Cite Us

Abrar Ul Haq [*]   Mubeen Adnan [†]

Peripheral Cold War: A Perspective Study of India and Pakistan Relations

Abstract: *India and Pakistan have long history of animosity which is evident in their bilateral relations. Defining the politics of security is an attempt to first develop the comprehensive definition of security in India Pakistan case and engender certain knowledge that how the threats are surfacing in other aspects of state affairs. The political, economic and social sectors have associated with security while strategic relations of India and United States to counter China are also very important aspects of Pakistan security proposition. This research paper seeks to have a latest oversight to observe how these changing relations might incriminate the strategic environment of South Asia and specifically in Pakistan India relations and how the strategic importance of these periphery's lead them to cooperate with strong states to get the military and economic benefits. The conflict and strategic relations with the powerful states to maintain the balance of power, forms the peripheral cold war.*

Introduction

The traditional paradigm of security refers to a realist construction of security in which the state is referent object of security. The Realists theory in International Relations explains the large scale issues such as political and military, in a context where security and power is measured in terms of military capabilities, are the major factors in the international political system. Security, according to it, means national security. Security has inclusive nature and all the contributing factors have wide range of referent objects which the states like Pakistan and India need to secure. So the state has to protect itself from any threat which can lead to security issue. The evidence of this confrontation can be seen as the susceptibility of politico-military logics to over-securitization (Wilde, 1998). States often politicize the issues to protect the specific area because the main purpose behind the politicization will be security, although there are quite diverse issues behind it.

Politics is how actors on different occasions utilize policies to achieve more power over other with the ultimate aim to get secure from phenomena occurring others at that point. Using the words of Morgenthau, which he said in his book Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace, whenever economic, territorial, financial and military policies are under discussion in international affairs, it is necessary to distinguish between, say, economic policies that are undertaken for its own sake and the economic policies that are the instrument of foreign policy, a policy, that is, whose economic purpose is but the means to the end of controlling the policies of other nation (Morgenthau, 1969).

---

[*] PhD Scholar, Department of Political Science, University of Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
 Email: abrarulhaq702@gmail.com *(Corresponding Author)*
[†] Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

GIRR
GLOBAL INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS REVIEW

The political action is taken by keeping in view a certain purpose which may be of economic, military or political gains. This Endeavour of absolute power is generally caused due to the uncertainty of states in the disordered international paradigm (Kilgour & Zagare, 2001). These gains contribute in state's capabilities to remain in the system while any political action of the other state which hurt the interests of the first state will restrain her from achieving a certain position in the system. For all of these reasons, the end of the Cold War seems likely to bring greater freedom for the operation of local military security dynamics (Wilde, 1998). So the type of interaction between the states is very important because when two states engaged in hostile interactions, policies devise in a strategic perspective so that interests could be saved. There are several aspects of the state which has possible facets within them which can turn into a security issue.

Military Sector

States act as the most significant agents or actors in the global political regime most important actors in the international political system and their actions are taken on the basis of meticulous contemplation and apprehension while keeping in mind the relative power position in the world. Power is the most significant element in maintaining the relation with other states and states only think in terms of power and the power has significant facets which combine to form exercisable power. The elements of power in realism and sectors of securitization are the same but the orientation is different. The current world defines the modern state with the help of the idea of sovereignty and self-reliance which means that a state aspires to claim the absolute right to form a government and institutions based on the certain political and strong military to protect the integrity and sovereignty of the state.

Since military action or use of power proves to be successful in the way of growing one's territory or exercising one's control over it. Historically, it has been observed that the use of force becomes foreseeable when security concerns with respect to the threat to the integrity and supremacy of a state is increased and consequently the concerned state makes use of its military offensive against the belligerent state. The rivalry still has the external factor which gives the motivation for the military dynamics but when responses are preventive, the particularities of military expenditure, technology and procurement are mainly determined from within the state (Buzan, 1987). This idea has gained currency due to its logical and indispensable nature because if the states do not become wary, there is a potential danger to global harmony and peace and international anarchy may sprout out which may persist for unspecified periods of time and may result in the devastation of the state institutions leading to the disintegration of states and deterioration of law and order situation thus giving rise to certain security issues such as terrorism, insurgency, and fifth generation warfare.

