CHAPTER-4
MULTILATERAL SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

In international relations, the need of security arrangements for nation-states has always been of significant concern because of transforming and volatile nature of global politics. In this context, the well-known traditional approach for national security was originated with the formation of nation-states entity under Westphalian system. Since then, the nation-states mainly focused on conventional issues such as deterrence, self-defence, geographical contiguity, state sovereignty and military showcase to secure their national interest.¹

In the beginning of 20th century, the concept of the balance of power and collective security were frequently used by different nations to enhance their national power either in favour or against of the imperialism. In this way, these concepts were also used during the cold war period by the two superpowers to win a race of ideological warfare under the shadow of neo-imperialism. Moreover, in this complex environment, it was not sure that which military blocs provide secure environment and could work in favour of national interest of ally country. Besides, traditional security arrangements made it difficult for states to come-closer at regional and global levels.² Because of this complexity in security arrangements and competing national interests, many developing countries opted not to join any military group on bilateral and multilateral levels.

During the post-cold war era, concepts of security arrangement of nations underwent substantial change. Now, scope of security expanded beyond its traditional concern to include areas like global terrorism, piracy, drug trafficking, cyber security, disaster management, climate change etc.\(^3\) These multifaceted and non-traditional security threats compelled many countries to adopt cooperative security arrangements to fight for common security challenges around the world. As a result, new strategies in the form of regional security, comprehensive security, common security, common interest and human security have emerged to deal with such kind of threats. These strategies put more emphasis on dialogue, confidence building measures and interdependence among nations in the framework of their regional and global security arrangements.\(^4\) Although conventional threats from other state remain important, nevertheless, non-state actors and non-conventional security threats have become of greater concern for every country to attain their national security goal.\(^5\) This has required the need of security cooperation among states at various levels specially to address above concerns.\(^6\)

With the beginning of twenty-first century, the world essentially moved in the direction of multi-polar order due to post cold war structural changes and economic changes in the form of globalization. As a result, bilateral relations between the nations became more and more interdependent. Hence, concept of multilateralism got attention of the international community and become a keystone of international politics. In this changed scenario, India is no exception to this phenomenon. It
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also starts adopting multifaceted foreign policy and actively participated in the construction of multilateral security arrangements.\textsuperscript{7} In this context, India-USA relations got improved during the last two decades and both became strategic partners. It resulted in the form of improved ties not only in their bilateral engagements but also in trilateral, quadrilateral and multilateral levels beyond two countries. Besides, it led to evolution of new dimensions of regional security arrangements in their foreign policies. In this chapter, an effort has been made to examine the nature of mutual security arrangements between two countries and the likely impact of these regional engagements on their bilateral ties.

1. Regional Security Arrangements

Regional security environment always plays an important role in the foreign policy of every country in international relations. However, nations do engage in conflicts due to divergence in their respective national interests. After cold war era, Asia has emerged as a continent of nations with conflicting interests. In this context, Asia has been divided into regions of strategically, geographical, and economical significance. In some of these regions, India-USA cooperation is considered vital to uphold peace and security. Both are working collectively in several areas like Asia-Pacific, Indo-Pacific, IOR, South China Sea and South Asia on bilateral and multilateral levels to achieve these common regional security goals.

(i) Asia-Pacific- During the colonial times, Asia was sub-divided into East Asia, South-east Asia and South Asia and new boundaries were drawn to stabilize the spheres of influence. In the post-cold war period, Asia-Pacific region became strategically and economically important area
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for emerging and existing powers. The rise of Asia-Pacific nations, economically as well militarily, and in particular with the rapidly rise of India and China, propelled the US to shift its strategic focus from Europe to Asia. The term of Asia-Pacific region initially, was conceived in international politics during cold war period to embrace the geopolitical and geo-strategic interest of Asian and Pacific countries under single umbrella. To draw them closer to the US, Australia and Japan promoted the term ‘Asia Pacific’ in the 1970s and 1980s. In this context, it stimulated Pacific countries to involve in Asian affairs and also emphasizes on the engagement of Asian countries with Pacific region to legitimize latter’s extensive involvement.

On the other hand, America also needed a stable partner to encourage greater interaction across a broad range of issues and areas, such as commerce, energy, security and environment in Asia-Pacific region. Furthermore, India and the USA have had common understanding in several areas like deepening trade links, formation of new regional institutions, and increased attention to the threat of Islamic terrorism. Therefore, the US policy makers devoted more time and attention to improve ties with India.

Declaration of pivot of Asia policy by the USA as the future defence strategy in January 2012 to the Asia-Pacific, India was seen as
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essentially important nation because of its regional power status in the region. This strategic change was motivated by the need to respond to the increasing assertion of China’s military inventory and support to its allies in the region.\textsuperscript{12} As a result, the USA was keen to cultivate strong partner that can share similar strategic vision and have capacity to help to provide security and stability in Asia on a consistent basis. That is why; India represents a strategic bet for the USA to provide security in the Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{13}

A positive development into India’s relationship with the US, Japan, and Australia has been seen in subsequent years. At present, these countries are not only seeking to build up their relations with India on the issues like trade and investment, maritime security, defence engagement, science and technology and disaster management, but also advocating for a more proactive role of India in the Asia-Pacific region. In this context, America considers India as a ‘linchpin’ in its rebalancing policy towards the region. It is considered that strengthening relationship between the world’s largest and oldest democracy like India may help to promote regional peace and stability because both have common security challenges in the twenty-first century.\textsuperscript{14} Similarly, India has always prioritized its relations with Southeast Asian countries, as these states serve as a bridge connecting the Asia-Pacific region, with world economy. Strengthening of multilateral cooperation with Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) states may not only help India to
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promote its economic engagement with the world economy, but also facilitate to set up a secure maritime trade route.\textsuperscript{15} India’s decision to reorient its ‘Look East Policy’ into ‘Act East Policy’ is an indication of such improved economic and strategic relations with the Asian states in the Pacific Ocean.

Moreover, the strategic shift in India’s foreign policy is also a requirement of regional security environment. China’s maritime territorial dispute in the East and South China Sea is encouraging Asia-Pacific nations to engage with India strategically. In this vein, India has devoted considerable importance to strengthening of its relations with key East and Southeast Asian nations, with particular emphasis on Japan, Vietnam, Philippine, Australia and ASEAN.\textsuperscript{16} In recent time, a number of disputes have arisen among China and its neighbors such as Japan, Vietnam, Taiwan, and Philippine on the issue of maritime boundaries. It has created a sense of apprehension among its neighbors regarding their security. With growing Chinese economic and military power as well as its increasingly aggressive behavior vis-à-vis its neighbors; it is likely that the US would be improving closer cooperation with its Asian allies to successfully execute its rebalance strategy. Moreover, India has its own apprehension to see this region dominated by China which is a strategic competitor of India. Similarly, the US also requires a regional allies in Asia-Pacific region that can take more unified stand against China on the issue of the South China Sea where tensions have been created in the wake of Beijing’s building of seven man-made islands in the Spratly archipelago. Besides, several other countries such as Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, the Philippines and Taiwan also claim parts of the
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waterway. Both India’s Look East Policy and the US rebalance strategy have further built a common strategy for this region.

