

**Journal of Religion & Society (JR&S)**

Available Online:

<https://islamicreligious.com/index.php/Journal/index>Print ISSN: [3006-1296](#) Online ISSN: [3006-130X](#)Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)**US GROWING STRATEGIC INTERESTS IN INDIA AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN'S SECURITY****Umar Hayat**

MPhil Scholar, American Studies, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad

[Umar.hayat@consultant.com](mailto:Umar.hayat@consultant.com)**ABSTRACT**

The article discusses the implications of the US growing strategic Interest India and its implications for Pakistan's security. It argues that growing the US Interests in India would have strategic, political and socio-economic implications for Pakistan. At strategic level, the US is on the way to India in terms geostrategic goals, which can pose serious implications for Pakistan in terms of 'Balance of power' between India and Pakistan in the region due to their traditional rivalry. At political level, due to traditional rivalry India always wanted to isolate Pakistan in international politics. This strategic shift can easily harm the political status of Pakistan in international arena, and compel Islamabad to drag its policy towards eastward. At socio-economic level, Pakistan is essential to the region's economic integration. This strategic shift will depend Pakistan economy on China. The emerging strategic relationship between the US and the India has serious strategic implications both at the regional and global levels. India's strategic fostering poses a serious threat to Pakistan's security in the region. By awarding the STA-1 status to India, the US has undermined regional stability and the global non-proliferation regime.

**Keywords:** Nuclear Suppliers Group, Belligerent, Supersonic Fighter, Deterrence, Disarmament

**Introduction**

This article discusses the US growing strategic Interest in India and its strategic implications for Pakistan. It argues that the US is on its way to India in terms of its geostrategic goals, including China's participation in the US nonproliferation policy. On July 30, the US Department of Commerce granted India the status of "Strategic Trade Authorization 1 (STA-1)". The biggest gain for India is the easing of control standards and thus the coveted status of a "Major Defense Partner". The notification is now a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG).

Traditionally, the US has included only those countries in the STA-1 list that are members of the four export control regimes: Missile Control Regime (MTCR), Wassenaar Arrangement (WA), Australia Group (AG), and NSG. STA is a license exemption that allows the issuance of a number

of items on the Commerce Control List under US-defined conditions without a transaction-specific license. The STA exemption applies to exports, re-exports and transfers, regardless of which export control laws affect the manufacture, sale and distribution of technology. There are many reasons why the US has STA-1 Status to India. First, the US and India are interested in China's growing economic and military weight. \$ 15 billion in the last decade as New Delhi modernizes its Soviet military arsenal. Second, the US wants to stop buying its equipment and weapons from Russia for a good reason. S-400 Triumph missile defense systems from Russia valued at 5.5 billion US dollars against the threat of US sanctions. Once India has introduced S-400 systems, key assets such as nuclear plants and nuclear arsenal will be protected and preserved. This long-range missile system wants to be near the nearly 4,000-kilometer-long Chinese-Indian border. Sanctions against America's Adversaries The recently passed US law entitled "Opponents of America by Sanctions Act" (CAATSA) is intended to identify the countries where Russian weapons are purchased. The US Congress on July 23, which calls for India to help and campaign strongly for sanctions against India, would weaken the US-Pacific strategy to counter China's pro-active influence in the region. Conversely, the United States has prepared a plan to buy the Russian air defense system S-400, as they intend to use the powerful US Army Service Committee. It would be difficult for the US to share sensitive technologies. In this scenario, Pakistan would try to ally with China to fill the strategic vacuum.

Jaspal analyses the Indo-US Nexus severely from the strategic frame. In his words, the Indo-US Nexus is potential enough to "increase the asymmetry in the balance of power between India and Pakistan, which might lower the nuclear threshold between the belligerent neighbors."<sup>i</sup> Other observers of the US Nuclear and Atomic Energy Agreement (Indo-US) believe that it has turned the US non-proliferation rule into nothing more than rhetoric. The question that arose in the case of an established nuclear weapon was that it had reached an agreement with a non-signatory state of the NPT or the IAEA. Another mystery of the deal is the title called Civil so to mitigate any concerns that might arise from the deal. It is only a matter of time to say when civilian nuclear technology will not change its direction to the military.

The deal is nuclear-oriented and has something to do with substance. There is no argument for civilian and military substance. The deal with the opportunity for the US, which intensifies the clashes between the two South Asian nuclear states and in particular the shift in power balance and the obstruction of the confidence-building measure. Posterity cannot forgive the United States. New Delhi becomes the source of the arms race. Panetta's

visit to Afghanistan in June 2012 hampered the already strained relations between Washington and Islamabad when he asked Islamabad to do more to remove the militants and close all safe havens. Panama said that Islamabad tested Washington's patience and Afghanistan, Panetta urged the Indians to step up their engagement in Afghanistan. Not only satisfied with the Afghan security forces.<sup>ii</sup>

