Indian Foreign Policy: Chaos Theory and Perception Management

Fatima Raza[*] and M Taimur Fahad Khan[**]

Abstract

The purposefulness of the Indian foreign policy is already questionable due to its lack of clarity and direction, which afflicts the neighbouring countries through its affirmative and hegemonic regional policies. Smaller nations of the South Asia region feel threatened and bigger countries remain wary of India's dubious demeanour. Even with such designs, the Indian foreign policy goals remain unfulfilled. This is due to two important reasons. Firstly, the principles underlining the Indian foreign policy have been left ambiguous and idealistic ever since its inception. Secondly, the execution of the Indian foreign policy is most definitely not along the lines of its stated objectives. This disparate nature of policy execution has led to the perpetration of chaos in the region, which India has quite swiftly 'managed' through perception management. This is where the utilisation of Chaos Theory and perception management comes into play, which is analysed in this research paper. If India wishes to achieve its desired position in the region, as desired, then it is imperative that it revisits both the principles and implementation of its foreign policy to match the changing regional and global atmosphere.

Keywords: Pakistan, India, Foreign Policy, Chaos Theory, Creative Chaos, Perception Management.

Introduction

India is a significant country in South Asia owing to several factors; however, it most certainly is not a regional leader. Its innate thirst for leadership and identity construction is the major factor that has always influenced the Indian foreign policy objectives and, unfortunately, it is precisely what has held it back. There exists a lack of congruity between the

---

[*] *The author is Research Associate at the Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad.*
[**] *The author is Research Associate/Media Officer at the Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad.*

stated and practiced an external policy of successive Indian governments. To determine the reason behind this anomaly that exists between the objectives and actions of any state is important to understand its foreign policy in detail. However, to uncover certain ambiguous aspects of such strategies, Chaos theory and perception management prove to be quite useful. The application of this theory, particularly in the context of perception management, has helped clarify why India's external policy guides its government towards actions that tend to disrupt the regional peace and stability. Chaos is perpetuated through violent actions such as the Indian aggression in the Indian Occupied Kashmir (IOK) and endangering civilian lives and properties across the Line of Control (LoC). Chaos is also distributed subtly through adopting long-term policies that create lack of harmony and order in the region, for instance, India's refusal to attend the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Summit 2016, which pressured other regional countries like Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Bhutan to also pull out. This move seems to be counter-productive to India's claimed regional leadership since true leader cultivates harmony, not disparity and chaos. These policies being implemented by the contemporary leaders are not all that different from those of their predecessors. While many Indian analysts regret Nehru's choice to pass up on the chance of permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), calling it a short-sighted decision in the context of international relations. The argument here, to begin with, that India was not ready to shoulder the burden of regional leadership, which left it wary of alliances ever since its inception; hence, the declaration of 'Non-Alignment.' Thus, the Indian attempts to create a softer world image through cultural propagation, liberal democracy and secularism carry little or no weight, for all practical purposes. Rather it begets regional mistrust and confusion.

In the following sections, different doctrines of the Indian foreign policy through 'Chaos theory' and perception management will be analysed and it will be established how they have impacted regional countries and immediate neighbours of India. The Indian foreign policy is driven by engineered chaos and perception management techniques reflected in its actions and approach in both internal and external policies.

Theoretical Framework

At 11:30 am on a December morning in 2010, Muhammad Bouazizi doused himself with gasoline and set himself alight in Tunisia.[1] Afterwards, the entire region of the Middle East, comprising 16 countries, got embroiled in bloodshed, to date. An act of self-immolation by one troubled individual led to the toppling of multiple empires that had been in power for decades. The effects reached far and wide. Similar examples exist in history, where even minute things have caused drastic consequences for the regional and international state of affairs. This fascinating phenomenon finds its roots in the 'Butterfly Effect' of the Chaos theory by Edward Norton Lorenz.[2] According to Lorenz, Chaos theory is a multidisciplinary construction, which emphasises that even the smallest event can be consequential in altering the fate of generations. It is pertinent to mention that these events or their resultant consequences are either purely random or outside the human domain of control. However, when such changes are subtly induced in different regions with an agenda of causing rippling effects of chaos, it is called 'Creative Chaos.' Thus the Chaos theory may refer to the events which are purely involuntary in nature but creative chaos is a procured weapon of choice for all the realist regimes that perceive threats and tackle them accordingly.

