CHAPTER - 5

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

India-America relations have seen a significant transformation due to favourable international environment in the last three decades. Due to growing convergence in this bilateral understanding their collaborations have expanded towards new areas like defence engagement, counter-terrorism, economic trade, human security, cyber security, nuclear energy and collective security. Particularly, during the last one decade the increased cooperation between the two had helped in recognition of mutual areas of interest and trust.\footnote{Uma Purushothaman et. al, India-US Defence Trade Relations: Trends and Challenges, Observer Research Foundation, vol.1, issue 7, April, 2012, pp.1-2.} In spite these improvements, plethora of hurdles, barriers and controversies do exist between the two nations which have often proved as probable obstacles. These barriers have brought out some short of feeling of insecurity and have raised potential doubts and threats for strategic relations between two nations.\footnote{B. M Jain, India-US Relations in the Age of Uncertainty: An Uneasy Courtship, Routledge, New Delhi, 2016.p.162.} Thus, in the present chapter, effort has been made to understand these barriers so that appropriate solution of existing problems can be sort out.

1. Problems

Though, cooperation between India and the United States is growing progressively, yet divergences between their relations push them towards rough directions and divergent strategic perspectives.\footnote{Cherian Samuel, “Indo-US Defence Cooperation and the Emerging Strategic Relationship, Strategic Analysis, vol. 31, no. 2, March 2007, p.228.} Most notable areas of these challenges are related to their different policies regarding their national interests and defence perceptions. For instance,
issues such as dealing with Pakistan, state-sponsored terrorism, policy on non-proliferation, relations with China and Iran, issues of military and economic trade barrier, issue of climate change and human rights.\(^4\)

**(i) Issues of Terrorism-** Although the end of the cold war freed India-America relationship from the limitation of global bipolarity and created favourable regional and global environment, yet both the countries face some potential setbacks and obstacles in their relations on the issues of terrorism.\(^5\) In this regard, state sponsored terrorism is one of the major divisive issues where India and the US are decisively on reverse sides of the table. From 1993 onwards, when cross-border terrorism acquired a distinctive endeavor with the attacks on Mumbai, India and the USA have viewed with different angles. The then Clinton administration saw the attacks as an extension of the Hindu-Muslim communal divide in Indian sub-continent and thus rejected any terror linkage with the Pakistan military establishment.\(^6\) Thus, considering Mumbai attacks as result of India-Pakistan rivalry may be due to America’s need for utilizing Pakistan as a non-NATO ally in its own interest.\(^7\)

Similarly, both continued to follow different approach on how to deal with the global terrorism. In this context, Indian policy makers do not believe in the US version of war on global terrorism due to difference of ideological and substantial grounds.\(^8\) As a result, India refused to join American war in Iraq of saving democracy and fighting
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against Islamic extremist Saddam Hussein, which gave a signal of the underlying differences over what they defined global terrorism and the effective means to fight with it.\(^9\) Furthermore, India has shown anxiety over the US pursuing a war on terrorism on selective basis. As a result, India refused to send Indian troops to Iraq to fight against the terrorist group of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).\(^10\) On the other hand, the USA has different perception about terrorism in Iraq and strongly holds Indian stance as misguided.\(^11\)

This kind of difference is visible regarding their methodologies to tackle the problem. This is caused due to lack of proper exchange of information and trust in the area of intelligence sharing between the two countries. For example, the American Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has not even provided the transcripts of the interrogation of Afghan suspects in December 2001 Indian Airlines IC-814 hijacking case to Indian authorities.\(^12\) Further, the US handle the “case of Pakistani-American David Headley, who conspired with LeT in the 2008 Mumbai attacks, also disappointed Indian counter-terrorism professionals. The US reluctance to allow India free access to Headley only strengthened Indian doubts about US credibility in prosecuting terrorism cases linked to Pakistan.”\(^13\) US eagerness to allow Headley for a plea to bargain and the refusal to facilitate Indian investigation of his links to LeT and his role in the Mumbai attacks remain sore points for
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New Delhi.\textsuperscript{14}

The Obama administration dodged Indian expectations on the issue of India’s concerns about Pakistan-sponsored cross-border terrorism. America’s casual approach towards the 26/11 attack indirectly provided informal support to Pakistan for not taking appropriate action against the accused.\textsuperscript{15} Despite the successes in Indo-US counter-terrorism cooperation, the true potential of this relationship remains unfulfilled.

