CONCLUSION
The Bhartiya Janata Party was born under deplorable and changing circumstances when the Janata government could not fulfill its full term and the Congress Party was emanating with its powerful forces. The BJP was coming out with programmes to provide stable government and strong alternative to the Congress Party. The BJP spotlighted the historic role of Indian politicians and thinkers and was determined to fulfill the aspirations of freedom fighters for a developed and independent India, free from the clutches of imperialist forces. The Party marked out Gandhian Socialism and intended to implement those set of norms and values which would helpful for social upliftment and in eradicating poverty and exploitation. The BJP was highly distasteful to the Congress way of functioning but showed its readiness to support the Congress Party in case it entertains the policies which are designed to help poor masses. It also extended its willingness to cooperate with other parties in arresting authoritarianism and anti-national programmes of the ruling party. Reviewing the many-folded crises in various walks of life, the BJP cherished for consensual policies and programmes on major issues, national and international. It held the view that conflict and consensus are two inseparable parts of democracy and any kind of action contrary to it would spoil the sustenance of democratic ideas.

The Bharatiya Janata Party believed that people have no credibility on the opposition political parties. It is due
to their inability to provide a stable alternative to the Congress Party. So the BJP urged all the opposition political parties to work in combination to prove their integrity. Second, the opposition political parties are not mass based political parties. In this case also the BJP encouraged all the opposition political parties to work at the grassroot level fighting for the people’s cause. They can serve the cause of healthy democracy by concentrating their attention on people’s need and working achieve it instead of fighting to capture power.

The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) was founded in 1980 and fought the general election in the same year. It was not quite impressive in the first election result as it secured only four seats. The party was founded to provide an effective opposition in India. In the whole period of Seventh Lok Sabha the BJP could wield much influence inside and outside the parliament. In the Eighth General Election, though the party could not capture much seats, however, it secured massive popular support. No doubt, sometimes its pronouncements seem to be subjected to the interests of the party and not based on larger and general interests. However, the entire thinking of the party did not contradict the interests of the nation as a whole. So our study makes an attempt to examine some aspects of the foreign policy of India as well as the response of the BJP. This attempt has involved a brief study of some important issues which dominated the foreign policy of India in the eighties. We have
attempted the role of BJP in moulding and influencing the foreign policy of India. On the whole, our study supposes that the role played by the opposition has considerable impact on India's Foreign Policy. As national politics the BJP has different stances so also in foreign policy. The party considers that by making India powerful in defence, in nuclear, and economic field, the nation can preserve and protect its unity and integrity. On the issues like nuclear and West Asian conflict (Arab-Israel), its views are contrast to the views of the Indian government.

The cardinal principles of India's foreign policy is based on anti-racialism, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism which is the denouement of past experience of Indian leaders. Against this background even after independence the Indian policy makers advanced the championed principles of India. The most mirthless situation in the global strategic environment was the stockpiling of nuclear and anti-human weapons in Third World countries. Such an unencumbered race of arms in the early fifties not only splotched the image of newly establish United Nations but also contaminated immaculate air of the whole world and blotted the Paris Peace Conference. The enormous loss of money after the unchecked arms race could have been used for the process of industrialisation of the industrialised countries, even if not after the economically backward states. So the antagonistic attitude of the Western impe-
logical groups they looked after their problems, and strived to strengthen their economy and minimised the involvement with the Super Powers. In such a totality, non-alignment gained momentum for the promotion of peace.

The Soviet view bolstered up the non-aligned movement being pursued by the Third World. The Soviet leaders highly valued the contributions of the movement in urging the developing countries to desist from the imperialist blackmail. It is, of course, true that the Soviet Union had interests behind such a support to the NAM. It is clear that the USSR was opposed to Western domination and their policies to bring Third World countries under their grip. So the USSR and the US had ideological differences on many international issues. But it would be illogical if we see the Soviet stand on this angle alone. The Soviet Union was a Socialist state and it wanted that the developing countries of the world should pursue their independent course of action. The fact is proved on the ground that the USSR provided economic, scientific and technological aid to the developing countries; e.g., India, but not like the West where the Western aid had always strings attached to aid. On the other hand, the Soviet aid was aimed at development of the developing economy and certainly it did not compel India to toe the Soviet line. Therefore, there was strong Indo-Soviet ties with least divergencies whereas the Indo-American bilateral ties was factions and was characterised as multicolored dissonant. The American policy makers did not
support up the non-aligned policy of India. On different occasions they were captious about India’s links with the Soviet Union. They preconceived that India’s close relations with the Soviet Union corroded the non-aligned status of India. Whatever may be the statement of the Western press, no body will disagree with it that the Indo-Soviet friendship was based on different grounds, it was a cooperation that founded on mutuality of interests. While the US adopted its old policies, the Soviet Union had never attempted to intervene in the foreign policy choices of India. So by cementing the bond of Indo-Soviet friendship, India not only availed many advantages but also kept intact her non-aligned status.

