

CHAPTER - 1

INTRODUCTION

The Peace of Westphalia (1648), which ended the 'thirty years' war, is regarded by many as the key event ushering in the contemporary international system. Before the Treaty, even he was dynasty were used to frequently change, besides the boundaries of states were almost fluid. (Pant, 2010, p. 1). The peace established the right of the German state that constituted the Holy Roman Empire to conduct their own diplomatic relation. They were also formally started to enjoy 'an exact and reciprocal Equality; the first formal acceptance of sovereign equality for a significant number of state. The period from 1648-1776 saw the international society that had been taken shape over the previous 200 years come to fruition. Wars were frequent if lacking the ideological intensity of the Thirty years' war. Some states, notably the Ottoman Empire, slowly declined; others, such as Britain and Russia came into prominence. Some pointed to religious and cultural similarities in seeking to explain this phenomenon, but the central elements that all were agreed on were a determination by all states to preserve their freedom, a mutual recognition of each other's right to an independent existence, and above all a reliance on the balance of power. Diplomacy and international law were seen as the other two key institutions of international society. (John Baylis, 2014, p. 46)

With the treaty of Westphalia, these things were completely changed. Territories of the state head fixed and marked as inviolable. The sovereignty of the state become an acceptable norm. These changing script of the world give a perfect platform to the growth of international relations, now different states can tie their relations with the other state clearly according to their wish an interest and they and they can maintain their relations actively, and now state not changing their roll very frequently. The Westphalia world order was based on three principles. The first is *rex est imperator in sue* or that ' the King is the master in his land'. This means that the king is the highest authority. Also, all sovereign states are equal. The second is that the king determines which religion is to be followed in the state. The third and the last principle is that of the balance of power. This norms evolved to keep in check the hegemonic ambitions of a state. (Pant, 2010, p. 1)

The international relation can be defined as the study of relationships and interactions between countries, including the activities and policies of national governments and all

other governmental and non-governmental organisation which affect the policy-making process of a nation. It can be both a theoretical subject and a practical. The main reason behind the study of international relations is that the entire population of the world is divided into separate political communities or independent states, which profoundly affect the way people live. (Oded, 2010, pp. 1023-45). In the present world, there are almost 200 independent states. These States are independent of each other, and they are sovereign. But that does not mean they are isolated or insulated from each other. Furthermore, states are usually embedded in international markets that affect the policies of their governments and the wealth and welfare of their citizens. That requires that they enter into relations with each other. Complete isolation is usually not an option. IR is the study of nature and significances of these international relations. There have been State systems at different times and places in different parts of the world, in for example ancient Greece, and Renaissance Italy. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, p. 4)

To understand international relations, one should be examine their own daily life, and can be helpful for citizens of particular states to see what we generally expect from a state. There are at least five social values which are usually expected from every state to uphold it: security, freedom, order, justice and welfare. These are social values that are so fundamental to human well-being that they must be protected or ensured in some way in every way. In the modern era, however, the state has usually been involved as the leading institution in that regard; it is probable to ensure these basic values. Almost all states act like human organisation states present problems as well as provide solutions. Most states are likely to be friendly, non-threatening, and peace-loving. But some states may be hostile and aggressive and there is no world government to constrain them. That is a basic and age-old problem of state systems and national security. Many states also enter into alliances with other states to increase their national security. To ensure that no one great power succeeds in achieving a hegemonic position of overall domination, based on intimidation, coercion, or the outright use of force, it is also necessary to construct and maintain a balance of military power. Security is obviously one of the most fundamental values of international relations. The approach to the study of world politics is typical of realist theories of its (Jackson & Sorensen 2016; p 5).

