

# Has Modi Truly Changed India's Foreign Policy?

The noted Indian foreign policy analyst, C. Raja Mohan, in a 2015 book, *Modi's World: Expanding India's Sphere of Influence*, argued that Prime Minister Narendra Modi had ushered in a “third republic” in terms of the conduct of India's foreign policy. His basic argument was that Modi had fundamentally reinvigorated India's foreign policy, finally shedding many of the shibboleths that had previously hobbled the country's foreign policy choices. Among these, of course, was the hoary commitment to nonalignment and then its subsequent incarnation, “strategic autonomy.” He also contended that India was now in the process of dispensing with the visceral, reflexive anti-American streak that had long characterized its foreign policy.<sup>1</sup>

Modi has now completed more than half his term as prime minister. Consequently, it may be an apt moment to assess if Mohan's characterization of his foreign policy as constituting a wholly new epoch is indeed correct. There is little question that Modi has brought renewed vigor to India's foreign policy arena—indeed, his substantial attention to the foreign policy field has come as a surprise to most analysts of Indian politics, since during the election campaign he had evinced little interest in foreign policy issues. Interestingly, his decision-making style is one that he developed during his tenure as the Chief Minister of the state of Gujarat. During that period, he seized the policy agenda, relied on a set of trusted aides, and tirelessly drove civil servants to implement that agenda.<sup>2</sup> To a considerable extent, he has followed a similar strategy after having assumed the premiership of the country.

---

Sumit Ganguly is a professor of political science, holds the Rabindranath Tagore Chair in Indian Cultures and Civilizations at Indiana University, Bloomington and is a Senior Fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia. He can be reached at [sganguly@indiana.edu](mailto:sganguly@indiana.edu).

---

Copyright © 2017 The Elliott School of International Affairs  
*The Washington Quarterly* • 40:2 pp. 131–143  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2017.1328929>

Despite Modi's interest in altering many contours of India's foreign policy, bringing about significant changes is no easy task. India has a fairly well-institutionalized foreign policy decision-making apparatus, a growing attentive public, and a political culture that has a deep-seated propensity for incremental changes. This analysis will show that while Modi has made important departures in some areas, in others he has mostly deepened and broadened existing ties. Consequently, despite his spate of foreign travels and heightened emphasis on foreign affairs, his regime has not fundamentally altered the orientation of India's foreign policy. That said, he has departed from some practices held by prior regimes. The most significant of these has been his deafening silence on the subject of nonalignment.

### **A Requiem for Nonalignment?**

---

Even after the end of the Cold War, no regime in India seemed able to dispense with the hoary invocation of the doctrine of nonalignment. India's first prime minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, had been the principal exponent of nonalignment. The doctrine had called upon its members to steer clear of the Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, to eschew the use of force in international affairs, to promote universal disarmament, and to reduce global economic inequalities. At its peak, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) had well over a hundred member states. Despite its patent irrelevance in the post-Cold War era, every government felt compelled to insist on nonalignment's continuing viability in the global order. All previous prime ministers from India also dutifully attended every nonaligned summit and reiterated India's commitment to the organization and its professed goals of promoting human rights, self-determination, and universal disarmament. In a most curious departure, Prime Minister Modi chose not to attend the seventeenth meeting of the movement, held on the island of Margarita in Bolivia in September 2016.

**The Modi regime places little stock in the moribund nonalignment doctrine.**

Modi's decision to skip the summit was hardly coincidental. Since his assumption of office in 2014, not one member of his Cabinet has publicly referred to the doctrine. Both their avoidance of any mention of its significance for Indian foreign policy and Modi's decision to skip the meeting can be construed as signals that the regime, unlike its predecessors, places little stock in this moribund doctrine. Accordingly, it is reasonable to surmise that Modi has not only chosen to finally end rhetorical references to nonalignment but is unwilling to endorse its institutional apparatus any longer.<sup>3</sup>

Of course, given the unyielding attachment of the principal opposition party, the Indian National Congress, to this doctrine, it may be still a bit premature to argue that it has finally been given a decent burial. A future, non-Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) regime may well attempt to resurrect it. For the foreseeable future, however, it is apparent that India's current policymakers have finally abandoned any pretense about its utility as a guiding principle in India's foreign policy.

