

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 by United States during the World War II, the potential danger of using nuclear weapons have been realised worldwide. Though some states have voluntarily given up their weapon capabilities considering its dangerous consequence but there are some states that have crossed the nuclear threshold or intend to in future either for security reasons, for status and prestige or for bargaining purpose. The increasing possibility of the use of nuclear bomb by some rouge states or even by terrorist cannot be ignored or ruled out. Meanwhile, among others the most evident argument for possessing nuclear weapon lies in their non- use, as the concept of deterrence has gained credibility. Therefore nuclear issues continue to occupy an important space in the theoretical discussion of international discourse.

It has been contended that India had an agonizing relationship with nuclear weapons. From the beginning of independence, Indian leadership, particularly Jawaharlal Nehru, was among the first in the world to apprehend the dangers that nuclear weapon posed to humanity. But P.M. Nehru was convinced that nuclear technology could contribute immensely in national development.¹ To a lesser degree, he also believed that nuclear technology may have a role to play in countries' defence if efforts at nuclear disarmament failed. Till date these contradictory stands in India's nuclear policy is visible as they have been through last seven decades. This is evident from the fact that in 1974 when India conducted its first nuclear test but declared it to be a "peaceful nuclear explosion" and not a bomb and after the second nuclear test in 1998 India subsequently declared to be a nuclear weapon state.

Over the last few years, there has been a proliferation of books and scholarly essays that have attempted to pry open the mystery of India's nuclear decision-making. These works agree on one fundamental point, India's decision-making has been largely ad hoc. The rationales behind India's nuclear programme are

Technological and Scientific Factor

This viewpoint holds that technological and scientific factors among others have influenced India's nuclearisation process. Scholars like Itty Abraham, M.V. Ramanna, Srirupa Roy to name few have elaborately discussed the techno-centric view. They have proposed the existence of an India's nuclear and missile scientific technocrats who has driven India's nuclear policy, motivated largely by their bureaucratic and even psychological needs. They argued that the key individuals in Indian scientific and defence establishment have played an important role in India's decision to go nuclear, for instance Homi J. Bhabha exerted enormous influence in all decision related to nuclear establishment and decision making. Scholars have asserted now and again that by exploding a bomb India wanted to demonstrate its technological efficacy to the international community as the Indian nuclear test were considered to be the bi-product of scientific and technological momentum created by R&D programme. Itty Abraham argued that India's quest for nuclear weapon was mainly a "postcolonial state's project of modernity" and also highlights the secretive nature of the Indian nuclear establishment (Abraham, 1998, p. 26). Haider K. Nizamanni uses the expression "nukespeaks" to outline the role of strategic community on India's nuclear decision making. Karsten Fray has also stressed on the role played by strategic community comprising retired military officials, nuclear scientist and civilian strategists to generate public opinion on nuclear issue. The strategic groups have determined India's nuclear discourse by directly advising and influencing policy maker.

However the technological and scientific factor may provide some insight to India's nuclear choice but it does entail several shortcomings. It fails to explain why India did not opted for nuclear weaponisation when China exploded its first nuclear weapon in 1964 as it was clear that India had a more advance technical and nuclear R&D programme. Furthermore India's nuclear weapons are viewed as political weapons and the final decision making capacity lies with political leadership and not with scientific and strategic community.

Prestige and Status Factor

This factor is based on the presumption that nuclear weapon programme elevates national prestige and status in world community. Such views are based on the assumption that there is a close relationship between possession of nuclear bomb and great power status as all the five permanent members of Security Council are nuclear weapon states. Scott Sagan refers to it as "nuclear symbolism" that is, nuclear weapon are a symbol of prestige and status and performs symbolic function by shaping and reflecting leaders perception and appropriate behaviour. He argues that prestige was the main factor to drive Britain and France to nuclear path. Based on the same premise Nayar and Paul asserts that India is no exception as there was a deep-rooted aspiration among the Indian for great power status and the acquisition of nuclear weapons is regarded essential for achieving this elevated status.

The prestige and status model may be one of the factors for state's desire to elevate its status and prestige but it suffers from serious limitations. It fails to understand that nuclear weapons are not the only basis for acquiring great power status it needs to be supplemented with political, military and economic capacity. As it is evident that Germany and Japan are not nuclear power but are the major players in world politics because of it political and economic attributes. Additionally nuclear weapon programme involves a massive economic cost therefore why economically and politically weak states like Iran and North Korea are venturing in nuclear programme need to be considered. Even India initiated its nuclear programme immediately after its independence when the country was under immense pressure of poverty, underdevelopment and weak economy. This aspect should also be considered in order to rationalize India's nuclearisation.

Domestic Factor

The domestic factor also provides an alternative in explaining India's nuclearisation process. The advocates of domestic model have assumed that the attainment of nuclear capabilities serves the narrow interest of some of the actors within the state establishment. Scott Sagan has classified three prominent actors in a state as, state's nuclear establishment, military establishment and bureaucratic authorities (Sagan, 1993) who according to their perception play a decisive role in states acquisition as well

as denouncement of nuclear weapons. Dong-Joon Jo and Erik Gartzk asserted that domestic factors can influence proliferation of nuclear weapons mainly because states in order to divert the attention of public from domestic issue can pursue nuclear ambitions. Additionally political leaders may also use the nuclear card to gain votes and win elections. Kanti Bajpai asserts that domestic political consideration played a significant role in India's overt nuclearisation. He questions the security rationale for India's nuclear programme and considers it to be misguided. He argues that Hindu nationalist ideology of BJP and the personality of the then PM Vajpayee acted as a major impetus behind India's nuclearisation. Bajpai suggested that "BJP played politics with the bomb and the nuclear test consolidated Vajpayee's hold on his party and the collations"(Bajpai, 2009, p. 57). Thus the domestic model attributes India's nuclearisation to the aggressive political ideology of BJP.

The domestic considerations for India's nuclearisation process cannot be ignored but its importance seems to be overstretched. The rationales behind Vajpayee Government to opt for overt nuclearisation to consolidate power need to be revisited. PM Indira Gandhi lost elections after the peaceful explosion of nuclear weapon in 1974 and similarly after 1998 the BJP government failed to convert its successful nuclear demonstration to electoral win.

Successive Indian governments, across divergent political ideology have been committed to work towards enhancement of India's nuclear programme (Ganguly, 1999). The Congress Government went for nuclear test in 1974 which PM Gandhi asserted to be a peaceful nuclear explosion, then P.V Narasimha Rao government had also attempted to conduct nuclear test in 1995 but had to be put off as US intelligence source detected Indian preparation and exerted enormous pressure on India to abandon the test. The successive BJP government had inherited a large scientific-military nuclear infrastructure from the previous Congress regime as the 1998 Pokhran test would not have been possible in the absence of the well established nuclear programme.

