



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Utility of 'Ancient Indian Strategic Policies' in Contemporary International Politics of India:

Author:

Dr. Joginakatte Nagaraja

Department Of Political Science

Hagaribommanahalli (tq)

Vijayanagara (Dist)

Pin : 583212

Abstract :

This brief account examines India 's relations with Pakistan and China from the perspective of Kautilya 's strategic thinker of ancient India . The article advocates a realistic approach: assesses the foundation and intensity of threats, explores strategic opportunities among risks, and emphasizes overall policies to avoid the possibility of a two-front war. Has gone . In the beginning of the essay it is accepted that Pakistan and China look at India from completely different perspectives . For Pakistan India is an ideological issue while for China it is a matter of balance of power in geopolitics. Therefore, it becomes necessary for India to take a different approach towards these two countries. China is India's "strategic competitor", so keeping a flexible attitude towards it will be a win-win deal for India. Pakistan is India's "strategic adversary". Therefore, a more realistic goal for Indian foreign policy would be to pursue relations with China further rather than following the path of large-scale reconciliation with Pakistan.

Introduction :

In the last 12 months, India has gone through many ups and downs on its borders. In the summer of 2020, there was an atmosphere of heat and tension on the border of India and China - the Line of Actual Control. 20 Indian soldiers were martyred while about 40 Chinese soldiers lost their lives due to violent clashes between the armies of the two countries in the Galvan Valley of Eastern Ladakh. It was the most serious military confrontation on the world's longest disputed border since 1975. India's border-LoC with Pakistan also recorded the highest number of ceasefire violations last year. However , gradually from the Indian point of view the prospects of war on two fronts dimmed . In February 2021, India and China announced an agreement containing measures to reduce tensions by "thumping, phased manner and mutual coordination". In the same month , India and Pakistan issued a statement expressing their willingness to abide by the 2003 ceasefire agreement. However , despite all this , India will have to be vigilant so that in case of any disturbance in the current peace and tranquility , it can respond in time . If you look at the neighbourhood, Pakistan seems to match the category of "born enemy". It is in front, it lacks good or ideal qualities and is constantly causing harm. China is a "relevant enemy". It is certain that structurally, India is facing completely different challenges from China and Pakistan. Strategically , the opportunities presented to India by both the countries are also different . Through this short essay, an attempt has been made to present the most important teachings of Kautilya's Arthashastra, an ancient Indian article based on state art. An attempt has been made to better understand India 's long - term outlook on India 's current geo - political engagement and engagement ,

particularly in the case of Pakistan and China. Do Indian foreign policy makers gain useful ideas and knowledge from Kautilya's ideas about inter-state polity, the types of neighbors he described and his nuanced understanding of the "enemy"?

Circle of states :

The principles of economics are very "liberal" in the field of inter-state states. At the same time, the endogenous terms related to power, morality and order have been presented in a very effective way. Therefore, its importance comes to the fore intellectually in the theories related to international relations. The rajamandala (circle of states) associated with culture is based on the ideas of real politik . In it a specific hypothesis has been put forward about the neighboring kingdoms . Through this the best and meticulously presented approach in matters of relations with outside states comes out . By the way , mechanically and mathematically , the description of a circle with centers similar to the mandala indicates that the neighboring state is like the enemy , while the neighbor 's neighbor is the friend . However , this analysis is very crude and incomplete . The Arthashastra describes in detail the complex factors associated with the identification of friend and foe . In such a situation, the above description does not do justice to the principles of economics at all. Kautilya made the difference State sovereignty was described as an area with a fluctuating tendency. To some extent they dilute the stability and determinism of geography. The geographical location of a state is an important factor, but it is not the main variable determinant. It works according to the relative strength and nature (bhavin) of that state. So a neighboring state may be potentially hostile, but the nature of its intentions and the relative state power together determine which category it falls into: mitrabhavin (friendly neighbours), aribhavin (hostile neighbours) and bhartyabhavin (vassals). state government). The most important of these neighbors are those whose nature is the same as "enemy". They are of different types:

