

Security of Pakistan under the Shadow of Indo-US Strategic Partnership

Huma Amin

(Ph.D. Student at School of International and Public Affairs, Jilin University, China)

humaamin69@yahoo.com

Dr Qiaorui

(Lecturer at School of International and Public Affairs, Jilin University, China)

Abstract

The rising convergence between India and the United States, as well as their strategic interests, have been evident since the end of the Cold War. Over the last decade, the Indo-US strategic partnership has strengthened not only in the areas of defence, arms cooperation, counter-terrorism collaboration, ballistic missile defence, drones, nuclear technologies, space, and cyber technology, but India has also emerged as a prominent strategic partner of the United States in the areas of cyber and homeland security. India is becoming a pompous regional player who wants to be the regional hegemon as the Indo-US Strategic Partnership grows. As a result of the Indo-US strategic cooperation, the discrepancy in conventional and nuclear weapons between India and Pakistan could exacerbate the South Asian arms race and destabilise Pakistan's security environment. Pakistan must implement a proactive foreign policy in order to gain from the changing global and strategic environment. For Pakistan's economic and security, an alliance policy with regional and extra regional nations would be more prudent. Under the shadow of the US-India cooperation, this paper briefly emphasises the potential security threats to Pakistan.

Keywords

United States, India, China, Pakistan, Strategic Convergence, CPEC, Partnership, USSR, Realism, Non-Proliferation, Nuclear Supplier Group, Deterrence

1. Introduction

The strategic partnership between India and the United States is briefly discussed in this paper, as well as its potential threats to the security of Pakistan. South Asia has always been an important region in world politics, regardless of historical background. The Indo-US Strategic Partnership is the result of a long-term collaboration between India and the United States following the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 (Brands, 1990). Meanwhile, after the end of the Cold War, the United States has openly aided India as a regional power, owing to Indian leaders' opening up of their economy and adoption of a new economic policy known as Privatization, Globalization, and Liberalization (PGL),

which attracted the United States. The United States then began to invest in India. Both countries held their first military exercise in 1992 (Hussain, 1985).

Both states have maintained cordial relations since the dawn of the twenty-first century, and their presidents have made reciprocal trips (S, 2006). Both countries' current relationship is referred to as a "Strategic Partnership" (Bouton, 2010). This strategic alliance is built on reciprocal cooperation in sectors including defence, nuclear cooperation, and military, nuclear, and missile technology transfer. New Delhi and Washington also agreed to take the next stages in their strategic collaboration (NSSP). In 2005, the two countries signed a new framework for defence relations (NFDR) and a nuclear technology agreement for 123 civilians in 2008. In 2009, the strategic dialogue began. India is an inconsequential aspect in the United States' anti-China strategy.

In 2015, the United States and India reintroduced their new framework for defence relations (NFDR), and in 2016, they signed a logistic support agreement. When US President Barack Obama recognised India as a key defence partner in 2016, the Indo-US strategic cooperation evolved (Mahrukh, 2017). The present US President Trump has also shown his closeness towards India's so-called Prime Minister Modi, whom he refers to as a "True Comrade of the United States" (Perkovich, 2010). India is seen as a counter-power by the US administration, and it might play a significant role in delaying China's emergence as a regional force. Pakistan, on the other hand, is concerned that the US will continue to provide unconditional backing to India in order to help it become a global power, resulting in Indian-favoured conventional and nuclear asymmetry in South Asia. Furthermore, the regional balance of power (BOP) would favour India.

The bottom line is that Indo-US strategic collaboration jeopardises the security structure of South Asia. And, if India grows as a big power in the area and becomes a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) with veto power, Pakistan's interests will be manipulated at the international level. Pakistan must pursue diplomatic steps in order to survive on the international stage. This Strategic Partnership between India and the United States obligates Pakistan to engage in comparable engagements with China in relation to Indo-US strategic cooperation in order to sustain the BOP in South Asia. Because of the Indo-US strategic conglomerate and its implications for Pakistan, the issue chosen for this study is significant. India is gaining orthodox armed superiority in the world. India's ability to fight back has significantly overtaken Pakistan's. In terms of wide-area infrastructure awareness, India has made far more progress than Pakistan.

In comparison to India, Pakistan's modernization has been hampered by asymmetry of financial assets and limits on its capacity to get sophisticated systems. This conventional armed conflict raises concerns about whether it will lead to another conventional war between India and Pakistan, as well as whether these differences will lead to the use of nuclear weapons. If Pakistan's conventional armies and fissile powers are insufficient to deter India from using its superior conventional military might offensively against Pakistan during times of crisis, the asymmetry in South Asia will persist, with far-reaching consequences for Pakistan.

2. Indo-US Strategic Partnership (A Historical Evolution)

Historically, the US-India relationship has been characterised by scepticism and enmity. Two events in 1947 put a stop to the stormy nature of these unions for a long time. In the first, the Cold War began and a bipolar world emerged. Second, British India was partitioned, resulting in two antagonistic states, India and Pakistan (Burke, 1973). The Indian leaders' struggle for independence from the British government mirrored the American struggle for independence from the British government. The US respected Nehru and Gandhi's fortitude and regarded Gandhi as a political leader as well as a saint in

India. After Gandhi's death in 1948, the US wanted to build a memorial. That war had already begun in Europe between capitalism and communism when India obtained independence from the British.

The US redirected its attention to South Asia after Mao's communist forces defeated Chiang Kai Shek's nationalist army in 1949. The Indian Prime Minister was invited to America in 1949. The early struggle for independence made Indian administration famous in America. President Truman "remembered that America had been found by Columbus in quest of a new way to India" when Nehru visited the US in 1947. A "road of discovery" for Nehru, these notes. Nehru was greeted as a hero throughout his journey. "George Washington" for the US, Nehru. Then-Defense Secretary Dean Acheson likened him to Jefferson, Wilson, and The Times said that Washington wants India to be a communist barrier. India may be a key China counterbalance. He emphasised India's unique plan in his presentation to Congress. Nehru expected India to embrace US funding. But he refused US aid. In his remarks, he said that "the strongest ties are not links" between India and the US. His tour emphasised American anti-communism. As a result of his flight from the US, Nehru certainly avoided any East-West clash. As a result of the two leaders' differing viewpoints, the expedition to America was fruitless. Indo-Pak tensions escalated after British administration ended due to disagreements over Jammu and Kashmir. The US considered the Kashmir dispute as a sad disagreement between two South Asian countries, with no practical outcomes (Burke, 1973). The Indo-US also disagreed on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Korean War. This was a policy of containment, not confinement. Due to India's China policy, Nehru labelled the US an aggressive state during the Korean War. When SEATO and CENTO were formed in 1954 and 1955, the US wanted India to join the Asian Alliance. After Nehru's rejection, the US turned to Pakistan. Not China or the USSR, but India was Pakistan's main concern.

