



INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

**K Ravi Sankar
Shefalika Narain**

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

K Ravi Sankar
Shefalika Narain

BLACK ●●
PRINTS
NEW DELHI

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

K Ravi Sankar, Shefalika Narain

*This edition published by **BLACK PRINTS INDIA INC.**,
Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002*

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval
system or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publishers.*

Edition: 2022 (Revised)

ISBN: 978-93-82036-18-0

BLACK●● PRINTS

Excellence in Academic Publishing

Editorial Office: 116-A, South Anarkali, Delhi-110051.

Ph.: 011-22415687

Sales & Marketing: 4378/4-B, Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road,
Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002.

Ph.: +91-11-23281685, 41043100 Fax: +91-11-23270680

Production: A 2/21, Site-IV, Sahibabad Industrial Area
Ghaziabad, U.P. (NCR)

e-mail: blackprintsindia@gmail.com

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Exploring the Main Objectives that Underpin Foreign Policy Strategies of Countries	1
— <i>Shefalika Narain</i>	
Chapter 2. Approaches To the Study of India's Foreign Policy.....	8
— <i>Dr. Zuleika Homavazir</i>	
Chapter 3. Methods for the Promotion of National Interest	18
— <i>Dr. Yukti Khajanchi</i>	
Chapter 4. International Determinants of India's Foreign Policy.....	27
— <i>Dr. Varsha Agarwal</i>	
Chapter 5. Analyzing the Responsibilities of Central Government of India: Ministry of External Affairs	36
— <i>Subodh Chandulal Khanna</i>	
Chapter 6. Foreign Economic aid and India's Independent Policy	44
— <i>Subodh Chandulal Khanna</i>	
Chapter 7. India-United States of Dialogue Architecture.....	53
— <i>Dr. Zuleika Homavazir</i>	
Chapter 8. Examining the Multifaceted Dimensions of India–UK relations.....	63
— <i>Dr. Parag Amin</i>	
Chapter 9. Pakistan and Afghanistan Relations for Foreign Policy.....	72
— <i>Harishchandra Jaising Parab</i>	
Chapter 10. Exploring the Multifaceted Dimensions of the ULFA-ISI Connection	79
— <i>Subodh Chandulal Khanna</i>	
Chapter 11. Pacts and Agreements Between India and Sri Lanka.....	87
— <i>Dr. Zuleika Homavazir</i>	
Chapter 12. Relationship Between India-Nepal and the Maoist Insurgency	96
— <i>Shailee Sharma</i>	

CHAPTER 1

EXPLORING THE MAIN OBJECTIVES THAT UNDERPIN FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGIES OF COUNTRIES

Shefalika Narain, Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- shefalika.narain@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Foreign policy serves as a critical framework through which a nation engages with the international community to safeguard its interests, promote its values, and contribute to global stability. This paper explores the main objectives that underpin foreign policy strategies of countries around the world. By examining historical examples and contemporary practices, it becomes evident that foreign policy objectives are multifaceted and dynamic, influenced by geopolitical dynamics, economic considerations, security concerns, and cultural factors. This study sheds light on the diverse array of objectives pursued by nations, including economic prosperity, national security, diplomatic influence, human rights advocacy, and cooperative engagement. While objectives may vary, the central aim remains the advancement of a nation's standing in the global arena.

KEYWORDS:

Alliances, Diplomacy, Economic Relations, Geopolitics, Humanitarian Aid, International Cooperation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Every time there is a change in political leadership or the administration, no mature country permits its foreign policy to be drastically changed. India has unequivocally shown its maturity in this regard. Even seventy years after its independence, Nehru's non-alignment, peaceful coexistence, and pacific resolution of foreign problems remain the cornerstone of its policy. India's foreign policy favors global harmony and the peaceful resolution of international conflicts. India rejects all kinds of aggression, war, and bloodshed. India has complete trust in the UN's principles. In all of its political and socioeconomic endeavors, it has partnered with the UN. It advocates for a world free of nuclear weapons and favors disarmament. It aims to safeguard its national interests and is conscious of its security issues. India wants to see a decrease in conventional weapons and a complete prohibition on nuclear weapons within the confines of global peace and security. The purpose, purposes, objectives, and principles of India's foreign policy are discussed in this book, *India's Foreign Policy*. Additionally, it discusses the many methods used to examine Indian foreign policy. It also examines India's relationships with SAARC nations and major powers, its foreign economic policy, and the diplomatic roles of the UN, ASEAN, and EU. Finally, it describes the main actors and trends in India's foreign policy [1], [2].

This book is broken up into four parts and written in a self-instructional style. An overview of the "Unit Objectives" is presented after the "Introduction" to the subject in each unit. The information is then given in a straightforward and understandable way, with 'Check Your Progress' questions inserted here and there to gauge the reader's comprehension of the subject. At the conclusion of each lesson, there is also a list of "Questions and Exercises" that contains both short- and long-answer questions. Students may benefit from the 'Summary' and 'Key Terms' sections, which are designed to effectively summarize the book. A nation's foreign policy, often known as its foreign relations policy, consists of self-interested measures

taken by the state to safeguard its interests at home and accomplish its objectives abroad. These methods are strategically used while communicating with foreign nations. The globe is becoming more "globalized" or networked. We are no longer just a small group of distinct states. We depend on one another economically and militarily.

States may need to connect with non-state entities in order to realize the advantages of multilateral international collaboration as a result of the rising degree of globalization and transnational activity. Foreign policies are developed by the governments of different nations utilizing high-level decision-making procedures because national interest is of utmost importance. The difficulties of dealing with other nations may cause some nations to become isolationist. However, isolationism in foreign policy cannot be entirely avoided.

India's foreign policy is fundamentally derived from the liberation struggle. While battling for independence, the freedom fighters were also active in other vital causes. The principles that arose at that time remain valid now. India's foreign policy is largely concerned with maintaining friendly ties, ensuring that all nations are treated equally, emphasizing the ideals of non-alignment, and conducting international interactions fairly. Therefore, a foreign policy is nothing more than a policy that directs international relations. Foreign policy, which has a variety of aims, is crucial for understanding how other governments behave. Additionally, there are certain objectives that must be accomplished via foreign policy. You will learn about the idea of foreign policy in this unit, along with its definition, goals, and numerous techniques. The section will also cover the development of Indian foreign policy as well as its local and international drivers.

Foreign Policy's Purpose and Goals

There have been several scholarly discussions over what foreign policy means. It is, in plain and simple words, the relationship between nations on all matters of international importance, such as disarmament, peace, climate change, decolonization, justice, etc. In more precise terms, foreign policy refers to a nation's strategy for advancing its national interests in international affairs, such as by accepting or rejecting treaties like the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Non-Proliferation Treaty or by vying for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. A state strives to influence other states' behavior via its foreign policy. A state's and its statesmen's general guiding principle in this process is the national interest. Initially, it was thought that a nation's foreign policy developed only from considerations of national interest and that interactions with other nations were unrelated to any other interests[3], [4].

Different people have different ideas on what national interest is. The extreme idealists describe national interest with some universal moral aim, such as perpetual peace or human fraternity, whereas the extreme realists specify national interest with some kind of national power. A statesman, however, always looks for a notion that views security, domestic progress, and global order as elements of national interest. In the context of specific nations, in particular, the national interests of one nation may differ from those of another nation depending on the social and economic climate of that nation. A wealthy or developed nation would aim to maintain its current condition and make additional improvements. In the event of a poor or developing nation, the national interest would be safeguarded with regard to its political autonomy and desire to quicken economic growth in order to raise the quality of living of its people in the age of globalization.

It must be kept in mind that it is now extremely difficult to separate a country's national interests from its geopolitical or geostrategic position and the surrounding international environment in the age of globalization. Therefore, a country's foreign policy is more than just the sum of its foreign policies; it also encompasses its commitment, its present interests

and ambitions, as well as the moral ideals it upholds. As a result, both internal and international issues influence India's foreign policy. Some of these variables are dynamic and change over time, while others are fundamental and have a long-term effect or influence on foreign policy. As a result, there is often continuity and change among these aspects while a nation is deciding on its foreign policy. It is quite fascinating to see how a nation's foreign policy develops through time to take on its current complicated shape. It is a continuous process where multiple components interact with one another in diverse contexts and ways.

No state can escape becoming involved in international affairs nowadays, it might be stated. If it is based on certain established guidelines, this engagement may undoubtedly be enhanced and systematized. This gives rise to a sound motivation for the creation of foreign policy. Once again, the word "foreign policy" implies a higher level of logic and a methodical planning process leading to a clear and defined purpose. It is a reasonable reaction to the external circumstances, which are real and properly recognized. Even if there are regional and global restrictions on any such close-knit planning, efforts are made and will continue to be made in that direction.

An essential component of the logical justification of global behavior is foreign policy. Without comprehending state foreign policy, it is difficult to comprehend interstate relations. Therefore, one of the most crucial components of studying international politics is the study of foreign policy.

The external environment of a nation is the subject of foreign policy. It reflects the content of a state's international affairs. Instead of relying just on stated goals or intentions, a foreign policy should be examined in light of actual state behavior patterns. Its goal is to have an impact on things that happen outside of the state. Each state's actions have an impact on those of other states. Every state strives to gain the most from the acts of other nations in order to further its own national interests. Therefore, changing other countries' behavior to one's advantage is the main goal of foreign policy.

The definition of "foreign policy" is deciding on certain objectives and working to control other people's behavior in order to attain these objectives. Power may assist in achieving these objectives. Therefore, power and national interest are the most crucial elements of a foreign strategy. All states must act in a certain way toward one another because they have some kind of relationship. Therefore, one of the most crucial functions of contemporary governments is the formulation of their foreign policy. The behavior of governments on the outside is their foreign policy.

Theoretical Aspects of International Politics author and professor Mahendra Kumar says that foreign policy has an insufficient and flawed definition. It may not always be desirable for other governments or nations to alter their behavior. Occasionally, it could be a good idea to make sure that other people continue to act in the same way. It could be necessary to change certain aspects of one's behavior in the future. The goal of foreign policy should be to regulate and not only to modify the behavior of other governments, according to Prof. Mahendra Kumar. Regulation is the process of as closely as possible shaping the actions of other governments to best serve one's own interests.

India wanted to control the behavior of the greatest number of nations to create a powerful Non-Aligned Movement during the Cold War era as the superpowers, the United States and the former Soviet Union, attempted to affect the behavior of other governments to get the most number of bloc followers. To alter the course of events in its favor, the US contained communist policy. Additionally, the United States has made vain attempts to get India to ratify the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. By "the system of

activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment," George Modelski defines foreign policy.

2. DISCUSSION

The foundational idea of foreign policy is national interest. In essence, it represents the totality of all national values both in the senses of the word relating to the state and the country. National interest may be used in a political debate to explain, justify, or condemn a position. It can also be used operationally to apply to the actual policies and programs that are being pursued. Along with differing views on the nature of the national interest, these uncertainties often contribute to the ongoing debates concerning foreign policy. Modelski asserts once again that the main goal of foreign policy should be to "shed light on the means by which states seek to alter, and are successful in altering, the behavior of other states." 'A well-rounded, comprehensive strategy, founded on knowledge and experience, for conducting the business of government with the rest of the world,' according to Hugh Gibson, is how foreign policy is described. It aims to advance and defend the interests of the country.

"Foreign policy is an interaction between forces originating outside the country's border and those working within them," claims Northedge. A methodical declaration of well-chosen national interests is how Hartman describes foreign policy. Therefore, each definition emphasizes how states should work to control their own behavior and, if feasible, to alter or regulate the behavior of other nations in order to further their own national interests. According to C. C. Rodee, a state's behavior pattern while negotiating with other nations to safeguard or advance its vital interests is shaped by a set of principles that are developed and put into practice via its foreign policy. According to Crab Jr.'s theory, decision-makers in charge of foreign policy choose which national objectives to pursue and how to do so. Foreign policy is the relationship of the goals and the means. Foreign policies are syntheses of the goals and strategies of nation-states, according to Coulombis and Wolfes. Examining the definitions of national interest and power two concepts that, as was already established, are crucial components of foreign policy will be essential to comprehend this definition. In order to accomplish particular aims, foreign policy must be decided upon, and attempts must be made to control other people's behavior. With the aid of power, the objectives are attempted to be accomplished [5], [6].

As we've seen, foreign policy is concerned with both transformation and the status quo. There is still another one. Feliks Gross noted that even the choice to have no contacts with a state is seen as foreign policy. Each state must choose the level of engagement in its interactions with other nations that would best serve its interests. India made the clear foreign policy choice in 1949 to have no contacts with the racist government of South Africa. Similar to this, the United States' choice to delay recognizing the Soviet Union following the Bolshevik Revolution until 1934 was plainly a reflection of USSR policy. Foreign policy might be either beneficial or detrimental. When it strives to regulate the behavior of other states by altering that behavior, it is positive; when it seeks to do so by refraining from altering that behavior, it is negative. We must thus draw the conclusion that each state chooses a set of principles to govern its interactions with other states. These values are predicated on the interplay between national interests and methods to advance them. The formulation of foreign policy, in Bandopadhyaya's opinion, is essentially an exercise in the choice of ends and means on the part of a nation-state in an international setting.

Indeed, policymakers have a crucial role in determining foreign policy. The foreign minister, who directs the officials, sets the objectives of foreign policy, and establishes the guiding

principles, is largely responsible for this. The media and the general public both play significant roles in today's world. According to Modelski, "input" refers to the actions that come from the community and "output" refers to the choices made by policy-makers. As stated by the philosophy of national interest, Prof. Mahendra Kumar defines foreign policy as "a thought-out course of action for achieving objectives in foreign relations." Additionally, he lists foreign policy as follows:

Goals of Foreign Policy

Any nation's foreign policy should have the following five major goals. Protecting a nation's territorial integrity and the interests of its population from both within and outside the nation is the fundamental goal of foreign policy. States often choose to adhere to the status quo policy for this reason. A state is labeled as revisionist and the mistrust of other members of the international community is raised if it adopts a policy that aims to disturb the status quo. It must defend the interests of its residents both within and beyond the state in order to maintain its reputation. Maintaining relationships with other members of the international community and deciding whether to cooperate with them or engage in conflict with them in order to further one's own interests constitute the second goal of foreign policy. It is commonly known that India maintains diplomatic ties with the Jewish state of Israel, yet relations with the Arab nations also remain cordial, mostly as a result of India's extensive commerce with the Arab nations. The third goal of a nation's foreign policy is to advance and promote its national interests. Self-preservation, security, and the welfare of its people are each state's top priorities.

The states must safeguard their interests in light of the fact that various interests often collide. Promoting the nation's economic interests is the fourth goal of the foreign policy. An international state's standing is greatly influenced by its economic situation. The nations want to implement a foreign policy that will advance their economic development and provide them the opportunity to participate more actively in world affairs. The majority of treaties and agreements between states that other members of the international community have reached are primarily intended to safeguard and advance these nations' economic interests. This is a crucial aspect, which is shown by the fact that India chose the non-alignment policy primarily in order to focus on economic growth. Furthermore, during the Cold War, India aspired to get all aid and support from both superpowers in order to hasten the pace of economic growth. Similar to this, despite their ideological disagreements, the US and China were compelled to resolve their issues for economic reasons. The fifth and final goal of foreign policy is to increase the influence of the state, either by expanding its sphere of influence or by making other countries dependent on it. These factors significantly guided the post-Second World War policies of the United States and the former Soviet Union[7], [8].

Objectives of Foreign Policy

National interest is a good way to summarize the goals of foreign policy. National interest, however, might imply many different things. The national interest is what foreign policy decision-makers claim it to be, to quote Paul Seabury. The fundamental elements of each state's national interest are security, national growth, and global peace. In other words, it covers issues like defense against aggression, raising the level of life, and preserving circumstances for both national and global stability. However, Holsti has replaced the term with the concept of objectives in order to avoid any ambiguity or confusion. An objective is essentially "an image of a future state of affairs and future set of conditions that governments through individual policy-makers aspire to bring about by wielding influence abroad and by changing or sustaining the behavior of other states." Objectives, however, can only be

determined from national interest. Compared to hobbies, goals are more focused. As a result, the benefits of accommodating the interests of other nations influence aims. Therefore, when a specific national interest becomes crucial for a state to pursue, an aim is created. According to George Modelski, goals or purposes may include both objectives and interests.

The actions of any state in relation to certain standards or tenets indicate more or less formally established behavioural patterns that direct governmental behavior or policy. These beliefs collectively made up the foreign policy worldview. Every course of action and every policy entails the use of means. Therefore, a foreign policy is a well-considered plan of action for accomplishing goals in international relations as determined by the ideology of national interest. There are several pairs of competing aims or objectives that make up the objectives of foreign policy. For instance, Arnold Wolfers has explained the distinction between "possession goals" and "milieu goals." In the case of the former, it refers to the objectives that a country's foreign policy pursues in order to protect its holdings, such as a region of land or participation in particular international organizations. In the latter, it refers to the objectives that countries pursue in order to create favorable circumstances outside of their own borders. Peacekeeping successes, the advancement of international law, and the expansion of international organizations may all be seen as "milieu goals." In actuality, milieu objectives could just serve as a vehicle for pursuing possession goals. As a result, certain goals may be direct national goals, such as maintaining national security and independence, while others may be indirect goals that are primarily beneficial to the populace. Therefore, another set of opposing aims can be those that are ideological or revolutionary and those that are conventional[9], [10].

Core beliefs and pursuits: More individuals are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifices in support of the sorts of aims that align with their basic beliefs and interests. They are connected to a state's existence. Self-preservation, defense of strategically important territories, linguistic, religious, and ethnic unity, as well as the preservation of political, religious, and cultural institutions are among them. Economic growth and prosperity may encourage the adoption of a course of policy that disregards fundamental principles and interests while yet succeeding. attainable long-term goals: The majority of governments need trade, foreign assistance, access to communication infrastructure, supply sources, and overseas markets in order to increase social welfare. Increasing state prestige through increased military power, the provision of aid abroad, and diplomatic events that include status symbols like the development of nuclear weapons, space exploration, and various forms of imperialism or self-extension like the establishment of colonies, satellites, and spheres of influence. It is also common to promote the socio-economic and political ideals of a state overseas via ideological self-extension in many different ways. Universal long-term goals: The eventual political or ideological organization of the world system is the subject of all great plans, dreams, visions, and grand projects. The international system will be restructured as a result of these goals. Some examples of long-term goals include Hitler's idea of the Thousand Year Reich, the European New Order, Japan's vision of a Greater East Asia, the World Soviet Federation proposed by the Soviet Union, the American dream of securing a safe haven for democracy, and De Gaulle's Federation of Fatherlands. However, it should be remembered that the third category goals are intended for long-term pursuit, while the first and second categories of objectives call for urgent pursuit.

3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, for countries to manage the complicated and interrelated environment in which they operate, foreign policy is a crucial tool. Foreign policy's principal goals aren't set in stone or universally applicable; instead, they change in response to new information and a

country's ambitions and aspirations. While diplomatic efforts try to promote alliances and partnerships, security aims seek to defend a nation's sovereignty and its people. Economic goals seek to assure prosperity and well-being. The support for international cooperation and human rights highlights the dedication to common principles and world peace. Foreign policy goals will continue to be influenced by new issues including climate change, technological development, and transnational threats as the globe continues to change. When designing a successful foreign policy, pragmatism and idealism must coexist in a delicate balance as countries seek their own interests while contributing to the larger web of international interactions.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. K. Mitra and J. Schöttli, "The new Dynamics of Indian Foreign Policy and its Ambiguities," *Irish Stud. Int. Aff.*, 2007, doi: 10.3318/isia.2007.18.19.
- [2] E. Louise-Briant, "Countering terror, denying dissent," in *Propaganda and counter-terrorism*, 2015.
- [3] World Bank, "Growth Poles Program: Political Economy of Social Capital," *World Bank PREM*, 2014.
- [4] N. Hishamunda *et al.*, "Improving aquaculture governance: what is the status and options?," *Proc. Glob. Conf. Aquac. 2010. Farming waters people food*, 2012.
- [5] R. Maddock, S. P. King, H. Tran, and N. L. T. Pham, "A Surer Path to Banking Repair in Vietnam," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2015, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2671648.
- [6] D. Hopkins, "School Improvement and Cultural Change: An Interim Account of the 'Improving the Quality of Education for All' (IQEA) Project," *Annu. Meet. Am. Educ. Res. Assoc.*, 1994.
- [7] A. H. Hearn, "China's Relations with Mexico and Cuba: A Study of Contrasts," *Pacific Rim Rep.*, 2009.
- [8] J. A. Cassidy, "Conclusion: Progress and policies towards a gender-even playing field," in *Gender and Diplomacy*, 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315270777.
- [9] S. H. Brunner and A. Grêt-Regamey, "Policy strategies to foster the resilience of mountain social-ecological systems under uncertain global change," *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2016.09.003.
- [10] S. H. Brunner, R. Huber, and A. Grêt-Regamey, "A backcasting approach for matching regional ecosystem services supply and demand," *Environ. Model. Softw.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.10.018.

CHAPTER 2

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Dr. Zuleika Homavazir, Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- zuleika.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

India's foreign policy has undergone significant transformations over the years, reflecting its evolving national interests, geopolitical considerations, and global dynamics. This paper explores various approaches to the study of India's foreign policy, highlighting their contributions to understanding the complex decision-making processes and strategic priorities of the country. Three primary approaches are examined: historical, theoretical, and contemporary. The historical approach delves into India's foreign policy evolution since independence, tracing its non-alignment stance, strategic partnerships, and pursuit of regional stability. The theoretical approach encompasses realism, liberalism, and constructivism, offering insights into how India's foreign policy aligns with these paradigms. Lastly, the contemporary approach delves into recent trends such as India's expanding global influence, its responses to transnational challenges, and the impacts of domestic politics on foreign policy decisions. By synthesizing these approaches, this paper provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the multifaceted nature of India's foreign policy.

KEYWORDS:

National Interest, Nonproliferation, Soft Power, Sovereignty, Trade Agreements, War.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of international behavior within the framework of states is known as international relations. Analysis of how states operate and interact with one another is at the heart of this research. International behavior of governments really reflects the goals and strategies they use in relation to the outside world. These objectives, strategies, and tactics make up a state's whole foreign policy. As a result, the study of foreign policy has inevitably become the foundation of international relations worldwide. The majority of research on foreign policy have not compared the foreign policies of other governments. They have focused on developing a more comprehensive grasp of the varied methods employed by different countries to carry out their foreign policy. Many academics have attempted to investigate how these processes affect the final results. Realists often reject these methods because they are at odds with the idea of a single state actor that underlies realism. The methods used to examine foreign affairs have varied throughout time. Professors Black and Thompson claim that throughout a large portion of this study's history, historical, juridical, and descriptive methodologies have prevailed. The basic stages of the study of foreign policy and diplomatic history have been formed. It has always been the most conventional strategy. Black and Thompson made an attempt to accurately, precisely, and with proper regard to the important events, rebuild "the diplomacy of a particular period." It didn't result in the creation of any overarching laws, theories, or conceptual frameworks. The goal was to conduct a thorough and organized analysis of certain powers mostly great powers at a specific moment in time. By making a connection to the past, it aimed to illuminate the present. The legalistic method, in contrast to the historical approach, aims to examine the legal foundation and context of international relations. It is widely accepted and has as its main interest the recent past. This strategy has guided a thorough investigation of international law. Additionally, it examines governmental internal issues as well as state interactions on the outside, including

constitutional clauses, legislation, treaties, and regulations. This strategy has also been used to lead an examination of methods and processes for enhancing the stability of the global order.

The general approach is another name for the descriptive method. The foreign policy of certain powers is described in considerable depth via the descriptive method. This policy may sometimes be discussed in the context of certain institutions or recent occurrences. However, it is clear that the choice is affected in part by the analyst's predisposition and personal interests, as well as in part by the represented nation. This research has at times taken the lead in efforts to develop hypotheses and a conceptual framework. However, the two most significant methods have been widely categorized as ideological and analytical. The academics Thompson and Macridis contend that these two fundamental schools of thinking have been in direct competition with one another in Western thought at least since the French Revolution.

The ideological strategy is the most popular. It examines how the country's foreign policy reflects dominant political, social, and religious viewpoints. This method is used to categorize foreign policy as democratic or authoritarian, libertarian or socialist, and peaceful or combative. All governments utilize ideological rationale to support their policies. Ideological analysis of foreign policy is ideally necessary and beneficial. According to this perspective, a foreign policy is praised or berated based on how well it comports with the stated philosophy[1], [2]. Ideology is not necessarily a reliable barometer of a state's behavior in international affairs. It is often used as a disguise to forward other agendas. Ideology has always won out when there has been a confrontation between it and the interests of the country. This shared experience may be used to explain all variations in foreign policy across all nations. In reality, no state has ever been able to remain ideologically and politically consistent throughout the course of its history. Examples of this include conflicts between the United States' declared anti-imperialism and its particular claim to hemispheric influence in Latin America, China's anti-imperialism and its almost religious tolerance of the Portuguese enclave in Macao, the Soviet Union's principle of territorial integrity with the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, the British pocket of Hong Kong, and India's peaceful approach with the liberation of Goa. In truth, the majority of governments' foreign policy show a unity that transcends personal philosophies or convictions. Therefore, any study of foreign policy that just considers ideologies is certain to be limited and ultimately inaccurate. It will never be feasible to fully convey the truth of the situation, regardless of the expense.

As a direct response to the ideological approach, the analytical approach has emerged. It aims to address the shortcomings of the latter and provide a genuine image of the circumstance. It has been distinct from others not just in how it approaches issues, but also in how it approaches the topic of international politics in general. Consequently, the analytical technique has been established based on this notion. Policy "rests on multiple determinants, including the state's historic tradition, geographical location, national interest and purposes, and security needs," say academicians Kenneth W. Thompson and Roy C. Macridis. Therefore, we may argue that studying foreign policy necessitates taking into consideration and analyzing a wide range of elements. It asserts that every state has certain ongoing commitments or interests. These interests, which predominate over ideology in a state's foreign policy, were fairly well-known even in the 18th and 19th centuries. These are set in a hierarchy of larger and lesser interests, but they are permanent. Some interests are protected at all costs, while others are only protected in special cases, and yet other interests may never be protected at all. These methods may now be used to explain a state's "national interest." To analyze and understand such interests, the analytical method is specifically created.

The goal of the analytical method is to examine the fundamental influences on foreign policy as well as the many variables that are often taken into account by international policy decision-makers. It takes attention to a number of factors, including the idea of competing interests, the ability of states to advance their interests, the adoption and implementation of policies, as well as the global context in which those policies interact with one another. This contemporary perspective on history has in particular increased understanding and familiarity with national foreign policy. There are several additional approaches to international politics and foreign policy in addition to the ones just mentioned. The psychological approach contends that a nation's foreign policy is influenced by its cognition-related component. Cognition is described as "the process by which knowledge and understanding are developed in the mind" in the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. It is the method through which people choose and analyze data from their environment. Important issues are brought into the decision-making process as a result of cognition. Therefore, cognition has an impact on a policymaker's choice. The policy-maker will develop the country's foreign policy based on how he sees and understands the globe. Numerous research from the past demonstrate how policymakers' perceptions and comprehension do, in fact, influence how they make decisions. Understanding the decision-makers' beliefs is important when examining the cognitive approach to foreign policy. A country's foreign policy may stay the same for years, but when the decision-makers change, everyone adds to the formulation of the policy in accordance with his or her knowledge.

The psychological strategy contrasts with reason. While some think that policymakers are rational and make all of their choices logically, proponents of the psychological approach have a different view. They contend that each policy maker has a unique psychology, and that this psychology influences the choices made while developing policies. Jervis asserts that by highlighting the relevance of the operational environment as a factor in determining foreign policy, irrespective of the psychological environment, one eventually aims to diminish the role of psychological variables in foreign policy. He goes on to claim that if one does not include several levels of analysis in addition to the individual level, foreign policy cannot be properly described. At the individual level, factors such as bureaucratic restrictions, household pressures, and the external environment do affect perception, cognition, and personality. Furthermore, because ideas, perceptions, and ideologies are "socially constructed," rather than the work of a single person, it is not particularly pertinent to concentrate just on them. Putting greater emphasis on the social environment in which they function would be more significant [3], [4].

Psycho-analytical approach: The psycho-analytical method contends that a person's personality is shaped by their experiences as a youngster. Every person has unique objectives, and each person pursues those goals in a unique manner. Individual decision-makers have individual personalities, as well as varying life experiences, intellectual capacities, and decision-making preferences. They also have different values and views. Many academics who research individual psychology believe that it has an impact on one's capacity for making decisions. For instance, Bill Clinton, the 42nd President of the United States of America, received a lot of flak for his foreign policy. Clinton's willingness to compromise was a notable aspect of his personality. According to Clinton, his upbringing with an abusive, intoxicated stepfather made him become a peacemaker, always trying to minimize the disruption.

Methodology to decision-making: This theory and methodology are relevant to both the broader topic of international relations and the subfield of foreign policy analysis. By insisting that the explanatory focus point must be the foreign policy decision-makers

themselves and not wider structural or systematic phenomena, foreign policy analysis differs from other theoretical methods in international relations. The analyst is interested in all explanatory factors to the degree that they have an impact on the decision-making process, from macro to micro. Thus, of all international relations subfields, foreign policy analysis is the most profoundly integrative theoretical endeavor. The primary research agenda of Foreign Policy Analysis focuses on how personality traits, meaning perception and construction, organizational processes, domestic politics, group dynamics, bureaucratic politics, culture, and system structure all influence how foreign policy is decided. Richard Snyder together with his associates. These are crucial, according to Henry Bruck and Burton Sapin, one of the FPA's founders, since they have an effect on the only real actors in international affairs—human decision-makers. For the study of the processes involved in formulating policies, they decide to concentrate on decision-making.

The foundation of decision-making analysis is the question of how and why national actors behave in the ways that they do. This method concentrates investigation on those individuals who are considered decision-makers and on the state as a whole. The activities of decision-makers may be interpreted as the actions of the state. The decision-maker perceives the environment in which foreign policy choices are made. The environment is seen as having both internal and exterior components. Personalities, positions, governmental structures within which the decision-maker operates, organizations inside the decisional units, physical and technical circumstances, fundamental beliefs and aims, and numerous societal influences are all included in the internal context. The whole condition of the international system as it exists at a given moment is included in the external context. According to James Robin, the structure and internal workings of the legislative branch establish the true substance of a foreign policy. Such studies are useful, nevertheless, when the legislature and the general public are involved in the creation of a foreign policy.

Let's focus on the actual processes involved in comprehending foreign policy. Using the policy stances of different actors as the dependent variable, one may follow how a certain viewpoint evolves over time to become dominant within a decision-making group. One may step back and consider how such policy attitudes emerge from fundamental cognitive processes like perceptions, issue representation, and meaning creation. Another step backward in society would be necessary to address the question of how the decision-making group originally forms, as well as how group structures and procedures evolve through time. The nation-state's role conceptions as well as those of the many organizations and people that make up the nation-state might likewise be the subject of study.

Foreign policy strategies often fall into one of two broad categories: idealist or realism. The idealist method, on the other hand, is based on principles and norms and tends to be collaborative in character. The realist approach, on the other hand, is based on state security, advances its national interest by pragmatic and reasonable ways, and may be security-oriented. Iran's foreign policy may therefore be described as "realist idealism," and as it shows unhappiness with the current global order, it can also be described as reformist. The notion of power is emphasized in realist foreign policy. It may be contrasted with the atomic energy in physics or the economic worth of silver. According to Morgenthau, the objectives of foreign policy require politicians to conceal their immediate objective, i.e., gaining power, by using ideology. For realists, the most crucial factor in determining foreign policy is the fact that the international system is basically anarchic. Realists hold that all national foreign policies adhere to the fundamental guidelines established by the anarchic international system and that scholars should look into how the structure of the international system and the relative power of states affect foreign policy outcomes. Calculations of national interest are

self-evident and may be reached logically by carefully examining the material circumstances of nations as well as the specifics of a certain foreign policy conundrum they are facing. The balance of power formulation from classical realism offers a simple but powerful instrument for analyzing state behavior in international affairs. The idealist approach to foreign policy sees power politics as a fleeting moment in history and paints an image of a future international society based on a reform of the international system, free from power politics, immorality, and violence. The goal of this strategy is to improve the world via international cooperation and education. This strategy is fairly ancient and has traces of it in both the French Revolution of 1789 and the Declaration of the American War of Independence from 1776. It envisioned a future without tyranny, injustice, or conflict. Constant improvements in human happiness brought about by the application of reason, education, and science would characterize this new society[5], [6].

2. DISCUSSION

National interests are of various kinds. Thomas W. Robinson classifies national interest into the following six categories:

1. Primary interests
2. Secondary interests
3. Permanent interests
4. Variable interests
5. General interests
6. Specific interests.

Robinson also mentions three further sorts, which are referred to as international interest as a whole. A country must also advance its foreign policy objectives. A state may use coercive tactics, alliances, or diplomatic discussions to achieve this.

Important Elements in the Development of Foreign Policy

A foreign policy's development is a dynamic process. Typically, a change in administration does not signify a change in a state's core foreign policy, while a radical shift in the political system might bring about significant changes in a state. Because a state's foreign policy is influenced by a multitude of variables, many of which are static or unaltered, it often doesn't change. Although certain criteria may be altered, their effect or impact on a nation's foreign policy is often secondary. A nation's foreign policy is "composed out of many factors and forces." They all interact and affect foreign policy in one way or another. They range from being permanent to being transient, from being visible to being mysterious. A country must take into account a few fundamental aspects of life while forming its foreign policy. This context consists of the following:

1. Geopolitical circumstances
2. Prospective population
3. Financial assets
4. Ideological setting

"Fundamentally, foreign policy has its roots in the unique historical background, political institutions, traditions, economic needs, power factors, aspirations, peculiar geographical circumstances, and basic set of values held by a nation," write Norman Judson Padelford and George Arthur Lincoln in *The Dynamics of International Politics*. According to Bhandopadhyay, author of *The Making of India's Foreign Policy*, geography, economic growth, political traditions, internal and international environments, military might, and

national character are the primary factors of foreign policy. There are so many factors that affect a nation's foreign policy that they can't all be included here. Some of them, nevertheless, are covered in this section.

Historical Elements

States' borders are established by history, and this heritage also provides the principles guiding current foreign policy. It establishes a society's dominant tradition and self-image, and as a result, the unique national style. The Russian addiction to secrecy, the French obsession with security, honor, and glory, and the American tendency of seeing global challenges as moral issues all have clear and distinct historical origins. Such a national style has always been reflected in the development and implementation of foreign policy.

A nation's historical and cultural traditions have a significant impact on its foreign policy. Because all facets of society support it and share the same memories and ideals, a nation with a united common culture and historical experience can conduct a successful foreign policy. On the other hand, a nation with a fractured culture and history cannot conduct an equally successful foreign policy. A French historian named Duroselle once said of France in particular, "France is far more a "product of history" than a "geographic entity." History has influenced France's need for a natural boundary as well as protection from Germany. One of the most significant factors in the formation of Chinese foreign policy has been national history. Every state has experienced it. Thus, British imperialism in India and our fight for independence from colonialism and imperialism have had a direct influence on India's foreign policy. India's decision to fully support the liberation movements in Afro-Asian nations and the battle against racial discrimination is a result of our past[7], [8].

Population

Foreign policy is significantly influenced by population. The size, makeup, and distribution of a nation's population influence its political, military, and economic aspects of foreign policy. However, a country's population size alone is not a good indicator of how powerful its economy and military are.

The strength of a nation is determined by its level of social integration, degree of political stability, and level of industrialisation. However, population trends are a crucial factor to take into account. Naturally, nations with large birth rates, such as China and India, may draw from a pool of labor. As a result of these nations' falling populations, England and France have suffered. It is common knowledge that a nation's power will increase with population.

The population of a country affects its values, way of life, and even its aspirations in terms of living standards. Even superpowers like the US and Russia have shown respect for this element. In addition to population size, the quality of the population as shown by its health, education, technological know-how, and national character is a determinant in foreign policy. The quality of the people ultimately dictates the quality of the political system, the public sector, and even leadership.

Determinant of Effective Governing

The effectiveness of a nation's leadership and governance is one of the key factors affecting its foreign policy. A prospective power is transformed into a real power by the government. The public administration is effectively organized thanks to its popularity. In the long run, even the caliber of government officials influences foreign policy. Every state's unique form of governance is inextricably linked to its foreign policy.

