



DEFENCE AND DIPLOMACY

IN PURSUIT OF NATIONAL SECURITY

VOL. 10 NO. 2

ISSN 2347 - 3703

JANUARY-MARCH 2021

- The 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War
Heli-Borne Assault on Sylhet
Bhupinder S. Nijjar
- Indian Defence Budget 2021-2022—What is Enough?
Anil Chopra
- Arguing for a Norms-Based Framework for
Nuclear Responsibilities
Tanvi Kulkarni
- India and Its Role in the Indo-Pacific
Theatre: Partnerships and Prospects
Manan Dwivedi and Manisha Sarade
- China in Maldives: Implications for India
Shantannu Roy-Chaudhury
- China's "Marching West" Strategy: Creating a
Eurasian Great Power
Joshy M. Paul
- India-Sri Lanka Relations: Evaluating the
Impact of Global Politics
Sushmita Bharti
- China's Environmental Security
Ishka Yadav
- From Astrakhan to Vladivostok: Growing Relevance of
Subregional Cooperation between India and Russia
Chandra Rekha

Book Reviews

INDIA AND ITS ROLE IN THE INDO-PACIFIC THEATRE: PARTNERSHIPS AND PROSPECTS

MANAN DWIVEDI AND MANISHA SARADE

In November 2011, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton published “America’s Pacific Century” in *Foreign Policy* magazine, visibly signalling that the United States is beginning a pivot toward the Asia-Pacific, past Europe and the Middle East.¹ Even recently, the declassification of one of its most “sensitive national security documents” (“Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific”, 2018)² revealed that US strategic policy in the Indo-Pacific was significantly driven by allies and partners, especially Japan, Australia and India. With Asia’s sizeable renovation, constant economic development, and extensive martial upgradation, it is understandable why Asia

Dr. **Manan Dwivedi** is an Assistant Professor in International Relations at the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi.

Ms. **Manisha Sarade** is a B.A., LL.B (Hons.) student at Maharashtra National Law University (MNLU), Mumbai.

1. Hillary Clinton, “America’s Pacific Century”, *Foreign Policy*, November 2011, at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/10/11/americas_pacific_century. Accessed on February 1, 2021.
2. Rory Medcalf, “Declassification of secret document reveals US strategy in the Indo-Pacific”, *The Strategist*, Australian Strategic Policy Institute, January 13, 2021, at <https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/declassification-of-secret-document-reveals-real-us-strategy-in-the-indo-pacific/>. Accessed on February 1, 2021.

is viewed as a region on the rise and why it is all the time more at the centre of US foreign strategy. The transition from Asia-Pacific into Indo-Pacific is viewed as the shifting of centre of gravity of international politics towards Asia, which signifies a shift in the Balance of Power and the fulcrum of geopolitics. Many see “Indo-Pacific” as an evolved strategic frame of reference that has somewhat come to replace the formerly dominant “Asia-Pacific” construct.

Based on the idea that the diverse theatres of the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean constitute a linked strategic theatre and a unified strategic heft, the presence of four big economies (the USA, China, Japan and India) augments the standing of Indo-Pacific. There is no uniform Indo-Pacific concept to date. India is constantly pursuing to balance these narratives with the support of its engagement with its partners. With the global community beginning to accept India’s norms, salience and emergence as an important power, the paper argues that the Indo-Pacific is a major transition of the international political order, and further discusses the reasons and factors behind this shift. The paper analyses India’s approach, prospects and vision for the Indo-Pacific, also providing a brief account for other key players in the region. The paper attempts to examine the wide-ranging threats and problems in the region—securing trade routes, Maritime Security, and challenges to a rules-based order.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC AND EMERGENCE OF THE INDO-PACIFIC

In Asia, challenging ideas of order have arisen lately, with the likelihood of catalysing and stimulating conflicts. Asia-Pacific’s order, denoted as “Pax Americana” and overtopped by the United States, had not been debated for almost 7 decades. Forty years ago, the main portrayal of US tactical mindset was the *soi-disant* “Asia-Pacific”,³ wherein the economic dynamism of the Pacific Rim and the “Pacific Century” drew California, Japan and the Asian Tigers together. The establishment of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) apparatus demonstrated the same standpoint.

3. Bruce Cummings, “Rimspeak; or, the discourse of the ‘Pacific Rim’”, in A. Dirlik (ed.), *What is in a rim? Critical perspectives on the Pacific region idea* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1977), pp. 53-72.

