

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: RHETORICAL WORK IN SOFT POWER
DIPLOMACY: THE U.S.-INDIA 123
AGREEMENT AND A RELATIONSHIP
TRANSFORMED

M. Karen Walker, Doctor of Philosophy, 2014

Dissertation Directed by Professor James F. Klumpp
Department of Communication

My dissertation broadens and deepens our understanding of soft power diplomacy as a creation of constitutive rhetoric. I perform a rhetorical critique of discourses generated during three years' debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, a watershed moment in bilateral relations. In Chapter 1, I introduce the frames of reference that guided my research, set my project within the literature stream, and lay foundations for my argument.

In Chapter 2, I explore how soft power discourse facilitated India's diplomatic move from outside to inside the nonproliferation regime. I introduce identification and courtship as constructs to explain soft power attraction, presenting narratives of exceptionalism, deliverance and kinship that emerged from discourse. In Chapter 3, I explain the bilateral movement from estranged to engaged as deepened identification and consubstantiation, the achievement of a permanent union. I trace the development of "democracy," "pluralism," and "creativity" as terms of ideological commitment and

mutual obligation. I also present two additional narratives, the sojourner narrative, which reconstituted the Indian Diaspora's political identity, and the convergence narrative, which constituted the United States and India as bilateral partners and transformed the U.S.-India 123 Agreement from an idea about nuclear cooperation into the embodiment of a resilient, enduring, and comprehensive partnership. Each narrative drew in substances of identification that reduced recalcitrance, changed perspectives, overcame estrangement, and motivated concerted action.

Chapter 4 outlines benefits of my research for rhetoricians, soft power proponents, and diplomacy specialists. For rhetoricians, I enrich our limited study of diplomatic discourse and generate insight into dramatistic theory and criticism. For soft power theorists, my project as a whole gives explanatory force to soft power as a creation of constitutive rhetoric. The consequent reinterpretation of the telos, processes, and resources of soft power makes soft power attraction more transparent. For the diplomatic corps, I encourage new ways of conceptualizing and talking about diplomatic aims and achievements. Chapter 4 thus frames longer-term objectives to further develop the rhetoric of diplomacy, to undertake theory-building in soft power diplomacy, and to integrate soft power diplomacy with diplomatic tradecraft.

RHETORICAL WORK IN SOFT POWER DIPLOMACY:
THE U.S.-INDIA 123 AGREEMENT AND A RELATIONSHIP TRANSFORMED

by

M. Karen Walker

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2014

Advisory Committee:

Professor James F. Klumpp, Chair
Professor Robert N. Gaines
Professor Dale Hample
Professor R. Gordon Kelly
Professor Andrew D. Wolvin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I	Soft Power's Value to the Rhetoric of Diplomacy	1
	The Aims of Rhetorical Inquiry in Soft Power Diplomacy	3
	Grounding My Research in Professional Experience	4
	Situating My Project in Rhetorical Theory and Criticism	6
	Differentiating Rhetoric's Persuasive and Constitutive Modes	8
	Literature Review	17
	Foreign Policy Rhetoric	18
	Rhetoric-as-Persuasion	18
	Rhetoric-as-Constitutive	25
	Soft Power	32
	Nye's Project and Its Evolution	33
	Reading Nye Holistically	36
	The New Public Diplomacy	40
	Critical Studies in Soft Power Diplomacy	41
	Joining Rhetoric and Soft Power	44
	Elaborating Soft Power with Rhetorical Sensitivity	45
	The Nature and Projection of National Values	45
	New Actors' Exercise of Voice and Agency	47
	The Framing of Issues on the International Agenda	49
	Soft Power's Rhetorical Force	51
	A Partner Country in Bilateral Dialogue	51
	Civil Nuclear Cooperation	57
	Gathering Discourses Concerning Civil Nuclear Cooperation	60
	Everything, Preferably All at Once	64
	Chapter I Notes	66
Chapter II:	Identification and India's Move from Outside to Inside	77
	Seizing a Watershed Moment	78

Recognizing Authenticity in Soft Power Diplomacy	81
The Call for Rhetorical Sensitivity	82
Separating Persuasive and Constitutive Forms of Rhetoric	83
Soft Power as Constitutive Rhetoric	85
Enacting Constitutive Rhetoric in Courtship	87
Outside to Inside: Changing India's Place among Cooperating Nuclear States	89
India's Strategic Autonomy	89
Rhetorical Work: Engaging as Equals	93
Exceptionalism Narrative	94
Deliverance Narrative	100
Kinship Narrative	110
Augmenting Soft Power Theory and Practice through Identification	116
Chapter II Notes	120
Chapter III: Rhetorical Enactments: From Estranged to Engaged	125
The Hard Power Cycle	127
Sanctions	128
Export Controls	131
Breaking Free	136
Soft Power Diplomacy: Rhetorical Strategies to Achieve Bilateral Unity	138
Unity of Ideals: A Shared Commitment to Democracy	139
Co-Constructing <Democracy>	140
Introducing <Creativity>	145
Unity in Community: A Sojourning	152
Unity of Strategic Interests: A Convergence	158
A Relationship Transformed	169
Chapter III Notes	172
Chapter IV Fulfilling Commitments	178
Endorsing the Rhetoric of Diplomacy	180
The Rhetoric of Diplomacy	180

Deepening Our Knowledge of Dramatism	185
Ideographic Criticism	185
Narrative Criticism	189
Burkean Criticism	195
Reinterpreting Soft Power	200
Soft Power as a Constitutive Force	201
Telos of Soft Power	204
Enhancing Diplomatic Tradecraft	209
The Nature of Power	209
Lessons in Diplomacy	212
Democracy is Constructed and Enacted	212
Moments of Transformation	215
Decentering the Diplomat	217
Chapter IV Notes	221
References	226
Rhetoric	226
India	232
Soft Power and Related Themes	234
Additional Works Consulted	238

Chapter 1

Soft Power's Value to the Rhetoric of Diplomacy

During a visit with one of my nephews, then in middle school, he asked what I was writing about. I told him that I was writing about how countries become friends. A simple answer to a complex question. More accurately, I am writing about how diplomatic discourse can create a permanent and durable bond of friendship between countries that were formerly strangers to one another. More than a friendship of convenience, or a friendship based in “the enemy of my enemy,” diplomatic discourse possesses the capacity to transform two nation-states’ strained relationship into a durable and resilient partnership.

Bilateral diplomacy achieved such a transformation between the United States and India. The friendship between the two countries had waxed and waned since India’s founding, dependent on geopolitical circumstance, domestic politics, and the degree of personal affinity that existed between the heads of state.¹ The sea change in bilateral relations took place during the administration of President George W. Bush, as the United States and India repositioned themselves from estranged to engaged democracies.

Several factors contributed to this change, including India’s economic renaissance, joint security concerns in combating global terrorism, and the United States’ humanitarian response to the Indian Ocean tsunami. Based solely on these factors, the bilateral relationship was dependent on the two countries’ mutual affinity and good will. A more permanent bond could not be set while India remained isolated from the

community of nation-states allowed to cooperate in the development of civilian nuclear energy and advanced science and technology endeavors.

At the end of the Bush Administration, the United States and India signed a U.S.-India “123 Agreement,” which refers to Section 123 of the U.S. Atomic Energy Act.² The 123 Agreement, described as a watershed moment in U.S.-India relations, was a unique and novel element of the bilateral partnership. The perception of South Asian affairs experts and the U.S.-India business community was that the future of the U.S.-India partnership was allied with the Agreement and its implementation.

After decades of sanctions and export controls failed to persuade India to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the U.S.-India 123 Agreement—with its reciprocal commitments, joint obligations, and mutual benefits—ushered India into the community of cooperating nuclear states. The conversation about the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, however, largely ignored the rhetorical work of soft power in India’s move from outside to inside the nuclear regime, or in the transformation of bilateral relations from estranged to engage. Public diplomacy professionals recognized India as a country that possessed and wielded soft power. But the bridge from soft power diplomacy measures of favorability to bilateral diplomacy measures of a successful negotiation had not been built.