- (1) The enemy standing in front, who is of disturbed nature and is constantly hurting,
- (2) The enemy standing behind the curtain , one who has nexus with the enemy standing in front of him,
- (3) one who is vulnerable and vulnerable when caught in a disaster, and
- (4) who attacks the leadership in its time of crisis. Or seem to make a distinction between a "spontaneous enemy" and a "relevant enemy". The enemy of the first category is the one who has the same birth while the enemy of the second category is the one who has an enemy-like attitude (at least temporarily).
5. Looking at the neighborhood from this point of view, Pakistan seems to fit into the category of "innate enemy". It is in front, it lacks good or ideal qualities and it continues to cause harm. China is a "relevant enemy". In recent years, China has also emerged as a madhyama (king with intermediate or mediocre power)

A king who is geographically close to the conqueror and his enemy to crush them in scattered situations. , and has sufficient influence to disturb the balance of power in the circle of state - powers . It seems certain that China will soon become the world's leader in the technology sector. In such a situation, opportunities for Indian companies will increase there. By breaking economic ties with China and forging business partnerships with private companies there. The policy of refusal will be harmful from the future point of view. The intentions of China and Pakistan, I Strength and ability are different. In such a situation, it is important to understand this natural difference between Pakistan and China if seen from Kautilya's eyes. Had Kautilya been today, he would have advocated different strategies towards Beijing and Islamabad. He not only identified the difference in the threats posed by these two countries but also outlined the opportunities presented towards the realization of the Indian foreign policy goal.

Well-Being : The Goal of Indian Foreign Policy :

According to Kautilya , the criterion of foreign policy is whether it helps a state to rise up in the cycle of falling into the trough , moving forward on the path of status quo and development . The goal of foreign policy is to protect geographical borders as well as to provide economic prosperity. These two strengthen each other. Therefore, India's attitude towards Pakistan and China should be defined in accordance with the possible role of Pakistan and China in achieving the objectives of Indian foreign policy. This will make it easier to bring clarity to India's national interests. It will also help define Yogakshema (security and well-being) as the stated goal of Indian foreign policy in a world order with a global nature and an interconnected world . In his keynote address at the Shangri-La Dialogue, Prime Minister Narendra Modi linked India's future economic prospects not only to the size of the country's economy, but also to the depth of

India's engagement in global issues. The future of the state governments located in a particular area is intertwined . In such a situation, it is more sensible for them to build a relationship of cooperation instead of mutual conflict. In modern times the kingdoms of Mandala "have become intertwined . In such a situation, they combine the state duties in one political unit with the happiness of the people of the other state. "Indian is in favor of promoting a rules - based world order . Such imagination targets the twin objective of security and prosperity. 91 India's strategic and strategic calculations need to be seen in this context. China is an established regional superpower, with a very high status in the world economic system. Its importance in Indian strategy is far greater than that of unstable Pakistan . India is looking for a role of superpower for itself on the global stage. In such a situation, at least for a short time, but China's role is very important for India. However , a stable and peaceful neighborhood is vital to India 's economic prosperity . In such a situation, the relationship with Pakistan also needs attention. From India's point of view, a passive Pakistan is enough, while a positive and productive relationship with China is the need of the hour and more urgent. China is the world's second largest economy is. In such a situation, he is a character that cannot be ignored. Whereas Pakistan's place in this rank is 44th. Relations with China have brought some such advantages to India as compared to Pakistan which are clearly visible. For example, China is on its way to become India's largest trade partner in the financial year 2021. Chinese investment in important pharmaceuticals and technology for India continues to grow. Many start - ups in India are attracting private capital from China . It seems certain that China will sooner or later become the leader of technology in the world. In such a situation, there will be more opportunities for Indian companies. A policy of severing economic ties with China and refusing to enter into business partnerships with private companies there would be detrimental in the future . On the contrary , India should pursue its economic relations with China with a cool mind , in such a way that it can take maximum advantage of the available opportunities . Not only this, India should also prepare a group of its side in the business circles of China, which can strengthen India-China economic relations. The example of China itself is present in front of India in this matter . China's two largest partners in foreign trade are the US and Japan. Both of these are nations with which China is fiercely competitive . On the other hand, from the Indian point of view, even if Pakistan gets better, its contribution to India's progress is going to be negligible. Pakistan 's economy is the least competitive in South Asia . By size, it is comparable to the economy of Finland, the 12th largest economy of the European Union. Its position in terms of (sovereign) sovereign risk rating is as slim as that of Mongolia or Papua New Guinea . It is clear from this that the agencies of the world consider the environment there to be politically and economically very risky. Even Pakistan 's ability to "open " the gates of Central Asia as an aid to South Asia has been exaggerated . Pakistan's relationship with Central Asia is through Afghanistan. Afghanistan is a country where instability is going to continue for a long time to come. It is clear that in future frills friendly reconciliation or reconciliation agreements between India and Pakistan will not bring any great advantage to India on the strategic front . Before agreeing to give any huge discount to Pakistan , India should think carefully about this matter. In fact, the strategic. The benefits are going to be very minor. Even if an initiative like Aman ki Asha is successful, there will be no huge benefit. It becomes important to think about the possible role of its two largest neighbors in India 's efforts to secure its foreign policy goals . This would be in sync with Kautilya's ideas, in which Pakistan has to be treated as "innate or natural" and China as a "relevant" enemy. Pakistan has to be seen as a "strategic adversary" and China as a "strategic competitor". India 's new political leadership has been exhibited by " assertive bilateral diplomacy and nexus diplomacy with greater openness than ever before " . During the Doklam crisis of 2017 India's firm and uncompromising stand and diplomacy clearly leaning towards the US put China in trouble.