Yet, supremacy of this Asia-Pacific tactical chronicle in the United States strategy is now diminishing. The “Indo-Pacific” came to light around 2010 as a regional agenda for US strategic discussion under the Obama regime. It turned out to be an important term, officially, for the United States under the Trump regime by 2017, constituting a kind of “geopolitical nomenclature”.⁴ With regard to geo-spatiality, the Indo-Pacific is commonly considered as a link between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. Its stretch is perceived to extend from the eastern shores of Africa to the western coast of the United States, though with modified definitions varying with each actor and their particular geographic positioning in the expansive area. The interrelatedness of the two oceans is a result of increasing forces of globalisation, trade and fluctuating relationships amid several actors which has subdued older limits and unfolded new directions. In simple words, both these oceans are visualised as one adjoining space. The conception is built on the attribute that an enormous amount of the globe’s flow of commodities, energy provisions, are moved by corridors that pass through the two oceans.

There are mainly two reasons for the recent shift in strategic language: First, there is a geo-economic shift due to the overall bulk of trade and commerce, such as important energy flows between the Indian and Pacific oceans. Second, there is a geopolitical shift due to the escalation of China’s position, and also India’s position in the region. The United States has occupied its space as the chief dominion in the Pacific since 1945, and as a major influence in the Indian Ocean for more than forty years now. In the present day, the United States, Japan and Australia are facing Chinese assertion in the Western Pacific; whereas, in the Indian Ocean, the United States and an emerging India are confronted with an expanding Chinese presence. Unsurprisingly, as a reaction to this Chinese challenge, the United States has constructed an Indo-Pacific response.

In the context of China’s ascent to becoming a principal economic world power, consequentially altering the regional balance of power as to politics and military, China established a distinctive abstraction of regional order and then manoeuvred peculiar schemes and

4. John Hemmings, “Global Britain in the Indo-Pacific”, Asia Studies Centre, Research Paper no. 2/2018 (London: Henry Jackson Society, May 2018), p. 17.

endeavours. These initiatives are motivated by China's growing assertion to restructure the regional order in harmony with its self-interests. The "Belt and Road" Initiative (BRI) is a straight articulation of this assertion. Following this, numerous states have developed alternative concepts under the label "Indo-Pacific" in recent years.

The USA under President Donald Trump offered a strategic idea named the "Free and Open Indo-Pacific" (FOIP) as a counter-dominance rhetoric to a possible Sino-centric reformation of the region. Additionally, Japan, Australia, India and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have introduced unique abstractions of the "Indo-Pacific". France is the sole member state of the European Union (EU) that has espoused the expression "Indo-Pacific" and formulated a consistent approach, which stems largely from the idea of safeguarding state interests in its own areas in the region. China, in contrast, discards the whole construct of "Indo-Pacific" and the FOIP precisely, as a containment strategy fixed in opposition to Beijing. Further, the United States has constantly insisted on states, interior and exterior to the construct, together with Germany and other EU member states, to pledge unswervingly or indirectly to the notion of the "Indo-Pacific".

STRATEGY AND VISION OF KEY PLAYERS IN THE INDO-PACIFIC AND THEIR APPROACH TOWARDS INDIA

Australia

Australian policy analysts and strategy thinkers have lately welcomed the Indo-Pacific as a geopolitical concept to govern foreign and security policy—the conception was underlined in both the 2016 Defence White Paper and 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper, and has notably appeared in policy dialogues and academic discourse.⁵ This is in line with Japan's ambitions supposedly, and is possibly demonstrated through the erratic conception of a Quad uniting Australia, Japan, the US and India into nearer strategic coordination and partnership. These countries together confirm their preference for

5. Australian Government, Foreign Policy White Paper, "Opportunity, Security, Strength", Canberra, November 2017, at <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/2017-foreign-policywhite-paper.pdf>. Accessed on February 3, 2021.

a “stable and rules-based order” that upholds freedom of maritime navigation and international law. This could be seen as an implicit censure to those that seek to alter international structures through coercion and unilateralism.

The Indo-Pacific region is confronted with an overabundance of futuristic security challenges—piracy, terrorism, climate change and natural disasters, to name a few. Involvement of Australia in this domain will assuredly be advantageous. This was previously established by the fruitful quadrilateral HADR response to the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami. The Indo-Pacific Strategy is another attempt at repositioning Australia in the region, or rather “relocating the region to Australia”, reinventing its geostrategic milieu at the node of these two colossal oceans. Australia has characteristically been a victor in Asian regionalism. In the present day, the country pursues a higher and influential role in a freshly-defined region. Remarkably, Australia’s transcontinental railway which travels between Perth, Adelaide and Sydney is named the ‘Indian-Pacific’.⁶ This will facilitate Australia’s influence and espousal of bigger economic and strategic positions.

