Chapter 6

Conclusion
The tragic partition of Palestine by the United Nations gave birth to the Zionist state-Israel. After its creation, the United Nations accepted Israel as its 59th member. India's great nationalist leaders like Gandhi and Nehru rejected the Zionist claim to Palestine. They strongly opposed the creation of Israel and its membership to the United Nations. India, a member of the United Nations Special commission on Palestine UNSCOP, rejected the 'majority report' prepared by it, which recommended the partition of Palestine. India with Yugoslavia and Iran recommended 'minority report' which suggested an independent Palestine as a federal state with Jerusalem as its capital. However, the minority report was rejected by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Nehru always supported the Palestinian cause. He always supported Palestine as an Arab country. He viewed Israel as an Imperialist creation. But on 17 September 1950 India formally recognized the state of Israel. The decision to recognize Israel was a mark of respect to the institution of United Nations. He argued that the recognition could not be deferred for a long time because the United Nations, which had accepted the state of Israel, could treat the deferment of Israel's recognition as an act of defiance.

After approving recognition to Israel the then Indian government allowed Israel to open a consulate in Bombay but the diplomatic
relations were not established. Though the recognition of Israel was granted but the Indian government continued to support the Palestinian cause. She always supported the Palestinian struggle.

Though India maintained a consistent policy towards the then crisis in the region, there were certain groups of people who did not see eye to eye with the government. The Hindu Mahasabha represented them. They always criticized the Nehru government for withholding the recognition of Israel. They willfully ignored the fact that Israelis are the occupiers with imperialistic, colonialist ideology. Nevertheless, India being anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism her support to the Palestinian struggle was obvious.

Taking recognition as a welcome gesture, the Israeli government made some efforts for establishing diplomatic relations with India. But the then Indian Prime minister rejected those efforts and also refused to normalize relations with Israel. The Jansangh and other likeminded groups however considered Israel as a democratic state in the region and always demanded for having the diplomatic relations with the Zionist state. The Jansangh perhaps was deliberately ignoring the fact that the so-called democratic state was established at the expense of the majority of Palestinians, an act quite opposite to the basic principles of democracy.
India's West Asian policy was greatly influenced by her relations with the Arabs and the Arab Nationalist movements. The Egyptian revolution of 1952 created a new dimension in Indo-Arab relations, which had a chain reaction to her attitude towards Israel. Egyptian government's opposition to imperialism, qualified by non-alignment, found a place with Indian foreign policy makers. India and Egypt's consistent opposition to all forms of imperialism intrigues and maneuvers led to their attacks on the Baghdad pact. Their common policy brought both India and Egypt closer.

India's relations with Egypt had a major role in her policy towards Israel. When the Israelis in collaboration with Britain and France launched an attack on Egypt on October 29, 1956. The Nehru government strongly condemned the Israeli action and branded it as a case of clear naked aggression. He also supported the nationalization of Suez Canal by Gamal Abdel Nasser.

India also showed strong reactions against Israel in June war of 1967. India being a non-aligned country was reluctant towards accepting the aggressive policy of Israel and condemned the Israeli attacks and American policy towards the Arabs. Due to Israeli belligerence of 1967 on Arab world, India decided to break off relations even at consulate level with Israel as an immediate measure.
and she extended moral support to the deprived Arabs who were the victims of Israeli aggression.

However, the opposition leaders from Jan Sangh and other likeminded parties criticized the government's stand. They argued that India's unnecessary support to the Arabs could encourage them (Arabs) to adopt more hostile attitude towards Israel. It is ironic that they were ignoring the fact that Arabs were not hostile to Israel but it was Israel, which was very much hostile to the Arabs. The Jansangh also argued that Indian leadership was succumbing to Arab pressure in a bid to appease them and thought Israel to be a worthwhile force in the region and a symbol of stability. However, they conveniently forgot that Israel was and still remains the greatest destabilizing factor in the region.

Again, when a war broke out in the region in 1973. India strongly condemned the Israeli aggression and affirmed that the cause of the tension in the area was the Israeli aggression and its refusal to vacate the territories, which had been occupied by her by the armed forces and supported the Arab cause, which was based on justice and demanded immediate implementation by Israel of the United Nations resolutions for peaceful solution of the problem.