Pakistani politicians cannot hide their mistrust and resentment because it is an attempt to confirm and position India's hegemony over Pakistan. Therefore, India can continue to underpin its hegemonic actions in the region. An analyst considers the agreement between India and the US critical and submits it "the importance of the pact was spelled out by Dr. Singh when he said that it should be observed against the background of India's 1974 nuclear test and the international community's decision to refuse nuclear technology to India" <sup>iii</sup>One would not be surprised that the new deal will be a foundation of favored treatment for India over Pakistan.<sup>iv</sup>

The strategic balance in the region between India and Pakistan is not in line with the nuclear agreement. Pakistan fights for terrorism, Pakistan fights for the United States, New Delhi Islamabad should receive the reward of a civil nuclear deal. While Pakistan has been tapped as a major non-NATO ally, the difference is always clear and it seems that the nuclear deal has a chance on paper. The nuclear agreement between India and the US was part of the overall strategy and military cooperation. The United States has become known for its one-sided approach to global affairs. There is a possibility that such a conflict exists.<sup>v</sup>

Similarly, the deal suggests that the PAC-2 India was once rejected. The PAC-2 is perhaps one of the newest technologies introduced into the US Army less than in 2004.<sup>vi</sup> Islamabad may be forced to resort to similar weapons or from Washington itself or elsewhere. Sharing search technology with India is one of the contradictions of the United States disarmament policy. This policy causes armaments competition that leads to asymmetry in the region rather than reducing its spread. In short, the partnership between India and the US offers a new and shocking strategic environment. Syed Shahid Hussain Bukhari continues the implication from the deal for Pakistan as follows:

- It is expected that the value of nuclear deterrence will be reduced by advanced missiles and missile defense systems. India is now looking for Asian rather than regional power.<sup>vii</sup>
- This is highlighted in a special report by the United States Council on Foreign Relations, which alerts the agreement between India and the United States, "nuclear testing by India might enable it to wield nuclear

weapons with much larger explosive power than those currently in the Indian arsenal; that in turn would allow important changes in Indian nuclear strategy- for example, it might let India target Chinese or Pakistani nuclear sites that were previously safe; driving Beijing or Islamabad to develop new weapons themselves or to change their currently restrained strategies for using nuclear arms.”viii

- Taking Indian hegemony plans into account, Indian aspirations for supremacy in South Asia seek to prepare for their strategic relations with the United States, which would have a significant negative impact on weak states in the region and Pakistan.

It is a known fact that NSG was created in response to the abuse of civilian nuclear technology in India for the 1974 nuclear tests. It is therefore true that nuclear technology is advancing its program in secret ways.

There is no sound guarantee that nuclear technology will not be used for military purposes. India can achieve qualitative and quantitative improvements in its nuclear arsenal through the transfer of nuclear technology. There is no guarantee that the new skilled workers will be equipped with advanced American nuclear technology.

- The strategic partnership offers India the opportunity to increase its influence and manipulate the United States. In addition, Pakistan has lost prestige in the United States. Pakistan has become the US tactical partner, while India has emerged as a strategic partner.ix

- Adil Sultan claims that “the deal could force major stakeholders to re-evaluate their security interests in the face of emerging India-US strategic partnership thus triggering transformation of regional alliance structures, where India is seen decisively shifting towards the United States and Pakistan being compelled to explore options that could best serve its security interests independent of the United States.”x

- The vague separation between civil and non-civil nuclear reactors gives India the opportunity to misuse civilian nuclear technology for military purposes. “The differentiation among reactors geared to armed requirements and those destined for civilian purposes are very skinny. Any Indian administration can reroute products of civilian amenities to armed ones if and at what time it decides to carry out accordingly.”xi

- The security measures of the International Atomic Energy Agency cannot stop technology transfer for civilian purposes “a significant proportion of India’s nuclear complex would remain outside IAEA safeguards and continue to have a strategic function.”

- The immense United States will help India to develop the technology that forces Pakistan to engage with other countries, leading to an arms race between the two rivals and possibly reviving the instability of the region.

• Iftikhar, a Pakistani analyst, argues this “India’s utilizes 11% of various available energy sources including oil, gas, coal, wind and nuclear power for producing electricity. Out of this only 2-3% is produced through nuclear power. The civil nuclear cooperation agreement, once materialized in its true essence by 2025 could increase this production to a maximum of 6.5 - 8% only. Therefore, it is not clear how this increase of 4.5 - 6% in nuclear electricity could make any substantial difference in global climatic conditions or in the Indian economy. Therefore, it is more likely that India will continue to divert nuclear expertise and materials, provided for producing ‘cheap, efficient and clean’ energy, towards accelerating her ambitious nuclear weapons’ program.”<sup>xii</sup>

The United States has conditioned nuclear technology transfer without further nuclear testing. India's agreement with other NSG countries in the case of Indian nuclear tests.

• The Strategic Partnership Agreement is not only designed to support India with nuclear technology, but also to provide India with advanced military weapons, including supersonic fighters, advanced rockets and other important military tools. This gun sale is in the middle of a big deal between India and Pakistan.

• Pakistan's minimum credible deterrent strategy requires a fresh look at the evolution of high-tech war structures, including the ability to develop nuclear weapons.