### **Dealing with the Neighborhood**

---

Closer to home, from the moment of his inauguration as prime minister in 2014, it was evident that Narendra Modi wanted to emphasize the importance that he accorded the region in his foreign policy. (While his predecessor, Manmohan Singh, had professed a similar interest, Singh failed to follow through on his stated commitment.) This could be inferred from Modi's decision to invite all his counterparts from the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) states to the event.

Not long after, he turned his attention to an issue that had long dogged Indo–Bangladesh relations, that of a series of enclaves along the border. These territorial oddities were a legacy of the partition of the subcontinent and had not been resolved even after the break-up of Pakistan and the creation of Bangladesh in 1971. Previous regimes had sought to grasp this particular nettle but had ultimately failed in their efforts. In the late summer of 2015, Modi successfully concluded a Land Boundary Agreement (LBA) that led to the exchange of 111 Indian enclaves in Bangladesh and 51 Bangladeshi enclaves in India.<sup>4</sup> In fairness, it should be noted that Modi was able to accomplish this goal largely because he enjoyed a parliamentary majority in the Lok Sabha, the lower house of the Indian parliament, and because the principal opposition party, the Indian National Congress, did not attempt to block the process in the Rajya Sabha, the upper house.

The settlement of the enclaves issue, no doubt, represents an important step in improving Indo–Bangladeshi relations. Parenthetically, it should be mentioned that the BJP had undermined the previous regime's efforts to settle this long-standing dispute. Now in office, however, the party chose to portray the policy as a BJP initiative. Consequently, while the regime has hailed this development as a novel initiative, it was actually an endeavor that had been proposed earlier.

It is important to note that Modi has not wholly neglected India's smaller neighbors, notably Bhutan and Nepal, countries in which prior administrations had not shown great interest. However, his policies toward these two states have proven to be quite uneven. Modi has, without a doubt, improved relations with Bhutan. Almost immediately after assuming office, he visited the Himalayan kingdom. The visit was fraught with considerable significance, as Bhutan's

cooperation is critical for the success of India's counterinsurgency operations in its troubled northeast. More to the point, India, which is the largest bilateral aid donor to Bhutan, is keen on ensuring that China does not make any inroads into the country. Not surprisingly, during his visit Modi signed agreements designed to set up joint ventures to enhance the development of hydroelectric power stations in the country, taking advantage of its mountainous terrain.

His regime also showed much alacrity in responding to the aftermath of a massive earthquake in Nepal in April 2015. In consultation with the chief ministers of bordering states, he helped coordinate relief and rescue efforts to alleviate the plight of the victims. Modi's swift response generated considerable goodwill in Nepal. Sadly, the significant boost that his gesture had given to Indo-Nepalese relations was frittered away within a year. In an effort to garner certain electoral advantages in the north Indian state of Bihar, the home of a substantial number of Nepalese co-ethnics, Modi inserted himself into Nepal's domestic politics. Specifically, it appeared in May/June 2015 that India was interfering in the drafting of a new constitution in Nepal to ensure that the rights of a particular ethnic group, the "madhesis," would not be overlooked. To compound matters, when the madhesis resorted to demonstrations and sought to stop the supply of oil from India, it appeared that the Government of India was covertly supporting their efforts. Given Nepal's acute dependence on India for petroleum, even the appearance of such connivance led to a powerful nationalist backlash in Nepal.<sup>5</sup> Any advantage that India had gained in its earthquake relief efforts was quickly squandered.

Relations with Pakistan, however, took an adverse turn quite early in Modi's regime. In some ways, the episode that took place signaled a willingness on his part to demonstrate a degree of firmness when dealing with India's nettlesome

**R**elations with Pakistan took an adverse turn quite early in Modi's regime.

neighbor. On the eve of the resumption of Foreign Secretary-level talks with Pakistan in August 2014, the Pakistani High Commissioner (ambassador) to India, Abdul Basit, had ignored an explicit warning from India's Ministry of External Affairs not to meet the members of a Kashmiri separatist organization, the All Party Hurriyat Conference (APHC). Previous governments had issued similar warnings, but they had been mostly ignored and the planned talks had proceeded without any

hitch. On this occasion, however, the Modi regime chose to cancel the talks on the grounds that it would not tolerate interference in the "internal affairs of India."<sup>6</sup>

Despite the cancellation of these talks, the Modi regime, contrary to much fervid commentary about its anti-Pakistani bias,<sup>7</sup> undertook at least two more efforts to demonstrate its willingness to resume a dialogue with Pakistan. The first involved a surprise stopover in Pakistan in December 2014 on Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's birthday following Modi's visit to Afghanistan. The political opposition in India criticized this abrupt visit. However, the scholarship on enduring rivalries suggests that such unforeseen and unexpected gestures on the part of leaders can help break longstanding political deadlocks.<sup>8</sup> Though no breakthrough ensued, the two sides did agree during the visit to resume the Foreign Secretary-level talks.

