed China to first rank of nations. There are other potential contenders for future international influence, Brazil and India, for instance but

### *India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan*

Beijing is likely the next peer competitor to the US. No one knows, but some day the People's Republic of China and America are likely to meet as equals" (<http://eaglesofpakistan.com/>).

Probably, for this very reason, US wants to create a new Cold war era by strengthening India in face of China to compete China economically, politically and even militarily because a mini super power like India is more in favor and benefit of America than a rising super power like China. Hussain is of the view:

“The US is deeply concerned about the growing economic and military power of China which can pose a challenge to it on the Asian mainland within the next two decades and globally in the second half of the 21st century. It is, therefore pursuing a well-calculated policy of containing China through building up India as a counterweight, strengthening its alliances with South Korea, Japan and Australia, and developing its relations with the ASEAN. The recently signed Indo – US agreement for cooperation in civilian nuclear technology despite the fact that India delivered a serious blow to the international nuclear nonproliferation regime through its nuclear explosions of 1988 was motivated by the US desire to build up India as a major world power of the 21st century” (2010: 6).

However, America and its European partners have decided to assign India as a regional supervising policeman to counter China as well as to keep watch on different geographical units by strengthening and making her a (mini super) power for small countries of the region. This whole action is now attractively, “wrapped in a beautiful diplomatic term of “strategic partnership”. On the other hand India has also determined her objectives of international level, that is to become a big power and for the same objective she is declaredly trying to get a permanent seat in the Security Council of UNO, along with veto power like other five world powers. “The friendship treaty with Russia”, says Dr. Tamimi, “on one hand and strategic relations with America on the other hand are like a double share market that may be called a policy to pressurize People's Republic of China” (2010: vii).

Recently also India is afraid of China's attack on India in 2012. However, Chen Zheo is of the view that: “The reasons given for the invasion are senseless. There is only one possibility of a war, and that is India's ‘New Forward Policy’ which may increase border issues and compel China to use force. India can give all the answers.

### **India and the other Regional States**

India as a big country has established her relations with small neighboring countries filled with anxiety and tension or even disputes instead of balanced

relations. The small neighboring countries feel a threat to their internal security and solidarity due to her huge geographical figure. Professor Tamimi comments on the overt design of Indian domination saying:

“Her long and short term policies also reflect lust for territorial aggrandizement and her hegemonic designs based on her past traditions and domestic compulsion. Panikar considers that India’s security and defense is not possible until she does not have complete control on far off places like Singapore, Mauritius, Eden and Smatra and until her air and naval forces are not so strong and advanced to provide security to these areas. Indian security is possible only when she takes the responsibility to safeguard the defense of all these areas. It is essential for her own security.” (122)

He further comments on Indian Policy:

“IncurSION on the neighboring countries in the light of their tradition, history and ideology is a precise but comprehensive definition of the real manifesto of Indian Policy “(122).

However the territorial aggrandizing plans of India are as follows:

- Territorial factor is a decisive element therefore the areas near India like Nepal, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Burma, Malaya, Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Indonesia are very important from Indian point of view.
- Therefore, it is essential for India to occupy Singapore and Suez Canal which will be a doorway for India. But if some Indian enemy gets control on them the existence and independence of India will be in danger.
- For a considerable period, Afghanistan had been a part of India. But recently keeping in view her requirement of oil, Iran is very important for India so the interests of India are attached to that region.
- In the same way her oil-requirement forces India to pay attention to Arab countries. Same is the case with Iraq.
- After liquidation of British Empire, there is a vacuum in the region that needs to be filled.
- Being a great naval force it is necessary for India to have a complete control on Indian Ocean from Singapore to Suez Canal (Patil, 1960: 13, 22).

## **Background**

India is the biggest country of South Asia with reference to her population, area and resources for having 78% of the area, 73% of the population and 77% of GDP. She has a fast developing economy and her leadership has set a national target to make India an advanced country by 2020 AD. It is due to many reasons particularly her educational system, technology, a wide railway system,

### *India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan*

consistency of political system as well as a huge and well organized army, equipped with the latest Russian and American weaponry etc. “Indian economy” writes Riaz Ahmad Chaudhry, “had been as fast as Chinas and other developed states. Her information Technology (IT) industry, motors, universities, shopping centers, airports and even her media is on the way to speedy expansion “(Chaudhry, 2010: 9). She has also joined the Atomic Club due to two nuclear explosions in Pokhraran (Rajasthan) in 1974 AD and 1999 AD. She has also signed a Civil Nuclear deal with America and trying to sign such deals with Russia, France and even “to further enhance her position on international level”, writes Dr. Tamimi, “India has very skillfully determined her objectives at international level, that is to make her a big power and for the same objective she is declaredly trying to get a permanent seat in the Security Council of UNO, along with Veto power like other five world powers” (Tamimi, 2010: VII).