As a result, the US increased economic and military help. Nehru was embraced by Non-Align. These pacts harmed Indo-US Native Americans rebelled. The US-Pakistan security contracts have harmed Indo-US (Sultan, 1982). It was not his intention to harm India, he promised Prime Minister Nehru (Brands, 1990). President Eisenhower was troubled by the sour Indo-US India, like America, was a colony. Without US financial assistance, expatriate countries would be forced to accept Communism. So far, so good under Eisenhower. \$104. In the 1960s, the US-India relationship shifted. The communist menace to American freedom in 1961. On behalf of India, JFK pledged \$225 million in two years (1961-1963). Pakistan disliked US bigotry. It happened in 1962. The US helped India fight communist China. When China attacked India, Nehru sensed the Indian army's weakness. Nehru enlisted friendly nations' aid. Nehru's request received \$70 million in military aid from the US and UK (Husain, 1979). The US sent an e-130 navy transport squadron to India. Kennedy's pro-India policy weakened US-Pakistan relations (Soherwordi, 2010).

During the 1965 conflict, the US supplied weaponry and supplies to Pakistan and India, who were entrusted with controlling the USSR and China. India crossed the international border without declaring war on September 6, 1965. Asserting that the weapons were sent solely to combat Communism in Asia, the US imposed arms embargo Not just India, but Pakistan was unhappy with the US security deals. The US first imposed a weapons embargo on India in 1965. Post-war US food aid forced India to devalue (Brands, 1990). Détente, a period of peace between two foes, peaked in 1965. Relations with China and the US were good. Nixon did not consider China as a security threat (Soherwordi, 2010). Nixon's administration aided Pakistan in the 1971 Indo-Pak war. India dominated the region after its 1971 victory over Pakistan and the establishment of Bangladesh. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was a realist who saw India as a regional power. US-China truce in Korean War The USSR's veto prevents passage of any resolution. It was signed in 1972. They agreed to peacefully resolve their differences through bilateral talks. They committed to respect each other's sovereignty and

territorial integrity while adhering to the ideals of peaceful coexistence (Soherwordi, 2010). In the 1970s, India-US relations were sour. India halted the US global advancement agency. On Diego Garcia, the US kept its naval base in 1974, endangering India's sanctuary. Both countries attempted to minimise the impact.

India and the United States agreed to safeguard bilateral relations in education, culture, business, research and technology in 1974. (S, 2006). Fearing proliferation, the US chastised India following its first nuclear test in May 1974. US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger visited India in 1974 to promote good relations (M, 2010). Nixon imposed sanctions on India and Pakistan in 1975. In 1976, India and Pakistan cordially welcomed Jimmy Carter. In 1977, the Janta Party defeated the Congress. The first non-Congress Prime Minister, Moraji Desai. The Indo-US relationship seemed to be improving after India's elections. Carter visited India in 1978 to rekindle US interest. And the US decided to subsidise Tarapur's fuel.

The US saw India as the South Asian leader (Kumar D. 2009). Jimmy Carter and Moraji Desai met in India. These jaunts may not be enough to heal the nuclear rift in 1979, the US used Pakistan as a proxy in a proxy war to better understand the USSR. Indira Gandhi's friendship with Ronald Reagan shifted India-US ties in the 1980s. Reagan revamped India policy and boosted financial and technological collaboration. In 1982, Indira Gandhi visited America and had high-level meetings. Both states agreed on fuel and supplementary supplies for Tarapur in 1982. USA decided to expand tech transfer in 1984 (2006, S).

In 1984, after Indira Gandhi's death, Rajiv Gandhi became India's Prime Minister. Rajiv Gandhi and Ronald Reagan discussed regional security in South Asia in 1985. Rajiv Gandhi backed his government's efforts to protect regional sanctuaries through the SAARC. Reagan complimented Rajiv Gandhi's efforts to maintain regional calm. The world became unipolar after the USSR fell in 1990. As the world's solitary superpower, India had to find a new ally. This was seen as a strategy to counterbalance the Soviet Union's loss of authority in the region. If India was not included in the Pressler amendment, then US aid for Pakistan was removed. Both Bill Clinton and Narashima Rao were elected in 1991. A new era in Indo-US relations is dawning. Indian Finance minister Manmohan Singh started new economic policy termed as (PGL) globalization, Privatization India's liberalisation, Because of India's liberalisation efforts, the US government invested in India. This event strengthened commercial and defence ties between India and the US. Indo-American military cooperation emerged. But neither country helped write the NPT or the CTBT. General Claude M. Kickleigher of the US Air Force visited India in 1991 and proposed a large training and exchange programme. PM Narashima Rao believes effective bilateral cooperation benefits both countries. The Defense Policy Group had high-level conversations, policy evaluations, and senior officer visits (Singh, 2017). On Diego Garcia and the Persian Gulf, Indian politicians praised the US in 1992.

Both the US and Indian governments were determined to make atonement for India's non-ratification of the NPT in 1993. In 1994, Narashima Rao met with President Bill Clinton in Washington. Clinton tried to enhance relations with India. A growing Indo-US alliance was seen in 1995. In India, March 1995 (S., 2006). After the 1998 atomic tests, the US further restricted India. A nuclear war was avoided when President Clinton urged Pakistan's Prime Minister to withdraw his forces from the Kargil War in 1999. So the Bush administration chose to help India strengthen its global standing. The US saw China as a geopolitical competitor, not just a regional stimulus. India-US defence co-operation is now. It also committed not to discuss nukes openly with the US. Sanctions were imposed when India tested in 1998. (Maj, 2002).

3. Indo-US Start of Partnership (Agreements and Treaties)

With the rise of extremist Islam in the region following 9/11, the US saw India as the only entity in the region capable of safeguarding US interests in South Asia. The first major defence agreement between the United States and India was inked in April 2002. In which the United States agreed to equip India with eight Raytheon Co. long-range missile detecting radars worth \$ 146 million in order to track down enemy long-range mortars, artillery, and rocket launchers. On May 22, 2003, the United States approved a \$1.2 billion deal with India for Israel's Phalcon early warning system (Weitz, 2017). India and the United States signed a Strategic Partnership in 2004 that covered civil nuclear operations, missile defence, civil space initiatives, and high-tech trade.

Both the US and India decided in October 2004 to form an operational group that would ostensibly express not only the prospect of nuclear cooperation, but also India's commitment to non-proliferation. In June 2005, a new framework of defence connections was signed between India and the United States, in which both countries agreed to expand their defence cooperation and develop a structure for the following ten years, strengthening the Indo-US Strategic Partnership.

