

## Is India, or Will It Be, a Responsible International Stakeholder?

It has become a cliché that the key strategic challenges facing Washington and the wider international community, such as energy, water, terrorism, economic development, and nonproliferation, cannot be solved by the United States alone. Although the United States unarguably retains its post–Cold War preeminent position, events since the September 11 attacks have shown the limitations of Washington’s hard and soft power. Meanwhile, the power of Europe and Japan are waning as they face internal distractions that limit their influence, while China’s is rising globally and in Asia, arguably the most important region to the United States strategically. China’s increasingly high military spending has built strong and capable armed forces, and its economic power is developing swiftly, with annual growth averaging nearly 10 percent over the past 20 years.<sup>1</sup> From a low following Beijing’s crackdown on the 1989 Tiananmen Square protests, China’s influence is growing as well.<sup>2</sup> These power fluctuations compel the United States to seek out like-minded allies that will proactively help to resolve global as well as Asian challenges.

In September 2005, Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick asked whether China would rise peacefully to become a “responsible stakeholder” that “recognize[s] that the international system sustains their peaceful prosperity, so [that] they work to sustain that system.”<sup>3</sup> He went on in the speech to solicit China’s cooperation on a number of global issues, including North Korea, nonproliferation, and terrorism. Considering India’s significant rise over the past few years, the same question could be asked of India.

Largely unnoticed by the global community, India has ascended to the world stage over the past 15 years, building on its economic reforms of the

---

Xenia Dormandy is executive director for research at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University and former director for South Asia at the National Security Council. She may be reached at [xenia\\_dormandy@harvard.edu](mailto:xenia_dormandy@harvard.edu).

---

© 2007 by The Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*The Washington Quarterly* • 30:3 pp. 117–130.

early 1990s and nuclear tests in 1998. In addition to an economic growth rate second only to China's, at 8 percent annually over the past three years, New Delhi continues to retain its position as leader and cofounder of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and unofficial head of the developing world. India has the third-largest army, fourth-largest air force, and seventh-largest navy worldwide and is eagerly lobbying to be considered a global player, actively seeking a permanent seat on the UN Security Council.

**Stakeholders can help prioritize geopolitical issues or share resource burdens.**

---

Both President George W. Bush and then-Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee have described the bilateral relationship as that of "natural partners."<sup>4</sup> The United States has made India one of its central foreign policy foci and a powerful success story, especially since President Bill Clinton's triumphal five-day visit in 2000. Considering its capabilities, will, interests, and values, India would seem to make an ideal partner in the region and even

globally. Will India live up to the U.S. definition of an "international stakeholder"? What might be the constraints on its desire or ability to do so?

As Zoellick stated, international stakeholders help to defend or create an international system. Such an international system could be defined as a norm-sharing mechanism that establishes and enforces behavioral standards while sharing information to support those ends. In this case, stakeholders are less focused on who brings what resources to the table and more on identifying and prioritizing geopolitical issues, as is the case in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), organizations that focus on issues such as security, terrorism, economic development, and energy exchange. Alternatively, an international system could be a burden-sharing mechanism in which stakeholders are states willing to shoulder responsibility and make sacrifices to meet mutual goals, such as the response group to the 2004 Asian tsunami or the coalition of the willing in Afghanistan.

Whether India qualifies as a global stakeholder, either as a partner to help set international norms or to bear resource burdens, is a valid question. As a norm-setting partner, New Delhi is already valuable. India is a multiethnic and multireligious democracy with a strong military; great diplomatic influence, particularly within the developing world; and rising soft power. Its interests are not dissimilar to those of the United States. Its principal foreign policy concerns include terrorism, energy, nonproliferation, narcotics, and managing China as well as Pakistan. As Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has stated, "Our goal should be to ensure a prosperous, secure and dignified future for

our people and to participate actively in contributing to the evolution of a just world order.”<sup>5</sup> Can the United States look to India as a burden-sharing partner on the international stage?