### **Religious Philosophy of India**

However, every country or nation has a right to make an utmost progress in their own interest. There are many elements including history, geography and strains of inner situations or domestic compulsion behind all these actions. However Siraj Munir goes in further depth of the psyche of the nations and discovers that the character, actions and behavior of a nation depends upon religious belief of a nation (1987). The religious books of a nation are the best sources of viewing religious beliefs of a nation. *Rig Veda*, *Yagir Veda*, *Sama Veda* and *Atharva Veda* are the four books which have got the status of holy writ in Hinduism. Maulana Maudoodi says:

“In the teaching of these Vedas, there is a keen desire to dominate other nations, to win fame by showing courage and bravery among contemporaries and ruling other countries with majesty and grandeur” (1981: 329).

There are following objectives found in the holy books of the Hindu religion for their nation:

“O Indir! Bring that wealth which would bestow us pleasure, a permanent wealth of a conqueror that would help us a lot and through which we can ward off our enemies in hand to hand fight”( *Rig Veda*: 2-1-8-1).

“May our enemy become handless and may we make their lazy arms useless and thus O Indir! We may distribute all riches among ourselves” (*Atharva Veda*: 3-1-32-4).

“If you become victorious, you will enjoy all pleasures of life therefore, be up for a permanent war” (*Bhagavad Gita*: 2-35-37).

“When a Raja performs his religious obligations, he must try to occupy the areas that are not under his rule and protect well his own areas” (*Manu Smiriti*: 251-9).

Two aims are categorically enjoined for the Hindus in their divine books. They are to overcome other countries and nations and to grab more and more wealth and become rich. Manu Smiriti is a Collection of Laws for Hindu community that reflects a true picture of Indian politics also. Manu was in fact a king of Koshal dynasty who collected a collection of laws for Hindu nation in 880 B.C. which is called *Manu Smiriti*.

There is another book which got the status of a “Holy Writ”; *Arthashastra* that was written round about 320-21B.C. This book comprising 150 Chapters also contains rules and regulations of affairs of the state, of government, departments’ organization and division of Hindu governments, the guiding principles of an effective and well organized government including:

1. Obligations of a ruler,
2. Responsibilities of ministers and specially the principles of foreign policy,
3. Administration; the policies to regulate and principles of division of work relating to internal, external, civil, military, commerce, trade, finance and judiciary, etc.

This book was written by Chanakya (his scholarly name), Kautilya (his pen name) and Vishnu Gupta (his original name). Chanakya was the prime minister during the reign of Chandragupta Maurya. However, he was more famous as a king maker than a Prime Minister. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the lifelong Prime Minister and minister for foreign affairs of India thus pays tribute to Chanakya:

“Chanakya has been called the Indian Machiavelli and to some extent the comparison is justified but Chanakya was greater in every way: greater in intellect and actions” (Nehru, 1946: 96).

K.M.Pannikar a famous policymaker praises the *Arthashastra* of Chanakya in the following words:

“Arthashastra of Chanakya enables Hindu thinkers to evolve a purely secular theory of state of which the sole basis is power” (Gupta, 1985-73).

The principles of Hindu nationalism and especially the principles of dealing with neighboring countries, enemies and warring nations are described as a code of instructions which are summarized in following lines:

- The lust for achieving authority and territorial aggrandizement should never be appeased.
- The neighbor should be given the same treatment as given to the enemies and they should be kept under severe observation.
- Relations of friendship should be established with non-neighboring countries.
- Self-interest should be given priority while establishing friendly relations with other countries and craft politics should never be left.