Mostly states behave friendly and they love peaceful co-existence, but sometimes some states show aggressiveness and behave very hostile and there is no world government

to control their behaviour. The most basic component of state system is national security. Just to ensure their security some time state also consists some alliance. This alliance same time use to construct power balancing in different regions. The approach based on the power/might of a state called realistic approach based on Morgenthau theory. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, p. 6)

INDIA

India is one of the oldest civilisation and the largest democracies of the world and one of the important emerging powers in the world. It has achieved all-round socio-economic progress during the last 70 years of its Independence. It is a vast South Asian country and seventh large country in the world having diverse terrain – from Himalayan peaks to Indian Ocean coastline.¹ ‘It covers an area of 32,87,263 sq. km (1,269,346 sq mt), extending from the snow-covered Himalayan heights to the tropical rain forests of the south. Situated in the northern hemisphere, the mainland spreads among latitudes 8° 4' and 37° 6' north, longitudes 68° 7' and 97° 25' east and the area is about 3,214 km from north to south between the extreme latitudes and about 2,933 km from east to west between the extreme longitudes. It has a land frontier of about 15,200 km. The total length of the shoreline of the mainland, Lakshadweep Islands and Andaman & Nicobar Islands is 7,516.6 km’.²

India achieved its freedom on 15th August 1947 from the Great Britain after a very long struggle. During the freedom struggle, India got support from the different part of the world. Even before independence, we can see the US has a soft corner for India and at a different stage of world politics the US has supported India freedom struggle as it believes that India should be free from Britain and it has should be right to decide its internal and external affairs freely (Tiwari, 1977, p. 1).

There are many commonalities in India and USA especially in nature and structure of the political system. After independence India choose to have a government of people, by the people, and for the people like the USA. The US and India both are democratic countries. Both represent democratic ideas through elected representatives. Both are

¹ <https://india.gov.in/india-glance>

² <https://india.gov.in/india-glance/profile>.

dedicated to the freedom of the individual. Both belief in free and impartial elections. The constitution maker of India chooses a federal structure of the parliamentary system of government, in which power is distributed between state and central government. In India, there is a rule of law and Indian parliament got it all power from the Constitution of India.

In the pre-independence era, India's foreign policy was largely Euro-centered. India's relation with South Asia entered a new phase after the indo-Pak war in 1965. The conflict between China and USSR and the partially move on of America from Vietnam has to impact on relations of South Asian countries (Das, 2012). In the post, cold war era India reached to its boom of economic growth. In 1992, its launch a policy 'look east' to establish a closer relationship with the Asian state. By the time China has increasingly become the centre of gravity for Asian trade and it was the largest economic partner in Asian state. In the South Asia, India is an emerging power which can give competition of economic emergence of China. Even the newly elected Modi government continuing to emphasise the importance of its economic and strategic relations in Asia and committing to 'act' more ambitiously to further this interest. Of particular emphasis under the Modi government's 'Act East' policy is the dismal physical infrastructure connections between India and ASEAN markets. Apart from ASEAN countries, India has also pursued stronger economic relations with Japan and South Korea. India's attempts to find an export market in Japan have not met with great success. (India's Look East Policy, 2010)

In 2003 India, along with China, was the first states outside of ASEAN to sign the ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Cooperation and in 2004 ASEAN and India signed a Partnership for Peace, Progress and Shared Prosperity agreement. By December 2012, the relationship between India and ASEAN was declared by both sides to have the status of a 'strategic partnership'. Ignoring China's previous protests in 2007, Japan has been invited to participate in the US-India MALABAR naval exercise in 2009, 2011 and 2014 where the exercises were held in the North West Pacific. So by the time India is achieving is the strategical and economic aim of act East and it's making its position strong between Asian states. (Lee, 2015, pp. 78-79, 91)

The United State of America

In the United States America, the government gets its power to govern from the people³. Citizens in the United States shape their government and its policies, so they must learn about important public issues and get involved in their communities. The 55 delegates who drafted the Constitution included most of the outstanding leaders, or the founders of this country decided that the United States should be a representative democracy⁴. They represented a wide range of interests, backgrounds, and stations in life. All agreed, however, on the central objectives expressed in the preamble to the Constitution: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

