

OCTOBER 2009

The United States and India 3.0

*Cave! Hic Dragones**

ASHLEY J. TELLIS

Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

SUMMARY

The United States and India share the fundamental objective of preserving an Asia that is peaceful, prosperous, and free. Without security, India's meteoric rise cannot continue. While New Delhi can manage Pakistan, its longtime regional adversary, it will have more difficulty confronting the challenges posed by a rising China. As a result, India will continue to depend on the United States to preserve order in Asia until it can protect its own interests there.

On July 15 of this year, Hillary Clinton made her maiden voyage to India as U.S. Secretary of State. Prior to her departure, she gave a speech that highlighted various challenges facing the current international system. But while most Indian leaders would agree that "no nation can meet the world's challenges alone," they would argue that Clinton pays too little heed to the dramatic changes now occurring in the global distribution of power, which could have serious consequences over the long term. For the U.S.-Indian relationship to continue bearing fruit, senior policymakers must therefore be mindful of several enduring realities:

- India would like the United States to manage its relations with China in such a way that precludes both collusion and confrontation between Washington and Beijing.
- New Delhi looks to Washington to preserve a favorable balance of power in Asia, thus enabling it to concentrate on economic development without any distracting security competition.
- India seeks a strengthened partnership with the United States and with other key American regional partners such as Japan, Singapore, and Australia.
- India desires greater American support in confronting the terrorism emanating from Pakistan even as it seeks to avert any American intervention that could disrupt the peace process in Kashmir.

Secretary Clinton's visit to India was an enthusiastic step forward into the next era of U.S.-Indian ties, introducing a procedural framework that will permit both countries to cooperate extensively. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's forthcoming state visit to Washington offers the administration a splendid opportunity to consolidate substantive gains as well as to discuss issues of mutual interest, including climate change, nonproliferation, economic development, and defense cooperation, which are also priorities for President Obama.



Ashley J. Tellis is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues. While on assignment to the U.S. Department of State as senior adviser to the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, he was intimately involved in negotiating the civil nuclear agreement with India.

Previously he was commissioned into the Foreign Service and served as senior adviser to the ambassador at the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi. He also served on the National Security Council staff as special assistant to the president and senior director for Strategic Planning and Southwest Asia.

Prior to his government service, Tellis was senior policy analyst at the RAND Corporation and professor of Policy Analysis at the RAND Graduate School.

He is the author of *India's Emerging Nuclear Posture* (2001) and co-author of *Interpreting China's Grand Strategy: Past, Present, and Future* (2000). He is the research director of the Strategic Asia program at NBR and co-editor of the six most recent annual volumes, including this year's *Strategic Asia 2009-10: Economic Meltdown and Geopolitical Stability*.

Hillary Clinton paid her first visit to India as U.S. secretary of state in July 2009. Most news reports agreed that her five-day trip was successful. Reprising her maiden visit to India as first lady in 1995, she again captivated diverse audiences ranging from corporate leaders to poor women, from students to government officials. With her legendary diligence, she had carefully prepared for the mission, and she vigorously engaged her Indian interlocutors on disparate subjects ranging from business to climate change to terrorism.

Clinton was cognizant that this time her visit to India, now as U.S. president Barack Obama's chief foreign policy adviser, would be closely scrutinized for the signals conveyed, and she scored especially well on the symbols. From her deliberate stay at Bombay's (now Mumbai's) Taj Mahal Hotel—which expressed better than words America's solidarity with India in its struggle against Islamist terrorism—to her high-profile visit to the Self-Employed Women's Association store—which highlighted her long-standing commitment to women's empowerment—she clearly showcased her desire to broaden the U.S.–Indian relationship.