### *India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan*

- The fire of rivalry should always be kept burning in the heart and no chance should be missed to wage a war. During war terrorism of severe level should be spread and our own citizens should also not be eared of in this regard.
- An expedition of hostile propaganda, destructive activities, mental and ideological erection should be kept continue and spy should be (illegally) sent to the other countries, all these things should ever remain continued.
- Economic war should be waged against hostile countries through bribe and other tactics and people should be hired from other countries.
- Peace should never be considered even all world compels you (Shastry, 1967: 371).

However, the Indian nationalism is interwove with her history; especially with the thoughts and ideology of the holy books of the Hindus and different eras of their past confirm clearly that the foundation of Hindu rule is formulated on aggression and hegemonic steps. In both cases, either peace or war their diplomacy is ever active to perform their military designs, India calls it by the modern name of free and impartial foreign policy but in case of their national interest, they are neither free no impartial, even during the years of cold war, they had simultaneously, been plotting with both major powers of America and Russia and had treaties of mutual commerce, trade and defense and diplomatic relations with the both.

Chanakya's philosophy of politics and state is more 'advanced'. Raghonath Singh; a civilian of Jaipur (Rajasthan) wrote a letter to Daily, *Hindustan Times* who advised to determine Indian Foreign Policy in the political scenario of first three months in 2003. He writes that if they miss the chance of uniting India, America and Israel, they (Indians) will be very foolish. The, interests of all the three are common against Islamic terrorism. He does not know any nation that favors ethics to her own interests (*Hindustan Times*, March 25, 2003).

A comprehensive review on this letter appeared in "Khabro Nazar" in *Sehroza Da'wat*, New Delhi, lamenting on destruction of ethics regarding the national interests:

"This letter consisting of a few lines is not a personal perception of an individual; it reflects a permanent and extensive mentality in accordance with the teachings of Arthashata" (2003).

Briefly, the Indian leadership has been planning their policies based on nationalism according to these principles. It may be called centuries old traditions of India or a test of history; however, it is the spirit of the movement of Hinduism also of History. Their control may belong to any party but their national party remains the same. From Nehru to Indira and then from Gujral to Vajpayee since up to date, the thinking of all the people, holding authority after independence on August 15, 1947, on their national policy is identical and uniformed. Their objective is same though ways may be different and individually regarded but they are according to their national designs.

## **U.S-India Relations after Cold War**

From the very beginning, the US-India relations had been unfriendly because India became an ally of USSR. This circumstances remained continue for almost fifty years of 'Cold War'. However, the cold situation went through a gradual change in the post – Cold War era and both USA and India started cooperating in various fields including industry, agriculture, space technology and nuclear energy. "The main emphasis", write Mussarat Jabeen and Ishtiaq Ahmed, "was civilian nuclear cooperation. On July 18, 2005, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh paid a visit to the US and signed a joint agreement with President Bush. This visit was reciprocal and President Bush was in India in March 2006" (2011:411). The conclusion of these bilateral visits was that "US was willing to help India to become a major power in the 21<sup>st</sup> century" and American cooperation for this objective was assured (Balachandra, 2005: 2002). "The 10-years Defense framework agreement was signed for mutual cooperation in different areas of security. Agreed minutes were already signed in 1995" (<http://newdelhi.usembassy.gov/ipr062805>).s

Initially, India had to face severe US apprehensions on her nuclear program and "Indo-US Nuclear relations of last six decades saw fundamental difference. This conflicting situation jeopardized the bilateral relations for three decades" (Jabeen & Ahmed, 2011: 111).

Five permanent members of the UN Security Council were legalized nuclear powers under NPT, because they achieved nuclear capability before 1967. NPT does not allow any country of the world to become a nuclear state. "Article 9 of the Treaty", says Epstein "provided the definition of NWS as one which had conducted nuclear tests and built nuclear weapons before January I, 1967 and others were defined as non-nuclear weapons states as they did not detonate nuclear devices" (1976: V.C.) Trivedi calls it "global nuclear apartheid" because according to it "India remained an 'underdog' in nuclear order" (Ibrahim 2007: 6). "This discrimination", opine Jabeen and Ahmed, "was alarming for India, which was wrestling to keep its nuclear option open" (413). The NPT was enforced in 1970 and India, Pakistan, Israel and Cuba refused to sign CTBT (Comprehension Test Ban Treatises), on the other hand, "globally constrain legal mechanisms for solving down and eventually halting the increase in nuclear weapons" (Jabeen & Ahmed, 2011: 413). The NPT was considered as plan to dishearten innate resentment in nuclear arena. However, "The NPT made no efforts to discourage the state to get nuclear weapons as source of prestige or power but froze the nuclear status quo effectively" (Ibrahim, 2007: 7). For the very same reason India denied to sign NPT after detonating her first plutonium device; Pokhran I in Rajasthan desert and being sixth nuclear state in the world. "After this explosion, Indira showed her global approach to nuclear disarmament and repeated its rejection of the NPT on the ground that it was discriminatory" (2004: 14). On the other hand India incessantly advanced in her missile capability for the deployment