In a representative democracy, the people have right to choose officials to create laws and represent their opinions and concerns in administration. The world oldest federal democratic state comes into existence on 4th July 1776 when it got freedom from Great Britain. The 13 original states were all former British colonies. When the all 13 colonies turn out to state, each state established its own government. Eventually, the people in these states created a new form of national government that would unite all the states into a single nation under the U.S. Constitution. Today, the United States has 50 states.⁵

Washington did not want to be drawn into the wars which were raging in Europe. Even it says that the alliance with France, which helped in winning American independence, was no all time alliance to support France in all wars. He set on its view in the proclamation of neutrality which it made on 22 April 1793. (Tiwari, 1977, pp. 22-23) In his famous farewell address of 17 September 1796, Washington declared that America should avoid all political connection with the European states, the reason which prompted the United state to adopt a policy of non-involvement were its negligible military strength, critical economic problems, and serious political cleavages at home. (Robert, 1954). A succession of presidents- Madison, Jefferson, Adams, and

³ Learn about the United States: Quick Civics Lessons for the Naturalization Test , page1

⁴ Welcome to the United States: A Guide for New Immigrants, 2007, page 74

⁵ Learn about the United States: **Quick Civics Lessons for the Naturalization Test , page1**

Hamilton- followed the same policy. President Monroe went a step further when, in December 1823, he propounded the doctrine that no European power should be acquired territory in the two continents. This isolation policy helped the USA concentrated its energies and internal power. (Tiwari, 1977, p. 22)

The US had followed a policy of isolation for a long time. It had adopted that policy and followed it faithfully throughout the nineteenth century in view of its economic and military weakness. This policy was an occasional change to suit new circumstances after the 2nd world war. The US never kept aloof from world affairs. It formed several alliances in Europe and another part of the world. It entered into various types of defence pacts and organisations to strengthen security. These resulted in a cold war. Both the US and the Soviet Union have been trying a gear up their war potential and armament. This tendency of the two strong nations has naturally affected the peaceful life of other nations. In pursuance of its policy, the US has formed several defence alliances which aim at checking the spread of communism. (Tiwari, 1977, pp. 30-35)

Theoretical framework

In the late 1970s, Keohane and Nye argue that post-war complex interference is qualitatively different from earlier and simpler kind of dependence previously, international relations was directed by the state. The ‘high politics’ of security and survival had priority over the ‘low politics’ of economics and social affairs. But under the condition of complex interdependence military force is a less useful instrument of policy and this time different power resource, NGO and other international organisation also play an effective role in policy making. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, p. 107)

The realist view of international relations is based on the pessimistic view of human nature in which due to a high level of security concern and state survival they think war is the ultimate solution of the international conflict. Basically, in the world order, everyone wants to be on the driver seat so they can take advantage per their own. They believe that the acquisition and possession of the power, and deployment and uses of power, are central preoccupations of political activity. According to Morgenthau, Politics is a struggle for power over men, and whatever its ultimate aim may be, power is its immediate goal and the models of acquiring, maintaining, and demonstrating it determine the technique of political action. Here he clearly echoing Machiavelli and Hobbes. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, pp. 67-74)

In 1979 Kenneth Waltz gave neorealist theory which was heavily influenced by economic models. In Waltz's view, the best IR theories are one that focuses centrally on the structure of the system, on its interacting units, and on the continuities and change of the system. Basically, Waltz believing in a system of power balancing between state. According to him, bipolar systems are more stable and thus provide a better guarantee of peace and security than do multipolar system. His theory of international politics very seeks to provide a scientific explanation of the international political system. In his view, the best IR theory is that one which focuses centrally on the structure of the system. In classical realism, state leaders and their international decisions and actions are at the centre of attention. In neorealism, by contrast, the structure of the system that is external to the actors, in particular, the relative distribution of power, is the central analytical focus. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, p. 79)

According to waltz's neorealist theory, a basic feature of international relations is the decentralised structure of anarchy between states. All states have to collect taxes, conduct foreign policy, and so on. In the world order, we can see change according to rising and fall of great power and accordingly balance of power also shift from one to another. In the international political system balance of power can be achieved but it can give any guarantee that wars can stop by it. Waltz differentiate between bipolar and unipolar world system. He believes that bipolar system or balancing of power can give a better peaceful and stable security environment rather than a unipolar world system. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, pp. 70-80)