Her visit also could not have been better timed. After an unprecedented deepening of U.S.–Indian ties during George W. Bush's Republican administration, signaled most conspicuously by the civilian nuclear cooperation initiative, both Indian officials and the public had been disconcerted by President Obama's early positions on matters affecting India. For example, while he was still presi-

dent-elect, Obama had made remarks about mediating in the Kashmir dispute, and then there had been diplomatic wrangling between the Indian and American governments about the scope of his special regional envoy's charge—all producing deep anxiety in New Delhi that the new Democratic administration might undermine India's traditional approach to dealing with this vexed issue. And earlier, the reluctant support offered by several Democrats, including then-senator Obama, to the civilian nuclear initiative also fueled doubts about whether Obama's administration would complete the reprocessing negotiations that are universally viewed within India as essential to the agreement's success. Finally, the new president's rhetorical flourishes about creating jobs in Buffalo rather than in Bangalore increased fears that he might embark on a new protectionist effort that would limit India's growing exports of services to the United States.

Such fears, accumulating at a time when official contacts at the highest levels had dropped precipitously because of the election cycle in each country, left Indian policy makers nervous that U.S.–Indian relations might be approaching yet another meltdown, as has occurred with depressing regularity in the past. In fact, these patterns have been so pronounced—with stunning improvements succeeded by paralyzing crises—that the bilateral relationship historically took the form of a gigantic undulating curve. The prospect that New Delhi's partnership with Washington might again sunder on the shoals of disagree-

This Policy Brief, the first in a two-part series focusing on U.S.–Indian relations, evaluates the potential for improved bilateral cooperation in the context of Indian perceptions of the Obama administration's policy toward New Delhi. The second brief, which will precede Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's visit to the United States in November 2009, will focus on the issues that President Obama has identified as his administration's priorities: climate change, nonproliferation, and economic and defense cooperation.

ment appeared to be a dismal prospect, especially to India's prime minister, Manmohan Singh, who had staked his political fate at several moments during the preceding five years on his efforts to remove the structural impediments in U.S.–Indian relations.

Secretary Clinton's visit occurred against this backdrop of fretfulness and anxiety. Beyond all the specifics, her central challenges were to convince an apprehensive Indian leadership that the Obama administration would place the same importance on strengthening ties with India as had President Bush, that India's growth in power and overall success were still important to the United States, and that the United States still saw India as a critical partner in realizing the common vision that brought both countries together in the first place—the importance of preserving an Asia prosperous, peaceful, and free.

Of all the members of President Obama's Cabinet, no one was better suited for this mission to India than Hillary Clinton. Her often-expressed affection for everything Indian, from its culture to its food, which had earned her, whether with affection or opprobrium, the sobriquet “the senator from Ludhiana,” her close ties with the Indian American community, and her (and her husband's) continuing friendships with key members of the Indian governmental, business, and cultural elites—all positioned her perfectly for the role of Obama's emissary, which she played to great applause throughout her sojourn.

But did Clinton's visit deliver? Did she succeed in assuaging Indian apprehensions about the direction and conduct of U.S. policy? And did she lay the foundations for the continued success of what she herself had earlier dubbed “the beginning of a third era... U.S.–India 3.0”?

Hillary Clinton spent five days in India, which as Cabinet visits go was a long one. Despite strong advocacy by the president's

special envoy to Pakistan and Afghanistan, Richard Holbrooke, that she also visit Pakistan on this trip, she resolutely demurred. Wanting to confirm that India and Pakistan are not hyphenated entities in the Obama administration's eyes, she affirmed (both through her schedule and once explicitly in an interview

India must continue depending on the United States to preserve order in Asia until it feels it can protect its own interests independently.

with Pakistani television before setting out for the subcontinent) that India and Pakistan are two different countries with two dissimilar trajectories, and hence must be treated uniquely. India, she noted, has “had a very clear set of goals that [it has] been able to pursue because [it is] a largely stable and internally secure country now.” Affirming that “that's what I want to see for Pakistan,” she reminded her listeners that “the constant threat from the internal terrorists is one that has to be dealt with in order for Pakistan to grow and flourish.” Score one for reassurance in New Delhi.

Clinton's travel within India was also atypical. Though most senior U.S. officials mainly restrict their customary one-to-two day Indian visits to New Delhi, she spent four of her five days in Bombay, where she mourned the victims of the 2008 terrorist attacks and met with a broad cross-section of Indian society, including leaders of nongovernmental organizations, captains of industry, poor and working women, and students. When she finally got to New Delhi, she spent one day in a series of quick discussions with senior Indian leaders, including the prime minister.