Chaos theory entails the predictability of several tangible phenomena as an impossible task and such events can cascade into uncontrollable consequences upon the slightest nudge, either intended or random. This theory provides such phenomena with a non-linear but understandable trail of thought, which links these events to their humble beginnings. These starting points are often manipulated by both states and non-state actors to achieve their goals and, in order to do that discretely, 'perceptions' are 'managed.' This process is called perception management and the ultimate end to this process is the generation of 'Creative Chaos.' Managing perceptions to sow negative sentiments among the citizens of any particular state is also an extension of this very concept and can be called negative perception management.

---

[1] Michael J Willis, *Politics and Power in the Maghreb: Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco from Independence to the Arab Spring* (US: Oxford University Press, 2014).

[2] Edward Lorenz, "The Butterfly Effect," *World Scientific Series on Nonlinear Science Series A* 39 (2000): 91-94.

According to Steve Mann, the famous US foreign policy expert, 'Controlled Chaos Theory' uses certain methods to dismantle the state systems and brings chaos. These steps are used at random, apparently, but are quite orderly in nature.[3] For instance, the population in question is gradually de-ideologised, introducing new and disruptive values, exploitation of the elite class with the expectation of nuanced incentives and instigating violent movements, having a religious or ethnic character.[4] Either of these methods or others can be put to use for spreading of chaos which is most importantly, not random in nature at all.

This study has attempted to generate research based on the previously existent ideas of Chaos theory and perception management, which have only been applied to either numerical hypothesis or natural science processes in the past. This research attempts to construct a picture of the Indian foreign policy in the light of Chaos theory and perception management, which is a rather unexplored terrain of thought to date.

David Malone's book, *Does the Elephant Dance? Contemporary Indian Foreign Policy,* establishes its main propositions about India's external policy on the contours of historical developments. The author attributes the socialist and idealistic nature of the Indian foreign policy to Jawaharlal Nehru's policies. On the other hand, the consequential aggressive stance, taken by Indira Gandhi, has been attributed to the losses incurred on India during the Sino-Indian War of 1962. Malone suggest that there is a great deal of non-linearity in the motives, actions and consequences of different policies of India towards the international community.

While research proves that predictability does not use any concrete mechanism or linearity, perception management is also a hard reality employed by policymakers and their task forces to manipulate situations in their own favour. Different views on the Indian foreign policy are prevalent in the existing literature, some of which strongly highlight the covert interests of the Indian state and its external policies. For instance, Col (Rtd) Abdul Quyyum, in his article, "India in South Asia: An Analysis of Hegemonial Relationship," elaborates how the military

---

[3] Steven R Mann, "Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought," *Parameters* 22, no. 3 (1992): 54.

[4] Vladimir Prav, "Controlled Chaos as a Tool of Geopolitical Struggle," *South Front*, March 23, 2016.

interventions carried out by India in Hyderabad, Junagarh, Kashmir, Goa and East Pakistan were a part of the long-term plan to project India's place as a regional power.

Harsh V Pant, in his book, *Indian Foreign Policy: An Overview,* critically analysed that the Indian foreign policy has become more aggressive in the process of achieving a more prominent place in the arena of international affairs. The nuclear non-proliferation, democracy, climate change, increased trade and amicable regional policies have been discussed as the pillars of the Indian foreign policy by Pant. However, the chaos that the Indian policies have engineered in the region through gross human rights violations in Kashmir and intervening in the domestic politics of its neighbours is counter-productive to its desired place in global politics.

Dissent in the Major Doctrines of the Indian Foreign Policy

The Indian state is best defined in words of the famous political scientist B M Jain as "geographically giant in size, politically disunited and disintegrated, socially heterogeneous and ethnically divisive and diverse."[5] Home to nearly a fifth of the world population, India has more than two thousand ethnic groups that are disparate in religious beliefs, languages and social parameters like income and education. These disparities are also reflected in the Indian foreign policy and hamper its aspirations to become a regional power.