Unlike Schelling's strategic realism, waltz's neorealism not giving any fix policy guidelines to leaders to confront practical problems of world politics. His theory does not make many guidelines for statecraft and diplomacy for states. His argument is based on determinist theory in which structure dictates policy which is a move on from the classical realist concept. He opted a normative aspect. For example, he operates with a concept of state sovereignty which means state is in a position to decide and it's independent. He also give importance to the concept of state national interests. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, p. 80)

Waltz (1979:195) also argue that the great powers always manage the international system so the concept of the 'great power' follow by 'great responsibilities' is not a traditional realist idea but it is a care idea of the international societies approach. So it

is clear that he is convinced that international order is more likely to be achieved in bipolar systems than in multipolar systems. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, p. 81)

As Waltz has accepted the sovereignty of the state and he describe that he sovereign means not insulated , we can see that today's world order is based on interdependency and different state try to rise as a global power to balancing world power system. In this order to growth as a supreme power at different point, national interest of different states clash with other state; here conflicts raise between states. In the world order there is a numbers of basis of conflicts, many of them exist from the origin of states and many conflicts are the consequences of the change in the society.

Civil wars last many years longer on average than inter-state conflicts, and have a much higher civilian death count. Civil conflicts have rumbled on in Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Ukraine, the Central African Republic and South Sudan to name but a few. Terrorism also continues to make headlines and annual death tolls are rising. Organised crime can consider under terrorism. Terrorism is the reason between the conflict between India and Pakistan. Environmental issues is also a caused of the conflict where national interest of different country clashed with each other. Encroachment of others territory, like China in Indian territory, obligation of sovereignty of others state like America in North Korea or Russia in Afghanistan, fight for economic growth after globalisation, state desire to become a supreme power in the world and arm race and formatting different military troop; these things can be considered as issues of major conflict in the present world order. (Pant, 2010)

But when different countries suffered from the similar kind of problem they come closer and start to understand others pain and problem; on this situation, these states take step toward mutual cooperation and start making a strategy to come out with that problem, whether these problems are natural or it's man-made. In the present world, we can see that on the issue of terrorism different country coming together as in the world most of the country suffering from it. The Same fear of nuclear weapon is also same for every state and they are trying to work together so this weapon of mass distraction can't prove harmful for entire humanities. Interdependency is also a reason for cooperation in the world.

Statement of the problem:

The current wave of globalisation has been driven by policies that have opened economies domestically and internationally. In the years since the Second World War, and especially during the past two decades, many governments have adopted free-market economic systems, vastly increasing their own productive potential and creating myriad new opportunities for international trade and investment. Governments also have negotiated dramatic reductions in barriers to commerce and have established international agreements to promote trade in goods, services, and investment. Taking advantage of new opportunities in foreign markets, corporations have built foreign factories and established production and marketing arrangements with foreign partners. A defining feature of globalisation, therefore, is an international industrial and financial business structure. For the purpose of economic strength and development, different states try to establish good relations with each other. Now the economic growth is prime rather than other ideology. Developed and developing country both are dependent on each other to fulfil their need, example: developed countries need market while developing countries need Modern technology. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2010, pp. 196-197)

Today's world order is interdependent, where all states of the world are dependent on others to fulfil their requirement whether it is social, economic, culture or security. Sometimes they cooperate with each other or sometimes some stronger states dominant to others to fulfil their desire, it depends on the position in the world order of the particular state. Even now the objectives of the state have changed from ancient state and state is become a welfare state and virtually all states are recognised insiders possessing formal or juridical statehood where they also try to provide social-economic security to their citizens with conflict management.