Building this bridge is one aim of my dissertation. I conduct a rhetorical critique of discourses generated by the debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement to open a window on how soft power catalyzes and capitalizes on moments that portend a transformation in bilateral relations. A second aim is to broaden and deepen the conversation on soft power diplomacy. I demonstrate the suitability and benefit of adopting dramatism as a

theoretical underpinning for soft power processes of attraction, and assert a constitutive rather than persuasive role for rhetoric in the conduct of soft power diplomacy.

The Aims of Rhetorical Inquiry in Soft Power Diplomacy

The end of the Cold War reoriented and redefined the generation and purposes of the United States' power. This moment innovated scholarship regarding new actors, new agendas, and new forms of influence on foreign affairs policy making and diplomatic tradecraft. Soft power—the idea that nation-states gain influence through attraction rather than coercion—adapted traditional international relations theories and diplomatic tradecraft to this post-Cold War reality. With the premise that values, culture, and similar substances of soft power can be generated and possessed by communities and organizations beyond the nation-state, soft power theory accommodated new and nontraditional actors' entry into international affairs. No mere observers, new actors pushing nontraditional issues onto diplomatic agendas naturally followed.

Soft power maintained the nation-state as locus for international influence and action, easing the theory's entry into the foreign policy domain. Moreover, soft power proposed a new way to explain how nation-states attain and measure influence, for example by channeling new actors' energies in ways beneficial to the nation-state, and by shaping diplomatic agendas to the nation-state's comparative advantage. Soft power theory provided a rationale for pursuing international cooperation as a means to preserve national autonomy and protect strategic interests.

For rhetoricians, the unfolding of the post-Cold War era, in tandem with a globalizing economy, expanded interest in the construction and expression of identity and

how people come together to form communities. The forming of community relies on the rhetorical work of values, norms, cultural memory, and lived experience—the materials with which people construct and express their identity. Through discourse, people draw on these and other rhetorical resources³ and symbols to negotiate a symbolically oriented world and form social relations.

Grounding My Research in Professional Experience

I chose to work the nexus between soft power and rhetoric for my dissertation project because I am in a unique position to address challenges in diplomatic tradecraft through rhetorical theory and critique. I have experienced diplomacy's adaptation to external realities that renewed and re-forged diplomatic alliances; the emergence of new and non-traditional influencers in international affairs; the evolution of the foreign affairs agenda from national security, to environmental security, to economic security, and ultimately human security; and the introduction of new technologies that broadened participation. My public service has given me unique insight into how this evolution has stretched and strengthened diplomacy's institutional norms and purposes.

As a public affairs specialist, foreign affairs officer, and academic, I have witnessed and, in modest measure helped shape, diplomacy programs in the post-Cold War environment. When the Berlin Wall fell, I was serving as a public affairs specialist at the U.S. Information Agency. Ten years later, I was again working in Foggy Bottom as a foreign affairs officer, addressing transboundary environmental challenges, climate change, and infectious diseases. I next managed commercial diplomacy programs, including efforts to promote entrepreneurship in developing and emerging economies. After 9/11, I helped launch the Middle East Partnership Initiative, with the aim of

narrowing the “hope gap” in Arab countries. More recently, I served as a Franklin Fellow, managing a portfolio of democracy and governance grants for Iraq punctuated by that country’s March 2010 national elections. In sum, I have managed soft power issues as an element of bilateral and regional diplomacy in Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia for the better part of two decades.

As a doctoral student, I tested the value of applying rhetorical theory and methods to issues confronting the diplomatic corps. In separate papers, I critiqued Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice’s transformational diplomacy initiative,⁴ discourses characterizing and enacting the Millennium Partnership Initiative,⁵ and discursive frames that warranted protection of Iraqi cultural heritage.⁶ Through these exercises, I discovered that I had a knack for explaining State Department operations to academics, and identifying problems in diplomacy best addressed from a rhetorical perspective.

My dissertation research deepens and extends the cross-fertilization of diplomacy and rhetoric, providing an answer to the question of how soft power works not only in theory but also in diplomatic practice. My previous efforts applied rhetorical theory and methods to a particular diplomatic initiative. My dissertation introduces rhetorical theory and criticism to a diplomatic approach—the bilateral dialogue—with the aims of elaborating the rhetorical dimension of soft power’s influence and offering the convergence of principles and strategic interests as the natural telos of soft power diplomacy.

My expectation is that future research will undertake comparable explorations of soft power in other bilateral and perhaps even regional dialogues. My ultimate aim is to enhance or expand diplomatic tradecraft and companion pedagogies to make discursive

techniques that are conducive to soft power accessible to the diplomatic corps beyond those working in the public diplomacy “cone,” the area of specialization where soft power is typically taught and practiced. I would like to help foreign affairs and Foreign Service officers more easily recognize and shape the inflection points in bilateral diplomacy when discourse has the potential to transform nation-state relations. My project thus reflects the dualism of my own identity as a scholar-practitioner, elaborating soft power’s rhetorical dimension, and plowing rhetorical theory and critique into diplomatic tradecraft.

Situating My Project in Rhetorical Theory and Criticism

Long before the fall of the Berlin Wall, rhetoricians were wrestling with the processes by which people construct identities and form communities. As early as 1934, George Herbert Mead’s *Mind, Self, and Society* challenged prevailing egoistic notions of identity.⁷ Mead sought to explain how individuals achieve a full expression of selfhood simultaneous with their interpretation, learning, and adapting to new experiences with others. Mead thus framed two key questions of contemporary rhetorical theory: how identity motivates and sustains social action, and how discourse constitutes a people into a rhetorical community, with reliance on both language and historical-social practice.⁸

My dissertation project is situated in two areas of rhetorical theory and criticism cued by Mead’s inquiry into social interaction and community formation. One area is the initiation and response to rhetorical gestures such as “hailing,” and rhetorical forms such as narrative that invite participation in discourse. A second area is the construction of symbols that have power to unify people and direct concerted action. These areas are

central to Kenneth Burke's dramatism, which provides the theoretical underpinning for my rhetorical critique. Moreover, dramatism explores how people explain their actions to themselves and to others, what the cultural and social influences in these explanations might be, and what language choice connotes with regard to the explanation and the act itself.

Writing contemporaneously with Mead, Burke explored how symbols appeal, including the hail and response through which people form attachments based on the multitude of "selves" that individuals represent.⁹ Further, Burke theorized on the role of language as a strategic response to situations and encounters, both mundane and momentous. Burke posited that language contains innate power to induce human cooperation, alighting on the use of words-as-symbols to form attitudes and catalyze action. When people hold concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes in common, they act in concert if not in unison; the acting together makes them consubstantial.

A core premise of my critique is that identity is strategic and positional. This means that identity allows for both the existence of a stable core and a dynamically constituted process of becoming through historical memory, language, and culture.¹⁰ Further, identities are politically and materially consequential. This approach to identity is especially well suited to the elaboration of soft power diplomacy. The shift in thinking of how nation-states gain and sustain influence, from coercion to attraction, relies on the capacity of individuals and groups to find something in common. Soft power theory posits that this "something" is composed of soft power resources—culture, values, norms, and policies that are interpreted and enacted in similar ways. Rhetoric explores how

language expands identity and identifications, thus increasing the possibility to experience the magnetism of soft power resources absent coercion.

This understanding of identity emphasizes the rhetorical resources that individuals and groups draw into discourse to exercise voice and social agency. In contrast to soft power theory's reliance on influencers who pronounce, rhetorical theory attends to rhetorical actors' voice.¹¹ When rhetorical actors exercise their voice, they grapple with the problems and obligations inherent to community-building. As an element of rhetorical critique, voice carries with it commitments to oneself and the community. Through voice, individuals and groups make themselves and their commitments present in the normative and emotional strains of discourse. Voice embodies the rhetor in a way that is extra-corporeal. Voice makes individuals and groups present in discourse, and through this presence, they are simultaneously rhetorical actors and a rhetorical resource for other participants' narrative constructions.