Following is an analysis of the three most significant doctrines of Indian foreign policy, explained through examples that point to the 'chaos-inducing' undertones in their essence and implementation.

Nehru Doctrine

As part of the Nehru's doctrine, Non-alignment is often frowned upon by the advocates of the aboriginal principles of the global politics and unity. As stated by Rashid uz Zaman "Non-alignment was a low-risk strategy to gain influence on the cheap."[6] However, it has remained the dominating factor of the Indian foreign policy because it was a consequence of the prolonged

---

[5] Bakhtawar M Jain, *Global Power: India's Foreign Policy, 1947-2006* (Lexington Books, 2009).

[6] Rashed uz Zaman, "Kautilya: the Indian Strategic Thinker and Indian Strategic Culture," *Comparative Strategy* 25, no. 3 (2006): 231-247.

colonisation of India by the rulers of foreign dissent and the conviction that any external involvement in the internal affairs of the country must be prevented. Non-alignment, when combined with the concept of Pan-Asianism in Nehru's doctrine, reflects an anti-imperialistic fervour that opposed the Western ideals. Nehru's intellectual inspiration comes from the famed poet Gurudev Rabindar Nath Tagore who said that India, as a great Himalayan state, shall lead all other sub-regional states and unite them under the banner of 'Pan-Asianism.'[7] Ashish Saniyal, in his feature on 'Tagore's Ideals' wrote "India's foreign policy which has been by and large shaped by Jawaharlal Nehru after independence, his internationalism, his endeavour for peace and harmony among warring nations and his vision about new social order for under-privileged nations which became free from colonial shackles, were largely influenced by the ideals of Rabindra Nath Tagore."[8]

These ideals, however, did not bode well for India in its interactions with China which was ironically party to the signed principles of bilateral ties; the Pancsheel Treaty. Non-alignment protected India from doing the bidding of the two world powers during the Cold War but it came at a heavy price. The misplaced Indian stance on the Hungarian occupation by Russia in 1950, and the misperception regarding the Chinese threat in 1962, were the dire consequences of this belief.[9] Condemnation of Colonialism was the foundation of the external policy of free India. However, the common crown of 'Commonwealth' was never renounced by Nehru, which contradicted the very belief that the colonial yoke needs to be thrown off. The dream of regional integration through 'Pan-Asianism' by bringing together Asian nations at the 1947 Asian Relations Conference and the 1955 Bandung Conference were supposedly the condemnation of the western influence but its ulterior motive was India's emergence as the leader of India. Also, the deep-rooted caste system atrocities rampant in the Indian society were contradictory to Nehru's foreign policy ideals of peaceful co-existence and anti-racialism.[10]

---

[7] Jain, *Global Power.*

[8] Ashish Saniyal, "Tagore's Ideals: An Inspiration to Nehru," Press Information Bureau, Government of India, http://pib.nic.in/feature/feyr98/fe1098/f2710981.html

[9] J B Kripalani, "For Principled Neutrality: A New Appraisal of Indian Foreign Policy,' *Foreign Affairs* 38, no. 1 (1959): 46-60.

[10] Shakuntala Devi, *Caste System in India* (Jaipur: Pointer Publishers, 1999).

Indira Doctrine

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi practiced an 'Indo-centric' approach that was more individualistic in nature.[11] Trevor Drieberg writes, "she took particular care to emphasise that she was a believer of a firm base of 'Indianness' as against Nehru's emphasis on internationalism."[12] While in India, the dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971, is celebrated as a victorious feat, it is attributed to Indira Gandhi's political acumen. However, it implies that she is being honoured for a sorry act of chaos which was an attack on Pakistan's territorial sovereignty. The years from 1969 to 1971, reflect two different time periods in the history of both Pakistan and India. What turned out to be the biggest integral loss to Pakistan's statehood and nationalism was dubbed as a stroke of ingenuity on the part of Indira Gandhi and her government. Engineering chaos and glorifying the acts of war is not a victorious feat, let alone for a country whose foreign policy objectives are peaceful co-existence, non-interference and non-aggression.[13] This is a glaring example of the use of creative chaos and negative perception management by a state to its advantage. By signing the 1971 Indo-Soviet Treaty, India took shelter under the Veto power of the former Soviet Union which permitted it to continue creating chaos in East Pakistan. It also provided the final blow to the already faltering façade of Non-alignment.[14] In 1975, Sikkim's integration into India was achieved by creating a perception that its people would be interested in merging into the Indian Union as the 22nd state, while in reality, the state of Sikkim enjoyed close diplomatic ties with China. This union was made possible through longstanding political interference by India. Ashok K Behuria writes about Indira's policy, "her assertive policies provoked more fear than respect among the neighbours."[15] Indira's policies managed to favour both major superpowers of the world, however, as usual India failed to create a likeable image in the neighbourhood as smaller neighbours were ignored.