### ***India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan***

of nuclear weapons. The US did not like this progression and India had to face US nuclear sanctions which damaged Indian nuclear program.

The Indian missile and nuclear programs were not only an intimidation for regional security but it was also a danger signal for American military installation in Diego Guracia. The rage of Agni – III ballistic missile fired on February 2010 was 3, 500 km. that could carry a payload of 1.5 tones. “The Director-General of Defence Research Development Organization (DRDO) and Scientific Adviser to Defence Minister Dr. V.K Saraswat called the test of Agni-III ‘a fantastic launch and a hat-trick’. He added: ‘It shows the development of the missile’s design and the quality of its systems because we have had three successes in a row without any mark. The flight gave us the full range and pinpoint accuracy. The missile traveled accurately its entire range to its last decimal place as we had planned’ (Policy Reports, Feb, 2010). Dr. Saraswat also announced his future plan of launching next missile Agni-V, ranging 5,000 Km (Policy Reports, Feb, 2010). According to “the defence pact 126, fighter jets, satellite and two atomic reactors will be provided to India. The Indian defence budget had reached Rs. 14 trillion and 17 billion after a recent increase of Rs. three trillion 167 billion and 300 million” (Chaudhry, 2010: 201).

### **Dawn of new era in U.S-India Relations**

The nuclear test conducted by both India and Pakistan; two South Asian states in May 1998 made very critical situation. However Indian Foreign Minister tried to stabilize the situation during his stay in Washington by pleading the case of India then a return visit of Clinton to India was considered to be dawn of new era in Indo-US relation. Eight rounds of discussions between Jaswant Singh and Strobe Talbott in different countries provided a sound base for new relations.

Aggressive strategic relations between US and India based on acrimony and mistrust went through a significant change when Condoleezza Rice, the US secretary of state visited India in March, 2005. “There remain significant, albeit surmountable, difference between the two states, particularly in regard to India’s reluctance to support the US operation in Iraq and its desire to develop every link with Iran and US concerns about India’s reluctance to conform to the NPT and CTBT; agreements, it should be noted, that India never agreed to sign in the first place” (Ganguly, Shoup & Scobell, 2006: 1).

However, the reasons behind the growing US-India strategic relations are the American realization of Indian emergence as a key regional player in swift economic growth which is also backed by its military strength like extension of its blue water navy. India’s fear of China is also shared by US who wanted to present India as counter weight to China to safeguard US interest in the region. Indian offer of all her support after 9/11 against war on terrorism is also considered important in such a difficult situation in Afghanistan and even after war the building up of infrastructure of war ragged country. Moreover India estimated to access US and European markets for its goods and concession.

Although there are some current factors working behind the improvement of US India relationship but China factor is the most significant and fundamental among them. “In many respects” writes Shoup and Ganguly, “The India US relationship is evolving in response of the changing role of India as a regional power (and potential counterweight to China), the growth of India’s economy and its attendant impact on US interest in such varied realms are energy policy planning and foreign trade, and Washington’s interest in continued stability in the subcontinent in light of its stated objective in the war on terrorism” (Chaudhry: 2010). The authors also note that “Recent improvement in Indo-US relations have largely been based on defense policy cooperation. This is not a trivial matter as a meaningful bilateral relations must have a sound footing in defense related issues” (Chaudhry, 2010: 4). After attaining the US status of sole super power of the world, China evolved as a problem for USA. However, India did not lag behind. “India’s nuclear programs must be analyzed as both a consequence of its own border regional security interests, particularly as they pertain to China, and also as a result of its burgeoning energy needs”. Such a rapid economic growth of India required equally rapid increase in energy availability. India’s rapid rate of economic expansion required an attendant increase in energy availability. This need for energy reserves is a powerful motivator behind New Delhi’s close relations with Iran, a state whose vast reserves of oil and natural gas are viewed as a viable source of power of India’s growing economy” (Chaudhry: 2010).