Differentiating Rhetoric's Persuasive and Constitutive Modes

One may appreciate if not also assess soft power diplomacy through two rhetorical frameworks—the persuasive and the constitutive. The framework of rhetoric-as-persuasion fits most aptly with soft power theory and practice as originally introduced by Joseph S. Nye, Jr. Realized power, Nye argued, was to be measured by the changed behavior of others, requiring the nation-state to gain the capacity to discern others' preferences—what the target audience would find attractive—and projecting an image or setting an agenda to shape those preferences.¹² Nye's own phrases—changed behavior of others and a target audience—are drawn from the persuasive framework.

My critique develops from an alternative framework, rhetoric-as-constitutive. This perspective, I will argue, offers a more satisfying explanation of soft power's rhetorical force and better captures rhetoric's impact on the diplomatic achievements of soft power. In this section, I distinguish the persuasive and constitutive modes of rhetoric. The two perspectives do not argue that the other is an invalid view of language's powers over human understanding and action. Rather, each paradigm stresses a different power of discourse and develops a distinct vocabulary emphasizing differing elements in describing the process of communication. Because the two frameworks provide differing accounts they also provide different measures of successful communication.

The rhetoric-as-persuasion frame offered a robust terminology to characterize U.S.-Indian nuclear diplomacy from India's founding and into the post-Cold War era. Prior to President Bush's and Prime Minister Singh's declaration to pursue full civilian nuclear cooperation, U.S. and international officials most often relied on coercive tactics such as sanctions and persuasive tactics such as carrot-and-stick bargaining to convince India to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and change its domestic program of nuclear development. When President Bill Clinton addressed the Indian Parliament in 2000, he praised his host, called for greater cooperation, then turned to "four large challenges India and the United States must meet together—challenges that should define our partnership in the years ahead."¹³ These challenges pointed toward changed behaviors for India to do, and for the United States to persuade India to do. On nuclear issues, Clinton called upon India to foreswear nuclear weapon development, pointing to nations including Brazil and South Africa whom he considered as exemplars for India to

follow. After affirming that “only India can determine its own interests,” Clinton urged India to “join the Comprehensive Ban Treaty” (sic) and enter negotiations with its nuclear neighbor Pakistan. His persuasive strategy cited American handling of nuclear matters with the Soviet Union as a model for India to follow. India was the audience, Clinton was the speaker, and his purpose was to persuade India to act differently. He drew on the past as he saw it to motivate the specified changes.

The rhetoric described in in this study, generated through public transnational debate on full civilian nuclear cooperation, captures how U.S. and Indian leaders reframed their approach to bilateral dialogue. Rhetoric-as-constitutive highlights a diplomatic effort to build an enduring partnership by developing a common rhetoric, rather than a diplomatic strategy that seeks to persuade a “friend” to change its mind. This study will describe how the interaction surrounding the U.S.-India 123 Agreement built a basis for action by “partners,” rather than “friends.”

Spurred by President Bush’s and Prime Minister Singh’s joint commitment, discourses generated by the debate on full civilian nuclear cooperation built and emphasized the health and longevity of the bilateral partnership. Discourse established in tandem reasons for U.S.-Indian nuclear cooperation and a common core of beliefs and commitments, emphasizing actions that the two nations would take together vis-à-vis nonproliferation. In the end, the rhetoric initiated the strategic partnership and transformed the bilateral relationship from estranged to engaged.

Rhetoric-as-persuasion conceptualizes the rhetorical process in terms of actors who possess a time-bound, other-directed intent for their discourse, to change the mind and/or actions of an audience who will react to the message. The speaker assesses the

situation, discerns the predispositions of the audience, and formulates a corresponding messaging strategy to influence the audience. Success is measured by the rhetor's ability to "move the needle" of public opinion, to change the attitudes and behaviors of the audience, to be persuaded in the desired direction.

Rhetoric-as-constitutive conceptualizes the rhetorical process of cooperation and interaction beginning in sustained social intercourse. Rhetoric-as-constitutive emphasizes the power of rhetoric derived from the basic human urge for belongingness. The power of discourse changes our being *apart from* to being *a part of* a community or *party to* an action. The separation of speaker and audience that is at the center of the account of rhetoric-as-persuasion is deemphasized in favor of a focus on how relationships and communities of action build through discourse.

Kenneth Burke has said that "The key term for the old rhetoric was 'persuasion' and its stress was on deliberate design. The key term for the 'new' rhetoric would be 'identification'." ¹⁴ This reorientation emphasizes that relationships among participants in discourse are dynamically developed or constituted in the context of a rhetorical act. Identification, Burke wrote, "is not in itself abnormal; nor can it be 'scientifically' eradicated. One's participation in a collective, social role cannot be obtained in any other way. In fact, 'identification' is hardly other than a name for the *function of sociality*." ¹⁵ When participants emerge from discursive exchange with a shared perspective and purpose and take concerted action, having transformed relationships to each other and the world they jointly inhabit, we may say that a constitutive process has occurred.

Identification achieves social cohesion through a transcendent move, by altering the grounds for action from the perspective of isolated individuals to the perspective of

communities built through shared experience and understanding. Thus, the social function of rhetoric is combined in the perspective of rhetoric-as-constitutive with rhetoric's function to interpret the meaning in the events that punctuate time and history. As rhetoric proceeds, narrative accounts of what has happened, is happening, or might happen in the future are rounded out. Accounts promote a common explanation from a particular interpretative viewpoint that we can call "perspective."

When an event confronts this process, discourse places explanations into productive tension, and multiple perspectives emerge. Making a selection from a collection of accounts emphasizes how each differs and the divining lines between them. But when the common grounding of community has emerged, identification compensates for this division. When I say that identification transcends differences, I infer a discursive and symbolic process through which fragments are merged to form the whole.¹⁶

These groundings, through which communities justify acting together, are what Burke called "substance."¹⁷ Rhetoric-as-constitutive stresses the emerging substance of discourse, that which stands beneath or supports: the groundwork, subject matter, argument, or starting point for rhetoric that Burke rolled up as context.¹⁸ Substance is at once momentarily fixed as rhetoric declares "the world as it is" (a stance), yet ultimately is malleable in its creation of "the world as it was or as it can be" (sub-stance). Because of the potentiality for change from below and the outward expression of a stance, substance is shaped by discourse. As those engaging in rhetoric-as-constitutive deepen their identification, converting ambiguity into substance extends connections and relationships contained within separate accounts to form the common sensations,

concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes that make those who constitute the community of rhetors *consubstantial*.¹⁹ This shared substance becomes the grounding for approaching the world as an *acting-together*.²⁰ Discourse enacts both the underlying context and its public manifestation in social interaction.

A term common to rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive is “strategy.” To fully conceptualize substances of identification, interpretative frames, and perspective building within soft power relationships, my study will describe the choices of discursive strategy that constituted a structure for symbolic action. The discourse generated from this structure formed, re-formed, and affirmed relationships as they evolved and ultimately thrived. Once constituted in the rhetoric, the structure generated the rhetorical strategies with a shared attitude toward characterizing and evaluating toward what had or was about to transpire.²¹ The events that invited rhetoric were real, but so were the understandings of those situations. The navigational strategies had public content. Strategies gave meaning to situations by transforming the words with which understandings evolved into symbols that embodied or entailed public commitments. As I discuss in my critique, discourse imbued the U.S.-India 123 Agreement with symbolic meaning, elevating it from the technical discussions on nuclear security and safeguards, creating a synecdochic relationship between the U.S.-India 123 Agreement and the bilateral partnership as a whole.