### **Breaking Out of Its Nonaligned Shell**

---

India’s recent emergence as a norm-setting partner of the United States should not be taken for granted. Historically, India has not been a strong supporter of U.S. interests. Its founding and subsequent leadership of the NAM, which came from a desire to avoid the East-West ideological confrontation of the Cold War, led it to pursue alternative interests that strictly avoided any perceived tilt in either direction. As Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru asserted in his speech before the 1955 Asian-African Conference, marking NAM’s founding, “Every pact has brought insecurity and not security to the countries which have entered into them.”<sup>6</sup>

Although India has been much more evenhanded in its foreign policies and its friends since 1991, many in the Indian government still see the United States as Pakistan’s ally, an untrustworthy partner, and a nation that spent significant diplomatic resources on keeping India out of the global power structure, particularly in the area of nonproliferation as India declined to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Nevertheless, as the United States distanced itself from Pakistan after the Soviet Union pulled out of Afghanistan in 1989, India also separated itself from the Soviet Union and subsequently from Russia.

Over the past decade, India has embraced development while retaining its leadership of the developing world. As it moves into the group of more developed nations, its interests will change to reflect this. India is already rejecting foreign aid, recognizing the value of being a provider, as demonstrated most notably during the 2004 Asian tsunami and the 2005 Pakistani earthquake. As India becomes more industrialized, its need to protect its agricultural base will diminish, and it will thus open up to more global trade and investment. India now has a significant and growing middle class, by some counts larger than the entire U.S. population, and the resources to invest overseas. New Delhi continues to improve its relations with its neighbors big and small, building a more benign reputation that allows it more flexibility of action.

India’s relationship with China has improved notably since 2002, although both sides remain cautious and continue to compete for influence in Asia and beyond. Despite ongoing border disputes, the two countries started a strategic dialogue and conducted their first joint military exercises together in 2005. President Hu Jintao visited India in November 2006, making him the first Chinese head of state to travel to India in a decade.

**As it moves into the group of more developed nations, India's interests will change.**

The Indian-Pakistani relationship has weathered several recent storms. The 1999 Kargil incursion, during which the Pakistani military, dressed as freedom fighters, crossed into India in the state of Kashmir, severely strained relations. The Indian government responded by mobilizing approximately 200,000 troops. Without the actions of the international community, this incident would likely have led to a nuclear war. Bilateral relations were further stressed

by a terrorist attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001, which is believed to have been undertaken by Pakistan-based militants.

Perhaps in reaction to the stark consequences of a collapse in relations, the subsequent Composite Dialogue has built trust between the governments and particularly between the two peoples. The dialogue has resulted in small but meaningful successes, including cross-border bus and train routes, military-to-military communication, and cricket competitions. Many in India believe that

the time is ripe for real progress in 2007, particularly on some of the more controversial border issues of Kashmir, Sir Creek, and the Siachen Glacier.

India is also responsibly engaging smaller countries in the region. In conjunction with the United States and the United Kingdom, India played a vital role in pressuring King Gyanendra of Nepal to reinstate democracy after he dismissed the government in February 2005. Although India has resisted playing a central role in Sri Lanka since Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's 1991 assassination by a Sri Lankan secessionist, New Delhi is more recently bringing resources and pressure to bear to promote peace. Additionally, New Delhi has invested about \$750 million in building infrastructure and training security forces in Afghanistan.<sup>7</sup> Finally, India was one of the five countries that came together as the core response group within 24 hours of the Asian tsunami in December 2004, eventually contributing more resources than any other country besides the United States, and is now leading an effort to develop a regional disaster alert system.

New Delhi is also beginning to take more interest in Asian regional architecture in conjunction with its "look east" policy. Many Southeast Asian nations urged India's involvement in the East Asia Summit (EAS), launched in December 2005, despite China's and Malaysia's clear desire to exclude them to ensure Chinese leadership of the organization. India is already a member of the SAARC as well as the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation and is pushing for membership in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. They are an observer in the SCO, which includes

China and Russia but notably not the United States. In 2005 this organization proposed that the United States provide a timetable for withdrawal of its troops from its member nations. India's engagement with these organizations would have been unthinkable under Nehru's nonaligned foreign policy, but the country's contemporary goal of building economic growth encourages such alignments.

India's activities as a norm builder should not be overlooked. As a nation with similar objectives and values to those of the United States, its leadership in such organizations, particularly those in which the United States does not participate, can be extremely valuable. India's role in the EAS as a counterweight to China will likely ensure that this organization does not promote policies antithetical to U.S. aims and will not replace APEC as the leading Asian regional organization. Likewise, if India were to become a full member of the SCO, this organization would not likely take actions such as voting to remove all U.S. troops from Central Asia.