Meanwhile the Janta party came to power in 1977. Moshe Dayn the former Israeli foreign Minister visited India during the Janta party's rule. The main reason behind his visit was to seek the
diplomatic relations with India. But he could not fulfil his dreams because the then Indian Prime Minister Mr. Desai rejected his (Dayan’s) proposals. Dayan returned back angrily as the Indian prime minister Mr. Morarji Desai suggested him for withdrawing from all the Occupied Territories for an independent Palestinian state. Nevertheless, Janta Party’s unequivocal support to Palestinian cause did not allow the normalization of relations with Israel, inspite of the attempts of its foreign minister Mr. Vajpayee with R.S.S mindset to accommodate Israel even at the expense of the Palestinians. After a couple of years of rule, Mrs.Indra Gandhi’s Congress party again replaced the Janta government in 1980.

There was another war in the region in 1982. India treated the atrocities committed by Israeli military during the war as very much horrific and condemnable. She condemned Israel’s infamous history of misdeeds and stressed for the recognition of the rights of the Palestinians for establishing durable peace in the region. The then Israeli consul in India Yosef Hassen criticized against the Indian protocol for being the proArab and succumbing to their pressure. As a result, the Israeli consul was directed to leave the country within hours.

It was Rajiv Gandhi, after the death of his mother-Mrs. Indra Gandhi, reopened Israeli consul that was lying vacant since 1982. He held some meetings with the Jewish leaders when he visited USA. But
these meetings could also not lead to the establishment of the
diplomatic relations between the two states.

After the death of Rajiv Gandhi Narsimha Rao became the Prime
minister of India. During his rule, the extension of the diplomatic
relations to Israel was almost a decree since there was no debate on
this issue in the parliament or outside. The decision came as a rude
surprise to millions of Indians who had up till now steadfastly held to
the view, first evacuation of occupied territories, second creation of the
state of Palestine and finally extension of diplomatic relations with
Israel. The very premise of the Indian foreign policy was turned upside
down by this decision.

According to some analysts, the end of cold war, disintegration
of the former USSR, emergence of USA as the only super power, Gulf
war of 1991 and the Madrid Conference forced Narsimha Rao to take
this hasty and immature step of establishing diplomatic relations with
the Zionist state. Before this, Narsimha Rao government in 1991 voted
for the revocation of the United Nations Resolution of 3379 of
November 1975 that had equated Zionism with Racism. Some analysts
argued that this step paved the way for Narshima Rao to establish the
diplomatic relations in 1992. Narsima Rao’s decision was hailed by
B.J.P. The B.J.P leader Mr. Vajpayee was more than happy with the
decision. Like wise, Shiv Sareen, the president of All Hindu
Mahasabha hailed the decision. The BJP and more broadly, the sangh parivar, have an acute and long-standing obsession with Israel. Establishing full diplomatic relations with Israel was always a distinctive part of the Jansangh- BJP’s agenda. While the communist party of India condemned the Rao governments move and decision and commented that, it was a step in haste. Moreover, the decision was taken without taking Indian public opinion into account. India’s long cherished principled stand against racism was thrown to winds overnight.

When the diplomatic relations were established, some claimed that Chandra Swami was instrumental in the process, others that it was part of a process of wooing the US, Israel’s mentor. The government claimed it was a key element in India’s overall West Asian strategy which had been devasted by its less-than categorical stand on Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. It was said that the move would get India a seat at the West Asian peace talks. Relations with Israel are part of a process that began in the early 1980s when Indra Gandhi moved towards the US and began to open up the economy. Under Rajiv Gandhi, the idea of a step-by-step approach was given official sanction. However, an official in the then government argued, “Events overtook us”. West Asian peace process got under way, aided by the shift in the power balance following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Iraq was
neutralized and Syria. Israel's remaining great antagonist, sided with the US.