In sum, discourse that achieves belongingness in social relations, cohesion of perspective, and completeness of accounts exemplifies the rhetoric-as-constitutive move. I opened this section with the contrast between persuasive and constitutive approaches in bilateral diplomacy, the former characterizing bilateral diplomatic discourse prior to the

debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, and the latter characterizing discourse that led to the Agreement's ratification. And I indicated that rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive place different emphases on human communication, and that a shift from the former to the latter as a mode of explanation would better reveal the rhetorical power unleashed in the discourse surrounding the Agreement. I can further explain why the shift is appropriate by drawing upon a discrete set of heuristics to distinguish the persuasive and constitutive modes of rhetoric. Three that proved helpful in my critique are the locus of intent, the treatment of time, and the span of control over narrative's construction.

“Invention” is the name given to how rhetoric initiates an account of what has happened in the past, is happening in the present, or might happen in the future. In the rhetoric-as-persuasive mode, invention occurs in the speaker's mind. The speaker systematically forms an intention vis-à-vis the audience, identifies the range of possible arguments given the situation and audience disposition, and mines the argument deemed most likely to achieve the desired effect on the audience.²² In short, invention is a unitary act of creating an appeal designed with a predetermined end in mind.

In the rhetoric-as-constitutive mode, invention is a social process in which participants engaged in discourse jointly and interactively construct an account. The construction and social influence of world views—the central organizing arguments and metaphors that help explain how the world works and why things happen—play a subtle but significant role in motivating consensus and action. The co-construction of accounts as well as the complex narratives that weave accounts together reduce the ambiguity and division at the outset into an understanding. In the rhetoric-as-constitutive mode, the

supporting rationale and reasoning that guides belief and justifies action emerges from discourse. Thus, invention emerges from rhetorical interaction focused on resolving ambiguities of understanding and identity.

The locus of invention has a correlative relationship with time, a second heuristic. The intentionality of rhetoric-as-persuasion implies that effectuating a change in the target audience's attitudes or behavior is time-specific. Rhetoric-as-persuasion is concerned with the conditions as they appear in the present, the discursive intervention, and the resulting change after the intervention. Rhetoric-as-persuasion treats time as a directional, linear sequence of events and actions with change located at, and caused by, the moment of messaging. Alternatively, rhetoric-as-constitutive, as a social process, accommodates the ebb and flow and natural pauses through which participants' perceptions are challenged and their relationship strengthened. As an intersubjective and dynamic process, rhetoric-as-constitutive reconstructs the meaning of past events, present actions, and future possibilities. Time bends back on itself. Messages in the present influence understandings of the past. Future possibilities entail altered meaning of past events. Indeed, the management of time itself becomes one of the characteristics through rhetoric can effect change.

The locus of invention and treatment of time correspond to a third heuristic that separates rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive: whether narrative is channeled toward a preconceived destination or allowed to develop organically. In the rhetoric-as-persuasive mode, invention arrives at an interpretation before the message is transmitted. The context and range of action are framed in zero-sum, black-and-white terms. In the rhetoric-as-constitutive mode, discourse accommodates growth,

encompassing a widening context that draws in more participants, each with his or her own perspective and narrative account. In the rhetoric-as-constitutive mode, participants use language to navigate their way into and through a discursive exchange, and discourse itself is the current that carries the participants along. A narrative that is open-ended and participatory diffuses in discourse, pulling in myriad experiences and substances of identification as it progresses. Identification springs from the connection between character and action, rather than the satisfaction of having achieved an explicitly defined outcome.²³

As the discursive exchange progresses, participants slowly reduce ambiguity as they borrow from and build upon each other's accounts.²⁴ The borrowing and building constitutes bonds that weave those in the rhetorical exchange ever more tightly into the construction and commitments of the account. The ambiguity and social nature of rhetoric-as-constitutive enables participants to adjust perspectives, redefine circumstances, remake identities, and transform the relational or social context that invited or hailed them to join the discourse. This transformative quality distinguishes most clearly rhetoric-as-constitutive from rhetoric-as persuasive discourse.

The mode I have called "rhetoric-as-constitutive" stresses rhetoric's power to incorporate events into a developing diplomatic relationship between and among nations. It highlights the developmental evolution that characterizes soft power as a diplomatic theory, which calls for nation-states to adopt a cooperative rather than adversarial stance toward one another in confronting transboundary issues. The inclusiveness of soft power, especially with regard to new and non-traditional actors and their agendas, reorients and evens out the relationship between a speaker and his or her audience. As a constitutive

process, soft power diplomacy engenders a sense of ownership or investment in a successful exchange, a giving and returning of material and symbolic resources available to all parties as co-arguers.²⁵ Capturing the possibilities of this co-orientation emerging from diplomacy becomes easier when working with the rhetoric-as-constitutive frame, which is compatible with the attitudes and commitments of soft power and relational strategies of engagement

Literature Review

My review of the literature adds value to the whole of my dissertation project, offering three major benefits. First, the literature review introduces the frames of reference that have guided my research and rhetorical critique. Second, reviewing the literature entails an assessment of my own point of entry, to ensure that I am building on sound foundations in rhetorical criticism and soft power. Lastly, the review of the literature sets boundary lines that new scholarship must cross or extend in order to generate new knowledge.

Because my dissertation crisscrosses the rhetoric of foreign policy and soft power, the literature review delves into both areas. I begin with the rhetoric of foreign policy, which receives more extensive treatment because it is my disciplinary home and because it is a long-standing and robust area of study. I conclude with an expository review of the soft power literature to provide the reader with useful premises and vocabulary that ground subsequent sections of this chapter. Since Joseph Nye's introduction of soft power in 1990, much thought has been devoted to the subject in the foreign affairs trade press and in social media. Critical and theoretical scholarship in soft power has

flourished only recently, and I discuss this development at the end of the literature review.

Foreign Policy Rhetoric

Soft power diplomacy as currently practiced relies on strategies and tactics designed to make the United States attractive in the eyes of foreign publics, with success of soft power diplomacy most often measured by foreign public opinion and behaviors toward the United States. My dissertation poses an alternative view, that soft power diplomacy is a process of constitutive rhetoric. Because the juxtaposition of rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive factors prominently in my critique, I locate both modes in the extant literature in foreign policy rhetoric. The ways in which argument acts upon endogenous and exogenous constraints on presidential influence is a consistent theme. Argument remains central to both the persuasive and constitutive rhetorical forms. How critics approach argument is a distinguishing factor between rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive in a foreign policy context.

Rhetoric-as-Persuasion

Turning first to rhetoric-as-persuasion, rhetorical critics have attended to the role of public opinion as grounds for argument and a measure of an argument's effectiveness. Other rhetorical critics have explained the force of argument by its structure, the key terms that synopsise an argument, and rational decision-making as an outcome of effective argument. In the paragraphs that follow, I present a review of criticism that assesses how presidents and their surrogates incorporate and mediate public opinion to

gain public assent for foreign policy decisions. I also present essays that seek to understand the rhetorical work of key terms such as *détente* that structure and warrant foreign policy argument. Rounding out the review of rhetoric-as-persuasion, I discuss essays that have emphasized the ends or outcomes of foreign argument, including essays enunciating the rhetorical conditions favorable to rational decision-making.

Presidents rely on domestic public opinion to justify their stance in foreign policy making and to defend their foreign policy actions. In many cases, public opinion is at odds with the desired action, and thereby acts as a constraint on how presidents frame foreign policy. Brandon Rottinghaus elaborated on the influence of public opinion on foreign policy frames adopted by Presidents Johnson, Reagan, and George H.W. Bush. Specifically, Rottinghaus conducted a comparative critique of presidential rhetoric with regard to President Johnson's deepening the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War, President Reagan's signing the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty with the Soviet Union, and President George H.W. Bush's commitment of U.S. troops in the first Persian Gulf conflict.

From this comparative case study, Rottinghaus defined and elaborated presidents' "crafted talk" to mobilize domestic support.²⁶ Crafted talk takes centrist opinion as a baseline and attempts to move preferences in a direction favorable to the Administration. This targeted approach subsumes unpopular facets of a policy within a frame constructed of the more popular elements of that policy.²⁷ Rottinghaus concluded that presidents have a limited ability to anticipate which language choices will be most likely to persuade majority opinion to follow the administration's lead in matters of foreign policy.