The bonhomie that Modi's sudden gesture had generated, however, would not last long. A series of border skirmishes in the disputed state of Jammu and Kashmir in late 2014 again led to mutual recriminations. As a result, the Foreign Secretary-level talks were not resumed until March of 2015. Whatever progress may have ensued from these talks again was thwarted: in January of 2015, Pakistan-based terrorists attacked an Indian Air Force base at Pathankot in the Punjab. Astonishingly enough, in the wake of this attack, the Modi regime reached out to their Pakistani counterparts to conduct a joint investigation. Knowledgeable journalists who cover Indo-Pakistani relations claimed that this was the final effort of the regime to publicly demonstrate its willingness to improve relations with Pakistan. In the event, little came of this effort.

The ultimate breaking point in relations with Pakistan came after a second terrorist attack at an Indian Army camp in Uri in the state of Jammu and Kashmir in September 2016. Indian authorities attributed the attack to a Pakistan-based terrorist organization, the Jaish-e-Mohammed. With Indian public opinion quite inflamed, the Modi regime chose at the end of September to launch a series of covert attacks at terrorist camps across the Line of Control (the de facto international border) in Kashmir.<sup>9</sup>

It is believed that previous regimes had carried out similar attacks. On this occasion, however, the Modi government chose to make the evidence of these attacks public shortly after they took place. In the wake of these attacks, it is evident that the regime has decided that it sees little value in pursuing a dialogue with Pakistan. Indeed, in conversations with key Indian foreign policy officials, it becomes apparent that the regime's preferred strategy is focused on improving ties with all South Asia states—with the exception of Pakistan.<sup>10</sup> A dialogue will only resume when Pakistan eschews its continued reliance on terror.

In the meantime, relations with Pakistan are also frayed as a consequence of India's improving ties with Afghanistan. Former President Karzai (2004–2014), though well disposed toward India, had nevertheless sought to conciliate Pakistan. The current government of Ashraf Ghani in Afghanistan, after being rebuffed by Pakistan, has turned more forthrightly toward India, much to the chagrin of the

Pakistani security establishment. Similarly, the Modi government has evinced fewer compunctions in seeking closer bonds with Afghanistan, supplying the country with military equipment. In late 2016, it agreed to provide Afghanistan

**Modi has sought to significantly boost ties with Japan.**

with four Russian Mi-25 attack helicopters. Though the scope of such transfers is small, the mere willingness of the Modi administration to move forward with them indicates a subtle policy shift. Ironically, the United States, which had for quite some time sought to bar India from providing military assistance

to Afghanistan because of Pakistan's stated misgivings, is now urging India to step up such assistance.<sup>11</sup> The policy changes that the Modi regime has instituted are not merely cosmetic; in many ways, they do represent substantive policy shifts.

### **Beyond South Asia**

---

The Modi administration has not only devoted considerable energy to India's immediate neighborhood but has also turned its attention to adjacent regions. After having long neglected the states of Southeast Asia during much of the Cold War, in the early 1990s, shortly after an unprecedented fiscal crisis, Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao (1991–1996) embarked upon what was referred to as a "Look East" policy. The principal purpose was to seek investment from the region and pursue its vibrant markets. Since then, India has made significant strides in both areas. When Narendra Modi assumed office he decided to give this existing policy an additional boost and changed its nomenclature to the "Act East" policy.

The shift in terminology was more than cosmetic. Modi was not only keen on enhancing trade and investment, he was also interested in improving road and rail connections between India and adjoining parts of Southeast Asia. Modi's interest

**Modi has adopted a noticeably tougher foreign policy stance toward the PRC.**

in strengthening India's ties to the region stemmed from his concerns about the PRC's growing footprint in the region. Accordingly, the "Act East" policy had two distinct prongs: it sought to build upon existing commercial ties, but also included a security component. The commercial element is easily understandable given that the regime has a pronounced business-friendly orientation. The security

dimension, however, stems in considerable part from the government's concern about the PRC's growing presence in the region.