Determinant of Economic growth

The economic health of a specific state also serves as the foundation for many foreign policy considerations. Every country in the world lacks economic independence. Even the United States depends heavily on international commerce to flourish economically. This reciprocal interconnectedness of the economies of nations is the root cause of the majority of economic issues. An industrial state like England must purchase industrial goods like tractors, fabric, and vehicles from an agricultural state, particularly like Argentina, in exchange for the sale of its livestock, wheat, and wool to that state. Because of this interconnection, there is global economic activity, which is reflected in trade agreements, taxes, import restrictions, and other financial arrangements. States do not engage in economic specialization of production or free exchange of products. Instead, they adhere to the "economic self-sufficiency" approach, which negatively affects international economic connections. This mis-adjustment causes economic stress throughout the globe, which may sometimes manifest as political and military action. Natural resources like uranium, rubber, coal, and other goods necessary for conflict are not uniformly distributed across all the states.

Uneven aptitude to use the resources at hand makes these kinds of disparities even more obvious. Therefore, governments design their foreign policy in a manner that ensures the availability of war supplies and a favorable balance in their commerce. Facilities and protection for foreign investments are also necessary for international economic activity. Because they have assets in this region's oil, Britain and the United States are both increasingly interested in the Middle East. The ability of a state to address these economic issues is reflected in its foreign policy. The majority of governments have increased their authority and stature through seizing control of economic resources. Once again, an industrialized nation is predicted to have a larger gross domestic product and be able to allocate more money for programs of economic help, military endeavors, and broad diplomatic commitments. Conversely, industrially backward nations are unable to actively participate in international affairs. They cannot benefit from the technical advance outside since the nation lacks scientists, engineers, and other experts.

Natural Resource Factor

This is yet another crucial component of a state's foreign strategy. Food, minerals, metals, and water resources are all important components of national strength and, by extension, foreign policy. The value of a nation is undoubtedly increased by the abundance of these resources. For instance, the existence of petroleum has highlighted the significance of West Asian nations on the global stage. 80 percent of the oil supply in West Europe come from these nations. Energy and food are both necessary. If not accessible locally, they must be obtained via international collaboration. A nation's capacity to conduct international affairs will always be boosted by the availability of strategic and vital raw commodities. Their absence will therefore lower a nation's standing abroad.

Industrial Development Factor

An important factor in defining a state's foreign policy is industrial growth. The standard for classifying nations as advanced, undeveloped, or developing has previously been presented. The majority of the industrial superpowers, including the US, Russia, UK, and Japan, have a strong standing. Such states also have the authority to utilize foreign assistance as a novel tool of foreign policy. The industrially underdeveloped and emerging nations, however, are destined to play a largely ineffectual role in world affairs. Their policy options are undoubtedly constrained by this deficit, which provides little room for active initiative and leadership.

Ideological Component

A country's ideology, which upholds certain core views about how power is distributed in society, has a significant impact on its foreign policy. Politicians or political leaders develop the nation's foreign policy in their thinking. Though they are influenced by custom and history, political leaders' ideas and behaviors are used to convey policy.

There has been much discussion on whether ideology alone may be considered a crucial national interest. Sometimes a leader will only employ ideology to explain his actions or policies in terms that his people can understand. However, on occasion, a country may wage war only to compel others to adopt its ideology rather than for reasons of national defense. Ideology by itself, however, is not a policy objective for expressing the true perspective on this issue. It is a known truth that countries with opposing beliefs may coexist peacefully for a while. However, there is also opposing documentation accessible. The former Soviet Union's foreign policy cannot be properly understood if we do not take into account 'global revolution' as one of its goals. The spread of communism was a legitimate objective. Since 1945, the goal of Russian empowerment has been the establishment of communism as well as its political hegemony. However, it is important to avoid exacerbating the role of ideology in the elements of foreign policy. They are only ever employed to mask the true nature of a situation or the true intentions of ambitious leaders[9], [10].

Strength Factor

A nation's foreign policy is directly impacted by its military might or capability. Only governments or countries with robust militaries have taken an aggressive stance. Making a successful and aggressive foreign policy requires having huge, strong armed forces that are equipped with cutting-edge military technology. It is the last component of a state's power status and, as a result, of its capacity to contribute significantly to international affairs. Even in peaceful discussions, a state with a weak military apparatus will often be at a disadvantage. A weak state or country would typically aim to minimize its disadvantages whereas a militarily superior state or nation would try to adopt a daring program to maximize benefits.

Strategic Geographic Consideration

The formulation of a foreign policy must take geo-strategy into consideration. A sort of foreign policy known as geo- strategy, a branch of geo-politics, is primarily influenced by geographical variables that limit or have an impact on political and military preparation. The goal of geo-strategy is to match the means to the aim, as it is with all other forms of strategies. Matching a nation's resources, whether abundant or scarce, with its geopolitical goals—which may be local, regional, or global in this situation. Geopolitics and strategy are interwoven, just as geopolitics and nationhood are, or, as Gray and Solan put it, "geography is the mother of strategy." Pacts may be broken, treaties may be unilaterally renounced, but geography keeps its victim fast, as the saying goes. Anything may be escaped by a country, but not geographic limitations. The elements of size, terrain, form, and climate are significant in a geographical position.

A wide area, with a homogeneous environment that encourages physical vigor and is preferable either temperate or tropical highland, is needed to maintain a big population. It should have a terrain with natural defense barriers like mountains, woods, marshes, rivers, deserts, and seas that provides borders. It should be simple to defend and have a compact form rather than being extended or fragmented as Pakistan was till 1971. It should also have some of the essential power capabilities to support an autonomous foreign policy. The topography and terrain were seen as a major advantage in sustaining national security before

the advent of modern military and equipment. Because of its position halfway between the Atlantic and Pacific seas, America was able to practice isolationism. The Himalayan Mountain range shielded India, the Alps acted as a protective barrier between France and Italy, and the immense African deserts similarly shielded Egypt for ages. The factors of form, mass, and geographic configurations have shaped the nature of foreign policy. In the past, infantry was highly reliant on landlocked nations, while naval forces were reliant on governments with long coasts. The expanding invading armies have often been held back by the strong landmasses of China and Russia. The significance of a country's place in the globe is influenced by its access to abundant resources like food and minerals, its level of industrialisation, and its proximity to important maritime trade routes and global economic hubs. The geo-strategic aspects of foreign policy, however, may be said to have been established considerably earlier from a conventional standpoint than the demonstration of the value of air power made possible by the development of nuclear weapons. This viewpoint seems to suffer from a lot of amplification and rhetoricism in the setting of new technical breakthroughs. We no longer accept claims that are couched in deterministic language, such as "a nation's location determines the main factor influencing its foreign policy" or "England was destined by geography to command the seas" or "sea routes have beckoned the Japanese abroad." Given the development of technology and science, this geographic influence on political phenomena has fallen prey to the law of diminishing returns. We cannot argue that despite air power's revolutionary impact on these geographical traits, many of them will still exist, along with the political ramifications that follow. Today, air distance and meteorological conditions are far more important for military purposes than land or sea surface distance. Any distance may be traveled in a day. Heavy bombers can round the globe in 45 hours. The outdated ideas of national security have been completely transformed by atomic, hydrogen, and cobalt bombs. Today, no nation on earth can resist an assault. Nuclear missile defense is nonexistent.

3. CONCLUSION

The complexity of India's decision-making processes and strategic view is shown by studying its foreign policy using a variety of methodologies. The historical study emphasizes how continuity and change are crucial in determining India's foreign interactions. Realistic theoretical lenses emphasize security concerns, liberal theoretical lenses emphasize economic and diplomatic cooperation, and constructivist theoretical lenses clarify the significance of norms and identity in explaining the motives underlying India's policy decisions. The current viewpoint provides insight into India's ambitions to become a world power, its attempts to combat global issues like terrorism and climate change, and the complex interactions between internal politics and foreign policy choices. Scholars and decision-makers may better comprehend India's foreign policy actions by combining these techniques. Understanding India's foreign policy holistically is crucial for promoting stability, collaboration, and effective global governance as India's position in the international arena continues to change.

REFERENCES:

- [1] M. C. Miller and K. S. de Estrada, "Pragmatism in Indian foreign policy: how ideas constrain Modi," *Int. Aff.*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/ia/iw001.
- [2] A. Das, "India's neighbourhood Policy: Challenges and Prospects," *Jindal J. Int. Aff.*, 2017.
- [3] C. C. James and Ö. Özdamar, "Religion as a factor in ethnic conflict: Kashmir and Indian foreign policy," *Terrorism and Political Violence*. 2005. doi: 10.1080/09546550590929219.

- [4] S. S. Chaulia, "Bjp, india's foreign policy and the 'realist alternative' to the nehruvian tradition," *Int. Polit.*, 2002, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.ip.8897388.
- [5] F. Lee Cooke and D. S. Saini, "Managing diversity in Chinese and Indian organizations: A qualitative study," *J. Chinese Hum. Resour. Manag.*, 2012, doi: 10.1108/20408001211220548.
- [6] World Trade Organisation *et al.*, "Pharma Industry in India: Pharma Sector Overview, Market Size, Analysis...I IBEF," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, 2013.
- [7] S. M. Aliff, "Indo- Sri Lanka relations after the LTTE□: Problems & prospects," *J. Emerg. Trends Educ. Res. Policy Stud.*, 2015.
- [8] I. Maharana, S. C. Rai, and E. Sharma, "Environmental economics of the Khangchendzonga National Park in the Sikkim Himalaya, India," *GeoJournal*, 2000, doi: 10.1023/A:1011032813319.
- [9] F. J. Childress, "Revolution Unending: Afghanistan, 1979 to the Present," *Hist. Rev. New Books*, 2005, doi: 10.1080/03612759.2005.10526756.
- [10] "Book Reviews," *Polit. Stud.*, 1967, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.1967.tb00905.x.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS FOR THE PROMOTION OF NATIONAL INTEREST

Dr. Yukti Khajanchi, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- yukti.khajanchi@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Promoting national interest is a fundamental objective of every sovereign state's foreign policy. This paper examines various methods employed by states to advance their national interests in the international arena. By analyzing diplomatic, economic, military, and soft power strategies, this paper sheds light on the multifaceted approaches used to safeguard and enhance a nation's strategic priorities. The study underscores the importance of a balanced and adaptable combination of these methods to effectively navigate the complexities of global politics and achieve long-term national objectives. The pursuit and promotion of national interest lie at the heart of a state's foreign policy endeavors. This study delved into diverse methods utilized to safeguard and advance these interests, showcasing the interconnectedness of diplomacy, economics, military capabilities, and soft power projection.

KEYWORDS:

Diplomacy, Economic Incentives, Military Alliances, Multilateral Negotiations, Political Influence, Propaganda.

1. INTRODUCTION

Public opinion is becoming a significant determinant of foreign policy. Foreign policy is no longer developed in a private office. Since it is developed in the open, public opinion often influences how foreign policy is implemented. The American government's decision to order the withdrawal of American soldiers from South Vietnam was made possible by the political clout of the public opinion in that country. Once again, the Suez crisis and popular sentiment against the British led to the Eden Government's resignation in 1957. For forty years, foreign policy leaders in India refrained from establishing diplomatic connections with Israel out of concern that they would irritate a small minority group [1], [2].

National Interest as a Foreign Policy Factor

The 'central notion' in a foreign policy is the national interest. In actuality, it serves as the foundation for developing foreign policy. National interest, which is the aim, must be understood if foreign policy is the product of the interplay between ends and methods. International politics in fact revolve on national interests. Self-interest is often quoted as not just being acceptable but also a primary driver of national policy. According to Morgenthau, "the national interest is indeed the last word in world politics so long as the world is politically organized into nations." All forms of politics, according to the famous realist thinker who has been referred to as Kautilya's 20th-century successor, are contests for power. No government may take any action that is not in the best interests of the nation. No government, regardless of its principles, can afford to base its foreign policy on anything other than the interests of the country. Before the 20th century, Lord Palmerston said that "neither we nor our enemies have eternal allegiance." Our obligation is to uphold these interests since they are everlasting. The degree of amity or hostility between nations does, in fact, alter over time as environmental conditions change and each state works to further its own interests. When two countries' interests diverge, they either change their positions following talks or adopt a policy of hostility. George Washington, the first US president,

emphasized this point and claimed that it is a maxim based on the human experience that no country should be trusted beyond what is required for its own interests, and that no wise leader or politician would dare deviate from it.

There's no denying that various authors use the phrase "national interest" differently. These applications of the idea have been categorized by various authors. The uses of the phrase "national interest" are categorized as aspirational, operational, explanatory, and polemical by Joseph Frankel in his book, *National Interest*.

National interest, on an aspirational level, refers to a vision of the good life and a set of ideal objectives that the country would want to achieve if it were feasible. On a practical level, national interest refers to all of the interests and policies that are really being pursued by a country. The notion is used to explain, assess, justify, or criticize foreign policy on an explanatory and polemical level.

We should make an effort to comprehend what is meant by "national interest" before we deduce anything from these conflicting perspectives. It is unquestionably a very nebulous concept. It is a very hazy and ambiguous idea. In the many circumstances in which it is employed, it takes on a variety of meanings. In actuality, there is no consensus on what it really means. The idea of national interest has never been defined objectively or scientifically, in reality. Many authors have attempted to define the phrase, nevertheless. For instance, the authors of *The Dynamics of International Politics*, Norman J. Padelford, George A. Lincoln, and Lee D. Olvey, correctly noted that "concept of national interests are centred on core values of the society, which include the welfare of the nation, the security of its political belief, national way of life, territorial integrity, and its self-preservation." According to Morgenthau, the political traditions and overall cultural circumstances in which a country develops its foreign policy constitute the subject matter of national interest. According to him, a nation-state's primary duty is to defend its physical, political, and cultural identities against invasion by other nation-states.

According to one definition, national interest refers to "the general and ongoing ends for which a nation acts." According to Bandopadhyaya, "each state seeks to safeguard its territorial boundaries in order to preserve its political independence and territorial integrity." The methods may differ, but the maintenance of territorial integrity is in the national interest. Spykman has outlined this concept in further detail. According to him, "the fundamental goal of the foreign policy of all states is the preservation of territorial integrity and political independence" because "territory is an inherent part of a state, self-preservation means defending its control over territory; and because independence is the essence of state, self-preservation also means fighting for independent status."

This diversity in the definition and elements of national interest left Raymond Aron utterly doubtful of its existence. James Rosenau concurs with him in his skepticism. It is undeniable that the nature of national interests precludes or steers clear of the prospect of a complete logical formulation. Foreign policy is often built on the idea of national interest, despite all the definitional challenges. Any effort to characterize, explain, anticipate, or dictate the international behavior must still start with this idea. National security, political independence, and territorial integrity must always be pursued by all countries. The promotion of economic interest, which includes the maintenance or acquisition of advantageous circumstances and terms of trade, is the priority after security. Although security and economic success are the two main factors, a nation's national interest may also contain other factors. Some governments, particularly major powers, may also include the preservation of international peace, the advancement of international law, or the creation of international organizations

among their foreign policy goals. According to Karl Deutsch, "the larger and more powerful a nation is, the greater the level of aspiration in international affairs among its leaders, elites, and populace." Arnold Wolfers describes such foreign policy objectives as "milieu goals." Last but not least, some nations consider it in their national interest to support global missions like the world revolution," "containment of communism," and "defense of frontiers of freedom.

It is often observed that a certain style of governance may have false assumptions or preconceptions on the national interest of the nation. Such ideas inevitably lead to the failure of policies, but as long as a leader is in office, he will continue to try to implement the policy in accordance with his view of the interests of the country. Therefore, when he began his war against Russia and later when he declared his bloody and uncivilized fight at Waterloo, Napoleon had once claimed that he was acting in the interest of France. In the sake of Germany's national interest, Adolf Hitler defended his expansionist policies, which included the annexation of Austria and the breakup of Czechoslovakia. British Prime Minister Chamberlain believed that it was in the best interests of his country to placate the tyrants of Germany and Italy. The Pakistani government made an effort to persuade people that it was in Pakistan's best interest to undermine Jammu & Kashmir, an Indian state. These exceptions are founded on a real awareness of the nation's aims and objectives and, therefore, its national interest, apart from a well-thought-out foreign policy.

A nation's fundamental claim to its national interest may also be of interest to other countries. In the modern world, every country must balance its interests with those of the others. Competing interests including regional, global, and even sub-regional interests are now a threat to the national interest. Our generation will have to choose between giving priority to states inside their current borders or to countries whose strategic, economic, and sociocultural requirements may be better met in a larger, i.e., regional or global framework. Foreign policy decision-makers nowadays are compelled to define their goals in a way that is considerate of others, and focus must be placed on a worldwide agreement about what is ethically acceptable in international relations[3], [4].

In the Indian Constituent Assembly in 1947, Jawaharlal Nehru said, "Whatever policy we may lay down, the art of conducting a country's foreign affairs lies in finding out what is most advantageous to the country whether a country is imperialistic, socialist, or communist, its foreign minister thinks primarily of that country's interests." However, some idealistic politicians contest the primacy of national interests in determining foreign policy. Having led the allies to victory in the First World War, US President Woodrow Wilson once declared, "It is dangerous to establish a nation's foreign policy in terms of interests...we dare not swerve from the idea that morality and not expediency is the thing that must lead us. We are not here for our own gain.

This is seen as an uncommon viewpoint that most statesmen do not have. Mahatma Gandhi was one of those who stressed on the need of morality, although never serving in the government. Gandhi, for instance, stressed morality even at the expense of national interest after India gained its independence when he went on a fast till death to force the Indian government to pay Pakistan '55 crores. But what does "national interest" really mean? We might conclude that "national interest" as a basic organizing principle is unlikely to vanish in the near future, while the states' ability to define it freely is likely to become more constrained. It is presented for interpretation in a more tolerant and enlightened form. In order for it to be considered legitimate, it will need to include both the goal of global integration and the concern for human existence.

National Interest categories

The idea of national interest may be further clarified by considering the numerous types of national interests. The following list outlines the major categories of national interest:

1. The main concern
2. Second-tier concern
3. Constant interest
4. Changing interest
5. Interest in general
6. Particular attention.

These are how they are described. The protection of the state's physical, political, and cultural identities against potential intrusion by outside forces is one of a nation's primary objectives. The state has a responsibility to protect these interests at all costs since they are eternal. Compromise is not even a consideration.

Primary interests are more significant than secondary ones. They encompass the maintenance of diplomatic immunity for diplomatic personnel as well as the defense of its residents when they are abroad. The state's long-term interests, which remain relatively stable, are permanent interests. The long-term interests either don't change at all or change extremely slowly. In the last several centuries, Britain has protected its booming commerce and foreign colonies by upholding freedom of navigation as an example of this sort of national interest. Variable interests are those interests that a country perceives to be necessary for the common good under certain conditions. The variable interest might thus be different from both primary and permanent interests. The "cross currents of personalities, public opinion, sectional interests, partisan politics, and political and moral folkways" shape these interests.

General interests are those favorable characteristics of a country that apply to many other countries or in a variety of specialized domains, such as diplomatic, commercial, and economic relations. For instance, Britain's national interest was on preserving the balance of power on the continent of Europe. Specific interests are the natural progression of broad interests that are time- and space-defined. For instance, Britain has seen it as specifically in its national interest to maintain the balance of power in Europe by allowing the Low Countries to stay independent. There are also the following additional interest categories:

Similar interests relate to those that multiple states share. For instance, the US and Britain both want to avoid having a single power rule Europe. The countries' complementary interests—which are not identical—can help provide the groundwork for agreements on certain particular topics. In order to gain control over the Atlantic Ocean, for instance, Britain desired Portugal's independence from Spain. Portugal supported British predominance as well because it saw it as a reliable line of defense against Spain. Conflicting interests are those whose priorities are always shifting in response to diplomacy and the course of events. Therefore, it is possible that over time and under certain conditions, disparate interests may converge. Similarly, competing interests may result from similar and complimentary interests.

2. DISCUSSION

Three most important methods which can help promote national interests are coercive measures, alliances and diplomatic negotiations:

Coercive measures

If the state adopts these steps, it may aid in the promotion and defense of its national interest. If these steps include violence and might trigger a global catastrophe, they are seen as coercive. Physical force is really used in the direct influence or coercion methods against the target state. These actions involve using physical force. For instance, following the 9/11 World Trade Center assault, George Bush Jr. declared war on Afghanistan to show the world that America was against terrorism and to demonstrate its dominance.

Alliances

A coalition of two or more nations is formed to safeguard and advance shared interests. Because of the alliance, defending these shared interests becomes a responsibility that the member nations are obligated to fulfill. These kinds of coalitions might be formed to safeguard the interests of many different countries. The kind of interest that the coalition aims to defend will define its character. As a result, we may infer that the alliance's composition and length will rely on how strong those interests are in comparison.

Diplomatic discussions

Through a process of "mutual give and take," these conversations often assist in balancing the conflicting interests of the state. Only when the interests of the involved nations are complimentary or congruent can diplomatic discussions be successful. In these situations, mutual bargaining may be used to establish an agreement. Conversely, negotiations are all but impossible when there are incompatible or opposing interests[5], [6].

The Influence of Power on Foreign Policy

One of the most contentious and significant terms in the foreign policy and international politics dictionary is "power." It plays a significant role in international politics theory. Politics must surely include power as a key component. Power has been cited as the means in the description of foreign policy as a synthesis of aims and means. It will be appropriate to quickly discuss the significance of power in foreign policy. A common phenomenon in all interactions is power. Although "power" has been defined by a number of academics, the underlying concept remains the same. Power has been defined as "the ability or capacity to control others and get them to do what one wants them to do and to also see that they do not do what one does not want them to do," according to one academic. 'Power' is a key notion in international affairs. As the foremost authority on statecraft in ancient India, Kautilya articulated this idea. He understood it to mean "the possession of strength," which is made up of knowledge, military force, and bravery. Hans Morgenthau expressed the same sentiments in the previous century. He defined politics as a fight for dominance in all of its forms. As a result, the fight for dominance among nations is international politics. He defined power as the ability of one man to influence the thoughts and behaviors of other men. Power in international relations refers to a state's capacity to compel respect and obedience from other nations as well as to impose its own will. According to Professor Mahendra Kumar's definition of power, it is the capacity to accomplish goals as directed by Actor A to Actor B. 'A' has power if it is successful. When used, this power gives a state the capacity to influence how other states behave. It is generally believed that foreign policy seeks to control how other nations behave. States may effectively create and carry out their foreign policy with just their might.

Robert Dahl similarly described power by saying that "A" has control over "B" to the degree that it can persuade "B" to do something that "B" would not ordinarily do." Because of this,

any state, regardless of size, has the ability to gain compliance from another state. As previously said, power is a crucial tool for a state. Every state wants more and more power; therefore it often becomes a goal in and of itself. Power is both "the capstone among the objectives which the states pursue and the cornerstone among the methods which they employ," in the words of political scientist professor V. V. Dyke. Most governments use force as a way of achieving their national goals, which form the basis of their foreign policy. Authors of *Introduction to International Relations: Power and Justice* Theodore A. Coulombis and James H. Wolfe defined power as an all-encompassing term that refers to everything that "establishes and maintains the control of Actor A over B." Coulombis and Wolfe assert that power consists of three components:

Authority

These three factors combine to create power. When Actor B voluntarily complies with Actor A's requests out of consideration, love, etc., this is referred to as having authority. Influence is the employment of tools of persuasion by Actor A to convince Actor B to carry out his desires, even if Actor B may initially be hesitant to do so. Finally, the use of force refers to Actor A coercing Actor B in order to further its political goals. There are several senses in force. Threats or the use of force are both examples of force. Therefore, depending on the availability of authority, influence, and force, Actor A may wield power.

Power really has the same impact on world politics as money has on the market economy. Furthermore, power plays a significant role as both a means and an aim. We might also assert that power in and of itself is neither good nor bad. According to Lasswell, "it is socially and morally neutral." In the context of international politics, political power is what we understand by power. The fact that a country engages in legal, economic, cultural, or humanitarian activities without taking power into account should be seen as evidence that it is not engaging in international politics.

Power in the modern age refers to a state's ability to influence, modify, or control the actions of other states. Thus, the instruments of foreign policy are power and the purpose or objective are national interest. Like the foreign policy of any other nation, India's reflects the predominate internal issues. It is an extension of its domestic policy. Our own policy will eventually determine "Our Policy," Nehru wrote. Interest, which is controlled by a nation's political, economic, and social structure as seen through its history, culture, and tradition, produces foreign policy. Domestic and international determinants are the two main categories. In this section, the domestic determinants are listed.

Geographically speaking, India is a sizable nation. India has to protect its Himalayan border from nations like China and Pakistan. In addition, India shared a border with several nations, including Pakistan, Afghanistan, Bhutan, Nepal, Burma, and Burma. The length of India's border is 15,106.70 kilometers. The boundaries between India and Bangladesh and Pakistan are defined by the Red-Cliffe Line, which was drawn during the partition of India in 1947. The Thar Desert and the Rann of Kutch are located along 3,323 km of India's western border with Pakistan. Between the portions of Kashmir that are controlled by India and Pakistan, there is an unofficial line of control, or LOC. In the northwest of Kashmir, a region governed by Pakistan, India claims a 106 km-long border with Afghanistan. India's border with Bangladesh stretches for 4,096.70 kilometers. In the past, Bangladesh had 92 enclaves on Indian territory, whereas India had 106 enclaves in Bangladesh. Bangladesh was given an indefinite lease on Teen Bigha Corridor, a section of territory that was once owned by India, near the West Bengal-Bangladesh boundary so that it could have access to the Dehgram-Angalpota enclaves.

The Chinese seized control of the Aksai Chin region of northeastern Kashmir during the Sino-Indian War of 1962, which was claimed by both countries. The 1643 km long border with Burma runs along the southern edge of India's north-eastern states. India and Bhutan share a 699 km-long border in the Himalayas. North India's 1751-kilometer border with Nepal follows the foothills of the Himalayas. The Siliguri Corridor is highly constrained owing to Bhutan's boundaries. Peninsular India is connected to the north-eastern states via Nepal and Bangladesh.

India's eastern shoreline is bordered by the Indian Ocean, while its western shoreline is bordered by the Arabian Sea. For commerce, transportation, and defense, all sides are seen as essential. India serves as a gateway for both Middle Eastern and South East Asian nations. In actuality, it is encircled by water on three sides. India has to implement a strategy to safeguard its border and prevent superpower rivalry in the Indian Ocean area. India's relations with South East Asian nations were also impacted by the politics of the Indian Ocean, since the majority of these nations called for the establishment of a zone of peace in the area. Any foreign hegemony over an Indian territory might be detrimental to India's national interests. India's extensive coastline demands both a strong fleet and cordial ties with other naval countries operating in the Indian Ocean. At Diego Garcia, there is a sizable naval facility shared by the United States and the United Kingdom.

India has suffered at the hands of both China and Pakistan, thus it is in everyone's best interest to find peaceful solutions to any disagreements. India has traditionally supported forging cordial ties with all of its neighbors. Other regional powers in Asia having amicable and peaceful ties with India include Iran, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, and Indonesia. In keeping with this belief, India seeks a peaceful resolution to any problems that may emerge with any of its neighbors.

It is accurate to say that the Indian military was trained along the lines of the British army. As a result, maintaining tighter connections with Britain is necessary. Additionally, India owes the United States of America for its moral assistance throughout the war for independence. The hostile stance of Pakistan, however, presents the biggest challenge to India's foreign policy decision-makers. The Muslim League's two-nation doctrine, which was never adopted by India, was used by the British administration to split India[7], [8].

Tradition and history

India has a long history of internationalism and peace. India has never waged war against another nation. It has been a nation characterized by acceptance, commitment, negotiation, assimilation, and flexibility. Truth, non-violence, internationalism, peaceful conflict resolution, fairness, mutual love, peaceful coexistence, and respect for one another are central to its ideology. The Vedas and Dharmashastra, as well as the works of great persons like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Vivekanand, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, and others, have passed down the ancient ideals to us. "The only possible real objective that we, in common with other nations, can have is of cooperating in building up some kind of world structure, call it one world, call it what you may," remarked Nehru in the Constituent Assembly. Indian foreign policy reflects this humanistic and internationalist orientation in Indian philosophy and ideas. The following three principles have influenced India's foreign policy:

1. Tolerance
2. Calculating means and ends
3. Non-violence

The core of Indian heritage is tolerance. India as a nation is aware that it is not essential for one's own opinions to match those of others. It is a tremendous virtue to respect other people's opinions. The notion of tolerance, according to Y. Raghavan, "invests the Indian traditional culture with a distinction and distinctness" is one of the most crucial ones.

Based on the teachings of the Rig Veda, Mahatma Gandhi once observed that Hinduism "lives at peace with all the religions" because it encourages everyone to worship God in accordance with his or her own faith or dharma. The Great Ashoka also promoted tolerance through his rock pillar inscriptions. India is dedicated to secularism in domestic policy, which is based on the tolerance ideology already expressed. Jawaharlal Nehru and his Chinese counterpart signed the renowned Panchsheel proclamation in 1954, which amply illustrated this. Our foreign policy, which is built on respect for diverse viewpoints, is guided by the ideals of reciprocal non-interference and peaceful coexistence.

Means-Ends Analysis

This is yet another significant Indian custom. Mahatma Gandhi emphasized on using pure methods to do good deeds. Because Manu's Dharmashastra, which states that "one should not do a good thing by following a bad path," strongly struck him. According to Indian tradition, trying to advance the welfare of the state by enriching it via deception and lies is like to attempting to conserve water by putting it in a pot that hasn't burned[9], [10]. While the fundamental tenet of Indian philosophy is the purity of methods, realist approaches are also prevalent. In his work Arthashastra, Kautilya explains the idea that faulty policy is what leads to unfavorable outcomes. According to Kautilya, diplomacy was an art that was focused on getting outcomes for the state rather than on ideas. Our foreign policy decision-makers could not disregard a crucial statecraft tactic. It was necessary to achieve harmony between "purity of means" and "reduce the enemy's men." Jawaharlal Nehru openly acknowledged that moral precepts could only be used to a certain extent in statecraft because of this. Even if it violated the ideal of the purity of methods, India's response in Goa in 1961 and the Bangladesh crisis in 1971 was in line with the leadership's assessment of the country's interests.

3. CONCLUSION

Building bridges via discussion and communication to establish common ground and avoid disputes is the role of diplomacy. Trade agreements and investment plans are examples of economic measures that not only increase a country's economy but also increase its influence on the world stage. Armed forces safeguard populations and preserve territorial integrity by acting as a deterrence and strengthening a state's security posture. Soft power promotes favorable impressions and alliances and derives from cultural, ideological, and educational draws. A complex grasp of the global environment, the ability to react strategically, and a dedication to international collaboration are necessary for the best promotion of national interest. Numerous case studies have shown that relying too much on one technique may result in imbalances and unforeseen effects. Effective foreign policy requires a thoughtful blending of approaches that are adapted to the changing possibilities and obstacles. States may traverse the complex web of international relations by adopting a comprehensive and dynamic strategy, improving their resilience and furthering their national interests in a world that is changing quickly.

REFERENCES:

- [1] L. Burlandy *et al.*, "Health promotion policies and potential conflicts of interest involving the commercial private sector," *Cienc. e Saude Coletiva*, 2016, doi: 10.1590/1413-81232015216.06772016.

- [2] P.-B. Ruffini, "International Trade and Foreign Affairs – Some Reflections on Economic Diplomacy," *J. Int. Logist. Trade*, 2016, doi: 10.24006/jilt.2016.14.1.3.
- [3] L. Kubalíková and K. Kirchner, "Geosite and Geomorphosite Assessment as a Tool for Geoconservation and Geotourism Purposes: a Case Study from Vizovická vrchovina Highland (Eastern Part of the Czech Republic)," *Geoheritage*, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s12371-015-0143-2.
- [4] M. Haigh, S. Shahid, K. O'Connor, and S. C. Thompson, "Talking about the not talked about: use of, and reactions to, a DVD promoting bowel cancer screening to Aboriginal people," *Aust. N. Z. J. Public Health*, 2016, doi: 10.1111/1753-6405.12565.
- [5] P. A. C. Zwanikken, L. Alexander, and A. Scherpbier, "Impact of MPH programs: Contributing to health system strengthening in low- and middle-income countries?," *Hum. Resour. Health*, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12960-016-0150-7.
- [6] L. Burlandy *et al.*, "Políticas de promoção da saúde e potenciais conflitos de interesses que envolvem o setor privado comercial," *Cien. Saude Colet.*, 2016, doi: 10.1590/1413-81232015216.06772016.
- [7] N. M. Amer, Z. M. Monir, M. S. Saleh, H. Mahdy-Abdallah, and S. F. Hafez, "A worksite health education workshop as empowerment intervention for health promotion in the National Research Centre of Egypt," *Open Access Maced. J. Med. Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.3889/oamjms.2016.093.
- [8] B. D. Jones and R. M. Cunningham-Williams, "Hookah and Cigarette Smoking Among African American College Students: Implications for Campus Risk Reduction And Health Promotion Efforts," *J. Am. Coll. Heal.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/07448481.2016.1138479.
- [9] J. Crowley, S. O'Connell, A. Kavka, L. Ball, and C. A. Nowson, "Australian general practitioners' views regarding providing nutrition care: results of a national survey," *Public Health*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2016.08.013.
- [10] A. R. Templeton *et al.*, "Patient-, organization-, and system-level barriers and facilitators to preventive oral health care: A convergent mixed-methods study in primary dental care," *Implement. Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s13012-015-0366-2.

CHAPTER 4

INTERNATIONAL DETERMINANTS OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Dr. Varsha Agarwal, Associate Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- varsha.agarwal@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

India's foreign policy is shaped by a complex interplay of international determinants that influence its strategic choices and diplomatic engagements. This paper examines the key international factors that shape India's foreign policy decisions, including geopolitical considerations, global power dynamics, regional stability, and economic interests. By analyzing how these determinants interact and evolve, this study offers insights into the dynamic nature of India's engagement with the international community and its pursuit of national interests on the global stage. The study of international determinants reveals the intricate framework within which India formulates and executes its foreign policy. Geopolitical considerations, driven by its proximity to major powers and regional dynamics, play a pivotal role in shaping India's strategic alignments and partnerships. The ever-evolving global power dynamics, marked by the rise of new players and the shifting priorities of established ones, necessitate India's proactive engagement to safeguard its interests and influence decision-making processes.

KEYWORDS:

Bilateral Relations, Economic Interests, Geopolitics, Global Power Shifts, Human Rights.

1. INTRODUCTION

Nonviolence, or ahimsa, was not just a core value of Mahatma Gandhi's but also has a long history in Indian culture. Ahimsa refers to more than only refraining from killing or hurting others. It promotes bondless love across the cosmos and is innocuous in thought, speech, and action. Since non-violence is a virtue, perfect non-violence is not always achievable. Gandhi believed that it was wrong for a democratic state or country to employ force. Violence and democracy cannot both exist together. Gandhi advocated nonviolence in both domestic and international affairs. Accepting nonviolence made the world a more peaceful place for good. Gandhi served as an influence for Jawaharlal Nehru, although only to a limited degree. In contrast to a spirit of retaliation and anger, Appadorai defined the use of the heritage of non-violence in India's foreign policy as "the deliberate acceptance of a method of approach to foreign policy problems which emphasized reconciliation, and the temper of peace[1], [2]"

The Government of India has pledged to work for world peace, and Part IV of the Constitution directs the state to look for a peaceful resolution to international conflicts. India's foreign policy has been significantly shaped by British rule, national movements, and the war for liberation. According to Appadorai, India's foreign policy was impacted by British control in India in three different ways. First, it sparked a national movement for independence, which in turn inspired India to support the emancipation of those who are dependant. Thirdly, India voluntarily decided to stay a member of the Commonwealth even after becoming a Republic. Second, racial inequality that existed during British Rule made India realize the evils of racial discrimination and, in turn, led to India's emphasis on racial equality in its foreign policy. Nehru reshaped the relationship between Britain and other independent Commonwealth members while securing India within the banner of the Commonwealth.

Gandhi urged the Indian populace to hate the sin, not the culprit. The majority of the freedom movement's leaders received their education in Britain. They supported liberty, equality, and democracy in line with the Western educational model. These ideas were highly valued by Indian decision-makers in charge of foreign policy. India did not fight the socialist countries while working with liberal democratic nations. Non-alignment policy results from sticking to the objectives and principles of the independence fight, which are valued by the populace, as well as by staying out of bloc politics.

The Indian National Congress had made it known that it opposed tyranny and racial discrimination via its division of foreign policy, which was led by Jawaharlal Nehru. "We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism wherever and in whatever form it may be practiced," Nehru had said in 1946. The battle against racial discrimination is one of the foundations of our foreign policy, he said in the constituent assembly in 1949.

