



# Foreign Policy Failures and Successes: Comparative Analysis of India and Pakistan

Tooba Ahmad

Humanities COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Vehari-Pakistan

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in), [www.isca.me](http://www.isca.me)

Received 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2014, revised 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2015, accepted 7<sup>th</sup> February 2015

## Abstract

*The International political system is a process of definition of various and multiple colors that flow within and under a flagship of a state. States, are not only rational actors, but are rather entities that mark their strategies and objectives through a codification of foreign policy goals and objectives. A foreign policy is a strong determinant that marks the states, position, capability and credibility with other states, in the region and in the International Community. The significance of analyzing this determinant to be as a failure or success being the by-product of states, is to make us realize the limitations, stakes and transitional impacts that are related with this one determinant. The study lays emphasis on four basic factors as a measuring scale of a comparative analysis between Indian and Pakistani foreign policies. Although a complex task, the study depicts a major fault at part of states while formulating the nature of foreign policies within a correlation or causal relationship that with the factors and the objectives set. How, two states that emerged on the face of the earth together are two different stories is a remarkable finding which can be redeemed and found a remedy off if only states realize, accept and comply with the standards that help create these foreign policy trajectories.*

**Keywords:** Foreign policy, international political system, India, Pakistan, South Asia.

## Introduction

Foreign policy termed as decisions which governing body of a state took to meet their choices in international world<sup>1</sup>. The decisions which decision makers of a state made to pursue outer boundary benefits and advantages. It is a process in which certain objectives are designated by states. States codify those objectives and then enforce them in their dealings with other states to preserve their national interests. It is the system of activities conducted by states to achieve their set goals in international environment. The states also evolved actions to compete or cooperate with each other in international community. It is also a political power to gain its particular interests and goals within and outside the territorial boundaries of a state. It is a behavior of one state toward the other state in international community. The behaviors of states depend upon the relation between them and the degree of relation defines their actions toward each other<sup>2</sup>. Foreign policy termed as strategies which states and their governments made to define their goals toward other states in the global world<sup>3</sup>. Every state has its own set objectives and determinants.

On 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> August 1947, both Pakistan and India respectively earned freedom from British rule and emerged on the map of world as sovereign rival states. Being independent entities both states formulated their foreign policies on the basis of their socio-political, economic and military dimensions. In regard to two states, ideology is also an important dimension. Both Indian and Muslims are two separate nations in terms of

language, history, culture and religion. The Muslim-majority state of Pakistan got separation on the basis of Islamic ideology. Instead of there are several internal and external factors which evolved their foreign policies.

Since the birth, both states are allergic to each other<sup>4</sup>. The differences started from unfair assets distribution to land disputes which eventually led towards war<sup>5</sup>. The disputed territory of Kashmir has been the flashpoint for two of three wars 1947-8, 1965 and 1999<sup>6</sup>. Moreover the disease deepened with the breakdown of East and West Pakistan in which east wing got succession with the help of India. Instead of allergy both states also shared competitive dilemma to maintain the balance of power in the region resultantly South Asia nuclearized. Other than hatred, seventy years of two fraternal twins have different history in term of progress and development.

Since the birth, Pakistan has faced internal challenges, domestic political upheavals and regional confrontations to which Pakistan failed to solve and ultimately have a weak foreign policy. While India has become the world's largest democracy, militarily strong with fast-growing economy and cultural influence and portrayed successful foreign policy.

## Analysis of Determinants of Foreign Policy

There are several internal and external factors of both states which makes ones foreign policy successful while others

remain weak during the same period of time. Although India has been developed in terms of education, economy and technology but still face several environmental, political and social evils. Whereas Pakistan has not been witnessed much development but remains an important geo-political and geo-strategic actor. There are several factors behind the success of Indian foreign policy and responsible for the failure of Pakistan's foreign policy. In regard to the research paper criteria, this paper will discuss few important factors in regard foreign policy success and failure.

**Neutral and Dependent foreign policy:** After the separation both neighbors adopted different strategy regarding the foreign policy faith. At that world was divided into two block capitalist and communist headed by two superpowers United States and Soviet Union respectively<sup>7,8</sup>. These super powers made different military and economic pacts to enhance their alliances. India under the leadership of Nehru kept its foreign policy neutral. It didn't join any block instead took economic and military advantages from both superpowers. On the other hand Pakistan aligned itself with the western block. Although the main reasons to join the block were to boost their economy and military but the alliance turned into severe dependency in which Pakistan still entangled<sup>9</sup>. Eventually the foreign policy of Pakistan greatly influenced by major powers and actors. On the real ground, Pakistan never tried to get out of this dependency web even indulge itself moreover. The reasons behind this web are weak and corrupt leadership along with the weak economy. It also halted the image of Pakistan in the international community and boosted the image of India.

