



RESEARCH PAPER

US Security Policy in South Asia during and after Cold War: An Analysis

¹ Salma Amjad*, and ² Dr. Ahmad Ejaz

1. Instructor, Department of Pakistan Studies, Virtual University of Pakistan & Ph. D Scholar, Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, Lahore, , Punjab, Pakistan
2. Associate Professor, Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author salma.amjad@vu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This article is an attempt to analyze the US security policy in South Asia in the Cold War and after end of the Cold War. South Asia has always been important for the US's strategic objectives in the Asian continent to be advanced. The US's perception of the threat in Asia has long influenced its policy, which is limited to the construction of security systems there. The main focus of US security strategy in South Asia is maintaining peace and stability in the region. The triangular relationship between the US, Pakistan, and India is actually the main focus of US security policy in South Asia. The United States has consistently reevaluated its South Asian policy in light of its regional security objectives and interests. During the Cold War, Pakistan was seen as the US's "most allied ally in Asia" because of its perceived threat from the communist growing influence. Pakistan was thus selected to defend US interests in the region. After Cold War, the US's foreign and security policies were reorganized as a result of the new world order, which turned the world into a unipolar framework. India was chosen as a "natural partner" in the US security strategy for South Asia after it was restructured in light of the US security interests and aims in the Asia-Pacific region, where a new balance of power arrangement has evolved. The 9/11 brought new shift in US and Pakistan relations and both were involved in the fight against terrorism; nevertheless, this "single-issue alliance" is only meant to last temporarily. The research is primarily qualitative in nature. The objective of US policy in the region has always been the security of South Asia as a whole, not simply of one country. India and Pakistan were essential to US goals in the region. Consequently, it wanted to strengthen both states, whether against the Soviet Union or China. The US occasionally modified its security strategy in South Asia to take into account its shifting interests in the region.

Keywords: India, Pakistan, Security Policy, South Asia, US

Introduction

Since the United States started its role on world scene leading the free world and democratic world, it realized the importance of South Asia that has been constantly increasing. The US policy towards South Asia was variable to the rhythm of its global security interests. South Asia was a region that had proximity with communist powers- Soviet Union and China. The US security policy towards South Asia had all along been the security of South Asia and not just of one country. India and Pakistan were important for US designs in the region. Therefore, it wanted to strengthen both sates, whether against the Soviet Union or China (Jentleson, 2007).

Though United State gave importance to both India and Pakistan equally, Pakistan, because of its geo-strategic location was more favorite to US policy makers and during Cold War it became part of US security alliance system in Asia for the containment of threats of communism. However, India despite obstruction of US strategic designs in Asia remained favorite to the Americans. So, the Indian factor had never been excluded from the US

strategic milieu in South Asia. Security deficit and divided South Asia was never supportive to US security strategies in the region. Thus, Americans always wished to keep both South Asian powers on board. In words of President Eisenhower, the US relationship with India was of the head, and that with Pakistan was of the heart. Washington constantly tried to push Islamabad and New Delhi to mend their relations. There is a long record of US efforts for defusing tension between the two neighbors and bringing them to negotiations for peaceful settlement of issues.

With end of Cold War, the new trends of US global security interests fixed by the US-sponsored 'New World Order' highlighted the role of India as regional power. India became a vital country for the protection of US interests in the region and US started to support the Indian nuclear policy that was not evenhanded. It could not equally deal with Indian and Pakistani nuclear programs. Pakistan's nuclear programme was point of irritation for the Americans, while they engaged India in nuclear partnership. In view of nuclear and strategic partnership between India and United States, both countries are mutually playing role to curb the anti-America interests in the Asia-Pacific region. This paper is attempted to present an over review of US security policy towards South Asia during and after Cold War.

Literature Review

Plenty of literature is available on the United States security policy for South Asia region. The American's interests in South Asia region have become a significant part of academic literature, but much of this literature has been constructed on the bases of U.S dominance in global context. That is apparently not India and Pakistan specific which are two regional important states. Most of the literature is a product of American think tanks that projects U.S global agenda and portrays its role as superpower. Selective review of literature is following;

"American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process" (USA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2003) written by Eugene R. Wittkopf, Charles W. Kegley, and James M. Scott is an impressive work to understand and to become familiar with new themes, perceptions and strategies of American foreign policy especially in a globalize world. Writers have provided a comprehensive analysis of U.S policy themes concerning different regions of the world. This book is a master piece of literature to understand the basis of U.S foreign policy but do not provide the details of impacts of this policy over South Asia region.