In June 2019, Reynolds highlighted substantial initiatives taken up by Australia, predominantly in the South Pacific and in maritime Southeast Asia (military training and education for 1,000 partakers annually, strategic defence interchanges with all ASEAN states, and the annual “Indo-Pacific Endeavour” military exercise since 2017).⁷ At the APEC summit in Papua New Guinea in 2018, Australia and the US declared aspirations for the joint expansion of the Lombrum naval base on the island of Manus. Furthermore, the United States, Japan and Australia declared the “Blue Dot Initiative” in the margins of the ASEAN summit, in November 2019.⁸ Australia’s visualisation of the Indo-Pacific positions ASEAN as a fine geographical context

6. Journey Beyond Rail, “‘Indian Pacific’, Journey Beyond Indian Pacific”, at <https://journeybeyonddrail.com.au/journeys/indian-pacific/#:~:text=Named%20for%20the%20two%20oceans,on%20a%20spectacular%204352km%20crossing>. Accessed on March 17, 2021.

7. Minister of Defence, Senator Linda Reynolds, Speech at the 18th IISS Shangri-La Dialogue.

8. Brendan Taylor, “Is Australia’s Indo-Pacific strategy an illusion?”, *International Affairs*, vol. 96, issue 1, January 2020, pp. 95-109, at <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiz228>. Accessed on February 3, 2021.

for its foreign and security strategy. Therefore, the “ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific” (AOIP) is visibly reinforced.⁹

Authorised Australian documents, at all times, denote the fundamental spot of maritime Southeast Asia as a conduit between the two oceans, thus assuring the ASEAN member states that ASEAN will stay essential in the new-fangled paradigm. Considering the fact that Indonesia continues to be a key partner of Australia in the region, long-lasting priorities in Australian foreign policy (Indonesia, Timor-Leste, Papua New Guinea) shall persist to occur in the new context.

Japan

In geographical understanding, Tokyo views the “Indo-Pacific” to cover the whole region from the east coast of Africa to the American Pacific coast. In the post-Cold War era, Japan’s strategy decisions have been analysed inside the account of a reactive state. Contrary to this reactive state thesis, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe put forward Japan’s role as a “proactive contributor to peace”, and first mentioned the “Free and Open Indo-Pacific” (FOIP) approach in a defining address to the *Tokyo International Conference on African Development* (TICAD) in Nairobi, Kenya (August 2016).¹⁰ Japan favours the term “vision” instead of strategy. Japan also puts greater precedence on infrastructure, connectivity, rules-based behaviour in the maritime realm and comprehensiveness. The Japanese government has underlined that FOIP is not a China-containment strategy, but rather a rules-based, all-encompassing framework for regional integration. In an address to the Japanese Parliament, obliquely, Abe referred to the prospect that his FOIP vision and China’s BRI could co-occur and, in fact, aid one another.¹¹

It is important to note that, although in 2016 and 2017 the FOIP was linked principally with security policy menaces, of late features such as “connectivity”, “infrastructure expansion”, “national

9. Prime Minister of Australia, “‘Where We Live’, Asialink Bloomberg Address”, Sydney, June 26, 2019, at <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/where-we-live-asialink-bloomberg-address->. Accessed on February 3, 2021.

10. The Government of Japan, “Towards Free and Open Indo-Pacific”, November 2019, at <https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000407643.pdf>. Accessed on February 4, 2021.

11. Prime Minister of Japan and his Cabinet, “Policy Speech by Prime Minister Shinzo Abe to the 196th Session of the Diet”, Tokyo, January 22, 2018, at https://japan.kantei.go.jp/98_abe/statement/201801/_00002.html. Accessed on February 4, 2021.

development” and “economic growth” have also been holding an influential role. This shift can be seen in a large number of projects that are associated with Tokyo’s professed goal of facilitating network between the two oceans. This precisely translates into increasing trade and investment through enhanced infrastructure.¹² Additionally, the economic mutuality between Tokyo and Beijing is quite evident. Hence, Tokyo’s understanding of FOIP varies noticeably from that of Washington and Canberra.

Japan has invested substantially in building strong bilateral relations with India. It is well known that India is Japan’s leading Official Development Assistance beneficiary, and with the US State Department’s credit of the US-India partnership being crucial to US Indo-Pacific policy, Japan will not just be encouraged to fortify Japan-Indian relations to comprehend the FOIP visualisation, but also to support multilateral collaboration with the US and other participants. The lucidity of this nation’s values-based style that is entrenched in the prevalence of collective principles like rule of law, democracy and human rights, attained importance in Abe administrations. India emerged as a major support in Japan’s important strategic constructs like the “Arc of Freedom and Prosperity”, “Confluence of the Two Seas”, “Quadrilateral Initiative”, Asia’s “Democratic Security Diamond” and the latest “Free and Open Indo-Pacific Vision”. The National Defense Program Guidelines, defence white papers, and the diplomatic blue book highlighted implications of forming multilayered defence cooperation with key partners such as Australia, India and ASEAN countries besides the US.