The goals of the American foreign policy also are to prevent the domination of any single power or coalition of powers in Asia-Pacific region. The US aims at this region to maintain a system of alliances to facilitate the projection of American control when needed; and to maintain the security of sea lanes of communication to facilitate the US commercial access and the free flow of trade in the region. American strategy can also be used to promote its values such as democratic governments or provision of humanitarian and disaster assistance.\(^{17}\)

The US strategic shift towards Asia-Pacific region desires to facilitate its strategic influence in the region and it is also aimed at securing regional security interests of its allies such as Japan, South Korea and ASEAN countries.\(^{18}\) In this context, the US is partnering with the Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia and Philippines and provides them additional assets for maritime security, counter-non-traditional threats and disaster relief operations. Besides this, the US is helping Singapore to develop regional information sharing hub.\(^{19}\) Moreover, the US maintains naval and airbase in this region to fulfill its commitment and to project its power in the region. In this context, the Pacific Command of


the US is situated in the region, which safeguards the interests of US and its allies in the region.\textsuperscript{20}

Besides, it is also considered by the US policy makers that China is the main competitor and likely to remain same in the coming decades because of many conflicting issues. If the US loses its strategic influence in Asia-Pacific region, then it is difficult for it to ensure the security of its allies such as Japan, South Korea and some nations in South East Asia region.\textsuperscript{21} Thus, the US, treats itself as non-resident Asian powers and wants to be counted in any Asian geopolitical arrangement. On the other hand, China treats US as extra regional power and wants to keep it away from Asia to realise its geopolitical ambition of emerging as undisputed power in Asia.\textsuperscript{22}

Beyond rising competition between the United States and China, other key geopolitical developments or potential conflict scenarios in Asia include renewed tensions between India and China, rivalry between China and Japan, increasing competition for energy resources, the North Korea nuclear programme and to moderate Muslim governments. In addition, existing challenges remain, such as ongoing tension between India and Pakistan and potential for military conflict on the Korean Peninsula or in the Taiwan Strait. An assessment of the US security interests in Asia-Pacific region must consider such challenges and shifts in the correlate of power in Asia.\textsuperscript{23}

In this complex security milieu, the US has begun to respond of these challenges in several ways. The US has sought to reinvigorate its bilateral alliances and security ties with regional states such as Japan, Australia, and Singapore; launched an ASEAN-US Enhanced Partnership
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Agreement; framing the military-to-military ties with Indonesia; and make the outline of the Trilateral Security Dialogue with Australia and Japan. There is an India-Japan-US trilateral and India-Japan-Australia-US quadrilateral partnership at multilateral level in Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{24} Presently, the US is keen to form actual multi-national security cooperation among the major democratic states of Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{25} On the other hand, India’s expanding economic ties, its increasing partnerships with key regional actors, and its capable navy is likely to have an important impact on the evolving regional order in the Asia-Pacific.\textsuperscript{26}

The wide range of conflicts in this geo-strategic region compels regional countries to engage with existing global power. In this way, India’s growing engage with the US is also a part of this strategy. On the other hand, the USA gave substance to this region because of their mutual strategic and economic interests. SO, both are trying to engage mutually with other regional countries to achieve their common foreign policy interests. The implications of defence and strategic cooperation between India and the US can be achieved through their multilateral level cooperation in this region. Thus, the US considered India as a strategic partner and mutual friend to fulfill its long term strategic goals.

(ii) Indo-Pacific- In the post-cold war period the term ‘Indo-Pacific Region’ has its own importance due to changed regional and global geo-strategic and geo-economic scenario.\textsuperscript{27} To focus on sea channel for commerce and security, the Indo-Pacific region is an alternative of late twentieth-century idea of South Asia and East Asia as separate strategic
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region. Geographically, it encompasses the North to Western Pacific Ocean region and the Western Indian Ocean region along with the Eastern coast of Africa.

Indo-Pacific has emerged as an important geo-strategic region for trade, energy supplies, investment, naval engagement, legal issues, sea lanes of communication, energy transport, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, as well as by non-traditional security threats such as terrorism, piracy, and weapons proliferation. Besides this, it has also became the most militarized region in the world with the world’s largest and most sophisticated navies, seven of the world’s ten largest standing armies, and five of the world’s declared nuclear weapon nations. Other Security challenges are the South China Sea, Korean Peninsula, Taiwan issue, border clashes, the Somali pirate threats etc that influence a large part of the region. Since, it compares and contrasts the roles and perspectives of the key maritime powers, stretches the need for multilateral cooperation to overcome the traditional and non-traditional challenges and security dilemma.

In this region, there is also a struggle for power between India and China. Both the countries look seaward and are likely to jostle for influence and advantage across the entire Indo-Pacific maritime theatre. Beijing is increasing its military modernization programme and seeks to enhance the blue water navy, which may give the facility to operate in second island chains that contains Japanese held Bonin Islands and the US held Northern Marianas, Guam, Palau and the Caro lines. In this regard China has been leading its attention toward the South China Sea
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and Indian Ocean, because of the vast majority of the nation’s oil must pass.\(^{31}\) There is also concern that the Indian Ocean Region becomes major military surge by China, turning it into a region of great power competition in Asia. China is rapidly expanding its relationship with Indian Ocean Rim countries. The attempt is identified as a ‘string of pearls’ strategy, to contain India in this region. In response to this containing strategy, India is improving its naval and security cooperation on multi-lateral levels with the South-East and East Asian countries, including Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Japan, Philippines, Vietnam etc.\(^{32}\)

On the other hand, India’s blue water ambitions are also encouraging it into the Western Pacific region. Both the countries view each other's military presence in the region with ambivalence. China is blaming the USA for encouraging nations like India, Japan, Vietnam and Philippines to engage in dangerous behaviour with her and for this the USA wants to construct the entire Indo-Pacific region on their own favour.\(^{33}\) China accused the US of seeking maritime hegemony in the name of freedom of navigation after a US Navy destroyer interned into 12 nautical miles of a disputed island in the Paracels chain of the South China Sea in late January 2016. In this region, neither the US nor India has claims to the South China Sea, but both the countries keen to freedom of navigation and over flight in the waterway.\(^{34}\) China is concerned about the engagement in this region and considered it is a plan of the US to strengthen its influence in the area with the help of its regional allies against China. Thus, the newly constructed region got significance not
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only in the discourse of international relations, but also got prominence for policy makers of global and rising powers along with states of this region.\footnote{Yadav, n.27, p.4.}