---

[11] William L Richter, "Mrs. Gandhi's Neighborhood: Indian Foreign Policy toward Neighbouring Countries," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 22, no. 3-4 (1987): 250-265.

[12] Trevor Drieberg, *Indira Gandhi: A Profile in Courage* (Vikas Publications, 1972).

[13] Sanjeev Kumar, "Time to Debate the Principles of Panchsheel," *Viewpoint*, June 4, 2013.

[14] Pranay Gupte, *Mother India: A Political Biography of Indira Gandhi* (Penguin Books India, 2012).

[15] Ashok K Behuria, Smruti S Pattanaik and Arvind Gupta, "Does India have a Neighbourhood Policy?," *Strategic Analysis* 36, no. 2 (2012): 229-246.

Gujral Doctrine

If there ever was to be a perfect example of the widest gulf between words and actions, it would be that of I K Gujral's doctrine. His five-point formula is wrapped up in the attractive packaging of regional connectivity; however, in reality, it focuses solely on how to ascend India to a dominant position in the region.[16] Gujral doctrine is a thoroughly misplaced notion based on the supposition that an amicable Indian policy, in terms of its neighbourhood, will propel India to a position of global repute. Why is it not possible? It is that the previous track record of India in the region which shows lack of a coherent and cohesive strategy towards its smaller neighbours. India's historical paradox of being a dominating empire overpowered by the sneaky tactics of British colonialism still manages to cloud its regional strategy. Its role as a leader remains obscured due to lack of sheer leadership potential, which it has confused with unwarranted regional hegemony. Also, unlike China's slogan of 'harmonious growth for all,' the Indian economic development has no regionally inclusive plans for benefitting small and impoverished neighbours, which is also due to economic woes at home. [17]

The doctrines and determinants of the Indian foreign policy formulate a case for the application of the theory creative chaos and perception management which will be elaborated in detail in the following sections. A conclusive summary of all the doctrines shows relative progress in the policies of successive Indian governments but it also reflects a deeply divided vision that is yet to bear fruit (if any), after years of intellectual effort that has been put into it.

Indian Chaos Theory and Perception Management

In recent years, India has managed to increase its weight in the international system. However, an intellectual vacuum exists at the heart of the Indian foreign policy, allowing its engagement with the rest of the world to drift. While some elements expect India to influence the emerging international

---

[16] Bhupinder Brar, "South Asia: A Region of States or a Region of Regions," *South Asian Survey* 6, no. 1 (1999): 89-98.

[17] Rekha Rao-Nicholson and Julie Salaber, "The Motives and Performance of Cross-border Acquirers from Emerging Economies: Comparison between Chinese and Indian Firms," *International Business Review* 22, no. 6 (2013): 963-980.

order, there is not much potential except lofty rhetoric and perhaps a few cultural attractions.[18]