• India has been granted full freedom with regard to the qualitative and quantitative development of its nuclear arsenal. Shaista Tabassum emphasized that “the accord only talks about on the subject of the civilian nuclear services while the quantity and capability of weapon programs, which is unlimited, is not discussed and deal does not require India to restrict or limit its fissile material manufacturing.”<sup>xiii</sup>

• To limit Indian advocates and maintain a credible minimum of deterrence, Pakistan wants to increase its defense budget, which is already too high given the high level of terrorism spending. The Pakistani budget for 2009-2010 has already risen to 22.5%. <sup>xiv</sup>

• The United States offers to give India a role in Afghanistan, which is alarming for Pakistan, as India lies on the western border of Pakistan. After Ashley Tellis “such as the commitment of the US and India to cooperate in Afghanistan and Africa for the US, to have India as a partner in two very sensitive regions sends a signal to important countries like Pakistan and China.”<sup>xv</sup>

• The support and support of the United States for the permanent seat of India in the United Nations Security Council has a haunting effect on Pakistan. India must be able to exploit Pakistan's interests through a veto

right. Currently, UN Security Council Resolutions are the only friendly source for settling the Kashmir conflict between Pakistan and India, which is seen as a possible ray of hope in Pakistani policy circles. Enable India to use the interests of nuclear Pakistan.

India wants to strategically take the traditional position that Washington has with Pakistan. For all practical purposes, this is not the interest of Islamabad, but the cross must endure. The Kashmir problem is more difficult or is resolved with the problem. Therefore, India is a loud trumpet as Pakistan supports cross-border extremism and promotes militant elements to destabilize democratic India. That was against the terrorism that the Americans had pulled Pakistan for was more expensive than beneficial to Islamabad. Unlike Pakistan, the heat of the war is a frontline state, with India and Washington in a joint counter-terrorism working group as both countries ask Islamabad to do more while their military faces the wrath of terrorism and extremism.<sup>xvi</sup>

The partnership between India and the US has a new relationship pattern that is more than Pakistan. India is now at the forefront of the partnership between India and the US when the problem of small arms, terrorism, narcotics and sponsorship of cross-border terrorism, all from Pakistan, is eliminated and lifted.<sup>xvii</sup>

The shift of the US preference from Pakistan to India as the main ally of the US in South Asia has been going on for years. The rise of India in American foreign policy, however, does not change the past. The United States in 1947 and immediately promoted the new country as the main partner of the Cold War with the Soviet Union. Pakistan played a crucial role as a mediator between the Nixon government and Communist China and in 1979 helped to normalize relations between the two giants. After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, Pakistan assisted the United States in expelling the Mujahedeen from the Soviets. Pakistan was admitted after the 9/11 attacks and was a major non-NATO ally in the 2001 war, one of America's key partners in the fight against terrorism. As a result, Pakistan has provided more than \$ 30 billion to assist the United States in countering terrorists (but not receiving the full amount). By contrast, India had been close to the USSR during the Cold War. During the year 1971 between India and Pakistan, the United States supported the latter, and in 1974 America condemned India for its first nuclear test. However, the administration of George W. Bush (2001-2009) experienced a dramatic warming in relations between the United States and India, mainly due to the rise of a growing, prosperous and powerful China and the American need for a strong US ally , The economic relations between the former opponents thus grew dramatically. The United States is now India's second largest trading partner

and largest investment partner, including trading in the fast-growing information technology sector.

In addition, since 2001, India has contributed significantly to the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Since then, India has provided more than \$ 3 billion to the war-torn country. India is the fifth largest international donor to Afghanistan and the largest donor in South and Central Asia. India has built thousands of miles of roads, dams, hydroelectric power plants, drinking water projects, hospitals, refugee housing complexes, schools, and even the country's new parliament building. In 2011, India and Afghanistan signed a Strategic Partnership Agreement, India's long-term commitment to Afghanistan's security and development. Afghanistan's armed forces are limited, however. These include the training of Afghan soldiers in their military academy and the delivery of combat helicopters to the aspiring Afghan Air Force. India was pleased, but received President Trump. Trump's speech of August 22, Afghanistan's Foreign Minister Salahuddin Rabbani and Indian Foreign Minister Sushma Swaraj signed an agreement with the frequently asked questions of the Indians. xviii However, India has no interest in sending troops to Afghanistan, despite the fact that the Trump government has made no limit.

US India connects and protects its economic and security interests. Pakistan's natural ally is building a new balance of power in the China region. Immediately after Trump's speech on August 21, China came to defend Pakistan. The Chinese Foreign Ministry said Pakistan is at the forefront of the fight against terrorism. The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) is a significant investment and part of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative. China shares its "all-weather friendship" with Pakistan. xix Pakistan has shifted its reliance on high-tech weapons from the United States to China. China is now the largest arms exporter to Pakistan. xx

However, Chinese support for Pakistan is limited. Concerns in China have been shared for years by Indians arrested in Pakistan and the US, including separatist Uyghur groups from Xinjiang province, who have taken refuge in northern Waziristan. xxi These fears, however, are centered on Pakistani terrorists in Turkey were Nationally National Managed Tribal Areas (FATA), including the North Waziristan Offensive (2013), Operation Zarb-e-Azb (2014) and Operation Radd-ul-Fassad (2017). China, however, has an eye on Afghanistan's rich mineral wealth and has invested in Aynak copper mine and electric rail projects. Afghanistan has large iron ore and gold reserves that China wants. China, therefore, benefits from the efforts of the United States and India to bring stability and security to Afghanistan. Pakistan supported Russia, Turkey, Iran and Saudi Arabia in support.

