

## **Conference Report "EU-India-US Triologue" (22nd January 2008, Brussels)**

For the third time, the *Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung* organized a two-day EU-India-US triologue. Meetings were held with representatives from the European Commission, NATO, the Indian Embassy, and Members of the European Parliament. In addition, the conference held at the European Office of the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung touched upon geo-strategic issues such as "Interests of Europe, India and the US in West Asia", "The Indo-US Strategic Partnership and its implications for Europe", and "Energy Security and Climate Change: New dimensions of geopolitics".

In the **introductory session**, *M.K. Lokesh*, Deputy Chief of Mission of the Embassy of India to Belgium, underlined India's willingness to become a global player. Therefore, relationships with the EU and the US were of crucial importance. Mr *Lokesh* stated that relations with the US still have a broader scope than those with the EU. India still does not perceive the EU as a coherent actor in foreign policy. Nonetheless, the EU and the US both stress the importance of their relations with India and underline that India is an emerging power, not only with rights but also with growing responsibilities, as Mr *Remond*, Head of Unit India, Buthan, Nepal, DG External Relations of the European Commission, stated. The current state of EU-India relations is reflected in the Strategic Partnership of 2004 and the Joint Action Plan of 2005. In 2007, the Science and Technology Cooperation Agreement was renewed, a Memorandum of Understanding covering assistance for the period 2007-2010 with a budget of €260 million was signed, and the establishment of a European Business and Technology Center in Delhi is planned. The ongoing FTA negotiations between the EU and India are also a sign of improved common economic interdependencies and interests. Additional efforts have to be made to confront challenges such as migration, terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, energy security and climate change, *Lokesh* concluded.

In the **first session** *Amb. Mansingh*, Former Foreign Secretary and advisor to the government of India emphasized that India should become more proactive in West Asia to be a credible actor and to contribute to the stability in the region. *Amb. Mansingh* especially underlined the good relationship with Palestine, Iraq, the Gulf Region and Iran. India was the first country to recognize the PLO in Palestine. India and Iraq have similarities due to the secular characteristic of its political parties. From a strategic point of view the Gulf Region will gain importance for India's energy import diversification strategy. On Iran, India has a clear position on nuclear weapons. Iran has international obligations and Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons is unacceptable for India.

There is a growing interest from the US side since 9/11 in that region, as *Dr Markey*, Senior Fellow for India, Pakistan and South Asia Council on Foreign relations in Washington, pointed out. Before 9/11, American Foreign Policy focused on South Asia especially on China. The US had been dedicated to strengthen its relations with India while for Pakistan and Iran it saw no options for improvement and pursued a policy of problem containment. There has been no strong commitment to the current conflict regions and these were seen as exceedingly costly. Considering the current situation, *Dr. Markey* requested from the EU and NATO to expand its Afghanistan mission and open it up to Pakistan.

*Mr. Geoffrey Barrett*, Adviser Asia Directorate at the European Commission in Brussels, mentioned that the negotiations with India should be more rigorous and India should play a more crucial role in the region.

### Discussion Points:

- The violence in Pakistan is steadily increasing. Bush should have acted earlier with regards to this region is concerned.

- The problems in West Asia are to be handled not unilaterally. Therefore, India should be encouraged to engage more in the process.

*Major General Dipankar Banerjee*, Director of the Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies in New Delhi, made clear that the scope of India-US relations cannot be compared with an alliance such as US-Japan or US- Australia. The Indian-US strategic partnership started off with Cooperation on civil nuclear energy, on security issues and space projects.

The EU on the other hand is perceived as lacking a common foreign and security policy. However, India, the EU and the US should pursue common objectives and face common challenges. The desire to be a global player will force India to avoid too much dependence on the US. Therefore India will look at the EU as *Ashley Tellis*, Senior Associate of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, stated. Mr. *Tellis* emphasized that US-India relations have not yet reached its peak. There are still differences in perception, capabilities and objectives. Nonetheless, good relations between the US and India can only be beneficial for Europe because these relations induce a spread of democratic values and in addition to that stability is enforced.

Discussion points:

- Included the preoccupation that power seems to relate to military power. This could lead to an arms race. However, there seemed to be consensus about having the necessity to have a certain defense capability.
- Indian representatives perceived the European societies as still closed, which was rejected by the European side with the argument that Germany invited 20.000 Indian guest workers, from whom only 1000 accepted the invitation.

The topic **“Energy Security and Climate Change: New dimensions of geopolitics”** must be tackled internationally as *Xenia Dormandy*, Project Director India and the Subcontinent and Board Member of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs in Boston, remarked. Energy demand is increasing in a world where resources are finite and environmental impacts are augmenting. This makes energy rich countries more powerful and influential and energy poor countries more dependent on external resources.