Besides, the conflict with Pakistan has severely tarnished India’s worldwide reputation, largely because India’s efforts to fight against the Kashmiri insurgents has been highlighted as human rights violations and the US considered it in same manners, is another hurdle between the relations of the two states.\textsuperscript{16} Unfortunately, Islamic terrorism remains a great security threat to India in particular and world in general. On this issue both India and the US undergo mismatch, they also continue to differ on methods of fighting against terrorism because of their divergent opinions and structural inequalities.\textsuperscript{17} The lack of proper examination on the issue of terrorism, more particularly about the involvement of Pakistan in terrorism in Kashmir, is likely to play a negative role in defining future Indo-US relations.\textsuperscript{18}

Finally, there are structural and capacity differences between India-US nodal agencies, on how to handle the problem of terrorism. Mainly the USA does not trust India’s counter-terrorism policy. The US’s perception is that India has weak intelligence sharing channels and ill-
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equipped institutions, which has led to less than optimal results in bilateral cooperation.¹⁹

(ii) Nuclear Non-proliferation- Both India and the US have committed to international community to support non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. India’s non-proliferation policy has been associated with its regional security arrangement and USA, being a superpower with a nuclear weapon status, always tried to stop any upcoming development in nuclear weapon at global level. India’s regional security concerns in South Asia compelled it to adopt a policy of nuclear deterrence because of its rival neighbours such as Pakistan and China. India is also committed to the principle of peaceful use of nuclear power and no-first-use, even if the USA is not fully convinced about India’s security and energy concerns.²⁰ Thus, issue of non-proliferation is where India and the US always have been in doubt and remain on opposite side to implement it at global level.

However, neither the situation regarding differences in opinion nor the issue of non-proliferation between the two countries is new. Initially, during cold war era non-proliferation policies of both the countries entered into different direction mainly because the US and China became a nuclear weapons power and have complex relations with India. Because, India was always in favour to make a nuclear weapon free world due to its non-nuclear weapon status and its idealistic foreign policy approach.²¹ That is why; it always supported non-discriminatory treaty for all the nations that would call for total disarmament. But that India’s stance was always protested by those countries already having

¹⁹ Joshi, n.13, pp.1-2.
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nuclear weapons including the state of USA.\textsuperscript{22} The US advocates a doctrine of nuclear safeguard for all five nuclear weapon states, but was not in favour of the same to the rest of world. To follow this approach, when the NPT was designed mainly by these nuclear weapon states, India criticized this treaty as it facilities only those nations who had attained nuclear status prior to 1\textsuperscript{st} January 1967.\textsuperscript{23} As a result, India not only refused to join the NPT, but also conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion (PNE) in 1974 for civilian use.\textsuperscript{24} Subsequently, USA stopped its nuclear assistance to India and constituted a Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) in 1975 to mount pressure on India and other countries to discourage development of nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{25} The American Congress also responded to the PNE by passing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA), which imposed new sanction regarding nuclear exports to non-nuclear-weapon countries.\textsuperscript{26} However, after initiation of this American law, India’s stance on nuclear issue remained as before and continues to consider NPT as discriminatory. Thus, the NNPA listed India ineligible for nuclear trade with the USA.\textsuperscript{27}

In the post-cold war era, particularly during the last decade of twentieth century, the relations between India and America got significantly improved. The non-proliferation issue, which has been the most important objective of the US foreign policy for prevention of further development of weapons of mass destruction and deterrent
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ballistic missile program, became little bit flexible. On the other hand, India stands by its stance, not to sign the NPT on the basis of its discriminatory nature. Simultaneously, it also rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on the similar grounds. India conducted five nuclear tests in May 1998 at Pokhran which invited international sanctions since it was projected as an act of initiating the race of nuclear weapons in South Asia. Thus, in this new situation, no substantive change occurred on the nuclear non-proliferation issue.