Culture

The most important aspect or component of foreign policy is culture. Even historically, India has always had a highly favorable position in terms of culture. India has cultural ties to South East Asia, Rome, and Iran, among other nations. Its treasures have attracted traders and tourists for years. Indian customs are still present in certain South East Asian nations. The existence of temples and pagodas in Thailand, Myanmar, and Cambodia, as well as the Angkor Wat Temple, serves as evidence. Sanskrit terms may be found in a number of different languages, including Indonesia's Bahasa. The Buddha traveled to India to preach. In order to study at Indian colleges, Buddhist monks and academics traveled to India with high aspirations. A natural and constructive interchange of ideas took place. Evidently, the effects were favorable, and they continue to be felt throughout Asia today. The fact that India is working with China, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore to resurrect the renowned Nalanda University is evidence of the significance that India attaches to its relations with the Asia-Pacific region.

The program is a good illustration of how the cultural and relational concerns of five distinct nations may merge. The religious and cultural principles of Islam are said to have been promoted in Singapore and Malaysia by Islamic preachers from India. Additionally, India was among the few nations in the world where Jews were not subject to legal action. India embraced Jews and today maintains a more accommodative foreign policy with Israel as a consequence. Millions of people worldwide practice yoga, one of the most popular and lasting Indian disciplines, not only as a form of physical activity but also as a stress reliever. In actuality, the discipline has spread around the world and is quickly assimilating into Western culture.

In the West, Indian food is highly popular. There are many Indian restaurants in nations like the UK where there are many Indian residents. Indian restaurants reportedly employ more people in the UK than the combined workforce of the shipbuilding and iron and steel sectors. In addition, various Western nations have grown to love Indian cuisine. The largest cities in the US and Canada are home to a considerable number of Indian eateries. People across Asia, Europe, Africa, and West Asia adore Indian music and movies. Hindi movies are very beloved in Russia. Due to their closeness to India and cultural resemblance, Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Afghanistan have large fan bases for Indian movies. While Indian television shows and movies used to be prohibited in Pakistan, recent news has focused on the cooperation between the Pakistani and Indian film industries.

Indian films and artists have the ability to improve ties between India and the United States, as seen by *Slumdog Millionaire's* enormous success at the Oscars, when three Indian artists

and technologists took home individual prizes. India's policy is strengthened when Indian authors take home international honors like the Man-Booker Prize, when India is invited to be a special guest at international book fairs like the Frankfurt Book Fair, when Indian films are shown at international film festivals like Cannes, or when Indians win Nobel and Magsaysay prizes.

No longer does the picture of a poor peasant come to mind when people across the globe think about India. Indians are thought to be intelligent and resourceful individuals. They are regarded as bright, skilled professionals, scientists, and IT experts. This perception has only been strengthened by the accomplishments of businesses like Infosys and Wipro Technologies in the information technology industry, as well as the Tata and Reliance conglomerates. In India, the Indian Institutes of Management and Technology are regarded as centers of excellence for advanced education, research, and development in the fields of science, engineering, and technology. The Silicon Valley revolution was significantly influenced by Indians.

Since there is so much violence and struggle nowadays, India's spirituality is also very in demand. India is accepting of other cultures and beliefs. *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* and *Loka Samastha Sukhino Bhavanthu* were both preached in this region. The world may learn a lot from India's message of secularism today. The peaceful coexistence of several faiths is referred to as secularism. Additionally, Indian diplomats have contributed to the improvement of India's foreign policy. In the 1960s and 1970s, they had a big impact on world affairs, and they now have a big say in global discussions on things like climate change. Indian diplomats are well-versed in Indian culture and values, possess great communication skills, and have worked in the Indian Parliament and media. They are able to communicate with other governments and citizens because of this. India's impact via its culture is projected to grow in the future due to the media's and culture's expanding globalization[3], [4].

Military and Economic Considerations

India had a poor economic foundation when it first emerged, along with a lack of technology and a weak military. India's commercial and economic relations were restricted to Britain and the Commonwealth nations soon after independence. Therefore, it made economic and military sense to develop favorable relations with western liberal nations. India was a developing nation that sought to industrialize and modernize in order to advance its economy. Peace at home and considerable economic and technical support from wealthy countries were prerequisites for economic progress. Jawaharlal Nehru was well aware that the goal of foreign policy should be to advance economic development. A growing nation like India need outside assistance, whether in the form of money or technology. India did not, however, wish to associate itself with either a capitalist or a communist bloc for this reason. It wanted to remain open to all types of help, whether it came from the West or the Soviet Union. India chose to follow the democratic socialist road rather than the free trade capitalism or the communist method, even as it pursued economic progress.

India made the decision to choose liberal democracy and a kind of socialism. Although there is no Soviet-style government in India, it has followed the Soviet model of planned economic growth. India sought help and support from both the blocs and the World Bank, but without forging any formal partnerships. India hoped for a stable international system since only then could it anticipate its fast progress. A developing nation might hire many professionals from wealthy nations who would bring in specialized training for development. Most wealthy nations successfully avoided transferring technologies to Third World nations. India made an effort to craft its foreign policy so that it could get loans at fair interest rates and unrestricted

external economic help. It was made feasible for technology to be transferred, and both the West and the East provided support. However, America and its allies were better positioned to help than the Eastern European nations. This element significantly influenced India's foreign policy. India, a non-aligned country, was formerly thought to favor the West. Such claims were made inadvertently by the Soviet media. However, the Eastern Bloc started to recognize India's position as it showed its determination and independence in making decisions during the Korean and Suez crises.

The Indo-Soviet Treaty of friendship and cooperation was signed in 1971, after the conclusion of the war with Pakistan, and the West began to criticize India's non-alignment and purported pro-Soviet attitude. However, Indian foreign and defense policy could not stay complacent after the Indo-China War of 1962. Therefore, it was determined that the nation would maintain its independence in issues of defense. India expanded the market for weaponry so that the military forces could get the training necessary to handle any eventuality that could arise. The 1965 Pakistani onslaught was quickly neutralized by India's defense forces, who used Indian-made tanks and aircraft. The majority of the weaponry used by the Pakistani military came from America and China. India adopted a non-alignment policy after becoming self-sufficient and refrained from seeking any military alliances. India's choice to pursue nuclear energy gave it the chance to conduct a nuclear test in 1971 and signaled to the world that India could quickly acquire nuclear weapons if it so desired.

India ultimately conducted five nuclear tests in 1998 after leaving the possibility of using nuclear weapons open for long years. Atal Behari Vajpayee, the country's then-prime minister, proclaimed India a nuclear weapons state and promised that it would stop conducting nuclear tests. The world community was taken aback by the Vajpayee government's audacious action, but India upheld its constitutional prerogative. Numerous nations, including the US, criticized India. Regardless of whether nations officially acknowledged India as a nuclear weapon state, the international powers quickly accepted a nuclear India. Even after reaching a civil nuclear agreement with India in 2005, the US still referred to India as a "state with advanced nuclear technology."

Ideological Component

India's foreign policy was established by Jawaharlal Nehru, who was greatly influenced by the liberal democratic ideals of the west. The Soviet Union's economic policies also had an impact on him. Nehru aimed for a synthesis of the positive aspects of Soviet socialism with western liberal democracy. But he wants to avoid both of their negative aspects. He thus made the decision to not slavishly adhere to any country's foreign policy tenets. H. J. Laski, the leader of the British Labour Party and a professor of political science, had made a significant impression on Nehru. Laski adhered to a philosophy that combined liberalism and marxism. Nehru attempted to imitate Laski. The fusion of liberalism and marxism also indirectly led to the policy of non-alignment. Only Nehru's ideas had an impact on Indian policy. Indian humanism and global brotherhood concept have had an impact on it. India received praise for this approach and its efforts to build relationships with both power blocs throughout the Cold War. While establishing India's foreign policy, Nehru also attempted to embrace Gandhi's principles of truth and nonviolence.

Indian society is pluralistic

India is a socially diverse society made up of many cases, classes, philosophies, languages, religions, and races. Politically, socially, economically, culturally, and politically, it was and is a diverse nation. Therefore, India had to establish a strategy that could satisfy the many nationalities and sub nationalities in order to strengthen the integrity of the state in unity in

diversity. Therefore, even internationally, it had to adopt a policy of amity and agreement among the world community, bearing in mind its own national interest. Similar to how India was strongly moved by the liberal democratic legacy of the West, it too admired Marxist socialism's accomplishments. India didn't follow either the West or the Soviet Union uncritically. It chose to follow a liberal democratic socialist route in the middle.

2. DISCUSSION

India's independence ushered in the Cold War, which saw the globe split into two rival power blocs. This directly influenced how India's non-alignment policy was developed. With the declaration of India's independence, the decolonization process got underway. The worldwide milieu primarily focused on opposing imperialism and colonialism. India continued its attempts to hasten the decolonization process and to combat all types of racial discrimination, colonialism, and imperialism. The Second World War had destroyed the economy of several nations. There were already initiatives for economic growth and rebuilding. India sought to quickly build its economy by taking advantage of this. After the Second World War, India openly enlisted the aid of organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund for this goal. Conflicts over ideologies were the cause of disagreements, aggressions, and wars. Ideological conflicts between liberal democracy and Marxism have taken the role of conflicts between fascism and communism, between democracies and totalitarian governments. India made the decision to stay out of these post-war ideological battles[5], [6]. After the Cold War ended, a new international environment started to take shape that placed an emphasis on economic liberalization even in nations like China. India was also motivated to change its focus from the public sector and the economy's partial management to the following:

1. Liberalization
2. lessening of state influence
3. promoting foreign investment in the corporate and public sectors

Negotiating bilateral issues throughout the globe became possible because to the post-Cold War process of reconciliation that started in regions like the Israel-Palestine conflict. India has made an effort to settle its differences with Pakistan, Bangladesh, and China. Thus, we may conclude that India's foreign policy was shaped by the global environment and continues to be influenced by it. In fact, India's foreign policy was directly impacted by the events of the 1990s. India's foreign policy was influenced by the breakup of the Soviet Union into 15 independent republics after communism's demise, the overthrow of socialist governments in East European nations and their transition to democracy, the reunification of Germany, the emergence of the United States as the only superpower, and the end of bipolarity. India's veto on the CTBT at the Conference on Disarmament and its reluctance to sign the CTBT as enacted by the United Nations General Assembly were two significant milestones.

India's Foreign Policy Has Evolved

In 1947, India attained independence and overtook the United States of America as the biggest democracy in the world. India follows China as the world's most populated nation. Six main faiths are represented, and sixteen major languages are spoken here. After gaining its independence, India did not want to be ruled by one of the military blocs. Two military blocs commanded by the capitalist US and the communist USSR divided and ruled the globe after globe War II. As a result of the tensions caused by the ideological divide between the US and the USSR, this conflict was known as the Cold War. India has always adhered to a policy of nonviolence and peace in both internal and international affairs. The foundation of Indian foreign policy is non-alignment, or not aligning with either of the armed blocs. She

was able to pursue a policy of peace and act independently without being coerced by either of the armed blocs because of India's foreign policy. India wanted to utilize its resources to rebuild and develop the nation instead of using them to buy weapons since it had been a colony for such a long time. India decided to pursue a non-alignment strategy as a result.

A nation's foreign policy is influenced by a variety of internal and historical circumstances. The concepts and goals of the foreign policy have been shaped by a number of these variables in the case of India as well. Every head of state, together with his or her foreign minister, puts their mark on the foreign policy of the nation. For more than 17 years, Jawaharlal Nehru served as both the prime minister and the foreign minister. These were the early years of India's independence. Foreign policy is a policy that is inherent in the circumstance of India, inherent in the past thinkers of India, inherent in the entire mental outlook of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom, and inherent in the circumstances of the world today, as stated by Jawaharlal Nehru in a speech delivered in the Lok Sabha after India gained its independence. This covered almost all of the fundamental factors that determine foreign policy, including geographic constraints, economic imperatives, cultural norms, political traditions and goals, as well as the domestic and global environment.

India's foreign policy's guiding principles

India was encircled by countries like Ceylon in the south and Afghanistan, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan, and Tibet in the north while it was under British dominion. British India was divided into two new nations in 1947: Pakistan and India. These disparities in language, religion, society, and ethnicity led to this divide. The economic and cultural relations between the two countries were also hampered by these circumstances. West Pakistan and East Pakistan were created as a result of the division of India into its western and eastern halves. Following independence, India's authorities worked to create a secular state whereby national identity would take precedence over local, religious, or cultural identities. The movements for regional autonomy in Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir, Tamil Nadu, and Assam were backed by India's neighbors Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and eventually Bangladesh because they were seen as dangers to the unity of India. Additionally, despite the leaders of the Congress' dedication to the principle of secularism, communal strife and the growing power of Hindu political parties forced the Indian government to associate Hinduism with the grandeur of India. Relations with India's Muslim neighbors were tense as a consequence of Indian authorities' failure to stop anti-Muslim communal violence[7], [8].

The majority of South Asia was seen by the British colonial authorities as a strategic entity throughout their reign, and they worked to keep other countries out of the area. As these countries might attack India from the north, the British rulers established a barrier of buffer states that encircled and attempted to isolate India from Russia and China in order to safeguard this strategically important area. The British emperors utilized naval might to defend India from the south. The leaders of India embraced this strategy after assuming power by taking a stand from both a cultural and a geographical standpoint. This geo-strategic view has three effects on India's international relations. First, India made an effort to reverse any action by its neighbors that it deemed to be detrimental to its own security interests via treaties, alliances, threats of force, or economic sanctions. Only China and Pakistan have been able to stave off Indian aggression. Instead of seeing their nation as a regional enforcer that imposed strict restrictions on its neighbors due to its size and military might, the Indian elite saw their nation as a regional peacekeeper whose actions were entirely defensive. Second, even though India had already established a strong position in the area, the involvement of extraregional countries in the South Asian region posed a danger to its

security. India resisted any efforts by outside forces to intervene or establish a presence in the area, whether they were invited to do so by New Delhi's neighbors or not. India has thus consistently denounced Pakistan's relationship with China, Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, US military support for Pakistan, and US presence on Diego Garcia. Despite signing a friendship pact with the Soviet Union in 1971, India never agreed to Moscow's desire to allow a Soviet naval facility in the area. In order to protect its territory, India has to strengthen its military, and security concerns have influenced its foreign policy. India's development of its ballistic missile and covert nuclear weapons program strained relations with Pakistan, China, and the United States. The 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was rejected by India because it felt that it discriminated against the development of peaceful nuclear technology by states without nuclear weapons and did nothing to stop the qualitative and quantitative vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons among those states that already had them. Pakistan also held a similar position. Although India continued to refuse to join and criticized the deal for "perpetuating nuclear discrimination," 174 other parties agreed to extend it indefinitely in 1995.

Before Independence, British India fostered diplomatic ties with a degree of autonomy. India joined the Commonwealth of Nations in 1947 after achieving independence from the British Empire, supporting other countries' independence struggles including the Indonesian National Revolution. India and Pakistan's ties have been tense for a long time due to the Partition and disagreements over some areas, such as Kashmir. India maintained a non-alignment foreign policy during the Cold War. In other words, it continued to be independent of any significant power group. However, it not only maintained cordial relations with the Soviet Union but also benefited greatly from its military assistance. The conclusion of the Cold War had an impact on India's foreign policy as well. The nation aimed to forge extremely strong diplomatic and economic ties with the US, China, the EU, Israel, Japan, Mexico, and Brazil. India has tight connections with Iran, the Arab League, the African Union, and the ASEAN nations. It also maintains links with the African Union. India and Russia have strong military relations. Israel is its second-largest military ally. Additionally, it forges a solid strategic alliance with the US. The 2008 signing and implementation of the Indo-US civil nuclear accord was a symbol of the healthy development in Indo-American ties.

India's foreign policy is being developed

Jawaharlal Nehru believed that India's foreign policy should aim to bring about peace, ensure the liberation of the oppressed nations, end racial discrimination, and refrain from interfering in the domestic affairs of other states. A big portion of mankind is affected by diseases, poverty, and illiteracy.

He also discussed defending freedom on a political and personal level. However, it was consistently underlined that India's foreign policy aimed for peace. The notion of non-alignment is one of India's foreign policy's most significant aspects. Nehru was certain from the start that joining any one power bloc was not in India's best interests. Nothing, according to him, would harm India more than joining a power bloc. This policy means that India will not embrace a certain power bloc's agenda or join a specific system of pacts or alliances that would bind India to one side or the other. It entails evaluating each problem solely based on its merits.

This policy does refer to neutrality in the commonly understood meaning of the word. Additionally, it does not imply avoiding decisions. It has a somewhat upbeat and lively neutrality. It entails taking a separate course of action. No power bloc country is obligated to get support from this policy on every single topic. Asia has a significant role in this strategy.

The Prime Minister's Function

While the institutional framework itself was inadequate, Jawaharlal Nehru's new paradigm for creating India's foreign policy needed the Prime Minister to have a major personal role. Nehru served as both the minister of external affairs and the prime minister. He managed and made decisions on all significant foreign policy issues after consulting with his reliable advisors. Senior Indian Foreign Service personnel were then given responsibility for managing foreign relations. This custom persisted, and the succeeding prime ministers continued to exert influence over the nation's diplomatic transactions. However, many foreign affairs ministers were chosen.

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri gave the PM's office additional authority between 1964 and 1966. In reality, the Prime Minister's Secretariat was a common name for it. The office eventually assumed the role of de facto Government of India coordinator by 1970. This improved and reinforced the PM's office's function and provided it greater authority over decisions pertaining to foreign policy. All of this, however, came at the Ministry of External Affairs' cost. Over and beyond what the Ministry of External Affairs advised, advisors in the PM's office gave information and advice[9], [10]. The Prime Minister and his aides have access to more information thanks to the Research and Analysis Wing's many functions. RAW carried out covert activities overseas and gathered data, which the Prime Minister's office analyzed. Throughout her two terms as Prime Minister (1966–1977 and 1980–1984), Indira Gandhi maintained tight control over the trusted personal adviser in the Prime Minister's Office. Her son Rajiv Gandhi, who succeeded her, held substantial power over the PMO from 1984 until 1989. Unfortunately, there was less authority over the PMO when the Congress lost the general elections and the coalition governments of Morarji Desai from 1977 to 1979, V. P. Singh from 1989 to 1990, Chandra Shekhar from 1990 to 1991, and finally P. V. Narasimha Rao. The role of the deciding authority on any given matter preserved the primacy of the prime ministers in the management of international affairs in the 1990s.

3. CONCLUSION

Indian efforts to promote peaceful cohabitation and collaboration in its immediate surroundings make regional stability a top priority. Foreign policy choices are heavily influenced by economic factors as well, with India's aspirations for growth and development being closely tied to its international trade and investment initiatives. These global factors coming together highlights how complicated India's foreign policy environment is. It takes a careful balance of pragmatism, adaptation, and the expert use of the nation's diplomatic, economic, and security instruments to manage this complexity. An in-depth comprehension of these international factors will be necessary to create successful foreign policy plans that preserve India's national interests while promoting stability and cooperation on a global scale as that country's position in international affairs continues to change.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Mohita Maggon, "Economic and Policy Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment: An Empirical Analysis in Context of India.," *Vivekanand J. Res.*, 2010.
- [2] W. R. Gardner, E. Marcus, and M. R. Marcus, "International Trade and Finance.," *J. Finance*, 1965, doi: 10.2307/2977287.
- [3] V. R. Singh, "India's Foreign Trade: An Exploratory Study," *ASBM J. Manag.*, 2016.
- [4] J. Zajackowski, J. Schöttli, and M. Thapa, *India in the contemporary world: Polity, economy and international relations*. 2015. doi: 10.4324/9781315662008.

- [5] Reenu and A. K. Sharma, "Trends and Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment in India: A Study of the Post-liberalization Period," *South Asian J. Manag.*, 2015.
- [6] K. D. P. Singh, "Foreign Direct Investment: An Empirical Analysis on Trend, Distribution and Sectoral Penetration From PeriodoF 1991-2011," *Int. J. Appl. Financ. Manag. Perspect.*, 2013.
- [7] H. Pant, *The Us-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process, and Great Power Politics*. 2012. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198073963.001.0001.
- [8] A. AbuDalu, "The Real Effective Exchange Rate Impact on ASEAN-5 Economic Growth," *Int. J. Econ. Manag. Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.4172/2162-6359.1000174.
- [9] M. C. Marcuzzo and A. Rosselli, "Trade and International Finance," in *Ricardo and the Gold Standard*, 1990. doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-10491-8_6.
- [10] D. N. Bhasin, "Editorial," *Focus J. Int. Bus.*, 2015, doi: 10.17492/focus.v2i1.6424.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYZING THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT OF INDIA: MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Subodh Chandulal Khanna, Assistant Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- subodh.khanna@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) serves as the cornerstone of India's foreign policy and diplomatic efforts, responsible for shaping the nation's international engagements and safeguarding its interests on the global stage. This paper explores the multifaceted roles and functions of the MEA, including its diplomatic initiatives, bilateral and multilateral engagements, consular services, and public diplomacy efforts. By delving into the organizational structure, decision-making processes, and evolving priorities of the MEA, this study sheds light on the vital contributions of the ministry in advancing India's foreign policy objectives. The Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) occupies a pivotal position in the formulation and execution of India's foreign policy. Its multifunctional role encompasses diplomacy, international relations, consular services, and public outreach. The MEA's organizational structure, including its various divisions and missions abroad, facilitates effective communication, coordination, and representation at both bilateral and multilateral levels.

KEYWORDS:

Bilateral Relations, Diplomatic Missions, Foreign Policy, Global Diplomacy, International Agreements, Multilateral Organizations.

1. INTRODUCTION

One division of the Indian Central Government is the Ministry of External Affairs. This organization's primary responsibility is to handle international affairs. It carries out tasks including developing foreign policy, putting that strategy into practice, and managing international relations on a daily basis. A few specific responsibilities of the foreign ministry include timely information and assessment delivery to the prime minister and the minister of external affairs. Maintaining contact with the foreign mission in New Delhi, outlining a future policy strategy and advocating particular actions as needed, is another duty of the Ministry. This ministry began operating missions overseas in almost 149 nations in 1994, and the Indian Foreign Service provided employees to run the organization. The head of this ministry, who is also a member of the Council of Ministers and has the title of Cabinet minister, is supported by a deputy minister, a foreign secretary, and secretaries of state from the Indian Foreign Service. Thirteen geographical divisions make up the Ministry of External Affairs, which covers a wide swath of the globe, including Eastern Europe, former Soviet Union republics, and smaller regions on India's border, such as Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan. The ministry is divided into functional sections that deal with the UN, other international organizations, conferences, protocol, and external publicity. The division ramps up its efforts in response to shifting governmental economic priorities and the global economic landscape. The ministry formed the economic coordination unit in 1990 to evaluate India's exposure to the Persian Gulf Crisis. Additionally, it looked at the developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as well as the development of the European Economic Community's single market. The Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR), which is operated by the Ministry,

arranges exhibits, festivals, trips, and other types of cultural exchanges with other nations. The operations of foreign cultural centers in India are likewise under the control of ICCR.

Additional governmental entities

Other government organizations, outside the Prime Minister's office and the Ministry of External Affairs, have some part in determining foreign policy. In principle, at cabinet sessions, the ministers of defense, trade, and finance also examine legal issues pertaining to choices made in foreign policy. An example of a bicameral legislature is the Indian Parliament. The Parliament only has a little influence in determining foreign policy. The state is legally obligated by the negotiated treaties and international accords, but domestic legislation is enacted by an act of Parliament. The Foreign Ministry appoints the other government officials and diplomats who work in the foreign affairs division of High Commissions and Embassies. The Parliament has authorized government initiatives or requested data. In the middle of the 1990s, the Lok Sabha's Committee on External Affairs served as the most significant formal conduit between the Parliament and the Executive. The Committee used to have regular meetings and had members from a variety of parties. It often functioned as a deliberative body or as a venue for government directives.

Political parties and interest groups' functions

As they had been since Independence, institutional links between public opinion and the formulation of foreign policy were frail or minimal in the mid-1990s. Although international concerns have garnered a lot of attention in the media and among academics, the opinions presented in these publications by journalists and academics have minimal impact on the formulation of foreign policy. Foreign policy-related interest organizations may be found both within and outside of Parliament, such as the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce International. Other organizations, like friendship or cultural societies, encourage stronger relations with certain governments[1], [2].

Some opposition parties have often had a more significant impact on determining foreign policy. However, their views on foreign policy have been shown to be divergent or hostile to the government. Their opinions had little influence on India's formulation of foreign policy at the end of the 1990s. Only a small number of groups, including the Communist groups, the Janata Party, and the Jana Sang, had any influence over the creation of foreign policy in addition to the Congress. The Bharatiya Janata Party, one of its predecessors, created ordered or consistent foreign policy programs. After the middle of the 1950s, the Communist parties were seen as being more helpful in the development of India's foreign policy. The then-prime minister of the Janata Party, Morarji Desai, made a commitment to revert to "genuine non-alignment" during his time in office. Because of security concerns, neither Morarji Desai nor A. B. Vajpayee, the then-minister of external affairs, altered the non-alignment policy. The BJP administration had a distinct foreign policy than the Congress. The BJP opposed non-alignment and favored a more aggressive use of Indian strength to protect national interests from being undermined by China and Pakistan. The BJP has always supported the purchase of nuclear weapons.

National Interest and Foreign Policy

Diplomacy or international relations policy are other terms for foreign policy. As a result, it has been said that foreign policy and diplomacy are the spokes on which the process of international relations turns. No state can exist alone. The relationship between national objectives and the resources needed to achieve them is a recurring theme in statecraft. The components of any country's foreign policy are the same, regardless of size. The nation's

objectives are identified by those who formulate foreign policy. Each state must determine how much effort is necessary to preserve ties with another nation that would keep it safe. India made a clear foreign policy choice in 1949 to cut all connections with South Africa's apartheid government. Similar to this, it is apparent that the USSR strategy was to refuse to acknowledge the Soviet Union following the Bolshevik Revolution until 1934. The survival and security of the state are the traditional definitions of national interest. Thus, it is accurate to state that India's national interest is the welfare, advancement, and happiness of its citizens. From a different perspective, the main component of international relations is national interest. Self-interest is a basic reason for national policy, not just a valid one.

Strength and Foreign Policy

Power is a very complicated idea. Finding a definition that will be agreed upon by everybody is not simple. A layperson may easily say that one nation is more powerful than another. Although it is well recognized that the US is more powerful than India, it is quite difficult to determine precisely what the power consists of. Everyone is familiar with this. But what precisely gives the US its strength? What makes the US strong is the sheer amount of power it has relative to other nations. Power has a different role in home issues than it does in world politics. It is impossible to control all relationships in civilized cultures only by physical force. By adhering to a system of non-violent principles and processes, wrongs are rectified. People no longer have the authority to impose their own laws. States are forced to use force to defend their rights since there are no universal guidelines or tools for international relations or foreign policy. For this reason, numerous dictators such as Hitler, Mussolini, Yahya Khan, and Saddam Hussain promised their nations a beautiful future, yet their actions often resulted in catastrophe. A democratic government is ultimately considerably more successful than a tyrannical one, which merely produces short-term advantages before descending into anarchy. Additionally, home policies always have an impact on international ones. Once again, we may state that a nation's military might directly affects its foreign policy.

2. DISCUSSION

Principles and Objectives of India's Foreign Policy

India's foreign policy goals in 1947 were to create a peaceful environment, secure its strategic autonomy, and avoid being involved in any Cold War wars or alliances while focusing on its internal integration and nation-building efforts. The capacity to evaluate matters on their merits and how they affected India's interests or, as our first Prime Minister Nehru liked to say, "enlightened self-interest" was a key component of non-alignment as a strategy. The foundation of Indian nationalism has never been a shared language, shared religion, or shared ethnicity. It was only logical that we would seek out and advance the same values overseas as we worked to create a plural, democratic, secular, and tolerant society of our own [3]–[5].

Indian foreign policy's goals

The objectives of Indian foreign policy are clear-cut and uncomplicated. The preservation and development of global peace and security has always been the major objective. The Indian Constitution established both the ideas and goals of India's domestic and international policies. The primary goal of any country's foreign policy is to advance its national interest, ensure its security, safeguard its sovereignty, contribute to its growth and prosperity, and generally enhance its stature, influence, and role in the comity of nations, according to Muchkund Dubey, a former foreign secretary of India. A nation's foreign policy should be able to further the goals of fostering world peace, disarmament, and development as well as

the creation of a just and equitable international system. Before establishing fundamental ideas and drafting the program, the foreign policy makers put forth a number of goals. Although the level of focus varies, many of these goals are similar. After gaining independence, India faced very challenging circumstances while deciding on the goals of its foreign policy. Internally, the division of British India created a legacy of intense animosity and malice that eventually gave rise to Pakistan. India has just one economic entity prior to then. Numerous economic issues were brought on by its split, which were exacerbated by the influx of millions of Hindus and Sikhs who left Pakistan and needed to be rehabilitated.

India quickly became embroiled in a conflict in Kashmir that was imposed by tribal groups along the North-West boundary who were supported by Pakistan. Strikes were planned by the left, further endangering the Indian economy. In order to provide food, clothes, and shelter for its enormous people, India had to address this enormous issue. India's military capabilities were likewise weak. India's security issue was made worse by an antagonistic Pakistan. India too had to handle a different issue. The topic was internal consolidation. There were a few isolated enclaves of French and Portuguese territories in India after the British withdrew in 1947. Naturally, India's first attempts focused on negotiating with the two superpowers. After protracted talks, the French finally decided to leave, but military action was still necessary in 1961 to free Goa and other Portuguese holdings.

Meanwhile, the Cold War had started, and East-West relations were rapidly worsening. The global environment was not particularly comfortable. In this case, India made the decision that promoting global peace would be a central aspect of its foreign policy. India needed peace as a necessity for its own security, not only as a desirable ideal. India's attitude to peace, according to Nehru, is a proactive, productive approach rather than a passive, unhelpful, or neutral one. India has always stressed on finding peaceful solutions to all issues in its message to the globe. Peace meant avoiding conflict, lowering tension, and, if feasible, the end of the Cold War. A international order based on understanding and collaboration needed to be maintained, which called for an effective organization like the United Nations. The use of armaments must be curbed before there can be global peace[6], [7].

Rooting out additional causes of conflict via initiatives like subject peoples' freedom and the abolition of racial discrimination was a top priority. India will pursue an autonomous foreign policy without adhering to any major power group in order to attain this aim. Additionally, it would have to support and have trust in the UN. The pursuit of peace was one of the foreign policy's main goals. As a result, India's pursuit of peace was motivated by both its own self-interest and the idealism it absorbed from Mahatma Gandhi. Another goal of the foreign policy was the eradication of needs, illnesses, and illiteracy. These social problems affected numerous emerging nations in Asia and Africa in addition to Indian society. While India's domestic policy aimed to eradicate poverty and sickness, it was strongly linked to the issue of foreign aid and assistance. Additionally, India worked in conjunction with other international organizations including the WHO, FAO, UNICEF, and UNESCO to combat hunger, poverty, illiteracy, illness, and starvation in a number of developing and undeveloped nations.

India has voluntarily decided to continue being a Commonwealth of Nations member. The Commonwealth, an alliance of independent, sovereign nations that were once British Empire colonies, currently recognizes the British Queen as the Head of the Commonwealth rather than the Crown of a republic like India. Before 1949, the so-called British Commonwealth solely included the British Dominions. The British Crown served as the head of state for all the dominions. India, which had just declared itself a republic, opted against leaving the Commonwealth and instead chose to recognize the British monarch as its head of state. India and the other Commonwealth members kept working together for the good of both parties.

India's goal is to uphold friendly relations with everyone, refrain from military alliances, uphold non-alignment as a moral principle, seek out peaceful resolution of international conflicts, and advance universal brotherhood and humanism by upholding and promoting the five Panchsheel principles. India has always upheld the values of non-interference and peaceful coexistence. All of these goals have been accomplished thanks to the foreign policy initiatives and guiding principles of India. Despite being forced into conflicts by China and Pakistan, India has continued to support peaceful solutions to problems between states or countries. India has always made an effort to maintain cordial ties with other nations, especially those who are its neighbors. India continues to strive for global peace and has insisted on the total abolition of nuclear weapons and the strengthening of the United Nations as a result.

India's foreign policy principles

The non-aligned movement and Panchsheel are the cornerstones of Indian foreign policy. Jawaharlal Nehru is credited with coining the phrase "non-alignment." Non-alignment during the Cold War means not aligning with either of the two major blocs. It implies that India may conduct its own foreign policy independently. Furthermore, on April 29, 1954, India and China signed Panchsheel, the second-most significant tenet of Indian foreign policy.

1. An imbalance

India was a key player in the multilateral movements of former colonies and recently independent nations that eventually became known as the Non-Aligned Movement. President Nasser of Egypt, Joseph Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, and Jawaharlal Nehru were the principal designers of the Non-Aligned Movement's foreign strategy. This strategy pleased the majority of the nations in Asia and Africa, who thereafter joined the non-aligned movement. Today, practically all of Asia's and Africa's nations are members. Belgrade hosted the first non-aligned conference in 1961. The Non-Aligned Movement promotes disarmament, independence, and peace. It denounces racial prejudice, colonialism, and imperialism. The Non-Aligned Movement was successful in implementing its vision of aiding nations vying for independence, partnering with other nations to foster their economies, and denouncing all forms of prejudice.

India has always participated actively in global affairs. India has been active in world politics even before becoming independent. India has denounced the fascist aggression of Japan, Germany, and Italy that started the Second World War. India firmly opposed the South African apartheid system, which was led by a white minority. India, a country that values peace, has backed disarmament in a number of multilateral fora. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, first used the phrase "non-alignment" in a 1954 address in Colombo, Sri Lanka.

It's crucial to realize that neither neutrality nor Nehru's definition of non-alignment imply abstinence from engagement in international affairs. In actuality, the policy is active in nature and requires choosing sides depending on the merits of each individual case. This suggests that valid issue-bound non-alignment tilts exist, and as a result, the idea does not necessitate being equally distanced from both super powers. The core and essence of Indian foreign policy is non-alignment.

It is a policy to refrain from supporting any power grouping. According to Nehru, non-alignment entailed no commitment to any political or military grouping. It denotes a conscious disengagement from either bloc or a resolve to evaluate each international topic on its own merits. Non-alignment, in Nehru's view, is a component of independence since it

allows for freedom of action. It serves as a way of preserving national sovereignty and promoting international peace. India's geographic placement at the crossroads of South East Asia and the Middle East, its strategic location in the Indian Ocean, and its proximity to communist China in the north made it essential to avoid military alliances, on the other hand. The non-alignment strategy is in line with Indian heritage and philosophy.

2. pacific coexistence and panchsheel

National independence and liberation movements exploded after the Second World War in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In order to protect their national sovereignty and grow their economies, newly independent nations sought the formation of new patterns of international relations based on equality. This strong and widespread desire of newly independent countries led to the creation of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. On April 1, 1950, India and China, two Asian superpowers, established diplomatic relations. The Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence were originally included into the prologue of an agreement on commerce and communications between the Chinese territory of Tibet and India on April 29, 1954, when the two countries signed it. Zhou En-Lai, the Chinese premier of the time, traveled to India and Myanmar in 1954 at their request and met with Jawaharlal Nehru and U Nu, his Indian and Myanmarese equivalents at the time.

Consequently, the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence were formally proclaimed as the fundamental principles governing Sino-Indian and Sino-Myanmar relations in the "Joint Declaration of Chinese and Indian Premiers" issued on June 28, 1954, and the "Joint Declaration of Chinese and Myanmese Premiers" issued the following day. The joint declarations from China and India recommended that "these principles are not only applicable to relations between nations, but also to the general international relationship," and China and Myanmar hoped that "all nations will observe these principles." China, India, and Myanmar started the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence after a year, in April 1955. The historic "Asian-African Conference" took place in Bandung, Indonesia, and included 29 recently independent Asian and African nations.

The meeting approved the "Declaration on Promotion of World Peace and Cooperation" and established the ten Bandung meeting principles as a result of the collective efforts of the participants[8], [9].

These 10 principles were an expansion and development of the five principles of peaceful coexistence, and they included issues pertaining to them. Since that time, an increasing number of nations and international organizations have recognized and embraced the five principles of peaceful coexistence. Major international texts, such as resolutions passed by the UN General Assembly, have included statements made at various international gatherings. The five principles were reinforced in treaties and communiqués that China signed with foreign nations, in addition to the agreements detailing its diplomatic relations with more than 160 governments.