The main motivation for the Indo-US strategic cooperation is broad. As a result of China's rise in the region and the convergence of geopolitical interests, as well as India's rise as an economic power, the US changed its policy in South Asia (Boutoun, 2010). In his speech to the US Congress in 2017, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi emphasised the start of the Indo-US strategic relationship. He stated that a robust Indo-US strategic alliance may serve as a global anchor for peace, prosperity, and stability. This growing strategic cooperation allows both countries to share a number of common interests. These sections include defence, space programme, expertise, civil nuclear cooperation, and so on. India's rise as a regional power was aided by strategic cooperation between India and the United States. India is also seen as a counterweight to China by the United States. The US has also expressed support for India's membership in the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), which would improve India's chances of gaining access to modern technologies.

The strategic partnership between India and the United States could stifle progress in South Asia. If this collaboration continues unabated, there may be possibilities of instability in the strategic balance of power in the region, which might lead to an arm antagonism in the region between India and Pakistan (Akhtar, 2009).

3.1 Indo-US Defence Deal

Defense cooperation is extremely important in the Indo-US strategic partnership, which is frequently referred to as defence diplomacy. Defense diplomacy, in a broader sense, is described as the use of armed forces in operations rather than war, and the application of skilled skills to achieve national and foreign objectives abroad. Defense cooperation, on the other hand, is defined as any interaction between two or more states in which their armed forces collaborate to achieve common goals. In recent years, Indo-US defence cooperation has improved in battling international terrorism, stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction, drug trafficking, human trafficking, and piracy, among other issues. Military-to-military contacts, dialogue, training, munitions sales, proficient military education exchanges, and practical military support have all boosted Indo-US defence cooperation (Bishoyi, 2010). The Indo-US defence deal was signed on June 28, 2005, to strengthen defence and military cooperation. This agreement has prepared the path for the US to ease export prohibitions on sensitive military technology to India without having to sign the CTBT (Akhtar, 2009). The Indian Prime Minister and US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel met in New Delhi on August 8, 2014, to discuss the renewal of the Indo-US 10-year defence contract for cooperative progress (Mahrukh, 2017). The US defence secretary's three-day visit to India was to discuss Prime Minister Modi's plans with President Barack Obama and sign a contract to buy at least 22 Apache attack helicopters and 15 Chinook heavy

lift helicopters, as well as C-130 Hercules transport planes and Boeing P-81 long-range maritime surveillance and anti-submarine aircraft (Kronstadt, 2012).

The New Framework for the United States-India Defense Relationship, a 10-year defence contract signed in 2005, is now known as the New Framework for the United States-India Defense Relationship (Bhat, 2015). By 2015, the Indo-US armaments trade will have reached \$100 billion. In 2017, as part of the Indo-US nuclear pact, both nations' companies decided to begin engineering and site enterprise work on six nuclear reactors in India as soon as possible (Weitz, 2017). Because India controls advanced nuclear weapons and a sophisticated missile defence system, the value of nuclear deterrence would be diminished, and India would attempt to establish a regional hegemon as a result of this pact (Fani, 2012). India's advanced nuclear technology might allow it to attack nuclear sites in Pakistan and China. To confront Indian technology, Islamabad needs to develop new armaments and upgrade its technology. In 2015, US Secretary of Defense Ashon Carter paid four visits to India and described himself as a friend of India. Ashon Carter described it as "strategic cooperation" to ensure regional safety and stability.

The United States wants to maintain its influence in the region, where Pakistan has been replaced by India. The growing Indo-US ties would have detrimental consequences for Pakistan's security. For the past eight years, India has been the world's largest arm importer, spending over a hundred billion dollars yearly on arms, of which two-thirds are currently being used against Pakistan. India would be inspired to act belligerently towards Pakistan if the US provided armed and civilian backing through this strategic alliance. India is attempting to strengthen its ties with the United States in the areas of space and ballistic missiles. The Indo-US High Technology Co-operation Organization (HTCG), a group that brings together commercial and government professionals, was established in July 2003. Communication systems, satellite networks, information security, encryption technology, mines weapon technology, ship building, combat air craft, Nano technology, UAV technology and associated sensors, software development, test equipment, tanks, armed vehicles, rockets, missile launchers, radar, air defence system, and small arms were among the items they discussed for joint development.

In today's world, India is vying for the most advanced space programme. Both countries issued joint statements in July 2005 to strengthen ties in space exploration, satellite navigation, and commercial space launch. In terms of satellite navigation, President Bush has decided to work with India. Suriya is a colossal missile with solid fuel stages in diameter and a total weight of roughly 275 metric tonnes that can carry a nuclear payload. Suriya employs PSLV rocket motors and is a colossal missile with solid fuel stages in diameter and a total weight of around 275 metric tonnes. This would make it the world's largest ICBM, with a launch weight three times that of the largest Russian ICBM. India's final step toward ICBM would be accelerated with US space support. Though the Indo-US space collaboration is for civil objectives, India's civilian space launch programme cannot be separated from its military agenda. The US had a policy against missile proliferation in the past, but it does not apply to India's missile development.

In 2005, India deployed the Agni 5 intercontinental ballistic missile, which has a range of over 5000 kilometres and can carry military targets in China and Pakistan (Hassan, 2010). The strategic context in Pakistan needs vicissitudes for Indian BMD deployment. The strategic cooperation between India and the United States generated a conventional military asymmetry in India, favouring military superiority. The BMD system also allows India to intrude and destroy the majority of Pakistan's missile capabilities. In this circumstance, India can launch massive strikes against Pakistan's counterforce targets, wiping out a significant amount of Pakistan's defensive capabilities. Meanwhile, Pakistan's

ability to resist Indian diktats and oppose regional hegemony is aided by a well-thought-out plan (Ahmed, 2018). Because Pakistan has failed to take sufficient steps to evict Afghan insurgents from its territory, US President Donald Trump postponed Pakistan's military funding of 1.3 billion dollars in January 2018. Seven Pakistani firms have been put to the Trump administration's list of foreign entities that presumably pose a threat to the US's national security. Pakistan's quest to join the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG), a prominent club of countries that can trade fissile materials and nuclear technologies, may be weakened as a result of the move. Pakistan filed for NSG in May 2016, but the US and other western countries are actively supporting India's bid to join the cluster. Pakistan is backed by China and Turkey (Iqbal, 2018). The strengthening of Indo-US strategic ties is critical to the Indo-Israeli-US defence and security nexus, but also instils fear across South Asia. In terms of defence, India is becoming closer to Israel. With the help of the US, the Indo-Israel defence cooperation allows India to get advanced technology from Israel, such as the Phalcon radar system and other advanced equipment.

3.2 Indo-US Strategic Convergence in Indo-Pacific Region

Because it is connected to the Strait of Hormuz, the Strait of Malacca, and the Sunda Strait, the Indian Ocean is home to a number of international choke points. If there is any disruption in transportation flow via these points, the world will pay a terrible price. Because the majority of their energy life lines are sea-based, the disorder of energy flows is seen as a security concern for littoral states. The importance of energy in encouraging a nation's geopolitical tactics cannot be overstated. Any disruption in its supply could cause major problems (Amin 2021). India and China are both energy-consuming countries in South Asia, therefore securing the region's marine lines of communication and choke spots is unavoidable and critical for both countries.