Despite the advancement of global order into a more interdependent one international politics is still dominated by the realist perspective with a focus on power politics; an arena of rivalry, conflicts, and war between states in which the same basic problem of defending the national interest and ensuring the survival of the state, and the security of its people, repeat themselves over and over again. The state is still a pre-eminent actor in world politics – individuals, international organisations, non-government

organisation etc. are either far less important or unimportant. This perspective to see global order place a great deal of importance on the balance of power, which is both an empirical concept concerning the way that world politics are seen to operate and a normative concept: it is a legitimate goal and a guide to responsible statecraft on the part of the leaders of the great powers. It upholds the basic value of peace and security. (John Baylis, 2014, pp. 16-17)

In the dynamic world, different country modifying their policies to make their relationship more positive with others. USA and India, first one the dominant power and another the emerging one, both are taking many steps to give a positive track to their relation in a different field. The security of boundaries along with the cooperation against the emerging potential threat is one of the important aspects of the cooperation. India-USA cooperating in the fields of nuclear non-proliferation, terrorism and security strategy, strategical cooperation in energy and environmental change, educational development and women empowerment, economic, business, agriculture development and food security, science, technology, health and new innovations. The ties between India and USA moves to limited relation stage to a strategic partnership where both the nation understand the importance and requirements of each other. Now the strategic relations become stronger than ever before as America support India's entry in NSG and MTCR. The USA also recognised India's strong claim on permanent membership in UN Security Council.

The present Indo-US rapprochement has been termed as 'irreversible' and is known as Strategic Partnership. Both states took numerous steps which lead them to develop a strong strategic partnership. This strategic partnership is comprised of a broader range of areas for mutual cooperation which includes economic, trade, space, nuclear technology, missile technology, and defence cooperation.

In the modern state system, state security is a complex phenomenon; each state in international sphere has its own specific security definition according to its strategic interests, therefore, one can not confine any specific concept of security which could cover the concept and definition of security in general and would be acceptable for all states in the world. Besides this, there are some general elements which are usually found in the security policy of almost all the countries in the world, i.e. Identifying and preserving core values, internal security, preservation of the ideology of the state,

security from external intervention and threats, economic security, political independence, avoiding hegemony, border security, avoiding disintegration, security from state and non-state terrorism, maintaining a favourable regional and international environment etc. Among all the above elements of security different states may have different priorities, for example, United States' priority may be avoiding terrorism, China's may be avoiding hegemony, India's may be avoiding disintegration etc. (Bukhari, 2011)

The nature and content of relations between New Delhi and Washington have been an enigma and a paradox over the last five decades. India's relations with the US have always been a roller coaster. A former Indian Ambassador to the US termed the relations as "a pattern of misunderstanding, miscalculations and missed opportunities." Dennis Kux has called India and the US "Estranged Democracies." The love-hate syndrome haunts relations between the two countries. Differences in our backgrounds, resources, attitudes, perspectives and priorities were clearly reflected during the Cold War. The characteristic American hostility towards India was particularly visible during the Dulles period when a country that did not toe the American line was considered to be against it. The battle lines got hardened during the Cold War when the differing world views of the Indians and the Americans came into sharp focus. Both New Delhi and Washington have viewed their national interests vis-a-vis the world at large in divergent ways.⁶

An ever more influential and significant India in the international arena is acutely in national interest of the United State. The United States that maintains its power and influence in the international arena, especially in Asia, is deeply in India's national interest. The adjoining possible policy partnership between India and the United States in all the dimensions of their relationship is more and more important to both nations, helps sustain a favourable balance of power in Asia and beyond, and promotes international peace and stability establishment in Asia writ large. With these ideologies as a foundation national interests of India and the United States and proposes specific policy prescriptions for both governments to undertake to advance the bilateral relationship in the period ahead. (Mukherjee, 2009)