Panchsheel quickly gained such a following that Nehru referred to it as a "international coin." By the end of 1956, Panchsheel had received the support of numerous nations, including Afghanistan, Myanmar, Indonesia, Egypt, Nepal, Poland, the USSR, Saudi Arabia, and Yugoslavia. The UN General Assembly likewise made the decision to adopt the five principles in 1959. The five guiding principles of Indonesian National Policy were also stated by Indonesian President Sukarno in 1955. These five guiding principles, known as Panchashila, were as follows: The five Panchsheel principles, however, which were announced in 1954, did not represent either nationalism or morality. These were the guidelines that sovereign governments should follow while dealing with other countries.

These are common standards for how civilized countries should act with one another. Important goals of amicable international relations include respecting the territorial integrity of nations and abstaining from violence[10].

3. Dependent people's autonomy

Making anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism foreign policy in India has always been a matter of faith. India resolved to fight all types of colonialism and imperialism after being a long-time victim of British imperialism. India made the decision to assist the cause of the liberation of Asia's and Africa's dependant people wholeheartedly as a result. During the Second World War, the Japanese had seized control of the former Dutch province of Indonesia. When the Netherlands attempted to reestablish their control after defeating Japan, India opposed it even at the UN and supported Indonesia in its bid for independence. Once again, India provided unwavering support for the liberation movements in Malaya, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, and the Gold Coast, among other Asian and African nations. India also backed Namibia's people in their fight for freedom from racist South Africa throughout their long period of colonial oppression. Thus, promoting the right of all colonial citizens to self-determination was a key goal and guiding concept of Indian foreign policy.

3. CONCLUSION

The ministry's diplomatic efforts are crucial in advancing India's interests and ideals across the world because they are guided by the non-alignment, strategic alliance, and economic diplomacy tenets. India's dedication to international cooperation and problem-solving is shown by its bilateral interactions with important nations and its multilateral involvement in fora like the United Nations. The MEA's provision of consular services reflects the government's responsibility to safeguard its people and ensure their well-being by providing help and support to Indian nationals living overseas. Initiatives in public diplomacy, such as internet outreach and programs for cultural interaction, strengthen India's soft power and promote favorable attitudes abroad. The MEA must continue to be adaptable and strategic agile in a world that is changing quickly. The MEA is essential in advancing India's national interests and promoting peace and collaboration on a global scale by navigating complicated geopolitical dynamics, resolving transnational issues, and taking advantage of economic possibilities. The Ministry of External Affairs continues to be a crucial tool in determining India's future on the international scene as its influence expands.

REFERENCES:

- [1] M. S., C. R., and S. I., "Telemedicine national framework for healthcare and education," *International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery*. 2016.
- [2] I. Mergel, "OpenCollaboration in Public Sector: The case of social codign on Github," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, 2012.
- [3] G. Stobbe, *Just Enough ENGLISH GRAMMAR*. 2013.
- [4] S. Kennedy and D. A. Parker, "Building China's 'One Belt, One Road,'" *CSIS*, 2016.
- [5] J. A. Laub, "Assessing the servant organization; Development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) model. Dissertation Abstracts International," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 1999.
- [6] P. P. Varma, D. K. Raman, T. S. Ramakrishnan, P. Singh, and A. Varma, "Prevalence of early stages of chronic kidney disease in apparently healthy central government employees in India," *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.*, 2010, doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfq131.

- [7] S. Khanna, "State-owned enterprises in India: Restructuring and growth," *Copenhagen J. Asian Stud.*, 2012, doi: 10.22439/cjas.v30i2.4237.
- [8] S. L. Murthy, "Land security and the challenges of realizing the human right to water and sanitation in the slums of Mumbai, India," *Health and Human Rights*. 2012.
- [9] V. Tiwari *et al.*, "Identifying the factors causing delayed presentation of cancer patients to a government medical college of central India," *J. Clin. Diagnostic Res.*, 2015, doi: 10.7860/JCDR/2015/15104.6512.
- [10] L. A. Patey, "India in Sudan: Troubles in an African oil 'paradise,'" in *Sudan Looks East: China, India and the Politics of Asian Alternatives*, 2011.

CHAPTER 6

FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID AND INDIA'S INDEPENDENT POLICY

Subodh Chandulal Khanna, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id- subodh.khanna@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Foreign economic aid has been a crucial component of India's post-independence foreign policy, shaping the nation's economic development, diplomatic relationships, and pursuit of strategic autonomy. This paper examines India's approach to foreign economic aid, highlighting its role in promoting self-reliance, diversifying partnerships, and addressing developmental challenges. By analyzing the complexities of India's independent policy in the context of foreign economic aid, this study underscores the delicate balance between accepting assistance and preserving national sovereignty. India's independent policy in the realm of foreign economic aid reflects its commitment to strategic autonomy and development priorities. Post-independence, India embarked on a path of self-reliance, seeking to reduce dependency on foreign aid while utilizing external assistance for targeted developmental goals. The nation's approach has evolved, navigating the tensions between accepting aid and preserving its sovereignty.

KEYWORDS:

Bilateral Assistance, Development Projects, Economic Sovereignty, Geopolitics, Grant Aid, International Donors.

1. INTRODUCTION

An essential need existed for a country like India to build its economy. India started focusing its resources on quick and well-planned global growth shortly after gaining independence. India, however, struggled with a shortage of sufficient materials and technological know-how. India has already chosen non-alignment as its fundamental stance. India might have received the financial and scientific assistance it needed from the US or the USSR. The USSR was thought to be unwilling to assist a non-communist nation. The Indian government and business sector both knew that the US would be the only nation able to provide India with significant assistance. India, however, was adamant about maintaining its national independence, non-alignment, and sovereignty. Despite its steadfast refusal to accept any help that came with conditions, India had managed to become relatively close to the United States by 1949. As nationalization of industry proved impractical, several sectors of the Indian industry placed pressure on the Indian government to acquire foreign investment. India realized there was a risk of communism emerging in India as well because of the success of communist China, but only if significant economic growth was started, naturally with foreign help. There was a rising awareness of the need of aiding India in order to prevent Chinese Communist triumph in the nation, even in the United States. Thus, the US's strategy of providing economic aid to India got underway [1], [2].

As the process of development advanced, India also began taking funding from the World Bank and a number of other nations. Over time, Soviet mistrust of India as a pro-Western nation was dispelled. Aid from the Eastern Bloc was appreciated in India as well. Then, as the Soviet Union struggled, two new economic giants started to emerge. As industrially advanced nations, Germany and Japan began aiding several nations, including India. Sadly, Western nations have been reluctant to provide India and other developing nations access to their

technologies. India made an effort to maintain its decision-making and foreign policy autonomy. It was accused as being pro-Western at times and clearly pro-Soviet Union at other times. India made an effort to strike a balance and follow its own course. India made the decision to nationalize a lot of things during the rule of Indira Gandhi. The western countries started to doubt India's strategy of autonomous decision-making and non-alignment since socialism was an aim of the Indian economy. Midway through 1991, India made the decision to liberalize its economy, and as the Soviet Union fell apart, India's economy inevitably gravitated toward capitalism.

Fighting against Racial Prejudice

India upholds the equality of all people. Its policy strives to combat racial prejudice in all its manifestations. The worst instance of prejudice and exploitation of coloured people, especially those of Indian ancestry, occurred in South Africa. India fully backed the cause of those who had been subjected to societal prejudice. India utilized its clout to apply broad sanctions on South Africa's discriminatory white minority rule in addition to severing diplomatic ties with that country in 1949. India refused to provide any assistance to the racist dictatorship, criticized the system both within and outside the United Nations, and supported the call for racial equality. Early in 1994, apartheid was finally abolished, and Nelson Mandela successfully led the election and installation of a majority administration. India restored its connections with South Africa by helping that nation achieve its aim of racial equality. India has consistently backed the creation of such a society because it is a culture that values equality and in which discrimination on the basis of race, color, or class is nonexistent.

United Nations's backing

The United Nations and several of its specialized organizations were founded by India. India has great confidence in global institutions and organizations. India has a strong commitment to maintaining world peace and security. Despite possessing nuclear weapons, India opposes the use of weapons and favors their total removal along with a significant decrease in conventional weapons and military forces. It thinks that through making the UN stronger, these objectives may be accomplished. India plays a significant role in the UN's non-aligned movement. It is a well-known Afro-Asian member of the international organization. In the UN and its agencies, India has sponsored and backed various progressive initiatives[3]–[5].

In 1953, an Indian named Vijay Laxmi Pandit was chosen to lead the UN General Assembly. India has served a number of stints as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council. Once again, India was chosen as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council and has been a member since 2011. Everybody acknowledges India's contribution to the cause of global peace. India has eagerly reacted to the UN's request for assistance in collective security and peacekeeping initiatives. In addition to sending a medical unit to the Korean War, India also actively took part in the repatriation of prisoners of war following the Korean War. India has also provided assistance to Egypt, Congo, and Yugoslavia at the request of the UN for peacekeeping. Since ancient times, the most popular means of resolving conflicts has been war. It was believed that using force to settle differences was acceptable. One country ultimately prevailed over the other as a consequence. The objective of India's foreign policy is the peaceful resolution of disputes; the word "peaceful" is stressed here rather than "settlement". Therefore, peaceful resolution of conflicts is the obvious approach if India's purpose is to promote world peace. All future administrations were specifically urged by India's founding fathers to remember that their country favored a peaceful resolution of international disputes. According to Article 51 of the Indian Constitution, the state must make

every effort to resolve international issues amicably. India opposes and rejects "negotiation through strength" as being unreasonable. India had to deal with conflicts that were forced upon it, but this did not cause it to lose trust in peaceful solutions. In countries like Britain, the fundamental tenets of foreign policy often do not drastically alter when a government is changed. With the adoption of this tradition, India's fundamental policy commitments have stayed the same or unmodified even when Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers have changed.

Gujral's doctrine

The Gujral Doctrine is a collection of five guiding principles that were articulated by I. K. Gujral, first as the External Affairs Minister and subsequently as the Prime Minister, to govern India's foreign policy with its closest neighbors. These five principles are the result, among other things, of the conviction that India's height and power are inextricably linked to the caliber of its interactions with its neighbors. As a result, it appreciates the value of amicable, pleasant relationships among neighbors. These guidelines are as follows: When it comes to its neighbors, such as Bangladesh, Bhutan, the Maldives, Nepal, and Sri Lanka, India does not demand recompense but instead provides and accommodates as much as it can in a trusting and good-faith manner. No country in South Asia should consent to have its territory utilized against the interests of another nation in the area. No nation should meddle in another's domestic affairs. Each South Asian nation must respect the other's sovereignty and geographical integrity.

2. DISCUSSION

The concept promoted intercultural exchanges, notably between India and Pakistan, to foster an environment that would allow the nations to resolve their disputes amicably. The Gujral Doctrine, which may be summed up in one statement as the practice of making unilateral concessions to neighbors and encouraging inter-personal communication, aims to improve relationships by amicable acts or gestures. The Doctrine portrays India as a sizable nation ready to assist its weaker neighbors on its own. It was commonly assumed that Gujral's close friend Professor Bhabani Sengupta was the author. As the post-Cold War international landscape altered, the Gujral Doctrine came to be seen as a key tenet of Indian foreign policy. The Gujral Doctrine gained importance when India and Pakistan established eight topics for dialogue in June 1997 at the Foreign Secretary level talks in order to foster trust and ensure the peaceful settlement of all concerns[6], [7].

India's Potential Nuclear Option

Jawaharlal Nehru started the atomic energy research, and Dr. Homi Bhabha served as the Atomic Energy Commission's first chairman. Jawaharlal Nehru never emphasized the need of acquiring nuclear weapons, but he also never voiced opposition to the notion either. It was commonly accepted that atomic energy should be used for good. India didn't start pursuing nuclear energy until much later. The Bangladesh Crisis of 1971 demonstrated how Pakistan's ally China would aid Pakistan in developing nuclear weapons. As a result, it became crucial for India to create nuclear weapons in order to defend its borders. In May 1974, India carried out its first nuclear test. The worldwide outcry over the test led India to claim that it had simply been a "Peaceful Nuclear Explosion." The discriminatory Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, which recognized just five nuclear weapon nations and required the parties to refrain from nuclear weapon proliferation, is persistently rejected by India.

Atal Behari Vajpayee, the then-prime minister, made the audacious choice to conduct five nuclear tests in May 1998. India was able to proclaim itself a nuclear weapon state because to

the secret tests that were carried out. India bravely endured a barrage of criticism and harsh penalties from the US and its allies. India already had nuclear weapons, according to Vajpayee, thus there was no need for any more testing. India has thus far refused to ratify the CTBT and the NPT.

India's Foreign Policy under Nehru

Jawaharlal Nehru is credited with creating modern India's foreign policy. In the years just following Independence, he handled India's volatile domestic situation with care. Nehru's impact to foreign policy has been mostly positive. Like his economic measures, Nehru's foreign policy was heavily contested and debated when he served as foreign minister. He was just as affected by socialism as he was by Gandhi's Satyagraha principles. Two main concepts dominated Nehru's foreign policy: first, he wanted India to establish a distinct identity free from any appearance of allegiance to either the US or the USSR. In regards to foreign events, he maintained unwavering trust in the goodness and integrity of people. The first strategy finally resulted in the 1962 assault because all of the terms of the Panchsheel, or five-point agreement, between New Delhi and Peking in 1954 were flagrantly broken. This betrayal of trust was both the cause of Nehru's passing as well as a great shock to him.

NAM and Nehru

The creation of NAM was the biggest accomplishment of Nehru's ambivalent foreign policy. Later on in his new coalition, Nehru found partners in Tito, Nasser, Sukarno, U Nu, and Dr. Kwame Nkrumah. The newly independent and long-colonized countries of Asia and Africa that made up the NAM were first not taken seriously by either the Eastern bloc headed by the USSR or the Western bloc led by the US. After NAM was founded and started operating independently of any bloc, its significance became clear. Additionally, it experienced significant pressure from both sides of the international community. Nehru, though, continued with his objective. It was understood that the NAM was a tough test of his bravery, not merely a platform of neutral and passive states. The primary goal of NAM was to free the nations vying for independence from colonial rule. The NAM member nations peacefully agreed to accept and support the decolonization process.

Nehru and the Crisis in China

China-related aspects of Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy have drawn criticism. With China, Nehru aimed to forge a close-knit, advantageous connection. The Panchsheel accord, often known as the five-point agreement, was signed in 1954 between New India and China for this reason. Following the signing of this agreement, China started to monitor certain sections of the Indian border in 1955. India had agreed to engage in talks to find a peaceful solution to the issue. The Chinese administration, led by Chou En-Lai, sought to address the border problem in its whole at once, in contrast to India, which desired to address one issue at a time under Nehru's direction. The Chinese government broke the terms of the Panchsheel pact. China invaded India in 1962. Not only Nehru, but the whole world community, experienced a profound shock. The Indian military at the moment was unprepared for the conflict. Superpowers like the US and the USSR gave India some symbolic assistance. Despite the Soviet Union's involvement in the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Khrushchev offered assistance to the nation. However, American support was somewhat less than what Pakistan received in 1954, when it received significant military aid.

As he transformed India's military loss into a moral triumph, Nehru executed his last brilliant act of world diplomacy. The Chinese invasion had little impact on India's foreign policy. Nehru was compelled to alter his stance on foreign matters, nevertheless, as a result of

internal opposition party criticism. Nehru acknowledged that while addressing global issues, perfect goodwill was not necessary. Dreams of Jawaharlal Nehru were more or less seriously derailed. Additionally, it was a huge, unexpected surprise. The primary guiding premise of Nehru's foreign policy was the country of India. Nehru, however, was not a Kautilya-Morgenthau realist. His leader Mahatma Gandhi, an idealist who advocated that moral ideal be applied to all aspects of politics, strongly affected him. As a result, Nehru did not see any conflict between India's national interest and the rightful interests of other countries. As evidenced by his general non-alignment policy and his choice to ascertain the opinions of the people of Jammu and Kashmir on the issue of the state's merger with India, Nehru insisted on national interest when formulating the foreign policy of the free India. This shows that he was more of an idealist than a realist. His agreement with Chinese Prime Minister Chou Enlai in 1954, which permitted Tibet's complete unification with China, demonstrates his utopian mindset.

Narendra Nehru and the Kashmir Issue

Kashmir remained a concern, and Nehru was unable to resolve it via negotiations with Pakistan. Nehru was a proponent of genuine altruism and political charity. Even via the United Nations, he attempted to engage with the Pakistani administration. All peaceful accords, however, were rejected by Pakistan's military government. In 1950, even the offer of a vote was declined. As a Muslim-dominated region, Kashmir is still strategically hazardous for national security. The Kashmir crisis has not been resolved. It continues to be a bone of contention between India and Pakistan today. South Asia is also experiencing it as a global issue.

Indian Foreign Policy Towards Different Countries

India's strategic place in the current world order has a significant influence on how it develops its policies, both globally and domestically. One such component is apparent in India's foreign policy, which very clearly demonstrates India's projection of its image as an impending global powerhouse by developing, maintaining, and strengthening partnerships with nations that are in its geographical vicinity or otherwise[8]–[10].

Since gaining its independence, India has worked to develop a foreign policy that should support its reputation as a potential and powerful country. However, a number of worldwide crises and events that significantly altered the political and economic landscapes of the world, particularly in the 1990s, have had an impact on India's foreign policy. India has extremely strategically maneuvered and diplomatically managed its position in the worldwide global sphere with the conclusion of the Cold War, the dissolution of the Soviet Union, challenges linked to nuclear weapons, economic crises, or border conflicts. From territorial disputes with its neighbors, including Pakistan, Bangladesh, and China, to its relations with superpowers like the US, former Russia, and India, these nations have expressed a desire to strengthen their cultural, regional, economic, and even political ties with India. India has taken a tough stance in the past when encroachment of any type has occurred, whether on a geographic, political, or other level. It would be interesting to observe how India's foreign policy responds to the present problems and solidifies its relationships with other nations via its participation in organizations like ASEAN and SAARC. Afghanistan and India enjoy friendly and cordial bilateral ties. Additionally, India has strong ties with Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and the Maldives. Bhutan and India have a relationship based on respect, confidence, and trust. For a variety of reasons, relations between India and Nepal are tense; yet, India is making steps to improve relations with one of its closest neighbors. The foreign policy of India toward different countries will be covered in this subject.

India's Foreign Policy: United States, Russia, United Kingdom, and China

India, one of the world's biggest democracies today, has one of the most dynamic and quickly expanding economies. India's potential is being recognized by nations all around the globe, and these nations want to work with it to assure their own development. The majority of the nations in the world have official and diplomatic connections with India. With some of its neighbors, India has amicable ties; with others, not so much. However, India understands the need of keeping friendly relations with its neighbors in order to become a major global force. India's policies toward the US, UK, China, and Russia is discussed in this section.

Relationships between India and the United States

The world's two biggest democracies have never had a close relationship. During the Cold War, South Asia did not factor significantly into American strategic thinking. India was formally a non-aligned nation, something the United States did not like. While Bangladesh remained an integral part of Pakistan until 1971, Nepal, the Maldives, Sri Lanka, and Bhutan were not large enough to be significant. Pakistan and Afghanistan were principally impacted by the rivalry of the Cold War. Because of its links to the Soviet Union, the US believed that India belonged in the Soviet camp. The policies of the US and India often ran parallel to one another or indirectly varied because of the relationships with developing nations like Pakistan. While the US did provide some assistance and support during the 1962 India-China crisis, it supported Pakistan during the 1965 Indo-Pak conflict. The US assisted Pakistan in the 1971 India-Pakistan conflict, but it also forewarned India of its impending involvement and even sent the US 7th Fleet to the Bay of Bengal. In actuality, the Kashmir issue, the US's support for Pakistan, India's non-alignment policy, its friendly relations with the USSR, and its refusal to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty were among the obstacles to the development of strong ties between India and the US.

Ronald Reagan became the president of the United States of America in January 1981. The Reagan administration placed emphasis on a South Asian-leaning strategy. The anti-Afghan rebels received covert military assistance from this government, while Pakistan received full economic and military backing. This strategy undoubtedly harmed US-Indian relations. Nevertheless, the US had plans to set up a substantial military facility in Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. However, the Indo-US relationship declined as a result of India's nuclear program and its acceptance of Kampuchea.

Apart from these issues, Indira Gandhi, the then-prime minister of India, wanted to forge a warm relationship with Washington for the following two reasons: First, India could not rely solely on the Soviet Union for defense material supplies because doing so would not be in India's best interests. In terms of quality, the United States and other western nations possessed superior defense technology than the Soviet Union. India did not welcome the Soviet soldiers stationed on the borders of Pakistan and Afghanistan for strategic as well as security reasons. It would be preferable to have tighter connections with the United States in order to balance the situation. When she directly met President Ronald Reagan at the Cancun Conference in 1981, Indira Gandhi's diplomatic attempts to establish connection with the US government were made feasible. She met Ronald Reagan in Washington, D.C., a year later. In the course of a few encounters, Indira Gandhi and Reagan became friendly. The expansion of scientific and technical collaboration between the two nations was formally agreed upon. Nevertheless, despite the development of this favorable connection, the fundamental, strategic, and political divide remained. As a result, there was continued tension between India and the United States.

Rajiv Gandhi wanted to reorient the Indo-US relationship. In 1985, he paid a visit to the US and made efforts to improve the tense ties. The United States also gave a positive response, consented to the transfer of cutting-edge technologies, and supplied cutting-edge military equipment. Even though Rajiv Gandhi's trip to the US produced no tangible outcomes, it did help the two nations better understand each other's interests. Both nations were content to deepen their ties throughout the 1980s without permanently compromising their respective national objectives. The Indo-US relationship eventually improved, but there was little substance. As a result, despite several attempts by the two presidents, the relationship between the nations remained tense.

Expectations of a new partnership with the US started with the conclusion of the Cold War and the rise of the National Front administration in India. The Soviet military forces had left Afghanistan in 1989. India exhibited a cooperative stance toward the US during the 1990–1991 Gulf War and offered refueling facilities to American military transport aircrafts headed for the conflict area in the Gulf. The Bush administration gave a positive response. The fact that the US warned Pakistan, put sanctions on Pakistan's nuclear weapons development, and stopped military funding shows a shift in the US's approach. The UN decision on the Kashmir problem, he said, was equally unimportant. A prospective economic partner for the United States was also identified in India, whose economy was liberalizing. In light of the dominating position it was anticipated to play in the international arena, India and the US became closer after the fall of the Soviet Union.

When Bill Clinton was elected president of the United States in 1993, he emphasized that the promotion of peace and stability in the area was the main objective of his South Asia strategy. The Kashmir dispute and nuclear non-proliferation became the focal point of the Clinton administration's new strategy in this area, shattering India's high hopes in an instant. The Clinton administration's policies had an impact on India's primary national security objectives, including its territorial integrity and the retention of the nuclear option. Even the economic cooperation fell short of expectations, and as a result, Indo-US relations suffered greatly in the early and middle 1990s. The US wants to monitor potential big power aspirants in order to maintain its status as the sole Superpower in the world. Naturally, India opposed both the US's stated goals and its attempt to establish a unipolar global order. India made the decision to acquire nuclear weapons for this reason in order to elevate its standing as a major world power. Preventing a conflict between India and Pakistan and halting the nuclear weapons race in the area were Bill Clinton's main priorities when he became president of the United States in 1993. However, it wasn't at all what India had anticipated. With the United States, India wanted to improve ties. India intended to strengthen its ties with Pakistan in the areas of political, military, and economic cooperation. India's main goal was to get US backing for its expanding international ambitions. India advocated a policy of collaboration with the United States, while the United States devised a containment strategy against it. Additionally, the United States and other major nations denounced India's actions when it carried out its nuclear tests in May 1998, holding New Delhi responsible for the proliferation of nuclear weapons in South Asia. Pakistan eventually carried out nuclear tests as well. The Clinton administration levied economic penalties on Pakistan and India, and it also put pressure on other nations to follow suit. The United Nations Security Council was persuaded or pressured into enacting a resolution even though it did not acknowledge Pakistan and India as *de jure* nuclear weapon states. The Security Council approved the resolution with conditions after a month following the tests—mandatory NPT ratification, which may halt or halt the development of new nuclear weapons. Consequently, a strategic interaction was added to or expanded this punitive framework. Both nations started looking for a new

foundation for their relationship. The talks were initiated by Jaswant Singh, a special representative of India, and Strobe Talbott, the US deputy secretary of state.

Bill Clinton visited India at the end of 2000, after negotiations between Strobe Talbott and Jaswant Singh. His visit forged relationships between the two nations and ultimately led to a better understanding of their shared interests. Finally, a connection between the two largest democracies in the world was solidified in terms of shared economic goals, the struggle against terrorism, and the advancement of democracy. Although the Clinton administration was able to forge solid connections with India, the Junior Bush administration had already made friends with this country by reaching a nuclear agreement with it. The collapse of the Soviet Union was the primary cause of the improved Indo-US ties after the end of the Cold War, although it took over ten years for both nations to develop mutual understanding. In addition to all disagreements being resolved, the two governments are also making efforts to strengthen their relationship.

The relationship between India and the United States seemed to have greatly improved during George W. Bush's presidency. This was a result of how passionately both nations felt about problems like terrorism, climate change, and energy security. After the World Trade Center assault on September 11, 2001, George Bush teamed up with India to monitor and regulate the important water routes in the Indian Ocean between Singapore and the Suez Canal. Additionally, the Indian and US warships collaborated in search and rescue activities as well as in the reconstruction of the devastated regions in December 2004 after the terrible tsunami. Aiming to boost commerce, trade, and tourism via an increase in flights, India and the US signed the Open Skies Agreement in April 2005. The US-India relationship has become even stronger as a result of Obama's visit to India.

Recently, there have been a lot more high-level visits and interactions between India and the US. From September 26 to 30, 2014, Prime Minister Modi paid a visit to the US. While there, he met with President Obama, members of the US Congress, and political figures from a number of States and localities, as well as with officials of President Obama's Cabinet. Additionally, he made contact with leaders in US business and industry, civic society, think tanks, and the Indian-American community. During the visit, a Vision Statement and a Joint Statement were released.

Following the trip, President Obama traveled to India as the chief guest for India's Republic Day from January 25–27, 2015. A Delhi Declaration of Friendship and a Joint Strategic Vision for the Asia-Pacific and Indian Ocean Region were also adopted during the visit by the two parties. The Strategic and Commercial Dialogue of Foreign and Commerce Ministers was upgraded by both parties from the Strategic Dialogue between their respective Foreign Ministers. On September 23–28, 2015, Prime Minister Modi paid a second visit to the US. During that time, he met with President Obama in a private setting, spoke with influential figures in industry, the media, academia, local government, and the Indian community, especially while visiting Silicon Valley. The presidents of the two nations often communicate with one another through phone conversations and meetings that take place outside of international gatherings. The Prime Minister's Office and the US White House have set up a hotline.

3. CONCLUSION

Infrastructure construction, technical innovation, and capacity building in important industries have all been made possible by foreign economic help. At the same time, India has sought to diversify its ties in order to avoid becoming too dependent on any one source and has been wary of any possible conditions associated with help. India has been able to make

the shift from being a large aid receiver to an aid provider, providing development support to other countries, thanks to the nation's economic growth and growing worldwide influence. India's dedication to shared wealth and togetherness is shown by this transition. In conclusion, India's autonomous foreign economic aid strategy exemplifies the difficulty of striking a balance between outside assistance and national interests and sovereignty. India has used foreign economic assistance as a vehicle for success while preserving its autonomous foreign policy agenda by carefully matching aid with developmental objectives, broadening alliances, and adopting a reciprocal strategy. In order to pursue its national objectives, economic progress, and diplomatic engagement, India will continue to negotiate the global environment, and its strategy for receiving foreign economic assistance will be no different.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. Naidu and H. Herman, "Africa's new development partners: China and India - challenging the status quo?," *Aid to Africa. Redeemer or Colon.*, 2009.
- [2] K. McQuillan, "Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population," *Can. Stud. Popul.*, 2010, doi: 10.25336/p6w32v.
- [3] J. A. Kirk, "A Bittersweet {"Graduation"} from Aid: Can the World Bank's {IDA} Hold On to India, and Will India Let It?," *Conf. Pap. -- South. Polit. Sci. Assoc.*, 2009.
- [4] "Fatal misconception: the struggle to control world population," *Choice Rev. Online*, 2008, doi: 10.5860/choice.46-0970.
- [5] J. Nelson, "Ukraine opens up for Monsanto, land grabs and GMOs," *The Ecologist*, 2014.
- [6] R. U. Zaman, "Kautilya: The Indian strategic thinker and Indian strategic culture," *Comp. Strateg.*, 2006, doi: 10.1080/01495930600956260.
- [7] R. S. Mane, "Science, Technology and Innovation Policy," *Current Science*. 2012. doi: 10.4324/9780203466032-12.
- [8] I. Abraham, "From Bandung to NAM: Non-alignment and Indian foreign policy, 1947-65," *Commonw. Comp. Polit.*, 2008, doi: 10.1080/14662040801990280.
- [9] D. A. Mahapatra, "From a latent to a 'strong' soft power? The evolution of India's cultural diplomacy," *Palgrave Commun.*, 2016, doi: 10.1057/palcomms.2016.91.
- [10] "Corrigendum: Redefining India's Independent Foreign Policy (Economic and Political Weekly (27-28))," *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2012.

CHAPTER 7

INDIA-UNITED STATES OF DIALOGUE ARCHITECTURE

Dr. Zuleika Homavazir, Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- zuleika.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The India-US dialogue architecture stands as a testament to the evolving relationship between these two nations, reflecting their shared values, strategic interests, and commitment to global stability.

This paper examines the multifaceted nature of the dialogue architecture, encompassing diplomatic, economic, defense, and cultural dimensions. By analyzing the historical trajectory and contemporary dynamics of this engagement, the study sheds light on the significance of the India-US dialogue architecture in shaping bilateral ties and influencing regional and global affairs.

The India-US dialogue architecture represents a remarkable journey from a cautious engagement to a strategic partnership rooted in mutual respect and shared interests. Diplomatically, the bilateral dialogues have fostered closer cooperation on various fronts, ranging from defense and security to trade and technology. Economic dialogues have paved the way for increased trade and investment, with both nations recognizing the potential for growth through collaboration.

KEYWORDS:

Defense Cooperation, Economic Relations, Energy Partnership, Foreign Policy, Geopolitics, Intelligence Sharing.

1. INTRODUCTION

Between the two governments, there are more than 50 bilateral discussion structures. The former Strategic Dialogue focused on five traditional pillars of bilateral relations: Strategic Cooperation; Energy and Climate Change; Education and Development; Economy, Trade and Agriculture; Science and Technology; and Health and Innovation. The first meeting of the Strategic and Commercial Dialogue at the level of EAM and MoS was held in Washington, DC, on September 22, 2015. Additionally, there are discussions at the ministerial level on housing, finance, business, HRD, science and technology, and energy.

Civil Nuclear Co-Operation

The agreement between the two countries on civil nuclear cooperation was completed in July 2007 and signed in October 2008. The two sides established a Contact Group to advance the complete and prompt implementation of the India-US Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement and to address outstanding problems during Prime Minister Modi's visit to the US in September 2014. The group has had five meetings so far and has come to consensus on the nuclear liability risk management strategy, the compatibility of India's nuclear liability legislation with pertinent international treaties, and the establishment of an insurance pool that would rely on industry best practices. Two US corporations, M/s Westinghouse and GE Hitachi, are now the subject of company-level negotiations over the technological and economic feasibility of their respective reactors at locations in Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh[1], [2].

Russia and India's Relationship

Due to the vast population and strategic position of the Indian subcontinent, great countries have always found it difficult to control it. By establishing a policy of non-alignment as soon as India obtained independence, Jawaharlal Nehru, the country's first prime minister, aimed to shield India from the rising hostility between the US and USSR. But some elements propelled the Cold War between the two nations to South Asia. Both superpowers made an effort to seize control of the South Asian region. Over time, both India and Pakistan used the growing competition between the major powers to their advantage when drafting their foreign policies. For instance, by agreeing to serve US interests, Pakistan not only invited the superpower to the subcontinent but also reiterated its hostility against India. India was hence compelled to seek assistance from the USSR.

Both India and Pakistan disagreed on the Kashmir problem after achieving independence. Pakistan kept its ties with the major nations up in order to counter the military might of India. This was made clear in 1954 when Pakistan joined SEATO under US leadership. The whole backdrop of Indo-Pak relations has shifted as a result of this incident. For the purpose of containing communism in South Asia, Pakistan gave the United States military bases in exchange for both military and economic aid. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, was adamantly opposed to outside powers interfering in local affairs so as to prevent the introduction of Cold War politics in this area. Therefore, with the help of US armaments to Pakistan, Indo-Pak ties declined. In response, India started to buy weapons from non-American suppliers. While India was not interested in acquiring armaments from the Soviet Union, the presence of US bases in Pakistan spurred the USSR to take a significant interest in the South Asian area with a security perspective in India. However, Pakistan had accepted the US weaponry assistance. India and Pakistan would have gone to war as a result of this. India, however, opposed any hostilities or conflicts in the area.

After Stalin's death, the new leadership in the USSR quickly understood that the non-alignment strategy was to their benefit. As a result, they positioned themselves as the defenders of the non-aligned countries and their anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism policies. When Jawaharlal Nehru visited the USSR, he was impressed by their commitment to peaceful coexistence. Both countries committed to working together for the good of both parties and the general public. Khrushchev and Bulganin paid Nehru a visit in return, and they also traveled to India. On the basis of equality and mutual benefit, they announced that all circumstances for bilateral commerce, economic cooperation, and growth between India and the Soviet Union were provided. Additionally, the USSR agreed with India's view that Kashmir was a natural extension of India and subsequently defended India's interests before the UN Security Council. The two nations also shared a stance in the Suez crisis, despite India's reluctance to condemn the USSR for its intervention in Hungary[3]–[5].

The Sino-Soviet and Sino-Indian ties were also declining at the same time as the Indo-Soviet relationship. In 1959, the Tibetan revolt prompted India to purchase helicopters and transport aircraft from the USSR. An Indian team traveled to Moscow in October 1960 to seal the contract for the acquisition of aircraft and communication technology. The USSR was in a precarious position after the Chinese incursion in 1962 since it was impossible for it to refrain from supporting a communist regime. As a result, it took a neutral stance. India received some military aid from the US. Pakistan, on the other hand, made steady progress toward China in an effort to avoid relying only on one source for its military needs. Ayub Khan visited China in March 1965 and returned with supplies for Pakistan's military as well as political backing. The Soviet Union took a neutral stance throughout the 1965 war but

promised to end the conflict between the two competing governments in a peaceful manner. When the US became engaged in the Vietnam War, Russia started acting as a mediator.

The 1960s saw a strengthening of Indo-Soviet ties, as well as the development of cordial ties between Pakistan and China, despite Pakistan's continuing active participation in the American bloc. Concurrently, the Sino-Soviet confrontation grew, to the point that China started labeling the USSR as a revisionist state. However, when millions of refugees started flooding into India as a result of the uprising that started in East Pakistan, the situation on the subcontinent deteriorated. Pakistan made the decision to go to war with India on the grounds that India was to blame for the turmoil and was aiding the MuktiBahini in their fight against the Pakistani security forces. India, on the other hand, need a powerful partner to balance out the strategic ties between China and Pakistan and the US, while Pakistan had the full backing of both countries. In spite of its non-alignment stance, India signed into an Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty in 1971 that granted India.

During the Indo-Pak War, there was political backing

India's foreign policy changed after the pact with the Soviet Union was signed in 1971. It was the first political agreement that India had with a major power. There have been claims that this pact violates the non-alignment principle in certain circles. However, the Indian authorities insisted that this had no bearing on India's foreign policy's non-alignment. However, handling Indo-Soviet relations for Indian authorities got increasingly challenging after the Afghanistan conflict. When the New Cold War started in 1979 as a result of Soviet action in Afghanistan, the world had abruptly transformed. India's approach to Afghanistan at the time was also questioned. Most nations in the globe denounced India's assistance for the Soviet invasion. In January 1980, as Indira Gandhi began her second term, she used the soft line strategy. This was harshly condemned since it plainly leaned toward the Soviet Union and undermined the non-alignment doctrine. India unquestionably opposed any foreign incursion into an independent nation like Afghanistan. Since India and the Soviet Union had cordial ties and Moscow had supported India economically and technologically, it was exceedingly difficult to criticize Moscow in public. Indira Gandhi was aware that Islamic fanatics governed Afghanistan and that the US did not support India's political and geostrategic objectives. Thus, Indira Gandhi implemented a policy that had the following three components:

India did not overtly protest the Soviet incursion. India did not raise the involvement at the bilateral discussions between the two nations. India didn't want to become involved in Afghanistan's domestic disputes by dealing with the de facto ruling administration there. The invasion, on the other hand, was obviously contrary to the principles and goals of Indian foreign policy. To avoid risking a split in relations with the Soviet Union, India did not want to denounce Moscow.