Security Factor

Various scholars have considered security concern as the motive behind India's nuclearisation. Ashok Kapur's main thesis is that Indian decision to test in 1998 was a

response to provocative Chinese, American, and Pakistani strategic behaviour. He argues that the close linkages between Pakistan and China and how China helped Pakistan in its nuclear quest, American complicity in ignoring evidence of such complicity and the rapid advances in Pakistani nuclear capabilities as a consequence. Bhumitra Chakma links India's nuclearisation with that of Chinese bomb arguing that in a deteriorating security environment India's decision to seek after a nuclear weapon was based on the perception that India's security as a state was best preserved by going nuclear (Chakma, 2009). Sumit Ganguly considers India's path to nuclearisation as a zigzag response to external threat and also as the failure of nuclear weapon states to provide India with a nuclear umbrella. He additionally contends that nuclear threat from China and Pakistan were vital in shaping and molding India's nuclear program (Ganguly, 1999).

The rationale behind the test can also be ascertained from the letter by PM. Vajpayee to President Bill Clinton following India's nuclear tests in May 1998, in which Vajpayee wrote about the complexities involved in the deteriorating security environment, especially the nuclear environment faced by India and the compulsions of circumstances confronting India to make overt its nuclear capabilities.

This reveals the necessity of a comprehensive analysis of India's nuclear policy, contextualizing it in the broad historical and structural setting. The study does not undermine the security concerns as a major factor to drive India's nuclear quest rather considers it to be an important factor but while considering the security perspective, there is a need to analyse the non security concerns of India's nuclear behaviour that motivated India's path to obtain nuclear capabilities. For this purpose the emerging discriminatory nuclear regime have diminish India's national interest which needs to be analyse. Moreover India's nuclear discourses have transformed with changing world politics, with a constant nuclear identity of recognition as a nuclear weapon power. It should be noted that this study does not dismisses the other perspective in understanding India's nuclear policy but instead it contends that a complete understanding of India's nuclear picture is not possible without taking note of the concept of threat perceptions and role of identity which are important components of constructivist approach used in understanding India's nuclear behaviour. State's identity becomes complete only when the "others" recognise that identity. In order to obtain that recognition, India has

practiced various discursive and material means. The prolific projection of its self-image has led to a partial, if not a complete recognition of India as an emerging power in world politics.

India's nuclear programme has evolved gradually rather than drastically. The process of making nuclear choice arose from India's own understanding of itself and the world order. In the initial phases, Indian nuclear programme was conceived as an instrument of economic development. Atomic science and development assumed a significant role in the technological development and the modernization of the country. But in the aftermath of the India-China border war, it became increasingly clear to India that the present nuclear strategy was not sufficient and thereby India started seeking positive nuclear assurances from great powers. During the 1960s and 1970s the cost of a nuclear program prevented India from considering nuclear option. The security concerns started developing in India with perceived Chinese and Pakistani nuclear threats. With mounting pressure from nuclear regime to sign NPT as a non nuclear state compelled India to pursued the policy of keeping 'nuclear option open' by not being a party to the NPT and CTBT. India's decision to conduct nuclear tests and formally declare itself a nuclear weapon state marks an important historical transition. The 1998 test was a logical and perhaps an even inexorable culmination of a decade long evolution of strategic which was influenced by increasingly complex and hostile security environment, geopolitical developments and its quest for status and identity. This issue is addressed by applying a discourse-based constructivist approach to examine first, the constructed nature of threats and identity, and then, India's quest for the acceptance of given representations of the nature of India's nuclear behaviour.

Every Indian leader regardless of their political affiliations has proclaimed an extraordinary role for India in Asia and the world. This proclamation was based on the "greatness of Indian civilization, its distinct view of the world and its strategic location" (Cohen, 2000, p.46). There has been a strong inter linkage between India's greatness and nuclear issues. The positions states have on nuclear issues is constructed by the idea they have about itself and the world (others). The security perceptions and the identity of a state with global role have considerably shaped India's national interests. In order to obtain the identity of a nuclear state, India has practiced various discursive and material

means. The prolific projection of its self-image has led to a partial, if not a complete recognition of India as an emerging power in world politics.

India has always regarded itself as destined to be a major player in international politics. The shift of India's status from a non nuclear weapon state (NNWS) to a 'state with advanced nuclear technology' marks a transformation in India's identity, from a regional to a global player. Till recently, India was seen as a target of non-proliferation and its role was considered to be limited to South Asia. But the only super power U.S. seems to be recognizing India's status as a nuclear-armed state by opening up nuclear cooperation. The signing of the Indo-US nuclear deal in 2008 represented fruit of Indian diplomacy which was carefully constructed for many years to establish India's nuclear identity as a responsible possessor of nuclear weapons (Sashikumar, 2007). The enabling factor was India's strategy of constituting itself as a responsible nuclear power. India has presented a unique example of restrained and non proliferation as compared to Pakistan, Iran and North Korea who had similar nuclear ambitions but has been labelled as 'rouge state' compared to India's status as a responsible nuclear state.

Among various theoretical perspective used by academicians and policy makers who have tried to rationalised India's path to nuclearisation, precisely realist framework has been used to understand and examine India's nuclear behaviour. However the constructivist approach to India's nuclear behaviour is missing, the role of idea, social construction of threat perceptions and the role of identity in shaping India's nuclear behaviour is missing. Therefore this study attempts to analyse constructivist approach to understand how India perceived threat from China and Pakistan and explore how identity construction have driven the transformation of India's nuclear identity from an irresponsible nuclear state in 1974 to a target of international sanctions particularly after Pokhran II in 1998 and then being recognized as a responsible nuclear weapon power by US since 2005.

1.1 CONSTRUCTIVIST FRAMEWORK

Over the last three decades Constructivism as an approach to the study of international relations has seen increased acceptance within the discipline. According to many of its advocates, constructivism is best described as an approach or orientation rather than a theory.² Whereas a theory seeks to give an explanation of particular phenomena, constructivism provides a framework to view such phenomena by focusing upon the importance of social interactions and the manner in which these interactions help create the reality of our world. As Gergen observes, "The terms by which we understand our world and our self are neither required nor demanded by 'what there is'...for any state of affairs a potentially unlimited number of descriptions and explanations is possible" (Gergen, 2007, pp. 47-48). He continues, "Our modes of description, explanation and/or representation are derived from relationship. ...Meanings are born of co-ordinations amongst persons – agreements, negotiations, affirmations. From this standpoint, relationships stand prior to all that is intelligible"(Gergen, 2007, pp. 47-48). Constructivism's central focus is on this social aspect that mediates our perceived reality.