In addition to his outreach to Southeast Asia, Modi has sought to significantly boost ties with Japan. Again, this is a break from his predecessors. The motivations for his attention to the Indo–Japanese relationship stem from the same set of concerns that has driven his focus on Southeast Asia. Earlier, as the Chief Minister of Gujarat, he had traveled to Japan in 2012. At the time, however, given the constraints of his institutional position, his primary goal had been to attract investment from Japan to his economically vibrant state. As prime minister, his interest in courting Japan is considerably greater. He is obviously interested in seeking Japanese investment, but he has also found a kindred spirit in his counterpart, Shinzo Abe. Both are not only ardent nationalists, but they share common misgivings about an increasingly assertive PRC. Not surprisingly, this relationship has thrived in the recent past and has become multi-dimensional.

How has Modi chosen to deal with India's fractious, behemoth neighbor, the People's Republic of China (PRC)? Do his policies reflect significant change or do they suggest continuity? Once again, his policies reflect both. Not long after assuming office in 2014, Modi invited President Xi Jinping for a major economic summit to his home state of Gujarat. Modi's decision to host Xi Jinping with considerable pomp was an indication of his initial willingness to continue a conciliatory policy toward the PRC, consistent with the choices of his predecessor, Manmohan Singh.

Even amidst the considerable fanfare associated with this visit, in September 2014 the People's Liberation Army (PLA) made a series of incursions in the region of Ladakh, the site of previous conflicts.<sup>12</sup> Few Indian observers, and certainly not the prime minister, were inclined to believe that these incursions had taken place without the knowledge and consent of the PRC leadership. Not surprisingly, despite the economic agreements that were reached during this visit, the regime concluded that a more assertive policy toward the PRC was now in order. Modi doubled down on choices that the Manmohan Singh government (2004–2014) had only tepidly approached.

Some of these choices included boosting the build-up and modernization of India's military capabilities along the Himalayan border. Modi has also signaled important diplomatic shifts in dealings with the PRC. For example, in a very direct snub to Beijing, the Indian government permitted a formal meeting in December 2016 between Indian President Pranab Mukherjee and the Dalai Lama, the temporal and spiritual leader of the Tibetan exile community in India. Earlier in the year, India had permitted both the Dalai Lama and the U.S. ambassador, Richard Verma, to make separate visits to Arunachal Pradesh, a state in northeastern India to which the PRC has asserted a claim in recent years. Apart from these symbolic gestures of defiance, the Modi regime also announced that it would sell to Vietnam a supersonic anti-ship missile, the BrahMos, which it had jointly developed with Russia. These decisions all

suggest that, following the very fraught 2014 visit of Xi Jinping, the present government in India has adopted a noticeably tougher foreign policy stance toward the PRC.

Modi has brought about a qualitative shift in relations with the PRC. He has been able to do so because he has faced few domestic hindrances in inducing a policy shift. Except for some members of the National Congress Party and two increasingly irrelevant Communist parties, there are few advocates for the PRC within India. A small handful of PRC sympathizers do exist within India's attentive public. However, they wield little or no influence on policymaking. Consequently, Modi did not face any significant opposition in bringing about some reorientation in India's policies.

The changes that Modi has instituted in Indo-U.S. relations, however, have required a willingness to abandon some long-held assumptions and proclivities within India's body politic in general, and within its policymaking establishment in particular. His willingness to engage the United States involved setting aside any personal pique that Modi may have harbored, as he had been denied a visa to visit the country in his previous capacity as the Chief Minister of Gujarat owing to an anti-Muslim pogrom that had taken place under his watch in February 2002.