## **Stepping Up to the Global Stage**

---

India's support for norm-building mechanisms is already evident in its quest for membership in regional organizations. In norm-building terms, it is on the cusp of becoming a responsible stakeholder globally. Whether India is ready to take on a burden-sharing role is another question, but Singh has at least articulated the need to strengthen global norm-setting institutions and multilateral arrangements, particularly for issues such as nonproliferation, the environment, and global and regional security.<sup>8</sup>

### **NONPROLIFERATION**

The Indian government has long described the nation as having "an exemplary nonproliferation record" and as one that supports the highest "nonproliferation standards and goals,"<sup>9</sup> despite not being a member of the treaties and agreements that constitute the nonproliferation regime. India regularly expresses its concordance with such agreements as the Missile Technology Control Regime and, as the Congressional Research Service reports, it has been very good at controlling the spread of sensitive nuclear technologies.<sup>10</sup> With the signing of the U.S.-Indian Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act on December 18, 2006, which allows the United States to conduct civilian nuclear cooperation with India, and the ongoing efforts by both countries to persuade the Nuclear Suppliers Group to pass similar rules, India is no longer entirely outside the international nonproliferation architecture. Crossing a long-standing redline, this deal would be the first legitimate exchange of nuclear technology with an NPT

nonsignatory since its creation in 1968. This provides an opportunity where India has or could show both norm-setting and burden-sharing leadership.

For norm setting, India declared in the 2005 U.S.-Indian Joint Statement that it would work with the United States for the “conclusion” of a multilateral fissile material cutoff treaty to ban the production of weapons-grade uranium and plutonium that could be used in nuclear bombs.<sup>11</sup> Being apprehensive

of letting any nation have insight into its civil or military nuclear programs as verification of any treaty would require, the United States has shown some reticence toward this treaty. India, however, could and should take more action to move this agreement forward.

On the burden-sharing side, India has not yet taken steps to contribute to the international system. The potential certainly exists. Although

India’s atomic scientists and many in the political sphere reject outright any proposal that might limit India’s self-sufficiency in this area, India could help create an agreement on enrichment and reprocessing by agreeing to forgo such activities on its own soil and signing up instead to the international fuel bank proposed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), thereby setting an example for other countries, such as Iran.

At a minimum, India should join the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), an effort launched in 2003 to enhance interdiction capabilities worldwide that now has more than 70 participants. India has significant resources to bring to bear, not least its navy and its geographic location, both of which would make valuable additions to the PSI and any interdiction activity. India also has great influence with the nonaligned and developing countries; its actions could lead others to follow. Gaining India’s leadership or, at a minimum, active involvement would be a significant boon to the nonproliferation community. In so doing, India would at little cost show its willingness to be a contributor to this community.

**As a norm-setting partner, New Delhi is already valuable.**

## **ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT**

Given its rate of development and gross domestic product (GDP) growth, India is becoming an increasingly important player in the global energy market. It is the fifth-largest consumer of energy worldwide,<sup>12</sup> and with anticipated annual GDP growth of 8 to 10 percent over the next decade, its energy demands will increase significantly. By 2030 it will likely be the world’s third-largest energy consumer, after the United States and China.<sup>13</sup> As of 2006, approximately 70 percent of India’s electricity needs are met by domestic (and dirty)

coal resources, with electricity demand expected to double by 2015. Although the country produces a lot of electricity, 30 to 50 percent is lost along the delivery chain.<sup>14</sup>

India's increased energy demand will tighten the worldwide energy market, raising prices, and will have a growing environmental impact. Slowing or stopping India's burgeoning demand is not an option, so encouraging India to become a responsible energy consumer is paramount. To date, New Delhi's actions on this issue have been unimpressive. It has joined the Asia Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate, a group that boasts many of the largest consumers, including Australia, China, Japan, South Korea, and the United States, but that has not yet taken any action.

India has significant potential for efficiency improvements. Given its relatively basic level of infrastructure, it could choose more environmentally friendly technologies from the start rather than incurring the additional costs of converting infrastructure as must many other countries. India could agree to adhere to short-term environmental targets as laid out in the Kyoto Protocol or another paradigm at relatively low cost and sacrifice. Such a step would set an example for other developing nations and demonstrate to the United States and other major powers its willingness to bear global burdens. Moreover, it would enjoy domestic support, as 51 percent of Indians considers global warming to be a critical threat.<sup>15</sup>

India also has a role to play in supporting global energy security. One-half of the world's oil is transported through the Malacca Straits, a route highly susceptible to terrorism and piracy that lies to India's southeast across the Bay of Bengal. India has had some part in ensuring the stable movement of shipping in this area despite the resistance of some of its Southeast Asian neighbors, notably Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore, who are wary of India's navy encroaching on their sovereignty and projecting Indian power into the region.<sup>16</sup> India's resources, namely its navy and proximity to the straits, make it a vital player to protect this channel in partnership with other countries in the region.