Social constructivism is primarily regarded as a theory that tries to bridge the gap between rationalist theories and alternative approaches.³ Different branches of constructivism like radical, social, critical and cultural constructivism occupy different polls of this bridge. Social constructivism distinguish itself from rationalist theories, their central argument is the way it regards reality as being constructed (Bernett, 2005, p. 259). In contrast to the realist claim, reality is not out there waiting to be discovered, rather, it is socially and historically produced, and, moreover, "culturally bound knowledge enables individuals to construct and give meanings to reality".⁴ Consequently, the international environment in which states exist consists not only of material factors but also cultural and institutional factors. This has a number of implications, like the identities of actors and the terminology they use are socially constructed. Interests, and concepts such as anarchy, balance of power, and relative security are not givens but they are the results of a specific social interaction process. Actors give meanings to their actions and the objects they construct. Social constructivist disagrees with rationalists

definition of culture as a constraint on action, rather argues that culture provides the meanings that people give to their actions.⁵ Since all meanings are the consequences of certain interactions, they are subject to change. It can be derived that international norms, rules and regulations have an effect on states' policy making. For social constructivists, "power is not only the ability of an actor to get another actor to do what they would not do otherwise but also the production of identities and interests that limit the ability to control their fate"(Bernett, 2005, pp. 263-264). Thus identifying identities and interests as a source of power.

The core elements of constructivism can be traced back to the work of Durkheim who, "consider social facts as things."⁶ According to Searle, these social facts "are only facts by human agreement."⁷ In contrast to material facts that exist independently of human agency, social facts are wholly dependent on the subjective meanings given to them. In effect, if humans no longer exist these social facts would also come to an end. It was in late 1980s Constructivism began to assert itself in the discipline of International Relations (IR). Nicholas Onuf and Alexander Wendt were the first two scholars to contemplate constructivism within IR. Although Onuf's is credited for introducing the concept of constructivism to IR but it was Wendt attempt to elevate constructivism as a theory in a form of systemic theorizing. He introduced constructivism as an IR theory in his most celebrated work "Social Theory of International Politics" Wendt's work has undoubtedly been a greater influence on international thinkers as it was widely accepted as an alternative approach to neo-realism in understanding international politics. As Wendt's constructivism evolved over time many internationally acclaimed academics became the heart of constructivist framework of International Relations.

Many alternative constructivist approach exist but what in actual constitutes constructivism is not self evident and therefore became a contested area often with substantial difference between each approach, became the central point within the discipline of International relations.

A number of alternative descriptions and formulation to Wendt's constructivism are available. Adler in his article "*Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics*,"⁸ focuses on the importance of shared meaning among actors in shaping the

world and asserts how constructivism shows that the most stable institutions are also based on collective understanding. Also, Finnemore and Sikkink in "*International Norm Dynamics and Political Change*",⁹ describes three elements that shapes constructivism, they argues that, first, ideational factors and not material factors primarily shapes human interactions. Second, these ideational factors are inter-subjective beliefs that is widely shared in nature and not reduced to individual only. Third, these shared beliefs are responsible for the construction of identities and interest of purposive actors. The association of constructivism with such wide-ranging concepts giving importance to idea over material structures, interests and identities, and patterns (that is, behavior, or norms), hints at the innumerable ways that constructivist thinking may be conceived of and applied. This point strengthen the argument that constructivism defies simple categorization.

Constructivists are divided into two camps, which will be briefly described as they will be used for the purpose of this thesis. The first group includes conventional constructivists. They accept "key aspects of neorealist systemic theorizing, such as the centrality of the state and the importance of a scientific or positivist approach to comprehend phenomena"(Agius, 2010, p. 61) Wendt with fellow conventional constructivists sees constructivism as a bridge between the rationalist and the reflectivist approaches, enabling both to benefit from the insight of the other. The second group encompasses critical constructivists who see reliance on positivism as problematic and argue that "the distinction between the ideational and the material world simply reproduces the binary distinctions that characterize the positivist methodology" such as strong/weak (Agius, 2010, p. 61).

In spite of the fact that constructivism is not really one comprehensive school, all constructivists agree on three core ontological propositions concerning social life, the key Constructivist principles are:

- Inter-subjectivity (shared contextual beliefs drive human action): Constructivists consider normative and ideational structures as important as material structures because material structures have only "meaning for human action through the structure of shared knowledge in which they are embedded"(Wendt, 1995). Constructivists also highlight the

importance of normative and ideational structures because they are thought to shape social identities of political actors.

- Co-constitution: The agents and structures are mutually determined or constitute each other. The meanings ascribed and identity of an individual actor or even the patterns of appropriate political and economic activity are defined by institutionalized norms and ideas (Reus-Smit, 2001, pp. 217-218).
- The importance of identity (which is determined by, and determines, the field of political action) In Wendt's words: "Identities are the basis of interests", or in other words, identities matter.

The approach taken in this study is drawn from constructivist insights about the socially constructed nature of threats, specifically of the relationship between threat and identity construction – how the identity of both oneself and of a significant other affects, how a particular situation is construed, and accordingly, how interests are thus dependent on the identities of the actors involved. An explanation of identity construction provides a basis for understanding state conceptualizations of threat. Such an understanding offers a foundation to examine the dynamics of India's nuclear policy and to further understand India's action and intentions regarding its nuclear program.

1.1.1 SECURITY PERCEPTIONS

Traditionally, security and strategic studies has been dominated by realism and later by neo realism, moreover various scholars have been driven by a realist perspective considered security concern as the motive behind India's nuclearisation. According to Waltz, states as a primary actor in international politics within the anarchic system tend to preserve their interest and behaviour by seeking to survive through self-help¹⁰ by maximizing their security. The need for self-help comes from the fear and mistrust of the intentions of others. Waltz argues that ability to address these concerns varies greatly and can be accounted for by the distribution of capabilities amongst states, conceived primarily in terms of material attributes like "size, wealth, power, and form."¹¹ However realism failed to answer as to how a state determines whether another state's actions are threatening or are aligned with its own interest.

The realist concept of national interest is seen as an objective reality defined in terms of military and economic power, ignoring the subjective aspect. Constructivist argues that national interest does not exist independent of perceptions. Charles Beard points out that idea and material interest cannot be separated and similarly interest is an idea which includes human perceptions and interpretation. The constructivist analyses security perceptions as a move from material to ideational considerations. The nature of threats and the objects under threat are not fixed or given, rather socially construct themselves, leading to a greater call to use constructivist understanding. Fierke argues that, "the central point [of this approach] is to demonstrate that threats are made in an active process rather than discovered in a static environment."¹² He continues, "it is not that weapons or threats of one kind or another have been made up but rather that the meaning attached to them, and the subsequent practice, has been molded in discourse."¹³ The main focus is on how some actors and their actions are labeled as threat. Since a security perception is an idea of a state, it is necessary to analyse what role idea play in India's articulations of threat it perceived from its nuclear armed neighbours that let to its overt nuclearisation.

1.1.2 IDENTITY FACTOR

In social science questions concerning identities have generated vigorous interest and concerns and there have been no exception to International Relations. The useful entry point to examine the concept of identity has been provided by Goff and Dunn, They argue that identity is a multi dimensional concept and highlights four aspect of identity as: "alterity, fluidity, constructedness and multiplicity" (Goff & Dunn, 2004, p. 4).