If India were to make a decision primarily on the criterion of Israel's West Asian attitude, there was and there still is no case at all for establishing the diplomatic relations. True, all of them have begun talking but Israel continues to hold out and is in illegal occupation of an entire country and parts of others. It is getting what was denied to it without an inch or an ounce of concession. There are those who argued that if India can have diplomatic relations with China and Pakistan, who are supposed to be in occupation of our land, what is the problem in having ties and yet opposing the policies of some one who is occupying not our but some body else's territories. The argument used by the BJP leaders is utterly amateurish. For one thing, India's ties with China were reopened precisely to talk and iron out problems peacefully just as the Arabs and Israel have now decided to. More important, Israel is in occupation of an entire country whose creation was legitimized by the world's premier International body, is stealing all its water and is in the process of appropriating occupied lands through illegal settlements being allotted to immigrants welcomed on the basis of religion. A doctrine diametrically opposed to what India professes to stand for.
After establishing the diplomatic relations, the two states began to have military collaborations. Before the establishment of the diplomatic relations, there were very limited military contacts between the two countries. But after the establishments of the diplomatic relations there have been several visits, contacts and consultations related to the military field, between the two countries. There are some who also argued that India would like to benefit from the Israeli experience in antiterrorist operations. However, they willfully ignored that Palestinian struggle for liberation was not an act of terrorism. Secondly even if it was Israel until now had been an alter failure to curb it. Weapons certainly are no solution to suppress a struggling people. Shimon Peres former foreign minister also raised the issue of terrorism and fundamentalism when he was on a visit to India in 1993. During his visit, he also raised his hands to support India regarding the Kashmir Issue and the Shimla Agreement.

Mr. Peres was perhaps ignoring the fact that it was the PLO chairman -Mr.Yasser Arafat who played a significant role in bringing both India and Pakistan closer to each other, which resulted in concluding the Shimla Agreement between the two countries. As far as Peres is concerned, he has double standards on the Kashmir issue. On one occasion, he has supported the solution of Kashmir issue on the basis of the Shimla agreement and on the other occasion, he tried to
make the situation more volatile when he immaturely suggested for changing the demographic character of the Valley of Kashmir on the pattern of Palestine. He was trying to saw permanent seed of discord as he and his friends in Israel had done vis-à-vis the poor Palestinians. After Peres, Ezer Weizman former president of Israel visited India in 1996. His main aim was to push an increase in ‘defense cooperation’ an euphemism for the selling of arms to India under one pretext or another. During his visit, the two countries decided to exchange military attaches. One can easily surmise that Israeli supply of arms can be seen as catalyst of arms race in the region.

Almost after a year of the President Weizman’s visit to India in 1996-97, the Bhartiya Janta Party BJP, after coming to power carried out the nuclear tests in 1998. That was the start of the arms race in the region because Pakistan, which is being considered a threat to the Indian security also carried out the nuclear tests in retaliation, thus becoming a nuclear power. This was a God send opportunity for Israelis to take advantage of the situation. After nuclear tests, Kargil war broke out between India and Pakistan in 1999. This war was a tremendous opportune moment for Israelis to market their military products when India was reeling under the sanctions. These weapons would put India into contention as the main power not only in South Asia, but perhaps, as the second front against the Chinese.
Furthermore, the fantasy of the missile defense shield and a nuclear capacity enables forces of Hindutva to believe that it has once again attained superiority over Pakistan- a conventional advantage that had been neutralized by the mutual nuclear tests of 1998.

Arms deals are continuously signed between India and Israel. Defense analysts estimated weapons sold to India by Israel crossed $500 million during 1997-2000. By 2001, India signed weapons contracts worth $2 billion with Israel. Recently Israel signed one more deal worth $1.1 million for selling her ‘Phalcon Airborne Warning and Control Systems’ to India. From the above estimations, it is clear that India is providing the market to Israel for selling her arms worth million US dollars to India. Israeli arms exporters are treating India as conducive market, which can be exploited by them even if they sold their hardware at very high price. Indo-Israeli arms trade is unilateral, arms from Israel to India. Only the pretext is combating terrorism and fundamentalism. This is high time top echelons in the government realize and save the poor Indian taxpayers from agony. India is the biggest customer for Israel’s military industry. Almost one-half of Israel’s total military sales in year 2002 worth $4.2 billion went to India. The Indian budget, therefore, subsidizes the Israeli arms infrastructure and in effect, the atrocities of the Israeli defense force. Even two generally conservative Indian analysts concur that the Indian
military does not gain immensely from the arms deals. Uday Bhasker of the Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis, New Delhi noted regarding the arms deals as ‘Israelis not doing us any favors. They drive a hard bargain’. Brahma Chellaney of the Centre for Policy Research-New Delhi stated regarding the relationship as, it is a patron client relationship rather than a relationship of equals.