Taking Mrs. Gandhi’s tenure as a whole, she started with cementing India’s relation with the US, but in the process the Indo-American relations clashed with each other. The Indian government upheld its policy of non-alignment and guarded its independence in all international fora without being dictated by Super Powers’ directions. At the same time, the Indira government did not allow India’s relations with USA or with USSR go unsymmetrical. So the guiding factor of the foreign policy of India was to maximise benefits, a matched game of politics but without getting bolted in their policies. So Nehru’s doctrine of asserting India’s place under the sun and to uphold non-alignment, was obviously India’s chosen path in the eighties also. Thus it would be apt to state that India’s foreign
policy throughout the eighties was to construct a benign relations with the West and to retain the good will of the USSR. Of course, the critics view it in a different angle. This policy of winning friendship of both the Super Powers was to invite hostility with them. Besides it was talked that with this stand of the government the policy of non-alignment would loose its strength. But in unhealthy situation of troubles on many fronts, adversaries all around, predominance of hostile elements inside and outside the country, India's option of reaping warm and benevolent relations with the great powers was the need of the hour.

In a changed international environment the role of the NAM was more challenging. The NAM which had so far been characterised as an 'evil movement' by the Western press, soon started gaining confidence and popularity. The emergence of detente in the eighties did not relinquish non-aligned movement. The critics argue that since there is end in cold war and bloc confrontation, there is no relevance of the movement. But it is foolish and illogical to give such a statement ignoring other factors and issues that the NAM had been fighting for. May be NAM was struggling for an end to colonialism, imperialism and racialism, but the end in racialism or colonialism does not make it redundant. The most challenging task before the NAM was economic. Third World countries were still groaning under poverty, illiteracy and multi-faceted socio-economic problems. The international financial institution were not favorable to the
developing countries. There was existence of rigid tariff
to the Third World. Though it seemed that
East-West division has ended, in true sense the division
still existed. Thus the problems had multiplied and mani­
folded. It is much more challenging than before. The world
is at crossroads, tensions are mounting. Inspite of the
agreement between the two Super Powers to destroy their
nuclear weapons, no concrete result has come out of it.

New states are getting their independence and are
running with economic subjugation. India's role in this
situation is widely recongnised. It should work relentless­
ly and move vigorously to achieve its objectives; a peaceful
world free from tensions, a just and equitable economic
order, and end of colonialism. The Indian government con­
sidered non-alignment as an elementary instrument to bring
peace in the world. So it urges the South Asian nations to
keep a vigilant eye on the imperialist moves whose aim is to
distract them from that direction. The Government of India
also asked the neighbouring countries to give a better shape
to the movement so that the imperialist forces would not
be able to break the NAM. In this direction an
effective role of the non-aligned countries in the interna­
tional fora is required, much more than before. The Indian
stand is that keeping aloof from the imperialist camp and
tightening the bond with the Socialist bloc, the non-aligned
states could play effective role and they could preserve the
main contents of the non-aligned movement. Here it is
surprising to note the contradictory choices of the Indian government. While on the one hand it asks to avoid Western aid and the industrialised countries blackmail, on the other hand it does not find any fault in getting aligned with the Soviet Union. It remains as a mute question whether India should avoid USA alone, why not both the Super Power? The US had also offered invaluable aid when India was in need of it, as for example, aid of food-grains in the days of famine. So why did India always seek to avoid West not the Socialist Russia?