India's 'Enemy' Pakistan : Strategic adversary :

As a "born enemy" in the basic sense, Pakistan must always oppose India. Pakistan was established as a homeland of Indian Muslims in 1947 when the British government bid farewell to the Indian subcontinent. In such a situation there will always be a need for Pakistan to disclose the needs of its existence to all. The mighty army of Pakistan also believes that it is threatened by its ideologies as well as existence from India. The army there has proved itself with great success as "the power over the state". It has got the power to impose its own veto on Pakistan 's foreign and defense policies. The heart of Pakistan to oppose India is not new . Even in the early years after independence , Pakistan 's foreign policy was designed keeping in mind the possible threats to it from India . During the early period of the Cold War , Pakistan joined hands with the US on several organizational fronts . Pakistan 's motive behind this was to blunt the effect of

conditions which had traditionally been beneficial to India in military affairs. Although Pakistan had openly described the alliance with America as its exercise to fight communism, but the rulers themselves never paid any special attention to this cause. India is one of the countries with the largest Muslim population in the world. Despite this, Pakistan refused to admit India in the Organization of Islamic State. has opposed. Pakistan has always been rejecting India's demand for permanent and non-permanent seats in the United Nations Security Council. Not only this, Pakistan had also hindered recent attempts by India to obtain geographical indications on basmati rice. Pakistan's anti-India attitude seems to be structural. He'll never change. Even after the settlement of Jammu and Kashmir, the main issue of dispute between the two countries, it does not seem that there will be any change in Pakistan's stand. However, the resolution of the dispute in Jammu - Kashmir itself is a distant dream. In many ways Pakistan is far from an ideal Kautilyaist state. According to Kautilya, an ideal state is one that respects political leadership, emphasizes on decision-making based on scientific investigations (anvikshaki). It includes rationality with morality. Simultaneously, existence is conceptualized in both physical and non-material terms. Its basis is the principle of Saptagana. It is easy to understand that Pakistan's identity as a "born enemy" has given it the face of India's "strategic adversary". This is also evident from Pakistani policies. Pakistan has also opposed India in matters which in fact have the potential to benefit it itself. In this the ruler (swami), ministers (amatya), territory, and population (janapada) are given a higher position than armed power (danda). It can be said that Pakistan overcomes its weaknesses against India to some extent by adopting unconventional tactics, mobilizing nuclear weapons and colluding with China against India. All these strategies have been described by Kautilya as a sign of a "weak ruler". A comprehensive and wonderful description of state art is given in Arthashastra. From this point of view too, Pakistan would be described as a mindless and brash or unprincipled state. Even today, Pakistan continues the policy of giving priority to Dand (military power) over Janpad (population and territory). There the 'power above the state' has a far greater influence in policy making. Pakistan has been continuously using radical terrorist groups to destabilize Kashmir. This has had a disastrous effect on the soil of Pakistan itself. There have been many terrorist attacks on Pakistani soil in recent years. The roots of the extremism and fundamentalism that existed there are still deeper. Pakistan has been accused of providing financial aid to terrorist activities. Pakistan is facing these allegations in international forums. that financial action It is in the 'Black List' of the Task Force (FATF). Because of this Pakistan is facing obstacles in the way of getting foreign investment. Rawalpindi (Military headquarters) has historically played the role of swami (Ruler) instead of civil administration in Pakistan. The district seems to have been easily sacrificed in Pakistan for the strategic interests of Rawalpindi. It is easy to understand that Pakistan's identity as a "born enemy" has given it the face of India's "strategic adversary". This is also evident from Pakistani policies. Pakistan has also opposed India in matters which in fact have the potential to benefit it itself. These include matters related to international trade to regional connectivity or connectivity. Pakistan's callousness to strengthen economic ties with Asia's third largest economic power (India) clearly shows that its strategy is driven by ideology and potential strategic goals. According to this ideology, Pakistan is allowed to remain backward, but it is not acceptable to have any kind of stake in a "shining" India. According to India's Foreign Minister S. Jaishankar, "Pakistan's refusal to allow normal trade or connectivity with India tells us a lot about its real intentions. The Foreign Minister, citing an episode involving the Trigarta warriors of the Mahabharata, said that "the dangers posed by enemies smaller in size are enormous. The sole goal of such enemies is to harm their enemy, even if in the process he is in danger." Why not destroy yourself.