Other sectors of cooperation between these two stats are agriculture, trade, science and technology. India is technologically sound. Its information technology and technically skilled labours are worldwide accepted. Its technological cooperation with US, Japan and other developed countries would be more beneficial to her than Israel. However, solar energy is an area the Indian experts are looking for. It is claimed that Israelis have the only workable solar power generating system in the world. This is not just for fans and tube lights but also for generating substantial amounts of power for supplying power grids. Such system is said to be working in California. The Israelis are offering India a collaborative role in a more advanced ‘water tower’ solar technology, which is even more effective. Agriculture is considered one more important area of cooperation between the two states. Farmers are being sent to Israel to know the Israeli techniques regarding the agriculture production and so on. Israel has utilized its marginal water resources to make the desert bloom. Its strides in
horticulture, aquaculture and floriculture and arid zone farming hold applications for India. Rajasthan and other semi-arid states have used the Israeli agricultural techniques. Indo-Israeli Research and Development Farms were inaugurated in the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, IARI at Pusa in New Delhi. It is claimed that the farm would demonstrate the Israeli expertise in high tech agriculture and would endeavor to find different techniques and methods of cultivation suitable for the diverse agro-climatic zones in India.

Other sector of cooperation between two countries is trade. Since 1992, various trade agreements have been signed between these two states. Prior to 1992, there was little direct trade between India and Israel. However, after establishing the diplomatic relations the trade between these two countries has been growing. Since the establishment of the diplomatic relations, agreements and treaties like Memorandum of Understanding MOU, Most Favored Nation Status MFN, Double taxation treaty DTT, and so on have been signed between the two states. The bilateral trade is almost limited to two major items in both states. That is, rough diamonds and chemicals together form about 63% of Israel's exports to India. While as the polished diamonds and cotton yarn account for approximately 76% of Indian exports to Israel. In 1992 that is, after the establishment of diplomatic relations, the total bilateral trade reached $186 million and in 1999 it reached $1004 and
in 2000, the total bilateral trade touched $1009 million. Apart from the diamonds, the other main Israeli exports to India are the military arms, which are being sold to India worth million US dollars. These arms, which Israel is exporting to India, can strangle/ garrotte the industrial development since huge amount is being wasted on the purchase of these Israeli arms at very high price.

On the other hand, India's trade relations with the Arabs are growing fast since decades. The oil, which is in abundance in the Arab World, has built these trade relations stronger and almost still overwhelming. Almost the GCC countries including Iran presently account for almost all the India's oil imports. Moreover, three million Indian workers are working in the Gulf States. Their remittances, which India is receiving in billion dollars per annum strengthening Indian economy. While the Israeli arms, which are being imported worth million US dollars, is emaciating the Indian economy as huge amount is being utilized in importing these arms. However, these arms are being imported on the pretext to curb the so-called terrorism and fundamentalism

The Hindutva- Sharonist alliance is not simply about the opportunistic needs of the Israeli defense industry and the Indian military, but it is also about the creation of an alliance alongside the Bush-run Pentagon against two foes: Islam (or, in the most vulgar
interpretations, the Arab states and Iran in general) and Communism (or China). "Terror is the major issue and challenge for both countries. We understand each other and we see each other in similar terms, of Islamic terrorism" were the arguments of New Delhi's Israeli Embassy Spokesman, Yaran Mayer.

Actually, Israel has been extremely successful in using the bogey of Islamic terrorism and fundamentalism to further its interests and deprive Palestinians of their legitimate rights. Even the Israeli stance on terrorism has been a tactical one. It is widely acknowledged that it was Israel, which pioneered terrorist activity in Asia. But according to Valsan Cherian, the American commentator Noam Chomsky says, the 'evil scourge of terrorism' in America and Israeli discourse refers to terrorist acts by Muslims and Arabs, but not by Zionists, just as 'peace' means settlement that honors the right of national-determination of Jews, but not of Palestinians. The goal of Israel has always been to encourage terrorism in West Asia so that Palestinians or Islamic militancy can be blamed, delaying a peaceful solution to the Palestinian question.