The United States has strengthened its strategic position in the Indo-Pacific, which connects the oil-rich Persian Gulf to East Asia. South Asia and the Indo-Pacific connects Washington's European Atlantic policy with its Asia Pacific strategy in terms of geopolitical potential. During the Cold War, these two were separated. To deal with anticipated risks posed by China's unpredictable future, the US revised its new European Asian strategy. In this new policy, India is a key player in containing China. "India has the potential to safeguard the peace in the huge Indo-Pacific and its periphery," according to former Secretary of State Collin Paul (Hassan, 2010). The United States is beefing up its Asian bases in order to bring them closer to China and lower their vulnerability to assault. The Malabar drill was co-ordinated by the Indian and US warships. The Malabar naval drill demonstrated a common Indian and American interest in keeping the Indo-Pacific's maritime routes and choke points open to international shipping. The Indo-US strategic partnership reflected both countries' desire to maintain a stable balance of power in Asia. In June 2012, India's external affairs minister S.M. Krishna and US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton met in Washington and issued joint proclamations that clearly stated that India and the US had a shared vision for concord, firmness, and opulence in India. During the annual Strategic Dialogue in June 2013, similar joint statements were also published (Nazamani, 2014).

3.3 United States War on Terror and India's Support

With the sharing of skills, information exchange, operational help, and access to advanced counter-terrorism technology and equipment, counter-terrorism cooperation has improved dramatically. A new Indo-US Counter-Terrorism Cooperation Initiative was inked, which was unveiled during President Obama's November 2010 visit to India, to significantly enhance operational cooperation, counter-terrorism technology transfers, and capacity building. In May 2011, US Secretary of Homeland

Security Janet Napolitano visited India for the first session of this discourse. Another meeting of this Dialogue was held in May 2013 in Washington, DC. Megacities Watching, Fighting Illicit Finance, Money Laundering, Cyber Security and Dangerous Infrastructure Protection, Port, Border, Maritime, Transportation and Supply Chain Sanctuary, Science and Technology Cooperation, and Capacity Building were also discussed during the Dialogue. When relations between Pakistan and the United States deteriorated in Afghanistan, Indo-US strategic collaboration improved. As the US calls Indians, India is busy creating infrastructure there, and the US wants India's cooperation in Afghanistan, which would be disastrous to Pakistan (Nazir, 2016). Pakistan has had major internal security issues since the US military presence in the region for the war on terror began. As a result, Pakistan must safeguard its national interests while being open to all possibilities. For its own sake, Pakistan must eradicate terrorism and ensure that no terrorist organisations operate from its soil.

In recent years, the Indo-US military coordination has improved, and both countries have performed numerous joint military exercises. India's intention to undertake as many joint military exercises as possible with the US in order to advance their strategic cooperation. India is enthralled by the opportunity to obtain hands-on experience through war games, while the United States is interested in learning from Indian expertise in areas like as improvised explosive devices (IEDD), counter-insurgency, and mountain and jungle warfare. Both countries held yearly military drills in 2010, which included instructions for various US army weapon systems. Yudh Abhyas are traditional exercises that both countries hold on a regular basis. These drills are intended to promote military cooperation between the two countries through a joint military decision-making process (Bishoyi, 2010). The increasing number of joint military exercises between the Indian and US armed forces will improve the Indian forces' working capability and proficiency.

3.4 US War in Afghanistan and India

Afghanistan is another area of strategic collaboration between the two countries. The Bush administration praised India's strategic efforts in Afghanistan to improve the security environment and establish the Afghan national army through a tough training programme. During his visit to India, President Obama stated that the US wants Indian involvement in helping Afghanistan achieve self-sufficiency. The United States saw India's unwavering support for Afghanistan's development as critical to the country's long-term success (Bishoyi, 2010). Cooperation between India and the United States may provide India with an opportunity to persuade the United States to take action against Pakistan in counter-terrorism operations along the Pakistan-Afghan border. Following the partial withdrawal of the United States from Afghanistan in 2014, Neo realism asserts that the nature of international structure results in an arms race and a security dilemma among competitive states. Both India and Pakistan are compelled to pursue their own survival due to the same international anarchic structure. Pakistan's security would undoubtedly be impacted by the growing Indo-US strategic partnership, Indo-Afghan strategic collaboration, Indian consulates in Afghanistan's major cities such as Kandahar and Jalalabad, and an Indian air base on the Afghan Tajik border, which is close to the Pak-Afghan border. Furthermore, if the US seeks to establish Indian hegemony in Afghanistan, India and Pakistan will engage in a proxy war in Afghanistan, undermining the entire South Asian area (Inayat, 2016).

4. Theoretical Construct

For the purpose of completing this paper, the researcher used realism and its offshoots, such as neo-realism, balance of power (BOP), and alliance building. "To various people, the word theory means different things. It could possibly imply various things to different people" (Paul R Viotti, 1999).

“Theory can be seen of as a road map for conducting research, especially when the goal is to analyse rather than simply describe international politics. Theory guides us through the process of upgrading our studies from description to analysis” (Jorgenson, 2010). “The attitude or habit of taking a situation as is and preparing to cope with it appropriately” (Waltz, 2008). Moreover, Classical realists observe and examine the world as it is; orthodox realists, on the other hand, believe that the sphere is faulty, as Morgenthau emphasises, and that countries are egomaniacs who act solely for their own advantage. Furthermore, this theory emphasises that all countries live in a "international" system, in which the primary characteristic is the never-ending struggle for dominance (Neal, 1979). In the field of international relations, realism emerged as the dominant systematic paradigm primarily after the outbreak of World War II, when it expatriated idealism theories by providing fresh precise information and more applicable replies to the origins of the war and the extinction of peace. Several characteristics of today's realist worldview can be traced back to the time of Thucydides, Niccolò Machiavelli, and Thomas Hobbes (Paul R. Viotti, 1999).

Hans Morgenthau, Edward Carr, and Kenneth Waltz are among the modern philosophers who see the Balance of Power as a starting point for regional and global stability because of its ability to maintain the predominance of a single administration (Scot Burchill, 2009). Neorealism, often known as structural realism, is a foundational theory of international relations that aims to explain how states, particularly the most powerful, operate and interact in the world. Kenneth Waltz's book *Structure of Foreign Relations*, published in 1979, is often credited with the theory. Two elements are key in Waltz's concept of structure: first, there is anarchy—the absence of international government at the international level. Anarchy produces a self-help system, and every state's primary purpose is to survive. The distribution of abilities among the components comprising the international system is the second defining principle (Neal, 1979).