With the beginning of 21st century there was a change in the US tactic to work on the issue of non-proliferation. It mainly pursued the policy of persuasion and conversation rather than coercion and economic blockage to fulfill its non-proliferation objectives especially with respect to India. On this issue Indo-US relations have also been visualized as one of mismatch and pursuing contradictory policies. This can be accredited to gradual change in international arena both at political and strategic levels. In this favourable environment, India and the USA continue to remain constant on their differences regarding NPT and CTBT. However, a changed in this context has been noticed after July 2005 declaration regarding the 123 Indo-US civil nuclear deal. But before the deal was actually concluded between them in 2008, a numerous factors worked as irritant in the finalization of the deal. The first such problem has been the Hyde Act, which was passed by the US
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Congress in December 2006. From the US side many arguments came in favour of the Hide Act like it is an America’s internal legislation and it will not harm the agreement. But when text of 123 agreement came into public, in July 2007, it clearly stated that the act will be used by the USA in the operation of nuclear agreement. Although, 123 agreement was also not help India to gain its high technology from the US. The transfer remained subject to application of to US laws, regulations and license policies.  

On the other hand, the UPA government of India failed to take a firm decision to address its nuclear liability law. The government broke faith and lost the trust of the USA by not fulfilling its commitment to facilitate access to the Indian energy market for the companies of the USA. Besides, India blamed Obama administration in delaying the full implementation of the nuclear deal. Another panic between the two countries is strong advocacy by Obama administration for the strengthening of the CTBT and has pressurized India to sign the agreement. India’s special envoy, Shyam Saran, warned the USA that India would keep on opposing any such agreement, which was discriminatory.

It may be noted that the last UPA government had promised to cooperate in concluding the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT). But with the change of government in 2014, India hinted to maintain its sovereign right to carry out nuclear tests in future. The fact that present Indian government has stressed much more on national security than
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anything else, possibility of conducting any nuclear tests by India, remains the unsolved question for USA. Thus, there are many unresolved hurdles on both sides regarding the issue of nuclear non-proliferation.

(ii) Defence Cooperation - At present, India-US defense relations are growing gradually. In recent times, their cooperation has been improving in the areas of defense trade, technology transfer, personnel exchanges, military exercises and armaments cooperation. These developments demonstrated their willingness to engage with each other on their own terms. But, there are still many irritants do exist between them which cannot be ignored easily. These problems were there since historical periods, which have often been negative and contentious, characterized by friction and mistrust. They are likely to remain these as important irritants or roadblocks, which require serious attention if the relationship between the two is to continue to prosper.

Presently, India is in need of modern military equipments and technology, whereas America is major supplier of defence equipments. Hence, for India, USA is a source of defence equipments and high technology and for the USA; India is one of the potential market. But certain areas of defence trade and technology transfer continue to remain a sore point. Besides, Indo-US trade in defence sector is small in
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proportion to their overall trade, because the USA is not ready to transfer advanced weapon technology to India due to certain commercial and security reasons.

After lifting of sanctions by the USA, India purchased weapons of more than $9 billion from America. But such purchases did not involve technology transfer from the USA. Hence, it seems that both of them were not able to execute the issue of military technology transfer in an appropriate manner.\textsuperscript{41} Superiority of the USA is recognised in the area of high technology, which is the foundational source of its defence trade. Therefore, technology control is a root of its defence policy. Besides, its defence and technology transfer regimes are much tighter than any other country.\textsuperscript{42} As a result, India’s defence trade cannot be outfitted on the USA’s pattern of technology transfer. So, the military trade between the two countries is not proper due to their different trade criteria.

On the other hand, India tries to develop strategic relationship with the USA as it does with Israel, Japan, Australia and other Western countries. India accepts the technological superiority of the US weapon systems, but it seeks to have natural partnership with the latter and is interested in seller-buyer relationship for long term security goals.\textsuperscript{43} Defence budget of the USA is 23 times more than the size of India’s defence budget and spending money on development of advanced defence program is affordable to the USA, but not to India.


On the other hand, India cannot make technological gains as per its needs through such spending. Thus, between the two countries the road towards military trade and defence collaboration is much more difficult than many envisage.  