Pakistan has been granted full membership of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). Iran is also interested in buying agricultural products from Pakistan because it banned such imports from the European Union. However, Russia's prospects as a close ally of Pakistan are limited. Russia and India have long military relations, and India is a major buyer of Russian military equipment and weapons. India was the main customer in the past.<sup>xxii</sup> Due to the large amount of Russian hardware in its inventory, India intends to conclude equipment, ammunition and maintenance contracts from Russia that will exceed the value of its military imports from the United States. However, India is working hard to reduce its dependency on Russian weapons and equipment and seek independence in military equipment. By opening up and expanding new markets in the Middle East, Russia has become a decline in the defense industry in India. Russia wants to sell energy to Pakistan, which desperately needs it. However, due to Pakistan's debt, weapons or oil and natural gas can only be bought by Russia. Russia also regards China, Pakistan's next ally, as a rival in the search for global influence and economic influence.<sup>xxiii</sup> Due to the geopolitical conditions, a Pakistan-China-Russia Alliance is unlikely to cooperate with the US, India and the European Union.

It is not in Pakistan's interest to respond to the sharp criticism by the Trump government regarding support for terrorists, most likely expressed in a presidential tweet on New Year's Day 2018.<sup>xxiv</sup> China's rapid economic growth and increasing military capacity and presence in Central, South and Southeast Asia, as well as Russia's ambitions to regain its status as a world power, make the United States the only superpower in the world.<sup>xxv</sup> In addition, as a debtor state, Pakistan is dependent on US support for continued lending by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Pakistan wants to continue to need rescue packages from the IMF due to the growing current account deficit and falling currency reserves. As the largest depositor, the United States can reject Pakistan's claims.<sup>xxvi</sup>

Despite the harsh rhetoric of the White House and some members of Congress, a positive relationship with Pakistan is crucial to US interests in the region. First, there is no lasting solution to the armed conflict in Afghanistan without the full participation of Pakistan. US and Afghan forces alone cannot defeat the insurgents and regain control of the vast areas currently controlled by Taliban fighters. For example, the number of US troops in the Afghan theater has fallen from more than 100,000 under President Obama to under 15,000 under President Trump. Pakistan historically had the Taliban and the Afghan government. Pakistan and Afghanistan also have control of the 2,430-kilometer Afghanistan-Afghanistan



border, and Pakistan has attempted to prevent the Afghan government's access to terrorists.

Second, Pakistan is central to the US counter-terrorism strategy. There are 20 officially US-recognized terrorist organizations operating in Afghanistan and Pakistan - the largest concentration in the world. The Pakistani intelligence services work together on strikes and other counter-terrorism measures.<sup>xxvii</sup>

Third, there is no solution to the Kashmir conflict unless Pakistan allows the United States to play a mediating role in negotiations with India. However, Pakistan's credibility in the eyes of Pakistan has been severely hampered by America's inclination towards India and the transfer of its embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Fourth, the United States has no alternative to the Pakistani route for its supply in Afghanistan. The US needs Pakistan's cooperation to keep this supply chain open.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Fifth, Pakistan is vital to the region's economic integration, an important US foreign policy goal. The conflict between the Russian and British empires in the 19th century was followed by the emergence of the Soviet Union and the Cold War. The collapse of the USSR in 1991 gave us the opportunity to reopen these trade routes. In October 2011, US Secretary of State Hilary Clinton called for a new Silk Road. She said: "Turkmen gas fields could help meet both Pakistan's and India's growing energy needs and provide significant transit revenues for both Afghanistan and Pakistan. Tajik cotton could be turned into Indian linens. Furniture and fruit from Afghanistan could find its way to the markets of Astana or Mumbai and beyond."<sup>xxix</sup>The project would provide access to minerals, energy and agricultural products of sparsely populated Central Asia to the large populations of Pakistan and India. The concept includes initiatives such as the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India Gas Pipeline (TAPI) and the Central Asia-South Asia Energy Project (CASA). The Afghan government is no longer dependent on the central bank of the Asian republics of the United States of Russia. The United States and India, however, reject China's efforts to join the Belt and Road Initiative and China-Pakistan Economic Corridor.

Sixth, the United States has a strong interest in getting nuclear weapons into the hands of Islamic extremists, and the prosperity and stability of Pakistan and its major institutions, including the military and the state, are prejudices against such an outcome.