L.K. Advani and his own political party and other like-minded radical Hindu parties saw in Israel a valuable strategic partner on the grounds of the mutually common anti-Minority agenda. Advani feels that Israel and India should be closer to each other in the field of
defense and counter-terrorism. After coming to power in 1998, the Bhartiya Janta Party took steps towards normalizing the relations with the Zionist state by sending ministers of high rank such as Advani and Jaswant Singh and other military officials to strengthen the relations with Israel. Israel's outrages against Palestinians rose just as the Bharatiya Janata Party government began wooing it. A relationship has been established, especially in purchase of military hardware. National interest, however, does not require the government to grovel before Israel and tender abject apologies for Jawaharlal Nehru's policies as Jaswant Singh did. As external affairs Minister, he spoke to the Israeli council of foreign relations in Jerusalem, on July 2, 2000, 'of a tectonic shift of consciousness'. He attributed India's policy in the past to, predictably, the Muslim vote and, at one remove, Nehru. He went to the extent of saying that it was this 'vote bank policies', which prevented the two countries from becoming natural allies. He perhaps was ignoring the fact that India being a non-aligned country could not be a natural ally of Israel, which is the occupier of other's land. Ilan Pappe a scholar of Haifa University has amplified that 'the Jews came and took, by means of uprooting and expulsion, a land that was Arab...We wanted to be a colonialist occupier, and yet to come across as moral at the same time.' As the peace loving Israeli Scholars. journalists understood the reality of their state (Israel). However, the
Indian External Affairs minister Mr. Jaswant Singh could not understand this reality.

The BJP government made a paradigm shift from cultivating the Arab world towards a strategic partnership with Israel to curb the so-called terrorism. Hindutva’s alliance with the Zionist state is not so strange because at the ideological level Hindutva is much like Zionism, for both extol the importance of the Race-State and both cast aspersions at the presence of religious minorities. If the activists of Hindutva yell ‘Hindu Rashtra for Hindus’ against Indian religious minorities, those radical Zionists follow Golda Meir, the former Israeli Prime minister, in the belief that, ‘there is no such thing as a Palestinian.’

After the visits of Advani and Jaswnt Singh to Israel in 2000, Mr. Shimon Peres again visited India in 2002. He had played well to Hindu extremist sentiments and stressed on the need for India and Israel to cooperate to combat the so called ‘Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism’. During his visit, he disclosed that Indo-Israeli relations are witnessing the highest level of friendship since a couple of years of the BJP’s rule. He further argued that India could look up on Israel as a friend in the war against the terrorism. He also made some comments regarding the December 13 attack on the Indian parliament, only to keep the flow of Israeli arms continue to India. The BJP
leadership taking advantage of being there in the government was hell bent on capitalizing on the volatile situation in India, which was a creation of their own purport, and projecting Israel their savior. According to an analyst the saffronistas, which were unable to cope with the relentless revelations of underhand dealings, found an escape in the December 2002 attack on Parliament and jumped at the opportunity and mobilized troops along the Indo-Pak border only to disengage them eight saber-rattling months later.

After Shimon Peres, the Israeli Premier Ariel Sharon visited India in September 2003. During his trip to India, he also raised the same bogey of so-called ‘terrorism and fundamentalism’, which had been already raised by all those who had visited each other’s country. He also argued some measures for combating the terrorism during his discussions with the Indian officials including Prime Minister Mr. Vajpayee. It is an irony that a person who himself is a war criminal and a terrorist gave some tactics to the Indian government and supported the proposals of Mr. Mishra for making an axis comprising of three states viz India, Israel and US for dealing with the terrorism and fundamentalism.

It was the Indian National security Mr. Brajesh Mishra who proposed for an axis between India, Israel and US for combating the so-called terrorism, during his visit to Washington in May 2003. He
considered these three states as democratic with common vision of pluralism, tolerance and equal opportunity. He perhaps ignored the fact that world knows the worth of the US democracy, where a candidate with less popular votes than his opponent was confirmed as the president by the Supreme court with a majority of conservatives showing open prejudice against the democrats. George W. Bush’s elevation to the US presidency by the decision of the Supreme Court to stop the re-count of the deeply flawed ballots in the state of Florida where his brother, Jeb, happened to be Governor and thus award him the White House, had even then felt like a Judicially- Sanctioned Coup d’etat.

No body can compliment Israel of tolerance when it is openly committing genocide against the Palestinians in a systematic manner. More methodical than Hitler’s more brash final solution. And speaking of India, where ultranationalist BJP, that is out to obliterate all diversities in India’s teeming millions, through the communal riots, through imposing of own hindutva brand of a state religion, through writing text books and re-writing history books, all by railroading its agenda on agitating majority, would be the last to own up Mishra’s boast of plurality and tolerance.

During the same address Mishra also pointed out that all the three states viz, India, US and Israel have some ‘fundamental
similarities’ and are ‘natural allies’. Further, more the relationship between these three states bears a ‘natural logic’. What seems ‘natural’ in the world of geopolitical alliances may not seem so obvious to the citizenry of the states in question. ‘India’, Mishra noted correctly, is one of the ‘very few countries with no history of anti-Semitism’. However, the foreign policy of India has been strongly opposed to Israeli intransigence on the question of the Palestinians.