In the modern world, ethnicity has not yet outdone the state as a referent object for military security apart from the diminutive scale of radical cults. In the background there are lying the theory of the clash of civilizations, the Western suspicions about Islam and the ascend of Hindutva suggests that the Westphalian claim about the state to its distinctiveness as the referent object for military security is not a distant challenge from both larger and smaller elements. The state is also susceptible of challenges from within, which can be caused by the outer support and producing sub-national groups. The obvious candidates are revolutionaries, secessionists, and unionists. Threats from the military, in contrast to other kinds, are frequently deliberate and specific. When in use, they stand for the breakdown or rejection of conventional political relations and the desire for the use of force to settle political, economic, and social issues. The dynamics of relations among states does not produce the defense dilemma of the state, even though these do add to this issue, but how the states developed and deployed the military means keeping in view the nature and dynamics of military (Buzan, 1983). States in conflict put their own peace as well as the political, economic, and social weaknesses at risk. Everything in a society can be disrupted by military threats, and only a

powerful military can prevent the destruction of internal substructures and territorial integrity.

Political Sector

The sovereignty of the state means it choose for itself how it will manage its internal and external issues (Waltz 1979). There were so many ideas originated in the twentieth century like democratic, liberal, communist and fascist political ideas which contradict each other in practice. Just like republican and monarchical ideas did in the nineteenth century. The incongruity in the ideas is a fundamental aspect which explains that the state's affiliation may well sense threat by the ideas incorporated by others. There is always need to have an anti-ideology, like the USA has created for communism and the USSR for imperialism. But it bears at the cost of the fostering the negatives which begin to supersede the positive values, they are supposed to protect. The contest between the ideologies is exceptionally intricate. It makes it very complicate to describe precisely what should be considered as a political threat. More specifically in terms of structural political threats which occur when the organizing principles of two countries confront each other in a certain perspective where the countries cannot simply neglect each other's reality. The respective political systems thus engage in a zero-sum game with each other either they will it or not. Relationship between two different ideological nation's, relations like between Pakistan and India, ideological and state relations between South and North Korea and the rivalry between the Soviet Union and United States at global level. The triumphs and achievements of one involuntarily minimize the political stature of the other, and this happen frequently which naturally leads to more intended forms of political threat.

Internal legitimacy of the Political unit considers any ideological contradiction as a political threat which can be formed by external link. It transmits largely to ideologies and constitutive ideas and issues relating to it for defining the state. External recognition and legitimacy of the state is based on threats from outside which are not necessarily directed at sovereignty, which is the domestic pillar of the state, but can intend to disrupt the ideological legitimacy. It is quite possible for legitimacy to be challenged externally. India and Pakistan Case for example and during the Cold War also, the legitimacy was matter of concern externally exclusive seeking the answer of recognition. However, this is a fine rationale to focus particularly on external legitimacy for the recognition of the country as a particular type of state. Threats of this nature can be directed at the state's geographical integrity, the present structure of the government, or even the state itself by challenging the ideology that underpins it. Political threats might take the form of a challenge to authority, a rejection of recognition, a complete rejection, or a rejection of sovereign equality.

Government frequently persuades to use security arguments when the actual concern is in fact the government itself is in jeopardy. This phenomenon occurs in relation to internal and external threats. Typically internal threats produce in weak states which are the result of inefficiency in establishing firm statecraft. The ability of the government to govern in a weak state is contested to a much larger extent than in strong states, where the strong structure and the government forms the basic legitimacy of the state which is usually accepted. Basic institutions as well as ideologies of the weaker states are often challenged and the political violence is broader in these states, therefore when the stake holders attempt to make pleas on the name of the state their ability to do so is challenged more systematically. Stake holders view the government's action taken on behalf of its personal interests rather than for the state.