India currently reasons that attention to environmental concerns will diminish economic growth. As a developing nation, it believes that it should not be held to certain environmental standards until it reaches consumption levels similar to those of the United States. As Thomas Friedman recently pointed out, however, nations and companies that include "green" considerations in their planning will see economic returns over time as others have to catch up

**India has been less enthusiastic about global burden-sharing.**

later on.<sup>17</sup> Despite much evidence to support this argument, it would take significant political capital for the government to sell this to India's population. Nevertheless, given the bilateral U.S.-Indian agreement to start a new "green revolution," the U.S. government and business sector can do much to support these efforts toward greater efficiency and alternative technologies that can be catalysts for this process.

## **REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

Because India prioritizes internal economic development, it requires external stability and security. India's military is exceptionally capable and well trained to support these ends. Its competence was proven clearly when it bested the U.S. military in joint air exercises in February 2004.<sup>18</sup> India continues to modernize its military, spending more than \$19 billion in 2005<sup>19</sup> and increasing the budget by almost 11 percent from 2001 to 2006.<sup>20</sup>

Perhaps most significant to the United States, India has the potential to play a vital role with Iran. As a longtime friend of Iran, India has the influence that the United States is lacking, but it must be willing to see its relationship with Iran in a larger perspective that looks beyond its own personal bilateral history and energy concerns to the greater global challenge that a nuclear Iran might become. It has voted in the IAEA to condemn Tehran's deceit over its nuclear program, but it now needs to do more to apply real pressure. Although expecting India to forgo cooperation in the area of energy is unrealistic—an Iran-Pakistan-India pipeline is currently on the table—making it clear that, like many in the international community, India does not trust Iran with a nuclear capability will go a long way toward convincing Tehran that it has little foreign support for their intransigent position, even from old friends.

New Delhi also has a direct and vital role in ensuring regional stability vis-à-vis Pakistan and in promoting the development of China as a responsible partner. Although the United States does not "have a policy that would build up a relationship with India to contain China,"<sup>21</sup> Washington and New Delhi are watching Beijing carefully and pursuing policies that will induce China to move in a positive direction. India has made clear that it will not be a pawn against China, and like the United States, it is increasingly engaging in political, diplomatic, and military exchanges with China. Given the commonality of U.S. and Indian concerns and hopes about China, this is an issue on which they can and must closely collaborate.

Given its impressive economic growth and location, India could support trade with Central Asia through Afghanistan and Pakistan. India is beginning, like China, to reach out to Africa, another region of the world where it has in-

terests. Its increasing need for energy sources makes Africa and Latin America two particular foci of attention,<sup>22</sup> but unlike China, it does not pursue this policy to the detriment of democracy or human rights. Activity in Africa is also a sign of its wider efforts to become a global power and the realization of the importance of the African grouping in the United Nations, as India needs Africa's support in a bid for permanent membership on the Security Council.

Having experienced terrorist attacks for decades, India is a central player in the war on terrorism. New Delhi has stepped forward in some areas, providing training and significant infrastructural support in Afghanistan. Given their focus on domestic terrorism, however, particularly in Kashmir, they have been less active in helping to create an international definition of terrorism or even a local regional norm. India has worked with Pakistan and others in South Asia to sign the Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism, but this has not resulted in any action.<sup>23</sup> Given their multiethnic and religious heritage and as the country with the second-largest Muslim population in the world, their contributions in resources, training, and norm setting would be meaningful.

**India has the potential to play a vital role with Iran.**

As the world's largest democracy, India has enormous soft power and influence that it could use to support democracy promotion more actively in other countries of the region and world. To date, India has only been willing to promote democracy passively or as part of a larger group, such as cofounding the UN Democracy Fund, but they have shown some reticence in taking leadership.<sup>24</sup>

Finally, in the economic field, India has already taken a positive role in the international community through its leadership of the Group of 77 developing countries in the World Trade Organization (WTO). For the Doha round to succeed, however, the Indian government needs to do more than insist that the United States and the European Union compromise. They too will need to find a middle ground with developed nations.