J. Michael Hogan and Leroy Dorsey explored similar framing efforts with regard to the nuclear freeze debate that took place in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1982 and 1983. Hogan and Dorsey adopted the view that public opinion is socially constructed; their critique demonstrated how policy makers rhetorically mediate public opinion to their advantage.²⁸ Hogan and Dorsey's critique revealed that House Members' construction of public opinion not only affirmed popular sentiment, but also allowed legislators to diffuse the strength of the Nuclear Freeze proponents' objections to increased nuclear stockpiles. Discourse subsumed the impetus for the Nuclear Freeze resolution within the more encompassing frame of arms control.²⁹

B. Wayne Howell's critique of President Reagan's advocacy for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) deconstructed the enthymeme at the heart of President Reagan's discourse, and then demonstrated how public opinion warranted U.S. action as reasonable and necessary to protect the United States' interests. President Reagan's rhetorical strategy portrayed the Soviet Union as untrustworthy: the Soviet ideology sanctioned violations of the Helsinki (human rights) Accords; these violations were not isolated to a particular moment in time; and a country unwilling to protect basic human rights could not be trusted to abide by a treaty meant to preserve the peace.³⁰ President Reagan's rhetorical strategy used American public approval of the SDI to prod Soviet President Gorbachev toward liberalization and democratization, particularly in the area of human rights.³¹ If Russia were to implement reforms and improve its human rights record, these actions would undermine President Reagan's argument for SDI, which the Soviet Union viewed as a threat to its interests. President Reagan's rhetorical strategy thus allowed both leaders to achieve one of their primary aims in the bilateral relationship.

The critiques issued by Rottinghaus, Hogan and Dorsey, and Howell emphasized how public opinion places limits on presidential foreign policy making and public advocacy. Although constrained, presidents and their surrogates have at their disposal framing and other argumentative strategies to make their arguments convincing and their policies palatable. Other critics have explored the force of argument based on rhetorical choices of structure and language, including how ideology shapes these choices.

David S. Birdsell examined the structure of argument in his critique of President Reagan's October 27, 1983, nationally televised address in which the President responded to the bombing of the marine compound in Beirut, Lebanon, and explained the United States' defense against Soviet designs on Grenada. Birdsell's Burkean analysis surfaced President Reagan's motive to balance power and response. In the case of Lebanon, the U.S. role was subordinate to the multinational community. In the case of Grenada, the U.S. role was definitive, to check a malignant force and mischief in the Western hemisphere.³² The speech presented a "structural indictment of multilateralism"³³ and a defense of a muscular foreign policy. The United States stood as a vanguard against the Soviet Union, which was a malevolent force in Middle East geopolitics and a sponsor of Cuba's transgressions against the free people of Grenada. The structure of the speech persuaded the American public of the rightness of the nation's sacrifice and ongoing role as protector in a dangerous world.

Presidents make deliberate choices in their language, privileging some terms above others to increase the persuasiveness of their public pronouncements. David C. Klope's critique of President Reagan's Lebanon/Grenada address elucidated the function of myth and victimage as a persuasive strategy. President Reagan named the Soviet

Union as the guilty party and reaffirmed the United States' overseas presence as a force for good.³⁴ Juxtaposing civilizational ideals with savage behavior, President Reagan created clusters of meaning driven by progress, freedom, mission, and national self-interest. The use of these terms in President Reagan's narrative commanded public assent to his foreign policy decisions.³⁵

D. Ray Heisey compared rhetorical strategies adopted by President Reagan and President Mitterand to respond to the Beirut bombing and to justify U.S. and French interventions in Grenada and Chad, respectively. Heisey found that President Reagan presented the image of a foreign aggressor to maintain the appearance of power as a deterrent. President Mitterand privileged respect rather than power, maintaining France's role as the balancer in international conflict.³⁶ Both leaders demonstrated skill in reading their respective publics' reaction to these events, tapping into perceptions of the United States' and France's historical roles in world affairs. These roles, defined by past actions, established expectations that justified their present action in response to crisis.

Some terms achieve an ultimate place of privilege, exercising the suasive force of foreign policy doctrine. This was the conclusion of H.W. Brands' diachronic study of détente. Brands' study is premised on détente's function as a foreign policy doctrine that bridged foreign policy to diplomatic action. Brands described how President Nixon and his National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger first avoided and then embraced the word as a signature of U.S. foreign policy. Nixon and Kissinger successfully expanded the scope of détente from the divide between East and West Germany to encompass China and Russia. By setting détente within its global context, Nixon and Kissinger could

accept the principles of détente, essentially fixing the term to fit their policy aims while satisfying world leaders' desire for consistency and predictability.³⁷

In foreign policy argument, ideology conditions how presidents construct a vocabulary that they subsequently place within an enthymematic structure. Ideology legitimizes a set of assumptions and preferred outcomes to the exclusion of alternative perspectives and courses of action. Ideology functions rhetorically, constructing a set of beliefs to which all in society must subscribe but which cannot be demonstrated rationally to each individual concerned. Acceptance of the group's core precepts is achieved through a moral imperative.³⁸ The role of ideology has sparked a vociferous and wide-ranging response from Robert P. Newman. In his most recent work, *Invincible Ignorance in American Foreign Policy: The Triumph of Ideology over Evidence*, Newman presented a number of examples supporting his claim that ideology skews the factual record and evidentiary force of argument.³⁹

I am partial to Philip Wander's approach to ideology in foreign policy argument, which is less concerned with unmasking "truth" and more attentive to legitimacy of foreign policy making that takes place within and through the public sphere. Wander's seminal essay, "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy,"⁴⁰ is best known for the presentation of two forms of foreign policy argument, which Wander termed prophetic dualism and technocratic realism. Wander explicated the two forms of argument through the rhetoric of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, respectively. Prophetic dualism presumed a world divided by conflict between good and evil, with no pre-determined outcome. Conflict would be resolved only through total victory of one side over the other, leaving no quarter for neutral parties or compromise.⁴¹ Technocratic

realism offered an alternative view that acknowledged keen competition between nation-states but allowed room to negotiate issues of mutual interest.⁴²

The taxonomy alone was insufficient. Wander wrote that “a systematic examination of the rhetoric of American foreign policy will take into consideration a variety of audiences, the relative importance of any given audience within the context of domestic politics, and the ways in which official statements are or are not adapted to them.”⁴³ Giving name to a policy entails a systematized clustering of vocabulary that may discount others’ social, political, or economic preferences,⁴⁴ or that could frustrate the search for consensus.⁴⁵ Wander identified these consequences and issued a call to action for rhetorical critics to assist in the creation of publics able to rise above parochial concerns. Critics were asked to balance assessment of a rhetor’s technique with a corresponding judgment of purpose.⁴⁶

Wander presumed that foreign policy rhetoric was the privilege of presidents, an assumption appropriate to the time of his essay’s publication. Moreover, U.S. presidents exercise this executive privilege within the confines of deliberative democracy and representative government. Subsequent criticism maintained these assumptions when answering Wander’s call to action, to understand how presidents used language to marshal public support for consequential foreign policy decisions. When speaking on foreign policy, presidents have the task of sustaining or adapting the public view toward world events while ensuring that their arguments resonate with the public’s interpretation of those events.

Critics working within the tradition of rhetoric-as-persuasion have each addressed foreign policy *argument*. The literature includes rhetorical-critical essays in which

authors identified the structures and vocabularies that make an argument resonate, decoupled public opinion from public will as backing for foreign policy argument, and explored expected notions of nation-state behavior to warrant foreign policy action. Regardless of the thrust, critique eventually came around to assessing effectiveness in deliberation, either as winning the argument or influencing the conditions that swayed decision-makers. This critical stance has generated valuable insight for critics working to challenge prevailing foreign policy doctrine and to improve the health of the polity. This contribution, however, presumes an adversarial relationship among foreign policy actors, or between foreign policy actors and the citizenry. To understand consensus-building as a facet of foreign policy rhetoric, an alternative stance, which I categorize as rhetoric-as-constitutive, is required.