In a dramatic departure from past precedent, the prime minister took the extraordinary step of inviting President Barack Obama as the chief guest to the Republic Day parade in January 2015. This gesture was fraught with considerable symbolic significance, as no American president had ever been accorded this honor. Beyond this striking signal, more substantive developments have taken place in Indo-U.S. relations. Among these was New Delhi's decision to finally accede to a Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA), an accord that had been under discussion for over a decade. Under its terms, the two sides will be able to use each other's military bases for refueling and other logistical support. Modi went ahead with this agreement despite predictable criticisms about the loss of India's "strategic autonomy" from the Congress Party and two Communist parties.<sup>13</sup> The conclusion of this agreement clearly heralded a move toward closer security cooperation. Additionally, Modi has evinced a willingness to turn to the United States for critical weapons acquisitions. Indeed, during his time in office the United States has emerged as India's principal weapons supplier. India has either purchased or ordered attack howitzers, helicopters, heavy-lift transport aircraft, and maritime patrol aircraft. It has also signed a ten-year defense cooperation framework.<sup>14</sup>

Four key factors, for the most part, explain this surge in defense cooperation. First, Modi, unlike his predecessors, has few, if any, ideological reservations about a closer relationship with the United States. This has enabled him to adopt a more pragmatic approach. Second, there is little or no question that

both parties have viewed the rise and assertiveness of the PRC with increasing concern. This has driven the two sides to expand the range of security cooperation. Third, the myriad shortcomings of India's own defense industrial base, coupled with the burgeoning needs of its armed forces, has forced New Delhi to look abroad for reliable suppliers of sophisticated weaponry. Fourth, its turn toward the United States has also been strengthened as a consequence of some tensions that have arisen in recent years in its hitherto tried-and-true defense supply relationship with Russia. Among other matters, a major project to co-develop a fifth generation aircraft has floundered over questions of cost-sharing and technology transfer.<sup>15</sup> Earlier, Indian policymakers were unhappy over the significant cost overruns involved in the retrofitting of the Soviet-era *Admiral Gorshkov* aircraft-carrier for the Indian Navy.

### India and the Middle East: A High Wire Act

Beyond Modi's renewed attention to East and Southeast Asia as well as the United States, Modi has not neglected India's ties to the Middle East. In fact, he has pursued a very deft balancing act in the region. He has sought to improve India's relationship with Israel while managing to improve existing bonds with the critical states of the Persian Gulf. He has been able to adroitly manage this tangled web of relationships in considerable part because of the legacies that previous governments had bequeathed to him. The two United Progressive Alliance (UPA) regimes (in power from 2004–2009, and then 2009–2014) had laid the foundations of this very dexterous policy of maintaining good relations with a number of mutually adversarial states ranging from Israel to Iran to Saudi Arabia. There is little question that Modi has been the beneficiary of these initiatives.

He has not, however, been content to simply rely on existing ties but has energetically sought to bolster them. To that end, he has visited Iran, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia. The goals of these visits have been fairly straightforward. He has sought to ensure the well-being of the vast number of Indian expatriates who work in the Gulf, is keen on limiting Pakistan's influence in the region to the extent possible, is anxious to promote counterterrorism cooperation, and is eager to secure an uninterrupted supply of petroleum from the region.

**M**odi has few, if any, ideological reservations about a closer relationship with the United States.

His goals in Iran are more complex. India and Iran share a common interest in combating Sunni Islamic extremism and consequently are both wary of a resurgence of al-Qaeda. Furthermore, given the persistence of the Indo-Pakistani rivalry, the Indian role in the development of the port of Chabahar enables India to wholly bypass Pakistan in the quest for a trade route to Afghanistan. Finally, given Iran's vast gas and petroleum reserves, assuming that U.S. sanctions do not again disrupt access, India sees distinct possibilities of investment in those hydrocarbon resources.<sup>16</sup>

The one country in the Middle East toward which policy change has been more cosmetic than substantive is Israel. When Modi initially assumed office, India's foreign policy circles widely believed that his regime would substantially alter policy toward Israel. Such an assumption was hardly unreasonable. Previous senior BJP leaders had visited Israel and had subtly moved away from India's full-throated support for the Palestinian cause. Indeed early in his term, there was much speculation that Modi would make an early visit to Israel. Such a visit has yet to materialize, however, though rumors in New Delhi suggest that such a trip is indeed in the offing in June or July of 2017.

What explains the caution that has characterized Modi's Israel policy? In part, it must be attributed to the Indian foreign policy establishment's inherent caution,<sup>17</sup> coupled with concerns about how such a visit would be viewed in various parts of the Arab world. Incontrovertible evidence about the foreign policy apparatus' role in circumscribing Modi's policies is hard to present. However, on the basis of inference and attribution, it is possible to make a plausible argument that their long-standing political affinity for the Arab world, as well as concerns about the substantial Indian diaspora in key states, may have prevented a fundamental policy shift.