Actually these speeches indicate BJP’s interests in supporting US president’s ‘global war on terrorism’ which was launched by United States supported by other countries after the World trade centre and Pentagon were attacked on 11 September, 2001. India offered whole support even not asked for, to Bush’s call of ‘global war on terrorism’. In his fateful speech of 20th September 2001, Bush referred to this ‘war’ as ‘a task that never ends’ and one that might be fought in as many as fifty or sixty countries. He further argued that, ‘any country that does not actively concede to US demands, whatever they may be, shall be deemed a friend of terrorists and shall meet the same fate: ‘regime change’, ‘dead or alive’, and so on. By his speeches Mr. Bush echoed John Foster Dulles, the rabid secretary of the Eisenhower years who said that non-alignment was ‘immoral’ Bush too has put the whole world on notice: ‘every nation in every region has a decision to make. You are with us or you are with the terrorists’, every country must join
up each time, or else it too becomes an enemy and perhaps the next target’.

A brief word about this particular form of fighting, which is called ‘Terrorism’. Bush was careful enough to say that America’s enemy was that particular ‘terrorism’ which has global reach’. In other words, he is not particularly concerned with the great many varieties of terrorism, which include the IRA in Ireland, the RSS fraternity in India. Nor is ‘fundamentalism’ the issue: Taliban fundamentalism is bad but fundamentalism in the entire Gulf is good, and Bush himself of course speaks the language of that Christian fundamentalism which defines the far right in the contemporary United States. ‘Terrorism with global reach’, the designated enemy, is the one that challenges American Power.

The BJP led government always came forward to endorse Bush’s proposals whether it was the National Missile Defense Plan or the War on Global Terrorism. The Indian government was among the very first to seek membership and offered its own facilities even before Bush’s own European allies or any other country on the planet. Actually, the Vajpayee government’s offers of the Indian airspace and naval facilities to US were to get an upper edge over Pakistan. However, in fact it got as little out of this unilateral concession as it did from the earlier, equally abject support for the American National Missile
Defense Programmes. But Musharaf got the desired concession from Collin Powel—the US secretary of State when the latter argued that the ‘Kashmir dispute should be resolved in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri People’

Indian government even considers herself as a strategic and natural ally in the Bush’s war of terrorism. Israel and America are allies for many a reasons. As for India, being a key ally along with them seems to be a ludicrous proposition. Recently, the US secretary of state Mr. Collin Powel ignored India by announcing Pakistan to be the ‘major non-NATO’ ally. Clearly, the secretary of state did not think it worthwhile to take India as a valued strategic partner of the US. By this American move, the BJP had probably lost the hopes of a strategic United-Israel-India axis fighting Pakistan.

Now, it is strange that a, ‘strategic partner’ should not disclose to its intimate ally that it is about to confer MNNA status upon a neighbor with whom the ally has a relationship of strategic hostility and a hot-cold war for half a century. The US decision to elevate Pakistan’s status as an ally just proves that Washington’s relations with New Delhi and Islamabad are not a ‘Zero-Sum game’. It also proved that the BJP leader’s self-Congratulatory, self serving claim to have raised India’s global profile by riding the partnership with the US bandwagon was essentially hollow. Pakistan’s historic involvement in
Afghanistan on the side of the Americans and its enduring geo-political location has come to haunt Jaswant Singh’s dream of turning India into America’s ‘most allied ally’, as Pakistan was once called. The BJP led Indian government cut a sorry figure since its Prime minister has oft repeated dictum that India, ‘a natural ally of America’ had fallen flat on its face.

The America’s global war on terrorism was nothing but the implementation of her imperialistic designs over some regions. Bush’s attack on the Afghanistan followed by the attacks on Iraq and warning of the attacks on Syria and Iran are her imperialistic designs for which it sought the support from the other nations. However, this war on so-called international terrorism was fully appreciated and supported by the BJP leadership without analyzing the political situation arising out of the fall of the world trade centre. However, nobody would condone the ghastly act of bombarding. They perhaps could not understand that US tries to consolidate a ring of military bases in Southwestern Asia and the Caspian states, to capture oil resources estimated to be worth over a trillion dollars and to choke both Russia and China militarily.