Arms aid by the Super Powers to India and her neighbours has created tension in the region. Due to Super Powers strategies to win their respective friends with their vitriolic military help, the years of relative peace turned out into frantic conflicts. The BJP welcomed all peace initiatives initiated by the USSR but was critical of her suspicious role of offering peace plans and not allowing itself to desist from arms race. If the hypocrisy implicit in stockpiling the war heads, there could be no hope of peace in the world. The key to regional security and stability in South Asia subjects to the warm relations between India and Pakistan. Though the conflicts are deep-rooted both states should endeavor to wipe out the shade of wide differences for larger interest. So what was urgently required was a reconciliation between India and Pakistan. As we have observed, there was lack of sufficient initiatives by both India and Pakistan that marred their bilateral
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relations. The critics give different opinions regarding deteriorated Indo-Pakistan relations. They say that the climate of mistrust and suspicion aggravated as a result of irreconcilable stands adopted by both countries, some day or other. Though both of them realised that only widespread people-to-people contact could ease the tension, their efforts failed once and again. All agreements, all peaceful drives and doctrines, be it Shimla or bilateral talks other than Shimla, turned out to be futile and the prospects of settlements of the basic problems remained as before. The opposition political parties blamed the Indian government for its failure of promoting a climate of good neighbourliness. But we should not forget Pakistan’s actions, in letting down all peace initiatives proposed by India and went on getting military aid from USA. So the chaotic situation that prevailed in the sub-continent alone encouraged the hostile forces to exploit not only India but also Pakistan.

The ‘real causes’ for their divergences were manifold. First, it was because Pakistan’s subversive activities in Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab. Second, the role of the US to instigate local hostile forces to create terror in the country and above all, the third factor was the ‘unwillingness of the rulers’ of both countries to restore cordiality in their mutual dealings. The BJP holds the view that the national security is a primary responsibility of a state. Security of a nation is an integrated whole: an amalgam of
the internal, the economic, the social, the political, the military and the diplomatic. The Indian diplomacy can assist in the protection of our national interest only if it is guided by a purposeful foreign policy. Therefore, the BJP urges the government to find a solution in the strategically sensitive areas.

With the solution of the Punjab problem and the US direction to solve the Jammu and Kashmir problem in the spirit of Shimla Declaration, one may be hopeful of solution to the Indo-Pakistani confrontation. It cannot be denied that friendly relations with the neighbouring countries are deemed of utmost importance and considered as the most effective antidote to the imperialist threats and to overcome sharpened confrontation among themselves. So the 'easiest solution to the problem of the sub-continent' is that the Government of India should stick to its policy of peace and non-alignment and should urge the Pakistani government to abjure its policy of military preparedness and creating hostility in the Indian border. Friendship with the neighbouring countries is of utmost importance to the BJP. The security threat can be wiped out by strengthening South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and by strengthening relations among the South-Asian countries. The BJP evangelised for an all-embracing settlement of all outstanding matters with Pakistan.
There is little doubt about Moscow's concern with the developments in India. Time and again it has shared its opinion with India about Anglo-Pakistani policies to harm Indian interest. Though Rajiv Gandhi assured the Soviet Union to continue the policies of his predecessors, slightest inclination towards US for technology and scientific knowledge created suspicion in the Soviet quarter. The inclination to the West was short-lived and the Indo-Soviet bilateral relations improved well. The Indo-American trade relation could not succeed well due to USA's uncompromising attitude towards India. As a result, the Indo-Soviet trade expanded towards the end of the eighties. India also received arms assistance from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union's principal concern in South Asia had been to prevent the region from coming under the grip of the US. It was the Chinese factor also which encouraged the Soviet Union to come closer to India. The Chinese government aided Pakistan militarily and supported Pakistani nuclear programme. Towards the end of the eighties the international scenario changed altogether. Democracy revived in Pakistan. The newly elected Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto was more interested to develop cordial relations with India. It was felt that there is no end in the arms race and both India and Pakistan would not be benefited from attacking each other. They had numerous problems to tackle; economic, social and political. It was also realised that by spending their money after arms they will not be able to check their economic depressions. Besides, the world economy was also
regressing. The Indian counterpart also equally responded the Pakistani desire. The fact is that, with the end of cold war they were not eager to aggravate their relations. On the other hand, there was tremendous improvement in Sino-Indian relations. Collaborations on science, technology and other related fields between India and China was impulsive. Notably, the improvements in Sino-Soviet relations also helped to ease tension in South Asia. So the three nations India, China and USSR came closer to each other. These was high hope among the people that the cold war in South Asia will not last long.

