

INTRODUCTION

An international order is sustained through participation or engagement of various actors. The more interconnected the international order, the more it necessitates deeper and wider engagements. Foreign policy making has been plagued by the foundational question of whether states should isolate themselves against the outside world and pursue its interests or to actively participate in the global order. In the Post-Cold war globalized international order states no longer have the privilege to follow a completely isolationist foreign policy. Engagements and interactions are not only important, rather they are essential for a state's survival, development and goal achievement. States are placed as per a power hierarchy and they have distinct interests and ideas and the ability to realize those they engage extensively. Great powers with greater capabilities can exert influence and forward its objectives more effortlessly. Secondary states or emerging powers with considerable lesser capabilities pursue strategies to build and maintain effective relations to enhance their status and capabilities. They engage not only to respond to power preponderance or threat but to achieve desired interests and objectives. The strategies of states with differing power capabilities and diverse interests adopt to engage with each-other informs about how common interests are identified and how divergences are dealt with. This also indicates how the international order is manifested through the constant struggle of maintaining the status quo by the preponderant power and the alternative ideas projected by the emerging powers.

The study attempts to describe and analyze the diverse modes of interactions or strategies adopted by a superpower and a regional power to engage with each other sidelining the inherent aspects of structural conflict, power asymmetry and difference over strategic worldviews. It posits the relation between United States and India in the post-cold war era to have a systematic understanding of areas of convergences, divergences and how a continued process of interaction is entailed. It aims to construct a comprehensive framework of engagement strategies that can enable a superpower that is motivated to retain its primacy and an emerging regional power that aspires a global role with alternative distinct vision can engage in an interdependent international order.

The end of the cold war saw the emergence of the United States as the sole superpower that has preponderance over all relevant spheres of power (Krauthamer, 1990; Brooks & Wohlforth, 1997). U.S as a superpower should be seen as retaining its preponderance through maintenance of an international order, providing security and benefits and deep engagements mainly through alliances. India as an emerging regional power is considered through the regional global nexus where apart from retaining regional dominance its foreign policy is driven by its desire to achieve a major power status with its distinct ideas and strategic autonomy. For the United States its foreign policy or engagement policies are primarily aimed at preserving and extending its eminence and the stability of the constructed international order. The rise of new emerging powers with niche distinct ideas and vision of the order that contradicts the prevailing norms or principles of the established order is a challenge to U.S. The astounding power asymmetry between these emerging powers and U.S does not posit them as direct threats but the desire to pursue alternative structures or norms and resist the prevailing one is a long term challenge to the survival of the U.S led world order. India as an emerging regional power is dominant in the regional sphere and has considerable influence and capabilities and seeks a global role on its own terms. The new emerging power desires to be recognized with distinct ideas and their activism at the global level is pregnant with their stress on promotion of alternative structures, greater equity and redistribution (Nel, 2010; Hurrell, 2007). India's embedded an aspiration of major power status that necessitates its engagement with the superpower but it has strongly advocated for strategic autonomy and avoided formal alliances. Furthermore, India has vociferously resisted many prevailing international rules or norms and actively participates in indigenous regional structures to promote alternative ideas. U.S is not an eminent threat to India and the striking power asymmetry and the benefits it accrues from its relation with U.S dissuades India to directly balance the U.S. At the structural level, a superpower aimed to preserve its primacy and an emerging power attempting to move up the power hierarchy will inevitably land in a frictional course resulting in a structural conflict. However, when a superpower and an emerging power avoids the structural conflict and constructs a global partnership essentially signifies that there are underlying engagement strategies that can provide means to cooperation even within conflicts and differences.