The notion that a robust economic growth is a panacea for obstacles in India's regional influence has led to a serious lack of a substantive foreign policy. This leads to reactive strategic decisions. However, there is a method to madness[19] and it would be over-simplistic to term this Indian state behaviour only as *ad hoc*. A thorough examination of India's foreign policy reveals that this behaviour is not that arbitrary after all. It can very well be explained under the framework of Chaos theory and perception management framework. The first Indian foreign policy objective to be analysed in the light of Chaos theory is Non-alignment. Supposedly, India remained neutral during the Cold War. In practice, things were totally the opposite as India was joined at the hip with the former Soviet Union. During the 1960s and up till the first decade of the new millennium, the bulk of India's imports of military technology and hardware came from Russia. Apart from that, intelligence sharing and military cooperation of India with the former Soviet Union was so intimate that the its military hardware, technology and intelligence was all at India's disposal during the 1971 Indo-Pak War.[20] India managed to create chaos in East Pakistan by creating, funding and training the *Mukti Bahini* against the Pakistani state.[21] This creative chaos helped India in managing the perception and successfully projected Pakistan as a capitalist bloc member and an enemy of the former Soviet Union. Hence, it was necessary for India to crush this threat to establish a foot-hold in South Asia, due to which the former soviet union sided with India in the war.

India's acceptance of its involvement in the dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971, brings forth the two other Indian foreign policy objectives: i) respect for other nations' territorial integrity and sovereignty and ii) non-interference in internal affairs of other states.[22] These Indian foreign policy

---

[18] M Ilyas Khan, "India's Surgical Strikes in Kashmir: Truth or Illusion," *BBC News*, October 23, 2016.

[19] Shakespeare's *Hamlet* 1602. It means that there is always a plan behind the odd/strange behaviour of a person or an entity.

[20] "Modi says India will Work to 'Isolate' Pakistan Internationally," *Dawn*, September 24, 2016.

[21] "Indian Forces Fought along Mukti Bahini: Modi," *News*, June 8, 2016.

[22] "India and Peoples Republic of China," *United Nations, Treaty Series*, 299, no. 4307, 70.

objectives were severed by the Indian politicians and military when it meddled into the internal affairs of Pakistan by fuelling the anti-state sentiments of the Bengali Muslims in East-Pakistan and creating, funding and training the infamous rebel group, *Mukti Bahini* to fight the Pakistani state machinery.[23] India managed to create chaos in Pakistan by perpetrating an insurgency in the eastern wing of the country. This gave the Indian military, the 'excuse' to cross the international border into East Pakistan by projecting to the world that Pakistani state was carrying out atrocities in East Pakistan. India claimed that it was imperative for it to invade East Pakistan (or rather disrespect and violate the territorial integrity of Pakistan and interfere in its domestic affairs) as the local insurgency posed a threat to the Indian national security. The reality, however, was entirely the opposite to it. It was India, not the Pakistan that gave rise to the insurgency in East Pakistan. It was India that violated Pakistan's territorial integrity for its own nefarious designs.

Then there is the case of the Indian intervention into the domestic affairs of the rest of its neighbours such as Sri Lanka, Nepal and China. India intervened in the domestic affairs of Sri Lanka and violated its territorial integrity under the farce of peacekeeping. The Indian military subjected to many human rights violations, the massacre at Jafna Teaching Hospital.[24] Even China is not safe from the Indian intervention into its internal affairs on the issue of Tibet, where it supports the separatist elements.[25] It also harbours the 14th Dalai Lama, who is considered a separatist and political troublemaker by China.[26] India, till date, refuses to hand him over to the Chinese authorities and continues to support Dalai Lama's political claims.[27]

---

[23] Farrukh Saleem, "Mukti Bahini, the Forgotten Terrorists," *News,* March 14, 2016.
[24] "Indictment against Sri Lanka," Tamilnation.org, http://tamilnation.co/indictment/indict047.htm
[25] Commodore Katherine Richards, "China-India: An Analysis of the Himalayan Territorial Dispute," *Indo-Pacific Strategic Papers* (February 2015): (7-8), http://www.defence.gov.au/ADC/Publications/IndoPac/Richards%20final%20IPSD%20paper.pdf.
[26] "Who is the Dalai Lama and Why does China Hate Him?," *All Day*, http://www.allday.com/who-is-the-dalai-lama-and-why-does-china-hate-him-2180790832.html
[27]"India to Host Dalai Lama in Disputed Territory, Defying China," *Dawn*, March 3, 2017, https://www.dawn.com/news/1318170