G. W. Choudhury, "India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Major Powers: Politics of a Divided Subcontinent" (New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1975). Choudhury argues that U.S tilted towards India in the decade of the 60s when during the Presidency of Kennedy, arm assistance was provided to India to defend her against China. Latter American support was given by pressurizing Pakistan for not taking action on Kashmir front during the Sino-Indian War. This was the era when policy of arming India was partially incorporated against China. Choudhury also explains that roots of strategic partnership were grounded by Nixon 'New Asian Policy' in which he claimed the role of U.S as Asian Pacific power and indicated that the national interest would be achieved through partners. The writer further explains that American perceived new 'Asian Grouping' including India, China, Japan and U.S as Four Joint having the capabilities of determining Asian's future.

Bruce W. Jentleson, "American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century" (New York: W.W Norton & Company Inc., 2007). This book (3rd edition) explains the American national interest in the framework of 4Ps (Power, Peace, Prosperity and Principles). This book provides the detail of transformation of U.S foreign policy with reference to great debates of American's foreign policy. Post-Cold War geo-politics and globalization agenda of U.S foreign policy comprehensively discussed in this book. This book specifically explains the approach of primacy, and unilateralism through American foreign

policy. Jentleson is of view that American power is the 'defining feature of the world affairs and power balancing is one of the tactics to avoid multi-polarity and mainly derived from realist perspective. Bruce argued that approach of primacy by American's policy makers is applied through deterrence against a rising power is either through alliance or through strategic partnership. This also established that 'Pivot to Asia,' means increase in U.S efforts to contain rising China, which needed a strategic partnership with a potential power like India.

Shirin R Tahir-Kheli, "India, Pakistan, and the United States: Breaking with the Past" (Lahore: Vanguard Books, 1998). This book also presented the picture of triangular study about U.S and two South Asian rival countries, India and Pakistan. It unfolds the relationship chemistry among Washington, Islamabad and New Delhi focusing on two decades of 80s and 90s. This book traces the key issues in South Asia such as nuclear weapons proliferation, Kashmir issue and problematic Afghanistan. This book highlights systematically the interplay between Delhi, Islamabad and Washington and identifies their tumultuous relations. Writer eludes that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan made containment of communism a principal objective of U.S foreign policy, which needed to focus on maintaining effective relations with China, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Pakistan was also seen as an important ally and this initiated the U.S policy of balancing India and Pakistan. End of Cold War brought a shift in the American approach to look South Asian region. In the changed scenario, India was seen as an asset of economic generation rather a state capable of bilateral relationship (Muzaffar, & Khan, 2016).

Pakistani perspective is missing because most of the literature is produced by western scholars who do not assess this policy repercussions over other regional actors like Pakistan or from a neutral stand view. The underlying study is an endeavor to provide a detail and critical analysis of changing pattern and transformation of U.S security on South Asia region. Moreover, it also offers to provide the detail on the development of this strategic partnership. Furthermore, this research also explains that how and in what way this U.S security policy can alter the South Asia scenario by not addressing the Pakistan's apprehensive largely emergent of this strategic equate of U.S and India.

Results and Discussion

In Cold War Period

The United States espoused the policy of isolation for a long time in international affairs as they apprehended by the perception that involvement in world matters would bring conflicts and threats of intervention of the imperial powers of that time to the American periphery. Due to overspending and the "economic depression," which followed World War II, major states collapsed. This altered the balance of power in international politics and allowed the United States to expand its influence beyond Latin America. New real states emerged after colonialism and imperialism's dominance over various regions of the world ended, but these states lacked the political and economic capacity to manage their own affairs. "This led to develop new complex political and economic systems prone to decline which needed financial assistance and support from other countries. Bloc and alliance politics of the Cold War was characterized by a consistent competition between two major powers (U.S and USSR) for bringing these newly independent states under the domain of influence and access to their unexplored recourses to feed the Defence and security needs of these major players of bi-polar World Order. The significant feature of Cold War politics was a clash of economic ideologies which pertained posture of non-existent to the other side. Liberal internationalism became a defining feature of western bloc and expansion of communism was perceived as a direct threat to capitalism" (Amjad, 2017, p 1).