These parleys produced important substantive results. The United States and India concluded two initiatives begun by the Bush administration—the End-User Monitoring

Agreement and the Technology Safeguards Agreement (box 1), inaugurated a \$30 million endowment for joint research, development, and innovation in science and technology, and announced the rationalization of the numerous ongoing U.S.–Indian exchanges into a new Strategic Dialogue (box 2).

These outcomes were intended to reinforce the message that U.S.–Indian ties are in good shape. Notwithstanding this fact, Clinton

scientists call low politics (meaning that relating to economic, social, and human development) overwhelm those related to high politics (meaning that concerned with national security and the very survival of the state), with perhaps no single issue receiving undivided attention.

At one level, this comprehensive approach suggests a genuine maturing of the relationship brought about by the civilian nuclear cooperation initiative, which, as Clinton acknowledged, has “helped us get over our defining disagreement.” But it also masks what could become a problematic illusion: that low politics and enhanced intersocietal ties, no matter how conscientiously pursued, can compensate for the inability to reach convergence on the key strategic issues of importance to both the United States and India.

In fact, the lessons of the United States and India “1.0” are especially pertinent here. Although the Bill Clinton administration made strenuous efforts to improve bilateral relations with India from the very beginning, it attempted to do so by sequestering the issues of high politics, on which the United States and India were at odds, in the hope that progress in low politics, which appeared more likely, might relieve the disagreement. Accordingly, the administration designated India one of four “big emerging markets” and attempted to build the foundations for a partnership on the

This centrality of national security in U.S.–Indian relations will remain for some time to come.

hoped that the next iteration of the partnership—the United States and India “3.0”—would be marked by even greater “expansion in our common agenda, and a greater role for India in solving global challenges.” This expansion, which of necessity would need to transcend intergovernmental relations, included reaching out to the private sectors in the two countries and integrating their efforts to resolve various international problems. These themes found their clearest manifestation in the shape of the refurbished Strategic Dialogue; they underscore the fact that U.S.–Indian relations now cover an immense canvas, where the multiplicity of concerns pertaining to what political

BOX 1 Agreements Concluded During the Clinton Visit

END-USE MONITORING AGREEMENT: This agreement is a congressionally mandated requirement governing all U.S. defense sales involving high technology. The agreement is intended to ensure that U.S.–supplied military equipment is used, broadly speaking, to advance peace and security and is not illicitly sold, transferred, or modified.

TECHNICAL SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT: This agreement is intended to prevent the transfer of sensitive missile technology to a space launch vehicle program. By protecting the interface data related to the form, fit, and function associated with mating satellites containing U.S.–origin components to launch vehicles operated by third parties, the agreement enables the United States to license the export of U.S.–origin and third-party satellites containing American components for launch by India.

basis of enhanced economic access and better people-to-people links, even though critical conflicts about the global nuclear order and India's nuclear weapons programs loomed in the background.

The limits of this approach were manifested by the Indian nuclear detonations in May 1998, and although the Clinton administration thereafter made valiant efforts to resuscitate the bilateral relationship from the depths of mutual recriminations, this effort would also have been unsuccessful if it had not been providentially bailed out by the foolish Pakistani aggression at Kargil in June 1999. Although it would take several more years before the civil nuclear initiative begun during George W. Bush's second term could eliminate this discordance, the lessons of the Bill Clinton years should highlight the all-important fact that successfully addressing the challenges of high politics is central to maintaining progress in U.S.–Indian relations and that, no matter how useful, improvements in low politics simply cannot be a substitute.

This centrality of national security in U.S.–Indian relations will remain for some time to

come for three reasons. First, because high politics by definition fundamentally concerns a state's core security, because India is still in the process of consolidating its statehood after centuries of colonization, and because the profound disparity between American and Indian power will persist, any divergence in the realm

The success realized in most of the critical areas encompassed by the Strategic Dialogue will not derive from official U.S. contributions as much as from decisions made within India itself.... Lasting success will depend more on internal institutional and structural changes produced by the Indian state through the political process.

of national security between the United States and India undermines New Delhi's vital interests (and possibly also Washington's) in highly consequential ways that cannot be offset by those benefits otherwise deriving from successful cooperation in areas of low politics.