Another obstacle in India-US defence relations is structural imbalance in their national defence policies. The two countries have had different criteria and stance on the issues, such as dual-use technology, transfer of high technology, nuclear liability level, user procedure and the manufacturing processes. It is because US laws prevent the transfer of sensitive defence technologies to countries that have not signed certain agreements. It is also fact that technological superiority is the foundational source of US military power and therefore technology control is a cornerstone of its defence policy. Consequently, defence and commerce departments put lots of conditionalities in regard to share such transaction with outside world. Though India has already signed an agreement on General Security of Military Information Agreement (GOSMIA) with the USA in August 2002, yet the agreement plays only a minor role in their defence trade. India has also signed the End User Monitoring Agreement (EUMA) in 2009 to manage it, but it is also not succeeded to resolve most of existing problem. However, USA is pressurizing India to sign the three foundation agreements: Communication and Information Security Memorandum of Agreement (CISMOA); Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement (BECA); and, Logistics Supply Agreement (LSA) which is not easy for India because

---

44 Koithara, n.42, p.3587.
46 Ibid.
defence acquisition procedures is very complex here.\footnote{47\textit{}}

There are only a few countries with whom the USA is engaged in joint development and production of military weapons. The experiences of Britain and Israel have been good, but in both cases there have been special underlying relationships regarding burden sharing. The experience of Japan, though technologically advanced, has not been good. Japanese output from joint R&D has invariably proved expensive. At present, India is keen for co-production of military weapons with the USA. But, USA is more worried about their joint R&D of defence armament because it may terminate the purchase of its arms by India.\footnote{48} Besides, USA is also worried that lack of proper infrastructure facility for R&D in India may create difficulty in developing a vibrant and secure defense manufacturing base.\footnote{49} So, the future plan by both the countries to engage in joint production of defence equipment in India is loaded with many problems, which cannot be easily ignored.

\textbf{(iv) Divergent Perceptions on Regional Issues-} At regional level, India need a meaningful strategy for security arrangement to facilitate longstanding peaceful and prosper environment.\footnote{50} Though, India and the USA are working together on many areas, yet they continue to pursue divergent strategic interests. Both continue to have divergent perceptions on the issues like terrorism; containment of China; military aid to Pakistan; and, divergent postures towards Iran, Myanmar and Sri Lanka.

So, both continue to differ on regional security environment in South Asia, which can work as an important irritant in their bilateral defence cooperation.

In present time, Asia has acquired importance for the world, particularly with the rise of India and China as strategic and economic powers.\(^{51}\) Besides, China, Russia and India are the major countries on the Eurasian landmass which separately have the economic, military, and technological potential to counter the USA. Geographical landmass; demographic structure; and their political will have the capacity to challenge the US global hegemony. In this regard, India-Russia longstanding strategic relations may play important role to manage the US’s strategic influence in Asia.\(^{52}\) Besides, China’s relation with India and Russia also has a long history of cooperative and competitive relationship. In the post-cold war era, it is evident that they are making efforts to improve their multilateral relations through the forums, like BRICS, SCO, RIC, and DB.\(^{53}\) Moreover, China is India’s most important neighbour and the inclusion of India in the US containment policy may aggravate their border problems with China. Thus, India and China need to focus to resolve their border problem bilaterally. With the solution of their border disputes they may cooperate on several other issues. So, any blunder by the USA may change its superpower stance and harm overall American interests at the regional and global levels.\(^{54}\)
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USA wishes to enhance security cooperation with India to contain China’s naval power in the Asia-Pacific region, but the latter does not wish to promote military alliance with the USA on regional level. India’s stand is limited to its economic and security developments. Though, India and the USA share similar concerns regarding China, yet Indian officials are against the formation of any overture by the USA that appears to be used to counter Chinese influence.\(^5\) Although, the US is having engagement with China regarding economic and strategic areas yet, the USA is making efforts to contain China, both at the regional and global levels. Thus, it is believed that the strategic relationship between China and the US have become very complex for other countries like India in changed scenario. India has its own geo-strategic significance and compulsion to grow its meaningful engagements with the Pacific countries.\(^6\)

Thus, the US, treats itself as non-resident Asian powers and wants to be counted itself in any Asian geopolitical arrangement. China treats former as extra regional power and wants to keep it away from Asia to realise its geo-political ambition to emerge as undisputed power in Asia.\(^7\) Besides, it is possible that the Indo-Pacific region may turn into as zone of conflict due to regional power competition in the next decade.\(^8\) 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
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powers, such as Australia, China, Japan, India and the US, determine the pivot of the Indo-Pacific region as they seek to dominate and influence each others to achieve their national goals.\(^5^9\) China feels panic about the engagement in this region and considered it as a plan of the USA to enhance its influence in the area with the help of its regional allies against it.

