

## Conflicting views on Indo-Pacific concept

### What is the issue?

\n\n

There are conceptual differences between India and US on the concept of Indo-Pacific.

\n\n

### What is the conflicting perception on Indo-Pacific?

\n\n

\n

- The Indo-Pacific, as described in the National Security Strategy document of U.S., represents the most populous and economically dynamic part of the world.

\n

- It stretches from the west coast of India to the western shores of the United States.

\n

- There are prevailing views in India that through “Indo-Pacific”, U.S. has made India the central point of its strategy.

\n

- India has tended to present the term “Indo-Pacific” as raising India’s strategic stature.

\n

- But the NSS document of 2017, which outlined America’s top security concerns, have corroborated the Indian interpretation.

\n

- U.S. has hailed Vietnam as being at the very heart of the Indo-Pacific at the APEC Summit last year.

\n

- The NSS 2017 also views the ASEAN and APEC as centerpieces of the Indo-Pacific’s regional architecture.

\n

- Thus, this part of the strategic vision does not cater to India’s interests.

\n

- The NSS 2017 has omitted some of India’s most vital interests, including the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea.

- \n
- Also left out is the Strait of Malacca, which links the Indian and Pacific Oceans and is India's gateway to trade with Southeast Asia, Japan and South Korea.
- \n
- India too, in recent times, hailed ASEAN as the foundation of the Indo-Pacific and asserted that a geographical definition could not be a strategy to contain any country.
- \n

\n\n

## **What are the views regarding countering China?**

\n\n

- \n
- The concept of the Indo-Pacific, as perceived by U.S., seeks to counter China's assertiveness in Asia.
- \n
- China is the main security threat to U.S. primacy in Asia and it also has a long-standing border dispute with India.
- \n
- This gives India and the U.S. a shared interest in countering China's growing military power and territorial revisionist tendencies.
- \n
- The NSS 2017 recognises that China's military power rests on its economic progress.
- \n
- To blunt China's competitive edge, U.S. focusses on –
- \n

\n\n

- \n
1. protecting American jobs through its "America first" policy
- \n
2. ensuring reciprocal bilateral trade practices
- \n
3. the key role of the private sector in directing investment
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- Thus, Business engagement with Asian countries is at the centre of the U.S.'s strategy for a "free and open Indo-Pacific".
- \n
- However, for India, only defence cooperation is the most significant

dimension of the India-U.S. strategic partnership.

\n

- Also, maritime power is the key to international clout in the 21st century.
- About 90% of India's trade passes through the Indian Ocean and while India has less than 20 submarines in service, China holds a larger number of 78 submarines.
- Thus India demanded intelligence-sharing and drones from the U.S. at the 2+2 Dialogue to detect Chinese submarines in the Indian Ocean.
- Significantly, of India's three services, its Navy gets around 15% of the defence budget.
- But the U.S. Navy and Marines get the lion's share of the U.S. military budget.
- Moreover, in April 2017, China successfully launched its second aircraft carrier, which was domestically built.
- But it will be many years before India's second home-built aircraft carrier becomes operational.
- All these made the U.S. sceptical about India's capacity to counter the growing influence of China in the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

\n

\n\n

### **How useful is India to the U.S. in the region?**

\n\n

\n

- The NSS says that prosperous states are stronger security partners who are able to share the burden of confronting common threats.
- However, China's economy (\$14 trillion) is nearly five times bigger than India's, and its defence spending (\$228 billion) is far more than India's \$63 billion.
- U.S. also wants India to offer more investment to Asian countries.
- But India needs Chinese investment to upgrade its own infrastructure and is nowhere near competing successfully against China as an investor in Southeast Asia.

- \n
- In 2016, two-way trade between India and ASEAN moved up to \$71.6 billion.
  - \n
  - In contrast, two-way trade between China and ASEAN stood at more than \$452 billion.
  - \n
  - Moreover, U.S.'s contemptuous labelling of India as the "tariff king" points to strong differences between the two countries over trade practices.
  - \n
  - The U.S. has sold nearly \$15 billion worth of arms to India over the last 10 years.
  - \n
  - However, U.S. perceives Russia as a security threat and it stresses interoperability with U.S. armed forces.
  - \n
  - It has also expressed displeasure at India's recent decision to buy the S-400 missile system from Russia.
  - \n
  - This shows that U.S. aims to help American defence firms compete successfully against Russian and Chinese arms manufacturers.
  - \n
  - But India depends on U.S. and Russia for most of its arms and on the U.S. and China for much of its trade.
  - \n
  - This shows India's simultaneous efforts to cultivate good relations with the U.S., Russia and China.
  - \n
  - All these highlights the conceptual differences between India and U.S. on the Indo-Pacific and on how best to counter China in Asia.
  - \n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n\n

\n