Rhetoric-as-Constitutive

Critics who have approached rhetoric-as-constitutive have explored the construction and influence of world views for achieving consensus on foreign policy, especially when external events or circumstances demand reification or revision of U.S. grand strategy. When fully formed, world views provide substance and motivate action in international affairs.

As previously noted, both rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive are well represented in rhetorical criticism of foreign policy. Both traditions treat foreign policy argument as a central concern for critical reflection. Critics working within the rhetoric-as-constitutive tradition have emphasized the co-construction of foreign policy arguments, minimizing assessment of a specific argument's appeal and effectiveness.

Rhetorical critics following in the footsteps of John F. Cragan have charted the creation and diminution of world views as central organizing arguments that motivate foreign policy consensus and action. Cragan's dissertation thesis, "The Cold War Rhetorical Vision, 1946-1972," established a critical approach and vocabulary to make sense of U.S. foreign policy behavior over time. Cragan employed fantasy theme analysis to public discourses about foreign policy from the conclusion of World War II through 1972, the beginning of the end of U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the advent of President Nixon's rapprochement with China.

Rhetorical visions "chain out" in public narratives, forming a community's social reality in the process.⁴⁷ Cragan discovered and documented three rhetorical visions that competed for influence as the United States made the transition from the "hot war" rhetoric of World War II to the rhetoric of the Cold War. Cragan named these competing rhetorical visions "one world," "power politics," and "red fascism."⁴⁸ Each rhetorical vision synopsis a corresponding foreign policy drama that explained world events, characterized actors in global affairs, and assigned meaning to foreign policy actions.

Cragan's descriptions of the rhetorical visions and corresponding dramas grounded subsequent criticism, and are therefore worth recounting here. Individuals espousing the one world rhetorical vision promoted the ideal of nation-states cooperating openly and transparently, with the aim of removing the threat of nuclear annihilation.⁴⁹ Individuals participating in the power politics foreign policy drama believed that nation-states operating competitively and interdependently in a global system of checks and balances could best preserve the global order and prevent aggression.⁵⁰ Individuals

caught up in a red fascism foreign policy drama foresaw and guarded against totalitarianism in which Communism displaced Fascism as a villainy in world affairs.⁵¹

Elements of each contributed to the solidification and longevity of the Cold War rhetorical vision and the policy of containment, a cornerstone of American grand strategy from the mid-1940s to the late 1980s.⁵² The strength of the rhetorical vision waxed and waned, however, and Cragan himself postulated that the Cold War rhetorical vision would be overcome by social and political tumult as well as a hot war in Vietnam. When such events call a grand strategy into question, discourse either sustains motivation to continue the current course, or constructs an alternative world view to synthesize public belief and U.S. foreign policy doctrine.

The power of discourse to re-constitute an existing world view, or to constitute a new world view, provided a focal point for rhetorical critics following in Cragan's tradition. One challenging event, explored by Thomas Hollihan, was President Carter's desire for a new Panama Canal Treaty. The debate called into question America's colonial past, juxtaposed against the long-standing pillar of protecting U.S. interests within its own hemisphere. The juxtaposition activated and propagated the Cold War and Power Politics foreign policy dramas. Owing to the north-south binational context and the history of the canal's physical construction, an additional, anti-imperialist foreign policy drama emerged during the debate, which Hollihan called the New World Order drama.⁵³ Whereas the treaty would place the Canal under Panamanian control, discourse reconstituted the Power Politics drama by incorporating the United States' guaranteed access and the right to protect the waterway, should the need ever arise.

The Cold War rhetorical vision carried with it the fear that the great power competition between two nuclear armed nation-states could lead to annihilistic consequences.⁵⁴ Accordingly, the American public was attuned to and wary of changes that could portend a first-strike attack. In this context, President Reagan's discourse on nuclear deterrence needed to allay public fears. The President succeeded by creating consonance between his own world view and that of the American people. President Reagan reconstituted the Cold War foreign policy vision for an era of technological innovation, a conclusion of G. Thomas Goodnight's critique of the President's rhetoric on nuclear deterrence.

Goodnight conducted a close text analysis of three speeches that President Reagan delivered in his first term, which introduced "zero option," "evil empire," and "Star Wars" to the lexicon of U.S. foreign policy. The speeches established a particular ordering of four seemingly contradictory propositions: science and technology inevitably produce more powerful and varied weaponry; nuclear weapons make an effective defense impossible; military power exists to deter a nuclear attack; and nuclear states sustain deterrence through their capacity to retaliate against an adversary's first strike.⁵⁵ Taken together, the three speeches recast science and technology as the force behind an impregnable system for national defense.⁵⁶

The Cold War foreign policy vision maintained public assent with the U.S. foreign policy doctrine of containment. The consonance between American ideology and foreign policy doctrine received a jolt when President Nixon announced in 1971 his intent to visit China. Denise M. Bostdorff's critique of President Nixon's foreign policy rhetoric elucidated how events changed the President's world view, and conversely, how

the President's discourse carried within it discernable signposts of a rapprochement with China.

The President's rhetoric suggested a changing view toward China as early as 1967.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, the July, 1971 announcement broke the dominant frame that foreign affairs watchers and the public at large had relied upon to calculate the United States' power position.⁵⁸ Moreover, the Cold War rhetorical vision placed an emphasis on "war." Robert L. Ivie's critique of justificatory war rhetoric tells us that presidents' definitions of *casus belli* are reduced to a singular frame for action with moralistic and idealistic dimensions.⁵⁹ President Nixon's rapprochement with China effectuated a shift from prosecuting a Cold War to conducting Cold War diplomacy. The shift from war to diplomacy allowed pragmatism to enter the conversation. By making this shift, President Nixon reconstituted the Cold War vision with a more expansive approach to détente, harmonizing pragmatic and moral intentions in diplomatic discourse.

In the examples above, discourse re-constituted the Cold War foreign policy vision, as Cold War presidents adapted the U.S. grand strategy set forth in the Truman Doctrine and containment to technological advances and a changing geopolitical context. At the end of the Cold War, discourse had a very different role, to construct a new foreign policy vision and energizing narratives that would support post-Cold War presidents' ability to motivate public action.

Mary E. Stuckey has argued that foreign policy dramas, which she calls orientational metaphors, are a rhetorical form that orders political reality. Absent an orientational metaphor, people interpret foreign policy events as independent or anomic occurrences rather than as part of a pattern.⁶⁰ Stuckey assessed President George H.W.

Bush's and President Clinton's respective attempts to use orientational metaphors to forge a post-Cold War foreign policy consensus. In contrast to Hollihan's determination of a clear "winner" among competing foreign policy dramas, Stuckey found that both Presidents attempted to construct hybrid strategies. Grafting elements of the Cold War and New World Order metaphors together failed to forge a new foreign policy consensus.⁶¹

Timothy M. Cole's analysis of President George H.W. Bush and President Clinton elaborated Stuckey's thesis. The post-Cold War environment had altered public expectations regarding the United States' summons to international leadership.⁶² Cole found that the terms presidents use when discussing foreign policy convey the criteria the public is intended to use to judge those policies. President George H. W. Bush attempted to stretch the Cold War orientational metaphor, with its polarizing vocabulary of good and evil, friend and foe, and brutal aggressors, to premise foreign policy on the belief that the world remained dangerous. President Clinton premised national security on the belief that the world was safe, and that conflicts could be compartmentalized and managed. Neither approach succeeded in forging a national consensus on military intervention to shore up weak and failing states, or to intervene militarily to staunch humanitarian crises.⁶³

Taking a step back from the constitutive role of discourse, Bostdorff, Stuckey, and Cole make a larger point regarding the interplay of discourse and material conditions. That is, diplomatic discourse has the potential to transform the perspectives of nation-states, including the interpretation of their actions and the global scene in which action takes place. In this regard, Bostdorff's, Stuckey's, and Cole's essays are written in the

same spirit as my own project, which likewise explored a changing, post-Cold War scene and the fresh perspectives with which two countries addressed one another.