Economic Sector

Ever since Adam Smith, economists have acknowledged that achieving the interests in trade are the means to the wealth of nations (North, 2003). Threats relating to the economy normally do not consider serious more than military ones, because these threats operate only against the economy of the target state. Political and military consequences may take place from a threat employed against the economy, but there

is no direct threat to other sectors, because there is a strong connection of the economy with military power. This means that economic threats tend to be either swift or precise in their effect and at lower levels may easily become identical from the normal rough economic performance. The economic sector is an important component of the substantial pedestal of the state's power, and it is also robustly related to the institutional elements and organizing ideology of the state. Although for economic threats to be considered as threats to security is supposedly believable and it must be handled with substantial care due to its role in national security.

Major problem with the economic sector is that it increases the impasse of differentiating between domestic politics and national security. Threats to the economy resemble an attack on the state in the sense of planned external actions by other countries which results in substantial loss, and create tensions in various institutions of the state. One cannot prove that the outer environment determines the reaction by simply showing that the decision-makers believed this to be the case (Jervis, 1976). Foreign trade and collaboration are therefore likely to be crucial to national security, given that the economy is the primary source of military security. States will thus weight the security implications of cooperation according to the benefits gained through foreign economic policy. It is more probable to be about how well or inadequately the state is doing in absolute and relative terms, rather than about the survival of the state and national economy.

Security and Identity

Security has four dimensions, first is the ideological formation of identity, second is the threats to that identity, third the power structure in the world and fourth is the strategic environment in which state wants to establish that identity and pursuing the interests related to it. It means security is protecting the material means of the state which ensures the establishment and expression of that identity in national and international domains. Through the use of analogies, explains how policy makers form their own images of reality and simplify

decision-making (Yetiv, 2004). The role of institutions in assessing the security threats and the mindset of policymakers due to aiming at specific interests in relations with other states also need to incorporate so that one can understand the true nature of security.

Ideology and Identity

States are the most significant actors in international relations who interact with each other in different ways to form a diverse set of relations. The interaction is based on a different set of policies having the influence of a specific political ideology. Every state forms their political setup upon certain ideology which is shared by people. The organization of political institutions and power structure depend on that ideology which becomes the part and parcel of the state behavior. Nations have their specific ideologies upon which their respective structures establish which create their identity. The "ideas" and "beliefs," however they may have arisen, essentially formed a structure no less real or convincing than the material conditions which restrain or facilitate human thinking, preferences, and action (Kolodziej, 2005).

The formation of identity is a very crucial aspect of state-making because the states compose and express their interests through identity and the ways actors conceive of themselves in relation to others. Identity and norms are considered as an essential part of the study of security, collectively offering the limits for pragmatic and legitimate political action (Mcdonald, 2006). The depiction of that identity, understanding of the international structure and utilizing the strategic environment is the basic elements of these policies adopted by the states which ensembles the politics of security. Following discussion is about the sector specific security interpretation which enables reader to understand security.

Political Security

Third World states has the characterization of security which should principally be political, because other spheres "must be seen through the political realm" (Ayoob 1995). Political security is discrete from politics in general and threats to

the legitimacy or recognition either of political units or of the essential model of structures, practices or institutions among them (Wilde, 1998). Already established ideology, legitimacy, and territorial institutions serve as the elementary building blocks of the state, and any threat to one of these will be viewed as a political security issue. The political-military clash between India and Pakistan has been the main source of security concerns in South Asia. This battle had some social undertones in that the two countries' divergent political and racial ideologies were a major contributing factor. The religious foundation of Pakistan calls into doubt the secular federal structure of India. All of these circumstances result in vertical identity differences between states and the social units that make up those states and both parties have frequently used coercive tactics and military force to resolve these conflicts. As a result, a dynamic of insecurity arises that confronts supporters of the state and its identity project against a variety of ethno-religious organizations ready to challenge the state for failing to uphold its own identity inside it (Katzenstein, 1996). These dynamics of internal unrest play a role in the development of the long-standing conflict between India and Pakistan. It also includes the speculation about cyber war spots the sorts of clash in which distance may not matter much (Der Derian 1992). Each government accuses the other on a frequent basis of supporting and equipping its own internal dissidents which is the major source of political rift between them.