### **The Critical Test: Will India Take On Burden Sharing?**

Aside from its role in the tsunami response group and in UN peacekeeping operations, the government has been less enthusiastic about participating in burden-sharing mechanisms. Although both norm-setting and burden-sharing systems are important, the Bush administration has clearly favored the burden-sharing construct. Its treatment of the UN, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's absence from the 2005 APEC summit, and its dismissal of the

Kyoto Protocol exemplify its disregard for organizations or agreements that only promote ideas or are unverifiable or ineffective in addressing particular problems. Although the United States has some responsibility to create space in the international community for India, New Delhi must show that it is willing to bear the burdens that come with being a global power, including navigating significant domestic and international constraints.

**India will be constrained by a political and practical necessity to focus on reducing rural poverty.**

India's colonial history and NAM leadership have built a strong domestic consensus to retain its autonomy. The perception of independence has factored into its UN vote on Iran, the decision regarding troops in Iraq, and most recently the furor over the U.S.-Indian nuclear deal. In these cases, the domestic political dialogue revolved around the primacy of India's sovereignty and ensuring that decisions were made to promote national, not international, goals. As Singh stated

during the parliamentary debate on the nuclear deal, "[N]othing will be done that will compromise, dilute, or cast a shadow on India's full autonomy in the management of its security and national interests."<sup>25</sup>

India will also be constrained by a political and practical necessity to focus on reducing rural poverty. The economic and social gap between the rich and poor within India is growing.<sup>26</sup> With 25 percent of the population, more than a quarter of a billion people, living in poverty,<sup>27</sup> the government is focused on lifting them up. The previous Bharatiya Janata Party–led government lost the May 2004 national elections due to a significant vote from the rural population expressing their dissatisfaction over their standard of living and lack of growth. New Delhi will inevitably need to make compromises for the sake of stability, growth, and integration into the global economy,<sup>28</sup> but it will be less willing to devote attention and resources to foreign policies that are not directly relevant to promoting the welfare of its poverty-stricken population.

India's willingness to devote resources to international objectives that do not directly benefit its people in clear and concrete ways is therefore in doubt. Officials in the prime minister's office have privately stated the priority that domestic interests have over foreign ones and their intent to avoid the costs associated with taking a leading role in international burden-sharing mechanisms.<sup>29</sup> Leading pundits in India agree, expressing no great need for India to take on wider public responsibilities, considering the costs they involve and the possibility of being perceived as a U.S. pawn.

New Delhi has stepped up to the plate when its domestic and foreign priorities require, such as its role in the tsunami response or its condemnation

of Iran through the IAEA. In these cases, India's actions have supported its broader goals of being a global provider or maintaining its security—India wants a nuclear Iran as little as the United States does. Otherwise, it is less proactive, focusing on a general norm-setting role. The lack of strategic perspective of many of India's elites reinforces this tendency. Too many still think in transactional terms, looking for a direct quid pro quo rather than appreciating broader or more long-term benefits, a policy that has long been reinforced by the lack of trust between the Indian and U.S. governments. Although certainly not the case among the very top of India's foreign policy community, elsewhere it is widespread, if changing slowly. Moreover, the increasing fractionalization and regionalization of Indian politics makes creating and implementing substantive policies ever more difficult for the administration. The necessity of building and ruling by coalition in India often requires the government to reduce policy to the lowest common denominator.

The nation is not yet willing to forgo immediate domestic interests for longer-term international objectives. To become a major international player, however, India will at times have to put its own requirements second. Until it shows an ability to do so more regularly and on more vital issues, India's reputation as a responsible stakeholder will be tenuous.

### **How Can Washington Ease the Transition?**

---

Beyond its domestic priorities and opposition, if India were to assume greater global leadership roles, other states will often be antagonized. The United States has ways to make it easier. Although in the fall of 2005 the U.S. government resisted declaring explicit support for an Indian seat on the UN Security Council, expressing the need for reform before expansion, it should now do so. Washington should also overcome its inherent resistance to expansion and historical bureaucratic concerns regarding India and support its entrance into international regimes such as the APEC forum and the Group of Eight.