Rajiv Gandhi succeeded his mother Indira Gandhi as prime minister of India after her passing in October 1984. After the two brief terms of Andropov and Chernenko as president of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev was appointed general secretary of the Communist Party in 1985. During this time, when Mikhail Gorbachev was in charge of the USSR and Rajiv Gandhi was in charge of India, Indo-Soviet relations were further strengthened. On the majority of global concerns, the two nations had views that were essentially same. Gorbachev saw that the previous socialist experiment could no longer be implemented in the USSR and so he embraced the Perestroika and Glasnost ideology because it was more conducive to relations between the East and the West. This directly impacted both India's overall foreign policy as well as the relations between India and the Soviet Union in particular.

In May 1985, Rajiv Gandhi visited Moscow. The Soviet authorities told him that they were aware of India's concern about Pakistan's nuclear weapons development. Both nations signed agreements for economic and technological cooperation, which resulted in a significant rise in Soviet aid to India. Gorbachev's visit to Delhi culminated in the release of a momentous Delhi Declaration. Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi, both signed it. Gorbachev had issued a warning upon his arrival in India that if the Indo-Pak conflict was not resolved peacefully, it may have significant repercussions. Four factors led to cordial relations with Moscow:

1. Keeping China, Pakistan, and the US in political equilibrium
2. Purchasing Soviet inputs in the high-tech industry
3. Purchasing Soviet defense products
4. Maintaining commercial commerce.

Due to the Soviet Union's détente with the West, India had the leeway to pursue relations with western nations at the same time. India maintained a strategy of continued and strengthened Indo-Soviet relations in the late 1980s, while gradually widening its connections with the West. P. V. Narasimha Rao took over as prime minister of India when the Soviet Union collapsed. India implemented a privatization and liberalization program. Globalization of the economy was quickly taking hold. The fall of the Soviet Union and the effects of economic globalization forced both nations to reconsider their foreign policy goals. The previous foreign minister of Russia, Kozyrev, named the West, the near neighborhood, which includes the former Soviet republics, and the rest of the globe as the three rings of Russian foreign policy.

This strategy made it clear that India was not one of the primary partners that the new leadership in Moscow preferred. India was not necessarily under any obligation to maintain the long-standing relationship with Moscow. However, Russian President Boris Yeltsin visited India in 1993. He made an effort to dispel any uncertainty around relations between India and Russia. Yeltsin's visit demonstrated that Russia was unwilling to part ways with its dependable ally. Yeltsin reaffirmed that Russia stood for India in its dispute with Kashmir. Consequently, the two states re-established contact. After the Cold War ended, the Group of Seven highly industrialized nations made a lot of noise in 1992 and 1993 in support of Russia. As a result, Russia was accepted to the exclusive G-8 club, much to its dismay. Russia shifted its attention to China and India as a result. The Soviet Union's commitment to upholding India's territorial integrity and security was previously reaffirmed in 1993 when the Indo-Soviet Treaty was renewed. A military cooperation pact was reached after a year. The strains of economic globalization were straining the economies of both nations. Because of this, both nations welcomed the resurgence of Indo-Soviet relations and needed a strategic partner to provide them with weapons and technology. The two nations also agreed to promote bilateral commerce and maintain the supply of spare parts for Indian defense equipment. The two nations signed a new treaty of friendship and cooperation in January 1993, resolving the long-running rupee-to-rouble exchange rate dispute and promising collaboration in a variety of areas, including the economy and politics. The two nations' connections are seen to be a crucial strategic relationship for both, and Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has recently been working to further improve them[6], [7].

The conclusion of the Cold War had a significant impact on Indo-Soviet ties. The Soviet Union was one of India's most significant allies throughout the Cold War. However, it ceased to exist following the conclusion of the Cold War. As a result, India had to rebuild its relations with the former Soviet republics, Eastern European nations, and its successor state,

the Russian Federation. The new Moscow administration also changed the direction of its foreign policy and strengthened connections with Western European and American nations. It is significant to remember that early in the 1990s, relations between India and Russia were not as robust as they had been. However, the relationship was restored within a short while, and both India and Russia became extremely significant players in each other's foreign policy agendas.

2. DISCUSSION

Nuclear Energy

India is acknowledged as a nation with cutting-edge nuclear technology and a spotless non-proliferation record by Russia, a key partner in the peaceful applications of nuclear energy. The Strategic Vision for increasing collaboration in peaceful applications of atomic energy between India and Russia was signed in December 2014 by the Department of Atomic Energy and Rosatom of Russia. With Russian assistance, India is building the Kudankulam Nuclear Power Plant. The KKNPP Unit 1 started up in July 2013 and reached full generating capacity on June 7, 2014, while the Unit 2 will be put into service in the first few months of 2015. A General Framework Agreement for KKNPP Units 3 and 4 has been signed between India and Russia, and more contracts are in the works. On June 9th, the Secretary of DAE traveled to Moscow to assess the broader level of cooperation in the area of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. During the Annual Summit on December 24, 2015, a deal was also reached regarding the localization of nuclear equipment in India. The three main institutional mechanisms for bilateral Science and Technology cooperation are the Working Group on Science and Technology operating under IRIGC-TEC, the Integrated Long Term Programme, and the Basic Science Cooperation Programme, while the Science Academies of the two countries encourage inter-academy exchanges. ILTP supported over 500 joint R&D projects over the course of its 25-year implementation period and helped establish 9 thematic centers in India and Russia. These initiatives led to the creation of over 1500 joint publications, numerous new products, processes, facilities, and research centers, as well as the creation of over 10,000 scientific contacts. In order to encourage the transfer of innovations in both directions and their commercialization, the India-Russia Science and Technology Centre was established in 2011–2012, with a branch in Moscow and one in Delhi–NCR.

Following their completion in October 2013, two new programs of cooperation in the fields of science, technology, and innovation as well as biotechnology have already become operational mechanisms. These have already provided assistance for the first group of 11 cooperative R&D projects in 2014. An MoU for collaboration in health research was signed in December 2014 by the Russian Foundation of Basic Research and the Indian Council of Medical Research. A contract to support fundamental and exploratory research was signed by the Department of Science and Technology and the Russian Science Foundation on May 8, 2015. CDAC, IISc, and Moscow State University inked a contract for collaboration in high performance computing at the 16th Annual Summit.

China and India's Relationship

Just two years after India attained independence, Mao Zedong announced the founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949. The two nations' ties began to improve with the rise of the People's Republic of China. India supports China's admission to the UN. India and China signed a treaty pertaining to Tibet in 1954, at which point Tibet was acknowledged as a part of China. The two nations' resolve to manage their relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence was also emphasized in this treaty. However, Sino-Indian ties deteriorated during the 1962 border conflict. India and China attempted to mend their diplomatic ties in 1976, but

the situation did not change. The diplomatic impasse lasted until 1988. Both nations declared their desire to normalize Sino-Indian relations when diplomatic connections were reestablished. Political links could not be created, despite improvements in commerce, cultural, and scientific ties between the two nations. India was seen as a Soviet ally by China. Additionally, China vehemently condemned India for recognizing the governments of Kabul and Phnom Penh. India felt misled by China for a while as it worked to improve ties with other South Asian nations. Despite their unsolved border dispute, China and Pakistan have developed strong strategic ties. Regarding the Sino-Indian border conflict, India and China have engaged in several rounds of negotiations without result. Concerns about China's true intentions were raised as a result of its help to Pakistan in its nuclear weapons development. Chinese forces were sent into Indian territory, and China protested the country's decision to award Arunachal Pradesh sovereignty, which India viewed as meddling in the country's internal affairs.

Chinese President Deng Xiaoping proposed to Indian Foreign Minister A. B. Vajpayee that China was interested in normalizing its ties with India by resolving the border conflict and also wanted to concentrate on other areas of their relations. This was under the Janata government. When Rajiv Gandhi assumed office as India's prime minister, he carefully considered Deng's suggestion as a motivator and came to the ultimate decision to end the political impasse between the two nations. In December 1988, Rajiv Gandhi traveled to China for the first time in more than 25 years. A Joint Working Group was formed to examine the border issue during his visit to Beijing, which resulted in intensive bilateral negotiations and an agreement between the two nations to strengthen bilateral cooperation in all areas. Rajiv Gandhi's visit and its results marked a significant improvement in Sino-Indian relations, which resulted in cordial ties between the two nations beginning in 1989. In the early 1990s, China had the opportunity to intervene and emerge as a significant ally as the Soviet Union broke apart and Indo-Soviet ties soured. Following many high-level visits by the presidents of both sides, the two Asian nations inked a series of commercial, scientific, and even military accords. The Sino-Indian Agreement on the Maintenance of Peace and Quiet Along the Actual Line of Control was signed in 1993. It signaled better Sino-Indian relations, and it became clear that the two Asian Powers would eventually resolve their differences. However, it was determined that just strengthening military and commercial links and the Joint Working Group would not result in a resolution to the border issue. Due to the momentum of relative détente, the two nations tried not to push for a rapid settlement of the border conflict[8]–[10].

There were other troubling aspects of Sino-Indian ties besides the unresolved boundary conflict. There were a few other elements as well. China strengthened its military and commercial relations with the other nations that India shares borders with while simultaneously providing political and military assistance for Pakistan. Even then, India supported China's encirclement strategy and recognized Tibet as a separate, autonomous region of China. China followed a containment strategy and enhanced its ties with Taiwan, Japan, and other Southeast Asian countries. Between the two Asian countries, enhancing bilateral ties was considered as Cold War thinking. Both nations were developing as prospective world powers and were mindful of one another's respective regional objectives.

India surprised the world when it performed its nuclear tests in May 1998. Additionally, the relative détente in Sino-Indian relations came to an end after a decade. China felt the necessity to acquire nuclear weapons when India emerged as a de facto nuclear state. In a "secret" letter, the then-Indian Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee warned US President Bill Clinton that China was a nuclear danger to India. The nuclear tests carried out by India in 1998 drew vehement criticism from China. China was anticipated to aid Pakistan during the

Kargil conflict. Unexpectedly, China chose not to back Pakistan and instead advocated for a bilateral, non-violent settlement to the issue. Midway through 1999, things started to fast shift, and it wasn't long before Sino-Indian relations started to improve. In June and July 1999, China put pressure on Pakistan to withdraw its troops from the Line of Control in Kargil. This served the cause of a new, multifaceted partnership between India and China while also taking into consideration the desires of the whole world community.

On the official request of his Chinese counterpart, the Indian External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh visited China during the Kargil conflict. Several topics of international and bilateral relevance were addressed by both parties. The two nations decided to further up their confidence-building efforts and open communication on issues of shared interest. K. R. Narayanan, the president of India, traveled to China in May 2000. Narayanan's arrival signaled a new turning point. He laid the foundation for a union that would be more fruitful. The return trip of Chinese President and Party Chief Jiang Zemin the same year ushered in a new era of confidence. A. B. Vajpayee, who was the then-prime minister, was invited to China. When Manohar Joshi, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, visited China in January 2002, Zhu Rongji, the then-President of China, predicted that the two nations will soon establish a fresh cooperative collaboration. China was prepared to put the past disagreements behind her and start again. A. B. Vajpayee started a new era of collaboration with China in June 2003. Additionally, China's perspective on Sikkim has altered. China acknowledged Sikkim as a part of India, and India in turn acknowledged Tibet as a part of China. It might be claimed that Rajiv Gandhi's trip to Beijing paved the path for cordial relations between China and India. The conclusion of the Cold War, however, also cannot be disregarded since it resulted in a marked improvement in Sino-Indian relations.

When Chinese President Hu Jintao visited India in November 2006, it marked another significant turning point in the development of the Sino-Indian relationship. Both countries have previously discussed topics of mutual interests on the regional, international, and bilateral levels. Their relationship was significantly improved by their visit. Wen Jiabao, the premier of China, traveled to India in 2005. Both nations have made the decision to establish a strategic and constructive alliance during his visit. It was highlighted that their relationships had developed beyond the bilateral level to take on a strategic and global importance. The current period of Sino-Indian relations, according to Chinese President Hu Jintao, is "a new historic beginning," and he urged both nations to seek to deepen their friendship and establish more beneficial long-term connections. Numerous initiatives to expand institutional ties between the two nations were announced during his visit, including support of comprehensive economic engagement, promotion of cross-border connectivity and collaboration, and improved science and technology. The main emphasis area, however, was economic cooperation. Other areas of collaboration were beginning to emerge as China and India both aimed for multipolarity in international affairs. The Manmohan Singh administration committed to the process of normalization between India and China in May 2004. Singh concluded that the Special Representatives-level border talks were going in the correct path. He was happy that China acknowledged Sikkim as a "indispensable part of India." The bilateral commerce was stated to have surpassed the 13-billion-dollar level by 2004 and it was anticipated that by 2008 it would reach the 20-billion-dollar figure.

Greater understanding resulted from a meeting between Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President Hu Jintao in 2006 and 2007. The two nations' trade was expanding. In the first quarter of 2007, it increased by 56.8%, and by 2010, it had surpassed 40 billion US dollars. India-China relations were finally strengthening. However, when China claimed Arunachal Pradesh as part of its sovereignty and refused to provide a visa to an IAS official from the

state in 2007, tensions between India and China once again grew tense. Due to this, a group of IAS officials' trip to China had to be canceled. However, the two state's leaders continued to have cordial ties. The Chinese President said that China would be pleased if India was successful in its bid to join the UN Security Council permanently. The two nations agreed that they could both effectively contribute to solving global problems such as equitably sustainable development, energy security, peace and prosperity in Asia and throughout the globe, environmental protection, and the war on terrorism and transnational crimes. During his visit to China in 2006, the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Mani Shankar Aiyer, signed a contract that allowed ONGC Videsh Ltd. and China National Petroleum Corporation to participate in joint bids for project promotion. For their foreign relations, this had significant ramifications. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited China in 2008 and met with President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao. They spoke bilaterally about trade, business, military, and other topics. China and India reopened Nathula, a historic trading route that was a component of the Silk Road, on July 6, 2006. In October 1962, when the Sino-Indian border conflict started, the Himalayan pass Nathula was shut down for forty-four years. The first agreement for the reopening of the trade route was drafted in 2003, and the final agreement was formally signed on June 18, 2006. Officials said that the resumption of border commerce will assist to lessen the area's economic isolation.

Relational Education

An overarching agreement for educational collaboration between China and India was reached in 2006 under the name Education Exchange Programme. In accordance with this agreement, 25 students will each receive a government scholarship to attend a recognized institution of higher education in the other party's nation. Indian Council for Cultural Relations is the organization that provides the 25 scholarships given out by India. During the visit of the Honorable Prime Minister Sh., a new EEP was signed. China hosted Narendra Modi in May 2015. The same allows for better collaboration between institutions of higher learning, as well as increased cooperation in the sphere of vocational education. Additionally, each year scholarships are given to Chinese students to study Hindi at the Kendriya Hindi Sansthan in Agra. Eight Chinese students were chosen to study in Agra in 2015–16 as part of this program.

The Central Board of Secondary Education made the decision to include Mandarin Chinese as a foreign language to its curriculum in 2010. Central CBSE and Confucius Institute signed a Memorandum of Understanding in August 2012 wherein both parties agreed to exchange academic staff, teachers, and trainees as well as information on the system and structure of teaching Mandarin Chinese as a second language in Indian schools. at accordance with this MoU, the first group of 22 Chinese instructors worked for two years at certain CBSE schools, from January 2014 to January 2016. The number of Indian students studying in China has increased as a consequence of the two countries' collaboration in the education sector. There were 12998 Indian students enrolled at different Chinese universities during the academic year 2014–2015, pursuing a range of subjects. Similar to this, there are around 2000 Chinese students studying at different Indian educational institutes.

Three-way Collaboration

The concept of trilateral cooperation between Russia, India, and China started to take form in the 1990s. The three countries' ties have significantly improved since then. The track one and a half conversation, which is essentially an unofficial gathering of the official authorities acting in an unofficial capacity to negotiate or support accords, was started by the meeting of the foreign ministers of India, Russia, and China. As a consequence, the leaders of the three

countries held a summit. Since 2001, a range of officials and academics from the three countries have met multiple times to collaborate in a variety of fields. Energy security, commerce, and the economy are some of the key areas where India, Russia, and China have chosen to work together. Concerning non-proliferation and disarmament problems, all three countries take them very seriously. Additionally, the three countries have resolved to investigate the issue of climate change and are going to take steps to raise awareness of the problem of resource depletion and solutions.

India, Russia, and China certainly vary from one another, yet they all have a wide range of interests. All three countries are in favor of multilateralism and share the vision of a multipolar global order. India, Russia, and China place emphasis on the need for democratization of international relations and the creation of an impartial international order. They both have the same opinions on terrorism.

A regional cooperation system, which would aid in resolving several problems facing the globe today, such as globalization and the financial crisis, is seen to be necessary by India, Russia, and China.

India, China, Brazil, Russia, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and China

Brazil, Russia, India, and China, or BRIC, is a commonly used term in economics. These nations now have the distinction of having sizable economies that provide capital as well as products and services in equal measure to the global economy. Potential consumer markets are also thought to exist in these nations. Regarding the size of their economies, all four nations are seen as being on level with one another. Even South Africa has recently been included in this list. Together, the populations of these five nations account for 40% of the world's people today. Additionally, these nations account for almost 25% of the world's GDP in PPP terms.

Every BRICS member may boast a variety of successes in the area of agriculture as far as accomplishments go. The use of advanced agricultural technology made possible by the "green revolution" has significantly enhanced food production in these nations and permitted substantial global developments in the agricultural industry.

Utilizing cutting-edge agricultural technology to ensure global food security is now vital due to the deteriorating state of the agriculture and food industry and climate change. To guarantee that the capacity of agricultural technology increases, the BRICS members have promised to promote and strengthen the interchange of better technologies, human resources, and cutting-edge gear.

The presidents of China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan created the Shanghai Cooperation Organization in Shanghai in 2001. Essentially, it is an intergovernmental institution for mutual security. It was established in 1996 to settle boundary disputes between its members and maintain peace. China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan made up the first five members of the group, which was formerly known as the Shanghai Five. But Uzbekistan was joined in 2001, and the group's name was changed to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Five other nations have now joined the SCO, however they only have observer status. Afghanistan, India, Iran, Mongolia, and Pakistan are the five nations. As of 2007, SCO has successfully launched a number of initiatives in the industries of transportation, telecommunications, and energy. The SCO has also been successful in forging ties with the UN. In order to promote mutual trust, equality, and benefit, SCO has labored. It has been effective in fostering tranquility and stability in the area.

3. CONCLUSION

Defense discussions highlight how counterterrorism operations, maritime security cooperation, and strategic goals are all aligned. Cultural and interpersonal exchanges deepen the ties that bind India and the US as nations, fostering mutual understanding and encouraging cooperation in a variety of disciplines. The development of the conversation architecture demonstrates its adaptability to shifting geopolitical conditions and the demands of the twenty-first century. Despite potential disagreements, both countries' dedication to the dialogue process has allowed them to efficiently tackle problems and grab possibilities. The structure of the India-US discussion is not only a bilateral effort; it also affects the stability of the region and the world. It promotes democracy and pluralism, upholds international law, and responds to threats to regional security.

REFERENCES:

- [1] B. M. Jain, "Upward Graph in Strategic Ties Between India and the United States: Implications for Asian Security Architecture," *Indian J. Asian Aff.*, 2016.
- [2] T. Fues, "Global governance beyond the G8: Reform Prospects for the summit architecture," *Int. Polit. und Gesellschaft*, 2007.
- [3] I. Mergel, "OpenCollaboration in Public Sector: The case of social codign on Github," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, 2012.
- [4] W. Szymański, "Globalisation, money, taxes – past and present," *Kwart. Nauk o Przedsiębiorstwie*, 2017, doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0010.4691.
- [5] J. E. Finn, "Counterterrorism regimes and the rule of law: The effects of emergency legislation on separation of powers, civil liberties, and other fundamental constitutional norms," in *The Consequences of Counterterrorism*, 2010.
- [6] W. T. Tow, "Great powers and multilateralism The politics of security architectures in Southeast Asia," in *ASEAN and the Institutionalization of East Asia*, 2011. doi: 10.4324/9780203804650-22.
- [7] G. Stobbe, *Just Enough ENGLISH GRAMMAR*. 2013.
- [8] European Commission, "Digital single market - communication on exchanging and protecting personal data in a globalised world questions and answers," *Eur. Comm. fact sheets*, 2017.
- [9] J. Haacke and N. M. Morada, "The ASEAN regional forum and cooperative security: Introduction," in *Cooperative Security in the Asia-Pacific: The ASEAN Regional Forum*, 2010. doi: 10.4324/9780203863114-7.
- [10] C. A. Land, "The future engineers and scientists: You need them? I have them. Lots of them," in *OCEANS 2008*, 2008. doi: 10.1109/OCEANS.2008.5151826.

CHAPTER 8

EXAMINING THE MULTIFACETED DIMENSIONS OF INDIA–UK RELATIONS

Dr. Parag Amin, Associate Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- parag.amin@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The diplomatic relationship between India and the United Kingdom (UK) holds historical significance and continues to evolve in the modern era. This paper examines the multifaceted dimensions of India–UK relations, encompassing historical ties, economic cooperation, cultural exchanges, and geopolitical collaboration. By analyzing the trajectory of this relationship from colonial times to the present day, this study sheds light on the complexities and opportunities that shape the bilateral engagement between these two nations. The India–United Kingdom relationship traverses a rich historical backdrop and stands as a testament to the enduring ties between nations despite historical complexities. Economic cooperation has emerged as a significant driver, with both countries recognizing the potential for trade, investment, and innovation collaboration.

KEYWORDS:

Intelligence Sharing, Joint Strategic, Nuclear Cooperation, Security Dialogues, Trade Agreements.

1. INTRODUCTION

Close and cordial relations exist between India and the UK. With the visit of British Prime Minister David Cameron to India in 2010, when the Enhanced Partnership for the Future was established, the bilateral relationship, which was elevated to a strategic partnership in 2004, was further solidified. Three times during his first tenure as prime minister, in 2010, February 2013, and again in November 2013, he traveled to India to reaffirm the UK government's commitment to advancing ties with that country. With the visit of Prime Minister Narendra Modi to the UK from November 12–14, 2015, ties between the two oldest and greatest democracies reached new heights. The two Prime Ministers approved a Vision Statement outlining the basic values upon which the UK-India relationship is based and defined a path for further collaboration during the visit. To further the alliance, the two Prime Ministers decided to convene PM-level summits every two years. They also came to an agreement on a new partnership for international security and defense that would increase cooperation on issues including cyber security, terrorist prevention, and maritime security. They also released a Statement of Intent to expand bilateral collaboration into a worldwide partnership for development cooperation in third countries and adopted a Joint Statement on Energy and Climate Change[1], [2].

During the PM's visit to the UK, numerous significant steps in this sector strengthened the relationship between India and the UK economically. It was decided that the City of London, with its resources and skills, could play a significant role in directing investments toward Indian infrastructure projects. In addition, numerous private sector organizations, including HDFC, Bharti Airtel, State Bank of India, and Yes Bank, declared their aspirations to raise capital via the City of London. The Government of India announced its intention to issue the first Government-backed Rupee Bond in London. The two Prime Ministers organized the first gathering of the reestablished India-UK CEO Forum. Between Indian and British businesses,

transactions totaling more than £9.3 billion have been announced. In addition to creating an India-UK Partnership Fund under the National Infrastructure Investment Fund to allow international investments for Indian infrastructure projects via the City of London, it was agreed to create a fast-track mechanism to facilitate UK investments into India. The UK has shown interest in working with India to construct smart cities in Amravati, Pune, and Indore.

The most recent high-level bilateral visits and interactions between the two sides took place in 2016, with UK Finance Minister Arun Jaitley traveling to the UK in January to attend the 8th India-UK Economic and Financial Dialogue, UK NSA traveling to India on January 18, UK Immigration Minister James Brokenshire traveling to India from February 16 to February 19, and UK PM's Special Envoy for Infrastructure Alo visiting India from February 16 to February 19. Institutionalized discussions: India and the UK have many bilateral conversation frameworks in place that cover a variety of topics, including politics, commerce, education, science and technology, and defense. The important ones are the Joint Economic and Trade Committee at the Commerce Minister level, the Strategic Dialogue at the NSA level, the Consultations of the Foreign Office at the level of the Foreign Secretary, the Defense Consultative Group at the level of the Defence Secretary, the Cyber and Counter-Terrorism Dialogues at the level of Senior Officials, and other thematic dialogues between the two Foreign Offices.

Contacts Among Members of Congress

India and the UK have strong parliamentary ties. The two main political parties both have Friends of India Groups. On ties with India, there is an All-Party Parliamentary Group. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has hosted parliamentary discussions as well.

Trade

UK is one of India's main trade partners, and in the top 25 trading partners list for 2014–15, it came in at number 18. Two-way goods trade in 2014–15 was US\$14.33 billion, down 9.39% from 2013–14, according to figures released by the Department of Commerce. The UK's percentage of India's international commerce decreased from 2.07% in 2013–14 to 1.89% in 2014–15. Clothing and textiles, equipment and instruments, petroleum products, leather goods, gems and jewelry, engineering products, transport equipment and components, spices, medicines, and marine items are among India's top exports to the UK. Other important categories include maritime products, marine services, and marine equipment. Machinery and equipment, ores and metal scraps, precious and semiprecious stones, silver, metals, aircraft parts, beverages and alcoholic beverages, engineering products, other professional instruments besides electronics, non-ferrous metals, and chemicals are the main imports from the UK to India[3], [4].

Services

According to the UK's Office for National Statistics, bilateral trade in services between India and the UK was over £2.5 billion in 2014. The value of India's service exports to the UK in 2013 was £1.5 billion, whereas the value of India's service imports from the UK in 2014 was £975 million. After Singapore and Mauritius, Investment UK is the third biggest foreign investor in India with a total equity investment of US \$22.56 billion. For the period between April 2000 and September 2015, UK accounted for around 9% of total foreign direct investment into India, placing it top among the G20 nations. Over the last five years, foreign direct investment has decreased from US\$7.8 billion in 2011–12 to US\$1.4 billion in 2014–15. One of the main source markets for FDI projects in the UK is still India. According to the "2014/15 Inward Investment Annual Report" published by UK Trade and Investment, India

conducted 122 FDI projects in the UK in 2014–15, a rise of 65% over the previous year, making it the country's third biggest source of FDI and creating over 9,000 new employments. The UK Office for National Statistics reports that between 2004 and 2013, when the value of Indian FDI into the UK increased from £164 million to £1.9 billion, there was no rise. The UK draws more investments from India than the whole EU.

Economic Consultation

Institutional interactions between the two nations are based on bilateral frameworks like the India-UK Joint Economic and Trade Committee and the India-UK Economic and Financial Dialogue. The agreement between the finance ministers of the two nations to develop the economic and financial ties between India and the UK led to the formal establishment of the India-UK Economic and Financial Dialogue in February 2005. Finance Minister Arun Jaitley and UK Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne co-chaired the 8th India-UK EFD, which looked at new opportunities for collaboration in the financial services industry. The Dialogue included topics such as Financial Services, Infrastructure Finance, Macroeconomic Risks and Policy Responses, and Global Economic Challenges. The UK government has promised to assist India in completing significant infrastructure projects in a number of crucial fields, including smart cities, renewable energy, and railroads, all of which are essential for India's future economic development. The idea of Indian corporations issuing Rupee Bonds in London was welcomed by both India and the UK, and it was decided that the Indian Railway Finance Corporation would issue the first such public sector issuance. Both parties committed to taking significant steps toward UK Fin-Tech companies assisting in the delivery of a "digital India," covering priority areas like access to finance for micro-enterprises, and made significant joint commitments to high-profile Fin-Tech trade missions between the two countries.

The development of the corporate bond market, mutual sharing of expertise on financial sectors and market regulations, pensions, infrastructure funding, financial inclusion, internationalization of the rupee, cross-border provision of financial and insurance services, and improving financial training and qualification were all decided upon at the most recent India-UK Financial Partnership meeting, which took place in London on November 2, 2015[5], [6].

A business-driven institutional structure known as the India-UK Joint Economic and Trade Committee was founded on January 13, 2005, with the goal of forging a strategic economic partnership. JETCO delegations convene once a year, alternately in Delhi and London, under the direction of the Minister of Commerce and Industry and the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation, and Skills. On January 19, 2015, the 10th JETCO meeting took place in London, where industry and government representatives came together for fruitful discussions in three working groups organized around the topics of advanced manufacturing and engineering, smart cities and technological collaboration, and education and skill development.

The bilateral relationship between India and the UK is heavily based on education. With the development of bilateral mechanisms like the Newton-Bhabha Fund, Scholarship programs, Joint Working Group on Education, India-UK Education Forum, UK-India Education and Research Initiative, and others during the last ten years, the relationship has significantly improved. These announcements on education were made during the Prime Minister's visit to the UK in November 2015. The year 2016 will be designated as the UK-India Year of Education, Research, and Innovation. Virtual partnerships will be established at the school level to give students from one country the chance to experience the educational system of

the other and gain an understanding of the social, familial, and cultural norms of that other country. The UK intends to send 25,000 students to India as part of the Generation UK India initiative, 1000 of whom will work as interns for Tata Consultancy Services. The third phase of the UK-India Education and Research Initiative has begun, with a goal of attaining reciprocal recognition of credentials from both countries. From December 9–11, 2015, Vice Chancellors from the Universities of Birmingham, Warwick, Nottingham, and Leicester traveled to Mumbai and Bangalore. During the visit, the Human Resource Development Minister, top Indian officials, professors, school and college administrators, education agents, students, corporate groups, and the media attended an event to launch the 2016 UK-India Year of Education, Research, and Innovation.

2. DISCUSSION

As a result of their shared history, India and the UK have strong and wide-ranging cultural ties. The mainstreaming of Indian culture and the incorporation of Indian food, movies, languages, religion, philosophy, and performing arts have occurred gradually. Involving the Indian Diaspora, British organizations, and individuals, a number of Indian cultural groups in the UK actively promote Indian culture. The Nehru Centre, the cultural arm of the Indian High Commission in the United Kingdom, was founded in 1992 and is now one of ICCR's premier cultural institutions overseas. Additionally, India and the UK signed a Memorandum of Understanding on Cultural Cooperation in October 2014 at the ministerial level; it is in force until the end of October. Both Prime Ministers stated that a UK-India Year of Culture will be held in 2017 to honor our close cultural relations and commemorate the 70th anniversary of Indian Independence during the PM's visit to the UK in November 2015. Additionally, they pledged assistance for the archive collections stored jointly at the British Library and the National Archives of India.

Diaspora of Indians

With 1.5 million individuals of Indian descent in the UK, or almost 1.8% of the population and 6% of the GDP, the India Diaspora in the UK is one of the biggest ethnic minority populations in the nation, according to the 2011 census. Over 60,000 people of Indian descent attended a community greeting held on November 13, 2015, at Wembley Stadium, during the visit of the Prime Minister to the UK. Independence Day festivities organized jointly by the Mission with the collaboration of important community leaders and Indian groups on 16 August 2015 were a record success with an attendance of over 12,000 people. The reception was addressed jointly by the Hon'ble PM and British PM. On January 9, 2016, the Mission also hosted the PravasiBharatiya Divas-2016, which included a live video chat with the External Affairs Minister. On January 9, 2016, a presentation/reception was conducted, and over 150 eminent members of the community were present. In order to move the India-UK relationship forward, the Mission is still in contact with the Indian Diaspora.

India's Approach to Saarc Nations

Understanding India's connections with its neighboring neighbors is essential to fully comprehending its foreign policy. Learn about India's relationships with Afghanistan, Bangladesh, the Maldives, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, Nepal, and Pakistan in this section.

Afghanistan-India Relations

The Republic of India and the Islamic State of Afghanistan established bilateral connections, and these relationships have long been regarded as cordial and robust. In the 1980s, India was the only nation in South Asia to recognize the Soviet-backed Democratic Republic of

Afghanistan. However, during the Afghan civil wars and the Taliban's rule in the 1990s, ties between India and Afghanistan began to deteriorate. India was in favor of toppling the Taliban regime. In fact, it made its presence known by generously donating humanitarian and rebuilding supplies. The Afghan Foreign Ministry said that India was a "brother country" and that relations between the two countries could not be impeded by any foe in the wake of the 2008 bombing of the Indian Embassy in Kabul. Pakistan is in charge of the Gilgit-Baltistan area of Kashmir, which borders Wakhan, although India asserts that it is their border with Afghanistan. Afghanistan has a border with the Indian Congress Party-dominated North-West Frontier Province, which was once a part of British India until 1947. Pashtuns who actively participated in the Indian independence struggle made up a significant portion of the inhabitants of the region. However, conditions significantly altered after Partition in 1947, and NWFP became Pakistan. However, there were still connections between the Republic of India and modern-day Afghanistan, both cultural and economic. Afghans love Indian music and movies, but Indians are also huge fans of Afghan carpets and dried fruits. For the most of their separate histories, both nations have had cordial ties with one another. Additionally, they have collaborated in their own issues with Pakistan. In April 2007, Afghanistan became the eighth member of SAARC after India approved of its full membership[7], [8].

Revolution in Saur

Numerous changes occurred in Afghanistan in 1979, and Soviet forces invaded the country to support the Saur Revolution. The Afghan revolution was torn apart by an internal power struggle between M.'s two groups, the Khalq and the Parcham. Amin and his adversaries. While in other regions of Afghanistan, which borders Pakistan, a revolt was also led by mullahs, qazis, landowners, and tribal chiefs. Taraki, the president in office, was deposed by Amin, who was then killed by Babrak Karmal. The Soviet forces invaded Afghanistan as a result of this miscommunication and claimed that the Afghan government had welcomed them. Insurgents received significant material and armed support from the surrounding regions, which added to the complexity of the situation. A big number of Afghan refugees moved to Pakistan as a consequence of this complex circumstance. In addition to serving as refugee camps, the camps established in Pakistan served as military outposts in Afghanistan. For the first time, India was encircled by powerful nations, posing a grave danger to its security. Except for the Bangladesh Crisis, it was a more perilous condition than India had experienced in the years before following independence. India's strategy needed to be smart, intricate, and in line with its historical views and conventions. India's greatest national interests were promoted in conformity with its fundamental principles, which was a nearly difficult feat. In India, where the government of Indira Gandhi had taken office over three years earlier in the midst of political turbulence and was beset by a plethora of both domestic and foreign issues, the Afghanistan strategy was caught off guard. Not all the greatest solutions were offered right away. The initial speech of the newly elected administration in the UN Security Council caused some trembling excitement and sought to convey that India had no objections to the entry of Soviet soldiers into Afghanistan.

Many of the misconceptions emerged during the transition due to uncertainty, but right away the direction of the policy towards this area became more evident. India was confronted with the challenge of withdrawing foreign soldiers from Afghanistan while also ending other forms of foreign engagement, such as the provision of weapons and supplies to Afghan insurgent groups. Naturally, there were differences of opinion within the upper class, and many believed that the Soviet forces' departure was the main factor influencing the situation and that everything else was thus incidental. Some people in the society felt that India had no desire to operate in a situation where the Kabul administration was set to be replaced by

extremist fundamentalists or members of the communal right, who were supported by Pakistan. It was unable to plan for the possibility of a pro-Pakistan, pro-US, and pro-China administration. The power-sharing partnership of the landlord, the mullah, and the quiz was not a very appealing choice.

It is without question that Soviet forces in Afghanistan should have been evacuated. India vehemently opposes the deployment of foreign soldiers in any other nation. India did, however, recognize the claim that the Kabul Government had asked the Soviet Union to deploy soldiers to assist in quelling the local revolutionary forces. According to India, a nation had the right to request assistance. However, India insisted on several occasions that the Soviet soldiers should leave Afghanistan. India likewise urged the immediate cessation of all other sorts of international involvement.

Then-External Affairs Minister P. V. Narasimha Rao said, "Our position regarding Afghanistan is well-known," in a statement to the Lok Sabha on June 12, 1980. We oppose the establishment of foreign bases or military in another nation. As a result, in our opinion, Afghanistan should continue to be a sovereign, independent, and non-aligned country. These goals could not be realized without a comprehensive political solution. Afghanistan should also be guaranteed that foreign involvement and meddling against it would cease and will not continue. India has to make an effort to make such a settlement a reality. Perhaps it was not entirely random that a political settlement could only be acknowledged as the sole answer to the complex situation in South West Asia after India mapped out an alternative path of action. A political solution was emphasized in the months that followed, which prompted many high-level trips to India. Giscard D'Estaing, the president of France at the time, made the first high-level visit in January 1980. He received recognition from Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi for the situation's rationality and her support for a political solution. Kurt Waldheim, the then-UN Secretary General, also urged Indira Gandhi to defuse the tension and restrain uncontrollable responses in order to prevent the action-counteraction syndrome, which would have led to a more acrimonious competition between superpowers.