Societal Security

Depending on how their identities are created, various societies have various social weaknesses. If a state's identity is founded on division, even a very tiny percentage of foreigners will be seen as problematic, and countries that dominate a state but only by a slim numerical margin or only via majority repression will be exposed to a rival population. National unity will be hampered if national identity is linked to particular cultural practices that distinguish people from one another (Harbom & Wallensteen 2010). We can see this type of societal division in India. Although the nationalist element is there but the continuous rise of Hindutva in social and

political sector can be seen from very long time. The fundamentalist ideology of RSS and their political representation through BJP has become the dominant force in Indian politics. In 2015 Modi, the Indian prime Minister, has accepted in Bangladesh about the India's contribution in the dismemberment of Pakistan (Time of India, 2015). Acknowledging these kinds of policies for the neighboring country explains the political aspirations of India which is dangerous for the peace of South Asia.

Economic Security

Wealth is increased with the help of markets without damaging state organizing principals, all states pushed to get all economic and political benefits that they could produce simultaneously (Parpart & Shaw, 2013). The economy's capacity to translate riches into power is among the foremost security issues that relate to it. Economics can actually persuade a state's ability to attain security; the wealthier a state is the more military resources it can mobilize. Therefore, the authority of states and, by extension, their relative position in the system, is robustly influenced by relative economic expansion. Because "money is generally needed to conserve military power, and military power is generally needed to attain and defend wealth," wealth and power are strongly tied to one another. Foreign trade and collaboration are therefore likely to be crucial to national security, given that the economy is the primary source of military security. As in every war, economic powers are dependent on military force (Tunader, 2006). States will thus weight the security implications of cooperation according to the benefits gained through foreign economic policy. The single most significant provision is the maintenance of common interests between states (Keohane, 1993). It is more probable to be about how fine or scantily the state is doing in absolute and relative terms, rather than about the national economy or the survival of the state. To that extent, it is evident that the risks are caused by such economic issues, rather than by the effects they have on the economic sector itself, because of how they affect other sectors like political, military, and social.

Military Security

Military capabilities establish the process of securitization because the conventional or nuclear balance decides the relations of the states. Historic events influences military perception and threats turn out fundamentally in terms of the impact of past incident on present perception. The subsistence of past antagonism and war mongering will tend to intensify current perceptions of threat. India and Pakistan has fought two full wars has have a lot of military escalations in their history line. So if both countries fear from each other it will be quite natural as both are nuclear armed. There is a consistent chance of a war in the world in which there are a lot of states seeking to endorse their set of benefits but have no authority above them on which they can rely for security (Waltz k. N., 2001). The possession of sophisticated weapons and military hardware was objective of both countries because their perception of each other forcing them to gain more and more power in military sector, because the possibility of aggression increases when the conventional deterrence shifts from one actor to another. This kind of balance is attached in the region undoubtedly with shift, as US-India alliance gets strengthen, mutually shared military and strategic apparatus that are strengthening their economy, permissible into the nuclear weapon regimes (Mallik, 2019). Decades of long rivalry has seen many deals of arms, with powerful states, on both sides for land, navy and air force. Not to mention here because the purpose is to show the intention of both countries in military might.

Strategic Environment and Politics of Security

The animosity between India and Pakistan is evident in their security propositions and security apparatus. The construction of identity and associated interests are important aspects of security. It is the identity which every state wants to establish in specified territory and building the society and political institutions on the basis of it, while protecting the material interests associated with it is the cause of politics between the countries. The interaction between the states depends on the possession of material aspects and the political development, military modernization, diplomatic engagements, economic cooperation or competition is the result of the interests based on that political identity.

Every state vying for her interests to maximize the material means in global anarchical structure where states act according to capabilities they have. These material means define the structure on the basis of capabilities in political, economic and mili perspective. The state that can protect her interests, in relation with other states, is considered as powerful state and the states that can dependent on these states for economic, military or even ideological borrowing is considered as weak states. The interaction between weak and powerful states forms the global political structure. The structure shaped itself when the respective capabilities of the states shift and the states gain or lose in their respective power. The competition creates the environment where states rationally decide a strategy to achieve certain objectives it is called the strategic environment. It is essential to understand four proportions of growing strategic rivalry, which comprise: strategic capabilities and doctrines, cooperation in maritime security with big power and in the sphere of diplomatic friction (Lalwani & Wheeler, 2017).