⁶ <https://www.idsa-india.org/an-jun-6.html>

To maintain a balance of power in Asia and in Europe that promotes peace and stability; promote the security of the global energy supply; cooperate in the management of the global economy, and effectively address climate change. A strong, vibrant, ever-deepening U.S.-India relationship advances the vibrant national interests of both nations. In this respect, India and the United States seek to slow the spread of weapons of mass destruction and ensure the safe and responsible stewardship of nuclear weapons and fissile material; reduce threats from international terrorism. Henry Kissinger observed well over a decade ago that the United States and India have “no conflict of interest in the traditional and fundamental sense,” a point that the late premier Indian strategist K. Subrahmanyam also eloquently emphasised in ensuing years⁷. Although undoubtedly Washington and New Delhi will have periodic tactical and conceptual differences over how best to defend them, these congruent national interests—together with democratic values—represent the most long-lasting basis for ever friendly U.S.-India relations in the years ahead. Executing policies which strengthen the dynamic national interests can make available content to what could otherwise risk becoming purely a rhetorical “strategic partnership” illuminate the relationship’s significance in the middle of a vast range of competing pressures on the time of policymakers in Washington and New Delhi, and reduce the frequency of lower-level bureaucratic skirmishes and paralysis.⁸

Review of literature

Swaran Singh & Jayanna Krupakar (2014) Indo–US Cooperation in Countering Cyber Terrorism: Challenges and Limitations, Strategic Analysis, 38:5, 703-716. In this paper, authors analysis about cyber terrorism that how the internet is using for Cyber attacks on critical infrastructure, online hate propaganda and recruiting, planning and effecting terrorist attacks have become new frontiers of terrorism. The ubiquitous cyberspace has expanded terrorism structures and transformed their operations. Given their democratic traditions of privileging basic freedoms, such as individual privacy, and the unprecedented spread of the internet, India and the US face a formidable challenge in confronting cyber terrorism. While both countries share a strong

⁷ <https://books.google.co.in/books?isbn=0876095090>

⁸ International Relations , pant

political affinity to cooperate and have set up institutional mechanisms to secure cyberspace, divergences in their approaches and a lack of clarity and consensus on their immediate and long-term goals continue to be their fundamental limitations. In spite of their strong commitment to work together, their divergent approaches to internet governance and episodes like the WikiLeaks and Snowden affairs have only re-enforced their continuing trust deficit.

Bharat- America sambandh ki eitihasik samiksha aur modimay America by Prof. M.D. Badrul Alam published in World Focus (Hindi) Feb 2015.

In this article, he discussed the relation b/n both countries during the cold war and post-cold war period. How both countries work to save a life during the Tsunami in 2004. Both provide a licence for import technology and go through the open-air agreement. Bilateral trade b/n both raise to 40 billion dollars from 13.48 billion dollars. Both work for strategical cooperation and to make sea area more protected both works on marine cooperation framework. America also helps in the nuclear field to fulfil energy supply. Both are committed to fighting against terrorism. To improve citizen living standard, different organisation of America will help USAID to develop smart cities. In the field of education under GYAN project India will invite at least 1000 teacher from America to teach in the central university of India. So, during the Modi-Obama administration, both countries are more committed to the cooperation and good relation.

India – America security and internal security cooperation in the 21st century by Dr Rajesh Kumar, a paper published in World Focus in Dec 2015 (Hindi).

In this paper, mainly the analysis India-America defence relation during the current Modi government period. America not only sold Arm and plan to India but they also signed an agreement to produce ordinance compositely in 2005. In 2002 America sold 12 arms locator radar made in Rethiyan in 200 million dollars which were the matter of concern for India's biggest arms supplier Russia. Even during the Modi's 3rd USA visit America focuses on single window recommendation system to sell defence utility to India. Modi met with all high CEO of Silicon Valley to transform Make in India campaign in Reality. The Indian government also open some defence venture

of FDI cooperation. India is changing its strategy in act East policy to rebalancing in Asia Pacific region. Both countries together trying to prod China to rebalance in Asia.

US-India Defence Relations: A strategic partnership for the 21st century by John Pedro; Cornell international affairs review 2016, In this article, John Pedro (2016) review US-Indo relationship from the time of India's independent, he goes through the reason of difference and now how common interest of both country help to grow a strong relationship between both countries. vol. 9 no.1

Amit Cowshish (2015) Indo-US defence cooperation: Harvesting Defence Technologies at IDSA says that the US offer all those defence technic to India which required. Out of 41, 17 has been transferred to India while 24 believed to be on the card. The US has emerged as the largest supplier of arms to India, surpassing Russia and Israel. But still, there is some issue.