The study focuses on the various strategies that states can adopt to build constructive relations with other states based on

- (a) States irrespective of their power position seek engagements in an interdependent global order.
- (b) The idea of engagement is conceived differently by a superpower or great powers and secondary states or lesser powers. Engagements are utilized by superpowers to modify or change another state's behaviour by offering aids or incentives. While engagement is a multipronged strategy for secondary states that helps to manage its relation with major powers and integrate with smaller powers to forward indigenous interests.
- (c) Emerging regional powers adopt strategies not only to respond to power preponderance or threat but to promote niche objectives and desired outcomes in the international system.
- (d) Engagement strategies can be enabling strategies that help emerging powers to manage their relation with dominant powers and pursue distinct interests to enhance their influence and power.

The acceptability of the existing international norms and principles and the sustenance of the international order is key to retaining U.S primacy. U.S has stressed on building an order through consensus and participation which was comparatively cheaper than coercion and ensured durability. Thus, U.S has incentives to self -bind and be the benign superpower that supplies public goods and provides security (Kupchan, 1998). Challenges or resistance to these norms and the intent to form alternative structures by new emerging powers however less powerful are of significant threat to U.S. hence, engagement strategies will be applied not only to achieve its strategic interests but also to either accommodate these new powers within its parameters or by restraining their capacity building efforts. India as an emerging regional power is primarily aimed to achieve a major power status integrated with its desire to have a distinct leadership role based on the niche ideas that informs its strategic worldview. Its resistance to biases in international norms, stress on emancipatory inclusive indigenous structures signifies system altering traits. Engagements are sought to maintain its partnership with U.S and enable it to further integrate into the system to attain its niche objectives.

The power asymmetry, difference over strategic objectives and the differing views over the kind of international order they seek often set India and the United States on a contradictory course. Despite that when they identify diverse issue areas to commit and cooperate to build a global strategic partnership; a study of the underlying engagement strategies becomes crucial in understanding the crevices and nuances of Indo-U.S relations in the 21st century.

The study considers a range of engagement strategies to develop an analytical framework to have a comprehensive understanding of strategies available to an emerging regional power like India, responses that can be adopted by U.S as a superpower and finally to assess Indo U.S relations. The quest is to identify dominant strategy or combination of strategies that will be most feasible to define the contours of Indo-U.S relations and structure to understand superpower regional relations in an interdependent globalized system.

Theoretical underpinnings

The end of the cold war presented an unprecedented emergence of a sole superpower with preponderance over all spheres of power. Many commented that this initiated unipolarity in international order. The United States as the superpower has stressed on building an international order based on interconnectedness. To retain the primacy the superpower will undertake preventive measures to suppress the emergence of new great or major powers (Layne, 1993). Layne similarly argues the constraints of a unipolar order will catalyze the rise of new powers (Layne, 2006).

The study utilizes the neo realist theory that in an anarchical system struggles for power occur as states are primarily concerned about their survival and security. “In an anarchic system, states must provide for their own security and they face many real or apparent threat” (Waltz, 1989).¹ Thus states irrespective of their power and capabilities will be concerned about their security and will actively seek to enhance their power and prestige. States with greater power capabilities will be able to exert

¹ On structural realism and power competition refer to Kenneth N. Waltz, "America as a Model for the World? A Foreign Policy Perspective," PS, December 1991, p. 669, Waltz, Theory of International Politics, Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," in Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb, eds., The Origin and Prevention of Major Wars (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 49

greater influence and will be in a higher position in securing its survival in comparison to others. Position in the power hierarchy and distribution of power capabilities significantly affects a state's influence in the international system (Frankel, 1996). Structural realism however, simplifies state's motivation to acquire power only for survival in an anarchical international order. A due consideration is given in the study to the fact that anarchy in the international system is not the only factor that puts pressure on the states to struggle for power, the states require some ambition or aspirations that motivates them to enter into power competition. Randall Schweller stresses that if survival was the only goal states would not risk taking part in power competition, at the unit level revisionist or reformist goals are the incentives that would influence a state to pursue power (Schweller, 1996:91-92). The study proceeds with the understanding that states with higher ambition or desire to achieve great power status will try to reform or bring changes in the existing order to sway power distribution in its favour and attain the strategic space for itself. New states trying to climb up the power hierarchy will affect the degree of dominance and influence wielded by the preponderant powers. Established major powers will resist the rise of new major powers to accommodate others in a similar role to diminish one's own power (Nayar & Paul, 2003). The great powers will try to extend their power and retain their position while trying to dominate others. The new powers under such constraints will try to alter the existing structure and promote alternative structures that will be flexible in accommodating them.