The United States was skeptical about Soviet-Indian relations. The US suspected was that if India received arms from the US it would leak the secrets of American arms to the Soviet Union which was its cold war rival. If at all it happens, it would hamper United States strategic concerns in South-Asia. So the US insisted on the General Security Military Information Agreement (GESOMIA) which the Indian government considered inimical to its interests. Thus they had different perspectives on arms agreements. The United States would have been a comfortable partner, had India sacrificed her Soviet links. But the Indian government cannot do it (if USA persist India on the same line today) even after the breakdown of Soviet Union. The reason is simple, on the ground that in the past whenever India showed her need to buy American arms there were always demurral from the American side. So one cannot be sure, if India
goes to Washington instead of Moscow (now after the breakdown of USSR) the former may put more stringent terms as there is no USSR to fulfill Indian needs. It may also affect India's self-reliance in defence production like the nuclear fuel supply to Tarapore.

There is no longer Soviet threat to America's actions. It is trying to impose its interests and desire over all nations. Here it may be noted that in the nineties also the US is more concerned about Pakistan than China or Japan. USA has long-term interest in West Asia, economically and politically. So to get access to Saudi Arabia or Iraq or elsewhere in West Asia, Pakistan will alone give her needful leverage. So, Washington not want to please New Delhi at the cost of Islamabad. In case of arms supply to India, supposing that USA would not bring any hurdle in terms of contract or supply, it is certain that Pakistan will go out of Washington's hands as Pakistan can not see an armed India. So unless a broad political understanding comes into existence among the three nations, any sort of arms aid from the US in the nineties seems to be bleak.

In years to come, the casque of American policy will remain anti-communist and anti-nonalignment. The US would not see eye to eye with Moscow even if it is not a communist regime. Moreover, it will definitely keep on opposing nonaligned policy of India. So despite the desire of the Indian government in the nineties to build a more subtle relation
with United States, it is hardly expected to give result in concrete terms. Therefore, what is required now is that the Government of India should not try to appease either USA or the imperialist forces of the West, by giving up its nonaligned status. Only desirable step is that differences and discord that exists today should pass out of sight. The openness in our dealings should not dissipate at any cost. We must recognize the deep roots we have with the erstwhile Soviet Union and should try to arrange it in a new form with all the countries those were part of Soviet Union once upon a time. Understanding the reasons for embroilment the government should adopt a more pliable, pragmatic and meritorious policy to build her image in the world. These is no permanent foe in the international relations and a mature relationship around the world would facilitate for an efficacious role of India in the international forums.

In the eighties, Indo-American relations had been a cluster of misunderstandings, allegations and counter-allegations. Though there are many reasons behind it, the nuclear issue is also one among them. The motive of the United States and its 'vital interests' in the South Asian region causes to reverse the process of detente. Thus, India's relation with the US is was marked more of strain than cordiality. We have also seen that Indo-American divergences also cause discrepancy between India and Pakistan on nuclear issue. Both sides attack each other's nuclear programme. Even if both sides reiterates their positions
and policies with candor time and again, differences on vital issues remain unresolved.

Regarding India's nuclear policy, there is no need of elaboration. India has always stood for peaceful use of nuclear energy. The hostile elements, no doubt, sketch the nuclear programmes non-conducive to create regional stability. But we cannot accept this view as India has never shown any type of aggression or violation of contracts that it is obliged to do. If there is any sort of discord between India and Pakistan and India and USA, it is due to the lack of mutuality of interests. If Pakistan goes for an atom bomb being assisted by one Super Power, there is no reason why India will not go for nuclear taking the help of other powers. Security of a nation depends not only how it is modernising its army or navy or how it is superior to other powers, but the attitude of the neighbours. 'When my neighbour is attacking me with a knife, it is folly on my part if I do not go for a knife and I shall alone be responsible for my destruction.'