Considering the corpus of criticism, I observe that the rhetoric of foreign policy is influenced by presidential rhetoric and public address scholarship. Working with more than a dozen essays, all but three concerned the rhetoric of American presidents from Eisenhower to Clinton; Hogan and Dorsey's essay concerned the achievement of a president's legislative agenda; and Brands' essay attended to a president's resistance and appropriation of a potent symbolic term of American foreign policy doctrine. Cragan's dissertation distinguishes itself by exploring the circulation of discourses that captured and held the public's imagination. The energy driving rhetorical criticism in foreign policy comes from the desire to understand and add legitimacy to the relationship between a president and the people.

This place of privilege loses exclusivity when pivoting from foreign policy to diplomacy. Rhetorical criticism of diplomatic engagement necessarily entails a degree of intersubjectivity, to understand the effect of discourse on participants' respective constituencies as well as diplomatic relations. A rhetoric of diplomacy focuses a critical lens on dialogue, engagement, or negotiation involving two or more nation-states or other foreign policy actors. Martín Carcasson's essay on the Oslo Accord exemplifies rhetorical critique of diplomatic engagement. Carcasson performed a narrative analysis of the discourses generated by Israeli and Palestinian negotiators on the occasion of the September 13, 1993, signing ceremony of the Oslo Accord. Pulling both verbal and visual messages into his analysis, Carcasson discovered that the leaders' discourse symbolically transformed long-standing animosities of conflict by reframing protagonists

and antagonists. Within this alternative narrative, the Oslo Accord was a victory for peacemakers on both sides.⁶⁴

Carcasson unquestionably plies his craft within constitutive rhetoric. The essay represents a search to understand rhetoric's transformative power in diplomacy. It also has the benefit of being accessible to practitioners of diplomacy who are charged with managing Near Eastern Affairs and carrying out U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. I therefore consider Carcasson's essay as my entry point in the literature stream, and anticipate that my dissertation research will contribute to future scholarship conducted in the spirit of enhancing diplomatic tradecraft.

My review of the literature reaffirms that critique of soft power discourse will garner greater insight working within the rhetoric-as-constitutive vein. The vocabulary that fits most naturally in my critique is borrowed from critics who have extended the rhetoric-as-constitutive line of inquiry. Clearly, the debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement was a public argument. I treat those engaged in the debate as co-arguers. Their discourses constituted the underlying rationale and justificatory grounds for their positions and actions. Frames of acceptance and rejection emerged from discourse. Differences agitated participants to engage in discourse; discourse that transcended differences achieved reconciliation and deepened identification.

Soft Power

The other major literature governing my critique is about soft power. In this section, I deliver an exposition on the seminal work of Joseph S. Nye, Jr., and the cross-over of soft power literature into studies concerned with the "new" public diplomacy and

nation-branding. I also introduce more recent scholarship in critical and cultural studies of soft power, including an embrace of relational and engagement theories of public diplomacy. Familiarity with the premises, vocabulary, and lineage of soft power is the primary benefit one will gain from this section, establishing a foundation for theoretical elaboration and rhetorical critique of soft power discourse. The literature review offers a basis from which to elaborate soft power theory from a rhetorical perspective, and to share how rhetorical critics have contextualized (and problematized) soft power's premises and assumptions using real-world events and issues.

The review of the literature on soft power must necessarily begin with the works of Joseph S. Nye, Jr., whose writings on soft power span more than two decades.

Whereas soft power has gained greatest traction in the field of public diplomacy and related areas of national influence and persuasion, Nye's project suggests a more fundamental concern about how foreign policy is made and implemented. Accordingly, I share observations on Nye's project from a full and fair reading of his collective works. I conclude this section by introducing more current works that subject soft power to critical inquiry and theory-building.

Nye's Project and Its Evolution

Soft power entered the lexicon of U.S. foreign policy in the immediate post-Cold War period, when Nye published *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*.⁶⁵ Nye had presented an essay-length argument in *Political Science Quarterly*, on "The Changing Nature of World Power,"⁶⁶ and the Autumn 1990 issue of *Foreign Policy*, titled simply, "Soft Power."⁶⁷ On the occasion of *Foreign Policy*'s twentieth anniversary,

the foreign affairs community welcomed Nye's historical perspective and prognostication regarding the changing nature and distribution of power resources in a unipolar moment.

Soft power redefined not only the means but also the ends of national influence, measured by behavioral outcomes. In his most recent book, *The Future of Power*, Nye delved further into persuasive strategies of relational power and power behavior.⁶⁸ One strategy is the overt and transparent attempt to change another's preferences, which Nye called inducement. A second strategy is an indirect form of persuasion, to frame issues and set agendas that others must follow. A third strategy, which lies closest to soft power attraction, attempts to shape others' preferences such that their choices align with desired behaviors.

Over time, soft power in practice has reached further into persuasion. The correlation of soft power with public diplomacy and nation branding is one manifestation of this evolution. Attention to soft power does make public diplomacy more integrative and purposive, including high-level coordination of the U.S. public diplomacy apparatus, enhanced foreign exchange programs, more effective public-private collaboration, rapid response capabilities to crisis situations, and programs of engagement with cascading benefits.⁶⁹

In diplomatic tradecraft, soft power has become a pragmatic approach that serves the needs of public diplomacy professionals concerned with foreign publics' attitude change. Nye defined public diplomacy as "an instrument that governments use to mobilize [soft power] resources to communicate with and attract the publics of other countries."⁷⁰ If the United States' standing depends upon world opinion, then public diplomacy will increase the United States' soft power. Conversely, diversion of attention

and resources away from public diplomacy reduces the United States' capacity to exercise influence.

Nation branding is the newest variation on the soft power theme. Commentary takes stock of a nation's soft power, judging the extent to which soft power advances a country's international ambition. Examples are many and varied, and include security studies professor Amit Kumar Gupta's effort to promote India as "an archetype of an ancient civilization" possessing untapped spiritual knowledge⁷¹; political science professor Lam Peng Er's study of the Japanese government's attempt to harness market and consumer affinity for *manga* and *anime*, both distinctively Japanese and possessing universal youth appeal, in an attempt to burnish a fresh international image⁷²; and political science professor Sheng Ding's exploration of China's soft power strategies, including development assistance, to cultivate a favorable national image among peoples in Africa, East Asia and Latin America.⁷³

Whether pursuing a strategy of inducement, framing, or preference shaping, a leader may employ a combination of resources, including military action, economic influence, and the soft power resources of culture, values, norms, and policies. Regardless of how a national leader harnesses resources to strategy, the outcome is the same: to convert potential power, as measured by resources, to realized power, as measured by the changed behavior of others.⁷⁴ The emphasis on changing *others'* behavior, even by their own accord, is unmistakable.

Reading Nye Holistically

Soft power has somewhat overtaken Nye's foreign policy project, which is an expansive effort to find the most advantageous "set point" from which American foreign policy may be derived. My holistic reading of Nye's body of work suggests that the set point falls within four dialectics, each guided by an identified trend in global affairs and its consequences. From these consequences one may derive a key premise or assertion regarding a nation-state's capacity to generate soft power influence.

These four dialectics are hegemony and transnational interdependence, national and strategic interests, unilateralism and multilateralism, and declinism and triumphalism. In each case, and indeed throughout his entire project, Nye has studiously avoided the extremes. Preventing others from misreading signs and over-correcting is among Nye's primary motives. The search for a compromising, middle-of-the-road path, with a "both/and" vocabulary, has consistently characterized his scholarship and commentary.