An international system with a superpower with unparalleled power preponderance makes power competition or balancing a difficult proposition. Power preponderance or asymmetry automatically do not render balancing specially when threat perceived from the superpower is very less (Walt, 1985) or the superpower is involved in distributing public goods and provides security (Brooks & Wohlforth, 1997). However, even under benign superpower new powers will emerge as unipolarity induces certain structural constraints that influences relatively powerful states to seek new norms, "In international politics, overwhelming power repels and leads other states to balance against it" (Waltz, 1991). But power asymmetry alone does not ensure new powers to emerge and challenge the existing order rather an international order structured by a superpower imposes certain constraints on other states, thus, states with a certain degree of power will try to limit those constraints and project

their own interests. On a similar line Layne argues that, “structural constraints press eligible states to become great powers” and “International politics thus is a competitive realm, a fact that in itself constraints eligible states to attain great power status” (Layne, 1993:9-11). This power struggle is embedded in the international system that leads to contradiction between existing preponderant power and rising powers and exacerbates the chances of a system level conflict or structural conflict (Nayar & Paul:2003). An international order that is built on complex interdependence makes direct conflicts costly as substantial interests are at stake². However, when despite power asymmetry, differences over strategic objectives and distinct interests a superpower and an emerging regional power engages to construct a global partnership it signifies that importance of certain engagement strategies that can tide over differences and avoid the inherent conflictual approach for greater common interests. The study harps on analyzing the range of responses emerging powers can develop in relation to a superpower and simultaneously strategies available to a superpower in response to the rise of new powers. Soft balancing, bandwagoning, hedging and omnimeshment are considered as strategies that can be utilized by an emerging regional power like India and strategies like engagement, accommodation, satellization and regional containment are considered as responses of United States (the theoretical explanations of these strategies are dealt in details in Chapter 1 and 5).

In International Relations the work on strategies like balancing or bandwagoning are discussed as responses of secondary states to power preponderance or threat perception. The study has used these strategies as ‘engagement strategies’ having broader scope beyond being restricted as response to threat perception. Engagement strategies should be treated as enabling strategies that will assist non-leading states, specifically regional powers with desire to achieve greater status to not only manage their relations with superpower but also as means to forward niche interests. Engagement strategies can also be applied by superpowers to enhance its acceptability, influence or modify non- confirmative elements and strengthen its dominance. The study posits the relation between India and the United States within the framework of superpower regional power ambit and has analyzed the

² For complex interdependence and cooperation refer to Keohane, R.O. and Nye, J.S., Jr (1972) *Transnational Relations and World Politics*, Cambridge, ma: harvard university Press. Keohane, R.O. and Nye, J.S., Jr (1998) 'Power and Interdependence in the Information Age', *Foreign Affairs*, 77: 81-94.

various engagement strategies that can be applied to balance the convergences and divergences in their strategic understanding and approach and to promote specific objectives. A systematic understanding by considering various strategies of engagement will help to redefine the contours of superpower regional power relations in the international system in terms of their differing interests and objectives.

Objectives of the research

The research will address three principal objectives

- a) To construct a framework based on major engagement strategies between a superpower and regional power.
- b) To posit the Indo-U.S relations in the post-cold war era within such a framework to underline a systematic understanding of the convergences and divergences on interests and approaches.
- c) To identify what form or forms of engagement will be more plausible or befitting.