Seventh, Pakistan has a population of more than 200 million people, making it the sixth largest country in the world. The stability of Pakistan is therefore a pillar of peace in the region. For example, US development aid for Pakistan remains high, even with diminishing military aid. Pakistan is

the second largest recipient of US aid in the region after Afghanistan. The main objective of the US Civil Program is to develop a stable, secure and tolerant Pakistan with a dynamic economy. The United States Agency for International Development has identified five areas that are essential to Pakistan's stability and long-term development: energy, economic growth, stabilization, education and health. The Trump government provided \$ 211 million in economic aid to Pakistan in 2018, compared to \$ 134 million for security-related assistance.xxx

### **Political Implications for Pakistan**

This section discusses the Political implications for Pakistan of the US growing strategic interest towards India. The debate over India-US cooperation has not escaped the Pakistanis, but has escaped the concrete and prudent response to change. The Pakistani Foreign Ministry on June 30, 2005 represents this itself “Pakistan had already conveyed its concern to Bush administration over its negative consequences of the India- US strategic partnership, in particular, over the induction of new weapons system such as missile defense that would destabilize the strategic balance in the region and may trigger an arms race here” xxxi Both Michael Krepon and Adil Sultan argue that the regional impact of the India-US agreement has not really been addressed, except for the aspect of non-proliferation. Sultan means that “the India-US civil nuclear cooperation agreement if implemented without checking India’s potential to increase its fissile stocks and eliminating any possibility by India of improving its nuclear weapons could lead to arms competition in the region involving Pakistan, India and China, thus destabilizing the entire region.” xxxii Krepon says “no attention on the regional implications of the nuclear agreement has been discussed except nonproliferation.”xxxiii

The India-US partnership for a biased and search-oriented approach in Washington, Pakistan has been added to Pakistan's nuclear programs. While the Pakistani nuclear program contains some degree of Islamophobias, it is reinforced by the wave of extremism and terrorism in Pakistan. Pakistan wants to have a matter of time, but the one mentioned above, along with AQ Khan saga, wants Pakistan to be a matter of time and any country that hosts nuclear technology as a responsible state. The American also argued that the case of India and Pakistan was more of a trick to stem China. From a traditional point of view, Islamabad cannot be satisfied with this argument. The fact is that India can always be considered as a power plant. This is India, a drama that wants to leave Pakistan as a spectator.

Pakistan can refer to the pattern of diplomatic action and international support against India. However, this is plausible if Pakistan is in the trustworthy book of the international community. Other translations of Pakistan is facing major energy problems than India, and that's a plus and a convincing point. Pakistan can carry out as a reason for similar civil nuclear technology.<sup>xxxiv</sup> Since the beginning of September 11, Pakistan has been at the forefront of bearing the burden of extremism and terrorism, which in itself requires recognition. NATO's recent suppression of forced deliveries to Afghanistan can be used more effectively in areas such as the United States. India faces a human rights violation that does not exclude the alienation and isolation of minorities and mainstream groups.<sup>xxxv</sup> It is not at the expense of a new one. Washington wants to be better in Pakistan than anyone else. The topic of Afghanistan remains as a referee in the neighborhood. Pakistan owns the Joker cards in the Afghan game, a reality known as Washington, which is unacceptable. If Washington continues to upset Pakistan, it wants to be one of its clients as Pakistan. Pakistan wants to have another option in the east (China). Islamabad wants to get away from it. Islamabad wants to get away from it. The India-US partnership aims to make the region more anarchic with respect to the coalition of Pakistan, China and India and the US, while smaller countries in the region are seeking the Alliance's spider web and anarchic environment.

It is obvious that the partnership between India and the US was involved in the anti-Americanism wave of the Bush administration. The United States is anti-Pakistan, which is synonymous with anti-Islam. Meanwhile, the alliance between India and the United States has become the point of conflict between India and Pakistan. Pakistan is more vulnerable to international blame and is being pushed around. New Delhi in Washington has announced that the Pakistani state of health is over.

"There was a danger of Pakistan growing even more isolated, drawing even more resources from the need of the people. Pakistan must help create conditions that will allow dialogue to succeed and pursue reconciliation for the sake of the future."<sup>xxxvi</sup> It is true that Pakistan must prove worthy during the war on terror. The United States took advantage of the situation and threatened Pakistan. Islamabad had to face the challenge as a frontline state. Islamabad is to rob New Delhi. Islamabad therefore saved his face from the indictment of the state terrorist.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

The military has always picture itself as the rescuer of Pakistan and it will continue, but can the establishment be nice guy in the face of the democracies and predominantly the United States.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Occasionally the evaluation between India and Pakistan is frequently positioned on the level to which both country support rule of law, democracy and allow civil

society in their system. India is habitually viewed as the largest democracy and thus get freed from being categorized undemocratic. President Clinton in his speech once said that US will deal with Pakistan and India “in terms of their own individual merits and reflecting the full weight and range of US strategic, political and economic interests in each country.” xxxix Presumably, New Delhi can serve as viceroy of Washington in the region and intervene in Pakistan's internal affairs.