Second, although the growing U.S.–Indian partnership on education, energy, science and

BOX 2 The United States–India Strategic Dialogue

The current Strategic Dialogue, which encompasses numerous bilateral activities between the United States and India, consists of five principal pillars, under which a variety of working groups bring together different components of the two governments:

- strategic cooperation, with a focus on securing political convergence with regard to nonproliferation, deepening counterterrorism cooperation, and expanding military cooperation;
- energy and climate change, with a focus on increasing energy cooperation and reconciling approaches to alleviating the effects of global climate change;
- education and development, with a focus on increasing access to and investment in education and supporting women's empowerment;
- economics, trade, and agriculture, with a focus on expanding business and market access, sustaining trade liberalization, and food security; and
- science and technology, health, and innovation, with a focus on advancing leading technologies and in increasing joint activities to address global health challenges.

technology, health care, and women's empowerment—to name just a few of the issues of low politics identified in the Strategic Dialogue—is undoubtedly important and contributes to India's success, activity on these issues is increasingly dominated by private organizations in both countries. Although governments can—and should—play critical catalytic roles in these arenas, success will derive mainly from the degree to which both

The administration will need to pay attention in the months ahead to three critical issues on which there is still considerable uncertainty in both New Delhi and Washington: preserving the balance of power in Asia, terrorism, and Kashmir.

societies draw on each other's resources outside state control—and this process will continue intensively without in any way producing any assurance of strategic convergence in high politics, at least in the short run, as the events of the 1990s demonstrated.

Third, the success realized in most of the critical areas of low politics encompassed by the Strategic Dialogue will not derive from official U.S. contributions as much as from decisions made within India itself. And because India's developmental challenges are multifaceted and enormous—though ideas, technology, and resources from the outside are important for mitigating them—lasting success will depend more on internal institutional and structural changes produced by the Indian state through the political process. American contributions in the arenas of low politics, therefore, however important, cannot be fundamentally transformative—and even if they occasionally are, they could nonetheless coexist with divergences on high politics to the detriment of both countries' key strategic goals.

Accordingly, although Hillary Clinton's visit to India did a good job of affirming the Obama administration's desire for an expanded partnership with India and put in place the procedural building blocks toward that end, in addition to outlining its own agenda with India, the administration will need to pay attention in the months ahead to three critical issues of high politics on which there is still considerable uncertainty in both New Delhi and Washington: preserving the balance of power in Asia, terrorism, and Kashmir.

Preserving the Balance of Power in Asia

Both the United States and India share the fundamental objective of preserving an Asia that is peaceful, prosperous, and free. This objective is of great importance to Indian policy makers, because the success of their internal economic reforms requires a peaceful geopolitical environment in which India's security and autonomy are not threatened by any outside power—especially its rivals, Pakistan and China. Though New Delhi arguably can contain the challenges posed by Islamabad more or less independently, the same is not true of Beijing. Thus India must continue depending on the United States to preserve order in Asia until it feels it can protect its own interests independently.

The Bush administration and Indian policy makers saw eye to eye on this issue, and this congruence formed the foundation for the rapid improvement in bilateral ties starting in 2001. Preserving an Asian balance of power that safeguards the region's states drove Bush's decision to strengthen India's rise as a global force capable of protecting its interests in friendly, even if only tacit, collaboration with Washington. The government of India hopes that the Obama administration will continue this policy—if for no other reason

than to protect U.S. interests. But gnawing uncertainties persist.

Indian leaders would agree with much of Secretary of State Clinton's depiction of the world in her major foreign policy address of July 15, 2009. They would endorse her judgment that "no nation can meet the world's challenges alone," because the dangers are too complex and the players too many. They would also concur that "most nations worry about the same global threats, from nonproliferation to fighting disease to counterterrorism." But they would argue that these "two facts," important as they are, do not constitute a complete description of contemporary challenges because they exclude a third reality: the incipient changes in the global distribution of power that could have serious consequences for peace and stability over the long term. These changes are occurring thanks to the rise of China and, consequently, the character of U.S.-Chinese relations has a critical impact on Indian security.