Unlike classical realism, which believes that limitations in international politics finally emerge from human nature, the theory he discusses holds that the intrinsic structuring of the international system is the primary factor of state conduct. It depicts an international system characterised by anarchy, which pushes governments to prioritise the acquisition of power as a structural requirement. According to Waltz, states' principal goal is to maximise their relative power in order to ensure their security. As a result, governments will strive to counteract the greatest external threat by creating short-term alliances with other states that are similarly threatened (Neal, 1979). A key concept among realists that refers to a symmetrical arrangement between states. Realists disagree on whether statesmen create symmetry or power balance among states. Decision makers may use the application of the balance of power as justification for a particular foreign policy (Jakobsen, 2013).

The foundation of the balance of power theory is realism, which holds that a state's dominant strategy is to strengthen its security by pursuing armed, economic, and political power rather than ideals or morals. The realist perspective emphasises the need of looking at the actual or true situation, whether it is favourable or negative. In this anarchic society, hegemonic intimidations must be balanced, according to Kenneth Waltz, who believed Balance of Power to be a basic aspect of Neorealism or Structural Realism. Small and big states equally use the balance of power to counter perceived threats. During the Cold War, Pakistan's goal in joining the US-backed accords was to counterbalance the strategic alliance between India and the Soviet Union. Because the US has proven to be a disloyal ally for Pakistan throughout the years, the Pakistan-China entente cordiale is still balancing the Indo-US strategic relationship in order to bring peace and stability to the area. Multiple techniques were used to maintain the balance of power between the US and the USSR. The United States established NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) in 1949, whereas the Soviet Union built the Warsaw Pact, a communist alliance to resist NATO dominance.

Due to the Balance of Power, the Cold War may not escalate into a raging conflict. "A formal agreement or coalition between two or more states to work together on military or security issues. In Balance of Power politics, military ties frequently play a role." (Jorgenson, et al., 2010). Internal balancing and alliance forming theories are two of the most reliable and credible ways for countering or balancing threats. The idea is for states to keep a close eye on their own interests and to avoid harming other interests, whether friendly or hostile. There is a well-known saying that describes the complex nature of international relations: "In international politics, there is no permanent friend or permanent enemy, only permanent interests; a friend of today may be an enemy of tomorrow, and an enemy of today may be a friend of tomorrow." In order to protect itself from the Indian threat, the newly constituted Pakistan decided to join a Western-led alliance and sign the SEATO and CENTO safety contracts, which were led by the United States. Despite Pakistan's membership in the US Security Alliance, the US provided no help to Pakistan in the face of Indian hostility during the 1965 and 1971 wars and the disarmament of East Pakistan.

As a result, Pakistan chose to practise internal balancing, which makes the country stronger than any other. "In an anarchic international system, state A may sincerely increase its defence spending only for defensive purposes and self-preservation, but it is rational for other states to assume the worst and impute aggressive intentions to state A, leading state A to feel insecure and contemplate a further increase in mil (Tang, 2009). The Indo-US strategic partnership is also a symbol of power politics in the post-September 11 era; this engagement, which began with President George W. Bush's visit in 2006, was practically in every field ranging from defence cooperation to nuclear trading. The main motivation behind Indo-US collaboration is to contain China, which is rapidly becoming as a significant economic and political power, posing a threat to US global hegemony.

Following China's rise, the United States and its western allies require a strong partner to counterbalance China. India may be the best option for countering China and preserving the United States' strategic position in the area. According to the report, the Indo-US strategic cooperation would have far-reaching ramifications for Pakistan's security as India rises to become a regional hegemon and a counterweight to China. Because of their partnership with India, the US-China power balance tilts in favour of the US, affecting the power balance between Pakistan and India. The Indo-US strategic relationship has the potential to cause a power shift in South Asia's strategic balance, disrupt the current strategic balance, and create circumstances for war between India and Pakistan. There is a link between Pakistan's security and the strategic cooperation between India and the United States (Bukhari, 2016).

The study's claim is that the US wants to use a balance of power approach to turn India into a counter-power to China. The US's BOP and "security dilemma" methods have produced a critical proclivity for its China strategy. To offset China's dominance in South Asia, the US pursued an alliance-building policy. The US secures its interests in the Asian region on the basis of the Indo-US strategic relationship, and after establishing India as a natural and trusted friend of the US, and Pakistan as an ally in the fight on terror in US security measures, as well as alliance with Japan. On the dais of the Indo-US strategic alliance, India aspires to be the Asian North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), seeks a permanent seat on the UN Security Council (UNSC), and demands security assurances from the US to counter China. In addition to the US alliance plan, China has advocated for a counter-alliance strategy as well as alliance formation through the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) (Amin 2020). The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is also playing an important role in countering the ongoing strategic cooperation between India and the United States.

In addition, China's involvement in the Association of Southeast Nations (ASEAN) and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) reduces the United States' influence in

Asia. As a result, the world's two largest democracies wish to counter their joint adversary (China) from a political, economic, and strategic standpoint (Bukhari, 2016). It also may be claimed that modifying the BOP in India's favour would hasten the power transition in South Asia, which would be damaging to Pakistan's security. The South Asian area is concerned that it is operating on the BOP principle. There would be insecurity in the region if any changes are made to the system. The BOP theory lends credibility to this research.

5. Security of Pakistan under the Shadow of Indo-US Strategic Convergence

With the rise of the United States of America (US) as the world's most powerful actor, India altered its foreign policy and began to collaborate more closely with the US. The United States replied by assisting India in its quest to become a Great Power in South Asia. The strategic cooperation between India and the United States has the potential to exacerbate power imbalances in South Asia. Pakistan's strong anti-American sentiments contributed significantly to the current Indo-US strategic relationship. The strategic alliance between India and the United States in the field of missile defence systems has a negative effect on the strategic environment of the entire region, particularly for Pakistan (Ali, 2018). The strategic cooperation between India and the United States will have serious consequences for Pakistan and South Asia, which must be considered. The strategic relationship allows India to purchase conventional weapons worth \$5 billion from the United States more quickly. It might as well take a pass on the nuclear-confidentiality discussions with Pakistan. The strategic alliance between India and the United States is a strong indication that the United States no longer views India and Pakistan as equal partners in the South. This will worsen the dilemma of India's and Pakistan's unequal build-up of conventional and nuclear capabilities. The strategic cooperation between India and the United States could lead to a misalignment in Pakistan's strategic interests with the United States (Jaspal, 2007).

5.1 Potential Diplomatic War against Pakistan

India has waged a diplomatic war against Pakistan, claiming that Pakistan is unsuitable for the counter-terrorism coalition because it provides funds and support to terrorist organisations operating within the country. The bombing in the Srinagar Assembly, as well as the subsequent attack on the Indian Parliament, were linked to 9/11. The build-up of prepared armies along the border was a move aimed at pressuring Pakistan to abandon its Kashmir policy (Singh, 2017).