The status of the South Asian policeman so that neighbors could be bullied. While Pakistan cannot be bullied by India, India and Pakistan have rather opposed it. On the ideological platform, Pakistan intentionally or involuntarily wants to make the devil's advocates pass the controversial Huntington's view of the clash of civilization.xl After the Cold War, India and the United States merged this amalgam that is actually closer to China and Pakistan. Huntington, another Nostradamus, wants to turn Huntington into another Nostradamus into a true believer in the collision of the civilization theory of a Sino-Islamic world against the Western world.xli Although India is sponsored by the United States as a rising power in the region and uses India as a proxy against China, it should be a blessing for Pakistan. It is a fact that Pakistan's existence and foreign policy have long been supported and decided by Indian-centric approaches.xlii The approach has had more of an impact on Pakistan's progress than on the path of real progress. As India draws attention to China and moves its focus away from Islamabad, this should be one of the biggest opportunities for political leaders in Islamabad, saving the defense budget and diverting it into civilian expenditures that make the lives of the most worried Pakistanis economic Could improve development as geopolitics that has ruined the country since its inception.

### **Socio-Economic Implications for Pakistan**

This section discusses the socio-economic implications for Pakistan of the US growing strategic Interest towards India. It argues that Pakistan is essential to the region's economic integration, an important goal of US foreign policy. The conflict between the Russian and British empires in the 19th century followed the advent of the Soviet Union and the cold of the United States in the 20th century, which hindered the normal north-south trade between Europe and South Asia. The collapse of the USSR in 1991 gave us the opportunity to reopen these trade routes. In October 2011, US Secretary of State Hilary Clinton called for a new Silk Road. She said, "Turkman gas fields could help meet Pakistan's and Pakistan's growing energy needs and generate significant transit revenues for both Afghanistan and Pakistan, and Tajikistan's cotton could be turned into Indian lines, with

furniture and fruits from Afghanistan making their way to Astana or Mumbai and beyond".<sup>xliii</sup> The project would provide access to a large population if India and Pakistan had access to the minerals, energy and agricultural products of sparsely populated Central Asia. The concept includes initiatives such as the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India Gas Pipeline (TAPI) and the Central Asia-South Asia Energy Project (CASA). The benefits of the economic integration of Central and South Asia for the United States are the growth of the Afghan economy to the point where the Afghan government no longer relies on US financial support for its basic functions and the reduction of economic dependency. The central government in Asia is republic to Russia. However, the United States and India are opposed to China's efforts to integrate these economies through the Belt and Road Initiative and the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor.<sup>xliv</sup>

The externalities of these poor people must be understood by both countries. The use of destructive weapons contributes to the destruction of our green world, from production to expulsion. India, on the other hand, plays the game in a green environment. In addition to environmental issues, Pakistan wants to have a great economic importance. Emigration to the economic difficulty of ordinary Pakistanis. The country needs social structures and services that are necessary for well-being. The search for a diversion in the direction of military spending will further restrict the already fragile economy. Another problem concerned the economy, which affects Pakistan and other countries. Asymmetric situation for Pakistan.

Most Pakistanis expect more from Washington, which makes the longest Pakistan wet or dry. India wants to be the beneficiary of Pakistan, as the deal will open the American market to the Indians. It wants to be a goldmine for both parties, as a business exchange; Industry and professionals want to promote industrial development and ultimately reflect the Indian economy. Nonetheless, civilian nuclear cooperation aims to bring more to the United States than to India, as US companies are expected to sell their technologies in the new market. Pakistan wants to be missed. Pakistan wants the latest technology and know-how to be sold to the Indian market and the public.

At the same time, she is looking for a global opportunity for New Delhi and for a global market for US defense companies. The deal aims to make India an alternative market for those who want to surf the US. Indian market, where they can buy American technologies cheaper. A comprehensive look at India-US partnership from an economic perspective that India would like to see favored.<sup>xlvi</sup>

## Conclusion

An analysis of Indo-US nexus and its Implications for Pakistan, it has many implications, from defense agreements to international relations. One can imagine a regional security system in South Asia where a mutual alliance system exists. United States and India posits Pakistan in a less secure position. If the two nations are expanding their cooperation in strategic partnership areas with the new ones, with advanced technology, excess nuclear fuel and resources are now available against the third state (Pakistan). The implication is cooperation, that arises in the form of 'strategic partnership' would compensate for the Indian-Pakistani balance of power. That can be in sight argued that if the Indo-US Nexus, wants to mature, the balance of power between Pakistan and India are not only nuclear, they want it too, to influence Pakistan's interests in defense, politics, business and foreign affairs. In addition, India has become a major powerhouse based in the UN Security Council, with the power of 'Veto'. The 'veto power' makes India capable to manipulate and influence Pakistan in international affairs. The great powers favorite card to use it in International. Politics To mitigate these effects, Pakistan must take intensive diplomatic action to ensure international support for Indian hegemony concepts. Pakistan needs to use diplomatic channels to receive the same exemptions that the United States has granted India by planning its energy crises. In addition, Pakistan must seek peace with the United States. Pakistan should highlight hypocritical acts of non-proliferation regime to facilitate India in international forums. Therefore, Pakistan has to disclose the unfair democratic attitude of India, by pointing out human rights violations against minorities and depressive Hindus in different parts of India. In this way, Pakistan wants to be able to support international peace and security.