The Japan-US-India Trilateral Infrastructure Working Group can also discover ventures in important subregions of the Indo-Pacific, possibly with South Asia or, precisely, Southeast Asia. Japan has also carried out a crucial part in earlier rounds of Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) discussions. The regional free trade agreement is proposed to consist of China and India, inter alia;

12. Axel Berkofsky, “Tokyo’s ‘Free and Open Indo-Pacific’: Quality infrastructure and defence to the fore—Analysis”, *ARI* (Analyses of the Elcano Royal Institute), 34/2019 (Madrid: Elcano Royal Institute, March 14, 2019), at http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/ri/elcano_en/contenido?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_in/zonas_in/ari34-2019-berkofsky-tokyos-free-and-openindo-pacific-quality-infrastructure-defence-fore. Accessed on February 4, 2021.

India, though, dropped out of the negotiations in 2019 owing to the unsettled issues of core interest. Along with endorsing “Quality Infrastructure” and trade enterprises, Japan has featured its standing as a vital contributor in the arena of development cooperation. The emphasis of the White Paper on Development Cooperation 2017 precisely complements the primacies of the FOIP strategy.¹³

The United States of America (USA)

The US National Security Strategy (NSS), released in December 2017, marks the difference between “Indo-Pacific”, “Middle East” and “South and Central Asia”. Here, the Indo-Pacific construct was noted as stretching from the west coast of India to the western shores of the United States—exactly the area of duty of PACOM (now Indo-Pacific Command). The NSS is fairly China-centric in its threat evaluation, dwelling a little on the situation in the IOR and its governance instruments.

During the Trump administration, as a step towards elevating US-India ties for FOIP, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson became the first person to mention the umbrella term. Discursing on their ties with India at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in 2017, he acknowledged that the United States and India found a common ground on adherence towards the rule of law, choice of navigation, free trade, and should add to progress, constancy and security in a free and open Indo-Pacific region. Moreover, former US President Donald Trump had promoted the concept in his speech at the APEC summit in Da Nang in November 2017.

The 2017 National Security Strategy and the 2018 National Defense Strategy nominated China, along with Russia, as a crucial strategic security menace.¹⁴ The documents read that a new epoch of competition and enmity between them was gaining pace. The document said that China is growing its presence at the cost of other

13. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, “Japan’s International Cooperation”, White Paper on Development Cooperation 2017 (Tokyo, 2018), at https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/page22e_000860.html. Accessed on February 5, 2021.

14. Jim Garamone, “DoD Official: National Defense Strategy Will Enhance Deterrence”, US Department of Defense, January 19, 2018, <https://www.defense.gov/Explore/News/Article/Article/1419045/dod-official-national-defense-strategy-will-enhance-deterrence/>. Accessed on February 5, 2021.

countries' sovereignty, employing "predatory capitalism", economic enticements and intimidating actions, and inflicting totalitarianism with the aim of vehemently reforming the order in the region. In May 2018, the United States representatively renamed its Pacific Command to Indo-Pacific Command. This was widely recognised as a symbolic move for its oldest military command. US Vice President Mike Pence's stern words against China, in his address to the Hudson Institute in October 2018, became a defining moment for US diplomatic policy. He inculcated China of using measures that are inconsonant with the principles of free and fair trade.

In June 2019, the Department of Defense disclosed the Indo-Pacific Strategy Report which observes the Indo-Pacific as the most important region in the world. The report criticises China's activities as revisionist and mentions Russia as a "malign" actor (for the first time). In November 2019, the State Department came up with its own strategy for a free and open Indo-Pacific (FOIP) region. Some of the priorities were: firming ties with partners and regional organisations, economic affluence, better-quality governance, amity and security, and ventures in human capital. In May 2020, the White House came up with another report named "U.S. Strategic Approach to the People's Republic of China" detailing the US policy towards China. The report presents a competitive method towards the PRC directing to progress the durability of institutions and collaborations, in addition to forcing China to terminate measures believed damaging to the interests of the US or partners. The text submits that strategic competition is going to be the foremost method for the coming times.

The report of United States Congressional Research Service released on December 23, 2020 stated that the US-India trade relations under President Donald Trump have declined because of the raised tariff policy from both sides. According to the report, the United States imposed tariffs on significant Indian exports, counting steel and aluminium (2018).