By thoroughly reviewing the above-mentioned examples, it is evident that how India is creating chaos in different parts of its neighbourhood and managing perceptions to achieve its vested political gains. The Indian foreign policy objective of non-aggression has also been deserted by the Indian state many times. India abandoned its policy of non-aggression in 1948, when it subjected to a military build-up in Kashmir leading to the first Indo-Pak war of 1948.[28] India repeated this hostile behaviour which resulted in two wars (1965 and 1971) and one limited war (1999) with Pakistan.[29] India has also been subjecting to cross-border firing and violation of international border at Kashmir which cost countless innocent civilians. In 2016 alone, there were more than 180 incidents of cross-border firing by India in Kashmir.[30]

In 2001, India got engaged in border clashes with Bangladesh when the Indian forces launched an unprovoked attack on a Bangladeshi post in Kurigram, along with the India-Bangladesh border, which killed more than 20 soldiers on both sides.[31] The 1962 Sino-India war was also a result of the Indian aggression when India created forward outposts along and across the disputed McMahon Line claimed by China. These aggressive postures and military deployments finally escalated to a full-scale war where India suffered a humiliating defeat at the hand of the Chinese army.[32] India remains adamant to further beef-up its military presence in northern India, close to the border with Aksai Chin. The unprovoked Indian military deployments in 2002 and 2008, against Pakistan, further testify the Indian state's predilection for aggression. In all of the incidences of the aggression mentioned above, India managed to conjure up a narrative which would create chaos and help it manage perceptions to misguide the international community and its own public.

Peaceful co-existence is supposedly a founding principle of the Indian foreign policy but has never been practically followed. While in reality, the

---

[28] "War History: Kashmir War 1947-49," Pakistan Army, https://www.pakistanarmy.gov.pk/AWPReview/TextContent.aspx?pId=47#Kashmir War1947_49

[29] Ibid.

[30] "Pakistan Lodges Requests with India over Ceasefire Violations," *Dawn*, November 1, 2016.

[31]"India-Bangladesh Border Battle," *BBC News*, April 18, 2001.

[32] James Barnard, "The China-India Border War," https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/1984/CJB.htm

Chankiyan Realism has always been the driving factor of the Indian foreign policy. The Kautilyan principle of "circle of states," or *rajamandala* is more reflective in its external policy as it views states such as Japan and Afghanistan — its allies against China and Pakistan. It is a case of underhanded perception management and chaos mongering that India has deployed by trying to drive a wedge between Pakistan and Afghanistan, which share religious and ethnic bonds and by also exploiting differences between China and Japan by fraternising with Japan to aggravate their mutual distrust. India is at loggerheads with all its neighbours since the time of its independence, be it China, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka or Myanmar. It has border and water sharing disputes with Pakistan, China and Bangladesh. It has fought several wars with two of its larger neighbours. Claiming "surgical strikes" against Pakistan and Myanmar; supporting separatist elements in Tibet and Sri Lanka; carrying out human rights violations in Kashmir; maligning Pakistan and attempting to isolate it in the world community, such activities and actions indicate that India does not truly believe in peaceful co-existence.[33] Rather the Indian foreign policy follows Machiavelli's political maxim of maximising power through chaos.

India's ties with the countries offering defence cooperation are paradoxical as they oppose its principles of peaceful co-existence. Being the largest importer of military technology and hardware in the world, it also has the fastest growing nuclear programme in the world.[34] It purposefully keeps relations strained with all its immediate neighbours by creating chaos and managing perceptions (of its own public mostly), cultivating a sense of insecurity about the state. The Indian policy makers have used creative chaos to keep the public incognisant of their blunders. This way, they divert public attention from issues like poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, healthcare and corruption to focus on matters of, 'high politics.'[35] India has cultivated 'interest groups,' which according to the chaos theory; consist of its diaspora to influence foreign governments economically to endorse the negative Indian political agendas. A case in point is the Indian blame-game after the Uri attack to isolate Pakistan, internationally. Many US Senators

---

[33] Carole Oudot, "A Wall Goes Up in Myanmar," *Asia Times*, January 31, 2016.
[34] Syed Muhammad Ali et al., *Indian Unsafeguarded Nuclear Programme*: *An Assessment* (Islamabad: ISSI, 2016), 102 and Rajat Pandit, "India Remains World's Largest Arms Importer, with 14% of total share", *Times of India*, February 26, 2016.
[35] Robert O Keohane and Joseph S Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (New York: Longman, 2001) 20-21.

and Congressmen with constituencies dominated by wealthy Indian donors favoured this propaganda. The US support for India's bid for membership of the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) without prerequisites and a permanent seat in the UNSC was the work of wealthy Indian lobbyists.