## References

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Nawaz, Z. Jaspal. "The India-US Strategic Relationship and Pakistan's Security," *South Asian Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI)*, Research Report 9, (December 2007): 3
  - <sup>ii</sup> Marya Mufti, "Washington-Delhi Nuclear Deal" *The Frontier Post*, Peshawar, (August 12, 2005): 7.
  - <sup>iii</sup> Robert Grenier, "The US, Afghanistan and the 'India card'," *Aljazeera*, June 12, 2012  
<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/06/20126119229712686.html>
  - <sup>iv</sup> Ibid

- <sup>v</sup> AfzaalMahmood, "A Strategic Defense Pact," *Dawn*, Lahore, (July 9, 2005): 8
- <sup>vi</sup> Ibid
- <sup>vii</sup> Syed ShahidHussainBukhari, India-United States Strategic Partnership Implications for Pakistan, *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (January 2011): 5-7.
- <sup>viii</sup> Michael A. Levi and Charles D Ferguson, "U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation A Strategy of Moving Forward," *Council on Foreign Relations Special Report*, (2006): 11
- <sup>ix</sup> Syed ShahidHussainBukhari, India-United States Strategic Partnership Implications for Pakistan, *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (January 2011):8
- <sup>x</sup> Adil Sultan Muhammad, "India – US Civilian Nuclear Cooperation Agreement: Implications on South Asian Security Environment," *Henry L. Stimson Centre*, (2006): 8
- <sup>xi</sup> Muhammad IshaqueFani, "The India- US Strategic Partnership in Post 9/11: Implication for Pakistan," *Pakistan Vision*, Punjab University, Vol. 10, no. 2, (December 2009): 149  
[http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/studies/PDF-FILES/Artical%20No-7-V10,%20No.2%20Dec\\_09.pdf](http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/studies/PDF-FILES/Artical%20No-7-V10,%20No.2%20Dec_09.pdf)
- <sup>xii</sup> MominIftikhar, "India's Civilian Nuclear Energy Program – Hype or Reality?" *South Asia Research and Analysis Studies*. (June 12, 2006): 12
- <sup>xiii</sup> ShaistaTabassum, *Emerging India-US Relations: Concerns for Pakistan* (Karachi: Area Study Centre for Europe, University of Karachi, 2008), 20
- <sup>xiv</sup> Huma Mir, "Pakistan's Defence Budget 2010-11," *Pakistan Observer*, February 2010, 7.
- <sup>xv</sup> Ashley Tellis, "The Real Meaning of Obama's visit." *Forbes India*, November 24, 2010, 12.
- <sup>xvi</sup> *The Express Tribune*, "Clinton says Pakistan Needs to 'Do More' on Militancy," May 8, 2012 [Tribune.com.pk/story/375723/Clinton-says-pakistan-needs-to-do-more-on-militancy/](http://tribune.com.pk/story/375723/Clinton-says-pakistan-needs-to-do-more-on-militancy/) (Accessed on December 20, 2012)
- <sup>xvii</sup> Sridhar K. Khatri and Gert W. Kueck, *Terrorism in South Asia: Impacts on Development and Democratic Process* (Colombo: RCSS, 2003), 20
- <sup>xviii</sup> AnjanaPasricha, "India to Provide More Assistance to Afghan Defense Forces," VOA, September 11, 2017.<https://www.voanews.com/a/india-assistance-afghanistan-defense-forces/4023686.html>
- <sup>xix</sup> SriparnaPathak, "Trump's South Asia Policy: Implications for China." In Tourangbam, Monish ;Maini, Tridivesh S. ; Pathak, Sriparna: Perspectives on Trump's South Asia Policy. URN: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssaoar-53480-3>. pp. 13-17.
- <sup>xx</sup> Omer Farooq Khan, "Report: Pak shuns US for Chinese weapons." TNN. April 20, 2018.

<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/pakistan/report-pak-shuns-us-for-chinese-weapons/articleshow/63838695.cms>.

<sup>xxi</sup> Sriparna Pathak, "Trump's South Asia Policy: Implications for China," *IndraStra Global* 2017, 1(1), 1-4. <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-53948-6>

<sup>xxii</sup> Usman Ansari, "Pakistan cosies up to Russia, but Moscow doesn't seem to want to take sides." *Defense News*. May 2, 2018. <https://www.defensenews.com/global/asia-pacific/2018/05/02/pakistan-cosies-up-to-russia-but-moscow-doesnt-seem-to-want-to-take-sides/>

<sup>xxiii</sup> Ume Farwa, "Pakistan's Evolving Regional Policy: Impact Of Trump's South Asia Strategy," *South Asian Voices*, October 27, 2017. <https://southasianvoices.org/pakistans-evolving-regional-policy-impact-of-trumps-south-asia-strategy/>

<sup>xxiv</sup> "Pakistan Will Continue To Have Engagement With US: Foreign Secretary." *NDTV*, January 7, 2018. <https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/pakistan-will-continue-to-have-engagement-with-us-foreign-secretary-1796897>

<sup>xxv</sup> Kenneth Holland, "How Unipolarity Impacts Canada's Engagement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization," in Christopher Kirkey and Michael Hawes, eds., *Canadian Foreign Policy in a Unipolar World*, pp. 241-267 (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2017).