Energy dependence is a driver of policies, creates strategic alliances and broadens foreign policy objectives. Energy rich countries are often seen as authoritarian and hostile (eg. Iran, Venezuela). Therefore, the US in the long term will appease its energy demand with an diversification strategy combined with increasing investments in technology funds for alternative energy sources such as ethanol, wind energy or nuclear energy. As for India, Mr. *Chandrashekar Dasgupta*, Distinguished Fellow The Energy and Resources Institute in New Delhi, underlined India’s intention to contribute to the mitigation of climate change and is being aware of the fact that development puts further pressure on energy security and climate change. However, he emphasized that more responsibility lies with the industrial countries concerning climate change since they have higher emission of carbon dioxide per capita and a more significant record of historic emissions. As for energy, India is an energy demanding country. According to *Dormandy*, the US fears that India’s energy limitations bring it closer to states like Iran. Therefore, EU-Indian-US relations have to be strengthened by cooperation in several fields (eg. stability of regions, diversifying current sources of energy, developing new sources, developing new technologies, mitigation of environmental impacts, taking seriously the post-Kyoto negotiations). Also for energy security and climate change, the EU favors multilateral mechanisms to overcome asymmetries, as Mr *Bocharev*, Project Coordinator of Energy Security and Global Security Program of the East-West Institute in Brussels, declared.

Discussion points:

- In the discussion, emphasis was put on the comeback of nuclear energy and the problem of nuclear waste. Nuclear energy is seen as an alternative source of energy and is therefore reinforced by the US. The US and India have a nuclear civil arrangement since 2006, which was highly criticized because India has a nuclear weapons's programm and did therefore not sign the NPT. For the US it seems crucial to strenghten the nonproliferation regime and to have India under international safeguard. India will have access to US nuclear technology and open up its nuclear facilities for inspection. However, it is questionable if new civil nuclear arrangement will ensure energy security and climate mitigation. Nuclear energy is only partially a solution because it provides electricity, but does not provide for oil. In India, nuclear power supplies about 3% of India's electricity. By 2050 nuclear power supply is expected to provide 25%. In the US, 20% of electricity is supplied by nuclear power and in Europe 32%.
- Emerging countries like India claim the right of equal development and the right to preserve energy as they wish, wanting to maintain their sovereignty. Having the world's second largest population and over one billion people, India's per capita emission rate for 2004 was of 0.34 metric tons of carbon, which is well below the global average (1.23). It has the smallest per capita rate of any country with fossil-fuel CO<sub>2</sub> emissions exceeding 35 million metric tons of carbon. India is open to substantially contribute to the mitigation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, but requests the same rights as the industrial countries.

**Concluding** the conference, Mr *Singh*, Member of the Indian Parliament pointed out, that the strategic partnership between India and the EU is "not tangible" and that the US-India relations were lately reduced to the subjects around 9/11. The economic aspect seems to prevail in both relationships with a growing importance given to energy security and climate change. Mr *Tellis* claimed that security has to develop to a cornerstone of EU-India-US relations and asked whether power or institutions are going to provide for security. He favors the nuclear energy approach the US is having as a response to climate change and energy dependence and sees no other option for India. Reasons for favoring nuclear energy might be that in the US electricity consumption is going to increase up to 40% in the next years and nuclear energy is more economic than fossil fuels. In addition, uranium prices have been steady, which gives more security than prices of fossil fuel. It is also the nearest to non-polluting energy.

## Conclusions and Summary

- **India:** India is becoming a world power and claims for more responsibilities in the world. Therefore, it advocates for multilateralism. Only on a multilateral basis, world topics can be addressed. However, despite India's desire to become a world power, it is in between being an emerging country and a developing country. India is very concerned about climate change, but needs to exploit its energy resources in order to grow economically. So, there is a trade off between economic development which increases the energy demand and damaging the environment. Often economic growth leads to an increase of environmental damages and the costs to finance the growth rate are higher than the growth itself. Especially industrialized countries contribute to the climate change and are seen as the main responsables to take action. However, after the last summit in Bali it became clear that all countries have to contribute to the solution of the climate problem.
- **US:** The US puts its focus rather on security issues since 9/11. Security is put even before development cooperation. More engagement from the EU and NATO in Iraq and Afghanistan is demanded. The US has rather a hard power approach and questions the multilateral mechanism to handle world problems. However, it has to be said that the US also engages heavily in development aid. It is the largest contributor to the UN and for

Pakistan, for example, the US has currently budgeted around \$750 Mio for foreign development assistance.

- **EU:** The EU favors the multilateral mechanisms and has a soft power approach. There seems to be a consciousness about the lack of "speaking with one voice", but there is the confidence that with the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty there will be more transparency and coherence in the common foreign and security policy.