What New Delhi is looking for in this regard is neither American containment of China nor American hostility toward China. Neither of these approaches would be feasible given the current conditions of interdependence, and both would undermine Indian interests in serious ways. Instead, India seeks above all an assurance that U.S.-Chinese relations will not turn in the direction of a geostrategic condominium, either out of choice or because U.S. power runs itself down to the point where such a concession to China becomes inevitable. Where India is concerned, this objective would require Washington to both get its own economic house in order—a goal to which New Delhi believes it can contribute by increasing the symbiosis between the two economies—and also support the strengthening in various ways of its other Asian partners, such as India, Japan, and the Southeast Asian states.

On this subject, Indian officials understand all too well that current American economic vulnerabilities and Washington's dependence on Beijing as a source of capital may make the

Washington has an enduring interest in preserving a favorable Asian strategic balance for its own well-being.

Obama administration reticent to speak out too loudly. But Indian officials believe not only that the United States has more power than it may itself acknowledge but also that Washington has an enduring interest in preserving a favorable Asian strategic balance for its own well-being. Thus, this subject ought to become the focus of private high-level conversations because it will affect, among other things, India's strategic choices about its nuclear force posture and the size and quality of its evolving deterrent capabilities.

Terrorism

In different ways, both the United States and India find themselves locked in a continuing struggle against global terrorism conducted by radical Islamist groups. Often, even their adversaries are the same, from al-Qaeda to Lashkar-e-Taiba, and the most energetic battles of this war are being waged in Afghanistan and Pakistan—in close proximity to India, which is involved in different ways. Yet there are significant differences in Indian and American perceptions about the struggle against terrorism, and these center primarily on Pakistan.

By traditional American standards, Pakistan remains a state sponsor of terrorism, because organs of the Pakistani government, primarily the army and intelligence services, continue to either actively support various armed groups that conduct murderous attacks on civilians in India and Afghanistan or acquiesce to their

activities. But Islamabad also happens to be Washington's partner in the struggle against terrorism—and therein lies the rub.

Because Pakistan is thus part of both the problem and the solution to terrorism, Washington's policy toward Islamabad has been far more indulgent than most Indians, and increasingly many Americans, would like. Ever since the start of the George W. Bush administration, Washington has attempted to secure Islamabad's cooperation by plying it with generous military and economic assistance, on the assumption that such aid would wean

tion has allocated most of the vastly increased U.S. assistance to Pakistan to civilian programs, Indian security managers, aware that financial resources are fungible, fear that the net ability of the Pakistani military to support terrorism has actually increased at a time when its conventional war-fighting capabilities are also being augmented by U.S. assistance on the grounds of improving Islamabad's counterinsurgency capacity.

India's leaders would be more forgiving of the U.S. approach if there was evidence that this engagement strategy was actually yielding results—that Pakistan was indeed uniformly confronting all terrorist groups operating against the United States, Afghanistan, and India. But on the contrary, the history of Pakistani responsiveness, including after the Bombay attacks, has been dismal; though U.S. influence has been effective in preventing Indian military retaliation against Pakistan—an outcome reinforced by the Manmohan Singh government's own preference for peace—it has thus far been ineffectual in persuading the Pakistani military to eviscerate the terrorist groups that partake in targeting the American, Indian, and Afghan homelands as well as American forces in Afghanistan. Although officials in New Delhi remain chagrined at Washington's tolerance at a time when the Obama administration is ramping up its own military campaign in Afghanistan, they are concerned that future terrorist attacks from Pakistan may compel them to undertake military responses that will not only heighten tensions with Islamabad but also inadvertently undermine regional U.S. counterterrorism operations and put at risk U.S.–Indian relations. What the Indian public is simply getting tired of, however, is accepting its long-standing victimization for the sake of protecting bilateral solidarity in the war against al-Qaeda.

Because Pakistan is part of both the problem and the solution to terrorism, Washington's policy toward Islamabad has been far more indulgent than most Indians, and increasingly many Americans, would like.

the Pakistani military away from its dalliance with terrorism while inducing it to assist the American-led operations against al-Qaeda.