Methodology

The study is influenced by the neo realist idea of the presence of a structure in the international system and also stresses on the importance of strategic choices of individual states and their actions that affect outcomes as per classical realism. Individual states with a certain degree of power and influence thus can intervene between systematic forces and the structure of international system. The study is posited on the premise that the behavior of a state is largely determined by its position in the international system and that this position is affected by the interactions between it and other major powers (Nayar & Paul, 2003). Drawing from this it is considered that for an emerging regional power that seeks to attain a major power role within an international structure maintained by a superpower will need to engage with the superpower but again its relation with others are significantly important as it contributes to its status attribution. Emerging powers' relation with the superpower is not only conditioned by the structural imperatives but also by the relations it

maintains with other states in the international system.³ States placed differently in the international system may have distinct strategic vision and security concerns, even though security and power enhancement are the main motives of most of the states. Thus, U.S as a superpower and India as an emerging power can differ significantly over strategic objectives and security concerns and their relation can be best understood by using a framework of engagements with a greater focus on systematic factors.

For a comprehensive analysis of the research the basic method is the descriptive analytical approach combined with a single case study method. It proceeds through a narrative explaining the sequence of the events of the particular case in which the key step in the sequence is in turn explained with chosen theories and causal mechanisms. The case study of Indo-U.S relations is posited within the theoretical framework of engagements to analyze it through process tracing. The process tracing is undertaken to determine whether the intervening variables between the cause and observed effect move as per the theoretical expositions under consideration. It also delves into counterfactual analysis to observe whether adoption of particular or combinations of engagement strategies are necessary for successful engagement. Qualitative data is predominantly collected through accessing and analyzing official documents like Joint Statements, policy briefs, press releases, treaties and agreements, extensively utilized interviews and speeches of government officials, diplomats not only delivered on government forums but also in think tanks, various universities and other informal forums which have helped the study to gather relevant primary information on specific strategies, policy objectives and also comments on emerging issues and challenges. Independent interviews with scholars, researchers, administrators have further enriched the study with varied opinions and views.

Quantitative methods are undertaken for specific areas of requirements like comparing and analyzing variable associations through economic data, defense and arms trade data, trade and commerce data, opinion surveys, high level visits etc. Content analysis has been utilized as an important means to decipher the significance of certain terms or issue areas. Content analysis of Indo-U.S joint statements has been

³ The idea of relations between two actors are conditioned, in part, by the relations between each of them and other actors in the international system is taken from Robert Jervis, "System Effects: complexity in Political and Social life", Princeton, NJ:Princeton University Press,1997.

considered to trace the occurrence of the term strategic partnership, marking how certain issue areas were prioritized over the years. The endeavor has been to identify and define new variables, unobservable entities or structures that operate in specific contexts to generate the phenomenon we largely observe.

Review of Literature

The literature consulted for the study have been varied and can be broadly categorized under three parameters; firstly, the theoretical understanding of power in international system, measurement of power and power hierarchy in the international order; secondly, responses to power preponderance, means of engagement; thirdly, the strategic understanding of Indo-U.S relations.

Power has been a central concept of discussion in international politics and has been described and debated in multiple ways. Realism has a strong power centrality and there remains a tendency to treat power having an exclusive disciplinary attachment to realism. Thus, power is broadly understood as the phenomenon whereby a state utilizes its material capabilities to compel or influence another state to do something it otherwise would not (Carr, 1964; Mansfield 1993; Ray and Singer 1973; and Mearsheimer 2001). This realist notion of power is based on the aspects of ‘power over’ and greater material capabilities equates with exerting greater power. Material capabilities were primarily understood in terms of military power and states with greater military power were designated as great powers and the international politics was to be dominated by them (Spykman, 1942; Sprout and Sprout, 1945, 1962; Wight, 1946). In the ensuing years efforts were given to measure power by adding new dimensions that included population, territory, army and states were seen as seeking to maximize power in relation to others by adding up various elements of power to be termed as ‘capabilities’ or ‘power resources’ (Claude, 1962; Gulick, 1955; Haas, 1953; Morgenthau,1949). Structural realism stressed on the relative power notion and how states ought to struggle to amass greater power in relation to others for their survival and security (Waltz, 1979). As Kenneth Waltz writes, great powers are defined by capabilities: "States, because they are in a self-help system, have to use their combined capabilities in order to serve their interests. The economic, military, and other capabilities of nations cannot be sectored and separately weighed.