In this regard, India is not an ally of any country or military block. It maintains good relations with all global powers. On the regional level, it has its own set of friends such as Japan, Vietnam, South Korea and Taiwan which have also good relations with the US during this time. India also supports freedom of navigation in the international waters and emphasizes that all controversial issues must be settled in accordance with international law.\footnote{P.K. Gautam, “Military Dimensions of US Pivot and Its Implications”, in Muni, n.8, p.75} India has its own geo-strategic significance and compulsion to grow a meaningful engagement with the Pacific countries. In the Indo-Pacific region India tries to develop multi-directional relationship with the regional and extra-regional powers to secure its national interests. It also recognises the centrality of ASEAN in the Indo-Pacific region and wish to play a key role in shaping the economic and security architectures with this region. The proponents of the concept among the Indian policy makers support India's position in Indo-Pacific by stating that it preserves the geo-strategic autonomy. It is believed that the Indo-Pacific construct seeks to establish inclusive and open security architecture. This helps India to create a network of cooperative relations with all the regional players on the basis of their mutual interests and benefits.\footnote{Upadhyay, n.30, p.3.} For this, India is keen to extend its relations with north-eastern region with South-East Asia by increasing security cooperation, trade connectivity, cultural and people-to-people contact and capacity building.

As the world’s oldest and largest democracies, respectively, with similar values and goals, there is substantial common interest between
India and the US in the region. The US sees India as an economic and security anchor in the Indo-Pacific region, and has drawn attention towards the latter to ‘Look East’, ‘Engage East’ and ‘Act East’. Indeed, the US perceives strong connection between its Pivot strategy and India’s Look East policy, and has been urging to develop mutual India-US security interests in the Indo-Pacific region. In all recent high-level visits to India, US political functionaries have mentioned India’s Look East policy and envisioned a security role for India in the broader Indo-Pacific context.\(^38\) Both countries are making the efforts to create Indo-Pacific region as a zone of their own control and then the zone may work to enhance their influence in Asia-Pacific region. The two countries have launched creative diplomatic efforts to build understanding and enhance coordination across the Indo-Pacific region because of fast gaining prominence on the global map.\(^39\)

The US ‘rebalance strategy’ focuses in Asia is aimed at to preserve its influence in the Indo-Pacific region. As a result, it is making effort to build good relations with allies’ countries in the region which give shape to a regional strategic architecture in order to manage the Indo-Pacific on their own part. During her trip to Honolulu in October 2010, the then US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton used the term ‘Indo-Pacific’ to explain a newly emerged and integrated theatre. Later, during his visit to Australia in November 2011, Obama also talked regarding Indo-Pacific and he referred it as a new opportunity to train with other allies and partners, from the Indian Ocean to the Pacific.\(^40\) From Indian side the then Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, used this concept for the first time during India-ASEAN summit in 2012 and afterward the term became a
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significant subject matter of conversation among intellectuals and foreign policy makers.\textsuperscript{41} Thus, there is a common approach of India and America on the issue of Indo-Pacific, not only into global trade and commerce but also as regional security arrangement.

To strengthen its defence relations, the US is also trying to engaging Asian states economically. As a result, it is launching multilateral partnerships with countries of South East Asia and South Asia in areas of food security, agriculture, education, connectivity, environment and energy security. Moves like Indo-Pacific Economic corridor and Lower Mekong initiative permit US to show its presence in areas where historically it had been underrepresented. It is also working on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) that seeks to bring together economies from across the Pacific-developed and developing alike-into a single trading community. Given the nautical nature of the Indo-Pacific theatre, the US navy is expected to play a major role in the region.\textsuperscript{42}

The USA also desires to have a multilateral security arrangement on the web of understandings, engagements and alliances in this region. It is also working toward strengthening its traditional relations with Australia and Japan and is aiming new security relations with India. It is working towards joint defence production and development with Japan and India and securing bases and increasing rotational presence with Australia, Singapore and Indonesia to enhance its presence in the wider Indo-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{43}

The American rebalance strategy towards the Indo-Pacific region is most important foreign policy achievement of the Obama administration. It is a widespread strategy which aims to promote and
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protect the US national interests in the region by accelerating its diplomatic and economic engagements with its traditional allies and emerging partners, namely, Indonesia, Vietnam and India. The Indo-Pacific region also has military, strategic and ideological dimensions for India at regional level and its implications for US interests in global context.\(^{44}\) Therefore, as the geo-strategic importance of “the region has rapidly increased; the US has redefined its broader foreign policy engagement with the region. It strongly believes that its foreign policy interests would be best served by moving from an earlier emphasis on just the ‘Asia Pacific region’ to one based on a broader ‘Indo-Pacific region.’”\(^{45}\)

In the given context, it is possible that the Indo-Pacific region might appear as zone of race of power competition in the next decade and afterward. In such environment, where China is apprehensive about India’s rise and the US containment, India is also apprehensive of China’s containment policy and simultaneously US is also concerned with Chinese dominance, there is the possibility for many friction areas to develop into potential areas of conflict.\(^{46}\) In essence, the Indo-Pacific envisages new frameworks that feature competitive and convergence security interests which are evident in the light of global power shift to the region. Importantly, the maritime powers, such as Australia, China, Japan, India and the US, determine the pivot of the Indo-Pacific region as
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they seek to dominate and influence each other to achieve their national goals.\textsuperscript{47}

Thus US policymakers are engaging India in Indo-pacific region to fulfill its interests. On the other hand, India welcomes the concept because it wants to construct such as geo-strategic region which give its more weightage than its revelry countries like Pakistan and China. With this, India can connect with all regional player conceptually and geographically.

Therefore, India is direct stakeholder rather than only being an alliance partner of the US.\textsuperscript{48} Thus region is providing a favorable environment for both India and US to secure their mutual interests. Both have common security thread on the issue of freedom of navigation in international waters. For this, they are also collaborating in joint defence dialogues and meeting bilaterally and multilaterally in this region. Besides, India and the US are engaging in the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean to fulfill maritime security goals which is possible when the two countries create more balanced security architecture in the region. In changed security environment, it is essential for India to take help from its strategic partner.