Since the conclusion of the Cold War, the policy interests of America were supporting India against China in South Asia region (Hari, 2004). The power rivalry between the US, China, and Russia has started to affect US-India relations in the international political backdrop that frames the bilateral relationship in South Asia, but it has also created new opportunities. In South Asia, regional dynamics have also become unbalanced as a result of the potential US exit from Afghanistan. USA's geostrategic policies for peace on the basis of liberal ideology and its approach of sustaining peace through power is probably becoming inconsequential as America has been profoundly depending on India for its strategic interests (Khan, 2013). The Indo-Pacific region's current geopolitical rise has also opened up new possibilities for potential US-India strategic partnership. Regional Hegemons have a preference in their policies that there

should be two or more big powers in the every important regions of the world, because those neighboring states will possibly compete with each other all the time, which leave few chances to threaten a far-away Hegemon (Mearsheimer, 2001). The US and India are working for economic development and strengthening partnerships in military perspective in order to avoid China's growing role in South Asia. Pakistan has been the main preventer of Indian regional hegemony, through nuclearization, but also due to Pakistan's ability to build alliances or deep collaboration with other powers such as China or the US (Sauerborn, 2014). When the civil nuclear deal between the United States and India was signed on March 2, 2006, the security paradigm in South Asia undergoes a paradigm change. On the other hand, two months prior to the US-India nuclear agreement, China and Pakistan formed a strategic alliance.

The relations of the powerful states and their interaction with each other provide the opportunities for smaller states to go for their interests. USA and India have been using all doable actions to deter China from converting its remarkable economic power into aggressive military power in the indo-Pacific region (Pande, 2019). The policies adopted in it are on the basis of knowledge about the interests of the powerful states so states develop such policies which can compel these powerful states to fulfill the interests of weak states to accomplish their own interests. The geo-political, geo-economic and geo-strategic interests of the powerful states often result into the alliances with smaller states that can increase their military and economic capabilities. The nature of the relation with powerful states is the second aspect of the politics of security. The states need to acquire modern technology and military hardware and economic opportunities for sustaining the relation with hostile forces. The policies are designed on the basis of ideological interests which are prone to power and supremacy. As the Cold War ended, the conflicts in the international system has become more regionalized, there is a requirement of more decentralized system of order-maintenance (Acharya, 1994). The power competition, threat perception and aligning the interests with other states to form powerful

blocks were the traits of cold war. Similarly when peripheral states have hostile relations with each other on the basis of ideology to dominate the conflict in specific region they align their interests with the strategic interests of powerful states for gaining military, political, diplomatic and economic support to defend her from threats pose by other countries and to increase the security apparatus. It could be termed as peripheral cold war.

Peripheral Cold War and India Pakistan Relations

The ideological differences between USSR and USA were based on Liberalism and Communism, the economic system both states want to implement in the world. Pakistan and India has colonial history and their political struggle result in their independence from the British Raj. India consider sub-continent (Pakistan, India, Bangladesh) the land belong to them and the aspiration of becoming regional power and dominate the affairs of South Asia can be seen from the birth of India, which gained more importance when BJP, a fundamentalist political party, gained the power in India. The dominant ideology in the early years for Pakistan was the two nation theory, which dies down with the separation of East Pakistan now Bangladesh. Since then the prominent ideology was lacking politically in Pakistan's structural foundation. Although the hostile relations between India and Pakistan sustained due to several reasons but that was purely on the base of security and integrity of the state. In the arms development political relations will always be susceptible, as it is in the logic of arms racing (Buzan, 1987). That's why the policy objective was to save from Indian threat and create an environment which guaranteed the safety of the state from the Indian threat. Pakistan went into several pacts with USA, fought in proxy wars, and became front line ally in war on terror to form the security apparatus which can deter the India attack.

The role Pakistan played for USA in cold war and post cold war era is enormous and the sole objective was security. This suggests that if there is a lack of dominant ideology in Pakistani political perspective the identity which Pakistan

formed as a nuclear state with the passage of time can play its role in India Pakistan relations. This identity formation in South Asian perspective is necessary, as China wants to maintain the power balance between India and Pakistan to gain the regional Hegemony in Asia. Pakistan has natural way of achieving security and economic objectives with the completion of CPEC while reading the strategic position it has acquired in the region due to increasing collaboration between USA and India to counter China. An offence–defense balance and the rationality that favors defense, states should support status quo according to defensive structural realists (Elman, 2006). Pakistan has to understand the strategic nature of the Indo-US partnership in South Asia and Pacific Ocean and should form strong military and economic ties so that the power balance in the region could remain status quo.