States are not placed in the top rank because they excel in one way or another. Their rank depends on how they score on all of the following items: size of population and territory; resource endowment; military strength; political stability; and competence” (Waltz, 1979:179) Measurement and distribution of these power capabilities soon gave rise to the attempt of ranking power or introducing the concept of power hierarchy in international order. It was no longer confined to the description of great powers rather efforts were given to induce a hierarchy by ranking the overall power of states from highest to lowest thereby connoting the divisions of superpower, great/major powers, middle powers and regional powers. (Fox, 1944, Waltz, 1979; Mearsheimer, 2001; Keohane, 1969; Wright, 1978; Osterud, 1992; Huntington, 1999). With identification of new ranks of power newer dimensions of power were introduced to draw distinction between superpower and great powers or middle powers from regional powers. For instance, during the cold war possession of nuclear weapons were considered a benchmark to identify superpower from the great powers (Nijman, 1992). With emergence of U.S as the only superpower in the aftermath of cold war elements of power also extended to newer concepts of ‘soft power resources’, Joseph S. Nye (2004) and Samuel P. Huntington (1999) argue that only the United States has the "soft" power resources (socio-cultural and ideological attractiveness to other states) that Nye and Huntington claim are a prerequisite of great power status.

Despite the addition of new concepts the idea that greater power resources whether material or ideational possessed by a state gives it greater capacity and higher rank in the international order remained. Preponderant powers with greater power resources in relation to others have the potential to influence the structure of international order and are the potent actors that determine global outcomes. The tendency to equate degree of power possession to resultant global outcomes neglects the agency of smaller states and how in an interdependent globalized order states are differently enabled or constrained to act which further influences the global outcomes.

The tendency to stress on preponderant powers as the inducing source that defines contours of global outcomes can also be noticed in the works on strategies and responses of second tier states in international relations as primarily aimed at managing relations with great powers or to respond to power preponderance in the

system. In the post-cold war period the presence of U.S as the superpower revived the discussion on how second tier states should react to such astounding power asymmetry. The initial response was states would balance against U.S power either in coalition or by enhancing individual capacity (Waltz, 1979, Mearsheimer, 1990). The instinct behind balancing behavior was survival and security of second tier states in relation to preponderant power almost negating the prospect that second tier states might have distinct interest other than survival to enter into coalitions.

The absence of countervailing coalitions against the U.S brought fore the idea of Stephen M. Walt's (1985,2004) 'Balance of threat' whereby he argues that state's do not automatically enter into balancing when confronted with power preponderance rather they ally against perceived threat emanating from a preponderant power. A new debate arose around the concept of bandwagoning and its proponents argued that the United States is not perceived by second tier states as threatful and being the provider of security and public goods states will bandwagon with U.S (Brooks, Wohlforth, 2007; Liber, Alexander, 2004). Both Balancing and bandwagoning as strategies or responses of second tier states are predominantly aimed at how states should act in order to manage its relation to dominant power or threat restraining the scope that these second tier states might have opportunities to adopt strategies that enable them to forward niche interests beyond power management.