(iii) South Asia- South Asian region represents one of the largest geopolitical and geo-social formations in the world. Its geographical linkage with Western countries, on the one hand, and Central Asia, China, and South-East Asia, on the other, makes it the zone of strategic importance for whole world. It includes Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, Maldives and Sri Lanka as regional countries which make
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this region a complex security zone.\textsuperscript{49} Considerably, most of them shared land and maritime boundary with India and not with each other. Bhutan and Nepal are not only landlocked but also India-locked countries. Bangladesh is also India-locked country but it has its own maritime boundary.\textsuperscript{50} Maldives is the smallest Asian country in both land area and in population and its economy is dominated by fishing and tourism like Sri Lanka.

With the end of Second World War and the origin of new sovereign states, South Asia got unstable political and security environment. Therefore, regional countries tried to protect their national interest by opting different strategic stances. Most of them applied the traditional security approach by following arms race to counter security risk.\textsuperscript{51} On the other hand, with the beginning of the cold war, the USA pursued a global policy of containment against communism. It got connected to South Asia when Pakistan participated in the Middle East Treaty Organisation (METO) or Baghdad Pact, later Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO) during the decade of 1950s.\textsuperscript{52}

During cold war period, the USA’s view about India was very pessimistic. India’s closed and weak economy did not attract the former for their economic interests. Strategically, India’s non-aligned policy


\textsuperscript{50} Iram Khalid, “Re-Energizing India US Relations” \textit{South Asian Studies}, vol. 26, no.1, January-June 2011, pp. 53

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Ibid.}, p.54.

\textsuperscript{52} Lloyd I Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, “The Making of US Foreign Policy for South Asia: Offshore Balancing in Historical Perspective”, \textit{Economic and Political Weekly}, 2006, p 703.
created differences between the two countries. As a result, India took a leading role in organizing the non-aligned movement. On the other hand, during President Eisenhower’s administrations, the then US secretary of state, John Foster Dulles declared that ‘if a country isn’t with us, it is against us’. This was a warning to non-aligned countries and being a non-aligned country India did not go with the USA because of their divergent point of views on contemporary global political issue issues. Therefore, US often ignored India and gave support to Pakistan during the cold-war period. Hence, India faced difficulty to manage its regional security arrangement in South Asia. During this period the USA gave a clear priority to Pakistan by providing a total of $3.8 billion in military aid to the latter. Though it was extended to Pakistan for the containment of communism in South Asia, yet actually it was used against India. Thus, US support to Pakistan destabilised the region badly.

With the end of cold war era, the USA tried to improve good relationship with India. Simultaneously, the USA made effort to ensure that Pakistan did not figure heavily in its interest. However, during cold war period, the US had stronger and significant relations with Pakistan. But with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan meant the end of huge amounts of US military assistance towards Pakistan. Since then Pakistan’s importance as a frontline state shrieked in America strategic vision. During President Clinton’s second term, the then US deputy secretary of state Strobe Talbott made it clear that the US diplomacy with India during the Clinton years was deliberately coordinated by knowledgeable professionals. He explained that it was an extraordinary
collegial process, and it helped keep to a minimum the personal backbiting, bureaucratic warfare, and mischievous leaks that too often accompany policy making.\(^{56}\)

Another arena of change has been visioned in America’s relations with South Asian states since the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. After the incident, the US President Bush’s called for a ‘war on terrorism’. Once again, the US was tilting towards Pakistan in the South Asian region by providing it military and economic aid. Again, Pakistan became the vehicle for the USA to engage in ‘war on terrorism’ in the South Asia. But, there was a qualitative difference at this time; the USA was trying to collaborate with India as well as Pakistan on a common ground.\(^{57}\) In this regard, the USA perceived that a war between India and Pakistan may disrupt its campaign against terror. Its war on terror can only be saved by avoiding the outbreak of a regional conflict. So it initiated a genuine effort to defuse the situation.\(^{58}\)

However, new amicable era in Indo-US relations begin with President Clinton’s very successful visit to India in March 2000. During his visit to South Asia, he spent five days in India and five hours in Pakistan. His visit to India was widely acclaimed and much celebrated, but his visit to Pakistan was tensed and censorious.\(^{59}\)

During this time, South Asia emerged as one of the core areas for US foreign policy interest. Besides, global security environment has undergone radical changes, having a major impact on South Asia’s security environment. The center of power in the world has been shifting...
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from the West to Asia. Several new powers are arising with new challenges, which are different from the challenges faced during the old world order. In Asia, India and China are rising rapidly, especially latter become world’s largest economy and military power, which has left Japan behind and is likely to overtake American economy in next few decades.\textsuperscript{60} Being the dominant actor in the region, India is also considered a promising power and ‘indispensable partner’ of the United States.\textsuperscript{61} In terms of economic prosperity and political stability as an epicenter of South Asia, India can play a pivotal role through building bridges across the region, which is likely not only to benefit the region’s economy but also for enhancing its “benign power” image. Building such an image requires soft power skills. In this context, India is an appropriate power as it shares strong cultural, religious, historical, and ethnic linkages with many countries in the region.\textsuperscript{62}

Dominance of India’s power both in terms of size and resources, characterizes the political and security milieu of South Asia. India has more than 63% of total area, accounts for 75% population of the region, 78% of its GDP which make it largest territorial country in South Asia. India’s stability and well-being are important for peace and growth of neighborhood countries. Pakistan is another main state in this region, which is a nuclear power and has economic potential.\textsuperscript{63} It is the sixth largest country in the world in terms of population, which makes it a potentially large market for American investment and products. Once the regional South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA) is realized, this potential
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is only going to be much greater as a region, and US-India economic ties are bound to play a major role in that.\textsuperscript{64}

Although, the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) has made several attempts to create common consideration on counter-terrorism, yet time and again its efforts have become hostage due to India and Pakistan conflicting relations. But since the beginning of 'War on Terror' by the U.S. in Afghanistan, the region has developed into a breeding ground of global terrorism. It can be stated that the emergence of terrorism as a destabilizing aspect has put in danger the whole quest for peace and progress. Thus, the danger of terrorism is likely to remain an important threat to the US interests in the region and also to the South Asian states. In this context, the US has a long term strategic interests in the region regarding the threats posed by terrorist organisations.\textsuperscript{65}

Additionally, issue of nuclear non-proliferation has been an important factor in the US foreign policy towards South Asia. In this region, the main concern has been that India and Pakistan are nuclear weapon states and both have pungent relationship. The U.S. considers the current arms race between India and Pakistan very dangerous as there is every possibility that it can end up in the nuclear confrontation between these two South Asian rivals. In a statement on 12 November 1998, the then US Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbot concerned mainly to stop the nuclear and missile race in the region; making the global non-proliferation regime stronger; and encouraging the good relations between India and Pakistan with the solution of Kashmir issue.\textsuperscript{66}