Perhaps as important as support for India's ambitions and membership in these organizations, the United States should not expect a quid pro quo. Such expectations would play into India's fear that it would compromise its own independence and would add enormous political tension to the already significant sacrifices asked of Singh as he tries to reform long-held views of perceived U.S. imperialism. Not asking for something in return may run afoul of some current or former U.S. policymakers, who already feel that Washington has given India enough without reciprocation. They have argued that India's politicians have not shown gratitude for U.S. nuclear recognition, instead maintaining that they were entitled to it and resenting the strings, however few and loose, that the U.S. Congress attached to the deal.<sup>30</sup>

The United States should also do what it can to help India's economic development. Although India's success is currently restrained by problems in areas such as business regulations, enforcement, labor laws, and intellectual property rights, as India reforms Washington should support investment; consider increasing visas for highly skilled workers; and resist any backlashes against outsourcing, which will be particularly vocal in the run-up to the 2008 U.S. presidential elections.

**India gradually will take on additional burdens.**

Finally, the United States should not automatically assume that India, as a responsible international stakeholder, is always going to act in the U.S. interest. They are not always going to be aligned. In the WTO negotiations, for example, even if India finds a compromise position, it is unlikely to be where the United States would like it. A good faith effort should be enough. At the end of the

day, India's interests will be parallel to those of the United States more often than not, but they will not be identical. Regardless, this should not be the test of a responsible international stakeholder.

### **A Work in Progress**

---

The Indian and U.S. bureaucracies have long been wary of one another, sometimes with good reason. India has voted against the United States in the UN more times than Cuba has. Trust must be built in the coming years for a strong partnership to flourish. The pending U.S.-Indian civilian nuclear deal is a good start, but only a start. For its part, in time India will need to assume more burden-sharing responsibilities globally if it wants the United States to recognize its membership in the top tier of the international community.

In time, India's reticence will likely diminish. The civilian nuclear agreement, when it is completed, will finally remove the concrete barrier that has long kept India out of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. It will also remove the more intangible intellectual barrier that has stopped Indian governments and its people from playing a more assertive role in the international community.

Even now, however, the United States should not overlook that India is already acting as a responsible stakeholder, setting the norms and pursuing the values that are such an important part of what the United States represents. Like the United States, India is synonymous with democracy, development, equality, freedom, liberty, and other such fundamental beliefs. As former defense minister Pranab Mukherjee stated, "[The U.S.-Indian] partnership will ... help shape global norms and institutions that are universally accepted and democratic."<sup>31</sup> As India gradually becomes a wealthy nation able to meet the

basic needs of its population, it will take on those additional burdens with capabilities it is already beginning to develop. For that day, the United States needs to have patience for a powerful friend and eventual partner to continue to emerge.

## Notes

1. International Monetary Fund, "World Economic Outlook Database," September 2006; Public Affairs Division, Public Affairs and Communications Directorate, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, "Economic Survey of China 2005," *OECD Policy Brief*, September 2005, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/25/35294862.pdf>.
2. Joshua Kurlantzick, "China's Charm: Implications of Chinese Soft Power," *Policy Brief*, no. 47 (June 2006), [http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/PB\\_47\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/PB_47_FINAL.pdf).
3. Robert Zoellick, "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility?" (speech, New York, September 21, 2005), <http://www.ncuscr.org/articlesandspeeches/Zoellick.htm>.
4. Office of the Press Secretary, The White House, "President Signs U.S.-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act," Washington, D.C., December 18, 2006, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/12/20061218-1.html>; Stanley A. Weiss, "America and India Are Getting Together, and It's About Time," *International Herald Tribune*, February 9, 2001, <http://www.iht.com/articles/2001/02/09/edstan.t.php>.
5. Manmohan Singh, "India: The Next Global Superpower?" (speech, New Delhi, November 17, 2006), <http://pmindia.nic.in/speeches.htm>.
6. "Speech to Bandung Conference Political Committee, 1955," Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955, <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1955nehru-bandung2.html> (speech by Jawaharlal Nehru).
7. "India Increases Aid to Afghanistan," *Hindu*, January 19, 2007, [http://www.app.com.pk/en/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=2276&Itemid=2](http://www.app.com.pk/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2276&Itemid=2).
8. Manmohan Singh, "Making Globalization Work: An Indian Perspective" (speech, New Delhi, December 17, 2006), <http://www.ficci.com/media-room/speeches-presentations/2006/dec/dec18-pm.htm>.
9. Shyam Saran, "Indo-U.S. Relations: An Agenda for the Future" (speech, Washington, D.C., March 30, 2006), [http://www.indianembassy.org/newsite/press\\_release/2006/Mar/43.asp](http://www.indianembassy.org/newsite/press_release/2006/Mar/43.asp).
10. Sharon Squassoni, "U.S. Nuclear Cooperation With India: Issues for Congress," *CRS Report for Congress*, RL33016, July 29, 2005, p. 7, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33016.pdf>.
11. Office of the Press Secretary, The White House, "Joint Statement Between President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh," Washington, D.C., July 18, 2005, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/07/20050718-6.html>.
12. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, "International Energy Annual 2004," May–July 2006, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/iea/overview.html>.
13. Carin Zissis, "India's Energy Crunch," *Council on Foreign Relations Backgrounders*, December 8, 2006, [http://www.cfr.org/publication/12200/indias\\_energy\\_crunch.html?breadcrumb=%2Fissue%2F426%2Fenergy](http://www.cfr.org/publication/12200/indias_energy_crunch.html?breadcrumb=%2Fissue%2F426%2Fenergy).
14. Paul Maidment, "Energy Outlook 2007: India's Powerful Dilemma," *Forbes*, November 28, 2006, [http://www.forbes.com/business/2006/11/28/india-energy-environment-biz-cx\\_pm\\_1128indiaenergy.html](http://www.forbes.com/business/2006/11/28/india-energy-environment-biz-cx_pm_1128indiaenergy.html).