In effect, what happened over the years was that the Pakistani military perfected a segmented counterterrorism strategy: it substantially, but not completely, aided Washington's fight against al-Qaeda and used American (and indigenous) resources to vigorously combat domestic militants targeting itself, while it continued to ignore, if not actively support, those terrorists working against Afghanistan and India. Because Pakistan's geography is crucial to the ongoing U.S. military operations in Afghanistan, the Pakistani military has for all intents and purposes been able to deter America from penalizing its continued support for terrorism.

This U.S. strategy for securing Pakistani support for counterterrorism is increasingly undermining India's security, not to mention America's. Although the Obama administra-

The United States has appreciated this conundrum since 2001. Most recently, it has renewed its effort to mitigate this dilemma through increased intelligence cooperation with India. But even this initiative, important and overdue as it is, will not be able to stop the disaster that will ensue if India acts forcefully after a future terrorist attack on its soil. Therefore, New Delhi and Washington ought to soon undertake serious conversations on the challenges of coping with Islamabad's failure to sever its continuing linkages with terrorism (not to mention managing the problems of progressive national decay), even as Washington itself ought to redouble its efforts to secure the Pakistani military's compliance with the counterterrorism promises Islamabad has made since 2001.

Kashmir

There is not enough paper on the planet to describe the intense Indo-Pakistani competition over Kashmir. Yet the last eight years have also seen the greatest progress thus far by both countries to resolve this conflict—a tribute, first and foremost, to the persistence of Indian prime ministers Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Manmohan Singh and former Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf but also, as an important permissive condition, to calculated American silence.

Washington's deliberate reticence on Kashmir during the Bush administration, despite its deep engagement with Islamabad and New Delhi, had the critical effect of compelling both sides to make peace on what are essentially the only sustainable terms over the long run—their relative differentials in power. Washington's absence from this process prevented Islamabad from being able to up the ante in its negotiations with New Delhi on the assumption that it could rely on American support, while simultaneously per-

mitting New Delhi to be as generous toward Islamabad as was permitted by its desire for reconciliation and domestic politics.

Now, however, the fruits of these eight years of hard negotiations on the Kashmir dispute will be at risk if the Obama administration persists with its intimations of intervention. The administration could also inadvertently contribute to precipitating a major crisis in

The upward trajectory of U.S.–Indian relations will be substantially constrained if the two nations cannot agree on the three central national security issues—the balance of power in Asia, terrorism, and Kashmir.

South Asia if the Pakistani military, sensing an American willingness to intervene, were to escalate its terrorism against India to force New Delhi to open new negotiations or increase its demands beyond the framework already informally agreed. Although after quiet but clear Indian protests, the U.S. administration has backed off early plans to intercede in the Kashmir imbroglio, the temptation to do so will never really die—or so Indian officials fear.

Pakistan's continued refusal to comprehensively meet its counterterrorism obligations—despite all American inducements—will constantly tempt Washington to contemplate playing the midwife in resolving the Kashmir dispute in the hope that such a success might finally stimulate wholehearted Pakistani cooperation on counterterrorism. Yet such hopes are chimerical, because today the Pakistani military's antipathy toward India goes beyond any particular issue. Instead, it is produced by a malignant mélange of the army's own hold on power in Pakistan, its vast economic and financial interests within the country, its role in upholding the *raison d'être* of an otherwise

infirm state, and its desire to avenge its defeat and the vivisection of its homeland in 1971—along with all the specific disputes that could in principle be resolved.

Any U.S. intervention in Kashmir will therefore run the serious risk of both setting back the peace process and disrupting U.S.–

Any U.S. intervention in Kashmir will run the serious risk of both setting back the peace process and disrupting U.S.–Indian relations, even as it fails to secure increased Pakistani cooperation on counterterrorism.

Indian relations, even as it fails to secure increased Pakistani cooperation on counterterrorism. The dispute over Kashmir will be resolved only when both New Delhi and Islamabad independently reach the conclusion that each is better off without this ulcer than with it. India reached this conclusion at least a decade ago, if not earlier; Pakistan appeared to be gravitating toward a similar conclusion under President Musharraf, but things appear less clear under General Ashfaq Kayani.