<sup>xxvi</sup> "Pakistan Could Face US Aid Cuts Over Human Trafficking: An aid cutback would deal a fresh blow to US-Pakistan relations following President Donald Trump's suspension in January of some \$2 billion in US security assistance." *NDTV*, April 12, 2018. <https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/pakistan-could-face-us-aid-cuts-over-human-trafficking-report-1836719>

<sup>xxvii</sup> Tridivesh Singh Maini, "Trump's Straight Talk: India's Reaction." In Tourangbam, Monish ; Maini, Tridivesh S. ; Pathak, Sriparna: *Perspectives on Trump's South Asia Policy*. In: *The Dossier* by IndraStra 1 (2017), 1. URN: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-53480-3>, pp. 9-12.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Monish Tourangbam, "U.S. Strategy in Afghanistan: Old Wine in Trump's Bottle." In Tourangbam, Monish ; Maini, Tridivesh S. ; Pathak, Sriparna: *Perspectives on Trump's South Asia Policy*. In: *The Dossier* by IndraStra 1 (2017), 1. URN: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-53480-3>, pp. 5-8.

<sup>xxix</sup> Joshua Kucera, "The New Silk Road? The United States hopes that a combination of trade and infrastructure can help steer Afghanistan away from unrest – and Russia." *The Diplomat*, November 11, 2011. <https://thediplomat.com/2011/11/the-new-silk-road/>

<sup>xxx</sup> "Rezaul H Laskar, "US aid to Pakistan plummets to \$526m in 2017, set to fall further: The Trump administration has warned it could cut aid and revoke Pakistan's 'major non- NATO ally' status if it does not crack down



on terror groups operating from its soil.” Hindustan Times, November 29, 2017. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/us-aid-to-pakistan-plummets-to-526m-in-2017-set-to-fall-further/story-18j1louhIG3OoklGv28YXNL.html>

<sup>xxxix</sup> Muhammad IshaqueFani, “The India- US Strategic Partnership in Post 9/11: Implication for Pakistan,” *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 10. no 7, (December 2, 2009): 20

<sup>xl</sup> Adil Sultan Muhammad, “India – US Civilian Nuclear Cooperation Agreement: Implications on South Asian Security Environment,” *Henry L. Stimson Centre*, (2006):24.

<sup>xli</sup> Michael Krepon, “India-US Nuclear Initiative,” *Henry L. Stimson Centre*, (2006):30.

<sup>xlii</sup> Michael Krepon, “India-US Nuclear Initiative,” *Henry L. Stimson Centre*, (2006):30.

<sup>xliii</sup> Shireen M. Mazari, “Pakistan in the Post-9/11 Milieu,” *Institute of Strategic Studies*, 22, no 3. (2002):

<sup>xliiii</sup> Das Kamaliit, “Indo-US Relations in Post-Cold War and Concerns for Pakistan,” *Political Economy Journal of India*, (July 2009):4

<sup>xlv</sup> PrateekShankerSrivastava, “India-US relations in Post-Cold war era and its implications for Pakistan,” *Political Article*, (May 07, 2009): 12 <http://www.articlesbase.com/politics-articles/Indiaus-relations-in-post-cold-war-era-and-its-implications-for-pakistan-905138.html>

<sup>xlv</sup> Hassan Askari, *Military, State and Society in Pakistan* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 55

<sup>xlv</sup> Das Kamaliit, “Indo-US Relations in Post-Cold War and Concerns for Pakistan,” *Political Economy Journal of India*, (July 2009):4

<sup>xli</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998)

<sup>xli</sup> Knut Boeser and John Brownjohn, *Nostradamus* (New York: Radom House Value Publishing, 1994)

<sup>xlii</sup> Huma Yusuf, “Focused on India: Pakistan’s Foreign Policy,” *Dawn*, September 18, 2011 [Dawn.com/2011/09/18/cover-story-focused-on-india-pakiatan-foreign-policy/](http://Dawn.com/2011/09/18/cover-story-focused-on-india-pakiatan-foreign-policy/) (Accessed on December 20, 2012)

<sup>xliii</sup> Joshua Kucera, “The New Silk Road? The United States hopes that a combination of trade and infrastructure can help steer Afghanistan away from unrest – and Russia.” *The Diplomat*, November 11, 2011. <https://thediplomat.com/2011/11/the-new-silk-road/>

<sup>xliv</sup> Kenneth Holland, Dr, “The Implications of the Trump Administration's South Asia Policy for US-Pakistan Relations,” *Security and Strategic Analysis IV* (Summer 2018):.

<sup>xlv</sup> Muhammad IshaqueFani, “The India- US Strategic Partnership in Post 9/11: Implication for Pakistan,” *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 10. no 7, (December 2, 2009): 20