Dean Rusk Former Secretary of State in 1967 pronounced the American Perception of Power and Security after World War II and stated that "Other nations have interests. The United States has responsibilities" (Amjad, 2017, p. 1)

Ever since the US advanced its international strategic objectives, South Asian region always became important for the American policy makers. This engagement of United States can be divided into three distinct phases: The Cold War era, the post-Cold War period, and the post-9/11 era. The US interests in South Asian region always have always been desired to maintain regional stability. The United States' approach to South Asia primarily revolves around the intricate triangular relationship among the US, Pakistan, and India. American policymakers have recognized that a region marked by division and security challenges, exacerbated by tensions between India and Pakistan does not align with US objectives.

During the 1950s Cold War era, the United States sought to build a non-communist military coalition in Asia, a move supported by Pakistan but vehemently opposed by India. Since 1947 U.S-India relations passed through the periods of warmth as well as coldness and delusion due to their perception of power, peace and prosperity related to a number of issues at International and regional level. He is of the view that during the period of 1953-1954 when relations between the two countries were most agonized of that time, Indian reservations and concerns regarding provisions of American arms and ammunition to Pakistan were variously expressed on forums of foreign policy communications between USA and India. India expressed that this not only threaten the security, but it would jeopardize Indian notion of establishing "as an area of peace in Asia (Choudhury, 1975, p.91)

Finally, Pakistan aligned itself with US initiatives, participating in US-sponsored military arrangements despite facing criticism, particularly from India and the Soviet Union. While the US welcomed Pakistan's involvement in its anti-communist strategic coalition, it was disappointed by India's rejection of US overtures in South Asia. The primary concern of US policymakers was the security of the entire South Asian region, not solely that of Pakistan. They aimed for support from both India and Pakistan for their security plans. Recognizing that military counterbalancing against communist forces in Asia would be ineffective without resolution of conflicts, especially those between India and Pakistan. US policymakers understood that the Indian factor was integral to their strategic plans in South Asia. Thus, in US relations with Pakistan, the Indian element was also taken into account. The US leaders many times urged India and Pakistan to end hostility and usher in a new era of peace and harmony through coexistence in order to maintain the stability in South Asia. To achieve its aims, the United States several times applied its 'crisis preventive diplomacy' to defuse tensions between the two aggressive neighbors that had threatened to convert South Asia into a theater of bloody war.

The US had serious concern about Kashmir issue but could not take a definite stand on it. During the initial years of independence, intents and temper of the Indian political leadership kept reminding Pakistan that India would not let her independence to sustain and this Pakistani sense of mistrust towards India was augmented further by Indian occupation of Kashmir and later escalation of Kashmir dispute as a prime conflict between the two states (Shirin, 1997).

It responded to US security interests by taking different positions at different periods. It is still true that Kashmir is a hot spot that separates Pakistan and India and splits the area. The fight was viewed through the lens of Cold War issues of that time. The US was particularly worried that, given India's strong ties to both China and the Soviet Union and the region of Kashmir's proximity to these two communist countries, Kashmir would turn into a shelter for communist political and strategic successes. The US stand at that time in support of Pakistan's position and US was engaged in diplomatic maneuverings both within and outside the United Nations to secure a prominent role in achieving an equitable resolution to the Kashmir issue.

In post-Cold War Period

With the decline in US-Soviet tensions and escalation of tensions between India and China, the dynamics of the Cold War shifted, leading to a reassessment of India's significance by American policymakers. Recognizing an opportunity to encourage India to counterbalance China, the US adopted a more favorable stance towards India's nuclear program and began aligning its position on Kashmir with India. This included supporting India's electoral process in Indian-administered Kashmir, rejecting UN resolutions on Kashmir, and endorsing bilateral talks to address the issue. This US tilt towards India strained relations with Pakistan, leading to estrangement, and Pakistan gradually moved closer to China.