**Modi's changes have not constituted a fundamental break from India's past policies.**

### **What Lies Ahead**

---

This survey shows that Modi has undoubtedly brought renewed energy to India's foreign policy. However, as this analysis has also shown, the changes that he has instituted, though far from superficial, have not constituted a fundamental break from India's past policies. Admittedly, the end of the formal commitment to nonalignment does constitute a significant departure from the past.

However, the vast majority of the initiatives that the Modi administration has undertaken constitute a deepening and broadening of policies that it had

inherited. They do not, however, constitute radical departures. Factors at global, regional, and domestic levels have at times facilitated and at others limited the scope of the changes that he may have sought to usher in.

Globally, Modi was fortunate in being able to quickly establish a working rapport with President Obama and the United States, despite past differences stemming from the time he was the chief minister of Gujarat.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, the willingness of the Obama administration to cast India as a lynchpin in its “pivot to Asia” enabled Modi and his advisers to bolster the strategic partnership with the United States. Regionally, however, despite his willingness to thaw relations with both Pakistan and the PRC, his efforts were thwarted. And apart from a rather maladroit move toward Nepal, he has been mostly successful in improving ties with India's other neighbors. Finally, at a domestic level, despite predictable criticisms from the principal opposition party, the Congress, and the two Communist parties about the loss of India's “strategic autonomy,” he has not faced any serious impediments in pursuing his foreign policy goals. Also, while some members of India's growing attentive public, whose views are more aligned with those of the Congress Party, have expressed reservations about Modi's tilt toward the United States as well as his hardened stance toward Pakistan and the PRC, they have not really been able to influence his choices.

As the Modi regime peers into the foreseeable future, at an international level it still lacks sufficient clarity about what grand strategy the current U.S. administration plans to pursue. The strategic course that Donald Trump adopts will have significant ramifications for Asia generally, and specifically for India's foreign policy and security interests. For example, were Trump to order a precipitous withdrawal of American forces from Afghanistan, the regional security order could end up in considerable flux as both Pakistan and India would promptly seek to enter the breach. This could easily intensify the extant Indo-Pakistani competition in the country and further degrade an already strained relationship. Similarly, a reorientation of U.S. naval deployments in the Indo-Pacific could provide greater opportunities for the PRC to expand its influence in the region and thereby impinge on India's security interests. If India sees a U.S. strategic retrenchment from Asia, it may feel compelled to further bolster its ties with Japan, Vietnam, and Australia given its concerns about the PRC.

Within India's immediate neighborhood, apart from Pakistan, much will depend on the Modi regime's ability to sustain the initiatives that it has launched. Some critics have argued that his neighborhood-focused foreign policy has lost some of its sheen after its initial success. However, even his critics concede that the shortcomings are most evident in the regime's dealings with the PRC and Pakistan.<sup>19</sup> Yet as has been argued here, his ability to shape relations with India's two principal adversaries have been hobbled mostly because of their intransigent stances.

Finally, continued efforts to transform India's foreign policy will also depend on the viability of the decision-making model that he has adopted. Unlike most other prime ministers who granted considerable leeway to the bureaucrats in the Ministry of External Affairs, he has adopted a more centralized form of decision-making. To that end, he has given his National Security Adviser, Ajit Doval, a former intelligence chief, an outsized role in making foreign and security policy. He also appears to enjoy a close rapport with his Foreign Secretary, Subrahmanyam Jaishankar. It is worth noting that Jaishankar, a former ambassador to the PRC and the United States, was appointed to the position following the removal of a serving foreign secretary, which constituted a significant departure from past precedents. More to the point, in January 2017, Jaishankar, who was on the verge of retirement, was granted a year's extension. In effect, the key levers of foreign policy choices are now located in the Prime Minister's Office and not in the Ministry of External Affairs.

The centralization of policymaking may have yielded certain advantages to the regime. Utilizing reliable and trusted aides has enabled Modi to mold a foreign policy imbued with a specific vision. The drawback, however, of such a personality-dependent policymaking style is that it may alienate career diplomats who may see an attenuation of their formal roles and duties.<sup>20</sup> Thus far, Modi has been able, for the most part, to get the permanent foreign policy bureaucracy to implement his expansive agenda. As he enters the second half of his term as prime minister, it is possible that he will be able to continue to rely on his coterie of advisers while continuing to persuade and exhort the foreign service bureaucracy to implement his policies.