In any event, resolving the problem of Kashmir is so difficult—and the stress it places on U.S.–Indian relations is so significant, because of its importance to New Delhi—that

the Obama administration should at least refrain from making things worse. However, whether through absentmindedness or otherwise, it has instead unfortunately reached out again to urge—after a long gap—that the dispute should be resolved, taking into account “the wishes of the Kashmiri people.”

It is unclear whether today’s U.S. policy makers understand the unhelpful nature of this exhortation. Whatever its merits when it was first invoked in the early 1990s, such an invocation today is both gratuitous and counterproductive—gratuitous because more than 60 percent of the electorate participated in the 2008 statewide polls, and even erstwhile separatist groups are already engaged in dialogue with the Indian government; and counterproductive because adding more interlocutors to already-delicate bilateral negotiations between India and Pakistan could irretrievably derail them. Because both New Delhi and Islamabad completely understand that they must satisfy popular aspirations as a matter of self-interest if any deal they reach between themselves on Kashmir is to endure, the United States should at least avoid giving comfort through problematic locutions to those groups that have no interest in a practical resolution of this problem. In all such matters, the ancient aphorism “First, do no harm” still applies.

BOX 3 The Diversity of U.S.–Indian Engagement

As the following list of consultations shows, bilateral cooperation between the United States and India is both broad and deep:

- Strategic Dialogue
- Foreign Office Consultations
- Defense Policy Group
- Joint Working Group on Counterterrorism
- U.S.–India Economic Dialogue
- The CEO Forum
- Trade Policy Forum
- Energy Dialogue
- Global Climate Change Dialogue
- Information and Communications Dialogue
- Science and Technology Forum
- Education Dialogue
- Health Cooperation Framework

The Next Steps

Hillary Clinton's visit to India was an enthusiastic first step in iteration "3.0" of U.S.–Indian relations. She struck all the right symbolic notes, and she inaugurated a procedural framework that will enable both countries to cooperate extensively (box 3). Though many issues related to economic, social, and human development will play an important role in sustaining the partnership's upward swing, this trajectory will be substantially constrained if the two nations cannot agree on the three central national security issues—the balance of power in Asia, terrorism, and Kashmir—that brood like the mythical dragons off charted territory on medieval maps. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's forthcoming state visit to

Washington offers the Obama administration a splendid opportunity to engage on these issues, and also on the U.S. priorities of climate

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's upcoming state visit to Washington offers the Obama administration a splendid opportunity to engage on the balance of power in Asia, terrorism, and Kashmir, and also on the U.S. priorities of climate change, nonproliferation, and economic and defense cooperation.

change, nonproliferation, and economic and defense cooperation. The success and durability of the partnership between India and the United States will depend on it. ■

The Carnegie Endowment normally does not take institutional positions on public policy issues; the views presented here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Endowment, its officers, staff, or trustees.

© 2009 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. All rights reserved.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States. Founded in 1910, Carnegie is nonpartisan and dedicated to achieving practical results. Building on the successful establishment of the Carnegie Moscow Center, the Endowment has added operations in Beijing, Beirut, and Brussels to its existing offices in Washington and Moscow.

RESOURCES

Visit www.CarnegieEndowment.org/pubs for these and other publications.

India in Asian Geopolitics, Ashley J. Tellis, in *Rising India: Friends and Foes*, Prakash Nanda, ed. (New Delhi: Lancer, 2007), <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=20124>.

India As a New Global Power: An Action Agenda for the United States, Ashley J. Tellis, Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2005, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/CEIP_India_strategy_2006.FINAL.pdf.

India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership, Teresita C. Schaffer (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2009).

The Limits of Influence: America's Role in Kashmir, Howard Schaffer (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2009).

The Merits of Dehyphenation: Explaining U.S. Success in Engaging India and Pakistan, Ashley J. Tellis, *Washington Quarterly*, 31: 4 (Autumn 2008), pp. 21-42, http://www.twq.com/08autumn/docs/08autumn_tellis.pdf.

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT

FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

1779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