15. Chicago Council on Global Affairs, "The United States and the Rise of China and India: Results of a 2006 Multination Survey of Public Opinion," 2006, <http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/GlobalViews06Final.pdf>.
16. "Singapore on Saturday Welcomed India's Offer to Help Safeguard the Malacca Strait," *IndiaDaily*, June 3, 2006, <http://www.indiadaily.com/editorial/9380.asp>.
17. Thomas L. Friedman, "The Power of Green," *New York Times Magazine*, April 15, 2007, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/15/magazine/15green.t.html?em&ex=1176782400&en=821b6cf046e2c6ed&ei=5087%0A>.
18. Hampton Stephens, "USAF: Indian Exercises Showed Need For F/A-22, Changes in Training," *Inside the Air Force*, June 4, 2004, <http://vayu-sena.tripod.com/exercise-iaf-usaf-su30-f15-article01.html>.
19. "India's Defence Imports to Touch \$35 bn by 2026: Antony," *India PRwire*, January 15, 2007, <http://news.indiamart.com/news-analysis/india-s-defence-imp-14556.html>.
20. Primit Mitra and John Ryan, "Gathering Steam: India and the U.S. Extend Military Ties," *CSIS South Asia Monitor*, no. 99 (October 2, 2006), <http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/sam99.pdf>.
21. Office of the Press Secretary, The White House, "Transcript: White House Press Briefing by Tony Snow and State's Burns," Washington, D.C., December 18, 2006, <http://newdelhi.usembassy.gov/uploads/images/xiQWRyxHNMI0B9Qa2MDA9w/snowburnsprbrief121806.pdf>.
22. "Africa, Latin America Have Remained on Indian Radar," *Deccan Herald*, November 6, 2006, <http://meaindia.nic.in/interview/2006/06/11in01.htm>.
23. "SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism," <http://untreaty.un.org/English/Terrorism/Conv18.pdf>.
24. See C. Raja Mohan, "Balancing Interests and Values: India's Struggle with Democracy Promotion," *The Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (Summer 2007): pp. 99–116.
25. "Statement of PM in Rajya Sabha on the India-U.S. Nuclear Agreement," New Delhi, August 17, 2006, <http://pmindia.nic.in/parl/pcontent.asp?id=30>.
26. Pranab Bardhan, "India Must Reduce Inequality to Usher in Reform," *Financial Times*, August 8, 2006, Asian edition, p. 11; Gurcharan Das, "The India Model," *Foreign Affairs* 85, no. 4 (July 2006): 2–16.
27. CIA, "World Factbook: India," <https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/in.html>.
28. Pranab Mukherjee, "India's Strategic Perspective" (speech, Boston, September 25, 2006), [http://www.indianembassy.org/newsite/press\\_release/2006/Sept/8.asp](http://www.indianembassy.org/newsite/press_release/2006/Sept/8.asp).
29. Indian officials, interviews with author, New Delhi, January 2007.
30. Ashton Carter, "How Washington Learned to Stop Worrying and Love India's Bomb," January 10, 2007, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20070110faupdate86175/ashton-b-carter/how-washington-learned-to-stop-worrying-and-love-india-s-bomb.html>.
31. Mukherjee, "India's Strategic Perspective."