India was once called the leader and a major force in NAM and a bulwark against imperialism. Much has changed since then. Imperialism is perhaps stronger than ever, but the world is muddier and more confused and the Indian government under BJP, has clearly
abandoned any effort to project itself as anti-imperialist in any way. It has dismantled the entire edifice of the independent foreign policy based on non-alignment by joining with US and its major ally-Israel in the so-called war on terrorism. Even though an Israeli writer-Uri Avnery has emphasized that what the Bush administration envisions today is something Sharon has been advocating since the 1980s. B.J.P probably forgets the fact that it is the US itself were the word ‘terrorist’ could be more aptly applied for its unwanted presence in Afghanistan, in Iraq and help to Israel’s regime of terror on the Palestinians. The American administration’s full support to Israel in occupied territories proves the point more clearly. Before joining to Israel and US, the Indian government should also see the past history of the US, which is full with the terrorist activities like the horrible atomic bombardment on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Naked aggression on Afghanistan and the recent subjugation of Iraq by US has revealed the real face of terrorism and has proved as to who is a terrorist. On the other hand Israelis are the occupiers of some one else’s land. While India is a non-aligned country and fought her war of independence against imperialistic and colonialist powers. So how could India be a natural ally to US and Israel, as the Vajpayee government has been saying.
BJP government also could not realize the internal policies of both Israel and US, which aimed to project India as a regional counterweight to China's domination by taking India under their own umbrellas of axis, which could be used by US in its strategy to contain China. This will not be conducive to peace in the region. India's strategic objectives and interests will be made subservient to US designs in Asia. BJP leadership should also realize that the US has 'no permanent friends only permanent interests.' The recent US subjugation firstly over Afghanistan then over Iraq has proved this point. Both were the close friends of US. The friendship remained alive until the cause of the US became full filled.

At the time Iraq made the shift, the Euro was worth 82 percents to a US dollar, today it stands at $1.5 – gaining by 17 percent. Iraq's decision was a key element in making the Euro a competitive currency for the first time. If the other oil producing countries were to shift accordingly, the US economy would face the prospect of immense shrinkage, even collapse. For saving her economy and to bring its own people into the government in order to keep her interests alive in Iraq, it waged war against the Ba'athist regime on the pretext of 'Weapons of mass destruction', which were never found in the country. However, the Vajpayee government could not understand the US policies behind the war on so-called terrorism.
India’s unseemly rush to join the US-Israel camp indicated its weakening democratic credentials and diminishing commitment to governance through consent rather than coercion, chiefly under the current dispensation.

India is a democratic polity stands dangerously diminished by its clumsy effort to be part of the US-Israel strategic nexus. In pragmatic terms too, the strategic gambit is likely to backfire, since military responses to civil conflicts never been known to produce durable results. The blooming of India under BJP and Israel romance had merely helped to seal the dubious deal between three different countries. What is even more horrific about this emerging axis of the dangerous consequences is that all of them today harbor elements that have classic Nazi like inventions towards a liberal and saner world.

The growing strategic ties between India and Israel and their cooperation in the nuclear field have created much serious concerns in the Arab world. With the Indo-Israeli strategic collaboration gaining momentum in recent years, Arab leaders are becoming more vocal and critical of it. Arab league alleged the both India and Israel have military and nuclear cooperation and warned against the consequences for the Arab world. Arab countries are worried about the growing defense cooperation between India and Israel and some countries feel that these military collaborations could have adverse impact on the
region and can jeopardize peace and security. When Advani proposed India’s nuclear cooperation with Israel during his visit to the Zionist state in June 2000 the Israelis retraced. The Arab worries increased further. When Israeli Prime Minister Sharon visited India in 2003, an Arab diplomat argued that Sharon’s visit could have an adverse impact on Indian diplomacy in the Arab world. Some argued that India had encouraged Israel in its aggressive policies by receiving a war criminal prime minister. Yasser Arafat commented that the Israeli prime minister’s visit to India could only escalate the situation and war between Pakistan and India. Arab diplomats are also of the opinion that US could use the campaign as a pretext to establish a permanent presence in the Asian region, which has the world’s largest energy reserves. They also point out that the new situation has arisen after the failure of the ‘New World Order’. Some Arab diplomats argued that Israel and US can never subdue the Arabs and India is isolating herself by choosing Israel as an ally.

While the U.S. actively backs Israel, the Arabs states do no more than mouth protest. The non-aligned movement is quiescent. And, the BJP regime is all admiration for Israel, as a role model for repression.