China : Strategic Competitor :

China on the other hand is a "Strategic Competitor" of India. It is not necessarily a "strategic adversary" either. Its attitude towards India is not the result of an inherent stubbornness or motivation to oppose India. On the contrary, China's attitude towards India is determined by a competitive approach. There is politics of regional power balance. There is no feeling of dissatisfaction or hatred towards India in the hearts and minds of Chinese people. India is a country with a democratic system, despite India's political identity to China. The danger is extremely low. China considers its ideological competition only with America in the world. However, the strategic challenge posed by India to China has emerged in recent times. At the end of the Cold War, India and China (which at that time were countries of almost equal strength) entered into a peace treaty for mutual interests and benefits. Be it the agreement signed in 1993 to maintain peace and tranquility on the border or many other agreements made in 1996, 2003 and 2012. These agreements helped in

establishing stability between the two countries. This environment was very important for the success of the ongoing economic reform efforts in both the countries. However, by the end of the first decade of the 21st century, China had overtaken India in terms of economic growth. In this way his position was elevated to the rank of madhyama (medium-ranked ruler) in the rajamandala. India's former foreign secretary Vijay Gokhale more or less described this period as the first phase of misconceptions that arose between the two countries. After nearly two decades of peacefully strengthening its organizational structure economically and strategically, China was ready and eager to fulfill its ambitions on the global stage. There was an imbalance of power between India and China. With this there was a gradual change in the intentions of China. This changed the picture and nature of bilateral relations between the two countries. In the later period, India made a place in China's strategic thinking. This may have been due to the "outspoken bilateral diplomacy and nexus diplomacy with greater openness" displayed by India's new political leadership. During the Doklam crisis of 2017, India's firm and steadfast stance and diplomacy clearly leaning towards the US put China in trouble. By the way, China has also left no stone unturned in opposing India from its side. This tendency of his has increased with time. It has blocked India's entry into the Nuclear Suppliers Group. At the same time, he also tried to start a discussion on Article 370 in the United Nations Security Council. Not only this, China is touted as one of the "biggest obstacles" in the way of India's efforts to achieve permanent membership in the UN Security Council. The ongoing conflict in Ladakh may perhaps be seen as a manifestation of this climate of increased mistrust between the two countries. It is called a change in China's policies - from the treaty to the study (moving on the military path after the peace agreement). can be defined as. Under this, the strategic advantage gained itself is used to win over the troubled side. As the Ladakh episode progressed, the manner in which India improved its infrastructure and intensified the work of military patrol there, China was irked by it. Violent skirmishes along the Line of Actual Control (LAC) in the summer of 2020 may have led many observers to believe that India is indeed swinging between the prospects of a two-front war with its two neighbours. However, it would not be appropriate to draw such a conclusion. Like Pakistan, China is not a strategic adversary of India, but it is a "strategic competitor" of India. China's stand has been full of neglect towards India. He has been refusing to accept India as a power. In particular, he has been eating bitter with India's actions on the disputed LAC. Despite all this, the mood of the challenges posed to India by China is far different than that of Pakistan. Even though the LAC is a dispute related to the world's longest land border, but despite this, this matter is not one of the main concerns of China. Manoj Joshi also underlines the same point. Historically, the "primary direction" of Chinese strategic policy, according to him, "moved from the northeast (USA) in the 1950s and 1960s to the north (Russia) in the 1970s and 1980s, and today the southeast (Taiwan and Taiwan). US naval forces). "The realistic view is that competition between India and China cannot be avoided. However, from India's point of view, what can be avoided is the extent to which the tension in bilateral relations with China can be avoided. Preventing that India may not get any further benefits from China's progress. It is possible to create temporary or temporary arrangements with China till long standing disputes are settled, so that the existing opportunities can be taken advantage of. From a short term perspective. This will be an important component of policies helpful for India's progress. It would be a wise move to adopt such a policy. With the help of the fast growing private sector in China, many doors of opportunities can be opened in India's trade and investment related economic areas. Simultaneously, these ties of cooperation can be expanded from regional and global administrative systems, such as the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, to areas related to climate change. Ending cooperative relations with China will prove to be more harmful for India. India this time One has to be careful that its policy towards China should not be like Pakistan's India policy, in which Pakistan refuses to work together even on issues of mutual interest.