Indira Gandhi said in a public address that India and the Soviet Union had previously discussed the issue of military withdrawal. If Pakistan ceased to train terrorists and dispatch them into Afghan territory, the Soviet Union said, the soldiers would be removed as soon as possible. The Soviet Union frequently said that only at the invitation of the Afghan government at the time did their forces enter Kabul. However, the request was met with an increase in rebel activity as well as external threats. At several international gatherings, including the Seventh Non-Aligned Summit, India's stance on the evacuation of Soviet soldiers was reiterated. Even Pakistan said that it was prepared to pursue a political course of action, and over time, the notion of a political resolution came very close to being accepted. Under the sponsorship of the UN Secretary General, negotiations then began.

It was acknowledged that the problem was exceedingly complicated and that finding a solution would not be straightforward or simple. Although the then-Indian Foreign Secretary, R. D. Sathe, claimed in a statement to the media that the "process" to resolve the situation in Afghanistan had already started and was "nearing solution," no such rapid developments could really be seen in the objectives of the powers and concerning states like Pakistan, China, the US, USSR, and others. Indira Gandhi told a foreign reporter in December 1980 that she did not predict any rapid progress. The Soviet forces would not have left Afghanistan if a fuss was not made. Due to ongoing tensions and issues with Pakistan, the newly democratically elected Afghan government increased its ties with India. Pakistan was thought to be protecting and aiding the Taliban. India currently pursues a strategy of tight coordination with Afghanistan to strengthen it as a regional force and limit its adversary

Pakistan, which still provides assistance to the Islamic insurgents in Kashmir valley and other regions of India. Furthermore, with a commitment of more than US \$2.2 billion for rehabilitation, India is the country with the greatest investment in Afghanistan. India and the world community backed the coalition government that would take over Afghanistan after the Soviet military troops left in 1989, but these ties and connections came to an end when a new civil war broke out in that nation. Afghanistan's Taliban government, an Islamist group sponsored by Pakistan, took control. Only Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates recognized the Taliban authority. The Taliban and Afghanistan became a security danger to the Indian government as a result of the emergence of Islamism in Afghanistan and the expansion of the Afghan Mujahideen's insurgency in Indian-administrated Kashmir. India, which is regarded as the country where Buddhism originated, was outraged and protested vehemently when the Taliban destroyed the statues to the Buddha in Bamiyan. In 1999, the Taliban and Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence were accused of aiding them when Indian Airlines Flight 814 was hijacked by Pakistani Muslim ISI operatives and landed and remained in Kandahar, Afghanistan. India became one of the coalition's most important backers in its fight against the Taliban. India and Afghanistan's relations during the Taliban rule deteriorated significantly. Such a regime will never have the support of India.

India-Afghanistan relations after the fall of the Taliban

India provided the coalition troops with information and other sorts of assistance during the US-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001. India reestablished diplomatic relations with the newly installed democratic government after the Taliban were overthrown, and it sent help and took part in the rebuilding operations. Up to this point, India has donated between 650 and 750 million dollars in humanitarian and economic relief. The Border Roads Organization of the Indian Army is building a road in the isolated Afghan region of Nimroz. India's assistance and cooperation extends to the restoration of air routes, the construction of power plants, investments in the health and educational sectors, and assistance in the training of Afghan diplomats, civil workers, and police. India is also interested in establishing gas, oil, and electrical pipelines in Afghanistan. Government of India scholarships are also offered to Afghan students. In order to combat Islamic radicals, India and Afghanistan have strengthened military and strategic collaboration. 200 troops from India were stationed at the Indo-Tibetan Border Police to protect Indian people after a Taliban insurgent killed an Indian person there in November 2005. During Hamid Karzai's visit to India from April 9 to 13, 2006, three Memorandums of Understanding were signed between the Bureau of Indian Standards and the Afghan National Standardization Authority to strengthen cooperation in the areas of rural development, education, and standardization. When Afghan Foreign Minister Dr. Spanta visited India between June 29 and July 1, 2006, India and Afghanistan struck an agreement allocating 50 million US dollars to encourage bilateral commerce. India increased its contribution to Afghanistan by 150 million dollars to 750 million dollars in the same year. India backed Afghanistan's application to join the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation as well. One of the bloodiest assaults in Kabul and the first after the collapse of the Taliban in 2001 occurred on July 7, 2008, when a suicide vehicle bomber targeted the Indian embassy. 58 people were killed and 141 injured in the attack. This incident happened while political counselor V. Venkateswara Rao and senior Indian Army officer Brigadier Ravi Datt Mehta drove through the embassy gates. Unfortunately, the explosion claimed the lives of both men. The ISI of Pakistan, according to the Afghan authorities, was engaged in the assault. India pledged an additional 450 million US dollars for current and future projects in Afghanistan during the 15th SAARC conference in Colombo. Hamid Karzai, the president of Afghanistan, visited New Delhi in August 2008. Through this visit, the two nations' bilateral ties were further reinforced, and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh promised to

provide further help to Afghanistan. On October 18, 2009, a little over a year after the first incident, a vehicle bomb targeted the Indian Embassy in Kabul. At least 17 persons died in this incident.

Since a military triumph was impossible, the US and its allies altered course and extended a peace offer to the Taliban, posing further difficulties for India. As a result of its political investments in supporting the Karzai administration, Raghav Sharma, Research Officer at IPCS, said in a Special Report released by the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies in New Delhi that "With a potential return of Taliban in Kabul, New Delhi's options will shrink." Sharma said that finding the ideal balance was India's urgent issue. The breakdown of Pakistan's governmental apparatus in its border area highlights the situation in Afghanistan and brings the danger posed by extremists closer to home. Sharma said that India would need to make sure that its prior assistance for the Tajik-dominated Northern alliance against the Pashtun-dominated Taliban did not operate as a propaganda weapon opposing its objectives in order to achieve an effective state policy[9], [10]. India should actively participate in enhancing state governance capabilities, according to Sharma. By sharing expertise and experiences of grassroots government, like as the LokAdalats and Panchyati Raj system, it should aim to gain the trust of the Afghan people. He believed that India might help Afghanistan, which was suffering from the effects of the drought, by offering assistance in the form of indigenous farming and irrigation practices. In his report, he recommends that India assist the Senlis Council's 'poppy for medicines' scheme to stop the illicit poppy trade. Additionally, this would provide India the chance to discuss their own licensing of the growing of poppies. The Strategic Partnership Agreement between the two parties, among other things, calls for support for an Afghan-led, Afghan-owned, broad-based, and inclusive process of peace and reconciliation, as well as education and technical assistance to help rehabilitate Afghan capacity in various areas. It also calls for encouraging investment in Afghanistan's natural resources. India hosted the Senior Officials Meeting of the Heart of Asia nations in New Delhi in January 2014, and with assistance from FICCI, India conducted the sixth Regional Technical Group in New Delhi in November 2015, serving as the lead nation for Trade, Commerce and Investment CBM of the Heart of Asia Process.

3. CONCLUSION

Cultural interactions promoted by the Indian diaspora in the UK and collaborative academic projects strengthen the ties between the countries, fostering intercultural communication and human relationships. In terms of geopolitics, India and the UK share a commitment to promoting democratic ideals, combating terrorism, and addressing global concerns like climate change. The recent formation of the Comprehensive Strategic Partnership denotes a renewed commitment to working together in fields including technology, security, healthcare, and military. The potential for both countries to use their unique capabilities for mutual gain and to tackle common problems is highlighted by this relationship. India and the UK's relationship serves as an example of the value of adopting a forward-looking perspective while honoring historical links as they negotiate the complications of the 21st century. India and the UK can promote security, prosperity, and collaboration on a global scale by using their complementary assets and working together on international forums.

REFERENCES:

- [1] D. Scott, "The rise of India: UK perspectives," *Int. Aff.*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/ia/iw007.
- [2] E. Salmerón-Manzano and F. Manzano-Agugliaro, "Worldwide scientific production indexed by Scopus on labour relations," *Publications*, 2017, doi: 10.3390/publications5040025.

- [3] P. C. Pati, P. Rajib, and P. Barai, "A behavioural explanation to the asymmetric volatility phenomenon: Evidence from market volatility index," *Rev. Financ. Econ.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.rfe.2017.07.004.
- [4] V. Ustyuzhantseva Olga, "Cooperation in education between Russia and India," *Sib. Hist. Res.*, 2016, doi: 10.17223/2312461X/13/3.
- [5] G. B. Nambissan and S. J. Ball, "Advocacy networks, choice and private schooling of the poor in India," *Glob. Networks*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0374.2010.00291.x.
- [6] K. Twamley, "Gender relations among Indian couples in the UK and India: Ideals of equality and realities of inequality," *Sociol. Res. Online*, 2012, doi: 10.5153/sro.2756.
- [7] R. Verma, "Engaging the world: India's foreign policy since 1947," *Int. Aff.*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/ia/iix185.
- [8] P. A. Jayalekshmi, P. Gangadharan, S. Akiba, R. R. K. Nair, M. Tsuji, and B. Rajan, "Tobacco chewing and female oral cavity cancer risk in Karunagappally cohort, India," *Br. J. Cancer*, 2009, doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6604907.
- [9] T. V. Analysis, "AN OVERVIEW OF What is Vulnerability□?," *Heal. Without Borders*, 2017.
- [10] K. L.V., "Indian Diaspora in the UK," *MGIMO Rev. Int. Relations*, 2017, doi: 10.24833/2071-8160-2017-2-53-160-183.

CHAPTER 9

PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN RELATIONS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

Harishchandra Jaising Parab, Associate Director

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- harish.parab@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The relationship between Pakistan and Afghanistan holds immense importance for both nations' foreign policies, regional stability, and the broader geopolitics of South Asia. This paper delves into the multifaceted dimensions of Pakistan and Afghanistan relations, examining historical ties, security concerns, economic cooperation, and the impact of external actors. By analyzing the complexities and nuances of this relationship, this study sheds light on the intricate interplay of national interests, regional dynamics, and global influences in shaping the foreign policies of both countries. The Pakistan-Afghanistan relationship remains intricate and multifaceted, marked by historical, cultural, and geopolitical factors. These two neighboring nations share a complex history that includes shared ethnicities, historical ties, and border-related disputes. However, their relationship has also been marred by security challenges, including cross-border terrorism and insurgency. For Pakistan, stability in Afghanistan is crucial for its own security, given the potential spillover of conflicts and the refugee influx. Conversely, Afghanistan seeks regional cooperation and an end to external interference to ensure its sovereignty and development. The involvement of external actors, including the United States, China, and India, adds another layer of complexity to this relationship.

KEYWORDS:

Economic Relations, Geopolitics, Humanitarian Aid, International Cooperation, Military Strategy, National Interest, Nonproliferation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pakistan sees a danger to itself in the growing influence of India in Afghanistan. Pakistan's security is at danger because of Indian military stationed in the Afghan border areas. Pakistan has often claimed that the Indian consulates in Afghanistan provide protection to Indian organizations carrying out covert activities against Pakistan. Pakistan has accused the Indian mission in Afghanistan of facilitating the flow of counterfeit Pakistani cash over Afghan borders. Although ties between India and Afghanistan are friendly, it would be beneficial for all three countries to work together so that all three may gain from it. The whole South Asian area might be affected by even the smallest sign of instability in the ties between these three countries. India and Pakistan both have nuclear weapons. They both rank among South Asia's dominant countries. They would thus benefit if they concentrated on enhancing their relationships and fostering confidence in the South Asian area [1], [2]. Following the SAARC conference in Colombo, Afghan President Hamid Karzai made an important trip to India. He was the first to attribute the assault on the Indian Embassy in Kabul on July 7 to the Pakistani espionage agency. Although Yousuf Raza Gilani, the prime minister of Pakistan, originally denied these accusations, he promised to launch an impartial inquiry to determine how the ISI was engaged when Manmohan Singh brought up the matter at the SAARC summit.

The Taliban-led insurgency was allegedly supported by Pakistan's intelligence services, according to Afghanistan. It often complained that terrorists headquartered in Pakistan

violated international boundaries and carried out terrorist activities in Afghanistan. There have been sponsored organized assaults not only on the Afghan government but also on Indian forces. Soon, increasing conflicts in Afghanistan were being caused by militant organizations that primarily operated in Jammu and Kashmir, such as Hizb-ul-Mujahideen, Jaish-e-Mohammed, and Lashkar-e-Tayiba. It was concerning that Kashmir and Afghanistan were engaged in a "proxy war." Operating for more than three decades, ISI.

Pakistan has been let down by the cordial ties between India and Afghanistan. The Karzai administration continued to deepen connections with India and granted permission for Indian consulates to open in Jalalabad, Kandahar, Herat, and Mazar-e-Sharif. In order to enable the building of dams in the northeastern Afghan province of Kunar, Afghanistan may also seek to India for assistance in training its new army. PM Manmohan Singh has pledged support for Afghanistan's efforts to create a stable and affluent society during Karzai's visit.

The rising sway India has over Afghanistan irritates the ISI. In actuality, Pakistan's fight with India includes the Afghan war. There has been conflict between India and Pakistan for many years, both directly and indirectly. Additionally, Pakistan's eastern port of Karachi has been bypassed by trade routes started by India, Russia, and Iran. Plans for the building of rail and road connections between ports in Western Afghanistan and Iran, on the Arabian Sea, are also being developed by Iran and India. The poppy is another element that links Taliban, ISI, and Pakistan-supported terrorist groups in Afghanistan. The region closest to Afghanistan's border with Pakistan is also the one where poppy production is most prevalent. Poppy growing is profitable for the farmer, the Taliban, and the corrupt government. As a consequence, it gives the Taliban unrestricted resources to fight the US and hinders the establishment of the Karzai administration. The production of poppies in southern Afghanistan obstructs development initiatives that get significant funding from India. For Pakistan, it has been necessary to make an effort to lessen India's influence in Afghanistan[3], [4].

2. DISCUSSION

Following the conflict between West Pakistan and East Pakistan following the general elections in 1971, under Yahya Khan's rule, Bangladesh was separated from Pakistan. India was a key player in the establishment of Mujibur Rehman's administration and the foundation of Bangladesh. Despite friendly ties in the beginning, there have been disputes around the 1975 building of the Farakka Barrage between the nations. On August 15, 1975, a group of military officers killed Mujibur Rehman, and as a result, Ziaur Rehman assumed control of the Bangladeshi government.

Bangladesh would not exist today if it weren't for the courageous actions of Indira Gandhi and the sacrifices made by the Indian Jawans during the conflict that Pakistan started on December 3, 1971. In addition to assisting in Bangladesh's creation, India provided economic and military support as well as security guarantees to care for Bangladesh throughout its early years. The two countries had friendly ties for as long as Mujibur Rehman was alive. However, after his murder in 1975, the US-China-Pakistan axis started openly operating in Bangladesh and incited anti-India frenzy there.

However, the passage of time has brought about certain negative changes in Indo-Bangladesh ties, especially the propagation of anti-Indian propaganda by some sectors of the Bangla press and other entrenched interests. These sometimes-strained relations between India and Bangladesh. Particularly near the latter of Mujib's reign, this unfavorable situation became to be of concern. Some academics even claim that Mujib's affinity with India contributed to the overthrow of his government in August 1975.

Bangladesh and India both belong to the Indian subcontinent and have a long history of political, economic, and cultural development. India was a key factor in Bangladesh's separation from Pakistan. India recently offered support and collaboration amid natural disasters. India is Bangladesh's top exporter, and one of the main points of contention between the two countries is how they share their water resources, namely the Farakka Barrage problem.

Following his election as president of Bangladesh, Ziaur Rehman traveled to India for the UNIDO Conference. There, he met twice with the foreign minister and prime minister of India to address topics including the Farakka Barrage and the Indo-Bangladesh border. Ziaur Rehman was killed on May 30, 1981, in a military takeover, and Justice Abdus Sattar, the Vice President, became the presidency. Lt. Gen. H. M. Ershad, who later assumed the role of Chief Martial Law administrator, overthrew him on March 24, 1982, in another military coup because he was unable to provide a just government. He said that he will implement Mujibur Rehman's agenda with reference to South Asian nations and regional cooperation. The nation had a solid base for its foreign policy, which prioritized collaboration and goodwill with Islamic states. Romesh Bhandari, the Indian foreign minister, traveled to Bangladesh on April 15th with a letter addressed to President Ershad from Rajiv Gandhi. The six unresolved concerns between the two nations that he covered there are as follows: Sharing the Ganga and Teesta waters, putting the 1974 border accord into effect, and giving Bangladesh the Tin Bigha corridor. The ownership of South Talpatty Island, the maritime boundary, the construction of border walls between India and Bangladesh, and the anti-Indian operations of the US-Britain-Pakistan axis in Bangladesh are all issues that need to be resolved.

Reviewing the Indo-Bangladesh relationship throughout the time period indicates that a number of significant issues that had previously hampered the two nations' relations and had the potential to further deteriorate them were still present. No effective steps could be made to get rid of, or at least manage, these irritants. Fortunately, Bangladesh's leaders somewhat understood that keeping things tense with India was pointless. In his piece titled "Delhi and Deccan, New Beginning," Rajendra Sareen expressed the opinion that there looked to be a positive shift in both nations' perspectives toward one another, which offered promise for the future growth of Indo-Bangladesh friendship and collaboration. According to current trends, both nations want to work together cooperatively and amicably, the author noted. There is no doubt that India has a stake in the success of Bangladesh[5], [6].

One of the first nations to recognize the new state and develop diplomatic and commercial links with it was India. India generously contributed substantial sums to Bangladesh's economic rehabilitation shortly after the nation was founded. The Indo-Soviet deal of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation, which came to an end the previous year, served as the model for the 25-year deal that the two countries inked in 1972. Both nations vowed to increase global security and peace while opposing imperialism, racism, and colonialism. The two countries have negotiated a series of agreements in an effort to deepen their social, cultural, and economic ties. Similar to this, both parties agreed to work together in the realm of research and technology. The boundary difficulties between the two states were also peacefully resolved. The line between the two states had to be drawn in a way that protected the interests of both countries and treated both states equally. After then, there were undoubtedly occasional boundary conflicts between the two nations, but overall, both exhibited a spirit of perfect tolerance toward one another, and their relations remained warm and peaceful.

The Farakka Barrage issue was left over from the Indo-Pakistani ties after Bangladesh was established, and it continued to irritate both India and Bangladesh. Bangladesh attempted to internationalize the conflict by bringing it up at the UN. India refused to ratify it, stating that

doing so would make the problem worse and that a solution should be found via communication and collaboration between the two countries. Bangladesh ultimately decided to remove this matter from the UN. The sharing of the Ganga's waters is the most challenging issue between India and Bangladesh. As is well known, the Ganges River has its source in Gangotri and travels across India and Bangladesh in a south-eastern direction. 38 kilometers south of Farakka, in West Bengal's Murshidabad District, is where its mainline bifurcates. The Padma stream joins the Brahmaputra and travels along the India-Bangladesh border before meeting the River Meghna and the Bay of Bengal, respectively. The Bhagirathi-Hoogly stream flows in the lower portions of West Bengal.

The Ganga water dispute involves the sharing of freshwater between the two nations from mid-March to mid-May, when the Ganga's flow drops to a minimum of 55,000 cusecs, during the lean season from January to May. The fundamental issue is that Bangladesh only gets 15,000 cusecs, which is insufficient to satisfy its needs, if India withdraws 40,000 cusecs to maintain Calcutta Port. By extracting this greater volume of water, India causes a wide range of issues in Bangladesh. The two states' equitable water distribution is the subject of the conflict. New Moore Island, which is located between Bangladesh and India, is another issue. It is situated in the Bay of Bengal and ranges in size from 2 to 12 square kilometers. It is dependent on the ebbing and flowing of the tide. almost 5,200 kilometers and almost 7,000 kilometers, respectively, separate this island from Bangladesh's and India's respective coastline points. This island was initially seen by India in 1971, and the British Admiralty was informed of the discovery. It appeared on the Admiralty map as "New Moore Island." India informed Bangladesh of the Island's existence during maritime discussions between India and Bangladesh in 1974.

India did not assert its possession of the island until 1979. The issue occurred when Bangladesh renamed the island South Talpatty after West Bengal referred to it as Purbasha. On this Island, the Indian flag was raised on March 12, 1980. At this point, Bangladesh claimed control of the area and declared New Moore to be a region under dispute. When Bangladesh protested to the Indian ship I.N.S. Sandhyak docking in island waters in May 1981, the situation quickly escalated. Despite being debated at many levels, the disagreement has not been settled. The problem was no longer relevant after the island was entirely buried in the water sometime in the early 2000s. The issue of Chakma refugees affects the relations between India and Bangladesh as well. In the Indian state of Tripura, many migrants from Bangladesh have found asylum. Negotiations in 1994 resulted in the return of Chakma refugees from Tripura to Bangladesh's Chittagong Hill regions. In 1994, about 5,100 of these migrants were sent back home. Up until 1996, negotiations for the return of over 50,000 more Chakma refugees were ongoing. Every repatriation was done voluntarily.

The Tin Bigha corridor controversy once again harmed the two nations' ties. The two Bangladeshi enclaves of Dahagram and Angorpota are separated from the Bangladeshi district of Rangpur by Tin Bigha, a tiny portion of Indian territory. When Bangladeshi President Ershad and Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi signed an agreement in 1982, it was intended to be resolved. The deal guaranteed Bangladesh's long-term lease on Indian Territory of Tin Bigha. Dahagram and Angorpota residents were happy to see this deal signed, but West Bengal residents were against it, making it impossible to put into effect since renting out Indian territory needed a constitutional modification. Additionally, a petition against the leasing of the Tin Bigha corridor was submitted to the Calcutta High Court in this respect.

A large exodus was caused by the flood of Bangladeshi refugees and the Assam issue, which led to significant issues between India and Bangladesh. A barbed wire fence along the border

will be built by the Indian government at an estimated cost of 550 crores. Even while the Bangladeshi government initially supported the concept, it eventually declined to participate, which further soured relations between the two nations. The nations came to an agreement on the border problem after extensive discussions. This put an end to the matter, which had been open for over 20 years. Sheikh Hasina Wajed, the current prime minister of Bangladesh and the daughter of Mujibur Rehman, has always supported India. She had previously held office from 1996 until 2001. When the Ganga waters sharing deal was signed in New Delhi on December 12, 1996, the relationships had improved. Both presidents decided to form a working group to tackle insurgency in India's North-Eastern region and the Chittagong Hill regions on the other side, and they hailed the dawn of a new era in mutual collaboration. Additionally, it was decided that urgent action would be taken to improve border administration and quell the North East insurrection.

In an editorial, *The Tribune* applauded the Treaty and characterized the development as a new chapter in relations that improved the chances of establishing a long-lasting Indo-Bangla friendship based on respect for each other's independence, dignity, and mutual benefit. According to a quote from the treaty, the two countries have 30 years to explore joint economic ventures, substantially increase trade, facilitate cultural and other exchanges at the grassroots level, and decide how to increase water flow in all other common rivers. Whether these goals would be accomplished relies largely on Bangladesh and the BNP's position toward India. India's exports to Bangladesh reached above 2000 crores in the years 1994–1995. Both a loan deal for 30 crores and an agreement to prevent double taxation have already been reached. India provides Bangladeshi staff with training facilities under the Technical Assistance Program. The most crucial platform for assisting South Asia economically is SAARC. The choice to allow preferential commerce via SAPTA was probably going to boost economic cooperation between Bangladesh and India[7], [8].

As a result of the two countries' decision to begin negotiations on the Free commerce Agreement, the key Joint Economic Council meeting between India and Bangladesh concluded with the news of significant progress toward boosting bilateral commerce. Since April 1999, there has been a land connection between Kolkata and Dhaka. It was determined that the Free Trade Standing Committee at the level of the Foreign Secretary would convene early in 2004 to assess the results of the first round of FTA negotiations. As a sign of good neighborly ties, India has decided to extend the state-to-state credit of "200 crores" that had previously been approved for a number of development projects in Bangladesh. This extension will last till the credit is used up. Just before Hasina Wajed traveled to India, West Bengal Chief Minister Jyoti Basu made a visit to Dhaka. When he first saw the deal in the preliminary stage, Basu was not happy, but after it was guaranteed that there would be adequate water to maintain Calcutta port in excellent shape, he was happy. According to Basu, the deal would be advantageous for both Bangladesh and India. He believed that the water sharing agreement will make it possible to work out a deal for both countries' industries to use the Chittagong port. Fortunately, the Awami League has a very favorable stance toward India. Hasina Wajed criticized Pakistan's autocratic government and demanded the return of democracy. All of the main political parties in India, with the exception of the BJP, unanimously applauded the deal, albeit they did so with certain misgivings. Since the West Bengal government participated directly in the discussions, it has no reason to question the treaty's provisions. In the years to come, the pact might offer the relations between India and Bangladesh a stronger boost.

There have, however, been several additional situations when Indo-Bangladesh relations have strained. On November 26, 2002, Yashwant Sinha, India's foreign minister, said that

Bangladesh had become a haven for Indian militant organizations in the country's northeast. And he grumbled that the ISI's actions were centered at the Pakistan High Commission in Dhaka. The fact that Bangladesh never explicitly denounced cross-border terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir also caused resentment in India. The collaboration between different religions and cultures is another significant facet of Indo-Bangladesh relations. India and Bangladesh must take a proactive and decisive part in this effort to eradicate senseless hate that is motivated by a person's religion or culture. In this subcontinent, Hindus and Muslims coexisted peacefully for more than a millennium; they are now able to do so once again.

The visit of Bangladeshi Prime Minister Hasina to India is universally regarded as a success. She said that it would take time to resolve the issues separating the two states. "We would like India to be our friend as it was during our liberation war," she said. We should resolve our minor internal political differences and exhibit a united, enlightened disposition both internally and externally when it comes to matters of national interest.' India has provided Bangladesh with a line of credit worth US\$ 800 million for a variety of projects, including the construction of railway infrastructure, the supply of Broad-Gauge microprocessor-based locomotives and passenger coaches, the purchase of buses, and dredging projects. Out of the \$200 million award, \$150 million has already been made available to Bangladesh in three installments for use in initiatives that are top priorities for that country[9], [10].

Cultural contacts between the people of two nations help to forge a strong connection given their shared history and lingua franca. Promoting interactions in the areas of music, theater, art, painting, literature, etc. has received particular attention. Such encounters are supported by a bilateral cultural exchange program. The Indira Gandhi Cultural Centre of the Indian Council for Cultural Relations was opened in Dhaka on March 11, 2010, to encourage cross-border cultural contacts. In 2011–12, both nations jointly celebrated Rabindranath Tagore's 150th birthday anniversary and Kazi Nazrul Islam's 90th anniversary of the publishing of the poem Bidrohi.

3. CONCLUSION

Initiatives for commerce, infrastructure development, and economic collaboration may all be ways to enhance ties. The region's economic development and connectivity might be facilitated through the Afghan-Pakistan Transit Trade Agreement (APTTA) and cooperative projects. For the security of the region, a permanent peace in Afghanistan is essential. Both countries must have a positive conversation while addressing one another's concerns and pursuing common objectives. To create an environment that is favorable to prosperity and security, nations must strike a balance between their own interests and regional stability. The connection between Pakistan and Afghanistan, in conclusion, highlights the complex interaction of history, geopolitics, security issues, and economic interests. While obstacles still exist, regional collaboration, diplomatic efforts, and a common commitment to stability are essential for establishing long-lasting peace and prosperity in both nations and the area as a whole. The dynamics of South Asian geopolitics will be shaped by how this connection develops and how it affects Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the bordering nations' foreign policy.

REFERENCES:

- [1] M. I, "Instability in Afghanistan: Implications for Pakistan," *J. Polit. Sci. Public Aff.*, 2016, doi: 10.4172/2332-0761.1000213.
- [2] R. Majeed, "Indo-Afghan Relations after September 11: Implications for Pakistan," *IOSR J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2013, doi: 10.9790/0837-1530914.

- [3] U. Javaid, "Analyzing the Dynamics of Pakistan-Afghanistan Relations: Past and Present," *South Asian Stud. A Res. J. South Asian Stud.*, 2016.
- [4] J. Milia, "Kebijakan LuarNegeri Amerika Serikat terhadap Kelompok Terorisme Al - qaeda pada Masa Pemerintahan Barack Obama," *Univ. Riau*, 2015.
- [5] R. Verma, "Engaging the world: India's foreign policy since 1947," *Int. Aff.*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/ia/iix185.
- [6] S. M. Amin, "Pakistan's foreign policy□: a reappraisal," *Oxford Univ. Press. Karachi*, 2000.
- [7] S. Sial, "Pakistan's role and strategic priorities in Afghanistan since 1980," *Nor. Peace Build. Resource Cent.*, 2013.
- [8] C. C. Fair and S. Gregory, "A state in flux: Pakistan in the context of national and regional change," *Contemp. South Asia*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/09584935.2012.670206.
- [9] S. Atique, S. S. Abdul, C. Y. Hsu, and T. W. Chuang, "Meteorological influences on dengue transmission in Pakistan," *Asian Pac. J. Trop. Med.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.apjtm.2016.07.033.
- [10] A. Rashid and S. Jabeen, "Analyzing performance determinants: Conventional versus Islamic Banks in Pakistan," *Borsa Istanbul Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.bir.2016.03.002.

CHAPTER 10

EXPLORING THE MULTIFACETED DIMENSIONS OF THE ULFA-ISI CONNECTION

Subodh Chandulal Khanna, Assistant Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- subodh.khanna@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The relationship between the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan has had significant implications for the security dynamics of India's northeastern region. This paper examines the multifaceted dimensions of the ULFA-ISI connection, analyzing the historical context, motivations, and impacts on regional stability. By exploring this relationship, the study sheds light on the intricate interplay of insurgent groups and external actors in shaping security challenges in India's northeastern states. The nexus between the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) reflects the complexities of insurgency, geopolitics, and regional security. ULFA, initially seeking autonomy for Assam, established connections with external actors such as the ISI to gain support and resources for its separatist cause. The ISI's involvement provided ULFA with funding, training, and arms, which exacerbated the security situation in India's northeastern region. This relationship deepened concerns about cross-border terrorism, internal instability, and the manipulation of ethnic tensions for strategic gains.

KEYWORDS:

Cross-Border Cooperation, Extremist Networks, Insurgency, Intelligence Agencies, Militant Groups, National Security, Non-State Actors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Begum Khaleda Zia's BNP administration was charged of aiding Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence activities in the Northeast and supporting insurgencies there. By all indications, Bangladesh at the time provided diplomatic assistance that aided ISI operations in other regions of South Asia and permitted the use of its territory as a supply route for weapons used against India. Syed Ashraf Islam, the general secretary of the Awami League and the minister of local government for Bangladesh, said in January 2010 that he had documentation of a meeting between Pervez Musharraf and Anup Chetia, the chairman of the ULFA, in 2002. He said that Musharraf's hotel room was the location of the 90-minute meeting that Khaleda Zia's administration set up. According to reports, the Pakistani High Commission in Bangladesh made it easier for ULFA commanders to travel to Karachi, from whence the ISI led them to the terrorist training facilities. According to rumors, the ULFA expressed its gratitude to Pakistan by standing behind it throughout the Kargil conflict. The ULFA seems to have allowed this weakened philosophy for military purposes when it asked Pakistan to free Assam. This just serves to demonstrate how military considerations are more significant than political considerations in ULFA's plans[1], [2].

On April 2, 2004, truckloads of weaponry bound for ULFA hideouts in northeast India were intercepted by Bangladesh Joint Forces. A little war may have been started as a result of the arm haul's size. According to reports, the package originated in Hong Kong and was then moved to smaller ships in Burma before being transported to Chittagong. A change in policy toward the Northeast insurgency didn't occur until the Awami League came to power. India

was accused by. Sheikh Hasina visited India after her second election to office. It was agreed that neither Bangladesh nor India would allow their territory to be used against the other. There has been an alleged ULFA assassination attempt on Sheikh Hasina during her first rule. In addition to a rebellion among the ranks of the Bangladeshi Rifles, radical Islamist elements have also infiltrated the military. Blind religiosity, the armed forces, and radical political groups might pose threats to the economic and political stability of Bangladesh.

The Maldives are around 700 kilometers away from Sri Lanka and are situated south of India's Lakshadweep Islands in the Indian Ocean. Following the Maldives' liberation from British domination, diplomatic ties between the two countries were established. Since that time, strong strategic, military, economic, and cultural ties have grown between India and the Maldives. The Maldives has seen relations with India as a source of help as well as a counterbalance to Sri Lanka, which is close by and its main commercial partner. India has backed the Maldives' "policy of keeping regional issues and struggles" away from itself. The majority of the population of the Maldives is Muslim, and they are a fusion of southern Indian and southern Arabian genetic threads in terms of ethnicity. Divehi, which is rendered in Arabic script, is the official language. In the 12th century, Islam likely traveled from the Malabar Coast to these islands. The Sultan served as the political leader historically, and a theocratic type of government predominated. Maldives was never directly colonized by a Western nation. The British made it a protectorate from the late 19th to the middle of the 20th century, mainly for the use of the Gan Island as a naval station. The Portuguese had indirectly established their brief authority in the 16th century.

Internal alterations started to happen about 1932. The Sultan's role changed to that of an elected leader who receives assistance and advice from a legislature chosen by universal adult franchise. The Sultanate was eventually disbanded in 1965 following a nationwide vote, after an unsuccessful effort to do so in 1954. As the "atoll supreme," a presidency was constituted. Ibrahim Nasir, a former prime minister, served as the nation's first president from 1965 until 1978. Maumoon Abdul Gayoom succeeded him in the position. He was chosen by the Majlis, a unicameral body of lawmakers. From March 8 to March 14, 1974, Ahmed Zaki, the prime minister of the Republic of the Maldives, paid a visit to India. He visited with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and President V. V. Giri of India and spoke about bilateral concerns. They also stressed the need of regional collaboration amongst the nations in the region for the advancement of economic growth, peace, and stability. Indira and Zaki both agreed that India will provide facilities "on a continuing basis" for training Maldivian workers in academic and technological disciplines. The parties would thoroughly discuss further steps for economic collaboration. Zaki understood that the actions done by India to normalize the situation on the subcontinent were positive developments that would promote the peace and cooperation amongst all the nations in the area. The two presidents emphasized the need of fully implementing the UN Security Council resolutions from November 1967 and October 1973 in relation to the west Asian conflict. Both countries emphasized their unwavering support for the Indian Ocean being "a zone of peace, far from Great Power rivalries, tension, and military escalation" in a joint communiqué released at the conclusion of his visit. The two nations voiced worry about the increase in military activities in the Indian Ocean area and hoped that everyone would recognize it as a zone of peace. The Republic of India and the Republic of the Maldives have typically had cordial and tight bilateral ties. Strategic, commercial, and military cooperation was formed between India and the Maldives. India has developed an alliance with the island country in support of its strategic objectives in the Indian Ocean and has helped to preserve security on the island nation. On January 12, 1975, Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi traveled to the Maldives and met with Ahmed Zaki, the leader of that nation. She was sure that in the next years, economic and technological collaboration would

increase much more. She made a short reference of the necessity to maintain stability and peace in the Indian Ocean. Both countries agreed that Great Powers shouldn't engage in a rivalry of strength-building in this ocean. She stressed that India maintained its fundamental commitment to non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. The evidence of Super Power détente really supported the viability of these approaches. Indira Gandhi encouraged the nations in the area to fend against pressure from the military, economic, and political spheres. Insisting on the development and equitable distribution of the world's resources was a key component of their shared agenda. All governments want the Indian Ocean to be a place of peace, she added, citing the 'increasing naval activity' that brought undesirable conflict closer to them. She continued by saying that the pressure applied to us by global economic forces has made the quest for ways to improve collaboration between nations like India and the Maldives "all the more necessary."