Moreover, the emergence of new transnational challenges such as terrorism, economic migration, environmental degradation and organised
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crime have ushered national governments to think regionally. In order to address these non-traditional security challenges India need to actively engage with its neighbors at multiple levels. A regional approach based on mutual consensus may provide the most feasible solution among these countries. Such approach can be applied in foreign policy strategy with less focus on military might and more emphasis on developmental efforts.67

India is the largest country in South Asia, much bigger than its other South Asian neighbors. India shares a common cultural and security space with the countries of South Asian region. India’s neighbors occupy much of its attention in its overall foreign policy dilemmas. Except Bhutan and Maldives, India is facing major security challenges at regional level and most of them are related with its neighbors. Some challenges are traditional in nature while other are non-traditional such as cross-border terrorism, piracy, ethnic group, naxalite hostility, illegal migration, drugs-truckling, environmental issues etc which are also prominent to manage region security arrangement. As a prominent Asian country with critical national interests in South Asia, India has special accountability to ensure peace and stability in the region. India can work to achieve these goals by cooperating with other countries in the region.68

In South Asian region, India and Afghanistan have traditionally been good friends, due to their common rivalry with Pakistan. Afghanistan was the only country who cast its vote against Pakistan’s accession to the United Nations Organization (UNO) and has still not accepted the Durand Line as an international boundary. Pakistan had been using the conflict with India to legitimize its intervention in
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Afghanistan and its support for the Taliban since the 1990s. Therefore, the Afghan civil war in the 1990s was also a proxy war between Pakistan and India, in which India with other countries supported the Northern Alliance against the Taliban. After the UN intervention in 2001, India became the leading non-Western donor in Afghanistan and has invested more than US$1 billion since then. Pakistan is regarded responsible for nearly all the problems in Afghanistan, whereas India enjoys very good relations with it. 69

The beginning of twenty-first century saw major transformation in US policy toward South Asia and it gave more weightage to this region than other region. In this regard, the US rearranged its strategic relations with Pakistan being a frontline state of Afghanistan in its war against terrorism. This transformation in the US strategy has also been influenced due to developments in China, maritime trade, and increasing investment in Indian market. 70 Thus, in this region, India and the US have been working together in the direction of counter-terrorism, encouraging democratic values, maritime arrangements and issues of non-traditional threats.

Thus, in South Asia, Pakistan remained the friend of need but India was chosen as the permanent ally by the US to fulfill its long term objectives. President Obama’s visit to New Delhi in 2015 was also an effort to show priority of India in the region. 71 India’s emergence as an economic power is also the focus of US attention. During this visit, emphasis on economic sector has mainly been in bilateral relations. US also realised the importance of Pakistan in the stability of region
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especially in the developments of Afghanistan. That is why; US gave special importance to its relations with India.\textsuperscript{72}

Consequently, USA stopped treating India and Pakistan on largely equitable terms, rather India got paramount role at regional level.\textsuperscript{73} Therefore it has been rightly observed that regional areas like Asia-Pacific, Indo-Pacific, South Asia, and IOR are of mutual economic and strategic importance for both India and the US in post-cold war era. Whereas, India’s foreign policy makers look for regional security requirement, while the US is engaged due to its long term global interests. Moreover, due to divergence and contradictory strategic relations, both are making efforts to contain China to be a dominant power in the region. India have unresolved boarder disputes with both China and Pakistan, which brought it closer to the USA as strategic partners in post-cold war era. Besides, US allies like Japan, Australia, South Korea and ASEAN countries also in favour of containment of China because of their security implications.

2. Global Cooperation in Non-Traditional Threats (NTTs)

The global security scenario qualitatively transformed with the end of cold war. Now, ideological contest among powers also disappeared. Probability of inter-state conflict, conventional fights or a great war likes the Second World Wars are also ruled out. However, some historical disputes among nations continuously remained security challenges for particular states. These disputes sometimes became so serious that they acquired global concern.\textsuperscript{74} Besides, revolution in the field of technology has converted security into a more lethal menace. Moreover, process of globalization and revolution in information and technology has expended
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the scope of conventional security threats at global level. Many such threats have acquired the capacity to become global menace for humanity. Hence, a meaningful cooperation is needed to deal with global threats like terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, cyber threat, natural disaster, intelligence sharing, climate change and outer space. These emerging global security challenges call for much greater cooperation amongst nation states, Such collaborations, are essential not only because of the prohibitive direct and indirect costs of modern threats, but also because many challenges are transnational nature and no single country can tackle them alone.\textsuperscript{75}

In the post-cold war transformed global situation, India revised its foreign policy and readjusted its diplomatic relations with major powers, including the USA, which has become the only dominant power in the world. On the other hand, the USA also reorganised India as strategic partner with increasing common interests.\textsuperscript{76} Both countries felt common security threats from above non-traditional and non-conventional global challenges and came closer for peace and prosperity of present world order.

\textbf{(i) Cooperation in Counter-Terrorism-} Ironically, the present world order lacks central global mechanism for prevention or collective response against terrorism. Landscape for counter terrorism activity also lacks consistency. In present time, terrorism has become transnational, multi-layered, well institutionalized, and have bases on regional or religion frameworks.\textsuperscript{77} Specifically, some groups with distinct political ideology and religious beliefs have preferred the pathway of violence and
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terror to attain their goals and had grown gradually in its character and actions.\textsuperscript{78} World witnesses increase of such terror activity, that either directly or indirectly, has influenced almost all the countries throughout the world.\textsuperscript{79}

During the last decade of the twentieth century, rise of \textit{Al-Qaeda} become a major security concern for almost all the countries in the world including India and the United States and has brought a transformation in existing global security scenario. The bombings of US Embassies in Nairobi and Dar-e-Salam waked up the former and its allies to identify the phantom of terrorism in all the democratic, liberal and secular polities. Besides, terrorist activities in India are also linked with the global terror network of \textit{Al-Qaeda} gave opportunity for it and the US to join hands together to cope up with this challenge.\textsuperscript{80}

Initially, incompatible international environment during cold war kept both the countries on reverse side. On numerous issues both countries have had different opinion and became critic of each other’s interest. For instance, during 1971 Indo-Pak war, the USA’s open support to Pakistan hampered India-US relations badly.\textsuperscript{81} But now USA and its strategic friends have had common observation on the issue of cross-border terrorism that Pakistan is instrumental in inducing terrorist activities in India. The rise of \textit{Al-Qaeda} brought a transformation in the existing global security scenario. India condemned bombings of US Embassies in Nairobi and Dar-e-Salam by the terrorists and felt the need for closer cooperation. As a result, both signed a bilateral agreement in

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., p.152.
1997 for the extradition of escapee criminal to combat the problems of narcotics trafficking and terrorism. Gradually, both moved ahead on the issue of counter-terrorism.\textsuperscript{82} As a result, a subtle shift can be noticed in the behavior of two countries and they reevaluate their counter-terror strategy. In overall global strategic and security vision of the US for combating terrorism, India gradually became a prominent figure.\textsuperscript{83}