In 1980s the US-Pakistan engagement achieved its targets in Afghanistan. Pakistan made enormous contributions to the Afghan War, which enabled the United States to win the Cold War and advance its strategic objectives in the area. Pakistan's advantages were minimal and confined to the Zia regime and army. Particularly depressing were Pakistan's national interests, position on the Kashmir dispute, and nuclear option. The aftermath of the war also affected Pakistan, bringing with it guns, drugs, refugees from Afghanistan, and militancy that quickly engulfed the country in problems. As the Afghan War came to a conclusion, the Soviet Union broke up, the Cold War ended, and the US withdrew from the area. As the US withdrew from Pakistan, it noted that the country's nuclear development posed a threat to the stability and peace of South Asia and imposed economic sanctions on it in accordance with the Pressler Amendment. It was also believed that Pakistan was destabilizing India and encouraging terrorism by aiding the conflict in Kashmir that contributed to the worsening of relations between Pakistan and the US. The U.S approach of primacy was apparent by Reagan while declaring that "We in this country, in this generation, are-by destiny rather than choice-- the watchmen on the walls of world freedom" (Wittkopf, Kegley & Scott, 2003, p.37).

The global political and strategic landscape has changed with the end of the Cold War. Global political, strategic, and economic environments underwent radical transformation, generating new ideas that international players explored. India rose to importance in the Asia-Pacific region at this time primarily due to its rising military capabilities, economic emancipation, and secular democracy. As the US and India's bilateral relations have changed, the two nations are now poised to collaborate closely in order to combat terrorism, stop the spread of nuclear weapons, advance democracy, and maintain a stable power balance in Asia for the long run.

In order to maintain the balance of power in Asia and the peace and stability of the Indian Ocean littoral, the US saw India as a counterbalance to China's growing economic and military might and influence. This new framework for US policy in the region fell within the bounds of the US-enacted World Order. Thus, the US tried to forge stronger connections with India in order to strengthen its position with China. However, India grew more and more persuaded that it was necessary to counterbalance China as it saw the warmth with which China was establishing itself on its borders and the extent of Chinese influence throughout Asia and the Indian Ocean. As a result, US ties with India and Pakistan were changed by the reorientation of US interests in the post-Cold War era.

With Pakistan being viewed as a state that sponsors terrorism and proliferates nuclear weapons, US-Pakistan relations were precarious while those with India led to a strategic relationship. In contrast, US-Pakistan relations have become strained, with Pakistan being labeled as a nuclear proliferator and a state sponsor of terrorism. China will be significantly impacted by Washington and New Delhi's strategic alliance. The strategic objective of the US's rapid and significant military build-up in South Asia is to weaken China's dominant position in the region. Globalization and the changing geopolitical environment since the end of the Cold War have given China a lot of chances. The notable

progress China has made economically and its rise to prominence as a military power are significant changes in the geopolitical landscape of the Asia-Pacific area today.

Of paramount concern to the US is the potential for China's ascent to fundamentally reshape the regional strategic and political dynamics. Hence, the primary objective of US policy in the region is to safeguard its interests and forestall China's dominance in the region. In December 2000, the US National Intelligence Commission published a report on the world in 2015 saying, "...if China becomes stronger, it will then seek favourable rearrangement of power in the Asia-Pacific and may engage in conflicts with its neighbours and some outside forces. As a rising power, China will keep on expanding its own influence without considering the US interests" (Benjian, 2001).

Speaking at Sophia University, Tokyo, on March 19, 2005, Condoleezza Rice, US Secretary of State remarked:

Knowing that China is a new factor, knowing that China has the potential for good or for bad, knowing that it will one way or another be an influence, it is our responsibility to try and push and prod and persuade China toward the more positive course.... I really do believe that the US-Japan relationships, the US-South Korean relationship, the US-Indian relationship, all are important in creating an environment in which China is more likely to play a positive role than a negative role (Rice, 2005).

Beijing is extremely concerned about India's growing naval prowess, which presents a serious threat to China's hegemony in the Indo-Pacific area. Chinese officials fear that China's vital oil supply routes could be put in jeopardy by India's growing supremacy in the Indian Ocean and the Strait of Malacca (Lee & Horner, 2014). As a result, there is now more friction between Beijing and New Delhi's maritime policies, as they both place a high priority on developing their naval forces to protect interests that go well beyond their shores.