It was with the advent of scholarly attention towards the significance of regions and regional order that due diligence was given to how these regional powers have distinct ideas, visions about economic and security order and their influence over international order. (Buzan, 2011; Huntington, 2004; Bandeira, 2006; Chin, 2010; Christensen, 2006; Shambaugh, 2004/2005; Walt, 2009). The rise of regional powers like China, India, Brazil initiated new literature on how these powers, despite limited capabilities when compared to the dominant power, can adopt strategies to forward their niche ideas and build alternative structures (Hurrell, 2007; 2010; Destradi, 2010). These regional powers were considered as actors who are aimed to attain a global status and how they utilize their resources to structure the regional order and promote their influence on a global scale (Buzan & Weaver, 2003, Destradi, 2010, Narlikar, 2013). The deliberations on the significance of the rising regional powers also enhanced research on probable strategies that can be adopted by these powers to

forward indigenous objectives, enhance their influence beyond responding to power preponderance. A prominent dialogue was initiated to determine that absence of hard power balancing does not automatically signify bandwagoning rather states are utilizing tacit means to soft balance against the U.S⁴ (Joffe, 2002; Pape 2005; Saltzman 2012). Soft balancing may occur through diplomatic means of international institutions, economic statecraft and ad hoc diplomatic arrangements. Soft balancing is a reserve plan that might convert to hard balancing if the superpower goes beyond certain limits (Pape, 2005). Complex strategic responses like hedging or omnimeshment were developed to broaden the scope of secondary powers as tactical approaches which showcases strategic preferences and urge to influence shaping of a regional order that cannot be explained by traditional realist approaches of balancing or bandwagoning (Goh, 2007; Khong, 2004; Ciorciari & Haacke, 2019; Kuik, 2021). While hedging can be defined as an insurance seeking behavior under situations of high uncertainty and high stakes whereby secondary states refrains from choosing one great power over the other and try to offset or mitigate risk (Kuik, 2021), omnimeshment aims at enmeshing a preponderant power through sustained engagements and exchanges to ensure its deep involvement in the region to benefit the secondary powers and crucially aimed at structuring new regional order (Goh, 2007). These strategies stress on the agency of secondary states as regional order builders, enabling them to maintain relations with all existing preponderant powers for indigenous benefits and project distinct interests.⁵

Though the scholarly works on these strategies have significantly broadened the scope of strategies available to secondary states through which they can manage great power relations and promote niche interests there remains certain limitations. Most of these scholarly works consider these strategies as options for generalized notion of secondary states or middle powers, whereas within the ambit of secondary powers,

⁴ Soft balancing have been discussed as strategy for emerging powers Femes, Daniel, Emerging Middle Powers' Soft Balancing Strategy: State and Perspectives of the IBSA Dialogue Forum (August 1, 2007). GIGA Working Paper No. 57, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1007692> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1007692> Chaka Ferguson (2012) The Strategic Use of Soft Balancing: The Normative Dimensions of the Chinese–Russian ‘Strategic Partnership’, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 35:2, 197-222, DOI: 10.1080/01402390.2011.583153

⁵ ASEAN and India: navigating shifting geopolitics, M. Mayilvaganan, Jones, Lee (2010), Still in the “Drivers’ Seat”, But for How Long? ASEAN’s Capacity for Leadership in East-Asian International Relations, in: *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 29, 3, 95-113; Evelyn Goh [https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/37465/1/Oxford_Handbook_of_the_International_Relations_of_\(Pg_487-505\).pdf](https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/37465/1/Oxford_Handbook_of_the_International_Relations_of_(Pg_487-505).pdf)

emerging regional powers have a considerable amount of capabilities, influence and autonomy than small powers. The emerging regional powers thus have higher ambitions and views relation with great powers differently and will be differently abled to utilize such strategies than small powers. Understanding these strategies from an emerging regional power's view will explain how these new rising powers are trying to assert themselves in the regional and international order differently than other smaller powers. Secondly, the existing scholarly works on the strategies have considered singular strategy as a way to describe how secondary states can utilize this strategy or how their behavior fits into the criteria of a particular strategy. A state specifically an emerging regional power when confronted with a preponderant power in an interdependent global order where it seeks to achieve greater status might utilize a combination of these strategies as it suits their terms. The focus on one particular strategy thereby leads to a limited and partial conceptualization of how these strategies are being utilized by states. Hence a study into developing a framework of relevant strategies available to these states and how these can be combined with each other over a period of time to achieve desired outcomes will give a comprehensive understanding of range of strategies and means that can be adopted by emerging regional powers.