Lavia Lee (2015), India as an of consequence in Asia: the potential and limitations of India's 'Act East' policy; The Journal of East Asian Affairs, vol.29 no.2 - In this paper author looked India's very prominent role in Asia under the leadership of Narendra Modi. It first outlines the historical basis for the Look East Policy which starts in 1992, which started with the objectives of economic boost up by earlier governments. But it analyses the economic, diplomatic and security objectives and strategies pursued by more recent Indian governments to deepen relations in Asia and try to find to explain why the region want Indian Partnership large scale. Finally, it also analyses the main features that obstruct in the growth of India's economic and strategic role in the region. India's economic integration in the region has improved, its capability has to be realised. The greatest scope for an extended role for India is clearly in terms of its capacity to play a soft-balancing role to be able to compete for the rise of China. India could support other strategic players by exerting extra expenses and limits the China to discourage behaviour that disrupts and undermines the normative and strategic basis of Asia's regional order. However, it can say that

India has its own strategy in South Asia to prevent China and make stronger relation to other Asian state to achieve its aim.

Gray K. Bertsch, Seema Gahlaut and Anupama Shrivastava (1999), Engaging India: US Strategic Relations with the world's largest democracy:- Books are about the India-US strategic relationship that how NAM has effected relationship of both the country and how India pro- Russian view and America tilt toward Pakistan has worked as a factor the relationship of both the country. It's also describe that after the indo-Sino war in 1962, India changes its strategic policy. Effect of India's first nuclear test and formation of NSG in 1974 and USA non-proliferation programme and effect on India's nuclear programme. In BJP govt. time India defence policy was different and what was the threat to Indian national treat.

Hypothesis

- Cordial relations between India-USA are complimentary to their national interest.
- Both the nation are facing similar kind of challenge especially in security dimensions.
- A strong defence mechanism will help India to maintain better border security which also helps to focus on the different field of development.

Objectives

As my thesis have the main emphasis on defence cooperation between both countries, so my objectives are:

- To find out the drivers which help in the betterment of ties between India-USA.
- To discern the trajectory of defence cooperation in multilateral perspective.
- To find out the roadblocks to the bilateral defence cooperation.

Research methods

The proposed study will be descriptive cum analytical in nature. Empirical evidence will be collected from the secondary sources. The focus is to discern the trend of India-USA relation through the content analysis techniques of the dominant literature. Also, the term and conditions of various MoUs and agreement will be taken into consideration in general and in defence term in particular.

Primarily following sources will be used for the collection of empirical evidence and content analysis:

- MoU signed by India-USA in a different field of cooperation will use as primary data.
- The article of different magazines, newspapers related to defence field and related to international relation will use as Secondary sources.
- Analysis of day by day activity.
- Books are written on India-USA relation and foreign policy of India.

Universe of the study

Many articles have been published on Indo-U.S. relations. But my research is different from all of these. I have especially tried to show why India's relations with the United States of America have been changed the time to time and what is the reasons behind these changes in the relations. And what kind of changes took place in the relationship between both countries. The factors which play vital roles in making good relations have been ostentatiously discussed in my thesis. America's relations with Pakistan always effect negatively Indo-U.S relation also have been mentioned. I have intended to explore reasons, why the U.S.A. regards India as a potential power. I try to explain how the relationship between both countries has taken a positive trajectory and why both countries are important for each other in world politics. India and USA relation face many ups and down. As this research work aims to study defence relationship among both countries especially in past one decade. The issue will be approached through a multilateral perspective and the role of various state and non-state actors will be visualised in the research concerned.