Conditions are ripe for increased trilateral collaboration among India, Japan, and the US. These nations have conducted joint naval exercises in the Pacific, with the goal of bolstering maritime collaboration and interoperability among their respective navies. Both Japan and India are engaged in territorial disputes with China and harbor concerns regarding Beijing's military objectives. Uday Bhaskar, a former Indian naval officer and defense analyst said that this joint naval exercise "is a reflection of the new strategic environment where there is a degree of unease in India and elsewhere over Chinese activities. To deal with the rise of China, India is now seeking to shape the environment by building collective capability" (Madha, 2014). US Defense specialist Ashley J. Tellis recommended that deepening and expanding relations with Japan, it is possible that India and other major partners in Southeast Asia may create organizational limitations to prevent the mistreatment of China's emerging capabilities. "Even as Washington attempts to preserve good relations with Beijing – and encourages these rim land states to do the same – cultivating ties with these nations may be the best way to prevent China from dominating Asia in the long-term" (Tellis, 2005).

Beijing is concerned about the US-Indian military alliance that is strengthening. As to China's threat assessment, the potential for collaborative containment operations against China and the strategic use of Tibet as a pressure strategy is indicated by the strong strategic alliance between India and the US. Chinese analysts indicate that they are more concerned about India's strengthened strategic position, which the US has backed, than they are about the US power structure remaining in Asia after the end of the Cold War. China's President Hu has expressed concerns about what he sees as American encirclement of his country. He said:

The United States had strengthened its military deployments in the Asia-Pacific region, strengthened the US-Japanese military alliance, strengthened strategic cooperation

with India, improved relations with Vietnam, inveigled Pakistan, established a pro-American government in Afghanistan, and increased arms sales to Taiwan, and so on. They have extended outposts and placed pressure points on us from the East, South, and West. This makes a great change in our geopolitical environment (Smith, 2005).

Chinese strategists assert that a strategic relationship between the US and the India, together with related alliances with other nations such as Australia and Japan, would significantly alter the power dynamics in the South Asia-Indian Ocean region. According to them, the US would try to restrain China's more ambitious goals in the Indian Ocean. The US has improved its military capabilities, adjusted its military deployment, strengthened its military partnerships, and expanded its strategic attention to input in the Asia Pacific region, according to the 2008 White Paper on China's National Defense (China's National Defense, 2008).

India is driven by its ambitious strategic goals to establish itself in Asian contexts and expand its influence beyond Southern Asia. In light of this, India used China's danger status to defend its goal of counterbalancing China's power. The first Indian Defence Minister George Fernandes, remarked in describing China as "India's potential enemy no. 1" (Singh, 2003). India is currently significantly bolstering its defense capabilities in comparison to China, and by 2017, it plans to have invested at least \$15 billion in military operations targeted at China. China is worried about the strategic implications of India's growing economic, political, and military might in addition to ongoing tensions along their shared border. Even while trade between the two neighbors has increased, bilateral trade is not a guarantee against risks to national security or foreign policy. Beijing has proposed a new approach to developing its relations with South Asian countries: good neighbor and peaceful coexistence. This is an attempt to undermine the Indo-US dominance in the region. "Mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, and collaboration" are encouraged by this policy. India views China's strategy of fostering closer ties with other South Asian nations like Pakistan as interference in internal matters and is opposed to it (Sahoo & Taneja, 2010).

China's deepening ties with its South Asian neighbors encompass various dimensions. In Nepal, substantial Chinese investments and active military cooperation, including arms supply and intelligence sharing, have paved the way for new avenues of friendship. Similarly, burgeoning trade relations and significant Chinese investments in Sri Lanka, coupled with maritime cooperation, have strengthened the bond between the two nations.

China's relationship with Bangladesh is characterized by extensive military assistance, including training, technology transfer, and equipment provision. Defense cooperation agreements signed in 2002 and 2004 showed their commitment to bolstering strategic ties, with 2005 marked as the 'China-Bangladesh Friendship Year'. China stands as Bangladesh's largest trade partner, with bilateral trade reaching \$7 billion in 2010. Furthermore, China has taken proactive steps to develop natural gas resources and nuclear power plants in Bangladesh. In Myanmar, China holds the position of the largest trade partner and supplies the majority of the Myanmar Armed Forces' weaponry. Efforts are underway to expand and strengthen relations with Bhutan (Sehgal, 2014).