Different organizational management by the USA also proved another hurdle in South Asian region which stop both the countries to project their common strategic plan in West Asia. It is because the Pacific Command of the US is situated in the region.\(^6^0\) But, such organization of US geographical commands is not compatible with India’s strategic vision. At present, the US Unified Command Plan uses the India-Pakistan border to divide military responsibility between Pacific Command and Central Command, with India falling within the Pacific Command whereas Pakistan set in Central Command.\(^6^1\) Therefore, Indians argue that many of India’s security objectives lie outside from PACOM’s area and lie in CENTCOM. Moreover, India’s security concerns like cross-border terrorism link with Pakistan and the country is also a part of CENTCOM. Besides, its role in Afghanistan, Middle East, and trade with the Persian Gulf lies outside the PACOM’s area of responsibility. Because of such organizational hazards, India is compelled to deal directly with Washington throw PACOM without connected to West Asia.\(^6^2\)

\(^6^0\) Singh, n.57, pp.166-67.
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Hence, it is clear that China may initiate all moves to counter the US attempts at reassertion in the Asia-Pacific region. The Indian difficulty is how to boost its relationship with the USA that can provide an impetus to its economy and defence capability building without antagonising China. Many Indians remain suspicious of the Obama Administration’s strategy for the Asia-Pacific. Moreover, India has remained skeptical of US reliability and question whether it would sacrifice its delicate relationship with Beijing for New Delhi’s sake. Thus, the challenge for India is how to leverage its economic relations China and at the same time of close defence cooperation with the US, while maintaining its strategic autonomy.\(^63\)

**(v) Dissimilar Cyber Security Concerns**- In the age of information and technology, the cyber security has become an important part of defence cooperation among nations. It assumes strategic safeguard in the context of increasing menace from terrorism and other new emerging threats. The US was the first country which formally declared cyberspace as the fifth domain of warfare area after land, air, sea and space. It has also formally classified the use of cyber root as a force for offensive capability.\(^64\)

At present, both India and the USA are also concerned about the threats that come from cyber route. It is also important because the nations lack deeper engagement on cyber security matters.\(^65\) Probably, it is because India and the USA have dissimilarity in the specified areas such as cyber capacity, innovation of technology, military preparedness,
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overall connectivity, and even the shape of the infrastructure system. Mainly, the USA is seriously engaged only with its closest partners and even that is governed by a treaty for the purpose of sharing intelligence, especially signals intelligence. On the other hand, India remain doubtful about the US process of intelligence sharing and fears that the latter may seek to exploit the cyber channel for its own national interest and intelligence gathering.

Lack of faith in the areas of intelligence and security matter is main obstacle between Indo-US relations. It seems, the USA has not been sensitive towards India’s interest in computer forensics, network surveillance, and the protection of supervisory control and data acquisition systems as means to defeat non-conventional threats mainly terrorism. Though India has developed an offensive information warfare capacity, yet it is relatively small in programmatic terms and uncertain in quality. As a result, India has never been able to attract foreign countries for its technological gain. Thus, the present shape of Indo-US cyber security relations is falling short of its full potential, which is characterized by misread expectations, mistrust, and different diplomatic obligations.

(vi) Lack of proper Engagement in Disaster Response- Initially there was no scope of disaster relief cooperation between India and the USA
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due to their different strategic interests. As a result, during the cold war period, both the countries were not ready to come closer on the issue of joint operation for disaster relief. With the end of cold war concepts, like common security and human security have emerged in the form of non-traditional security arrangement in almost all countries. Due to change of circumstances there is a profound possibility for the both India and the USA to collaborate on the issue of disaster relief because of their shared vision for peace, stability, and prosperity. So, it was considered that the cooperation between India and the USA on the issue of disaster management can be an important instrument to keep them under single umbrella.