The bipartisan CRS Report pointed out, "Under the Trump administration, bilateral tensions increased over each side's tariff policies. In general, India has relatively high average tariff rates, especially in agriculture. It can raise its applied rates to bound rates without violating its commitments under the World Trade

Organization (WTO), causing uncertainty for US exporters.”¹⁵ It is being increasingly suggested that trade relations between the United States and India would take a different turn in 2021 under President Joe Biden’s leadership.¹⁶

China

For some Chinese scholars, the Indo-Pacific construct is an idea at the initial stage so that the United States is able to link the Indian Ocean and the Pacific region, in order to restrain China’s advancement purely from a geopolitical standpoint, and to defend the US headship in the theatre. Many Chinese academics are of the view that the notion has not fully blossomed. For instance, Lin Minwang, a scholar from Fudan University, states that the Indo-Pacific strategy is still a perception that requires to be raised and the quadrilateral security dialogue¹⁷ is only the start of the Indo-Pacific security area’s formation. Officially the term “Indo-Pacific” is not used in China and thus does not occur in main documents.

Besides, many academics are of the opinion that the Indo-Pacific strategy is merely an offspring of the Obama administration’s “rebalance” tactic. Wang Xiaowen, a researcher at Beijing Language and Culture University, believes that the Indo-Pacific strategy is fundamentally an extension and furthering of the “rebalance”, with the purpose of tactically connecting both the Oceans. As far as India is concerned, as per the Chinese valuation, India’s commitment is mainly questionable for the reason that India refuses to be instrumentalised by the United States, Japan and Australia.

Scholars from China have recognised several loopholes in United States’ framework for the region. Some suspect the intent of the United States to make available the amenities essential to enforce the planned framework, particularly because, since Trump’s inauguration, Washington has been necessitating a reasonable

15. Lalit K. Jha, “India-US trade ties hit by tariff policies under Trump administration US Congress report”, *The Week*, January 4, 2021, at <https://www.theweek.in/wire-updates/international/2021/01/04/fgn24-us-india-trade.html>. Accessed on February 5, 2021.

16. *Ibid.*

17. Dong Wang and Weizhan Meng, “China debating the regional order”, *The Pacific Review*, 33: 3-4, 2020, pp. 497-519. DOI: 10.1080/09512748.2020.1728576. Accessed on February 6, 2021.

distribution of burden from its allies. Other scholars draw attention to the four influential players, namely, the United States, Japan, Australia and India. Each of them has a discrete idea of the Indo-Pacific space. A substantial disparity is evident not only in their geographical description but even in their tactical aims. Lack of consensus on this thought is remarked as an additional drawback.

From the viewpoint of Chinese experts, the major shortcoming of the Indo-Pacific concept is that, currently, the construct lacks a trustworthy economic element and hence is far from instituting a grave threat to China's appeal as a partner for commerce and trade, including within the outline of the BRI. This remark pertains especially to the United States, whose Indo-Pacific strategy (FOIP) concentrates mostly on security.¹⁸

Indonesia

In geographical context, Indonesia is an essential Indo-Pacific country, fronting the Indian Ocean on the west and the Pacific Ocean on the east. Indonesia's spot resembles a "cross-road location" (*posisi silang*). It performs as a "strategic funnel" between the Indo and Pacific apparatuses of the construct.¹⁹ From the 1950s to the 1990s, Indonesia's emphasis continued on the inside, focused on preserving archipelagic or geographic cohesion and regionally concentrated on the ASEAN. But, presently, Indonesia has enthusiastically strived out concurrently into the Pacific and Indian Oceans, thus out to the Indo-Pacific.

Despite the fact that there have been cavities between its condescending ambitions and clearheaded realities, it has indisputably played a significant and sometimes underappreciated part in the growth of the regional construction in Southeast Asia, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Under former President Yudhoyono, when FOIP as a concept did not exist, Indonesia had proposed a foresight for the Indo-Pacific architecture around the East Asia Summit (EAS), a Summit which is essentially a witness to ASEAN's own "Indo-Pacificization", gradually, to embrace

18. Bo Ma, "China's Fragmented Approach toward the Indo-Pacific Strategy: One Concept, Many Lenses", *China Review* 20, no. 3 (2020): 177-204. DOI:10.2307/26928116. Accessed on March 3, 2021.

19. Pandu Utama Manggala, "Rethinking Indonesia's global maritime axis", *Jakarta Post*, March 22, 2015, p. 4.

big powers. Then-Foreign Minister Marty Natalegawa openly discoursed the vision of an Indo-Pacific Friendship and Cooperation Treaty, though it is a fact that the outlook, on no occasion, proceeded in a successful way.