India finds China's unwavering military and economic ties with Pakistan especially aggravating. India opposes China-Pakistan military cooperation, particularly in the missile and nuclear domains. India has viewed China's acquisition of the deepwater port of Gwadar as extremely risky. They assume that the Gwadar will create a unique opportunity to China to "take a giant leap forward in gaining a strategic foothold ... to monitor US naval activity in the Persian Gulf, Indian activity in the Arabian Sea and future US-Indian maritime cooperation in the Indian Ocean" (Chandran, 2005). The Gwadar project will also provide China "a transit terminal for crude-oil imports from Iran and Africa to China's Xinjiang region. The network of rail and road links connecting Pakistan with Afghanistan and Central

Asian republics that is envisaged as part of the Gwadar development plan and would provide Beijing an opening into Central Asian markets and energy sources, is in the process stimulating the economic development of China's backward Xinjiang region" (Chandran, 2005)

After India's nuclear expeditions in May 1998, there was a momentous strategic dialogue between US officials and Indian leadership. Over the course of two and a half years, there were fourteen rounds of talks between Jaswant Singh, India's Foreign Minister, and Strobe Talbott, US Deputy Secretary of State. The strategic alliance between the United States and India was established in part because of American President Clinton's historic tour to India in March 2000. George W. Bush swiftly and successfully built and broadened this base even more. The previous administration's Indo-centric agenda has been carried out by the Obama administration. In the politics of the Asian balance of power, the US and the India are currently blazing a new path. In 2006, President G. W. Bush emphasized during his visit to India that US and India "are closer than ever before and this partnership has the power to transform the world" (White House. gov, 2006).

One of the greatest ties is quickly developing into a friendship between the US and India. Much has been done to support this partnership, including the noteworthy agreement on civil nuclear cooperation, increased cooperation in innovation and science, trade and commercial ties expansion, strong educational ties, cooperative health challenges, and coordinated efforts to combat terrorism, drug trafficking, and nuclear proliferation. American strategists see a great chance to positively advance US global interests in the alliance with democratic and rising powerful India.

US policymakers also perceive India as a stabilizing influence in South Asia and have bestowed upon it a leadership role, endorsing Indian initiatives on regional affairs. Additionally, the US has encouraged India to expand its involvement in Afghanistan, sharing a common vision for stability in the war-torn nation following the withdrawal of American forces. Both countries are collaborating on a strategy to foster a stable and amicable Afghanistan.

India's role in Afghanistan has significantly evolved over the past decade, with substantial contributions in economic, political, and security realms. India has actively participated in infrastructure development, including the construction of buildings, roads, power projects, dams, hospitals, granaries, and schools. Furthermore, India is engaged in training Afghan parliamentary officials in governance and parliamentary processes. However, Pakistan views India's engagement in Afghanistan, particularly in security matters, as a threat to its national security interests. The security agreements between Afghanistan and both the US and India are aligned with the joint strategic vision of the United States and India for the future of Afghanistan.

Pakistan, whose foreign policy has always been Indian-centric and centers around the India-Pakistan security paradigm, was forced to view Afghanistan from an Indian-centric perspective because to the triangle relationship between the US, Afghanistan, and India. Hamid Karazi, the President of Afghanistan, has made multiple trips to India, which is another indication of Kabul's shift in favor of New Delhi. He wanted to strengthen defense connections between the two governments, as originally outlined in a 2011 strategic partnership agreement, during his most recent visit in 2013. As per the terms of this agreement, New Delhi committed to supporting the Afghan security forces' training and equipment. In order to replace the military void left by the withdrawal of Western forces, Karazi sent Indian authorities a wish list of military hardware on his visit to India.

After the incident of 9/11, US needed Pakistan's support in its campaign of hot pursuit of terrorists, and Islamabad proved to be a reliable ally. This partnership rekindled both nations' cooperation in the global fight against terrorism. Despite Pakistan's significant

sacrifices and contributions to this effort, there is a perception that the US does not fully appreciate Pakistan's value. There is a prevailing belief that the strategic engagement with Pakistan is temporary and lacks the potential for a lasting partnership due to divergent ideologies and concerns. US officials express suspicion towards Pakistan, citing alleged discrepancies in their shared interests and actions. Mistrust persists between the two nations, with Pakistan being accused of harboring terrorists and providing safe havens for them, which undermines regional stability.