Both India and the Defence department of United States had been trying to find out some other areas for the nuclear program to make their relation better and more useful. Therefore both the countries were successful to explore certain areas of convergence of interests at political and strategic levels that supported in constructing a strategic partnership for gaining certain goals. These are:

- “The United States has vital strategic interests in the world’s largest reserves of energy lying in the Middle East, Gulf region and South Asia. India occupies the strategic location linking the Indian and Pacific Oceans.
- Other common value is “the freedom of the high seas” and more specifically the sea-lanes emanating from the Hormuz Straits and branch out in the West and East. The US military presence in this area has been strengthened by occupying the base facilities, particularly in South Asia.
- Chinese military power in the Asia Pacific is a challenge to the US dominance. This region has the largest reserves of energy in the world. India also perceives China as a security threat to its vital interests because it is becoming a more powerful by the passage of time with its preponderance of nuclear weapons and military might. Chinese assistance in missile development has strengthened Pakistan in South Asia.
- In international relations, geo-economic and geo-strategic considerations are very crucial and partnerships in enhance the strength of the nations. The US and Indian strategic partnership is inevitable as it is increasing relations and economic interests. For India, the US provides important, dynamic and

### *India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan*

strategically rich options to counter the emerging threats in the region (Kapalia, 2006).

- All above-mentioned factors led both countries to seek a strategic partnership as a step to access the wider field of cooperation as compared to erstwhile allies of the Cold War relationship. Authoritarian regimes and dictatorships are not in the position to provide the US with the sinews to counter new global challenges. The US chose India to face these challenges as both are democracies, where change of government is peaceful and economic growth is assured.” (Jabeen & Ahmed, 2011: 418).

The USA wanted to help India to become a significant world power in 21<sup>st</sup> century by assuring her cooperation (Balachandra, 2005: 202). The 10-years Defense Framework agreement was signed for mutual cooperation in different areas of security. Agreed Minutes were already signed in 1995. (<http://newdelhi.usembassy.gov/ipr062805.html>).

Both USA and India were also agreed on ‘separate plan’ that differentiates the military and civil requirements of India. The important points of this plan are:

- Eight indigenous Indian power reactors will be placed under an India specific safeguards agreement, the total number of power reactors is 22 and 14 will be brought under safeguards (6 are already under safeguards).
- Future power reactors would be placed under safeguards, if India declares them as civilian. Some facilities in the Nuclear Fuel Complex e.g., fuel fabrication will be specified as civilian in 2008.
- Nine research facilities, three heavy water plants would be declared as civilian.
- The following facilities and activities are outside the separation list:
  - Eight indigenous Indian power reactors.
  - Fast Breeder Test Reactor (FBTR) and Prototype Fast Breeder Reactor (PFBR) under construction.
  - Enrichment facilities
  - Spent fuel reprocessing facilities (except for the existing safeguards on the Power Reactor Fuel Reprocessing (PREFRE) plant
  - Research reactors: CIRUS (which will be shut down in 2010, Dhruva, Advanced Heavy Water Reactor.
  - Three Heavy water plants
  - Various military-related plants (e.g., prototype naval reactor) (Squassoni, 2007).

### **Kashmir Issue**

Pakistan had been a main problem for India since their inception as India considers the creation of Pakistan amounts to hack mother India to pieces. To India the existence of Pakistan is the main impediment in her solidarity and achieving her national goals of being a super power and to get a permanent seat in the Security Council of UNO with veto power. But it is impossible until India resolves her

controversies with Pakistan. For this reason many negotiations have been set but they bore no fruit. Pakistan in technical complications as she did in Indus Water Treaty. However the major clash of all is on Kashmir issue.

At the time of partition of India, Kashmir was considered to be included in Pakistan due to its geo-strategic, religious, civilizational and cultural positions. 90 percent Muslim population of Kashmir was also in favor of Pakistan. On October 27, 1947, Mountbatten ordered Indian force to enter Kashmir and thus India made Kashmir her colony. Since that day Kashmiris are facing humiliating atrocities of the Indian. India tried to make this imperialistic occupation perpetually by force instead of trying to win the hearts and minds of the people. Pakistan demanded the extraction of Indian forces from Kashmir and plebiscite under the joint control of both the governments but India did not agree. The Kashmiris retaliated with the moral and military help of Pakistan. When the Indian advance met with reverses, she went to the Security Council on January 1, 1948. The Security Council appointed the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) to investigate the factors and mediate between them on January 20, 1948.