The idea of identity of a state is at the center of constructivist critiques of realism. In constructivist analysis the identity of state depends on its preference and its actions. Identity means "who the actors are and what they and other perceives their role to be" (D'Anieri, 2012, p. 96). Identity is a core concept in understanding world politics though the constructivist prism.

According to constructivist understanding, identities and interest are socially constructed and not given. It not only provides an explanation of how states remain in conflict with one another but also eludes the possibility of overcoming conflict through mutual reconstruction of identities and interest. A state identity constitutes the distinguishing

characteristics of a state, forming the foundation of its self-respect and status. A state understand other state through the prism of identity as ascribed by them and at the same time it produces its own identity through its social practice. Consequently, Identity is inter-subjective as shared contextual beliefs drive states. As Wendt express“Identities are relatively stable, role-specific understandings and expectations about self” (Wendt, 1992, p. 397). Social identity can explain the choices made by states as interests and preferences of the states can also be explained by identities.

Nuclear weapons which is commonly viewed as symbolic in nature infact shapes and reflects the identity of the state. The intensity of the nuclear weapon lies with the national interest of the state. In the constructivist point of view, it isn't the weapon or the number of weapon that states possess concerns but the perception of a state towards the state having nuclear weapons matters. This significance of nuclear weapons can be outlined by the way that US thinks about nuclear Britain as ally and nuclear Iran and nuclear North Korea as enemies. States act differently towards ally than towards adversaries on the grounds that the latter is threatening while the former is not. Identities provide state's perception about other states' interest, role, motives and actions.

1.2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on the nuclear policy in general and India's Nuclear Policy in particular reveals that the literature can be broadly categorized into two dichotomous sets of categories. They are: (a) Evolution of Nuclear Politics and Policy, wherein two categories of literature has been located and reviewed-first, to the literature pertaining to general discussion on the evolution of nuclear politics and policy; and second, evolution of India's nuclear politics and policy; and (b). The constructivist theory in general, and applicability of constructivist approach to India's nuclear policy in particular.

The first category of the literature pertains to the general discussion on the global nuclear politics. Some representative literature in this category includes, Charles L. Glaser (2000), "*The Causes and Consequences of Arms Races.*" Desmond Ball (1981), "*Can Nuclear War be Controlled*", Jeremy Bernstein (2008), "*Nuclear Weapons: What You Need to Know*", Joachim Krause Andreas (2001), "*Nuclear Weapon into the 21st Century: Current Trends and Future,*" Joseph Cirincione (2007). "*Bomb Scar: The*

History & Future of Nuclear Weapons", Kenneth N. Waltz (1981), *"The Spread of Nuclear weapon: More May be Better,"* Michael Mandelbaum (1981), *"The Nuclear Revolution: International Politics Before and After Hiroshima,"* Scott Sagan & K. Waltz (2003), *"The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: Debate Renewed,"* Scott Sagan (1997), *"Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb,"* Stephen M. Younger (2009), *"The Bomb: A New History,"* William Epstein (1977), *"Why States Go – And Don't Go – Nuclear,"* Among others, deals with the themes like rationale for states' going nuclear, evolution of nuclear weaponry and its implications to international relations, interrogations on the possibility or otherwise of controlling nuclear proliferation and its ill impacts, changing power balance due to nuclear asymmetry and the resultant instability of international systems, issues of security, etc.

Another category of literature relevant to the present study relates to the evolution of Nuclear Policy in India. Whereas Abraham Itty (1998), *"The Making of The Indian Atomic Bomb,"* Bharat Karnad (2008), *"India's Nuclear Policy,"* George Perkovich (1999), *"India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact on Global Proliferation,"* Jaswant Singh (2006), *"A Call to Honour: In Service of Emergent India,"* Jain, J.P (1974), *"Nuclear India,"* Mohammed B. Alam (1988). *"India's Nuclear Policy,"* Raja Mohan (2005), *"Crossing the Rubicon,"* S.N. Yadav (2009), *"India's Nuclear Policy: Compulsions, Commitments and Constrains,"* Raj Chengappa (2000) *"Weapons of Peace,"* Scott Sagan, *"Inside Nuclear South Asia,"* Shyam Bhatia (1979), *"India's Nuclear Bomb,"* Strobe Talbott (2007), *"Engaging India: Diplomacy, Democracy and the Bomb,"* Sumit Ganguly, and S. Paul Kapur (2009), *"Nuclear proliferation in South Asia: Crisis Behaviour and the Bomb,"* T.T. Poulse (1978), *"Perspectives of India's Nuclear Policy,"* among others offers the reader a post modern and discursive approach to India's nuclear programme and deal with India's gradual development of nuclear weapons and evolutionary history of India's nuclear policy.

The Indian nuclear doctrine, strategy, force posture and command and control of nuclear weapons have been reviewed by many well-known Indian and international scholars. Some prominent works in this category include, among others, Alam B. Mohammad (2002). *"India's Nuclear Doctrine: Context and Constraints"*, Dilip Lahari

(1999) *"Formalizing Restraint: The case of South Asia"*, Gurmeet Kanwal (2001) *"Safety and Security of India's Nuclear Weapon's"*, Jyotirmoy Banerjee (2000) *Bomb and Strategy: The Nuclear Dilemmas in South Asia*, K. Subrahmanyam (1998) *"Vajpayee Propounds Nuclear Doctrine"*, Kelsey De Venport (2012) *"India Moves Closer to Nuclear Traid"*, Lawrence Freedman (2004) *"Deterrence"*, M. Hans Kristensen & R. Morris (2015) *"India's Nuclear force"*, P.M Kamath (1999) *"Indian Nuclear Strategy: A Perspective for 2020"* Sanjay B. Maharaj (2002) *India's Nuclear Arsenal"*, Uday Bhaskar (1999) *"India's Nuclear posture at the turn of the Century"*, V.N Khanna, *"India's Nuclear Doctrine"*. The key issues with regards to the Indian nuclear doctrine and its strategic options have been dealt extensively focusing on 'No-First-Use' in the Indian context, the credibility of deterrence, survivability concerns after first strike, lack infrastructure and the safety and security apprehensions of nuclear assets.

Gopal Singh & S.K Sharma, edited volume on *"Documents on India's Nuclear Disarmament Policy: Nehru Era"*,¹⁴ is equipped with treaties, agreement, reports, letters, UN resolution, proposal, speeches and recommendations made by India for nuclear free world. It covers from PM. Nehru era to PM. Vajpayee period.