During the commencement of Jokowi's presidency in October 2014, Rizal Sukma, currently the Indonesian Ambassador to the United Kingdom, had clearly associated the Global Maritime Fulcrum (GMF) concept to a link between the Indian and the Pacific Oceans (he referred to as the "PACINDO"), with deviations between the Indo-Pacific vision under the Yudhoyono administration on several aspects, including geographical scope, with more attention to India and the Gulf countries. Indonesian officials like Foreign Minister Retno Marsudi, have recurrently highlighted Indonesia's Indo-Pacific idea as a medium to both confront Jakarta's apprehensions and differentiate it from those of others, including inclusiveness, as well as ASEAN criticality to guarantee that the organisation is enabling regional conversations. Indonesia has also been dynamic in organising meetings and in discoursing the Indo-Pacific concept publicly on various forums; a Track 1.5 workshop on ASEAN and the Indo-Pacific in March 2018, to name a few.

Vietnam

India and Vietnam held a virtual leaders' summit on December 21, 2020. Co-chaired by Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi and Vietnam's Prime Minister Nguyen Xuan Phuc, the joint statement at the Summit abridged a variety of subjects both countries pursue to collaborate on.²⁰ The Indian Prime Minister noted that "Peace, Stability and Prosperity are our shared purpose in the Indo-Pacific region. Our partnership can make a significant contribution in maintaining stability and peace in the region." The Prime Minister went to add that "There is a similarity in our views on many global challenges, and about the future of our

20. Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, "List of Outcomes: India-Vietnam Virtual Summit (December 21, 2020)", Bilateral/Multilateral Documents, at https://mea.gov.in/bilateral-documents.htm?dtl/33325/List_of_Outcomes_India__Vietnam_Virtual_Summit_December_21_2020. Also see, "India-Vietnam Joint Vision for Peace, Prosperity and People", at https://mea.gov.in/bilateral-documents.htm?dtl%2F33324%2FIndia__Vietnam_Joint_Vision_for_Peace_Prosperty_and_People#.X-CvnKh2UvM.twitter. Accessed on February 6, 2021.

region, and we can work together to advance our shared values.”²¹ The South China Sea dispute was given an important mention in the summit. The joint statement stressed on the necessity for all claimants to obey the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, along with non-militarisation and associated standards.

As a traditional partner of India, Vietnam has also been recognised as an important factor in the Look East Policy (LEP). A careful observation reveals that India’s LEP and Vietnam’s policy of strengthening its relationship coincide, while multilateralising and diversifying its international relations leading to the establishment of Vietnam-India Strategic Partnership.

Interestingly, Vietnam’s philosophy for its foreign policy is analogous to India’s, administered as-it-stands by the “Three Nos”: no to basing rights for foreign military, no to military alliances, and no to partnering-up with one side with the purpose of combating another. However, unlike Vietnam, India has not formally included such principles in any policy text.

France

The debates and research pertaining to Indo-Pacific are mostly fixated on countries such as the US, India, Japan, and Australia, roughly labelled as “Quad”. Although important, it excludes powers like France, who not only have substantial capabilities but extensive interests in the region. France’s conceptualisation of Indo-Pacific (similar to India’s) stretches from the eastern coast of Africa to the western shores of America. France’s Indo-Pacific strategy includes defence of maritime shipping lanes from both traditional and non-traditional threats, strengthening multilateralism, and an assurance towards common and sustainable good (environment, climate change, biodiversity, digital technology, etc.)

It is important to note that France is an Indo-Pacific power, by virtue of its holding overseas territories in both the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The territories are, namely: Mayotte and La Réunion islands,

21. Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, “English Translation of Prime Minister’s opening remarks at the India-Vietnam Virtual Summit” (New Delhi: Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India), at <https://www.mea.gov.in/virtual-meetings-detail.htm?33323/English+Translation+of+Prime+Ministers+openin+g+remarks+at+the+IndiaVietnam+Virtual+Summit>. Accessed on February 7, 2021.

Scattered Islands, French Southern and Antarctic Territories, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna, French Polynesia and Clipperton. To counter challenges such as menace to multilateralism and international order due to the big power competition and enfeebling of rule of law, threats from terrorism, nuclear proliferation (North Korea) and climate change, France intends to develop a network of strategic partnerships in the Indo-Pacific.

French President Emmanuel Macron's visit to Delhi in 2018 and the signing of the logistics support agreement, makes France only the second country after the US with whom India has signed such agreement. Army, Navy, and Air force of both nations frequently conduct joint exercises, namely 'Shakti', 'Varuna', and 'Garuda'. Moreover, France, India and Australia are held to have a convergence in their principles and maritime security interests. To quote President Macron, "In order to be respected by China as an equal, we (France-India-Australia) need to organize ourselves."²²

As a step to firm up their strategic partnership in the western Indian Ocean, France and India have joined hands for a project²³ in the Western Indian Ocean Region, namely, the Vanilla islands, which includes Comoros, Madagascar, and Seychelles. The partnership envisions to discover sectors including port development, connectivity, and energy exploration in resource-rich areas around Mozambique channel near Vanilla islands.