### **Water Issue between India and Pakistan**

India wants to choke Pakistan by usurping water supplies that rightfully belong to Pakistan under Indus Water Treaty of 1960. "Under the treaty, Pakistan was awarded exclusive rights to Ravi, Beas and Sutluj rivers. The treaty proved uninterrupted water supply from India for ten years and in the meantime World Bank provided loans to build three dams – Warsak, Mangla and Terbel. Eight link canal and five barrages were also built under the treaty" (*Policy Report*, Nov 2009: 12). The violation of this treaty by India has caused water shortage in Pakistan.

"India has started construction of the 1,030MW Basrur Multipower project, 1,200 MW Siwalkot dam and 1,000MW Pakot Sul dam on Chenab after the completion of the Baglihar Hydropower project. It had not provided any technical information about the new dams to Pakistan as required under the Indus Water Treaty. India is not only building projects on Chenab but was also building 240MW Uri Power Project and 330MW Kishan Ganga Power Project on the Jhelum River. India plans to build a 21-Kilometer-long tunnel for diversion of the Neelam, Jhelum and the Kishan Ganga water Project, which threatened Pakistan's 930 MW Neelam – Jhelum Project. India is also using more than its permitted water share through Ranber and Partab canals" (Chaudhry, 2010: 173-74).

Among the recent issues are two main issues: Indo – Afghan Nesuis and Indian interference in Baluchistan.

### **Indian Activities in Afghanistan**

Sadly enough India is ever busy in subversive activities in Afghanistan against Pakistan, a front line ally, in spite of much sacrifice in war on terror. To Riaz Ahmad Chaudhry:

### *India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan*

“Pakistan is frontline ally of the US in war on terror still the US never snubs India who is busy in subversive activities against Pakistan particularly in Baluchistan and that too using Afghan soil. It depicts India enjoys full US support and its patronage for doing the same. Without American patronage, it is impossible for any country to make its own infrastructure in Afghanistan and that too at time when Afghanistan is under American control. Indian agencies have been running training camps in Afghanistan” (2010: 128).

However Pakistan has clearly and severely warned to check their activities. Gen. Kayani has clearly warned that:

“Pakistan will never accept such move which permits India to train Afghan national army; this issue has been subsided for the time being. However, India’s training camps are in full swing and are continuously sending their lots to Pakistan for different assigned tasks i.e bombs blasts, suicidal attack and other activities to destabilize Pakistan by creating uncertainty among the masses, crushing economy and spoiling the infrastructure of the country to declare it as a failed state. To fulfill all the above mentioned designs, India is looking forward to have some sort of permanent role in Afghanistan to get its vested agenda to be met by destabilizing Pakistan and establish it as the only power which can see into its eyes and possesses the strategic and military strength to wipe of Indian designs against Pakistan” (Chaudhry: 2010).

### **Indian Interference in Balochistan**

The province of Balochistan which is prolific in material and significant strategically is now extremely involved in active militancy that is worsening its security situation day by day. Among many others two main problems have become very serious: target killings and missing persons. It is very regretful that India is also plotting behind these problems on the incitement of America and Israel. All the three countries want to check China’s influence in Balochistan as well to use this region for various vicious objectives through providing funds, arms and training to the insurgents ([www.dawn.net/ddarlnew.asp?id5669](http://www.dawn.net/ddarlnew.asp?id5669)). According to a news reporter, “A few weeks ago more than one hundred Pakistani Baloch dissidents were sent to Indian consulate located in Kandahar for six months training” ([www.dawn.net/ddarlnew.asp?id5669](http://www.dawn.net/ddarlnew.asp?id5669)). Thus these forces are promoting terrorism, insurgency and instability in Balochistan.