Though after Pokhran-II, the USA imposed several economic sanctions on India, yet kept the pace of dialogue unaffected. For example, diplomats of the two countries met in September 1999 and discussed the issues of Jammu and Kashmir and Afghanistan. In January 2000, the two sides agreed to form a Joint Working Group (JWG) on counter-terrorism.\textsuperscript{84} Consequently, the first JWG meeting was held on 7-8 February 2000 in Washingtonon DC, where both sides condemned all methods, acts, and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, in spite of any ideological, political, philosophical, racial, ethnic, religious or any other basis.\textsuperscript{85} Subsequently, inter-agency teams from the two countries agreed on a range of measures to increase support to fight against international terrorism. In addition, both countries also agreed to share experience, actions, exchange information, and coordinate approaches.\textsuperscript{86} It has been noticed that, India has been a victim of cross border terrorism for several decades and expected its active role in US war against terrorism. In contrary to some positive development, the US took a more casual approach towards India’s concern on issue of state-sponsored and cross-border terrorism.
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Beginning of the twenty-first century, however, witnessed an event of terrorism that transformed the world vision against the terrorist groups. The terrorist attack on the New York based World Trade Centre and the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia on 11 September 2001 also known as 9/11, claiming about 3,000 lives, warranted the need for redefining not only American national security but international security as well. Although, the scourge of terrorism had been faced world for decades, yet these attacks, perplexed policy makers of almost every country. The terrorists involved in these attacks reportedly belonged to Al-Qaida; a radical Islamist outfits led by Osama bin Laden, and operated from Taliban-ruled Afghanistan. Smitten by these sudden terrorist attacks, the United States resolved to launch a worldwide campaign to combat terrorism. The manner, audacity, targets, and impact of the attacks engineered by Al-Qaeda was so prominent that it compelled the US and all leading powers of the world to rethink their strategy. As a result, the UN Security Council passed a resolution 1368 and condemned terrorism as a global threat in all its form. India’s swift offer of full support for the US led combat-terrorism operations after the 9/11 was widely observed as reflects of such change.

Another post 9/11 development has been the initiative to expand India-US Defence Policy Group (DPG) during the Clinton administration. This initiative enlarged military-to-military cooperation between the two countries in their fight against global terrorism. Subsequently, a joint statement issued in December 2001, at the end of
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the third meeting of the DPG held in New Delhi, observed that a strengthened bilateral relationship may assist both countries to counter threats such as the spread of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, narcotic trafficking and piracy. India and the US, thus, agreed to combat-terrorism to expand their defence cooperation and mutual support on this issue.

Thus, India started collaborating with the USA on non-traditional security threats including combating piracy and fighting terrorism. However common essential understanding and common political beliefs were missing between the two countries. Thus it failed to form a collective security arrangement against terrorism. But with the beginning of twenty first century, both countries have shown considerable improvement in bilateral cooperation against terrorism. After 9/11 Regional Defence Counter-Terrorism Fellowship Programme was set up in 2002. The programme was aimed at to provide tailored education and training to combat-terrorism capabilities by the civilian agencies and militaries to response against terrorism. In 2004 and 2005, respectively, 10 Indian officers were sent to the United States for training and two mobile training teams came to India to impart training under this programme.

On the 18 July 2005, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President George W. Bush issued a Joint statement in which they underlined that terrorism to be combat relentlessly through “vigorous counterterrorism cooperation.” The India-US defence pact of 28 June
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2005 called for strengthening the capabilities of militaries to promote security and defeat terrorism. Both states shared a common concern about terrorist attacks against their homeland or overseas. Such Cooperation between the two became evident during 26 November 2008 Mumbai attacks, which was characterised by frequent exchange of visits and intelligence sharing between them. On the issue of terrorism, ‘the US-India Counterterrorism Cooperation Initiative (CCI)’ was signed on 23 July 2010 to promote their coast guards and navies, exchanges on maritime security and work together to address maritime threats like piracy and terrorism. During President Obama’s visit to India both “Prime Minister Singh and President Obama in their joint statement signed in New Delhi on 8 November 2010, condemned terrorism in all its forms and agreed that all terrorist networks, including Lashkar-e-Taiba, must be defeated. The two leaders also demonstrated determination to begin a homeland security channel of communication for further enhancement of cooperation on combating the terrorism. As a result, during last decade both India and the US have increasingly covered long distance in their relations which is reflected through three expanding cooperation on counterterrorism.

White House National Security Strategy has also recognised Afghanistan and Pakistan as the focal point of practice and training by Al-Qaeda. For instance, on 16 December 2014, Taliban killed 132 children in Peshawar region of Pakistan. By doing so Taliban projected itself in the sense that there is no limit of use of violence against humanity. These evidences suggest that terrorists use weapons to such an
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extent that they have posed danger to the stability and security of civil society.\textsuperscript{101} It questioned not only about deaths and loss of properties, but also about a slow but sure erosion of authority of a state.

In this context, India-US bilateral cooperation is not enough. Multi-lateral collaboration among nations and their collective approach on international terrorism may provide long term arrangement of security. In this respect, over the past decade, the international community has developed instruments and created new initiatives to address the threat of terrorist attacks.\textsuperscript{102} Specifically, within the UNO alone there are more than thirty agencies conducting significant work on the issue of international terrorism. Moreover, sixteen departments and agencies of United States are devoted to deal with the issues of global terrorism. At present, there are eleven multi-lateral conventions aimed at state’s responsibility in combating terrorism. In most of these conventions, India and the United States have been prominent members. Besides such engagements, however, absence of proper coordination and rivalry among constituent nations continue to hamper the counterterrorism efforts.\textsuperscript{103} These are in fact, the major drawbacks to the tactics like intelligence gathering, security measures and use of collective force to counter terrorism. Therefore, gaining global support at multi-lateral level to counter-terrorism is an indispensable objective for India and the US. For most countries, this may be the main answer to the question, “how to fight against global terrorism”?\textsuperscript{104}

(ii) Cyber Security- The internet, which began as a small network, primarily to operate the scientific community has shown a surprising
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growth into a worldwide network where at present it has over 2.5 billion users. Increasingly, the expansion of the internet has facilitated to generate the cyber economy, financial transactions, sharing and storing of information and the emergence of new forms of communication such as email and social media via an automated regulation by key control systems.\textsuperscript{105}