**Terrorism:** Since 9/11, terrorism is also a factor behind failed and successful foreign policies of two states. India is successful in securing its prosperity and peace while Pakistan failed. Being the part of war is not a bad thing but if you decided to be a part of war on terrorism than you should also took some regulating steps to counterterrorism<sup>10</sup>. The severe consequences of war proved the Pakistan's foreign policy as failure<sup>11</sup>. The entrance in the war on terrorism being a front line state charged a high price. US gave a lot of aid but the question is in context of loss is it sufficient? The War on terrorism has imprinted severe consequences on Pakistan's society as well as on Pakistan as a country<sup>12</sup>. The foreign policy of Pakistan has been greatly influenced with the stance of "DO more"<sup>13</sup>. Moreover, Islamic extremist also halted the foreign policy of Pakistan. On the other hand India got a huge success in foreign policy by portraying Pakistan as a hub and supporter of terrorist.

**Civil-Military Relations:** The nature of a state's political maturity can be assessed by its civil-military relationship. The International political scene is reflected through a collective object of achieving global process of practicing true democracy, thus a state's position to influence and pave its way in the international community is based on the stability, capability and consistency of its institutional pillars that run

the state<sup>14</sup>. Pakistan, a third world country, that by birth has inherited numerous threats and conflict ridden situations, is unfortunately a case of dysfunctional civil-military model that can be assessed by its political history. The aim to understand this dilemma is basically a key to understanding a state's fate of surviving the threats from within and from the adversaries. Pakistan has been home to a total of four dictatorships, where India, a significant adversary has been prone and embedded into the process of democracy and stability of democratic governments. India has shown high levels of trust between the Military and civilian governments.

**Democracy and Political Transition:** The elements of a states structure are more or less associated with its foundation of political transition. Comparing the two states that have since the birth faced two different models of political transition is not so fruitful. Laying this idea, with the base of the transition, Democracy, India claims to be one of the largest democracies that ascertained process of a stable democratic procedure since 1947. Where Pakistan has been in twists and turns of experimenting with the civil-military clash. India although has been condemned to have issues of Human Rights, Corruption and suppression of political rights, but it has been very consistent in defending its democratic image by strengthening its diplomatic engagements<sup>15,16</sup>. So a clear political transition that Pakistan has failed to bring up is the "diplomacy factor", although the issues are much equal of both the states, yet Pakistan is considered to be failed or irresponsible state. Therefore the evolution of the political maturity as a successful transition in case of Pakistan clearly lacks, giving India an upper hand through vibrant diplomatic efforts.

**The Markets Influence:** The basic two periods of market orientation for Pakistan and India are from 1949-1960 and later 1969-70, these are the time periods that had most variation of Pakistan and India's GDP values, based on their major market of Agriculture, India in 1950's had an annual GDP of 3.8, where Pakistan's was 2.6, however, in 1960's India's remained the same but Pakistan's rose to a level of 5.8. Yet this was due to the 1965 war, more spending being done showed a superficial growth rate with aid coming in<sup>17</sup>. This was mainly, due to India's policy of deregistered markets than oriented ones.

The basic difference between India and Pakistan was that India's social indicators of GDP growth and Rapid growth were based on incremental and long term projects, with development within the market as per the trickledown effect, however, in Pakistan there was a lot of money circulating and flowing but it was not on basis of real development. So, the development led to a causal effect of poor equity and income distribution, which meant that the wealth in Pakistan was a by-product of the few families unlike in India.

**Trade-Centric strategies:** Another significant policy that showed a major difference was the trade policy. India has since the start been wise enough to utilize its geostrategic location to trade and enhance trade, where Pakistan has rather not implied the beneficial policy of taking advantage of its location<sup>18</sup>.

