



## U S aggressiveness in south Asia after British to fill the vacume

Dr. Ravin Kumar Sehrawat

Ex Student, M.D.U., Rohtak, Haryana, India

### Abstract

The core argument this article is When the nations of South Asia won their independence from British almost 69 years ago they were at once united an divided by claims of identity. Soon after independence most South Asian states were faced with various kinds of domestic conflicts. South Asia is an international sub system which assumed importance soon after the British withdrawal from region and the emergence of a number of new states which ever either parts of the British Empire or were its protectorates. British withdrawal was necessitated by their shrinking economic and military capacity to pursue a super power role and growing local opposition to their presence in the area this partial withdrawal by them is said to have created a vacuum in the area and supporters of this pernicious imperialistic theory naturally justified the entry of the US aggressive forces in to this area fulfill US interests.

**Keywords:** U S aggressiveness, core argument, domestic conflicts

### Introduction

This region of Asia comprising the modern states of India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Maldives, Bhutan, Nepal, Afghanistan which is among the world's most densely populated regions in the world. The countries of the third world have been manufactured into diverting their resources to the purchase of sophisticated weapons manufactured in US. In South Asia it plays an important role through Pakistan. The US has adopted various techniques to ensure and adequate supply of strategic raw material at favorable prices. The advent of American powers in the Indian Ocean has been a major cause of concern in India. Since the down of Indian independence, the US has perceived India as a possible obstacle to its interests.

The interests of the United States and South Asia have converged. The US and South Asia are at a unique place in time and history for building and cementing strong ties between the South Asian nations and its peoples, and these two blocks are determined to do so. The region is now, and will long remain, at the forefront of America's foreign policy concerns. The United States is committed to help South Asia achieve the bright future that it deserves. The American Chamber of Commerce is an important partner that is helping to strengthen ties between the United States and South Asian countries. The US as the primary power in the world has the capacity and responsibility to play an effective role in promoting the construction of security architecture for South Asian countries. As the US interests in South Asia become more Indian centric, stability in the South Asian region is a key concern for the US, and India plays the most important role in maintaining the peace and stability of the region. National Interests: This term is defined differently by different political scientists. National interest is a political process and a democratic expression of what citizens want from their government. National interest can be defined as "things of

benefit to nation: actions, circumstances, and decisions regarded as benefiting a particular nation.

National interests govern any nation's foreign policy. The characteristic of the relationship or agreements between nations is based on these national Interests and objectives. Their interests are based on the national character, policies, security, economics, and global standing of the nation in question. Regional security challenges in South Asia are effecting the security environment in the region as well as affecting the whole worlds peace and security environment as India and china are most powerful countries in south Asia after disintegration of USSR and Unipolar world the Supremacy of the sole superpower the United states is influenced by the rising superpowers in Asian region.

The Indian Ocean has an exceptionally important economic, political and strategic significance for the whole world. The Indian Ocean has assumed increasing importance in the past decade. While the United States lacks an explicit Indian Ocean strategy, many of the principles that guide its actions in the region are visible in the US military's treatment of the small British-owned island of *Diego Garcia*. The development of *Diego Garcia* reflects an overall strategy to establish a flexible and enduring presence within a critical and contested space. Moreover, the evolution of *Diego Garcia* as a forward-operating hub illustrates the trade-offs between political reliability and military utility that occur where uncontested access from well-located sites is in limited supply. The United States must reconcile such trade-offs in an effort to establish a functional network of assets from which to conduct planned and contingency operations.

After cold war US became sole superpower. USA played a major role in global politics environment like centre Asian region. Middle East & South Asian region. USA has two edge policy in south Asian region one side USA is helping Pakistan in all the ways despite knowing Pakistan is epicenter of

terrorism. USA has good relations with Shri Lanka, Nepal, Pakistan but with India the relations are very diplomatic and depends upon national interest of US. Any attempt by the United States to force India to comply with a new set of norms might be counterproductive. No government in India would be prepared to abandon the objective of promoting the economic well-being of its billion-plus population. For the United States, the operative principle is a simple one: to think and travel together with India in the construction of a new international system, rather than demanding that New Delhi This would mean making India a full partner in the writing of new rules for institutions that accommodate a rapidly changing world.