Generally, threats in this cyber world come from multilateral sources such as criminal networks or syndicates, state actors, politically motivated ‘hacktivists’, and/or terrorists.\textsuperscript{106} These threats can be seen in several different forms such as ‘phishing’ scams that tempt people reveal confidential information, terrorist recruitment, espionage and cyber warfare or cyber terrorist attacks attempted to degrade widespread systems, weakening critical infrastructure like power and water and to weaken economy and destabilize national security.\textsuperscript{107}

For example, in 1998 some 3000 Chinese hackers made an organized attack on Indonesian government sites to protest anti-Chinese riots in the country. The attacks were mainly attempted on computer networks belonging to banks, media and defence ministries and other government institutions. Most of these cyber incursions are motivated to spy or steal sensitive information and are categorized as ‘computer network exploitation (CNE)’.\textsuperscript{108}

Often, these activities are carried out by government-sponsored hackers. Besides, private criminals interested in private gain are the other major challenge to Internet security. In this context, it has been projected
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that resources should be utilized in developing a comprehensive treaty on
cyber security that de-militarizes cyberspace and emphasizes law
enforcement cooperation. Besides, improved international governance,
especially, through the International Telecommunications Union,
ensuring good computer and network defence and keep internet open and
available for peaceful communication and commerce should be other
objectives.\(^{109}\)

Presently, India and the USA need to cooperate on Cyber security
arrangement and should consider it as area of prime importance for
number of reasons. The two countries have a common democratic setup
which can act as a tool for common vision, shared values and universal
principles. These shared values, then, can be utilized to enhance
and work on cyber security threats.\(^ {110}\) Moreover, it is also necessary since
both countries have faced cyber threats from state-sponsored and also
from non-state actors. In this regard, certain structural complementarities
between the two countries, particularly, large number of users in the
services sector can provide incentive for India and the US to cooperate in
this sector. And, possibly, such cooperation on cyber security can act as
key element of the multilateral relationship of India and the US.\(^ {111}\)

In fact, there has been some advancement, in this regard between
the two countries. For example, the first US-India Cyber Security Forum
Initiative (CSFI) was established on July 2001 and its first meeting was
held in New Delhi in April 2002. The meeting comprised government
agencies and the private sector, and discussed collaboration on certain
key areas focused on cyber security, cyber forensics, technological
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research and law enforcement.\textsuperscript{112} Additionally, other issues of critical network information systems, particularly, involved in knowledge management software development and outsourced business processing, were also addressed through inter-governmental cooperation between India and the US.\textsuperscript{113} The fact that India grew as the most important outsourcing hub of US companies, so both countries were equally concerned to secure their network systems. Initially, private sector played a predominant role in this regard.\textsuperscript{114}

In November 2004, the second meeting of the CSFI was held in Washington, D.C. in which five joint working groups were established by higher officials from the US Department of State and the National Security Council Secretariat of India, dealing with issues of legal cooperation; critical information infrastructure and emergency response; defense cooperation; and standards and software assurance.\textsuperscript{115} The JWGs were also directed to exchange expertise in organizational, technical and procedural levels to identify areas for collaboration such as combating cyber-crime, improve cyber security research and development, and regarding information incident management and response.\textsuperscript{116}

The third meeting of the CSFI was held in 2006, in which two other important areas of cooperation such as financial sectors systems and transportation were discussed to enhance the scope of this forum.\textsuperscript{117} Besides, the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) collaborated with its
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US counterpart to set up the India Information Sharing and Analysis Centre, similar to the Information Sharing and Analysis Centre set up three years earlier in the United States under a Presidential Directive.\textsuperscript{118}

Major development on the issue of cyber security between India and the US came after the Mumbai terror attacks of 26 November 2008. Delegates from both countries convened the U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue in Washington, D.C. during 5-9 December.\textsuperscript{119} Both the countries conducted roundtable dialogues on various approaches to cyber security including security arrangement and put focus on the crucial infrastructure of internet and communication technology throughout world.\textsuperscript{120}

In May 2011, with the objectives to enhance security cooperation, the then Home Minister of India P. Chidambaram and U.S. Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano launched the India-U.S. Homeland Security Dialogue, in New Delhi which was pronounced by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President Barack Obama during the visit of Obama to India in November 2010 as part of the global strategic partnership of both the states.\textsuperscript{121} It was emphasized on to strengthen agency-to-agency engagement in the areas of information sharing, intelligence exchange, forensics and investigation, access and sharing of data relating to global terrorism and security of infrastructure, among others. Both the delegates agreed that the two sides would designate points of contact and establish protocols for cyber security
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arrangement. It was the first comprehensive strategic dialogue on homeland security issues between them.

Second US-India Homeland Security Dialogue was concluded between the then Union Home Minister Sushil Kumar Shinde and his counterpart Janet Napolitano in Washington, D.C. in May 2013. These arrangements improved capacity of Indian delegate by learning from their US counterparts in the areas of cyber security, critical infrastructure protection, and combat-terrorism intelligence. Training of Indian officers took place at Federal Law Enforcement Training Centre. The main area of training included best practices in cyber security and cyber forensics, advance course in technical surveillance, counter measures, control systems security programme for end-to-end network and systems security for servers, switches, routers, transmission and all information and communication technology hubs and facilities which gave experience to the officers of both the countries. Cyberspace can be better served if the two countries utilized their leadership position in the information technology domain to collaborate on a range of initiatives from cyberspace treaties to coordinating and funding joint private sector efforts and academic research into preserving the open and global nature of cyberspace.

Meaningful cooperation in cyber security is possible only if both countries are on the same page both in their understanding and their responses to the problems in cyberspace. In this regard a joint statement released by the two countries during the President Obama’s visit to India in January 2015 categorically, emphasized to increase their
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collaboration on issue of cyber security capacity-building, combating cybercrime, cyber security research and development, global security arrangement and in internet governance.

India-US Cyber Security Forum, thus, has proved an important platform to get all the different stakeholders in government and the private sector together. This dialogue mechanism between students, non-governmental organizations and other concerned parties which have the true spirit of cyberspace technology need to be encouraged further.\(^{126}\)

Besides, there is a need to develop capacity, build trust and better mutual interests in the field of cyber security between New Delhi and Washington. Joint discussion on a science of cyber security may develop diplomatic mechanism to achieve that goal. In twenty-first century, India and the US have the label of strategic friend and natural ally.\(^{127}\) To justify this and for common shared development and for the development of world, India and USA should improve current cyber security negotiations and move towards a substantive dialogue that targets the cause of security problems.