## Conclusion

The political structure of a state and its foreign policy both define what kind of State it is. Although, authority, capability, and credibility of a state are determined by its ties with the International Community, the case of India and Pakistan on a comparative study is a remarkable assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the country's policies. And of the various factors that have been implied till that that have reproduced such a strong code of the story of the political India than of Pakistan. The study depicts that it has rather been the factors (internal and external) that have been the reason of the stated foreign policies. This is not only measured as an impact on the state, but on the adversary as well as the region. So the basic failure on part of Pakistan's policy has been that: i. It has been a dysfunctional civil-military model, ii. Weakened democracy and instable political transition, iii. Terrorism, iv. Market Influences and Governments.

Whereas, India has been a successful case in making and stating its story, being wise enough to stand today as a politically matured state, even though the faults do lie at India's part too, it isn't much obvious because India has always opted a policy of side-lining its interests.

Hereby, to conclude, indeed it is a measurable scale that can lead to a good assessment of a state's standing. Comparison of Indo-Pak Foreign policy preferences have clearly shown that it has been playing a strategy of passing out the integrated polarity of conflicts within the region, parting itself from any external influences, India has grown as a Country with a political and economic base that exists in real rather than being superficial. It is imperative that the aforementioned foreign policy preferences are reviewed so that a better and hopeful Structure of Pakistan can be envisaged.

**Way Forward:** The issue lies not at home or within the adversary state, but within the nature of the state structure that emerged in 1947, a clear divide of fate between the two nations, states and ideologies, Pakistan and India are good example of foreign policy influences on the Governments to and the previous that existed. However, its not too gloomy, a fruitful hope does exist of formulating a path to move forward so that existence of such foreign policy failures and successes can be mitigated. The recommendations are: i. Defining Foreign policy goals, independent and multidisciplinary in nature, ii. Causal correlation of political and economic complexities, iii. Structuring factors, to pave way for sustainability, iv. Institutionalization as a process of political

transition, v. The military and the civilian government should make efforts for a composite dialogue on this dysfunctional relation by creating an effective channel under the National Security Committee that addresses and sorts out any tensions between the institutions. vi. Uniting pillars than creating divergent strategies, vii. Strengthening economic trajectories to balance between National Security and National Interest.

## References

1. Policy, F. The failed states index, *Foreign Policy*, **149**, 56-65 (2005)
2. Gojree, U.M. Foreign Policy of India towards China: Principles and Perspectives, *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, **3(9)**, 50-58 (2014)
3. Hunt, M. H. *Ideology and US foreign policy*, Yale University Press, (2009)
4. Jönsson K., Unity-in-Diversity? Regional Identity Building in Southeast Asia: Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies, Lund University, (2008)
5. Mitra S.K., War and Peace in South Asia: a revisionist view of India-Pakistan relations, *Contemporary South Asia*, **10(3)**, 361-379. (2001)
6. Amin S.M., Pakistan's foreign policy: a reappraisal: Oxford University Press Oxford. (2000)
7. Flanagan R.J., Were communists good human capitalists? The case of the Czech Republic, *Labour Economics*, **5(3)**, 295-312 (1998)
8. Gat A., The return of authoritarian great powers, *Foreign Affairs*, 59-69, (2007)
9. Gardezi H.N., The Post-Colonial State in South Asia: The Case of Pakistan, *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, **5(2)**, 1-7 (1985)
10. Zubair M., Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism in Pakistan, *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, **2(6)**, 20-23 (2013)
11. Momani B., The IMF, the US War on Terrorism, and Pakistan, *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, **31(1)**, 41-51 (2004)
12. Hussain T., *US-Pakistan Engagement: The War on Terrorism and Beyond* (Vol. 31): United States Institute of Peace. (2005)
13. Gregory S., The ISI and the War on Terrorism, *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, **30(12)**, 1013-1031 (2007)
14. Kamrava M. Military Professionalization and Civil-Military Relations in the Middle East, *Political Science Quarterly*, **115(1)**, 67-92 (2000)
15. Sewak M., Multi-Track Diplomacy between India and Pakistan: A Conceptual Framework for Sustainable Security (Vol. 30): Manohar Publishers, (2005)

16. Talbott S., Engaging India: Diplomacy, democracy, and the bomb: Brookings Institution Press, **(2010)**
17. Papanek G.F. et.al., Baldwin R.E. and Khan A.H., Market or Government: Lessons from a Comparative Analysis of the Experience of Pakistan and India [with Comments], *The Pakistan Development Review*, 601-646 **(1991)**
18. Kearney A. and Policy F., Globalisation Index, *Foreign Policy*, **6**, 74-81 **(2006)**