5.2 Indo-US Strategic Convergence and Cost for China and Pakistan

The Indo-US strategic partnership has the greatest impact on Pakistan and China, and Indo-US maritime cooperation has far-reaching consequences for China. The current US administration is likely to continue its policy of containment of China, which will be accompanied by economic engagement. For Pakistan, the US military presence in Afghanistan and Central Asia would be a tightrope walk. The delivery of anti-missile systems to India will jeopardise South Asia's precarious geopolitical balance (Akhtar, 2009). The US always looks at Pak-China amicable coordination for increasing Pakistan's military proficiency with apprehension. China is concerned about US dominance in South Asia, and the justification for the Indo-US strategic relationship is to strengthen India as a counterweight to China. As a result, the United States and India have united to curb and impede China's growing defence, military, and economic strength, as well as battle terrorism, which would disguise Pak-China strategic partnership and related initiatives within the country (Amin 2021).

5.3 Unresolved Kashmir Issue and Proposed threats to Pakistan through Afghanistan

India is attempting to use US support to persuade Pakistan to change its Kashmir policy. Pakistan is on the lookout for violent non-state actors across the country, as well as along its western border with Afghanistan, who could destabilise the Kashmir problem. Peace requires international attention, but due to the Indo-US strategic cooperation, the US appears uninterested in negotiating for peace, and Pakistan suffers as a result (Nazir, 2016). Pakistan would suffer as a result of India's presence in Afghanistan. India is putting forth every effort to instigate insurrection in Baluchistan. India intends to use contemporary Afghanistan as a stringboard for inciting terrorism and insecurity in the FATA zone on the Pak-Afghan border as part of its grand strategy objectives. India is actively training Afghan police and the Afghan National Army, holding legislative exercises for Afghan officials, conducting judicial drills, and assisting in the development of media, information, and broadcasting. India is undoubtedly stoking separatist sentiments in Pakistan's Tribal Region and Baluchistan.

Meanwhile, the presence of India in Afghanistan, if not curtailed, might have serious consequences for Pakistan. Furthermore, the strategic cooperation between India and the United States would allow India to participate more actively in Afghanistan. The US appears to be suspicious of Pakistan's counter-terrorism efforts and its failure to stop the Taliban from resurrecting in Afghanistan. Finally, it aids India in disseminating deadly anti-Pakistan propaganda (Inayat, 2013). The existing strategic cooperation between India and the United States would allow India to maintain a military presence in Afghanistan, which would have a significant impact on Pakistan's security. George Koblemtz raised concerns about the Indo-US missile and defence collaboration, claiming that India's acquisition of an anti-ballistic missile (ATBM) could jeopardise South Asia's nuclear balance. Pakistan's rulers may be concerned that they may be powerless to stop India's first strike during the emergency. It might also give India influence over Pakistan, which it could use in conventional warfare. India's infatuation with obtaining the most sophisticated warhead shield is certain to swing the nuclear asset pendulum even further in India's favour (Bhat, 2015).

5.4 Indo-US Partnership and Growing Arm Race between India and Pakistan

Through this strategic cooperation, the US may be able to destabilise or at the very least slow down China's ascent in the region. In the case of Pakistan, however, there would be an arms race between India and Pakistan, with the strategic balance tilting in India's favour. The strategic alliance between India and the United States would allow India to improve its nuclear collection in both quantity and quality (Jaspal, 2007). The United States appears to be in the process of completely eliminating nuclear weapons in the South Asian region. The US dismissing Pakistan's concerns over the provision of the most up-to-date missile defence system is a source of concern for Pakistan. In this aspect, India's missile weapons have thrown South Asia's strategic stability into disarray. The Patriot Advanced Capability three (PAC III) contract is a significant step further from the US's previous offer for PAC II, which India had already rejected.

In contrast to the previous Patriots PAC II, which carried out its mission by infecting targets and blasting them out of the sky. PAC III interceptors, likewise, have no chance of bursting and rely on dynamic energy to destroy short and medium-range artillery. The US army had been familiarised with PAC III setups until 2004. There is a genuine risk that the transfer of PAC III to India may pave the way for a South Asian anti-missile race, requiring Pakistan to either develop or acquire similar technology. The most important implication is that the strategic cooperation between India and the United States encourages India to develop a rigorous quantitative valuation. Because India has a superior Theatre Missile Defense (TMD) system, refined delivery mechanisms, and nuclear weapons, the Indo-US defence agreement is seen as a potential threat to Pakistan's security. A nuclearized

environment in the region would inevitably increase the threat and insecurity in the region (Akhtar, 2009).

In addition, the launch of the Proliferation Security Initiatives (PSI) signals an unbalanced situation in South Asia. The purpose of the Indo-US maritime security cooperation is to protect maritime domains that could generate serious maritime disputes between Pakistan and India in the Indian Ocean region (Suleman, 2014). Furthermore, the United States' military and political support emboldened India to demonstrate its hostile attitude toward Pakistan. Not only is Pakistan concerned about its security, but the US has imposed legal and informal restrictions on Pakistan's acquisition of advanced and dual-use technologies and weapons systems (Inayat, 2013). China has been pressured to refrain from transferring advanced weapons technology to Pakistan. Unless this trend changes, Pakistan's conventional defence and nuclear deterrence capabilities against India may become ominously twisted.

6. Conclusion

According to this study, realism and its offshoots, such as neo-realism, alliance formation, security dilemma, and the balance of power (BOP), are useful tools for understanding Indo-US strategic cooperation and its ramifications for Pakistan. It is important to note that the primary goal of this academic study was to explain the Indo-US strategic relationship and its consequences for Pakistan in a succinct manner. Both India and the United States share democratic values that have resulted in a bright future for both countries, yet collaboration between the two is troublesome and ominous for Pakistan.

As part of its containment of China policy, the US and its western allies have bolstered India as a regional superpower. The US and its backers looking the other way in regard to the situation in Kashmir is payment to India for assisting US strategic interests in South Asia. The US maintains a constant burden on Pakistan in response to terrorist incidents in India, while maintaining an incomprehensible calm in response to Indian-sponsored terrorism in Pakistan and India's covert support for the Baloch insurgency. Pakistan cannot be a strategic partner of the United States because the US's South Asian ambitions are incompatible with Pakistan's national interests.

Over the years, Pakistan and the United States have had divergent interests and aspirations. The United States sees India as a friend, while Pakistan sees India as an endless foe. Instead of reacting to world growth, Pakistan needs to articulate proactive diplomacy and operate as a mature nation. "Pakistan has been acting against its own interests in the region in order to serve the United States, and this must stop now" (Singh, 2017). Pakistan must reconsider its relationship with the United States while considering its own national interests. Pakistan needs to establish an efficient foreign policy that strengthens its ties with Iran and China while maintaining its geostrategic position. Pakistan joined SEATO in 1954 and CENTO in 1955. The goal of joining west-led coalitions was to ensure the country's security and survival. Pakistan's security was ensured by the development of alliances. In the post-9/11 era, strategic collaboration between India and the United States grew in practically every field.