## References

1. Perkovich George. *India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact on Global Proliferation*. University of California Press. ISBN 978-0-520-23210-5. The Kargil war ended as had previous wars, with an Indian victory, 2002, 479p.
2. Partha Chatterjee. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), esp. Chakraborty, A. K. "Kargil War Brings into Sharp Focus India's Commitment to Peace". Press Information Bureau, Government of India. Retrieved 23 May 2014, 3-13.
3. Breakdown of casualties into Officers, JCOs, and Other Ranks. Parliament of India Website. Archived from the original on 2 December, 2008. Retrieved 20 May 2009.
4. Complete Roll of Honour of Indian Army's Killed in Action during Op Vijay. Indian Army. Archived from the original on 22 December, 2007. Retrieved 20 May 2009.
5. Official statement giving breakdown of wounded personnel. Parliament of India Website. Archived from the original on 16 February, 2008. Retrieved 20 May 2009.
6. Musharraf claims Kargil was a big success militarily for Pakistan. Greater Kashmir. 1 February 2013. Archived from the original on 29 May, 2013. Retrieved 6 April 2013.
7. Pak quietly names 453 men killed in Kargil war. 18 November, 2010. Retrieved 6 April 2013.
8. Musharraf now has Pak's Kargil toll: 357. Indian Express. 7 October, 2006. Retrieved 2 February 2013.
9. Kargil probe body had sought Musharraf's court martial. Thenews.com. Retrieved 2 February, 2013.
10. Over 4,000 soldiers killed in Kargil: Sharif. The Hindu. Retrieved 17 January, 2013.
11. Malik VP. *Kargil from Surprise to Victory*. HarperCollins. ISBN 9788172236359. According to our intelligence estimates, their Army suffered over 737 casualties, primarily due to our artillery fire, 2006, 342p.
12. Pubby Manu. 19 November, Kargil: Pak suffered most casualties at Batalik. The Indian Express. Retrieved 27 June 2018. Indian records say a total of 249 bodies of Pakistani soldiers were recovered during the battle but estimates of total enemy casualties is put around, 2010, 1000-1200.
13. Kanwal, Gurmeet. *Pakistan's Strategic Blunder at Kargil* (PDF). CLAWS Journal 72. Retrieved 27 June 2018. The army recovered 249 dead bodies of Pakistani regular soldiers from the area of operations in Kargil; 244 dead bodies were buried as per military norms with religious rites; five bodies were accepted by Pakistan and taken back, 2009.
14. How artillery changed the tide of the Kargil war. The Economic Times. 25 July, 2017. Retrieved 27 June 2018.
15. It is also sometimes referred to as Operation Vijay Kargil so as to distinguish it from Operation Vijay, the operation by the Military of India that led to the capture of Goa, Daman and Diu and Anjdiv Islands.
16. Tom Clancy, Tony Zinni, Tony Koltz. *Battle Ready*. Grosset & Dunlap, 2004, ISBN 0-399-15176-1.
17. Pak commander blows the lid on Islamabad's Kargil plot. 12 June, 2009. Retrieved 13 June 2009.
18. Sharif admits he let down Vajpayee on Kargil conflict. The Hindu. Chennai, India. 10 September, 2007. Retrieved 3 January 2017.
19. Nawaz Shuja. *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, Its Army, and the Wars Within*, 2007, 420p.
20. Hussain Javed. (21 October 2006). Kargil: what might have happened. Dawn. Archived from the original on 2 December, 2008. Retrieved 20 May 2009.
21. Cheema, Pervaiz Iqbal. *The Armed Forces of Pakistan*. Allen & Unwin. ISBN 1-86508-119-1, 2003, 4p.
22. Profile of Kargil District Archived 18 May, at the Wayback Machine., Official website of Kargil District, 2009.
23. Climate & Soil conditions. Official website of Kargil District. Archived from the original on 10 April, 2009.
24. War in Kargil – The CCC's summary on the war, (PDF). Archived from the original (PDF) on 27 March, 2009. Retrieved 20 May 2009.
25. Chandran, Suba. *Limited War with Pakistan: Will It Secure India's Interests?* ACDIS Occasional Paper. Program in Arms Control, Disarmament, and International Security (ACDIS), University of Illinois. Archived from the original on 5 July 2010. Retrieved 20 May 2009, 2004.
26. Against the "accepted 3:1 ratio for attacking troops vs defending troops", the ratio over mountain terrain is estimated at 6:1. "Men At War" Archived 6 December, at the Wayback Machine., India Today, 2008.
- 27.