Praful Bidwai & Achin Vanaik book on *"South Asia on A short Fuse: Nuclear Politics and Future of Global Disarmament"*¹⁵ elaborates on the rivalry between India and Pakistan in the background of South Asia nuclearisation in 1998 followed by Kargil War in 1999. Kargil war is considered as 'short fuse' as nuclear threat was exchanged directly or indirectly between two rivals. They argues that India's overt nuclearization in 1998 has diminished its conventional strength over Pakistan and become prone to nuclear threat, bringing South Asia to nuclear threshold. Additionally they assert that nuclearization of South Asia is a blow to global nuclear disarmament.

Col. Ravi Nanda, in his book *"Strategic Compulsions of Nuclear India"*,¹⁶ rationalised India's nuclear choice in 1998 as self defence considering the strategic environment as India was surrounded by nuclear China and Pakistani covert nuclear programme. He makes a strong argument for nuclear triad for employing its 'minimum credible nuclear deterrent'. Recommendations are made with regard to what security policy, defence

strategy and command and control should India adopt and suggests a combined defence service under Ministry of defence.

George Perkovich, book "*India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact On Global Proliferation*"¹⁷ is a well written comprehensive account of India's nuclear journey from a champion of nuclear disarmament to a nuclear possessor. It gives a detail account of the evolution India's nuclear decision making. An insightful historical revelation on India's nuclear journey is drawn from various sources like interview with key Indian political leaders, diplomats, military leaders and nuclear scientist and strategist. He successfully reveals India's paradoxical stance on nuclear weapon.

Raju G.C. Thomas & Amit Gupta edited book, "*India's Nuclear Security*"¹⁸ is an insightful account on a number of important issues and problems that have raised after India and Pakistan nuclear test. Various authors explores India's motivations for becoming a nuclear state and examines controversies, complexities and dynamics of nuclear test as it have altered the regional security environment. Rajesh M. Basrur, in his article "*Enduring Contradictions: Deterrence Theory and Draft Nuclear Doctrine*",¹⁹ argued that India needs to draft a clear cut nuclear policy for the formulation of an effective strategy.

Chintamani Mahapatra in his book "*Indo-US Relations into the 21st Century*"²⁰ mainly focused on the evolution of Indo-US relations in the era of new world order. The author argues that India as a leader of Non-aligned movement followed an independent foreign policy which was not seen favorably by US during the Cold War period. However with the disintegration of Soviet Union a unipolar world was created where US emerged as a sole superpower. India started revising its policy towards US and with the liberalization of Indian economy in 1991 India managed to develop economic, political and strategic relations with US. Author also concentrates on the nuclear issues between the two states focusing on the economic sanctions imposed by US after India's nuclear test in 1998.

Ashley J. Tellis in his book "*India's Emerging Nuclear Posture: Between Recessed Deterrent and Ready Arsenal*"²¹ analyses how the May 1998 Indian nuclear test had surprised the international community and how the strategic environment of South Asia

was altered. Additionally he analyzes how India's status has been transformed to nuclear weapon power which has been repeatedly prorated by strategist and political analysis in India. He addresses these issues by contextualizing border contours of India's strategic interest, institutional structures and security goals. He further argues that despite demonstrating its ability to successfully undertake nuclear explosions, India still has miles to cover before it can acquire the capabilities that would make it a nuclear power.

Baldev Raj Nayar in his book "*India and the Major Powers after Pokhran II*"²² tries to rationalize India's nuclear behaviour to go for overt nuclearisation. It was the discriminatory nature of nuclear weapon states and nuclear regime that compelled India to challenged the hegemonic character of the nuclear powers by exploding the bomb in 1998. His work sufficiently covers the negative and positive reactions of the world powers after Pokhran II nuclear test. However other imperatives that have rationalised India's nuclearisation process has not been adequately incorporated.

Harsh V Pant in his book "*The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*"²³ tries to analyses different perspective of Indo-US nuclear agreement. He attempts to clarify that apart from India's energy security requirement, rising China and its influence in Asia and Pacific region is the primary driver behind the Indo-US nuclear deal. He asserts that US is supporting India rise as an great power to balance China. His work centers around the instrumental role played by the President Bush and Prime Minister M. Singh to seal the deal between two democracies. His work additionally examinations the complexities and difficulties set by the Indo-US nuclear deal.

P.M. Kamath, in his article "*Civilian Nuclear Deal: Turning Points in Indo-US Relations*"²⁴ examines the key aspect of Indo-US deal and explains why is it considered as the most defining incident in Indo-US strategic relation. He argues that the deal recognized India as a responsible nuclear power and supports India's nuclear status. He additionally analyses both national and international reaction to the deal.

Ashok Kapur in his book titled "*Pokhran and beyond: India's Nuclear Behaviour*"²⁵ historically contextualized India's nuclear journey since its inception before the independence of the India and considers factors which compelled India to go nuclear. The most significant being the China threat and Pakistan's clandestine nuclear behaviour. He

focuses on how nuclear policy of India have evolved gradually and defined by successive Governments regardless their political affiliation. Additionally he outlines India's future nuclear strategy.

Represented literature on constructivist theory in general and applicability of constructivist approach to India's nuclear policy includes, Alexander Wendt (1992) "*Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics*", Alexandra Wendt (1999) "*Social Theory of International Politics*", Barnett Michael (2005) "*Social Constructivism*", Christian Reus Smit (2001) "*Constructivism*", Christine Agius (2010) "*Social Constructivism*", Emanuel Adler (2002) "*Constructivism and International Relations*", Jo-Ansie Van Wyk . et. al (2007) "*The International Politics of Nuclear Weapons: A Constructivist Analysis*", John. G. Ruggie (1998) "*What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge*", L. Varadarajan (2004) "*Constructivism, Identity and Neoliberal (in)Security*", Maja Zehfuss (2004) "*Constructivism in International Relations*", Runa Das (2008) "*Explaining India's Nuclearization: Engaging Realism and Social Constructivism*", Shamsad A. Khan (2010) "*Media's Constructivism and the India-Pakistan Peace Process*", Ted Hopf (1998) "*The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory*", V. Kubalkova, et al. (1998), ed. *International Relations in a Constructed World*",

V. Kubalkova, et al., edited volume "*International Relations in a Constructed World*"²⁶ is an outstanding and all-inclusive series on constructivist IR theory. Kubalkova gives a general outline of constructivist theory and analyses the relevance of constructivism while focusing on some of the important concept like national identity, ethnicity and political economy.

Klotz and Lynch edited volume "*Strategies for research in constructivist international relations*"²⁷ came up with exceptionally valuable volume about doing research utilizing constructivist theory, which anybody using constructivism as an approach to their study should read.

Jack Snyder, celebrated foreign policy article "*One World, Rival Theories.*"²⁸ is an update version on a similar named article by Stephen Walt (1998). Snyder summarizes realism, liberalism and constructivism is a most simplest form and further compare and

contrast the basic principles of these theory. It is a perfect overview of international theory and constructivism.