Power Balance

The balance of power is policy and the position of a state or set of states, defending itself against another state or set of states by corresponding its power against the power of state or set of states. States can apply balance of power by increasing their own power. First, when states engage in an arms race or in the competitive acquisition of territory and second is the accumulating their own power in comparison of other states, with the policy of alliances. Due to fear of destruction at large scale states often tend to avoid the direct confrontation with nuclear armed countries and instead, states begin arms race whose lethal products were never used. For the enduring rivalry, according to John Vasquez the relative balance of power is the main characteristic, the stronger side will be in a place to dictate, according to its interests, to the weaker side to bring an end to the conflict because of asymmetrical power balance between them (Vasquez, 1996). It also seen that political meddling or limited military interventions by the states in balance of power competition like USA and USSR were doing in cold war and India and Pakistan is doing from quite long time now.

A state that is prepared to "retaliate massively" is not possibly finds the instance to use its capability (Waltz, 1979). One can see the arms race between India and Pakistan which led them to nuclear weapons and weapons of sophisticated technology to defend each other as a result of any aggression. The defense balance is based on technology and military hardware imported from powerful countries which encourages these powers to play the role in their conflicting relations. This factor leads to the assumption that the balance of power is maintained through strategic alliances and acquisition of military hardware from powerful countries. After the multi-polarity these powerful countries engage in strategic competition in different regions for their interests which forms the highly competitive environment in different regions. Like in Asia China's growing role threatens USA's interests due to that USA is supporting India to counter balance the role of China in Asia and specifically in South Asia. Social structures are more likely to be balanced than they would be by chance alone (Jervis, 1976). The disturbance in the balance between Pakistan and India so to maintain the power balance Pakistan needs a full spectrum engagement with China to counter balance India. The strategic importance of Pakistan for China is similar to USA for India with the CPEC project which is the part of BRI. This power balance forms the bipolar sub-structure of India and Pakistan in South Asia which is unique in the world politics.

Bipolarity

Bipolarity is the concept which came from cold war also when the power competition between USA and USSR was at its peak and many states went into alliances with them. NATO and Warsaw pact is the examples of these alliances. The bipolarity maintained the peace and stability in the world although there was threat of nuclear war all along. But the power balance and bipolar structure took USA and USSR to détente and then to arms reduction treaties. This means the power balance and bipolarity can lead to the cooperation between the two hostile nations. Taking the cooperation into consideration the power balance between India and Pakistan can lead them to cooperate in different sectors to reduce tension. India and Pakistan are nuclear countries but the military technology and

economic upheaval lead them to look for powerful allies and acquisition of military hardware and economic opportunities. The sub-structure of bipolarity in South Asia does not fit in conventional concept of bipolarity as it was in cold war era, the powerful blocs of USSR and USA, but the sub-structure of Pakistan and India as nuclear armed states could fall in this category after any kind of cooperation is not possible without their presence in South Asia, it is the very relations with others that embody one formation of identities and corresponding interests rather than another (Wendt, 1992). Bipolarity can provide strategic opportunities to the respective militaries. Second it can lead them to cooperate in South Asia to form more interdependent structure which could prevent war.

Conclusion

Pakistan and India are in constant competition for power and balance of power and the nuclear capability prevent them to engage in direct conflict. The strategic nature of the environment and strategic rivalry of China and USA in Asia and Pacific Ocean provides both countries to gain in their respective military and economic sectors that will ensure their security propositions. The sub-structure of India and Pakistan in South Asia which has ideological differences, power balance and bipolarity can keep them in status-quo, if both states that are in state building process effectively securitize referent objects in different sector which can evolve in security issue. The formation of identity and connecting interests are the main source of security interpretation, it means security is attached with identity and collaborating interests in state building so the states should adopt such policies which can protect their interests and create an environment that can undermine the security proposition of the state in conflict and the formation of alliance with powerful states and managing the mutual objectives is the politics of security. The politics of security is the main feature of peripheral cold war due to which India and Pakistan are in state building process and enhancing their capabilities to further reduction in vulnerabilities that are present in different sectors of the state.