India's nuclear strategy got "appreciation and full understanding from Maldives," according to a Joint Communiqué released at the conclusion of Indira Gandhi's tour. In this communiqué, Mr. Zaki emphasized his gratitude for and knowledge of India's position in this area as well as his confidence that the advantages of this technology might have a big positive impact on the region's economic growth. The communiqué also expressed India and Maldives' steadfast determination to keep the Indian Ocean a peaceful region and their worry over recent events there. In order to further economic, cultural, and other interactions, they decided that it was necessary to take steps to increase their bilateral cooperation in the areas of education, fisheries, and air and sea communications. The first flight service between Male, the capital of the Maldives, and Colombo was launched in 1977 thanks to a partnership between Indian Airlines and flight Maldives. On March 2, 1978, the Indian government made the decision to give the Government of India-owned Airport Authority a building contract for an airport in the amount of 11 million US dollars. According to M. A. Gayoom, the transport minister for the Maldives, the contract called for building civil works and fuel storage facilities at Male's Hulhule airport. Kuwait provided the majority of the funding for the project, which was finished in 1980. To make it easier for Jumbo-Jets to land, the runway was extended. International bids were received by the Maldives for the development of a communications system and airport navigational aids[3]–[5].

A contract for the operation of aviation services between India and the Maldives was signed on February 13th, 1979 in New Delhi. The Agreement states that Maldivian foreign airlines may run three flights each week to either Trivandrum or Madras, while Indian Airlines is permitted to operate three services each week to Male. The Agreement was signed by M. Naeem, Director, Ministry of Transport, Government of Maldives, and Air Marshal J. Zaheer, Director-General of Civil Aviation, on behalf of India. To boost their bilateral commerce, the two governments decided to establish a regular institutional framework. India promised to fulfill the Maldives' needs for basic necessities and agreed to establish an annual list of these products. Khursheed Alam Khan, the Maldives' deputy minister for public safety, and Ilyas Ibrahim, the minister of state for commerce, both signed the agreed-upon minutes of the Indo-Maldivian trade negotiations conducted in New Delhi from November 17–20, 1980. It was also decided that the responsibility of establishing business agreements for transporting the designated goods to the Maldives would fall within the purview of the governmental trade organizations of the two nations. Additionally, Mr. Ibrahim spoke with Pranab Mukherjee, the commerce minister, and expressed his country's significant desire in expanding trade relations with India.

On September 6, 1983, Maldivian President M. A. Gayoom traveled to India and met Indira Gandhi. The non-aligned movement and recent events in the Indian Ocean were topics of

conversation between the two leaders. He also spoke with P. V. Narasimha Rao, the minister of external affairs, and President Zail Singh. According to Zail Singh, India, like the Maldives, was alarmed by the "frightening consequences" of the rising unrest in the Indian Ocean area. If both governments were to flourish naturally without conflict and outside meddling, peace was required. Gayoom said that in addition to being neighbors, the two nations have longstanding historical and cultural links. He said that Maldives was dedicated to the idea of South Asian nations cooperating.

2. DISCUSSION

A cultural pact including art, culture, archaeology, education, social welfare, public health, mass media, and sports was signed by the two countries the next day. The 13-article agreement called for the exchange of academics, experts, and representatives of the fields of education, literature, science, technology, the arts, and sports as well as the provision of facilities and financial aid to students and scientists from the other country as well as publications of cultural, educational, scientific, and sporting literature as well as copies of works of art. Additionally, it included visits from sports teams as well as exchanges of musicians, dancers, and film and television programs. It also involved participation in each other's international film festivals. President Gayoom of the Maldives paid a second visit to New Delhi on February 4, 1985, when he met with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and spoke about bilateral, regional, and global concerns. The necessity to further deepen the cordial connections between the two nations was highlighted by both presidents. It was reported that the visiting President wanted more financial and technical support for the Maldives' quick growth. India has already provided the Maldives its knowledge of establishing small size businesses in several sectors.

On February 7, 1986, Rajiv Gandhi, the prime minister of India, paid a visit to Male and spoke with the president of the Maldives on regional affairs and bilateral ties. The Five Year Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement was also inked by the two nations. The agreement included the creation of a joint committee to find certain areas of mutual benefit and was intended to strengthen economic and commercial connections between the two governments. Both presidents voiced alarm about the ongoing weapons race and sternly encouraged the great powers to intensify their efforts in the ongoing global military conflict. Gayoom agreed with Gandhi that poor countries needed a new framework for international economic relations in order to have a more equitable share of global commerce and resources.

India offered the Maldives a comprehensive package of economic, technical, and commercial aid totaling around '21 crores, increased the disputed luggage limit, and committed to provide young Maldivians specialized training opportunities in Indian Institutes. The package was a component of the economic and technical aid agreements. There have been ongoing calls for India to reinstate the original luggage limit for travelers to the islands after it had been cut down in the past. For stays longer than three days, the luggage allowance would increase to 1,250 and be limited at 750 pounds. Gandhi, on the other hand, decided to provide aid in the fields of medicine, meteorology, the hotel sector, telecommunications, and television programming. With land provided by the government, India built a 30-bed general hospital in the Maldives, which included a 20-bed Indira Gandhi Cardiac Center. A two-year cultural initiative for the exchange of artists, academics, athletes, and media professionals was signed between India and the Maldives in 1987. Varadaraja, the secretary for the department of culture, and I both signed it. H. Zaki is the Maldives Ministry of Foreign Affairs' permanent secretary. This exchange program was the first of its kind. India aided the Maldives in November 1988 by swiftly dispatching its military troops to quell an attempt by certain Sri

Lankans to overthrow President Gayoom's legitimate government. President Mr. Gayoom expressed pleasure on July 23, 1989, that all areas of bilateral cooperation between the two nations had progressed. Both nations were working together and pursuing socialist ideals as their foreign policy goals. The Indira Gandhi Hospital, which will be erected by the National Building Construction Corporation of India, would serve as a symbol of the goodwill between the two nations, according to Mr. Gayoom. Mr. Menon, the Indian High Commissioner to the Maldives, said that the political, economic, social, and cultural relations between the two countries have increased. India saw it as an honor to take part in the historic economic revolution that the Maldives was undergoing at the time. He reaffirmed India's adherence to the SAARC's founding principles, which had been peaceful coexistence as its cornerstone.

Maldives and the SAARC

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, the South Asian Economic Union, and the South Asia Free Trade Agreement all include India and the Maldives as founder members or signatories. High-level conversations and discussions on regional problems have continued between the leaders of the two nations. India has a significant influence on the foreign policy of the Maldives and provides security, particularly in the wake of Operation Cactus in 1988, when India successfully deterred Tamil mercenaries from invading the Maldives. Maldives plays a crucial role in SAARC as the organization's founding member, including Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. Maldives calls for the establishment of a SAARC Human Rights Resource Center, the South Asian Free Trade Agreement, the creation of a social charter, the beginning of informal political consultations in SAARC forums, increased advocacy for environmental issues, and more. The Maldives supports giving SAARC a higher worldwide prominence, such as by developing unified stances at the UN. Maldives, however, claims sovereignty over the Muslim-dominated area of Minicoy, which is under Indian administration.

The People's Liberation Organization of Tamil Eelam and the Maldives

Speedboats carrying 80 armed militants from the People's Liberation Organization of Tamil Eelam arrived in the Maldives in November 1988, and with help from infiltrating comrades, they immediately started seizing control of the government. The Tamil nationalist organisation in Sri Lanka is said to have plotted the scheme as part of an effort by a Maldivian businessman and politician who was opposed to President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom's administration to seize power. The PLOTE, on the other hand, desires a secure location to call home and carry out its operations. Although the extremists took control of Male's airport, they were unable to apprehend Maldives President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom, who had left and asked India for military assistance. Rajiv Gandhi, the prime minister of India at the time, had sent 1,600 soldiers to assist the Maldivian government. Within 12 hours after Gayoom's appeal, Indian soldiers came to put an end to the coup attempt in the military action known as "Operation Cactus." They overran the whole nation within a few hours, killing 19 PLOTE terrorists and wounding 1 Indian soldier in the process[6], [7].

On September 18, 1989, Maldivian President Gayoom paid a visit to New Delhi and said that the Indian troops had done well, and the tiny detachment that had remained behind had helped the Maldives security forces by "advising and training" them. Gayoom was quite pleased with the conclusion of his discussions with Indian authorities in New Delhi, including the prime minister Rajiv Gandhi, and during this visit it had been determined that the first joint commission meeting would be conducted in Male between November 6 and 10.

On January 14, 1990, Indian External Affairs Minister I. K. Gujral paid a visit to Male and announced that both nations had reached an agreement in principle to do away with the need for visas for travel between India and the Maldives, making them the first SAARC members to do so. In addition, Indian Airlines will begin running direct flights from Bombay within 10 days to provide access to this island country. Gujral had previously attended a ceremony when President Gayoom laid the cornerstone for the Indira Gandhi Memorial Hospital. The greatest project India undertook as part of the foreign aid program was this hospital. Gujral said that since the island country was commemorating its 25th anniversary of independence, India was in favor of the Maldives hosting the Fifth SAARC Summit in that year.

A Memorandum of Understanding between the two nations was signed on January 13th, 1990, enabling Male to utilize an Indian satellite after its launch in July. Along with extending cooperation in the areas of security, civil aviation, health, education, and agriculture, the two nations also signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) pledging to do away with the visa need. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Maldivian Foreign Ministry's permanent secretary, I. H. Zaki, and the Indian High Commissioner, M. P. M. Menon, allowed Male to receive metrological data and television programs for rebroadcast on the local television network. Indian Airlines' decision to start offering direct flights from Bombay to Male was made possible by the inaugural meeting of the Indo-Maldivian joint commission. Gayoom did not believe that a defense agreement between India and his country was necessary, despite the fact that Indian military support had successfully thwarted an attempt at a coup in the island nation in 1988.

From March 15–17, 1990, President Gayoom of the Maldives paid a second visit to New Delhi. He spoke with Premier V. P. Singh and Indian President R. Venkataraman. Gayoom described his visit as "very successful and very fruitful," noting that he had addressed all bilateral problems and had come to a high degree of understanding on all of them. On March 22, 1990, Indian Premier V. P. Singh paid a visit to Male and met Maldivian President Gayoom, who had made eight trips to India during the previous 10 years, either on official business or to attend a conference or SAARC gathering. The partnership between India and the Maldives included a wide range of topics, from training Maldivian staff by Indian professionals to sharing Doordarshan programs through INSAT.

To promote bilateral relations, New Delhi provided Male technical support in many sectors on April 15, 1995. Both nations reaffirmed their commitment to fostering new connections and strengthening current ones in order to maintain a friendly and mutually beneficial partnership. India provided help in the fields of defense, medicine, unconventional energy, and maritime transport. India and Maldives, a significant maritime neighbor, continue to have extremely strong and cordial connections. Salah Shihab, the Maldives' deputy foreign minister, conducted a symposium on Indo-Maldives relations in June 1996 at the Institute of Asian Studies in Hyderabad. Ahmed Zaki, the minister of transport and communication for the Maldives, visited India once again in October 1996 as part of the Ministerial Conference on Infrastructure. In December of the same year, the Maldives' Foreign Minister, Fathulla Jamil, paid a visit to Delhi for the SAARC Minister Meeting. The Maldives received mostly human resource development support from India. Both nations decided to work together to establish a distant learning program for the Maldives. In order to analyze the needs of the Maldivians and prepare for the introduction of the program, a group from the Indira Gandhi National Open University, headed by Pro-Vice Chancellor Janardan Jha, traveled to the Maldives. The Maldives Institute of Technical Education, a project supported by the Government of India, was successfully finished and turned over to the Maldivian government on September 16, 1996. Other nations, including the United States, Soviet Union, Great

Britain, Nepal, and Bangladesh, supported India's invasion in 1988. The swift response, resounding triumph, and restoration of the Maldivian government boosted bilateral ties. Following conflicts with Sri Lanka and internal security issues, Maldives considered its connection with India as a source of long-term security. However, Maldives continues to struggle with significant macroeconomic imbalances that have led to growing debt, low levels of foreign currency reserves, and an inflated nominal exchange rate. The continued dominance of the heavily regulated public sector in economic activities has impeded private sector development. The government made plans to allow private companies to export fresh and tinned fish from the beginning of 2000. To make any real headway in boosting the economy, the administration needed to implement reforms in the banking and financial sectors and further reduce public spending. The government projects that the Maldives' economy would have doubled in size. The preservation of the delicate environment in order to ensure sustainable economic growth, the promotion of greater regained development in order to foster more equi growth, and an improvement in Maldivian teaching standards in order to increase the national skill base are three additional pressing issues that demand immediate attention. On his 27 March 2005 visit to India, Gayoom expressed gratitude for India's positive contributions to Maldives public health and human resource development. He also commended India for providing prompt aid during the disaster. On March 30, 2005, after speaking with Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh, he stated: "Although the death toll in the Maldives was relatively low, the tsunami created a nationwide disaster, wiping out approximately 62 percent of GDP."

Lt. Colonel Abdulla Shamaal served as the first defense attaché when the Republic of the Maldives' High Commission in India established the first Defense Attaché's Office overseas in 2005. The Maldives National Defence Force's Coast Guard received a 46-meter-long Trinkat Class Fast Attack Craft from the Indian Navy in April 2006 as part of a move to integrate the island nation into India's security network. The action was conducted when Maldives contacted India out of concern that one of its island resorts would be threatened by terrorists owing to a lack of military resources and monitoring equipment. When discussing the tense ties between India and Pakistan during the SAARC Summit in Bhutan in April 2010, Maldivian President Mohamed Nasheed voiced his optimism that the meeting of the two nations' prime ministers will result in an end to their tensions. Nasheed expressed his hope that the two leaders will have a meaningful talk and work out their disagreements when speaking at the 16th SAARC Summit. The conversation "will lead to greater dialogue between India and Pakistan," he said[8]–[10]. President Nasheed of the Maldives made it plain during his visit to New Delhi in October 2010—where he also met with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh—that the success of South Asia is dependent on ties between India and Pakistan. Nasheed pushed for the two nations to forge strong connections and said it was "doable." In order to strengthen their relationships, the two nations "should work from the ground up," according to the president, who also proposed that Indian multinational corporations invest in Pakistan. He continued by pointing out that India is developing quickly and that its neighbors may benefit from this, an idea that New Delhi has long sought to advance with the other nations in the area. He said that attempts had been made by India, and especially Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, to "go out of way" to reach out to tiny nations.

3. CONCLUSION

The ULFA and ISI's collaboration made clear how susceptible India's northeastern states are to outside forces. It emphasized the need of a thorough strategy that tackles not just security difficulties but also the underlying causes of insurgency, such as problems with identity, development, and governance. Cooperation between intelligence agencies, stronger border

security, and an emphasis on regional development are all necessary in the fight against this coalition. India's interaction with Bangladesh and other nearby nations is essential for reducing the amount of international assistance given to armed opposition organizations. In conclusion, the complex relationships between insurgent groups and outside players that shape regional security dynamics are best shown by the link between the ULFA and ISI. Policymakers may create policies to lessen the risks presented by cross-border terrorism, improve stability, and address the underlying socio-political grievances that fuel insurgency by understanding the drivers and effects of such interactions. For the northeastern states of India to experience permanent peace and stability, a comprehensive strategy that mixes security measures with socioeconomic growth is still essential.

REFERENCES:

- [1] D. Kotwal, "The contours of assam insurgency," *Strateg. Anal.*, 2001, doi: 10.1080/09700160108455349.
- [2] U. D. Rosada, "Memperkuat Karakter Anak melalui Dongeng berbasis Media Visual," *Child. Advis. Res. Educ.*, 2016.
- [3] M. R. Iriansyah, S. D. Nastion, and K. Ulfa, "Penerapan Metode Deflate Dan Algoritma Goldbach Codes Dalam Kompresi File Teks," *KOMIK (Konferensi Nas. Teknol. Inf. dan Komputer)*, 2017.
- [4] U. F. Zahra, A. Sarbini, and A. Shodiqin, "Media Sosial Instagram sebagai Media Dakwah," *Tabligh J. Komun. dan Penyiaran Islam*, 2016, doi: 10.15575/tabligh.v1i2.26.
- [5] Y. Soepriyanto, Sulthoni, and S. Ulfa, "Pengembangan Augmented Reality Sebagai Electronic Performance Support System Dalam Pembelajaran," *Edcomtech J. Kaji. Teknol. Pendidik.*, 2017.
- [6] Z. Ulfa, "Implementasi Metode Mimicry Memorization Dalam Menghafalkan Kosakata Bahasa Arab Bagi Siswa Kelas IV MI Al-Khoiriyah", *IAIN Wali Songo*, 2014.
- [7] H. U. A and S. Sukirno, "FAKTOR YANG MEMPENGARUHI MANAJAMEN LABA PADA PERUSAHAAN PERBANKAN DI INDONESIA," *Nominal, Barom. Ris. Akunt. dan Manaj.*, 2017, doi: 10.21831/nominal.v6i2.16651.
- [8] H. U. Almadara, "Pengaruh Leverage Terhadap Manajemen Laba Dengan Corporate Governance Sebagai Variabel Moderasi Pada Perusahaan Perbankan Yang Terdaftar Di Bei Bei," *Skripsi*, 2017.
- [9] A. M. Ulfa, "1) Dosen AKAFARMA Universitas Malahayati," *J. Kebidanan*, 2016.
- [10] A. M. Ulfa, "Analisa Kadar Tablet Antasida Di Beberapa Apotek Kota Bandar Lampung Secara Alkalimetri," *J. Kebidanan*, 2016.

CHAPTER 11

PACTS AND AGREEMENTS BETWEEN INDIA AND SRI LANKA

Dr. Zuleika Homavazir, Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- zuleika.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Pacts and agreements between India and Sri Lanka have played a crucial role in shaping the diplomatic relationship between the two nations. This paper examines the historical trajectory of bilateral agreements, ranging from trade and economic cooperation to security and cultural exchanges. By analyzing the significance of these pacts in fostering cooperation, addressing disputes, and enhancing regional stability, the study sheds light on the complexities and opportunities that define the India-Sri Lanka relationship. The pacts and agreements between India and Sri Lanka constitute a testament to the multifaceted nature of their diplomatic engagement. These agreements, spanning diverse areas such as trade, defense, cultural exchanges, and maritime cooperation, reflect the shared interests and historical connections between the two nations. Historically, the India-Sri Lanka relationship has faced both challenges and periods of close cooperation. Contentious issues, such as the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka, have tested the diplomatic ties between the two countries. However, agreements such as the Indo-Sri Lanka Accord of 1987 demonstrated the potential for cooperation in addressing regional challenges.

KEYWORDS:

Bilateral Cooperation, Border Management, Economic Partnership, Fisheries Agreements, Maritime Security, Peace Accords.

1. INTRODUCTION

With over 26,000 members, the Indian community is the second-largest expat group in the Maldives. Over various islands, the Indian expatriate population is made up of both laborers and professionals including physicians, teachers, accountants, managers, engineers, nurses, and technicians. Over 125 of the roughly 400 physicians in the nation are from India. Similar to this, around 25% of instructors in the Maldives, especially in the middle and upper levels, are Indian.

Sri Lanka-India Relations

Off the coast of South East India, in Sri Lanka, there are strong cultural ties to India. It is generally known that King Ashoka sent his daughter Sangh Mitra and son Mahendra to this island kingdom in order to spread Buddhism. Many Indians have moved in Sri Lanka, where they work mostly on tea and rubber plantations. On February 4, 1948, Sri Lanka formally ended its British control and joined the Commonwealth of Nations. It gave up its dominion status and changed its status to republic. Since 1961, Sri Lanka has participated actively in NAM. Sri Lanka shares the aim of global peace and the UN with no reserve. Additionally, it was a founder member of SAARC. Sri Lanka adheres to the non-alignment doctrine, same as India and other third world nations. Although there has usually been goodwill between the two countries, the ongoing civil conflict in Sri Lanka has controversially impacted those relations. India is Sri Lanka's lone neighbor, and the Palk Strait divides the two countries. Both nations work to create a shared security edifice for South Asia given their critical location there[1], [2].

The sovereignty of Katchatheevu, an uninhabited island of one square mile and situated in the Palk Straits off the coast of Jaffna, has been the subject of a territorial dispute. Every year, during the St. Anthony festival in March, pilgrims from Sri Lanka and India would go to Katchateevu Island for a four-day service at the local Roman Catholic church. In 1986, India criticized the presence of Sri Lankan police during the event. Although this led to friction between the two countries, both want to prevent a disastrous crisis. It ultimately took more than five years to come to a definitive resolution about this Island. The territorial dispute and fishing rights in the Palk Straits were discussed by the prime ministers of the two nations in June 1974. Finally, both leaders reached a thorough understanding on the maritime boundary's delineation, and India recognized Sri Lanka's possession of the Katchateevu Island. D. S. Senanayake, Sri Lanka's first independent prime minister, said that his nation would take a middle course in power politics and would not associate itself with any power bloc because it believed in peace. It has understood its strategic location as a sizable island in the Indian Ocean. Senanayake thought that communism may pose a significant danger to the newly developing countries. Because it lacked the resources to adequately defend itself, this island nation signed a security agreement with Great Britain and granted permission for British military installations at Trincomalee and Colombo.

India has been quite clear that it wants to be cordial with all of its neighbors since gaining its freedom. India hopes the same for Sri Lanka since the two countries are such close neighbors. Since a very long time ago, India and Sri Lanka have maintained friendly ties. In the early years of India's international relations after independence, the same friendly connection persisted. However, the racial unrest in Sri Lanka abruptly brought the age of goodwill to an end. D. S. Senanayake, Sri Lanka's first-ever elected prime minister, promised the Tamils that they would get justice when the country gained independence. He advised the Tamils not to be afraid of the Sinhalese. However, persecution against the Tamils reportedly started after his passing. The Official Language Act of 1956 established Sinhalese to be the only official language of Sri Lanka, despite the fact that the two-language system that was implemented under the Senanayake government was abandoned. Ethnic rioting resulted from the Tamils' opposition to this measure. Tamil was acknowledged as the language of the national minority in a 1957 agreement between Prime Minister Bandaranaike and the head of the Tamil people, Chelvanayakam. Sri Lanka has a significant position in India's foreign policy as one of its nearest neighbors with a long history of cultural links. Both countries abhor racism, colonialism, and imperialism.

D. Sir John Kotelawala, S. Senanayake's successor, stressed the non-alignment doctrine as well. He did, however, passionately oppose communist doctrine and support pro-Western policies. Kotelawala wanted to work with every anti-communist organization on the planet. He was vehemently opposed to imperialism and saw the Soviet Union's influence in Eastern Europe as harmful.

Citizens of Sri Lanka would be permitted to remain as foreigners

The Act passed in 1958 allowed for the use of Tamil in education, government service entrance exams, and the administration of the eastern and northern regions. However, the Sri Lankan government was unable to properly execute either the Act of 1958 or the Agreement of 1957. In the public sector, Tamils made about 30% of the workforce in 1948, but by 1975, that number had dropped to 5%. Their presence in the military and police was significantly decreased, and they faced discrimination in the educational system. By 1970, just 16% of university students identified as Tamil, down from over 31% in 1948. Approximately 10 lakh Tamils had their political rights taken away by the citizenship legislation of 1948 and 1949.

When Ceylon, subsequently known as Sri Lanka, attained independence and became a free country like India, it made the decision to adopt a non-alignment policy in February 1948. This allowed both nations maintain friendly ties with one another. In order to secure a shared sphere of influence in the area, both countries moved on with the establishment of strong cultural, commercial, strategic, and defense links, embracing non-alignment to restrain the impact of both the West and the Soviet Union. The success of the Non-Alignment Movement was greatly aided by Sir John Kotelawala, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka. The Bandung Conference was held in April 1953 as a result of his efforts. Sri Lanka was crucial in settling the conflict between India and China when China invaded India in 1962. As a result, Bandaranaike, the former prime minister of Sri Lanka, traveled to China to discuss the Colombo proposals, also known as the Colombo Plan, which was put up by six countries to resolve the Sino-Indian issue. Sri Lanka supported Red China's admission to the UN, just as India did.

Strong bilateral ties were a result of the close friendship between the then-prime ministers of India, Indira Gandhi, and Sri Lanka, Sirimavo Bandaranaike. Armed troops from India assisted in quelling a Communist uprising against the Sri Lankan government in 1971. However, the issue of the Tamils of Sri Lanka, who made up close to 30% of the population, caused more major issues and severely strained ties between the two republics. The Anglo-US imperialists and their Pakistani operatives were attempting to create a rift between the Sinhalese and the Tamil. According to reports, the US has set up shop at the strategic Trincomalese port, seriously endangering India's security. Additionally, Sri Lanka established ties with Israel and was actively supported by its foreign sponsors in its barbaric game to exterminate the Tamil community in the island's northern regions. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, the prime minister of Sri Lanka, traveled to India in October 1964. On October 24, 1964, Mrs. Bandaranaike and Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri inked an accord after protracted diplomatic discussions. Both presidents tried to find a solution to Sri Lanka's 9,75,000 stateless people. roughly 3,00,000 persons in Sri Lanka and roughly 5,25,000 people in India received citizenship as a result of this accord. It was expected that a decision would be made soon about the remaining 1,50,000 stateless people. A new agreement was signed between these two leaders when Sirimavo Bandaranaike visited India in January 1974 while serving in her second term and discussed the remaining stateless people with her Indian counterpart, Indira Gandhi. Half of the people obtained Indian citizenship, and the remaining individuals received Sri Lankan citizenship. This problem of statelessness was thus attempted to be resolved amicably.

Due to this issue, Colombo had been carelessly charging New Delhi of supporting the Tamil terrorists who were at the time calling for an independent Tamil state. The Sri Lankan government could not stop the island from being divided unless it met the Tamils' justifiable demands, upheld their human rights, and granted autonomy to the regions they resided within the framework of Sri Lankan federalism. Naturally, New Delhi had to keep an eye out for the Sri Lankan government's attempts to use the Anglo-US-Israel-Pakistan axis to mortgage the island and would have to choose when to defend the island by acting bravely[3]–[5].

The centrality of India in Sri Lanka's foreign relations matrix is widely accepted within the Sri Lankan politics. The Sri Lanka Freedom Party and the United Nationalist Party, two of the country's main political parties, have both contributed to the fast growth of bilateral relations over the last 10 years. Sri Lanka has backed India's bid for a seat on the UN Security Council's permanent membership. India and Sri Lanka just recently began working together economically. Due to the fact that both states are significant tea exporters, their relationship was formerly seen as competitive. Since India provided Sri Lanka with a loan of Rs. 2 crores

in 1966 so that it could purchase food from India, their economic ties have increased. Items including dried fish, textiles, and dried chillies were to be imported from India. In 1967, additional credit of "5 crores" was provided for the acquisition of electrical and communications equipment, railroad coaches and wagons, machineries and machine tools, and commercial vehicles, among other things.

While Sri Lanka only exported one crore of commodities to India in 1971, it purchased items from India worth 20 crores. Following Indira Gandhi's visit to the state in April 1973, the economic cooperation improved. India helped Sri Lanka with five different industries, including sheet glass, rubber-based products, graphite, refractory materials, and mica. For the following five years, India promised Sri Lankan project development an annual grant of Rs. 1 crore. India committed to give high-breed animals, equipment, and \$50,000 toward the construction of a center for raising cattle and sheep in Sri Lanka. India donated a shared facility for Sri Lanka's mica industry, which cost \$25 lakhs. Therefore, it was clear that India sought to encourage the development of new commercial ties and the diversification of Sri Lanka's economy. A contract for scientific and technological cooperation between the two nations was signed in 1975. The LTTE, also known as the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, is a separatist insurgent group, and it has been claimed that private companies in the Tamil Nadu government promoted financing and training for them.

Private organizations and factions of the Tamil Nadu government were suspected of promoting the financing and training of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, a separatist insurgent movement, throughout the 1970s and 1980s. India made the decision to intervene directly in the war in response to mounting resentment among Tamils living in the nation and a flood of refugees. After the Sri Lankan government attempted to retake control of northern Jaffna by military operations and an economic embargo, this incident occurred for the first time. India sent food and medical supplies through sea and air as help. Following further discussions, the two nations came to an agreement on a peace treaty that granted the Tamil provinces a certain amount of regional autonomy. The regional council was under the supervision of the Eelam People's Revolutionary Liberation Front, which also asked that militant Tamil factions put down their weapons. India then sent its IPKF peacekeeping force to Sri Lanka to oversee the regional council and assist disarmament.

The Tamil Tigers and other Tamil militant organizations were not involved in the deal's signing, which took place between the governments of Sri Lanka and India. The majority of Tamil militant groups approved the pact. In addition, the Eelam People's Revolutionary Liberation Front nominee for the position of Chief Administrative Officer of the combined Northern and Eastern provinces was opposed by the LTTE, who also rejected the agreement. The LTTE selected three other candidates in their place. India rejected the candidates that the LTTE had suggested. After that, the LTTE resisted giving the IPKF their weapons. Although there has long been hostility between the Tamil and Sinhalese populations in Sri Lanka, things really got out of hand in July 1983 when soldiers began ruthlessly killing Tamils in jails and other places. The government of Sri Lanka accused India of providing firearms training to Tamil terrorists in Indian territory during the early phases of the conflict between the Tamil and Sinhalese. It was clear that the continuous extermination of Tamils on the island would prompt Tamil Nadu and India to take decisive action, at the very least to prevent the present influx of Tamil refugees from the island from traveling to the mainland. India's involvement would be required to accomplish this, which would need to be avoided as much as possible. Rajiv Gandhi disallowed military participation in Sri Lanka on February 15, 1985. However, he sent Romesh Bhandari, the Indian Foreign Secretary, to Colombo as his special representative on March 24 in an effort to put an end to the ongoing ethnic bloodshed.

on the island. A solution would have been simple to find if Sri Lanka had quit taking part in anti-Indian positions at the behest of Britain, the United States, and Pakistan. Rajiv Gandhi, the prime minister of India, and Junius Richard Jayawardene, the president of Sri Lanka, agreed to a deal in July 1987 that would bring in a period of peace and prosperity. The new agreement avoided having the Tamils and the Jayawardene government directly negotiate. India was largely held accountable for the successful implementation and disarmament of the Tamil Tigers. The LTTE and other political factions in Sri Lanka once again resisted such an agreement.

As the IPKF was fully entangled in the war, the Indo-Sri Lankan Accord, which had previously alienated Sri Lankans by granting India a significant role, came under fire from nationalists. People in Sri Lanka objected to the IPKF's presence, and the country's recently elected president Ranasinghe Premadasa urged that it be removed. By March 1990, the project was finished. Rajiv Gandhi was murdered on May 21, 1992, and the LTTE was implicated in the crime. In 1992, India designated the LTTE as a terrorist organization. Since then, India has denounced Pakistan's military participation in the conflict, accusing it of providing weaponry and aiding Sri Lanka in choosing military action over political dialogue to resolve the civil war.

2. DISCUSSION

South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme, South Asian Economic Union, and Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation are just a few of the regional and multilateral organizations that India and Sri Lanka are members of. Since the signing and implementation of a bilateral free trade agreement in 2000, commerce between India and Sri Lanka increased in 2004 and tripled in 2006, reaching the \$2.6 billion level. With 3.6% of all exports from Sri Lanka, India is the country's fifth-largest export market. The South Asia Free Trade Agreement has been ratified by both nations. In order to enhance business investment and initiatives across a range of sectors, negotiations to widen the free trade agreement were made. It was projected that 2010, with Sri Lanka's exports to India rising by 45% in the first seven months, would be the biggest year for bilateral trade ever.

In Palk Bay, Indian fishermen have often come under fire. The Indian government has always placed a high priority on the problem of Indian fishermen's safety and has addressed it with the Sri Lankan government. There isn't currently a legitimate Indian fisherman being held by Sri Lanka. Concerning Indian fishermen who transgress into Sri Lankan territorial seas, a Joint Working Group has been established. On January 12, 2011, India formally denounced the Sri Lankan Navy for allegedly taking part in assaults on Indian fishermen. In Sri Lanka, India is involved in a variety of development initiatives. Sri Lanka receives around one-sixth of the entire amount of development credit provided by the Government of India [6], [7].

Under the "Aid to Sri Lanka" funds, a number of development projects are being carried out, including: Small development projects: An MoU on Cooperation in Small Development Projects had been signed between India and Sri Lanka, covering initiatives to provide fishing equipment to the fishermen in the East of Sri Lanka and solar energy-aided computer education in 25 rural schools. Health initiatives: India has sent ambulances as well as medical equipment to hospitals in Sri Lanka. Additionally, aid has been provided for 1,500 people's cataract surgery programs. Education-related projects: Computer laboratories have been set up for pupils, schools and other educational facilities have been rebuilt, and instructors have received training. Relations between India and Sri Lanka have changed both qualitatively and quantitatively in recent years. Along with greater defense cooperation, both nations also have

strong political relations in terms of commerce, investments, and infrastructure connections. Following the tsunami in December 2004, India was the first nation to react to Sri Lanka's appeal for aid. During the situation in Lebanon, India assisted in the evacuation of 430 Sri Lankan people, first through Indian Navy ships to Cyprus, then via special Air India aircraft to New Delhi and ultimately Colombo.

For years, Sri Lanka has been a top choice for Indian direct investment. In SAARC, Sri Lanka ranks as India's second-largest commercial partner. India is Sri Lanka's top international trading partner. After the India-Sri Lanka Free Trade Agreement went into effect in March 2000, trade between the two nations increased very quickly. According to Sri Lankan Customs, bilateral commerce reached US \$ 4.6 billion in 2014, up by 23.37% from 2013. In 2014, India exported US\$ 3977 million to Sri Lanka, while Sri Lanka exported US\$ 625 million to India. With cumulative investments totaling more than US\$ 1 billion since 2003, India is one of the top four foreign investors in Sri Lanka. The interests span a variety of sectors, including metals, tires, cement, glass manufacture, IT, financial services, real estate, telecommunications, hospitality & tourism, banking, and infrastructure development.

New investments from Indian corporations are either in the works or have already begun. None of these include the plans put up by Shree Renuka Sugar to build a sugar refinery in Hambantota, South City, Kolkata for the growth of Colombo's real estate market, the Tata Housing Slave Island growth project in collaboration with the Urban Development Authority of Sri Lanka, or the ITC Ltd.'s "Colombo One" project. In May 2013, Dabur already had a factory producing fruit juice up and running. On the other side, there has been a rising trend of Sri Lankan investments in India during the last several years. Among notable instances are Brandix, MAS holdings, John Keels, Hayleys, and Aitken Spence, in addition to other investments in the logistics and freight service industry.

Bhutan-India Relations

Before 1947, the Buddhist kingdom of Bhutan enjoyed a cordial but discretely distant relationship with British-India. Initial worries about the People's Republic of China's annexation of Tibet in 1950–1951 surfaced in New Delhi and Thimphu, the capital of Bhutan. India started giving Bhutan a significant amount of foreign assistance in the late 1960s. Bhutan received extensive military aid from India in 1962–1963, during the Sino-Indian War. Both countries have been maintaining friendly relations, and Bhutan fully supports India on all political, diplomatic, and economic fronts. Bhutan's admittance to the United Nations was sponsored by India, and India also assisted Bhutan in gaining membership to a number of other international organizations. Bhutan and India are closely related historically and culturally. Even though Bhutan is a tiny landlocked nation and India is a major state, both nations enjoy cordial political and economic ties. In reality, Guru Padma Sambhava and several other Buddhist instructors traveled from India to Bhutan in the eighth century, establishing the first links between the two countries. Their biographies are a goldmine of information about Bhutan's past.

The pact of Sinchula, which was signed by the two nations in 1865, was their first significant pact. It spoke of an ongoing state of peace between the two nations. Bhutan's monarchy was established in 1909, and British India at that time acknowledged it. Bhutan's foreign policy was thereafter placed under the control of the Government of British India by the Treaty of Punakha in 1910. However, the same treaty also stipulated that no foreign forces would meddle in Bhutan's domestic affairs. The pact of 1949 was built on the framework of the two aforementioned accords. In accordance with Article 2 of the Indo-Bhutan Treaty, Bhutan must consult India while managing its foreign policy but is free to accept or reject this advise.

Even today, this treaty provides the fundamental basis for bilateral interactions between the two countries, and as such, it has never caused friction in their historically cordial and amicable relationship.

After India achieved its freedom, relations between the two nations became closer. The third monarch of Bhutan, Jigme Dorji Wangchuck, paid a visit to India in 1954, and Jawaharlal Nehru paid a visit to Bhutan in 1958. The momentous visit by Nehru changed the course of ties between India and Bhutan. Since China claimed 2200 square miles of Bhutanese land during the years 1958–1959, Nehru made the definitive statement in the Parliament that any attack on Bhutan would be seen as an attack on India. India also guaranteed Bhutan's security even though the Treaty of 1949 lacked a defense clause.