Ted Hopf's, "*The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory*"²⁹ is widely cited articles by researchers. Hopf efficiently clarifies arguments posed by constructivism and how constructivism can give an insightful view of world politics. He compares critical and conventional constructivism and suggests that both form of constructivism are helpful in understanding international politics

John. G. Ruggie, article, "*What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge*",³⁰ clearly argues how the mainstream IR theory - liberalism and realism have ignored norms, identities and ideological factor in international relations. He argues that constructivism poses a major challenge to these theories as it fills in this gap.

Alexandra Wendt, "*The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory*."³¹ is his first significant article. He identifies that some IR theories have focused only on structure that is international system and some have paid more attention to the agent-actors within the system. Wendt argues that realism and liberalism fails to understand that structure and agent mutually constitute each other and provides a comprehensive understanding on how international system actually works.

Alexander Wendt, "*Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics*"³² is perhaps the most widely read article. Wendt challenges Kenneth Waltz's (1979) book "*Theory of International Politics*". He argues that unlike neo realism who considers anarchy as inherent, but anarchy is not given by nature nor inherited but socially constructed by states which is an ongoing process of social interaction and practice. Further he asserts that power politics and self help does not come naturally as proclaimed by neo realism, they are not the product of anarchy rather it come from due process and not the structure. Therefore anarchy is what states make it.

Alexander Wendt's "*Collective Identity Formation and the International State*"³³ is another very widely cited article. Borrowing insight from integration theories and critical theory of IR he asserts that endogenously collective cooperation is possible among states

at systemic level which will transform anarchy to 'international state' as interactions at the systemic level change states' interest and identities.

Alexandra Wendt's, book "*Social Theory of International Politics*"³⁴ was declared the "book of the decade" by the International Studies Association. Wendt directly criticizes Kenneth Waltz's (1979) "*Theory of International Politics*" and presents a holistic approach to both constructivist theory and IR. Wendt develops a socially constructed theory of international system. While analyzing the individualistic and materialistic approach taken by Waltz's neo-realism he presents a contrasting idealistic and cultural worldview. While examining states view of each other as ally or rivals he develops a cultural theory based on the roles which he characterized as "culture of anarchy" described as Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian. These cultures are a shared ideas which shapes states' interest, capabilities and identities. Further he argues that four factors (namely interdependence, homogenization, common fate and self restraint) bring structural change from one to another culture.

Hopf, Ted's "*Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*"³⁵, is an interesting book that focuses on Soviet/Russian identity in 1955 and 1999. It begins with an overview of constructivism focusing on the role of identity in foreign policy and how social identity was instrumental in shaping Soviet and Russian foreign policy choice.

Katzenstein, Peter J., edited book titled "*The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*",³⁶ is a well argued volume considering constructivist approach to understand the world in transition after the end of cold war. The book features case studies (NATO, Soviet foreign policy, the Middle East, Germany and Japan) illustrating the role of identity and culture which cannot be neglected in order to understand the growing complexities of the world which is undergoing change.

Nicholas Onuf book, "*World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*"³⁷ is a classical work in IR for understanding constructivist approach. His constructivist framework is built on four "core assumptions," that is intersubjective, co-constituent of social reality, ontological significance of language and

speech act theory, which lays the foundation of the rule oriented constructivist approach. He examines the crucial role of rules and rule in the process of social construction.

Van Wyk et. al., in their article "*International Politics of Nuclear Weapons: A Constructivist Analysis*"³⁸ argues that nuclear weapons since its inception continues to dominate world's politics, despite non proliferation efforts state continues to acquire nuclear weapons which is evident from North Korea and Iran nuclear development. The article focuses on the constructivist approach to international politics of nuclear weapons, emphasizing on how state acquire their identity which eventually shapes their material and non-material interest.

Scott Sagan, in his very famous article "*Why do states build nuclear weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb*"³⁹ articulates on three models namely realism, liberalism and constructivism to explain the cause of proliferation and why states build nuclear bombs. Based on 'Security Model' he argues that states go for nuclearisation to deter threat and to increase their national interest, under 'Domestic Model' he argues that domestic and bureaucratic interest are the driving force for some states to acquire nuclear bomb, it is a political tool and under 'Norm Model' he argues that some states acquire and some states resist the development of nuclear weapon because nuclear weapon is determined as a symbol of modernity and identity.

From the above review of literature, it is seen that although lot has been written on nuclear policy of India but adequate writings and research work are not available on the nuclear policy of India from constructivist perspective especially on how India has constructed its nuclear identity. Hence it justifies the present research on India's nuclear policy.

1.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To analyse the discourse of India's nuclear development.
2. To analyse security perceptions viv- a vis China and Pakistan as a factor in determining India's nuclear decision making.
3. To historicize India's nuclear trajectory and highlight the ways India's nuclear identity has been transformed and how it has transformed.
4. To understand the reasons behind India's acceptance as a nuclear weapon power and its integration with global nuclear order.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As revealed from the review of literature made above, there is an evident research gap on India's nuclear discourse through constructivist lens. Therefore, keeping research objective in mind the present study attempts to find an answer to the following research questions.

1. What are the major factors that have shaped the discourse of India's nuclear policy since 1947 -1998?
2. Does security consideration have impact on India's nuclear development? To what extent threat perception vis-a vis China and Pakistan factored on India's nuclear policy?
3. To what extent India's nuclear behaviour enhanced her identity as a nuclear power?
4. What made international community considers India as a unique case and no longer consider it as a target of Non-proliferation? Has this facilitated India's integration into nuclear world order?

1.5 METHODOLOGY

India's nuclear choice is mostly debated through the pragmatic worldview of security concerns or through liberal understanding of international trust. However little or no attention has been given to constructivist perspective with due regard to the role of identity in shaping the nuclear behaviour of India. Through the constructivist approach this study is an attempt to analyse the meaning ascribed by India to nuclear weapon and the range of discursive and material power that has been designed to advance its nuclear identity. The concept of identity is significant to this study and it is critical to understand its meaning. The identity of a state comprehensively means a set of preferences which drives state actions. Therefore the adaptation of Alexander Wendt and Ted Hopf's constructive approach relating to identity is used to explain India's nuclear behaviour. However it should be noted that the main emphasis on identity does not mean that the study tends to neglect other aspect of constructivist approach like culture, norm and institution. The study concentrates on identity because it is the most proximate reasons for India's nuclear preferences, choice and action.

The present study relies on analytical, exploratory, and qualitative analysis of the evolution of India's nuclear programme and its nuclear policy, nuclear behaviour, and the implications of India's existing nuclear policy on her strategy for deterrence and how India has integrated with global nuclear order. To this end, an extensive reading of the documents, reports, newspaper, newsletters, journal etc. has been done.

The researcher has analysed both primary and secondary sources of data through the analytical techniques of a historical document analysis, included under broad topics like "unobtrusive" or "archival research," (George, 2006; Platt, 2006). It involved the analysis of India's nuclear policy, a document review of official records on the Indian Nuclear policy and other memoirs of policy makers in the various administrations, and an examination of pertinent material detailing the evolution of India's nuclear program. The study also analyze the relevant documents dealing with India's integration with global nuclear order as well as its relations with other key players as they impact India's nuclear program.