The main goal of Indo-US strategic collaboration was to control China, which was establishing itself as a significant political and economic power and posing a threat to US global hegemony. The best option turned out to be India, while the United States maintained its strategic position in the region. Because to the Indo-US strategic cooperation, the BOP between India and Pakistan has been disrupted. The BOP concept governs the South Asian region. There will be instability in the region if any changes are made to the system. Pakistan used a counter-alliance approach to maintain a balanced BOP with India. Pakistan forms an alliance with China to offset the strategic cooperation between India and the United States. The BOP theory lends credibility to this research.

As a result, it is consistent with the study's fundamental premise or claim that Indian strategic relations support conventional military imbalance. It throws the power balance off and puts Pakistan's security in jeopardy. This study claims that the US strategic objective in South Asia during the Cold War was to contain Communism, and that in order to achieve this goal, the US fought many proxy wars such as the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the Afghan War, as well as supporting its allies in their efforts to defeat Communism. Finally, Communism fell apart in 1991, resulting in immediate changes to the existing international system.

Following the fall of Communism, during Clinton's visit to India in 2000, Indo-US relations took a positive turn. The most crucial event in the world system in the twenty-first century was 9/11, which pushed the United States to reclaim its creativity in the War on Terror. The main goal in South Asia is to combat terrorism and religious extremism while also containing Chinese power. The United States' tenacious policy toward South Asia would not only stop Chinese diplomacies from transforming their new economic presence in the region into geopolitical might. To achieve its aims in South Asia, the US looked to India as a partner who could best serve its interests. The fundamental goals of the nuclear innovation were to integrate India into the global nuclear order, erase long-standing mutual political scepticism between the US and India over nuclear issues, and lay the groundwork for a strong bilateral collaboration to achieve the intended outcomes.

The above explanation of the US main objectives and policies concerning South Asia from the Cold War to Strategic harmonisation, it can be concluded that this region has remained a dynamic area where US interests and thus its foreign policy primacies have vacillated with engagements and disengagements. However, it should be noted that strategic interests have remained the most essential factor in US policy towards South Asia. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union was that Communist force, and in the twenty-first century, China is a nascent Communist power in the region, according to US strategic assessments. As long as the shadow of "Contain China" lingers in the minds of US policymakers, India will be treated as a strategic ally in the South Asian region. At the same time, as long as terrorism is not eradicated and Afghanistan is not transformed into a peaceful and stable country free of terrorism and religious extremism, the US will attempt to maintain its current balanced South Asian policy. The painful effect of the security problem has been visible in South Asia since the inclusion of the nuclear factor in the Indo-Pakistan war.

In May 1998, India successfully conducted its first nuclear explosive test, which was shortly followed by a Pakistani test barely two weeks later. With the acquisition of nuclear capabilities by the region's two arch rivals, South Asia has accidentally become a nuclear flashpoint. The acquisition of nuclear capabilities by the two adversaries has arguably exacerbated the security situation. With Pakistan's assistance for non-state and other parties to counterbalance its strategic obstacle for India, the implications of power disparity between India and Pakistan become even more serious. The Kashmiri insurgency is mostly dependent on Pakistan, which, since 1994, has aided the Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan by allowing retired Afghan troops to join the Kashmiri guerrillas. Meanwhile, Pakistan has been accusing India of colluding with Afghanistan in a growing insurgency in Pakistan's Baluchistan Province for the past decade. It's difficult to see richer Indo-Pakistan relations as long as the latter continues to deploy proxy actors to promote its interests. Pakistan now relies on its nuclear weapons to overcome India's conventional disparity.

Moreover, Pakistan is plagued with strategic instabilities and instability paradoxes. South Asia's security architecture is undergoing a crisis, raising the risk of conflict between India and Pakistan. India has consistently attempted to carve out a region free of limited war and has maintained the threat of conventional warfare. On the other hand, given both sides' massive nuclear arsenals, a nuclear war in

the region cannot be ruled out. The United States is blaming Pakistan for its failure in Afghanistan, and by supporting India's position, it is also opposing the CPEC. The arrangement for the delivery of 16 F-16 fighter jets has been halted. It also opposes Pakistan's nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Furthermore, accusing and blaming Pakistan for everything. Pakistan has been placed on a no-fly list, and its nuclear weapons have been connected to terrorism. In his book "Reimagining Pakistan and Transforming a Dysfunctional Nuclear State," Hussain Haqqani, Pakistan's ambassador to the United States from 2008 to 2011, described the Pak-US relationship as "dysfunctional" and "unsustainable," stating that "Pak-US never shared the same interests and it is time to face that harsh reality," and that "the alliance with Pakistan no longer makes sense for the US." After extensive research and analysis, this report came to the conclusion that Indo-US strategic collaboration will allow India to expand its military, resulting in increased asymmetry between two regionally hostile powers—India and Pakistan—posing existential threats to Pakistan's security. Pakistan would have to rethink its deterrent strategy in the face of India's current modernization efforts in the conventional, military, and strategic realms. Pakistan, as a nuclear and vital country to sustain stability in Afghanistan, has its own strategic location connecting South, Central, and West Asia. To take advantage of the changing global and strategic environment, Pakistan must embark on a proactive foreign policy. For Pakistan's economic and security, an alliance policy with regional and extra regional nations would be more prudent.

The complex strategic environment of South Asia forces India and Pakistan to maintain a qualitative and quantitative edge in strategic artillery. India's pursuit of sophisticated technology and long-range ballistic missile advancements has made Pakistan even more determined to acquire parallel capabilities not just to counter Indian threat but also to maintain the credibility of its fissile dissuasion. In South Asia, the long history of armed hostility, increased asymmetry, and inconsistency has accelerated the process of learning current sophisticated conventional and atomic skills. Both South Asian states have developed sufficient nuclear-capable missiles, bombers, and airborne and cruise missiles. Significant increases in the nuclear environment of South Asia have been reported in 2017. The acquisition of advanced nuclear technologies, missile testing, the introduction of a new delivery mechanism and enhanced payload, as well as the variety, accuracy, and consistency of missile agendas, all speak to a shifting nuclear strategy. India's weapon upgrades highlight the country's shaky nuclear policy. This variation of India's aspirational hegemonic aspirations to pursue its strategic partnership with the US vigorously and indefinitely, ostensibly to oppose Chinese influence in South Asia. As a result, there is little doubt that India has been gradually moving toward acceptance of aggressive strategies. In 2017, India conducted seventeen missile tests, demonstrating its intent to undermine South Asian security.