The relation between the United States and India has long been debated, discussed and analyzed through diverse perspectives. The literature available on Indo-U.S relations is magnanimous to be considered in entirety so for the purpose of this study the literature that evolved after the end of cold war have been stressed upon. The end of the cold war definitely presented a new momentum for engagements between India and the U.S and a host of scholarly work appeared to discuss the various aspects ranging from economics, nuclear capability or growing clout of Indian Americans in U.S that has positively influenced the bonhomie after years of disagreements that besieged their relation during the cold war period (Moynihan, 1995; Kux 1993, Glazer & Glazer, Bajpai & Mattoo, 2000; Cohen, 2000, 2004, Malone & Mukherjee). While recognizing the growing engagement many works have duly stressed that strategic differences between them have not changed and cooperation will be an uphill task to retain, Rubinoff (2001), Hathway (2002) have argued that despite the current bonhomie and congruence there remains a substantial difference in their visions of the international order hence engagements will be plagued with disgruntlement and

hiccups. They will cooperate on common areas but will differ over approaches and means. If they remain so essentially diverged then how is the cooperation taking shape into defining it as a strategic global partnership with substantial engagement in core strategic areas? The works fail to take into account the underlying engagement strategies that both U.S and India have adopted to tide over differences and disgruntlement for attaining more significant strategic objectives. Moreover, these strategies helped them cooperate on identified common interests and at the same time enabled them to extend the cooperative attitude over diverse issue areas by regularizing interactions, exchanges and constructing comprehensive partnership. Aligning with the above mentioned notion of continued differences between India and the U.S will restrict them from entering into alliances. S.P Cohen (2001) *Emerging India*; P.B Mehta (2011) “*Still Under Nehru’s Shadow? The Absence of Foreign Policy Frameworks in India*”, argues that despite close partnership an alliance is not plausible between India and the United States. There remains an ambiguity over the fact that if not alliance then what modes of engagements are more befitting or whether sub forms of interaction can be identified. Thus to tide over such ambiguities it needs to be posited within the larger framework of superpower regional power engagements for a new perspective of understanding Indo U.S relations.

Some works have tried to identify different ways to define the nuances of Indo U.S relations. Teresita Schaffer (2009), *India and the United States in the 21st century: Reinventing Partnership*; the author examines the elements of the emerging U.S India partnership to assess which of these would serve as good building blocks for furthering the partnership. She asserts that they lack common strands in their broader global visions and uses the term ‘strategic pause’ to define their relationship. The book runs in ambiguity over the kind of engagement to be pursued in ‘absence of major advances in core characters of bilateral relation’ and what future changes or emergencies can create the possibilities of affecting the nature of strategic pause.

Rudra Chaudhuri (2013), *Forged in Crisis: India and the United States Since 1947*; the book proceeds through a historical narrative of Indo U.S relations since 1947 through a study of crisis or periods of diplomatic risks projecting that instead of estrangement they further strengthened the relation. The author posits India’s foreign policy specially policy of non-alignment as a resilient and proficient approach

intermingling 'ideas' and 'interests' to negotiate with Washington. The work, while claiming that India's strong autonomy driven stance on global and regional issues forced Washington into negotiation fails to analyze the larger strategic imperatives which paved the way for negotiations, secondly, he concludes optimistically that the engagements will grow despite conflicts and crises. However conflicts over diverging interest and crisis are very different situations which require different forms of negotiation and engagements. Ashley Tellis (2015) asserts that, "The most valuable operational bequest that U.S.-Indian engagement could yield, therefore, is continuous and intimate consultation on a wide range of global, and not simply bilateral, issues...Because the differences in relative power between the United States and India will persist for a long time to come, this challenge is best handled through a set of complementary policies—one arising out of Washington, the other from New Delhi—that together are most aptly characterized as unity in difference" (Tellis,2015). Power asymmetry, structural constraints will make cooperation difficult on many aspects but the continued interactions will also create mediated spaces and it is here that engagement strategies will play a prominent part enabling them to engage.