If it is about China, Kautilya suggests adopting a multi-pronged policy in its case. Clearly this policy would have been clever, intelligent and wise. There would be no place for foolish bravery in it, and no place for submissiveness or suffocating tendencies. India's policy towards China would have been between these two extreme positions. One more thing... For economic and geo-political reasons, there is a strong possibility of a positive response from China in return for India's cooperative policies. In order to successfully challenge America's global status, "China must take the first step towards improving relations with India." "Despite the ongoing border dispute, China has once again become India's largest trading partner. Clearly this has again exposed the potential for mutual dependence on economic issues and positive outcomes for both. In such a situation, India should be careful that the tension in relations with China should not go out of control under any circumstances.

Flexible Response :

The threats and opportunities posed by the two biggest concerns of Indian foreign policy have differing moods . Despite this, the most important factor is to react by analyzing the pros and cons with immediate flexibility. For Kautilya, power is three-dimensional. The most important of these is Mantrashakti (power of persuasion and diplomacy). It is followed by Prabhashakti (power of treasury and army) and Uthashakti (power of courage or might). While military and economic power are important, the use of precise elements of foreign policy according to the context is critical to success. These ideas are reminiscent of the concept of ' hard ', ' soft ' and ' clever ' existence put forth by Joseph Nye . They have emphasized the development of clever strategies by making full use of the widest range of soft and hard forces . He has emphasized "contextual intelligence" i.e. "the ability to identify and investigate problems intuitively, which helps policy makers to devise clever strategies in line with the desired goals of their strategies".

India is apprehensive of a military threat from both Pakistan and China. So there is a need to deal with both in a proper way. Kautilya 's approach to the famous double principle is very important for a ruler . Under this it has been advised for a warring ruler with one of his neighbors to maintain a peaceful relationship with his other neighbor . With this, situations like war on two fronts can be avoided at the same time. This principle may not be fully applicable in the current conditions of India. It is in the mutual interest of both China and Pakistan that they work in mutual coordination to keep India engaged strategically and militarily. It would be wise for India to revise its policy towards these two neighbors and give it a new dimension. In the case of its relatively weaker neighbor Pakistan , India should prepare for a short - term and intense military confrontation , in order to aggressively check Pakistan 's mischief in the future . However, if it is about China, Kautilya suggests adopting a multi-pronged policy in its case. Clearly this policy would have been clever, intelligent and wise. There would be no place for foolish bravery in it , and no place for submissiveness or suffocating tendencies . India 's policy towards China would have been between these two extreme positions . Certainly Kautilya 's comprehensive or holistic approach would have included measures such as augmentation of military power along with increasing resources and capacity through reconciliation and strategic partnership . Having a conscious association with China does not mean that India should attend or become a hanger of China in any area, including the disputed borders. Everyone has seen that the People's Liberation Army (PLA) of China has increased its infiltration activities on the disputed border. However, the specialty of China is that it is the second largest economy in the world, so India must cooperate with China in those areas in which India is expected to benefit. However , such cooperation does not at all mean that India should soften its stand on the LAC . India's stand is that China should restore the situation before April 2020 in most of the disputed parts of the LAC and China itself should withdraw from there. However , this does not mean that India should be prepared to use the necessary diplomatic capital to restore relations with China to a level that is satisfactory to both sides , once conditions such as border conflicts improve . Even though Kautilya would have given China an "enemy" status, at the same time he would also recognize the benefits of strategically cooperating with India to serve India's interests.