In such a totality the critics argue that India should go nuclear. But it is not a question whether India should go nuclear or not. Because it will not bring tangible results. The question is how to save the region? A Patriotic citizen definitely seeks to see nation's glory, but should it be by acquiring biological and chemical weapons? And also compelling its neighbours to go on that line? When the world economy is worsening, world financial institu-
tions are deficit of funds, should not we think in terms of global benefit? Should not we bother about the existence of our fellow-beings in our own country by providing economic benefits, eliminating poverty and illiteracy with the fund that we are spending on acquiring arms? While the world is moving towards nuclear disarmament, thanks to the peace initiatives of Gorbachev and largely by Soviet Union it would be insanity if we keep on arming ourselves. It is not a question whether disarmament efforts will succeed or fail. Even if it fails we should put every effort in it. Why should the developing countries like India and Pakistan will waste their resources in purchasing chemical weapons and next day going to the big powers for a loan? Disarmament process is in progress. The two Super Powers have agreed not to proliferate nuclear weapons to the non-possessing states. So there should be several talks between India and Pakistan to defer their nuclear programme. In this perspective, the role of non aligned movement as well as SAARC are more desirable. Though last non aligned summit held in Jakarta noted with concern about the developments in this regard, no concrete result came out. It is due to the irreconcilable stands taken by both India and Pakistan. It appears that the role of the great powers are also quite challenging in this issue. They should take up the 'regional issues' with consensual approach. It must be remembered that reduction of the nuclear arms should begin from the area where it is concentrated, not to speak of South Asia.
alone. The treaty to eliminate nuclear arms should bind all nations who are capable or incapable of producing nuclear weapons. A global nuclear weapons verification system can only ensure a peaceful and tension free world, or else mutual extermination is not far away. It should be borne in mind that unless we are able to usher in a non-violent, tension free world we cannot give a wide berth to certain military capability to guard our sovereignty and territorial integrity from Janus-faced military aggression.

The militarisation of Indian Ocean had raised eyebrows among the people of the sub-continent. The problem remained as a complex one and no settlement could make its way, because the talks held at the official level could not adopt a mutually accepted formula. Though there was 'climate for negotiations' to ease tension, the gesture of goodwill rejected by either of them. So the situation had developed to such a complexity that India and other littoral states were engulfed by the Super Powers confrontation. The critics viewed the situation altogether differently. To one section of the commentators the Indian Ocean militarization process has been so aggressive due to regional conflict, mainly the conflict between India and Pakistan. As the US took the Pakistani side, the USSR supported India in that case also. The Indo-Pakistani confrontation was aggravating day by day and it seemed sometimes that there was no solution to the problem. When Pakistan was envious of being powerful in South Asia, it invited USA to intrude into their
regional conflict. Gradually, USA strengthened its position in the Indian Ocean. Soviet Union supported India's call for a peace zone in the area in all international forums.

Another section of the critics view that the militarisation of the Indian Ocean is unconnected to the regional conflicts. It is rather the superpower rivalry to attack and counter-attack, to balance each other and the desire of thwarting the ambition of the other stimulated the intrusion of sophisticated weapons into the Ocean. They argue that India has also economic interest in the Indian Ocean. Though the Indian government has shown enough avidity in making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, it should not allow the region to be turned into a superpowers' playground. For this, India should increase her naval capability and naval strength to meet the threat of the external powers.

It is true that instability of the region has been greatly contributed by the external powers' intervention. But it would be impalpable to state that India should fall into the line of the Super Powers. If India goes on increasing her naval strength, first, it will put heavy burden on her economy. A developing country like India cannot sacrifice her economy just to counter external powers. Moreover, it cannot acquire enough strength to counter USA or Russia. Second, it will pose more security threat to the littoral states. It is also true that in case of any Indo-Pakistani war the United States will not hesitate to use her
maritime installment in the Indian Ocean. All this can be best tackled if India can raise world public opinion in favour of UN declaration, declaring 'Indian Ocean a zone of peace'. Moreover, it should take into confidence the neighbouring and littoral states. Political paramountcy would be more effective than the military build-up. Continuing the process of strengthening 'strategic awareness' against USA's increased military build-up it should keep faith in the United Nation's declarations. India, also, must emphasise the fact that due to geo-strategic realities the role of Pakistan is much more valid than Washington's actions. The coordinated and concerted efforts of the NAM can only put pressure on USA's maritime warfare.

After the disintegration of the USSR, it is not a point to discuss whether its maritime strength has decreased or not, but definitely it will pose security threat to India. Even the erstwhile USSR was not creating trouble to India, the movement of Russia in the Indian Ocean was actually on a much lower scale.

Today, we cannot think in terms of 'selective security safeguard' confined to a particular region. So the survival of humanity is also closely linked with all parts of the whole world. That is why India is against any intervention in the Indian Ocean. It must be correct to say that India stands upright and independent in this direction. The immediate and practical solution, therefore, rests on the
role of United Nations also. To renew the efforts for equanimity is though complex, yet the requisite steps can constrict turbidity and can transmit peace aftermath.