References

Acharya, A. (1994). *The Periphery As The Core:the third world and security studies.* Strategies in Conflict: Critical Approaches to Security Studies (p. 20). Toronto: the Centre for International and Strategic Studies. http://www.yorku.ca/yciss/publications/OP28-Acharya.pdf

Ayoob, M. (1995). *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System*, Lynne Rienner. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781685853778

Buzan, B. (1987). *An Introduction to strategic military technology and international relations*. The Macmillan press.

Buzan, B. (1983). *People states and fear*. Thomas Press.

North, C. D. (2003). *Institutions and Economic Growth:A historical introduction. In D. A. Jeffry A.Frieden, International political economy perspective on global power and wealth (p. 14).* Routledge.

Deria, J. D. (1992). *Anti-Diplomacy: Spies, Terror, Speed and War*, Basil Blackwell.

Elman, C. (2006). *Realism. In P. D. Williams, Security studies an introduction (p. 12).* Routledge.

Harbom, L., & Wallensteen, P. (2010). 'Armed Conflicts 1946-2009', *Journal of Peace Research, 47*(4), 501-509. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343310376

Hari, S. (2004). India & US Relations: Ground Relaities.

Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and Misperception in international politics*. Princeton University press.

Katzenstein, P. J. (1996a). *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics,* Columbia University Press.

Khan, H. (2013). Pakistan's Contribution to the global war on terror after 9/11. *IPRI Journal, 13*(1), 37-56.

Kilgour, D. M., & Zagare, F. C. (2001). The Impact of Conventional Force Reductions on Strategic Deterrence: A Game-Theoretic Analysis. *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy, 7*(2), 146–169. https://doi.org/10.2202/1554-8597.1045

Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (1995). 'The Promise of Institutionalist Theory', *International Security, 20*(1), 39–51. https://doi.org/10.2307/2539214

Kolodziej, E. A. (2005). *Security and international relations*. Cambridge University press.

Lalwani, S., & Wheeler, T. (2017). Southern Asia's Escalating Strategic Competition. https://warontherocks.com/2017/08/southern-asias-escalating-strategiccompetition/

Mcdonald, M. (2006). *Constructivism. In P. D. Williams, Security studies an introduction (p. 13).* Routledge.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. University of Chicago.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1969). *Politics among Nations a Struggle for Power and Peace.* Peking University press.

Mallik, R. (2019). *Indo-US Relations during George Walker Bush administration (PhD Thesis).* Centre for South Asian Studies, Pondicherry University.

Parpart, J., & Shaw, T. M. (2013). Endorsement. *Journal of China and International Relations, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5278/ojs.jcir.v1i1.213

Pande, A. (2019, 04 25). *The US wants India to be its partner in confronting China's rise across Asia*. The Print.

Sauerborn, D. (2014). *Tug of War over Afghanistan*. Heidelberg University.

India, T. T. (2015, 06 10). *Modi's remarks in Bangladesh aimed at fanning hatred against them*. The Times of India.

Tunader, O. (2006). *War on Terror and the US Transformation.* In M. A. Ifantis, International Security Today understanding change and debating strategy (p. 20). Centre for strategic research.

Vasquez, J. A. (1996). Distinguishing rivals that go to war from those that do not: A quantitative comparative case study of the two paths to war. *International Studies Quarterly, 40*(4), 531–558.

Waltz, K. N. (2001). *Man, the state and war*. Colombia University press.

Waltz, K. N. (1979a). *Theory of International politics*. University of California.

Waltz, K. N. (1979b). *Theory of International politics.* University of California.

Wendt, A. (1992). 'Anarchy is what States Make of it', *International Organization, 46*, 394–419.

Wilde, B. B. (1998). *Security A newframewok for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Yetiv, S. A. (2004). *Explaining Foreign Policy: US Decision Making and the Persian Gulf War*, Johns Hopkins University Press.