INDIA'S ROLE AND PROSPECTS AS THE REGION TAKES ON NEW GEOPOLITICAL IMPORTANCE

The Indo-Pacific theory has given a prospect for India to make the most of its strategic interests while responding to fluctuations in the security environment. Prime Minister Modi's Shangri-La address (2018) outlined an agenda for India's Indo-Pacific priorities, along

22. Reuters Staff, "Macron wants strategic Paris-Delhi-Canberra axis amid Pacific tension", May 3, 2018, Reuters, at <https://www.reuters.com/article/australia-france/macron-wants-strategic-paris-delhi-canberra-axis-amid-pacific-tension-idINKBN1I331P?edition-redirect=in>. Accessed on February 7, 2021.

23. Dipanjan Roy Chaudhury, "India, France explore 3rd country projects in Western Indian Ocean region", *The Economic Times*, October 24, 2018, at <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/india-france-explore-3rd-country-projects-in-western-indian-ocean-region/articleshow/71743985.cms?from=mdr>. Accessed on February 7, 2021.

with its apprehensions.²⁴ The address reaffirmed India's geographic description of the Indo-Pacific as being "from the shores of Africa to that of the Americas", laying out an extensive physical borderline for its action. At the centre of the speech was the significance of partnerships and the advantage of collaborations, denoting a change from seclusion to dynamic participation in its new diplomatic approach. Though it was imperative for India to set forth its readiness to collaborate with its associates, it was likewise vital to maintain a distance from any sort of "alliances of containment". India recognised the advent of an innovative security planning through "shifts in global power" and as "foundations of the global order appear shaken". That new order should be free, open, and inclusive, with robust ethics that obey dialogues, law, customs, and norms. India supported the regional architecture as the anchor of the new-fangled order and positioned ASEAN at the centre of its Indo-Pacific visualisation, paving the way for its own inclination towards a multipolar world.

By March 2020, India's Indo-Pacific vision had a lucid agenda as a theatre for opportunities. So, as pointed out by the Indian MEA, "Through the Indo-Pacific construct, India envisages a greater role for itself in the wider region."²⁵ As far as Partnerships are concerned, they have played a pivotal role right from the beginning. Japan, Australia, France and the United States came to the fore as India's trustworthy partners. India then reached out its partnerships to other important actors, namely, the continent of Africa, the nations of Indonesia, Oman, Singapore, ASEAN and the European Union.

India strengthened the regularity of its partnerships with its major partners. In conjunction with this rise in diplomatic reach to new areas, India is indulging in cooperation to recognise new measures and probable ordeals in the region. India and France collaborated to unveil the International Solar Alliance in an endeavour to encourage

24. Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, "Prime Minister's Keynote Address at Shangri-La Dialogue (June 1, 2018)" (New Delhi: Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India), at <https://www.mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl/29943/Prime+Ministers+Keynote+Address+at+Shangri+La+Dialogue+June+01+2018>. Accessed on February 7, 2021.

25. Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, "Annual Report 2018-19" (New Delhi: Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India), at http://www.mea.gov.in/Uploads/PublicationDocs/31719_MEA_AR18_19.pdf. Accessed on February 8, 2021.

the advance of renewable power, to combat climate crisis, and cut expenditure on solar power.²⁶ Likewise, backing India's pitch for disaster-resilient infrastructure, the United States, Australia and Japan founded the Coalition for Disaster Resilient Infrastructure on September 23, 2019, headquartered in New Delhi.²⁷ In following such subject-definite associations, India can learn from its past involvement with the tsunami core group in 2005, in which the same countries coordinated on relief work in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia.²⁸ As India subsists to discover new partnerships with its collaborators, the initiatives reinforced by the important actors in the Indo-Pacific outline India's picture as a trailblazer, hence offering reliability and integrity to its efforts.

From the frequent interactions and annual dialogues, it is evident that India continues to engage with its significant partners bilaterally at the highest level. New Delhi holds 2+2 Dialogues with Australia, Japan, and the United States once a year and has a yearly defence interchange with France. Moreover, several exchanges work on a myriad of matters; counterterrorism, cybersecurity, and space, to science and technology, to name a few. Similarly, India organises maritime security interchanges with prominent associates to discourse over regional and global security matters.²⁹ Even though the vision of the Quad seems blurred, the political disposition to cooperate and deliberate questions of international and regional interest highlights the union in strategic interests and a sense of common challenges among its affiliates.