Primary sources includes Annual Reports of Ministry of Defence and External

Affairs, Annual reports of Department of Atomic Energy, IAEA Annual Reports, UN Reports, Reports of National Security Council, working papers, research reports, White Papers, Official government announcements, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Debates, declarations and speeches, Foreign Affairs Record, Congressional Research Services (CRS) Records, Reports of think tanks like Rand Corporation, Carnegie International Peace Endowment and IDSA are used extensively. US declassified nuclear documents available on the websites are also used to complete the study.

Secondary sources include selected books, articles, internet resources, year books, newspaper clippings etc. has been utilized for the research.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This research intends to shed light on India's evolution from nuclear abstaining state to a threshold state, and in 1998 to a self declared nuclear weapon state that has tested its nuclear weapon but not yet a nuclear weapon state, and its strategy of portraying itself as a responsible nuclear power. It endeavors to evaluate India's security perceptions and its impact on its nuclear policy development, security threats from India's neighboring nuclear states like China and Pakistan, which has compelled India to go nuclear. It also attempts to evaluate the non security concerns as pivotal driving force behind India's quest for the nuclear bomb, and India's struggle for nuclear identity. There is a need to understand how India's nuclear discourses have transformed with changing world politics, with a constant nuclear identity of recognition as a nuclear weapon power. The study contends that a complete understanding of India's nuclear picture is not possible without taking note of the threat perceptions along with constrains imposed by nuclear regime which motivated India to demonstrate its nuclear capabilities. While doing so, the study purports to design an explanatory model which would act as a heuristic device in explaining the compulsions of states in adopting a particular kind of policy. This development of a theoretical model through the study would contribute to the development of the theory of international relations, and hence, enrichment of the discipline. Secondly, the findings may be useful for the policy makers in terms of possible implications of existing policies and thereby contribute to a more informed

policy decisions in future. Thus the study is envisaged to have both practical and disciplinary significance.

However, despite being ambitious in terms of its possible contributions, the study is also likely to suffer from some limitations. Firstly, the availability of primary information from defense and foreign ministries owing to the sensitivity of the subject became very difficult. Moreover, in terms of development of a particular policy of security and strategic nature, a lot depends on the psyche of the state which may be difficult to quantify for objective analysis. Thirdly, and most importantly, the twin constraints of time and resources hampered the collection of information from the multiplicity of sources requiring travel time and procurement resources. Hence, the study may not be able to incorporate a wide variety of variables involved in the analysis of such policy.

1.7 CHAPTERISATION

The thesis contains 7 (Seven) Chapters as stated below:

- Chapter I: Introduction.
- Chapter II: India's Nuclear Policy: A Historical Analysis.
- Chapter III: India's Strategy for Nuclear Deterrence
- Chapter IV: Between Realism and Constructivism: India's Nuclear Behaviour
- Chapter V: India vs. China/Pakistan: Issues of Security and Strategic Options
- Chapter VI: India and the Global Nuclear Order.
- Chapter VII: Conclusion.

1.8 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

In the **first chapter**, I have spelt out the constructivist theoretical framework within which India's nuclear behaviour and transformation of India's nuclear identity is analysed. Within the broader configuration of constructivist approach India's security/threat perception is analysed and India's self-identity is investigated on the basis of the notion of identity advanced by two prominent constructivist thinkers Ted Hopf and Alexander Wendt. Rationales are advanced by various scholars to explain India's nuclearisation, namely, scientific and technological factor, domestic factor and prestige and status considerations and security factor. Each explanation exhibit an illuminating insight about India's overt nuclearisation, and while considering the role of idea in articulation of security concerns and the role of identity in understanding India's nuclear behaviour has largely been missing or neglected. This study is an attempt to study India's nuclear process taking into consideration the articulation of threat and the notion of identity as a viable factor to understand India's nuclear policy.

The **second chapter** provides a historical analysis of India's nuclear behaviour since independence. Based on certain landmarks developments India's nuclear orientation has been delineate into various phases. When India gained independence in 1947 the nuclear age had already advanced. It was not possible for India to be unaffected by this world reality. India then under the leadership of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru followed the dual nuclear policy. Nehru was totally against the destructive use of nuclear technology but he was also convinced that nuclear energy and technology would contribute massively to the growth and development of underdeveloped India. Dr. Homi Bhabha, the chairman of ACE along with Nehru laid the foundation of India's nuclear infrastructure and played a significant role in shaping India's nuclear policy. With Indira Gandhi coming to power, she took the decision to test India's nuclear capability but fearing economic sanctions immediately declared it as a "peaceful nuclear explosion" with no intention to develop weapons. Then came the phase of nuclear ambiguity when India imposed self restrain but retained the nuclear option. Globally Indian leaders vigorously advocated global nuclear disarmament but at domestic level the importance of nuclear energy to its economy was undermined. Then came the end of long pause with

Vajpayee government decision to demonstrate India's 'shakti' in 1998 and self declared to be a nuclear weapon state.

In the **third chapter**, after the 1998 test India's strategy for nuclear deterrence has been outlined while analysing India's nuclear doctrine in detail which lay emphasis on 'no-first-use policy in compliance with 'credible minimum deterrence'. The rationale behind India's need for nuclear weapon is to resist nuclear coercion or blackmail, therefore India's nuclear doctrine ascertains political role of deterrence and not for fighting war. The chapter focuses on India's nuclear doctrinal aspiration to abolish nuclear weapons and analyses India's strategy to deter its adversaries. The use of nuclear weapon for retaliation purpose only, the limited number of nuclear weapon maintained for deterrence only, civilians in control of nuclear weapons with Prime Minister of India heading the political council having the sole authority to authorise the use of nuclear weapon and the position and requirement of India's nuclear force is outlined for India's strategy for deterrence signaling towards India's responsible nuclear posture.

The **fourth chapter** outlines both realist and constructivist perspective to analysed states nuclear behaviour. The study ascertains the constructivist framework for analysing India's nuclear behaviour and focuses on the articulation of threat and role of national interest in constructing India's nuclear identity. Detail explanation on India's preference in foreign policy guided by national interest is presented, the chapter investigate India's stand on non proliferation regime and how NPT and CTBT which India considers to be discriminatory in nature has influenced its nuclear behaviour. India has always cleared its stand between non proliferation and non proliferation treaty and has worked constructively towards non proliferation without being a party to the NPT. Its outstanding record with regard to non proliferation is evident enough. The intersections of India's economic growth with its nuclear capabilities are discussed as the rationale behind India's nuclear decision can be ascertained from it.