### **Conclusion**

According to her national agenda, India is permanently and continuously proceeding and trying hard to become a regional and international power and a permanent member of Security Council with veto power. She is showing progress on military, technological advancement and economic front and proceeding with national spirit in the field of education and organizing her institutions and striving for potential hunt and then patronizing it. Continuity in their judiciary,

constitution, parliament and democracy have helped her to get better and progress on external and foreign fronts. She is vigilant and ever ready in her foreign policy to achieve her national targets. After wholly utilizing Soviet Union, she has turned towards America and Europe and is successful in achieving more and more benefits on diplomatic front. However, on the other hand forty percent of Indian population is living below poverty line and is permanent victim of starvation. Millions of people in big cities like Delhi, Bombay, Chennai and Calcutta are forced to live on footpaths while millions of other live in Cottages. India is an ocean of poverty. It is not a blame, it is a fact that may be verified throughout India, outside the hotels, railway stations, airports, temples and shrines where hungry and lean people are longing and begging for food for one time. Her foreign policy is no doubt moving forward successfully and her foreign face has no doubt impression of leadership but her inner picture is miserably poor.

On the other hand she is trying to develop intimate relations with America and Europe and swinging in this regard with full force and trying to take the swing high up, but she must improve her relations with close neighbors particularly with China and Pakistan. The inner and even foreign picture of Pakistan is also not good. Law and order situation and corruption have made the life of the people very appalling. Terrorism, dearness and unemployment have shaken the very foundations of the country. Therefore, both India and Pakistan should pay their consideration to their inner problems as well as try to address and resolve their mutual disputes by substantial, useful and fruitful bilateral talks. In this way both the country can achieve their goals.

## References

- Blackwill, Robert D etal. (September 2011). The United States and India: A Shared Strategic Future. Council on Foreign Relations. file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/USIndia\_jointstudygroup\_IIGG.pdf
- Baluchandra, G. (2005, April-June). *“Indo-US Relations: Perceptions and Realities”*. Strategic Analysis.
- Chaudhry, Riaz Ahmed. (2010). *“The Real Face of India”*. Lahore: Cantt.
- Epstein, William. (1976). *“The Last Chance: Nuclear Proliferation and Arms Control”*. New York: Free Press.
- Gupta, M.G (1985). *“Indian Foreign Policy; Theory and Practice”*. Agra: Y.K. Publishers.
- Hindustan Times*. 2003, March 25.
- Hussain, Javaid. (2010). *“Post 9/11 International Scenario”*. In *“Post 9/11 Globe”*. Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore.
- Ibrahan, Ittij. (2007, May). *“Origin of the United States – India Nuclear Agreement”*. Working Paper, Washington, East West Centre.
- Jabeen, Mussarat & Ahmed, Ishtiaq. (2011, July-Dec). *“Indo-US Nuclear Cooperation”*. *South Asian Studies*. Vol. 26 Number 02.
- Kronstadt, Alan K. (January 30, 2009). India-U. S. Relations. Congressional Research Service.file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/nps49-031313-30.pdf

### ***India US relations: Concerns for Pakistan***

- Maudoodi, Maulana Abdul Ala. (1981). “*Al-Jihad Fil Islam*”. Idara Tarjamamul Quran, Lahore.
- Munir, Siraj. (1987). “*Millat-e-Islamiya; Tehzib-o-Taqdeer*”. Institute of Islamic Culture, Lahore.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. (1946). “*The Discovery of India*”. Calcutta: The Singnet Press.
- Policy Report*. Nov 2009: 12, PSC, University of the Punjab, Lahore.  
Retrieved from <http://eaglesofpakistan.com>
- Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org/coldwar>.
- Retrieved from <http://newdelhi.usembasy.gov/ipr062805>
- Retrieved from [www.dawn.net/ddarlnew.asp?d5669](http://www.dawn.net/ddarlnew.asp?d5669).
- Retrieved from [www.worldmag.com/articles/819](http://www.worldmag.com/articles/819)
- Shastri, Dr. Shama. (1967). “*Kautilya's Arithshastra*”. Mysore: Mysore Publishing House.
- Squassoni, Sharon. (2007, Feb). “*US Nuclear Cooperation with India: issues for Congress*”. Congressional Research service (CRS) Report and Issue Briefs.
- Tamimi, Dr. Muhammad Jahangir. (2010). “*Indian Foreign Policy: A Critique*”. Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

### **Biographical Note**

**Dr. Farhat Nasreen** is Assistant Professor, History Department, Govt. College for Women, Gulistan Colony, Faisalabad, Pakistan

---