Though presently both the countries are regularly engaged in joint military exercises, yet there is lack of initiative on the issue of disaster relief cooperation. Due to different attitudes about operational culture at official and government levels seemed primary source of limitations on inter-operability between India and the USA.\(^\text{71}\) There is no proper settlement of channels to exchange important information at institutional levels for quick and possible response.\(^\text{72}\)

It is fact that the US military has huge pressure in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) with crucial assets like helicopters, hospital ships, support ships and organisational skills. It may be helpful for regional countries to provide quick and possible response after natural disaster.\(^\text{73}\) But, India


being a prominent naval power in this region, but not being a military ally of the US, always feels panic with US presence in the IOR. In this regard proposals of any disaster relief activities by the USA are also considered by India as a plan to enlarge its strategic influence in this region. Thus, India always supports the elimination of great power presence in Indian Ocean region, especially USA.\textsuperscript{74}

In 2004 during tsunami disaster relief operations, both navies temporarily exchanged information and communication equipments and work tremendously in limited time frame. But during that short span it became evident that navies of both states face the lack on some executives and intuitional work to engage on broader level.\textsuperscript{75} Finally, it is also observed that on these issues both countries follow divergent viewpoints.

2. Prospects

On the basis of above mentioned differentiation and hurdles, it is observed that India and the USA are going to face some serious problems in future. Both countries may or may not be able to resolve these problems through a well managed and through organised strategy.\textsuperscript{76} At present, defence cooperation between the two are growing rapidly, but it likely to take some time to mature because of longstanding uncertain history of relations between the two states. For this, both countries need to identify the areas of common strategic interest which can help them to resolve these remaining barriers.\textsuperscript{77}
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(i) Dealing with Global Terrorism- As far as resolution of problem of terrorism is concerned, both countries have to follow a comprehensive and effective counter-terrorism strategy which may help them to contain terrorist threats and can simultaneously strengthen their defence and security relations.\textsuperscript{78} To facilitate more efficient collaboration, both countries need to be connected at institutional level. In this regard, India’s Home Ministry and Department of Homeland Security of USA must build special agencies to deal with the menace of terrorism. Through these agencies, both countries may share best practices, lessons learned and intelligence to prevent future terrorist attacks. It is likely that activities of terrorism in future may follow four main traits-Weapon of Mass Destruction, maritime threats, cyber-crime and threatening of energy security routes. These categories of terrorism can be tackled only with the cooperation by both at regional and global levels collectively. India and the US may be appropriate actors in this manner.

It is also clear that neither India nor the USA can tolerate terrorism both at South Asian and global levels. A full-scope, sustained, and multilayered counter-terrorism strategy can play an important role to enhance institutional capacity and anti-terrorist infrastructure to safeguard both countries form this non-conventional menace.\textsuperscript{79} Both India and the US can improve a counter-terrorism strategy through information exchange, operational cooperation, use of technology and methods to interrupting terrorist financial networks which facilitate their institutional and law enforcement measurement.

Besides, both the countries have to focus to know about different forms of terrorism prevalent at regional and global levels in order to
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suggest new policies for effective international cooperation against terrorism. In this respect, there is also a need to analyze the role of the police and military in countering the phenomenon of terrorism, outlining the methods and boundaries of cooperation between these two agencies. Within the framework of counter terrorism, both also need to focus on gauging how much a country’s counter terrorism policies stress the operational capabilities of terrorists as opposed to the motivational factors behind terrorism.

(ii) Need of Nuclear Cooperation- The Indo-US civil nuclear deal is not only about cooperation between India and United States in the field of nuclear energy, but it is going to be helpful in transfer of technology from the US to India. The deal provides the means by which both India and the US are able to pursue their political, economic and strategic interests. Through this deal, the USA wishes to create jobs through the export of nuclear reactors and provide huge market for its nuclear companies where they can sell their nuclear reactors and earn profit.

Another important issue related to this deal have been the liability bill which has been amicably resolved by them during Obama visit to India in January 2016. America considers that India is on a path of
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emerging power in the world, so its demand of nuclear energy are bound to enhance and in this context USA can be one of compatible source for its nuclear industry. The settlement on the issue of non-proliferation between India and the US are likely to base their future incentives on nuclear and defence relations.