In the **fifth chapter**, I have spelt out India's threat perception towards its nuclear armed neighbour China and Pakistan. Tracing the evolution of China's nuclear program and her stand on nuclear issues. China's ever rising economy and its aggressive political and military posture along with its nuclear modernisation and its unresolved border

dispute adds to India's critical view of other that is China as a threat. The other threat India perceives is from Pakistan, Pakistan has considered India as its enemy since the partition in 1947 and the evolution of Pakistan nuclear policy is driven by desire to match with India nuclear programme. India's security concern with regard to Pakistan is examined focusing on border dispute, terrorism and failed diplomacy. Pakistan 'no-first-use policy is seen as directed towards India to decrease India's conventional superiority. The perception of oneself (India) with regard to other in this case China and Pakistan is seen in the light of India's nuclear quest.

In the **sixth chapter**, India's integration with global nuclear order is examined. Despite India's past today, it is on the way to becoming an integral part of international nuclear order. The historic Indo-US Nuclear Deal led to a new partnership which virtually ended India's isolation and further redefined India's engagement with international nuclear order. The deal has been analysed in all aspect. The joint statement between the two heads of the states acknowledges India's nuclear capability by describing it as a 'state with advance nuclear power'. Indo-US deal opened the door to world nuclear order, India has signed 14 civil nuclear deal with different countries. India's ameliorate relation with international export control is also examined. It is asserted that among four international export control organisation namely NSG, MTCR, AG and WA, India has been included in MTCR, AG and WA in 2017-2018 because of India's impeccable record and unwavering commitment to non- proliferation and its willingness to contribute to the same cause has led to the recognition of India's nuclear capability which will contribute in raising India as a responsible stakeholder.

Chapter seven summarizes the research and highlights major findings with regard to the research questions formulated. It traces the hallmarks in India's Nuclear Policy since independence. Threat perception vis-a vis China, Pakistan and of international nuclear regimes and the role of identity has been the driving force for overt nuclearization and asserts how the nuclear weapons option was gradually converted from a national discourse into a strategic alternative by giving new political meanings to it.

NOTES /REFERENCES

¹ This contradictory and dual aspect of India's Nuclear Policy which began since free India's young days has been examined and analysed in details by Abraham, Itty. (1998). *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy and the Postcolonial State*. New York: Zed Books.

² For the purposes of this study the constructivism will be conceived of as an approach rather than a theory, allowing greater scope for application of the approach. See Onuf, Nicholas. (1998). Constructivism: A User's Manual. In V. Kubalkova et. al (Eds.), *International Relations in a Constructed World* (pp. 58-78). New York: M. E. Sharpe.; Hopf, Ted. (1998). Promise of Constructivism in International Relation Theory. *International Security*, 23(2), 171-200.; Finnemore, Martha., & Sikkink, Kathryn. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*. 52(4), 887-917.; Ruggie, J. D. (1998). *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization*. London: Routledge.; Wendt, Alexander. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

³ Rationalist Theory: Neo- realism, Neo-liberalism and Marxism. Alternative approach: post-modernism, feminism, normative theory, historical sociology and post-colonialism.

⁴ Ibid., 259

⁵ Ibid., 260

⁶ Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books. pp. 14-18. ; Ruggie, J. (1998). *Constructing the World Polity: Essay on International Institutionalization*. London: Routledge. 857-861.

⁷ Searle, J. R. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: The Free Press. p.1.

⁸ Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 319-363.

⁹ Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change, *International Organization*. 52(4), 887-917.

¹⁰ Rationality can be conceived of as "the ability of individuals to rank order their preferences and choose the best available preference" Little, Richrd.(2001). International Regimes. In John Baylis & Steve Smith (Eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* . Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 314.

¹¹ Waltz, Kenneth. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc. p.96.

¹² Fierke, Karin. (2007). *Critical Approaches to International Security*. Cambridge: Polity. p. 99.

¹³ Ibid., 102.

¹⁴ Singh, Gopal., & Sharma, S.K. (2000). Ed, *Documents on India's Nuclear Disarmament Policy: Nehru Era*. New Delhi: Anamika Publisher & Distributors (P) Ltd.

¹⁵ Bidwai, P., & Vanaik, A. (2001). *South Asia on a Short Fuse: Nuclear Politics and Future of Global Disarmament* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

-
- ¹⁶ Nanda, R. (1999). *Strategic Compulsions of Nuclear India*. New Delhi: Lancer Books.
- ¹⁷ Perkovich, George. (1999). *India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact On Global Proliferation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ¹⁸ Thomas, R., & Gupta. A. (2000). *India's Nuclear Security*. Colombia: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- ¹⁹ Basrur, Rajesh. (2000). Enduring Contradictions: Deterrence Theory and Draft Nuclear Doctrine, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(8/9), 610-613.
- ²⁰ Mahapatra, Chintamani. (1998). *Indo-US Relations into the 21st Century*. New Delhi: Knowledge World.
- ²¹ Tellis, J.Ashley. (1999). *India's Emerging Nuclear Posture: Between Recessed Deterrent and Ready Arsenal*. US: Rand.
- ²² Nayar, R.Baldev. (2001). *India and Major Powers after Pokhran II*. New Delhi: Har Anand Publishers.
- ²³ Pant, V.Harsh. (2011). *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- ²⁴ Kamath, P.M. (2006). Civilian Nuclear Deal: Turning Points in Indo-US Relations. *India Quarterly*, 12(3).
- ²⁵ Kapur, Ashok. (2001). *Pokhran and Beyond: India's Nuclear Behaviour*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- ²⁶ Kubalkova, V. (2001). *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*. New York: Routledge.
- ²⁷ Kubálková, V., Onuf, N. G., & Kowert, P. (1998). *International relations in a constructed world*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- ²⁸ Snyder, Jack. (2004). One World, Rival Theories. *Foreign Policy*, 83(6), 52–62.
- ²⁹ Hopf, Ted. (1998). The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory. *International Security* 23(1), 171–200.
- ³⁰ Ruggie, J.G. (1998). What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge. *International Organization*, 52(4), 855–885.
- ³¹ Wendt, Alexander. (1987). The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory. *International Organization*, 41(3), 335–370.
- ³² Wendt, Alexander. (1992). Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425.
- ³³ Wendt, Alexander.(1999). Collective Identity Formation and the International State. *American Political Science Review*, 88(2), 384–396.
- ³⁴ Wendt, Alexander. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- ³⁵ Hopf, Ted. (1999). *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- ³⁶ Katzenstein, Peter J. Ed (1996). *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

³⁷ Onuf, Nicholas. (1989). *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. University of South Carolina Press.

³⁸ Van Wyk, J., Kinghorn, L., Hepburn, H., Payne, C. and Sham, C. (2011). The International Politics of Nuclear Weapons: A Constructivist Analysis. *Scientia Militaria - South African Journal of Military Studies*, 35(1).

³⁹ Sagan, Scott. (1997). Why do states build nuclear weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb. *International Security*, 21(3), 57-59.