(iii) **Disaster Management and Humanitarian Relief**- In present world, there is substantial concern about the problem of natural disasters. Despite considerable scientific and technological progress had occurred,\(^{128}\) prediction and prevention about disasters have not been accurate. Hence, need is for multi-lateral, collective, immediate and efficient response, system to utilize technological tools against the disaster and it’s after effects.\(^{129}\) Moreover, to support the civil administration in such situations support of military is imperative, since
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the latter is organised, equipped and well-structured institution of any nation so can react efficiently and effectively. Therefore, military collaboration among nations, thus, is an indispensable for any disaster management and humanitarian assistance. Such engagements at the regional and global levels can not only save lives and property damage but also accelerate the recovery.

Besides, natural disasters have frequently experienced by human beings and the quest to overcome has been tingling factor in their consciousness. Consequently, it has compelled countries to come closer for the relief of mankind. In this regard, with respect to India-USA corroborations, beginning of twenty-first century brought them closer. As a result, cooperation between armed forces of these states in this regard became evident during disaster response of the December 2004 Tsunami. It was for the first time that Indian and US forces coordinated humanitarian work on multilateral level in the Indian Ocean region. About 40,000 military personnel from more than a dozen countries participated in aid operations in the region of Indian Ocean.

In this context, US military has the largest attendance in the area along with crucial assets like helicopters, hospital ships, support ships and organisational skills. In addition, India is also the prominent naval power in this region followed by other naval forces like Bangladesh, Australia, France, UK, Japan, and Pakistan but on a much smaller scale. Therefore, US forces were able to demonstrate its global assertion and send off men and material in support of Tsunami relief operations. To name them, the Abraham Lincoln Carrier Strike Group and two other
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navy vessels were deployed off Aceh and their helicopters transported food and relief materials to inaccessible areas, villages and creeks as also ferry the injured to hospitals. On the other hand, India successfully managed its own Tsunami crises. India was quick in response and negated any serious consequences. This preparedness reflected about its self-assurance and command over disaster management. In addition, extending its help to its neighbors, in such stressful situation, improved its relations with them as a regional leader.

The combined military operation of India and the US provided extraordinary response against tsunami induced human disaster. India being a member of tsunami relief coalition was one of among US, Australia and Japan. Notably, this cooperation provided strategic support for disaster management efforts in the tsunami-affected areas. As a result, India and the US created a Tsunami Core Group, which provided committed support to those affected and devastated.

These combined efforts got significant recognition worldwide. In response, both countries launched U.S.-India Disaster Relief Initiative (DRI) on 18 July 2005, in addition to the tsunami disaster of December 2004, to contribute to disaster preparedness and future relief operations. Emphasis was put on the initiative to build strong civilian relationship, between the Indian Ministry of Home Affairs and the U.S. Agency for International Development, among the two countries and work for disaster relief. Both states also agreed to cooperate on building of disaster response capabilities in each other country. Moreover, to strengthen the regional response against natural disasters prominence was given to
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contribute and share the best practices and experiences.\textsuperscript{136} Further, to increase their ability to respond to disasters in an integrated fashion, India and the US considered it appropriate to join hands with other nations and international organizations.\textsuperscript{137} This initiative was open to both civilian and military government agencies of other nations. This was an effort to improve bilateral disaster response, integrate the efforts and enhance cooperation and share best practices for the disaster management.\textsuperscript{138}

Being a responsible emerging power, India is considerate for every victim nation of natural disaster and had offered help whenever it is needed. For example, Indian government granted an export exemption that allowed the World Food Programme to purchase Indian rice for provision to 22 countries with severe needs to Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Haiti, among others in 2008. Close coordination between India and the US, especially in cases where India offers substantially more cost-effective means for providing assistance, mark the beginning of new kinds of humanitarian cooperation.\textsuperscript{139} To highlight their cooperative effort, the then US under Secretary of Defence for Policy Michele Flournoy gave a speech at the Asia Society in July 2010 and stressed that both the countries will continue to work collectively on disaster response and humanitarian relief and committed to develop procedures to facilitate more seamless cooperation in future natural disaster.\textsuperscript{140}

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is a governmental aid agency of the USA, which provides economic and humanitarian assistance around the world. An informal accord was
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signed between USAID and the Government of India in September 2003 with the objectives to reduce vulnerability to disasters and capacity building through governmental institutions. However, the final agreement in this field was signed on 4 April 2007. The scope of this important agreement was focused on three main areas such as incident response system, procurement of appropriate equipments and work to enhance capacity building programme for disaster relief.\textsuperscript{141}

To consolidate the human security, India-US defence relations expanded further during Defence Policy Group meeting the 2011 and declared disaster management, maritime security and counterterrorism as priority area for future defence cooperation. During his speech in Shangri-La conference in 2012, Leon Panetta, the then US Defence Secretary, said that “India-US defence cooperation is an essential part of the US effort to focus on Asian security and for this India will play an important role in shaping the security and prosperity of the 21st century.”\textsuperscript{142} He also pointed out that Australia would allow the US military to enhance its response to natural disasters in Southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean region.\textsuperscript{143}

To respond to foreign disasters, India was invited as an observer to the multi-national Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) exercise hosted by the USA in Hawaii in 2012. In RIMPAC 2014, India for the first time actively participated and contributed a frigate.\textsuperscript{144} Primary motives of these above collaboration are human security on broader level. These exercises concentrated on the efforts of human security; to provide training and certification for expeditionary forces, and, to respond to
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foreign disasters. Thus, in context of disaster management, there has been considerable progress between India and the USA which not only is essential for bilateral relations but also for the multilateral disaster management throughout world.

On the global level, there is profound possibility for multilateral defence cooperation for the two countries due to their shared vision for peace, stability, and prosperity for world. To tackle the above non-conventional global problem both India and the USA needs to have collective attempt for their security arrangement. Besides, a proper communication with other nations needs to be addressed based on intelligence sharing and exchange of information. In this context, a common understanding among nation is vital to take immediate action at multilateral level. Both countries have noticed the need and are working smoothly and swiftly to counter these new global threats and are major hurdle for present world.

Finally, the beginning of 21st century is an era of meaningful transformation in India-US security relations toward mutual understanding for regional peace and global stability to achieve humanitarian goals. Hence, main differences between India and the US on such issues like nuclear nonproliferation, human rights, climate change, ballistic missile development and trade regulations are diluting. In this regard, the two countries are making efforts to make common understanding on these issues through strategic dialogue, joint working group meeting, diplomatic discussion, joint exercises, exchange point of view and information.

As a result, both are sharing mutual interests in maritime security,
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combating terrorism, cyber security, disaster relief and for stable Asia. To increase India's strategic linkage with neighboring countries and also with key global powers, the multilateral defence cooperation is likely to play a key role. India’s rising as an economic and military power makes it an appealing partner for the USA, in terms of its democratic values, its geo-strategic location and its global appearance. These multilateral security arrangements are likely to prove one of the most visible, vibrant, and proactive component not only for India-US long term bilateral relations, but for the betterment of world.
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