(iii) Resolving the Irritation in Defence Cooperation- The planning of a future defence cooperation between India and the USA is likely to depend on the present limitations of arms transfer, volume of arms trade, technology transfer, joint production, intelligence sharing, importance and possibilities of defence cooperation. Through the cooperation in above areas both have attained the status of strategic partners. Their future ties are likely to depend upon how they are able to resolve their divergences related to this area. In this regard, USA is insisting to New Delhi to sign American foundation agreements like LSA, the CISMOA, and the BECA to boost their bilateral defence and strategic relationship. Though, India does not wish to an alliance partner of the USA, yet it is interested to have some technology transfer agreements. It is because the two countries have long history of distrust. Thus, India cannot go beyond a point to have defense cooperation; as a result, their relations are likely to proceed gradually than it is expected.

Both countries also need to remove barriers in the context of India’s national security needs with the US defence trader status. Hence
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to sustain such momentum, India and the US should undertake proactive measures to resolve these challenges faced by both nations towards bilateral defence cooperation. At the administration level, it is important that the both countries need to work toward building architecture for a strong defence relationship for the sake of their common security interests. If both sides develop diplomatic understanding, their strategic relationship may shape the geo-political contours of the 21st century in a manner that enhances peace, stability and prosperity in the world level.

To enhance their defence relations, it is important that both the countries to engage in joint production of defence equipments. In this way, India wants to develop military equipments at domestic level with the help of the USA. The latter also wishes to engage with India in co-production of military equipment, but in a limited manner. It is because USA is worried about India’s domestic infrastructure and institutional setup. It demands a proper channel and secure environment to transfer sensitive technology without revealing these to any other countries. India needs to be cautious about the US conditions of technology transfer. This problem can be resolved through proper convergence and institutional groundwork. Thus, both can identify their long standing irritants and then they can resolve them and can work as strategic partners. Thus, both need to find negotiation for protecting sensitive US technology and equipments that may allow deeper defense trade between them.

(iv) Joint Exercises- Indo-US military exercises have been regularly conducted between them since post-cold war period. With the beginning
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of 21st century both are regularly conducting joint military exercises. At present, India is the biggest training partner of the US military. However, their engagements in the land and air exercise remained the low key affair, yet the joint naval exercises have been working significantly.\textsuperscript{93} To enhance their defence relations for next level, both countries need to conduct parallel military exercises in all three areas such as Navy, Army and Airforce.\textsuperscript{94} If both the countries provide same weight to their other armed forces like Malabar, then defence cooperation between them may convert them as indispensable partners.

(v) **Common Strategy in Indo-Pacific Region**- At present, America need to continue its support towards improvement of India’s relationships with its allies countries in Indo-Pacific region. The possible multilateral arrangement in their relationship in the form of Delhi-Tokyo-Canberra-US is more sustainable in term of security interests, rather than partnerships perceived at bilateral level.\textsuperscript{95} It is going to help both India and the US to face any upcoming conventional and non-conventional challenges from states and non-states actors in this region. At present, both India and the US are making efforts to enhance their strategic cooperation in Asia-Pacific region. The logic of geopolitics dictates that both India and the U.S. have vital interests in strengthening defense cooperation.\textsuperscript{96} On the other hand, India is also enhancing its ‘Act East policy’ and deepening strategic and economic cooperation with Asian countries.

\textsuperscript{94} Purushothaman, n.1, p.2.
\textsuperscript{96} Mishra, n.49, p.2.
Now the situation is different from cold war era, when the US was strategically engaged with India’s rival countries such as China and Pakistan. But, at present time the US is engaging India as a strategic partner due to common security interests of both in Indo-pacific. It also needs, to move beyond its traditional aversion to all external powers activity in South Asia and consider working with the US on shaping the strategic and economic options available to India’s neighbours. It is beneficial for India to allow the US to engage with South Asian countries at democratic and strategic levels.