Unfortunately, the United States and the international community continue to turn a blind eye to India's progress. Despite the fact that both India and Pakistan tested short-range ballistic missiles (SRBMs), medium-range ballistic missiles (MRBMs), and submarine-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs), India gained the upper hand by launching subsonic and supersonic cruise weaponry from a variety of platforms. Pakistan and India are testing the K-4, BrahMos, and Nirbhay missiles from the sea, which echo the operationalization of India's nuclear trifecta of consolidation BMD. The unveiling of NS Arighat on November 19, 2017 was a significant strategic expansion. NS Arighat is the second submarine of the Arighat class, however India has had difficulty obtaining equipment for its nuclear-armed missiles. India's testing of canister-based launch systems, which require nuclear warheads, endangers South Asia's strategic stability. In addition, India's plans to expand the range of conventional strike methods and establish podiums to carry out proactive first strikes, such as the integration of the BrahMos with Su-30 MKI fighter bombers, will help the country enhance its strategic power capabilities. However, given India's turn toward belligerent policies, Pakistan's strategic limitations are jeopardised as a result of India's aggressive force posture. Pakistan must go to great lengths to counteract

the instability caused by Indian ballistic missile tests such as Agni II and Agni-V. It has been noticed that the introduction of new delivery arrangements, as well as long-term developments in ballistic and cruise missiles, will have far-reaching consequences for its bordering states.

The most significant advancements in South Asia in 2017 were the completion of the Nuclear Triad by both India and Pakistan, the improvement of Second Strike Capability, and India's admission into the Wassenaar Arrangement and Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). The fact that India joined the Wassenaar Arrangement (WA) soon after joining the MTCR shows how fast India has assimilated into the nuclear-weapons states. India's relentless missile development and military modernization of its conventional and nuclear weapons constitute a threat to Pakistan's security. In this regard, Pakistan believes that its pursuit of advanced nuclear capabilities and a missile programme is a sensible reaction to increasing Indian bellicosity, as it maintains effective minimum deterrence.

Bibliography

1. Ahmed, A. (2018). An Illusion of the Indian Ballistic Missile Defence System; Implications for Pakistan .South Asian Strategic Stability.
2. Akhtar, D. S. (2009 March). Indo-US Strategic Partnership ; Implications for China. Spotlight On Regional Affairs, XXVIII 1&2.
3. Akhtar, D. S. (2009 March). Indo-US Strategic Partnership ; Implications for China. Spotlight On Regional Affairs, XXVIII 1&2.
4. Alam, M. B. (2005). Analysing Indo-US Relations During Bush Presidency. The Journal of International Studies and Analysis.
5. Ali, N. (2018, March 4). The Significance of Indo-US alliance for Pakistan . Pakistan: Daily Times.
6. Amin, H. 2020. "CPEC: An Achilles Heel." Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences.
7. Amin, H., Arslan Rafique. 2021. "The Maritime Rise of China in Indo-Pacific and Indo-US Counter Balancing Approach." Journal of Political Science and International Relations.
8. Bishoyi, S. (2010). Defense Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship . Focus Journal of Defence Studies.
9. Boutoun, M. M. (2010). The Future of the US- India Partnership: An American Perspective. Aspin Strategy Group.
10. Brands, H. (1990). India and the United States; The Cold Peace. USA: Twane's Publisher.
11. Bukhari, D. S. (2016). Indo-US Partnership and Pakistan's Security: A Theoretical Evaluation. Strategic Studies.
12. Bukhari, D. S. (2016). Indo-US Partnership and Pakistan's Security: A Theoretical Evaluation. Strategic Studies.
13. Fani, M. I. (2012). Indo-US Strategic Partnership in Post 9/11; Implications for Pakistan. Pakistan Vision, Volume 10, NO.2, 132-159.
14. Hassan, S. (2010). Indo- US Nuclear/ Strategic Cooperation: Chinese Response . Strategic Studies .

15. Husain, D. S. (1979). Politics of Alliance and Aid : A Case Study of Pakistan (1954-1966). (M.Masood, Ed.) Pakistan Horizon, XXXII,.
16. Hussain, H. L.-E. (1985). US PAK forum: Relations with Major Powers. Vanguard Publisher.
17. Inayat, D. M. (2016). Conflict and Cooperation in South Asia Post 9/11; Implications for Pakistan's Security. MARGALLA PAPERS, 75-96.
18. Iqbal, A. (2018, March). Promoters of Terrorism in South Asia. Dawn News.
19. Jain, B. M. (2010). Asia, India in the New South Strategic Military and Economic Concerns in the Age of Nuclear Diplomacy. London: Tauris Academic Studies.
20. Jakobsen, B. (2013, November 6). Popular Social Science .
21. Jaspal, D. N. (2007, December). The Indo-US Strategic Relationship and Pakistan's Security. South Asian Strategic Stability Institute(SAASI).
22. Jorgenson, K. E. (2010). International Relations Theory . UK: Macmillan Publishers Limited .
23. Kronstadt, K. A. (2012). India -US Security Relations; Current Engagement. Congressional Research Service.
24. Kumar, D. (2009). Indo-US Relations : Historical Perspective. Calhoun.
25. Kumar, S. (2006). India's International Relations. New Delhi: Maxford Books.
26. Mahrukh, K. (2017). Growing Indo-US Strategic Cooperation; An Analysis.
27. Maj, P. P. (2002, December). Indo-US Relations For Symbiotic World Order. Delhi, India: Jawaharlal Nehru University.
28. Nazamani, S. (2014). india's emerging indian ocean strategy. (M. Anwar, Ed.) Islamabad Policy Research Institute, XIV NUMBER 1, 66-80.
29. Nazir, M. (2016, June 3). Indo-US Alliance in Changing Regional Dynamics. Center for Strategic Studies.
30. Neal, W. K. (1979). Theory of International Politics. Addison Wesley.
31. Paul R Viotti, M. V. (1999). International Relations Theory Realism, pluralism, Globalism and Beyond. USA: Allyn&Bacon.
32. Perkovich, G. (2010). Towards Realistic US India Relations. Carnegie Endowment.
33. Qiaorui, H., Amin. 2021. "CHINA PAKISTAN ECONOMIC CORRIDOR (CPEC): THE PROMISING PROSPECTS FOR CHINA AND PAKISTAN." PalArch's Journal of Egyptology.
34. S.M.Burke. (1973). Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis. London: University Press, Ely House.
35. Singh, b. (2017, july). Indo- US Strategic Relations In 21st Century. International Journal Of Research Granthiyala.
36. Soherwordi, S. H. (2010, jan-june). US Foreign Policy Shift Towards Pak-India between 1965-1971. South Asian Studies, 25, 21-37.

37. Suleman, L. C. (2014, december). US-India Strategic Alliance and Pakistan's Security Concerns. NDU Journal Opinion VOL 2 NO.2.
38. Sultan, T. (1982). Indo-US Relations. Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
39. Tang, S. (2009). The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis. Security Studies.
40. Waltz, K. N. (2008). Realism and International Politics. Routledge.
41. Weitz, R. (2017). Promoting US-India Defense Cooperation; Opportunities and Obstacles. US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute SSI.