Above all, India’s Indian Ocean policy is quite peaceful and aims at establishing a zone of peace. It is not titled towards any power. But the problem continues. So the main question before the Indian policy makers is how to get rid of the tense situation within a shortest possible time? Quite clearly, it depends on the attitude of the powers involve in the area and the support of the littoral countries in India’s endeavour of peace zone area. In other words, there should be mutuality of interests between the great powers those are employing fissiparous tactics in the Indian Ocean and the Indian Ocean littoral states to check out a mutually benefit programme to ensure that the security to the littoral nations does not place in a house of cards. An immediate halt to drift the atmosphere of congeniality and to prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from the Indian Ocean is the paramount importance in the nineties.

On economic front that the Indo-Soviet friendship came in a big hand to hasten developmental process of India. Scientific and technological collaborations continued to assign a key role in the development of public and private sectors rendering the needs of India for a rapid all-round development. Bilateral collaborations on steel, metallurgy, energy and other fields helped India to lay the
ed. Decelerated economic growth not only curbs economic development but also leads to involvement of a foreign power. It also retards self-reliant drive and liquidates established industrial resources. It is also suggested that the internal development of a country is related to economic independence. In case of Sri Lanka, the ethnic conflict prompted the US to provide all possible help only to keep Sri Lanka as an American hostage. Thus, external dependence is a multidimensional problem. It is well known that foreign debt problem often leads to dependence on foreign countries, who in the name of assistance captures economy of the receiving state. It is proposed that only economic confidence building measures can prevent a country to go the doors of the aid giving nations. So building up of environment against imperialist countries should be the priority of a developing country.

Towards the end of the eighties and the early nineties India has faced serious foreign exchange crisis. The economists suggest that liberalisation of Indian economy and Privatisation of public sectors can earn tangible results. India is going through slow restructuring of economy and is looking for liberalisation. It is admitted that the strategy of the Indian government is essential to support its developing economy. But at the same time it is viewed that liberalisation would invite multinationals to wield their importance and the national industry will be jeopardised. Importantly, the MNCs make inroad to the national economy in
such a way that sometimes they happen to influence the foreign policy of that country. That is why, the BJP strongly oppose the ruling party’s policies of surrendering before multinationals and allowing themselves to leave India letting the Indians to suffer from the evils created by them, for instance the Union Carbide case. So, not only Indian but also major South Asian countries are under the grip of economic imperialism of the West. The Western industrialised countries, on the other hand, are not abjuring their economic expansion. In such a situation India’s responsibility is to bring South Asian countries to a common economic platform for their common advantage as well as for whole Asia. The regional cooperation should have to be based on the interest of all nations of the region. The ‘centre-piece’ of the argument is that the natural and economic resources of each and every country should be made available not only to the concerned nation alone. In the initial phase of building modern independent industrialised economy, they may face serious economic problem and financial deficit which should be met by their mutual cooperation, i.e., the developed nations of the region should extend financial support to the developing countries of the sub-continent.

In the nineties, some remarkable progress have been seen all over the world. The Soviet Union is no more integrated. Pakistan is not getting American support. The Clinton administration has showed its desire to reduce aid
to Pakistan both economically and militarily. India is becoming stronger with its second largest army strength in the world and massive stockpiling of arms with newly built and modernised weapons. The US is becoming friendly to India after the crumbling of the Soviet Union. So in this situation, it is expected that the security problem of South Asia would be settled. Though there are occasional divergences between India, Pakistan and India, USA, it is hoped that the arms acquisition by the South Asian countries and arms supply by the US will soon end. We may state that mere words does not sound good, but to provide the means conceive concrete results, measures should be taken so that the 'dangers of annihilation' subsidises and purpose of the sub-continent is fulfilled. The justifiability to exist and to allow others to exist should be encouraged repelling the logic of arms acquisition at the earliest.

To sum up, the nineties have ushered in a totally different international world than the earlier decades. The world is undergoing radical transformation, transferring the multi-polar world to a uni-polar world. The influence of the United States is seen everywhere starting from global disputes to regional conflicts, from world financial institutions to regional institutions. In this situation, the Bharatiya Janata Party has always stood for closer ties with the neighbouring countries of South-Asia so that they can properly tackle external pressures -- political and economic. The importance of regional co-operation should be