India does not have any ideological conflict with China and there is no difference of any firm or fundamentalist thinking between the two countries . The relationship with Pakistan is not a very profitable deal for India economically. At the same time, China can benefit India a lot due to its economic, technical and scientific strength. Kautilya 's wise policies would have emphasized a cautious approach towards Pakistan . The argument is made to "open the doors of possibilities for South and Central Asia" and "move forward" to improve relations with Pakistan. For example, the success of behind-the-scenes talks with Pakistan, the biggest benefit that can come from their success is the restoration of normalcy in some areas of bilateral relations. These are the posting of ambassadors to each other and the restoration of relations on the playgrounds . The restoration of normal relations with Pakistan will not bring any significant economic benefit to India . The reality is that today the economy of Bangladesh has become much bigger than that of Pakistan. In such a situation, India is getting more economic benefits from relations with Bangladesh than with Pakistan. India's trade with Pakistan was only one percent of Indian trade with China in FY20. Even Equatorial Guinea had been a bigger trading partner of India than Pakistan. The prospects of a true meaning reconciliation between India and Pakistan are negligible . There is no indication that India will ever accept Pakistan as a relevant or credible role in future matters relating to Union Territories such as Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh . General Qamar Javed Bajwa has repeatedly reiterated that the issue of Kashmir is at the

heart of the dispute between the two neighboring countries. This clearly shows that the possibilities of large scale reconciliation between India and Pakistan are negligible. Therefore, the dream of establishing unity in South Asia for a long time is not likely to come true in the near future. From Kautilya's point of view, Pakistan appears as a "born enemy". According to this, Pakistan is India's "strategic adversary" and there is little hope of it getting ahead of this reality. This is not possible at all without bringing structural changes in the current government of Pakistan.

Conclusion :

From media reports in March 2021, relations between India and Pakistan were stressed on the prospects of melting of the frozen ice. However, even on general issues related to the import of cotton and sugar from India, Pakistan took a very relaxed and sometimes no - yes. This made it openly clear that the Pakistani rulers still see India through the prism of what they consider to be "strategic adversaries". Pakistan has declared that it is not willing to restore normal relations with India until Article 370 is withdrawn. It is clear that Pakistan is not paying attention to the immense possibilities it can get from relations with its neighboring country and is happy with its current situation. Of course, efforts to reduce tensions with Pakistan must continue. Initiatives to improve the situation, especially across the Line of Control, should continue. Despite this, the gist of this whole exercise is that Pakistan's status as a "born enemy" and a "strategic adversary" will not change significantly. In such a situation, India does not need to spend a lot of political capital to achieve the unsurpassed or inaccessible goal of reconciliation with Pakistan. On the other hand, China's status for India is that of a "strategic competitor". This indicates that even if the geo - political situation has created conditions for competition with China, there is a realistic possibility of cooperation with it. It is worth noting that India has no ideological conflict with China, nor is there any difference of firm or fundamentalist thinking between the two countries. The relationship with Pakistan is not a very profitable deal for India economically. At the same time, China can benefit India a lot due to its economic, technical and scientific strength. A successful state art requires a political approach. Along with this, it is also important to have a clear attitude about the risks and opportunities. There is no doubt that China is a bigger power than Pakistan. Therefore, the strategic threat posed by China to India is much greater than that of Pakistan. Because of these factors Kautilya would suggest in today's environment that India should neither initiate confrontation with China nor allow conflict situations to arise. However, India should understand that there are selective opportunities to work with China to strengthen itself. Even if there is a permanent solution to the issues with Pakistan in the future, it will still cost India the cost behind those efforts. Accordingly, the benefits will not be received. Even though India's Pakistan policy attracts more attention in domestic politics, but the reality is that India's China - policy is far more important. China - policy will prove helpful in achieving the goal of India's progress and yoga.