Impact of the Indian Foreign Policy on the Region

India is located in a peculiar region of South Asia where its geographic mass, its significant geo-strategic location and demographic uniqueness makes it a natural 'hegemon.' In terms of domestic dissent over national policy, India simulates large democracies like the US and the UK. Yet, unlike these large democracies, India's likely response to a crisis remains uncertain, whereas, the reactions of the latter are very much predictable to similar situations. The legacy of Gandhi, Nehru's *Panchsheela* principles and, above all, the political anchor of foreign policy in the larger project of nation-building, explain the ambiguities that characterise India's foreign policy.[36] India's foreign policy is still largely reactive, incremental and without any grand vision as stated by Malone. It is this lack of consensus and intellectual void that makes the Indian policymakers subject to *ad hoc* responses and later on saving face when the policy boomerangs.

Concept of Pax Indica and its Regional Impact

History is witness that any nation who has risen to the apex of power has tried to shape the international order according to its own political, economic and national security interests rather than ensuring perpetual worldwide peace and stability, be it the UK, Germany, former Soviet Union or Japanese in the pre-World War era or the US and Russia in the post-Cold War time. The Indian concept of global dominance known as *Pax Indica* is no different. *Pax Indica*, a term modelled on the concept of *Pax Romana,* which means India's global dominance is questionable because India does not have a neighbourhood policy.[37] India, after acquiring its nuclear capability and economic status, has displayed its power in a truly questionable manner. Rather than collectively moving forward with its neighbours, India has started flexing its muscles in the region. India's drive

---

[36] Subrata K Mitra and Jivanta Schöttli, "The New Dynamics of Indian Foreign Policy and its Ambiguities," *Irish Studies in International Affairs* (2007): 19-34.

[37] Shashi Tharoor, *Pax Indica: India and the World of the Twenty-first Century* (London: Penguin, 2013).

to isolate Pakistan in the world; economic protectionism against the Chinese products; attempts to acquire a permanent seat at the UNSC; stubbornness to join China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC); its bid to enter the NSG without signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and other nuclear conventions as a prerequisite are a few examples of its nefarious designs.[38]

The practical results of the Indian power in the region also reflect poorly on its self-proclaimed status of a world power. India is subjected to creating chaos within its surroundings and then swoops in to 'handle' the situation while it actually tends to favour its own vested interests. Kashmir, where India is carrying out immense human rights violations and atrocities against innocent civilians is a glaring example. When Pakistan raises the issue internationally, a self-orchestrated terror attack takes place somewhere in India (for example Pathankot and Uri attacks) for which Pakistan is blamed without any evidence of the latter's involvement.[39] All this is done to malign the image of Pakistan and divert the world's attention from the Indian atrocities that the state is carrying against innocent people.

India's Regional Rapport and the Modi 'Dilemma'

The current Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi's foreign policy initiatives are based on geo-economic developments of India and increased connectivity with the regional countries. While his government tries to revive the 'Look East' initiative of the early 1990s there are several gaps in thought and implementation. An example is the case of Nepalese Constitution of 2015, which reflects the clear bias in the Indian policy rhetoric regarding the provision of concessions to its neighbouring countries and its actual implementation. The Indian government managed to build a perception by rendering the constitution, an assault on the rights of the 'Madhesi' community while the covert fear was of insurgent spill-over through its border in case of any unrest in Nepal.[40] Other concerns of the

---

[38] Enrico Marelli and Marcello Signorelli, "China and India: Openness, Trade and Effects on Economic Growth," *European Journal of Comparative Economics* 8, no. 1 (2011): 129.