(vi) Containment of China- The two countries should continue their consultations on the issue of containing China in sincere manner. The need to balance the Beijing without publicly provoking may prove beneficial to both India and the USA to plan future strategy. On the other hand, China is also worried about the growing Indo-US strategic partnership. Because such showcase of India-US strategic relations may allow China to adopt soft attitude towards India, especially on the Line of Actual Control (LAC). For this India needs to develop its defence infrastructure near the LAC through effective national defence policy. On the other, India has to be continuously involved in bilateral conversation with China for any possible resolution of their unresolved border dispute. In future, it may be possible that, through the US containment policy India can build pressure on China. Similarly India can take promise from this strategy to resolve their border dispute through constructive foreign policy. In addition, it is important for policymakers and analysts of both countries to keep in mind that the containment strategy for China is examined time to time through proper channel not only on bilateral level

97 Madan, n.95, p.14-16.
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but on multilateral level due to its growing suspicious military improvement.\textsuperscript{100}

(vii) Stability Factor in Pakistan- At present neither Pakistan nor China is looking to the US as its strategic friend. India being a US strategic partner needs to rethink about its cold war era strategy of only bilateral talk on border dispute with Pakistan. India might conceivably welcome constructive mediation if the US is willing to resolve the clash between India and Pakistan over the territory of Kashmir and to demonstrate greater sensitivity toward its interests.\textsuperscript{101} A stable Pakistan is also valuable for India and the US relations in future. Pakistan may become weak, if America does not provide economic and military assistance to it. Any weakening of its position in Pakistan either through negligence or treading on an Indian path may ultimately compel the latter to push towards China and extremists, to which both India and America strongly disavows.\textsuperscript{102} In this regard, the USA perceived that a war between India and Pakistan will certainly disrupt its campaign against terror. Its war on terror can only be saved by avoiding the outbreak of a regional conflict. So the US initiated a genuinely effort to defuse the situation.\textsuperscript{103} Moreover, India needs to highlight issues like Baluchistan, PoK and terrorism on international platform to countering Pakistan’s Kashmir policy. If India is able to put pressure on Pakistan then the US as a common friend can play important role to resolve their border conflict. In future, the serious apprehensions for India’s national security are likely to come from the unresolved border disputes with China and Pakistan. So, India’s defence

\textsuperscript{100} Madan, n.95, p.14-16.
\textsuperscript{102} Gaan, n.8, p.191
relations with the USA may become a part of former’s regional security apprehension.

(viii) Efforts to Resolve Non-traditional Threats- The globalization and information and technology have expanded the scope of conventional security threats and made them menace for humanity. ¹⁰⁴ A meaningful cooperation on multilateral level is essential to deal with such threats like: terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, cyber threat, natural disaster, climate change, outer space and etc. These emerging global security challenges need much greater cooperation amongst all nations. Hence, collaboration between India and the USA is essential not only because of prohibitive costs of modern threats, but also because many challenges are of transnational nature and no country can tackle them alone.¹⁰⁵

This may require large-scale support from global power such as the USA, which may provide the necessary technology, information, equipments and share best practices to deal with such menace. It is possible if these shared interests and concerns become the guiding principles and collectively efforts on broader level.¹⁰⁶

For this purpose, India need to renew its foreign policy orientations and must actively participated in the construction of such multilateral security arrangements.¹⁰⁷ At the global level, there is profound possibility for India and the USA because of their shared vision for peace, stability, and prosperity. Both India and the USA felt common

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p.39.
security threats from above non-traditional and non-conventional global challenges. A meaningful cooperation between India and the USA on non-traditional issues is possible if they are on the same page and understand each other’s limitations related to these problems. On the basis of academic research, joint training, officials exchange, technical help and privacy assurance both the countries may improve their defence cooperation to tackle these non-traditional threats. Moreover, proper communication with other nations also needs to be addressed through intelligence sharing and exchange of information.

However, on numerous areas both the countries are working progressively. A multifaceted strategy has to be adopted for bilateral, regional, global, conventional and non-conventional issue by the two countries. To deal with conventional issues like non-proliferation, transfer of high technology, trade barrier, joint production both need to resolve problems at bilateral levels. On the other hand, regarding non-conventional threats such as: terrorism, cyber security, natural disaster, piracy, drug-trickling, hijacking, weapon of mass destruction, both need to make effort at multilateral level with global consideration due of their trans-national nature.

\[108\] Samuel, n.67, p.778.