Tentative chapter

- Introduction
- India-USA Relations- 1947-2005
- India-US socio - economic and others relations.
- India- USA Defence relations in multilateral world order (2005-16)
- Findings and conclusion

The United States looked upon the Middle East as an important area. In the fall of 1952, therefore, held a discussion with the United Kingdom on the question of setting up a Middle East defence organisation. Its plan was to include Pakistan as well, in the MEDO. The MEDO, however, did not materialise through the United State continued it's offered for a similar pact. Secretary Dulles declare to his people over the radio and television networks on 1st June 1953 that " the Middle East defence organisation is a future rather than an immediate possibility." he expressed the need for such an organisation in an area which had the Soviet Union for their immediate neighbour. On 2nd November 1953, the New York Time published a report from its Karachi correspondent that the Governor General of Pakistan would hold talks with the US President Eisenhower. The leader of the two countries held a discussion on the subject from 12 to 14 November 1953. The whole of India reacts strongly to the US proposal to give military aid to Pakistan. But Dulles favoured military aid to Pakistan. This was for 2 reasons first, India helped refuse to sign the Japanese Peace Treaty. The second India had not modified or abandoned its policy of nonalignment. (Jalal, 1989)

On 19 February 1954 Turkey and Pakistan announced that they had mutually arrived at an agreement which guaranteed closer political economy and culture tie between them. The US government warmly welcome this announcement. President Eisenhower announced on 24th February 1954 that the United State was complying with a request from Pakistan for military aid. The USA announced military aid to Pakistan at the time when the two countries were going to have direct negotiations on the Kashmir question. It was, therefore, very natural for the Indian people to think that US arms at to Pakistan were intended to force India to settle the Kashmir question to the advantage of Pakistan. The Western power, particularly the United State, try to isolate Pakistan from India no wonder, therefore, the Pakistan become increasingly anti-Indian. (Jalal, 1989)

References

- <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/bandung-conf>
- <http://www.nam.gov.za/background/history.htm>
- <http://www.nti.org/learn/treaties-and-regimes/non-aligned-movement-nam/>
- http://www.mpil.de/files/pdf1/mpunyb_01_strydom_11.pdf
- <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40202035>
- <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/02/07/the-effect-of-domestic-politics-on-foreign-policy-decision-making/>
- <https://www.idsa-india.org/an-jun-6.html>
- http://archive.mu.ac.in/myweb_test/M.A.28Eng%29.pdf
- <https://books.google.co.in/books?isbn=0876095090>
- Bose, N. S. (1982). *India and the United States : reflections on relationships*. Calcutta: Firma klm.
- Bukhari, S. S. (2011, january). india-united strategical partnership: implication for pakistan. *berkeley journal of social science*, 1(1).
- Das, K. (2012, june). india's growing relations with south asia. *world focus*, 86.
- India's Look East Policy. (2010). *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(48). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25764167>
- Jackson, R., & Sorensen, G. (2010). In *introduction to international relations theories and approaches* (p. 81). new delhi: oxford university press.
- Jalal, A. (1989). Towards the Baghdad Pact: South Asia and Middle East Defence in the Cold War, 1947-1955. *The International History Review*, 11(3), 409-433.
- John Baylis, S. S. (2014). *the globlization of world politics: an inroduction to international relations*. new york: oxford university press.
- Lee, L. (2015). india as a nation of consequence in Asia: the potential and limitations of India's "Act East' policy. *the journal of east asian affairs*, 29(2).

- Lowenheim, O. (2010, october). The 'I' in IR: an autoethnographic account. *Review of International Studies*, 36(4), 1023-1045.
- Mital, D. A. (2016, july). Non-aligned movement and its relevance today . *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 2(7), 22-27.
- Mukherjee, D. M. (2009). India-US relations The shock of the new. *International Journal*.
- Pant, P. (2010). In p. pant, *internatinal relations in 21st century* (p. 1). noida: McGraw Hill Education (India) Private Limited.
- Robert, S. A. (1954). netutralism in asia. *american political science review*, p. 163.
- Tiwari, S. (1977). In 1st (Ed.), *indo-U.S relation 1947-1976* (p. 23). new delhi: radiant.
- Vajpeyee, A. (2012). *samkalin vishv avam Bharat: pramukh mudde aur chunotiyan*. noida: pearson.