In 1949, the two nations agreed to a Friendship Treaty, which stated that India would support Bhutan's diplomatic efforts. The Indo-Bhutan Friendship Treaty was once again significantly updated on February 8, 2007, by Bhutanese King Jigme Wangchuck. "The Government of India undertakes to exercise no interference in the internal administration of Bhutan," stated Article 2 of the Treaty. In regards to its foreign relations, the Government of Bhutan accepts to follow the guidance of the Government of India. The new treaty now states that the governments of the Kingdom of Bhutan and the Republic of India "shall cooperate closely with each other on matters relating to their respective national interests." This is in line with the two countries' longstanding strong friendship and collaboration. Neither government should permit actions that might be detrimental to the other's national security or interests to take place on its territory. The preamble to the new treaty, which was omitted from the original version, read: "Reaffirming their respect for each other's independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity." As a result, Bhutan's standing as an independent and sovereign country is strengthened by the Indo-Bhutan Friendship Treaty of 2007[8]–[10].

The establishment of a permanent envoy in Thimphu in 1968 marked the beginning of diplomatic relations between India and Bhutan. Before this, the political officer in Sikkim was in charge of maintaining India's relations with Bhutan. The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, which was amended and signed in February 2007, serves as the fundamental tenet of bilateral relations between India and Bhutan.

Bhutan's first start on an international trip was its involvement in the Colombo Plan, which was funded by India in 1963. Bhutan's admission to the Universal Postal Union was supported by India later in 1969. With strong support from India, Bhutan was admitted to the UN in 1971, and in 1985 it joined the SAARC. India made it clear by its aid that Bhutan's desire for a global role does not conflict with the provisions of Article 2 of the Treaty of 1949. There is a full free trade agreement between India and Bhutan. The largest market for Bhutanese goods has been India. Almost 94% of all Bhutanese exports go to India, while 78% of all imports come from that country.

Bhutan did neither import or export to other countries prior to the 1970s. The 1972 trade agreement between India and Bhutan is up for renewal every 10 years. Bhutan, a landlocked and least developed nation, completely relies on foreign funding to pay for its development program and startup expenses. India has provided Bhutan with the most foreign assistance. Tata Power constructed a hydroelectric project in Bhutan with the intention of boosting the country's economy by creating jobs and meeting India's rising energy demands. The Indian government is now participating in several Bhutanese projects, such as those involving hydroelectric dams, the cement industry, highways, etc. Bhutan sells power to India for 40% of its foreign exchange earnings.

The Penden Cement Project was entirely financed by India and built for NU 142 million. Chukkha Hydroelectricity Project: In 1991, India turned over control of this project to the government of Bhutan. Paro Airport: India helped build Bhutan's sole airport, Paro, with financial and technical support. The Tala Hydroelectric Project was sponsored by India with a 60% grant and a 40% loan with a 9% interest rate. The generating plant for this project is supplied by the Indian company BHEL. India is the funding source for the Kurichhu Hydroelectric Project, while the NHPC of India is the turnkey contractor. A joint venture between ACC India Ltd. and the Royal Government of Bhutan, the Dunsam Cement Plant is planned to manufacture 5,000 tons of cement annually. Highways & Roads: In 1961, the Border Roads Organization of India launched the Dantak project in Bhutan. Under this project, all of Bhutan's main thoroughfares, helipads, and 15,000 kilometers of roads into challenging mountainous terrain were constructed. About 50 Bhutanese students get scholarships from the Indian government each year to attend different Indian colleges. Bhutan receives technical assistance from India in a variety of sectors. The only degree-granting institution in Bhutan that is connected with the University of Delhi is Sherubtse College. Also employed at this institution are several Indian instructors.

3. CONCLUSION

Economic accords have enabled trade and investment, fostering the growth and prosperity of both countries. Cultural exchanges and other people-to-people projects have boosted ties between India and Sri Lanka, building understanding and long-lasting relationships. Since both countries now value security cooperation and sustainable resource management in the Indian Ocean area, the maritime sector has grown in importance. These initiatives strengthen India and Sri Lanka's common interests while also promoting regional stability. In conclusion, the accords and pacts between India and Sri Lanka serve as an example of how complicated and dynamic their relationship is. While obstacles still exist, diplomatic efforts and a dedication to common objectives continue to influence their engagement's course. India and Sri Lanka may use their alliance for mutual advantage, regional stability, and the development of their peoples through adopting discussion, cooperation, and dispute resolution methods.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Anoma Abhyaratne and S. Varma, "IMPACT OF FTAs ON TRADE FLOWS: A STUDY OF THE INDIA – SRI LANKA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (ISLFTA)," *J. Bus. Thought*, 2017.
- [2] Y. Osanai *et al.*, "UHT granulites of the Highland Complex, Sri Lanka I: Geological and petrological background," *J. Mineral. Petrol. Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.2465/jmps.151227.
- [3] M. Siriwardana, "An Analysis of the Impact of Indo-Lanka Free Trade Agreement and Its Implications for Free Trade in South Asia," *J. Econ. Integr.*, 2004, doi: 10.11130/jei.2004.19.3.568.
- [4] C. Jayasumana, S. Gunatilake, and P. Senanayake, "Glyphosate, hard water and nephrotoxic metals: Are they the culprits behind the epidemic of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in Sri Lanka?," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2014, doi: 10.3390/ijerph110202125.

- [5] C. Sikdar, "Impact of Sri Lanka's free trade agreement with China on India," *Int. J. Econ. Policy Emerg. Econ.*, 2017, doi: 10.1504/IJEPEE.2017.089160.
- [6] S. Lanka and S. Lanka, "Agreement Between Sri Lanka and India on the Bound Ary in Historic Waters Between the Two Countries and Related Matters," *United Nations - Treaty Ser.*, 2017.
- [7] R. Jenkins *et al.*, "International migration of doctors, and its impact on availability of psychiatrists in low and middle income countries," *PLoS One*, 2010, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0009049.
- [8] M. S. S. Perera, "Impact of the Indo-Sri Lanka free trade agreement on the Sri Lankan economy: A computable general equilibrium analysis," *South Asia Econ. J.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/139156140700900101.
- [9] T. L. Gunaruwan and K. A. I. De Alwis, "Indo – Sri Lanka free trade agreement: a critical appraisal of influence on trade between two countries," *Sri Lanka J. Econ. Res.*, 2014, doi: 10.4038/sljer.v2i2.89.
- [10] S. Abeyratne, "Integration of Sri Lanka into Indian Supply Chains under the Bilateral Free Trade Agreement," *South Asia Econ. J.*, 2013, doi: 10.1177/1391561413500176.

CHAPTER 12

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIA-NEPAL AND THE MAOIST INSURGENCY

Shailee Sharma, Assistant Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- shailee.sharma@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The relationship between India and Nepal has been intricately intertwined with the Maoist insurgency that plagued Nepal for over a decade. This paper explores the historical context, motivations, and implications of India's involvement in Nepal's Maoist insurgency. By analyzing the complexities of this relationship, including support, mediation efforts, and security concerns, the study sheds light on the intricate interplay of internal conflicts and external influences in shaping bilateral ties. The Maoist insurgency in Nepal marked a critical juncture in the India-Nepal relationship, revealing the intricate interplay between internal conflicts, geopolitical dynamics, and regional stability. India's historical ties to Nepal and the open border between the two nations created an environment where the insurgency's spillover effect was a legitimate concern. India's involvement in Nepal's Maoist insurgency was multifaceted. While some segments of the Indian establishment were supportive of the insurgency's goals of democratization and inclusion, the broader aim was to prevent instability from spilling across the border.

KEYWORDS:

Border Security, Conflict Resolution, Counterinsurgency, Diplomatic Relations, Geopolitics, Peace Accords.

1. INTRODUCTION

The boundary between India and Bhutan is marked by a zigzag territorial demarcation that spans more than 200 kilometers, and terrorists may simply sneak through the passes to the Indian districts of Kokrajhar, Bongaigaon, Barpeta, and Nalbari. three militant organizations, i.e. From their strongholds within Bhutan, the United Liberation Front of Assam, National Democratic Front of Bodoland, and Kamtapuri Liberation Organization battle the Indian Security Forces. For over ten years, these rebel factions have agitated for their own independence and breakaway from India.

In reality, India has insisted time and time again that a combined army operation between Bhutan and India be launched against these extremists. Bhutan seems to be wary of taking such action, however, for fear that the militants would retaliate against the innocent residents of Bhutan who live in the 304 villages that are close to the insurgent camps. Bhutan has also attempted to engage these terrorist organizations in peaceful dialogue in the meantime. The announcement that the rebel groups had not responded to calls for new departure negotiations during the previous two years was made by the Bhutanese Home Minister in July 2003. To resolve the issue of their peaceful departure from the forcefully seized portions of Bhutan, the Royal government of Bhutan issued new formal invitations to the three Indian separatist rebel organizations for discussions in Thimphu[1], [2].

The National Assembly of Bhutan decided in August 2003 to make one more effort at diplomacy to persuade the separatist leaders to dismantle their camps in order to avoid military action. However, when the militants were unable to destroy their facilities, Jigme

Singye Wangchuk, the Bhutanese ruler, issued orders to expel the rebels from the Himalayan Kingdom. The ULFA base at Phukatong was taken over by the Bhutanese army. The Bhutanese government refused the ULFA's offer of a cease-fire, therefore all of the militants were caught and eventually turned over to India. The ULFA had no other option. Bhutan's initiative has been recognized as a regional cooperation model that other countries need to support.

In September 2003, Wangchuk, the King of Bhutan, traveled to India. On September 15, 2003, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed for a thorough project assessment on the 870 MW Punatsangchu Hydroelectric Project. Additionally, discussions on the issue of rebels and their anti-Indian activities were undertaken. The geostrategic significance of Bhutan has, nevertheless, made the relations between the two nations important. Without a doubt, the security requirements form the basis of this strong connection. As a result, we may conclude that Indo-Bhutan relations have not been static and have benefited both nations' shared interests.

The Amochu reservoir, KuriGongri, Chamkarchhu, and Kholongchhu hydropower projects are preparing for thorough project studies as a result of the four most recent agreements that have been completed. In addition, talks are ongoing for a Sankosh plant with a capacity of 4,000 MW.

A significant information technology project totaling 205 crores has been agreed upon between India and Bhutan. Numerous government employees, educators, businesses, and youngsters from remote areas will get computer training as part of this effort. India would create a sizable undergraduate medical school, and other agreements would include the management of illegal drug trafficking. King Wangchuck was persuaded during talks by Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh that India wants Bhutan's democratic experiment to be successful.

Despite the fact that India and other nations like the US and Britain would want to abolish monarchy in Bhutan, the people of Bhutan are highly loyal to the King and are happy under his leadership. It is thought that Bhutan ought to be a part of India since it is fully reliant on India for access to the sea and is bordered by it on three sides. Bhutan and China share borders, but India argues that Bhutan cannot adopt a pro-China stance. Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh expressed interest in working with Bhutan on security and defense during his conversations with King Jigme Wangchuck.

Bhutan's external relations are governed by India according to a 1949 pact between the two nations. Article 2 of the treaty stipulates that Bhutan must follow India's guidance when managing its foreign affairs, while Article 6 forbids Bhutan from bringing in weapons, ammunition, machinery, warlike supplies, or stockpiles without India's aid and consent. Even though there have been several analyses and debates of this agreement, Bhutan is still unable to develop its own autonomous policy. It is not enough to just amend the terms of the 1949 treaty; India must acknowledge Bhutan as a sovereign state. The King of Bhutan, not the Indian government, should decide whether to buy deadly or non-lethal weaponry. Ironically, Bhutan may only purchase non-lethal military supplies and equipment, while New Delhi must approve the purchase of other types[3]–[5].

Bhutan has to start making its own choices and get the same treatment as other nations of the globe. Joining SAARC at this time will help bring South Asian countries closer together. The historically distinct bilateral relationships, which are defined by trust and understanding, have become better through time. Today, there is a lot of collaboration in the area of economic growth, particularly in the hydropower industry, which benefits both parties.

Distinguished Visits

The custom of frequent visits and broad exchanges of views at the highest levels between the two nations has preserved this particular connection. His Majesty Jigme Khesar Namgyal Wangchuck, the King of Bhutan, visited India in 2013 as the Chief Guest for the 64th Republic Day festivities, which was preceded by EAM, Shri Salman Khurshid's trip to Bhutan. From January 6–10, 2014, His Majesty the King and Her Majesty the Queen undertook an official visit to India at the request of the Indian President. Their Majesties thanked the President for inviting them to be the first visitors to the Rashtrapati Bhawan's newly renovated guest wing. From August 30 to September 4, 2013, Lyonchhen Tshering Tobgay traveled to India for the first time since becoming prime minister. It was his first trip there on business. He was joined by several top RGOB officials, including the Foreign Minister and his wife. The President, Vice President, Prime Minister, as well as other ministers and dignitaries, met with PMTT. A support package from the GOI for Bhutan's 11th Five Year Plan was decided upon during the visit. During his tour to India, PMTT also went to Hyderabad.

Nepal-India Relations

In the Himalayas, the Kingdom of Nepal is positioned halfway between China and India. It is a feudal state, and there are several issues across the nation. Up until 1950, the Rana family's hereditary Prime Ministers presided over the Kingdom, and the development of the nation was disregarded. There were rebellions against the Ranas in 1950 and 1951. India assisted King Tribhuvan Bir Vikram Shah in seizing control of the government. After his death in 1955, Crown Prince Mahendra succeeded him. King Mahendra disbanded the B-led cabinet in 1960. Koirala, P. Concerned about the events in Nepal, the Indian government voiced its worry. The Nepalese government charged India of inciting unrest there. As a result, the relationships between the two nations deteriorated. Relations with Nepal were not given much weight in India's foreign policy during the early years of its independence. Two things were to blame for India's lack of involvement in Nepal.

India was fatalistically certain in its relationship with Nepal. The physical, historical, and cultural connections between India and Nepal were seen as the strong foundations on which the two nations were destined to preserve and strengthen their relations. India became complacent about its relations with Nepal as a result of Nepal's perception that its foreign policy must continue to focus on its interests as being reliant upon relationships with India.

India's excessive participation in world issues has the effect of almost neglecting its ties with its minor neighbors, including Nepal. Friendship between Nepal and India was seen as essential to its historical development. However, Nepal found this approach to be unsatisfactory. Due to a lack of other options, it first accepted the role. But later, when China began to assert itself as a significant player in international affairs, Nepal had no qualms in attempting to win China's friendship and cooperation. Then, in order to protect its own security and other interests, it decided to disregard India's worries and interests[6], [7].

As a result, we may infer that India was partially to blame for Nepal's search for an alternative to India due to its lack of interest in Nepal. In contrast, the absence of Indian effort in this area during the period 1947–1955, had a negative impact on Indo–Nepal ties. India thereafter had to be satisfied with limited success in its efforts to restore the damage. The view of the theory for India's unique relations with Nepal dictated Indian foreign policy. On December 6, 1950, Indian Prime Minister Nehru said in the Parliament, "We acknowledge Nepal as an independent nation and wish her well. However, even a little kid is aware that India is a necessary stopover on the way to Nepal. No other nation can thus have the same

close ties to Nepal as we have. We want every other nation to recognize how closely related India and Nepal are geographically and culturally. Nepal saw such an Indian viewpoint as an effort to have a "big brotherly attitude toward Nepal." Although it agreed to the terms of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship with India, it was apprehensive. Therefore, it was only natural that Nepal would forge relationships with China and try to strike a balance between India and China when there were significant tensions and conflicts in ties between China and India. After 1960, this shift in Nepalese mentality became very apparent, putting pressure on relations between India and Nepal. India made an effort to change its stance toward Nepal by adopting an appeasement policy, but the damage was not remedied. Even Nepal was urged to utilize China to influence India's desired policy choices. As a result, the "special relations with Nepal" idea turned out to be detrimental to Indo-Nepal relations.

India and Nepal have tight relationships, but they are also complicated by issues related to geography, the economy, large power vs little power issues, and shared ethnic and linguistic identities that cross the boundaries of the two countries. With the Treaty of Peace and Friendship and accompanying letters, which established security ties between the two governments and an arrangement that regulates both bilateral commerce and trade passing through Indian land, New Delhi and Kathmandu began their entwined connection in 1950. The 1950 Treaty and related letters required both parties to "inform each other of any serious friction or misunderstanding with any neighboring state likely to cause any breach in the friendly relations currently subsisting between the two governments" and stated that "neither government shall tolerate any threat to the security of the other by a foreign aggressor." These agreements established a "special relationship" between the two nations, giving Nepal preferential status economically and giving Nepalese in India the same access to employment and higher education as Indian residents.

Soon after China became a communist nation in 1949, this change started taking efforts to expand its authority and influence. It wasted little time in annexing Tibet and making an effort to strengthen its position in Asia. India was concerned about the developments. On the one hand, it set out to forge ties of friendship with China, and on the other, it made the choice to include the Himalayan monarchy in her circle of friends. In the 1950s, India made diplomatic efforts to halt the spread of Chinese influence in Nepal while also highlighting its deep historical and cultural ties to the country. To protect its security and other interests, the Himalayan monarchy felt the need to forge relationships with both China and India. The Indo-Nepal relationship is still significantly influenced by the China factor. Right now, it looks that democratic Nepal is more disposed to support the idea of cordial cooperation with India. However, in the past, the China factor unquestionably slowed down the growth of India and Nepal's collaboration. T. P. Acharya, the prime minister of Nepal, was unmistakably pro-Chinese. He said that Nepal would be happy to serve as a conduit between China and India when he visited India in 1956. Following Acharya's trip to China in 1956, Chou En-Lai, the premier of China, paid a visit to Nepal in January 1957. He explained to the Nepalese people that the Chinese and the Nepalese had a common ancestry. Perhaps the Chinese Premier wanted to connect China with Sikkim, Nepal, and Bhutan. The relationship between India and Nepal deteriorated when Acharya started to speak in Chou's language at international venues. He also commanded India to promote Nepalese nationalism in its own self-interest [8]–[10].

In 1956, Nepal was visited by Indian President Dr. Rajendra Prasad. He gave the Nepalese people assurances during his visit that neither India nor any of its territories has any plans to meddle in Nepal's internal affairs. In 1957, Dr. K. I. Singh was appointed prime minister of Nepal. While the media in Nepal prevented him from reversing the anti-India tone of his

predecessor, his policy was unmistakably pro-India. B. In an effort to strengthen connections between Nepal and China, P. Koirala, who took office as prime minister of Nepal in 1959, made an agreement with China about Mount Everest, which received harsh criticism from the Indian media. King Mahendra removed Koirala from office, and several Nepali Congress leaders were detained; others escaped to India. India was accused by the King of fostering anti-Nepal protests, further deteriorating relations between the two nations.

It is undisputed that the Kingdom had a difficult century. In previous ages, its isolation had been a benefit but was now a drawback. Due to its geographical isolation, Nepal has been deprived of the majority of the advantages of modernity and economic integration. This solitude has, at least in part, been brought on by me. India is to the south of it, where it has all of its natural markets. The Nepalese aristocracy has seen closer economic ties with India as the main danger to their independence ever since the reign of King Mahendra, the father of King Birendra. Due to this, manufactured items from Nepal entirely replaced Indian products on the Indian market. As a consequence, Nepal was unable to industrialize and generate employment outside of the conventional economic sector by taking advantage of the developing industrial markets to the south. As a result, even by the standards of a destitute subcontinent, Nepal has remained poor. Massive levels of unemployment have been achieved, and young people, who face an uncertain future, have become dangerously irrational. India provided assistance to Nepal in building the airport in Kathmandu for the Kingdom. India has constructed Simra's fine weather airport in addition to three all-weather airports at Bhairava, Janakpur, and Biratnagar. China, however, had by this point started to play a significant role in Nepal's political and economic relations. The choice of Nepal will be impartial between India and China, King Mahendra reiterated.

Due to misunderstandings that arose in the 1960s as a result of a variety of problems, ties between India and Nepal have not always been friendly. In an effort to clear up these misconceptions, Sardar Swaran Singh traveled to Nepal in 1964, and as a result, the two countries signed an agreement. When the transit deal expired in March 1989, the King, who was up against severe resistance from various political groupings to restore democracy, blamed India in an effort to distract public attention. However, under the leadership of Krishna Prasad Bhattarai, Nepal became a constitutional monarchy, and relations with India returned to their pre-revolutionary state. Recently, Nepal's monarchy was replaced with a republican, democratic state.

Nepal initially embraced tight ties with India in the 1950s, but as the number of Nepalese living and working there rose and India's economic influence grew in the 1960s and beyond, so did Nepalese discontent with the special relationship. When Nepal pushed for significant changes to the commerce and transit pact in its favor and publicly opposed India's 1975 acquisition of Sikkim, which was seen as part of Greater Nepal, tensions began to rise in the mid-1970s. In 1975, King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev urged that Nepal be acknowledged as a zone of peace on a global scale; China and Pakistan backed him in this. According to New Delhi, if the king's plan did not violate the terms of the 1950 treaty, an extension of non-alignment, it was unnecessary; if it was a rejection of the unique relationship, it may pose a danger to India's security and could not be supported. Nepal renewed the suggestion in 1984, but India made no comment. In 1990, 112 nations had endorsed the plan thanks to Nepal's persistent promotion of it in international fora.

The installation of King Birendra took place in February 1975. He supported the notion of Nepal being recognized as a "Zone of Peace." This idea would have guaranteed Nepal's security and neutrality if it had been approved by major powers and neighbors. King Birendra reaffirmed this request in 1980 in New Delhi at a formal event for the Zone of Peace. The

notion of Nepal as a Zone of Peace was aggressively promoted by the Nepalese diplomats, and it was publicly stated in 1985 that up to 58 nations had endorsed it. The Super Power Soviet Union and Nepal's two neighbors, India and Bhutan, did not advance, nevertheless. India disagreed because it thought the argument's main point was undoubtedly counterproductive to its interests.

In response to a persistent demand from Nepal, India agreed to separate trade and transit treaties in 1978. When the two treaties came due for renewal in 1988, India called for a single commerce and transit pact as a result of Nepal's failure to comply with its demands. Following it, Nepal adopted a hardline stance that caused a significant crisis in ties between India and Nepal. The two accords came to an end on March 23, 1989, after two extensions, leading to a virtual Indian economic embargo of Nepal that lasted until late April 1990. Although economic concerns played a significant part in the conflict between the two nations, Indian discontent over Nepal's 1988 purchase of Chinese weapons also had a significant impact. Treaties and letters that were signed between India and Nepal in 1959 and 1965 placed Nepal in India's security zone and prohibited the acquisition of weaponry without India's consent. India emphasized on evaluating India-Nepal ties as a whole and connected security with economic connections. Worsening economic situations caused Nepal to modify its political structure, forcing the monarch to enact a parliamentary democracy. As a result, Nepal was obliged to back down. The new administration aimed to quickly mend friendly ties with India.

2. DISCUSSION

The goal of forging closer relations with democratic India has gained momentum as a result of Nepal's democratic process operating systematically in the 1990s. As a result, both India and Nepal have been working to establish cordial, amicable, and highly cooperative connections between their two nations. Unfortunately, the history of friendship between India and Nepal has been rather easy. Particularly between 1962 and 1990, numerous irritants prohibited the two nations from establishing close-knit relations. Their interactions were typically kind and cooperative, but neither seamless nor especially so. There were ups and downs throughout these. Relationships between India and Nepal were strained by the Nepalese desire to be recognized as a zone of peace, trade and transit agreements, and contacts with China.

Girja Prasad Koirala took office as Nepal's prime minister in May 1991. During his visit to India, Koirala gave the Indian government assurances about his nation's assistance. The connection between India and Nepal was further cemented when India included the Nepali language to the 8th schedule of the Indian Constitution in August 1992. In spite of India's greatest attempts, the Nepalese did not cooperate in order to improve ties with India. The purchase of anti-aircraft weaponry by Nepal from China in 1987–1988 angered India since it showed that the Chinese had not only gained political access to the palace but were also prepared to play by their rules. Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister, as a result of this, used some economic pressure. In Nepal, where friendly relations with China were being developed, there was a strong anti-India sentiment. But in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, relations between India and the Himalayan Kingdom were at an all-time high.

India quickly stepped forward to offer full cooperation to the new democratic government after the Nepalese people were successful in overthrowing the monarchical authoritarian system, which had been operating under the guise of a Panchayat System. This adjustment drew India and Nepal closer together. However, Nepal's communists continued to refer to India as a "big brother" both while they were in power and when they were in opposition. The

result was a gradual and uneven growth in Indo-Nepalese relations. Thankfully, India and Nepal have been effectively fostering their relations since 1996 in order to achieve the ultimate goal of establishing a high level of bilateral, sub-regional, and regional cooperation. This fresh attitude, methodology, and dedication are evident in the River Mahakali and Power Sharing Agreement. The process of fostering Indo-Nepalese cordial collaboration in all areas of bilateral ties has been greatly aided by India's *Gujral Doctrine*. When Nepal's Prime Minister Krishna Prasad Bhattarai and India's Prime Minister V.P. Singh met in New Delhi in June 1990, the special security partnership between New Delhi and Kathmandu was once again formed. Nepal and India inked new, independent trade and transit treaties as well as other economic agreements during the visit of Nepalese Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala to India in December 1991. These accords were made to provide Nepal more advantages economically.

When Nepal's Prime Minister, Manmohan Adhikary, visited New Delhi in April 1995 and insisted on a significant revision of the 1950 Peace and Friendship Treaty, it looked that Indian-Nepalese ties were undergoing yet another reevaluation. Adhikary wanted to strengthen connections with China while also pursuing more economic independence for his landlocked country in response to his Indian hosts' conciliatory remarks about the pact. The signing of the "Treaty for Integrated Development of Mahakali Basin" by the Prime Ministers of India and Nepal on February 6, 1996, marked a turning point in bilateral relations. It became known as the Mahakali Rivers Treaty in the public eye. This pact contained a commitment to establish and build the Sarada and Tanakpur barrages as well as the massive 2,000 MW Pancheshwar Hydroelectric Project during an eight-year period. According to an equal cost-sharing arrangement, India and Nepal were to put up the Pancheshwar Hydel Power Project together. The Tanakpur Barrage was to provide Nepal with 70 million kilowatts of uninterrupted, free electricity yearly, as well as 1,000 cusecs of water during the monsoons and 300 cusecs of water during the lean season. The establishment of the Mahakali River Commission, whose duties included overseeing, coordinating, and inspecting the agreement's performance, was approved by both governments. It was given the authority to provide solutions for any issues that could come up during the implementation of the agreement. Along with the Mahakali deal, a linked agreement for the building of 22 bridges in the Kohalpur-Mahakali region of Nepal was also signed.

Since 1996, their relationships have significantly improved, and the people and leaders of the two nations are ready to not only maintain the trend but also to broaden and deepen it. The only way for Nepal to survive is to use its enormous power potential, and India's development goals need the availability of electricity. Both nations stand to benefit significantly from the strengthening of their relations, which by itself may assist them in addressing issues like as poverty, illiteracy, poor health, and other socioeconomic necessities. Both countries should now confidently go down the path to growth via partnership. To restrict the anti-Indian actions of Pakistan's ISI, smugglers, and drug dealers on the Nepalese side, Nepal must take prompt and required action. India must continue to maintain a policy of good neighborliness with all of its neighbors, but especially with Nepal because it is the nation closest to India and because there are no significant issues between the two that cannot be resolved through negotiations based on mutual trust, maturity, and openness.

On June 1, 2001, Nepal saw a tragedy of unfathomable proportions when Dipendra, the country's 29-year-old crown prince, went on the rampage at Kathmandu's Narayanhiti Palace and massacred the entire royal family. Then, it seems, he committed suicide. The Indian administration said that it had no desire to take a proactive role in Nepal's perplexing situation, calling it tense and complicated. In India, there was worry that suspicions

surrounding Gyanendra's rise to power may upset the fragile balance between the monarchy and party politics, particularly in light of the Maoist uprising. After King Gyanendra assumed power in 2005, ties between Nepal and India deteriorated. However, Nepal's Prime Minister Prachanda visited India in September 2008 after the return of democracy in that country in 2008. He spoke of a fresh beginning for the bilateral ties between the two nations. "I am going back to Nepal as a satisfied person," he said. I'll announce the start of a new era to Nepalis back home. The time has arrived to implement a radical shift in bilateral ties. He met with the foreign minister and prime minister of India, Pranab Mukherjee and Manmohan Singh. "On behalf of the new government, I assure you that we are committed to make a fresh start," he said. He urged India to support Nepal's efforts to draft a new constitution and to make investments in the country's infrastructure and tourist sector.

An agreement to restart water negotiations after a 4-year break gave Indo-Nepalese relations an additional boost in 2008. Shanker Prasad Koirala, the secretary for water resources in Nepal, said that the Nepal-India Joint Committee on Water Resources Meeting resolved to begin rebuilding the Kosi embankment when the water level recedes. The two Prime Ministers expressed their delight with the long-standing close, friendly, and broad links between their states during the September visit of the Nepali Prime Minister to New Delhi. They also pledged their support and collaboration for further solidifying the relationship.

Additionally, a three-tier structure at the ministerial, secretary, and technical levels will be developed to advance negotiations between the two parties on the development of water resources. Politically, India expressed its readiness to support initiatives aimed at bringing about peace in Nepal. Prachanda, the prime minister of Nepal, received a commitment from Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee that he will "extend all possible help for peace and development. Due to a sequence that implied Gautama Buddha was born in India, the Bollywood movie *Chandni Chowk to China* was banned in Nepal in 2008. All Indian films should be commercially boycotted, several demonstrators said.

India had issues with several of its neighbors on the eve of the new century. Till the end of the 1980s, Afghanistan was a nation with which it maintained cordial ties despite the Taliban dictatorship that was in power there at the time. It had a protracted disagreement with Pakistan over Jammu and Kashmir and was subject to cross-border incursions by Islamic terrorists headquartered in Pakistan. Taliban were among the militants. The hijacking of an Indian Airlines plane from Nepal was a significant setback for its security objectives. Pakistan, which believed its "strategic depth" had improved in regard to India, had tense relations with the Taliban. Since there were still border disputes in the Northeast and the Aksai Chin region of Ladakh in Kashmir, Sino-Indian ties had not yet returned to normal.

India was shocked by the Nepalese hijacking event. India had expected that the sole Hindu monarchy in the world's territory would stay in friendly hands; unfortunately, it was exploited to carry out a terrorist assault against the aircraft of the nation with the highest concentration of Hindus. The Taliban declared Israel, the US, and India to be mutual enemies. Pakistan joined the US in its fight against the Taliban and offered crucial assistance. The US and India had forged a strategic alliance. The US helped Nepal with its armament needs as the Maoist insurgency grew. India did not object as it had when Nepal bought weapons in 1988. Nepal's strategic significance in the area rose when its close neighbors, India, China, and Pakistan, a fellow SAARC member and part of the same subcontinent, all become nuclear powers. This is particularly relevant given that South Asia is anticipated to have a high conflict potential region in the near future owing to the availability of missiles that can deliver nuclear weapons and the fact that India and Pakistan are both nuclear-armed states. The fallout from radioactive radiation in the area brought on by nuclear testing in Sinkiang, Baluchistan, or

Pokhran in Rajasthan has not spared Nepal. Insurgency in Nepal's Jhapa District might endanger India's authority over the whole northeast if it were to expand to Chicken's Neck. In September 2004 in Delhi, a gathering of chief ministers from states that were affected by groups like the Maoists in Nepal was arranged. Senior government representatives from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, and Maharashtra, as well as the Chief Ministers of those states, attended. India also has a vested interest in seeing the Maoist insurgency in Nepal come to a peaceful conclusion. The Maoist insurgency has expanded quickly thanks to the porous Indo-Nepal border, which made it simple for the rebels to find refuge on the other side. The insurgency might have been significantly reduced if the border had been effectively managed, including by monitoring the movements of citizens in communities near the border and issuing identification cards.

Nepal can potentially be a desirable location for FDI coming from India. India is already Nepal's biggest investor. For Indian investors, Nepal will be appealing because to its alluring incentives, welcoming attitude toward investors, affordable sites, affordable labor, and easily trainable workforce. India invests mostly in the following fields in Nepal: Hindustan Lever, Colgate, and other Indian corporations established factories in Nepal with the intention of exporting their final goods to India.

Indian investors may choose to consider the tourism and hydropower industries. For Indian visitors traveling to the nation for both tourism and religious purposes, Nepal is a desirable destination. Young Indians are also traveling to the nation in greater numbers for adventure and honeymoon travel. Since 2004, private airlines from India have begun to travel to Nepal, including Air Sahara and Jet Airways. Additionally, there are opportunities for India and Nepal to collaborate in the hotel management industry and for the growth of health tourism. Chinese visitors also go to nations like Nepal. For pilgrimage tourism, many Chinese visitors go to Nepal and India to visit cities like Lumbini, Bodhgaya, Sarnath, and Kushinagar. Many pilgrims from India go via Nepal to reach Mansarovar.

Due to its extreme altitude fluctuation and plenty of water, Nepal has one of the biggest potentials for the development of hydroelectric power. Nepal's ability to produce electricity is estimated to be 83,000 MW. North India's need for electric power has grown significantly in recent years. The development of hydroelectric electricity in Nepal is something that both bilateral and multilateral donor organizations are interested in sponsoring. Nepal has, however, expressed some concern that India is hesitant to depend on another nation for such a crucial supply of energy. Using water resources in partnership with India has not always been successful for Nepal. The first significant river project was the Kosi Project. Bihar benefited from the project primarily because it helped with flood management. Considering the magnitude of the project, the electricity generated would be of very limited use to Nepal. Similar to this, the Gandak Project used a large river in Nepal but was mostly used for irrigation, which helped UP and Bihar in India but did nothing for Nepal.

3. CONCLUSION

India's efforts in promoting peace and settling the crisis via diplomatic channels showed its commitment to maintaining regional stability. With the Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2006, the insurgency came to an end and Nepal was put on the road to democratic reform. Thoughts and misunderstandings regarding India's objectives continued. This demonstrated the need for India to develop a climate of confidence while balancing its interests with Nepal's sovereignty. India and Nepal's ties have developed further after the end of the insurgency as both countries try to resolve old grievances and build a relationship based on respect and collaboration. In conclusion, the relationship between India and Nepal during the

Maoist insurgency highlights the complexities of outside interference in domestic disputes. Despite the complexity of its motivations, India's actions demonstrated the value of regional stability and a commitment to peaceful settlement. Building trust, encouraging economic cooperation, and resolving old resentments remain crucial for creating a robust and healthy alliance as both nations manage their relationship.

REFERENCES:

- [1] N. R. Nayak, "Landlocked and transit developing countries: Nepal's transit route negotiations with India," *Strateg. Anal.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09700161.2015.1136025.
- [2] E. Anand, S. Unisa, and J. Singh, "Intimate partner violence and unintended pregnancy among adolescent and young adult married women in South Asia," *J. Biosoc. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1017/S0021932016000286.
- [3] A. B. Shrestha, C. P. Wake, J. E. Dibb, and P. A. Mayewski, "Precipitation fluctuations in the Nepal Himalaya and its vicinity and relationship with some large scale climatological parameters," *Int. J. Climatol.*, 2000, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0088(20000315)20:3<317::AID-JOC476>3.0.CO;2-G.
- [4] S. Shneiderman and L. Tillin, "Restructuring states, restructuring ethnicity: Looking across disciplinary boundaries at federal futures in India and Nepal," *Modern Asian Studies*. 2015. doi: 10.1017/S0026749X1300067X.
- [5] G. Bishwajit, S. Tang, S. Yaya, and Z. Feng, "Participation in physical activity and back pain among an elderly population in South Asia," *J. Pain Res.*, 2017, doi: 10.2147/JPR.S133013.
- [6] Z. Asghar, "Applied Econometrics and International Development," *Appl. Econom. Int. Dev.*, 2008.
- [7] A. Ranjan, "Contours of India - Nepal Relationship and Trans-Boundary Rivers Water Disputes," *J. Int. Aff.*, 2016, doi: 10.3126/joia.v1i1.22637.
- [8] R. P. Pradhan, "Defense Spending and Economic Growth in China, India, Nepal and Pakistan: Evidence from Cointegrated Panel Analysis," *Int. J. Econ. Financ.*, 2010, doi: 10.5539/ijef.v2n4p65.
- [9] R. Zeb, L. Salar, U. Awan, K. Zaman, and M. Shahbaz, "Causal links between renewable energy, environmental degradation and economic growth in selected SAARC countries: Progress towards green economy," *Renew. Energy*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2014.05.012.
- [10] S. K. Prajapati, H. K. Dadhich, and S. Chopra, "Iseismic map of the 2015 Nepal earthquake and its relationships with ground-motion parameters, distance and magnitude," *J. Asian Earth Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jseas.2016.07.013.