[39] George Dalton, "Is Pakistan-India War Just on Terrorist Attack Away?," *Herald*, January 23, 2017.

[40] Mukesh Rawat, "Nepal's Constitution and Lessons for India," *Diplomat*, October 7, 2016.

Indian government over the new Nepalese Constitution are the gender equality provisions, compensations to the affected parties due to environmental pollution and abolishment of capital punishment from Nepal.[41] Uneven gender rights, utter disregard for environmental protection and unfair execution of the capital punishment are a few rampant concerns of the Indian society. Thus, in order to keep a lid on such issues at home, the Indian government has sparked and assisted unrest in Nepal by resorting to measures such as advocating Madeshi right to 'self-determination' and the undeclared blockade on food supplies to Nepal.[42] Maldives has also time and again, warned the Indian government against interfering in its domestic politics.[43]

The regional rapport card of Modi's foreign policy is admittedly an improvement as compared to his predecessors but his campaigns to malign Pakistan in the region under fabricated terrorist claims, refusal to build a workable rapport with China and strains with Moscow due to the visible tilt towards Washington are huge challenges that must be overcome.[44] Policies of prejudice at home towards all non-Hindu communities are the product of the flawed 'Hindutva' ideology.[45] All these policies have managed to keep India glued to its previous spot in the region: unclear, uncertain and extremely mediocre.

Conclusion

Creating chaos through systematic execution is deployed by the Indian policymakers and forces alike. The latest example being India's sudden support for Bhutan's claims over the area of Dhoklam to create a chaotic situation for China is reflective of their disruptive policy decisions. The reason behind going to such lengths is not exactly ambiguous. China's successful regional connectivity initiative is what naturally casts a shadow

---

[41] Yuburaj Ghimire, "Nepal: Uncertainty Prevails over Constitution Amendment Bill," *Indian Express*, December 11, 2016.

[42] Valerie Plesch, "Crisis on Nepal-India Border as Blockade Continues," *Al Jazeera*, December 24, 2015.

[43] "Maldives Warns India Over Pressure to Free Ex-president," *Express Tribune*, October 11, 2015.

[44] Lindsay Hughes, "India Caught between a Cruise Missile and a Hard Place," *Indian Ocean Research Programme*, January 27, 2017.

[45] Ahsok Swain, "How Modi, RSS are Converting the Indian Abroad into a Hindutva Bigot," *DailyO*, April 8, 2016.

over the Indian aspirations for regional and global grandeur. The visible transition of the world from 'uni-polarity' to 'multi-polarity,' China's economic and strategic rise, the lure of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), Trump's unprecedented political strategy, which is highly volatile in nature and Pakistan's economic uplift are only a few major challenges for India's external policy. Apart from these potent challenges to India's stature, these above-mentioned circumstances are also shaping up India's policy in the region which shows clear gaps of thought and lapses of judgment. All this results in the use and application of 'controlled chaos' which was described by the Russian Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, as a tool of the proponents of uni-polarity and supremacy of the West.[46]

Chaos Theory as a tool for controlling individuals, behaviours, societies and nation-states has been a relatively overlooked subject. The objectives to such chaos-mongering for different countries vary but for India, the objective seems to be of achieving a powerful status in the new world order. However, utilising this approach to achieve a role of a regional leader or a significant position in the world order is not very wise as it is both underhanded and counterproductive. India, as a thriving democracy and the second most populous nation in the world, has a lot to offer, provided it takes the initiative to link itself to the tide of regional connectivity rising around it. For that purpose, the Indian foreign policy must be rescued from the duality of purpose that plagues it. The first step is to manage the identity expectations and to humbly achieve a synchronised level of economic and cultural development. The next step is to extricate itself from the internal political affairs of its neighbouring countries and to put an immediate end to the rampant atrocities in the Indian occupied areas such as Kashmir. The final step should be to integrate itself with the region without prematurely assuming the role of a regional 'leader.' The best advice for this purpose also comes from Jawaharlal Nehru himself, "Integrate or perish!"

---

[46] "Russian Top Diplomat Shares his View on 'Controlled Chaos Theory,'" *TASS*, August 11, 2017.