Undoubtedly, India has always carefully watched Chinese military engagements and presence in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR). It is also true that the Indian Navy holds an upper hand in the theatre. Certainly, the geographic location of India in the IOR furnishes the navy with further advantage. Owing to its access throughout the IOR, the navy is easily the first respondent for humanitarian crises over the entire

26. French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, "International Solar Alliance", at <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/climate-and-environment/international-solar-alliance/>. Accessed on February 8, 2021.

27. Ministry of External Affairs, Annual Report 2019-20, p. 68.

28. Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, "Bridging the Indian Ocean: India Leads Relief Measures in Tsunami Hit Areas" (New Delhi: Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, January 2005), at https://mea.gov.in/Uploads/PublicationDocs/185_bridging-the-ocean-tsunami.pdf. Accessed on February 8, 2021.

29. Ministry of External Affairs, Annual Report 2019-20, p. 266.

region. Whereas China, on the other hand, is geographically distant. The absence of Chinese naval bases in the Indian Ocean, except for its logistics facility in Djibouti, is an issue for China's capability to keep up its military existence in the Indian Ocean.

As China gradually upsurges its involvements and existence across the Indian Ocean Region, the Indian Navy has also ascended its occupancy, attentiveness, and undertakings. While India remains convinced that China is nowhere near menacing India's military might, China's resolve of aligning itself as a security provider in the Indian Ocean Region remains beyond doubt. The Chinese permanent naval facility in Djibouti, known for establishing its strategic presence in the Middle East and North Africa, the submarine docking in Sri Lanka, aid in the 2014 Maldives drinking water crisis where they provided freshwater supplies, submarine dispositions, exercises with Bangladesh, and, latterly, China's oceanographic data mapping of the IOR are instances that carry the potential to challenge the pros that India has in the region. As a result, the Indian Navy has made Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) a priority area, as an extremely important element in its IOR strategy.

As India strives to advance its MDA proficiencies, its existence in the region and its part in safeguarding important Sea Lines of Communication (SLOCs) have assumed larger significance. Sea Lines of Communication, considered vital for a state's economic health, is a term that defines prime maritime routes between ports utilised for trading, logistics and naval forces. The navy places substantial weight on the choke points enabling entry to and exit from the Indian Ocean. Surveillance and presence across SLOCs are also central to submarine spotting, because it becomes more difficult to trace submarines in open seas. As far as SLOC defence is concerned, the navy notes, "In times of heightened readiness or conflict, for conduct of maritime operations, SLOCs would acquire increased importance, both for India and the adversary, necessitating measures for protection and interdiction respectively."³⁰ Yet, while India is a cut above in sustaining a consistent occupancy in the eastern and northern Indian Ocean, it does face logistical issues in the southern

30. Directorate of Strategy, Concepts and Transformation, "Ensuring Secure Seas", Integrated Headquarters, Ministry of Defence (Navy), New Delhi, 2015.

and western Indian Ocean. This remains a fundamental challenge. Moreover, with the major partners moving forward, countries must recognise and accept that their Indo-Pacific visions will, at no time, be entirely parallel to one another. India and its partners must remain to underscore the comprehensive and primary values of democracy, regulations, and further common interests while concentrating on issue-based collaborations in the Indo-Pacific.

Aerospace is a concern which has become aptly geostrategically significant in the power equations in the Asia-Pacific. Business, trade and investment are the threesome fulcrum over which the edifice of Indo-Pacific and Asia-Pacific peace and prosperity rests. Farnborough International reports that, "The economic growth in Asia-Pacific (APAC) is being reflected in its aerospace, aviation and defence industries, and the region is set to overtake the US to become the world's largest market."³¹ The web portal further reports that, "Airbus' new executive vice president and chief of sales, marketing and contracts, Eric Schulz, put it into context as he briefed the media ahead of the showcase event. Accounting for one third of Airbus total backlog, one third of Airbus total orders and one third of the overall Airbus in-service fleet, there is no doubt that Asia-Pacific is a core market for Airbus."³²

The Chinese once again appear as intransigent strategic and economic rivals for the APAC, wherein the Chinese aerospace and aviation companies are investing heavily in the South East Asian Nations which will have much impact on Indian and American interests in the Asia-Pacific. The APAA (Asia-Pacific Aerospace Alliance) was been established about fifty years back and persists with the idiom of interacting and more than hobnobbing in the South East Asian Nations vis-à-vis the Chinese geostrategic and geo-economic conundrum in the recent past. The Chinese dragnet of competition always holds sway as a hard and indelible geostrategic and geo-economic reality in the larger Asia-Pacific region.

31. "Aerospace in APAC: The Roar of the Asian Tiger", *Farnborough International*, at <https://www.wearefinn.com/topics/posts/aerospace-in-apac-the-roar-of-the-asian-tiger/>. Accessed on March 10, 2021.

32. *Ibid.*