Significance of the work

The study aims to define superpower regional power relations from a new perspective of engagement strategies. In an interdependent globalized international structure relations between a superpower and a regional power will be predominantly determined by the process of engagement with conscious efforts to avoid conflict. A superpowers main motive will be to retain primacy by restraining the rise of new competing powers while an emerging regional power with global ambitions will try to assert is position inherently results in conflict of interests. Despite this conflict of interests if strategic partnerships are being constructed then a study into the strategies that makes such cooperation possible is essential in international politics. Complex interdependence naturally does not lead to engagement as systematic constraints like economic sanctions, diplomatic pressures and containing international norms remain at the disposal of the preponderant power to modify contradictory or challenging behavior of any state. Emerging powers thus not only respond to power asymmetry but the systematic constraints. Their efforts to overcome those to attain desired goals and status require strategies that enable them to manage relations with dominant power and realize their power and status. An understanding of such strategies answers

a crucial question of how states with comparatively lesser power resources and influence are able to initiate reforms or changes in the international order and even try to develop alternative structures without an actual conflict.

The study stresses that strategies that enable a superpower to modify a rising power's behavior or enables an emerging power to tackle systematic constraints and engage to enhance its position should not be treated as responses. These strategies ought to be understood as 'engagement strategies' that enables engagement by avoiding conflict and minimizing discords and disagreement in the process. Thus, a framework of engagement strategies helps to posit a superpower and regional powers interests, strategic objectives and what they seek in the international system and how they are trying to achieve those by adopting suitable strategies. Understanding Indo-U.S relations through such a framework helps to underline how they try to engage one area of common interests, how they negotiate over differences to retain a partnership and how even within the partnership they seek to push forward individual interests.

An international system structured by a superpower however benign will contain elements to limit peaceful integration of new rising powers. Emerging powers will give efforts to limit those constraints and claim their desired status. The study will help to assist in the understanding that whether the presence of partnership between them is a way forward to peaceful integration of rising powers or it is a part of greater engagement strategy to dissuade discords over time to protect greater strategic interests? Can these engagement strategies enable emerging powers to attain changes in the international order without actual conflict? Emerging powers like India pursue to bring about changes or reforms in the existing structure and root for a more emancipatory and inclusive international order. If the engagement strategies can enable emerging powers to change the existing order without a major systematic conflict then a fundamental challenge of reform to international order will be answered.

Chapter outline

The study proceeds by first underlining the theoretical understanding of power, measurement of power and the various engagement strategies along with positing United States as a superpower and India as a regional power in the post-cold war era. Secondly, the strategic worldview of the United States is understood by analyzing the

American foreign policy over the years mainly focusing on the time period of 2000-2016 and thereby positioning India within its strategic understanding. Thirdly, India's strategic objectives are outlined with a stress to its aspiration to attain a major power status and positing United States within India's strategic imperatives. Fourthly, after considering the strategic understanding of the United States and India and how they are positioned within each other's strategic ambit, the study proceeds to analyze how despite their differences they are identifying issue areas to engage. Fifthly, the identified areas of engagement comes with their differences over approaches, means or over long term strategic

Objectives yet they continue to cooperate by adopting suitable engagement strategies. The study tries to note the possible engagement strategies that can be adopted by India as an emerging regional power and the United States as a superpower to continue their partnership and then to assess a possible engagement pattern to understand Indo-U.S engagements.

The study consists of five chapters and a conclusion. The chapter outline of the study is as follows

1. Understanding Indo US relations: Engagements of a superpower and a regional power
2. Strategic world view of United States: India's position and Strategic considerations.
3. Engagements with United States and India's strategic understanding.
4. Areas of engagement: Identifying interests.
5. Analyzing the modes of interaction.
6. Conclusion