## Notes

---

1. C. Raja Mohan, *Modi's World: Extending India's Sphere of Influence* (New Delhi: Harper-Collins, 2015)
2. Ashok Malik, "Modi the Risk-Taker: Is the PM's Foreign Policy Style Reckless and Unduly Personalized?" *The Times of India*, August 20, 2016, <http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/toi-edit-page/modi-the-risk-taker-is-the-pms-foreign-policy-style-reckless-and-unduly-personalised/>.
3. Sumit Ganguly, "India After Nonalignment," *Foreign Affairs*, September 19, 2016, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/india/2016-09-19/india-after-nonalignment>.
4. AP, "India, Bangladesh Swap Border Enclaves, Settle Old Dispute," *The Hindu*, August 1, 2015, <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/india-bangladesh-swap-border-enclaves-settle-old-dispute/article7488497.ece>.
5. Sunil Raman, "Madhesi protest in Nepal: Why India needs to step back a little," *First Post*, November 9, 2015, <http://www.firstpost.com/world/madhese-protest-in-nepal-why-india-needs-to-step-back-a-little-2501544.html>

6. Niharika Mandhana, "India Cancels Planned Talks with Pakistan," *The Wall Street Journal*, August 18, 2014, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/india-cancels-planned-talks-with-pakistan-1408377467>.
7. David J. Karl, "3 Reasons Why Modi is Misguided on Pakistan," *The Diplomat*, October 31, 2014. <http://thediplomat.com/2014/10/3-reasons-modi-is-misguided-on-pakistan/>.
8. Karen Rasler, William R. Thompson, and Sumit Ganguly, *How Rivalries End* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).
9. Ellen Barry and Salman Masood, "India Claims 'Surgical Strikes' Across Line of Control in Kashmir," *The New York Times*, September 29, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/world/asia/kashmir-india-pakistan.html>.
10. Personal interview with senior Indian foreign policy official, Ministry of External Affairs, December 22, 2016.
11. Josy Joseph, "US wants India to step up aid to Kabul," *The Hindu*, August 11, 2016, <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/US-wants-India-to-step-up-aid-to-Kabul/article14562564.ece>.
12. Victor Mallet, "China-India Border Stand-Off Overshadows Xi Jinping's deals," *The Financial Times*, September 18, 2014, <https://www.ft.com/content/28c61aae-3f0f-11e4-a861-00144feabdc0>.
13. Sushant Singh, "India, US Sign Key Defence Pact to use each other's Bases for Repair, Supplies," *The Indian Express*, August 31, 2016, <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-news-india/manohar-parrikar-signs-key-logistics-defence-pact-with-us-3004581/>.
14. Rajat Pandit, "India, US ink new ten-year defence framework," *The Times of India*, June 3, 2015, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/India-US-ink-new-10-year-defence-framework/articleshow/47532249.cms>.
15. Franz-Stefan Gady, "India and Russia Fail to Resolve Dispute Over Fifth Generation Fighter jet," *The Diplomat*, January 6, 2016. <http://thediplomat.com/2016/01/india-and-russia-fail-to-resolve-dispute-over-fifth-generation-fighter-jet/>.
16. Ramin Jahanbegloo, "Renewing the India-Iran Relationship," *The Indian Express*, June 2, 2016, <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/india-iran-chabahar-port-deal-narendra-modi-2829537/>.
17. On this subject see Nicolas Blarel, *The Evolution of India's Israel Policy: Continuity, Change and Compromise since 1922* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014).
18. Harsh V. Pant, "Modi's Unexpected Boost to India-U.S. Relations," *The Washington Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (Fall 2014), pp.93-112, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2014.978438>.
19. S.D. Muni, "Modi's Foreign Policy Misses in the neighborhood," *The Hindustan Times*, June 6, 2016, <http://www.hindustantimes.com/analysis/modi-s-foreign-policy-misses-in-the-neighbourhood/story-rrfk6PoeSz5iGpH9xFRoRJ.html>.
20. Suhasini Haidar, "South Block in the shade," *The Hindu*, May 13, 2016, <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/south-block-in-the-shade/article8591271.ece>.