Stable relations between India and Pakistan are considered by Americans to be the cornerstone of South Asian security. Any event that threatens South Asia's peace and stability would have an immediate effect on US policy goals there. The US has a significant interest in seeing the two nations work toward a durable and fruitful peace, especially by settling their issue and particularly the dispute over Kashmir, which might turn any time into a nuclear flashpoint point. However, the US always kept changing its security policy towards South Asia conferring its interests in the region. US has always emphasized that a nonviolent state of region. The Americans assert that the onus of ending hostilities ultimately rests with the people of India and Pakistan. Thus, Washington at all times encouraged New Delhi and Islamabad to reduce strain and helped them in this regard, and motivated them for talks.

This is because the US views both Pakistan and India as strategically valuable, and it is concerned about the issue of peace and security in the South Asia region.

Conclusion

The US has recognized the growing significance of South Asia ever since it first emerged as the leader of the free world. South Asia was a territory that shared borders with China and the Soviet Union, two communist states. The security of South Asia, not just one nation, has always been the goal of US strategy towards the region. Pakistan and India were crucial to US plans in the area. It therefore desired to fortify both states, whether in opposition to China or the Soviet Union. Occasionally, the US's security approach in South Asia changed to reflect its changing interests in the area. Because of its advantageous geostrategic location, Pakistan was chosen and included in US security alliance system in Asia for containment of spread of communism during the Cold War. New strategic and economic realities following the conclusion of the Cold War made the world a US-led world. India was chosen as a strategic ally by the US in its efforts to establish new centers of power in the Asia-Pacific region, emphasizing its importance as a counterbalance to China's growing military and economic might. Americans believe that China's expanding economic and military may pose serious challenges to US interests in the region and that China would eventually push for a multipolar international order in opposition to US global ambitions. The US approach to the South Asian region was significantly influenced by its new policy orientations in the Asia-Pacific region. New diplomatic tendencies were established, and the choices of the past were overturned. The American experts supported an Indo-centric strategy that highlighted India as the region's largest secular democracy, growing economic power, and developing military might. They saw India as a dominant force that would be essential in containing future threats, such as China's growing influence in the Asia-Pacific region. The US government finally formed a strategic relationship with India as a result of US strategic concerns. The strategic alliance between the United States and India, according to the Americans, is founded on a vision of democracy and regional security throughout Asia. The strategic alliance between the United States and India has been steadily advancing, increasing collaboration in the areas of counterterrorism, civil nuclear, and defense.

References

- Benjian, X. (2001, September). Security Dilemma, Balance of Power Vs. US Policy Towards China in the Post-Cold War Era. *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi the Journal of the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations*
- Chandran, S. R. (2005, March 4). 'China's Pearl in Pakistan's Waters. *Asia Time*. Hong Kong.
- China's National Defense in 2008. (2009, January). *Information Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China*. Beijing.
- Goldberg, J. (2014, August 29). Myanmar's Great Power Balancing Act. *The Diplomat*.
- Goodman, J. (2014, March 6). Sri Lanka's Growing Links with China. *The Diplomat*
- Lee, J., Horner, C. (2014, January 10). China faces barriers in the Indian Ocean. *Asia Times*, Bangkok
- Madha, N. (2024, July 22). Japan to Join U.S.-India Military Exercises: Maritime Cooperation Grows as Region Faces a More-Assertive China. *The Wall Street Journal*. New York.
- Muzaffar, M. & Khan, I (2016). China-Russia Relations after the Cold War, *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 1 (II), 151-169
- President Discusses Strong US-India Partnership in New Delhi. (2006, March 3).
- Relations between China and Bangladesh. *China Centre, Alipur Campus, University of Calcutta*. Calcutta.
- Remarks of Condoleezza Rice at Sophia University Tokyo. (2005, March 19). *U.S. Department of State*.
- Sahoo, P., & Taneja, N. (2010, February 5). China's growing Presence in India's neighborhood. *East Asia Forum*. Canberra.
- Sehgal, S. (2014, January 15). China Expands into Himalayan Neighbor Nepal. *International Relations and Security Network*. Zurich.
- Singh, B. K. (2003, May 27). George Fernandes and Sino-Indian Relation. *Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies*, New Delhi.
- Smith, A. (2005, September-October). China, Inc.-The rise of a new power. *International Socialist Review* (42). Volume issue page????? Chicago.
- Tellis, A. J. (2005, July 14). Indo-U.S. Relations Headed for a Grand Transformation? *Yale Global, Yale: MacMillan Centre for International and Area Studies*.