Nye described the tension between hegemony and transnational interdependence as the inclination to concentrate power in the midst of its organic and systemic diffusion.⁷⁵ A trend driving the hegemony-interdependence dialectic is the increasing openness and inclusiveness of foreign policy processes to the participation of new, non-traditional and private actors, including news media editors and cue-givers, corporations, non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, and networks of scientific communities.⁷⁶ By virtue of its plurality—itself a moderating force—this trend works against hegemony and reaches toward transnational interdependence.

Nye wrote that "the issue is not whether state or non-state actors are more important—states usually are. The point is that in modern times, more complex

coalitions affect outcomes. With changing actors in world politics come changing goals—new dimensions of security—economic and ecological.”⁷⁷ Nye inferred that as new actors exerted influence on bilateral and multi-lateral agendas, the scope of issues appropriate for diplomatic dialogue would expand in kind. Nye called out ecological change, health epidemics, illicit trade, and terrorism as issues of transnational interdependence that require collective action and international cooperation.⁷⁸

Nye advocated balance between national and strategic interests, of which national interests are broad and inclusive and strategic interests are a subset. Nye built his own claims on a schema developed by William Perry and Ash Carter that categorized threats into three lists.⁷⁹ A List threats are existential, such as the threat of nuclear war that permeated foreign policy making during the Cold War era. B List threats are imminent, and here Perry and Carter included North Korea and Saddam Hussein’s Iraq. C List threats are important contingencies that indirectly affect but do not directly threaten U.S. interests, e.g., the Balkans, Somalia, Rwanda, and Haiti.

Nye observed that the C List has come to dominate the day’s foreign policy agenda.⁸⁰ Nye attributed the inversion of existential and non-threats to the characteristics of new media operating in the information age. The 24/7 news cycle, with access to places previously unreachable by news crews, delivered dramatic visual portrayals of human conflict and suffering that offer a “here and now” reality in place of A-list abstractions. Issues that garner media attention tend to be peripheral threats, but mobilize shame⁸¹ and stoke public outrage and spontaneous responses that demand an official response.⁸² The narrow definition of U.S. national interest often alienates other countries.⁸³

Acting on his assessment of how the foreign policy agenda is set and maintained, Nye reclaimed deliberative democracy as the proper mediator of broad and particularized interests:

In a democracy, the national interest is simply what citizens, after proper deliberation, say it is. It is broader than vital strategic interests, though they are a crucial part. It can include values such as human rights and democracy, particularly if the American public feels that those values are so important to our identity or sense of who we are that people are willing to pay a price to promote them. Values are simply an intangible part of the national interest. If the American people think that our long-term shared interests include certain values and their promotion abroad, then they become part of the national interest. Leaders and experts may point out the costs of indulging certain values, but if an informed public disagrees, experts cannot deny the legitimacy of their opinion.⁸⁴

This statement conveys a strong normative belief in the American system's capacity to forge a productive relationship between public opinion and public policy. The statement offers a forensic account of deliberation, but it is not the only way that Nye has espoused deliberative bodies as a locus of foreign policy making:

We walk around with pictures of the future in our heads as a necessary condition of planning our actions. At the national level, we need such pictures to guide policy and tell us how to use our unprecedented power. There is, of course, no single future; there are multiple possible futures, and the quality of our foreign policy can make some more likely than others. When systems involve complex interactions and feedbacks, small causes can have large effects. And when people are involved, human reactions to the prediction itself may make it fail to come true.⁸⁵

This passage reveals in Nye's own thought a struggle between a discursive response to world events filled with imagined possibilities, and a mechanistic system of checks and balances, which when well looked after, will produce the right response.

The third dialectic mediates preferences between unilateralism and multilateralism. The growing interdependence of economic and military power, or more broadly, between geo-economics and geo-politics, navigates a position between these two

poles. Changing sources of power fuel this interdependence. Technology, education, and economic growth have surpassed geography, population, and raw materials as indicators of a nation-state's global status.⁸⁶ As a consequence of this integration of economics and politics, power itself becomes less coercive and less tangible; the attempt to substitute one currency, such as economics, with another currency, such as the projection of force, becomes a riskier proposition.⁸⁷

Finally, in the debate between declinism and triumphalism, Nye staked out a clear position, stating flatly in *Bound to Lead* that the declinists were drawing the wrong lessons from historical analogies to great powers that overreached.⁸⁸ Twenty years hence, Nye felt compelled to restate the argument, calling for a new framing of U.S. power that rejected the narrative of hegemonic decline.⁸⁹ One should not read into Nye's rejection of declinism support for its opposite. Whereas Nye's caution against triumphalism is comparatively muted, he saw the potential for both declinism and triumphalism to squander American influence: declinism through over caution, and triumphalism through arrogance.⁹⁰

To buttress his argument against declinism, Nye's thought leadership has spurred a fresh approach to evaluating power in a post-Cold War world. As previously mentioned, Nye's evaluative scheme replaced material inputs with behavioral outcomes.⁹¹ Consequently, contexts and strategies achieved a degree of co-dependence in the power conversion calculus, spoken of today as "smart power." Strategies that relate means to ends, and those that combine hard and soft power resources successfully in different contexts, are the dominant factors in smart power diplomacy.⁹²

The New Public Diplomacy

Nye's writings on soft power articulated the trends and consequences that spurred a renaissance in public diplomacy theory and practice, often referred to as the new public diplomacy. New public diplomacy aims to create partnerships and platforms, effectuating a shift from advocacy of a particular policy or cause to an ideas-based strategy that shapes an idea or argument that can be amplified and reconstructed by others.⁹³ Further, and equally important as a defining characteristic, new public diplomacy makes optimal use of new media in cultural exchange and people-to-people diplomacy programs, as well as international broadcasting.⁹⁴

Brian Hocking, writing on the new public diplomacy in 2005, identified five intersecting phenomena that closely aligned with Nye's assessment of new actors, new issues, and new media: the preoccupation with image in international politics and rebranding in the global marketplace; the "CNN effect" that changed how issues roused public attention; technology-driven innovation in how public diplomacy was practiced; the intensification of social networks that blurred the boundaries between domestic and foreign policy; and the possibility, if not necessity, of direct public involvement in diplomacy.⁹⁵

The cumulative effect changed perceptions of what diplomacy was and could accomplish. The image of diplomatic systems as hierarchical and neatly ordered gave way to a "network" model that better represented the circulatory nature of power.⁹⁶ The network model accommodated both relational and structural forms of power, the first form exercised by an actor who changes the values of another, and the second form exercised by social structures producing shared norms and values.⁹⁷ The network model

places a premium on engagement strategies that reach into and activate interconnected communities, playing to the strengths of the public diplomacy professional. R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher and Amelia Arsenault described this change as a “connective mindshift” that would make public diplomacy a core imperative of diplomacy writ large.⁹⁸

By privileging engagement, public diplomacy specialists were better able to define themselves and their mission, distinguishing public diplomacy practice from propaganda and nation-branding.⁹⁹ In such a complex, networked environment, public diplomacy could not achieve its goals “based only on how ‘we’ appear to ‘others,’ whether we have the reputation we deserve, or thinking (that) listening is about understanding how ‘they’ hear ‘us’.”¹⁰⁰ New public diplomacy aims to marshal and direct social power. It achieves this by creating partnerships and platforms for engagement, and by intertwining cultural exchange and broadcasting diplomacy to optimize opportunities offered by new media.¹⁰¹

Critical Studies in Soft Power Diplomacy

Significant recent additions to the literature on soft power diplomacy have expanded the scope of inquiry from public diplomacy practice to comparative and critical studies of soft power. These studies question the biases, ethics, and perceptions that affect how soft power is perceived, practiced, and evaluated. Accordingly, these studies open possibilities for alternative ways to qualitatively assess soft power as a force for changing how countries and peoples interact with each other and how the international system itself is structured and managed.

Chief among the biases is the tendency to judge other countries against criteria culturally attuned to the United States. Comparative studies have sought to correct this bias by studying soft power in its indigenous Russian and European contexts. James Sherr's *Hard Diplomacy and Soft Coercion: Russia's Influence Abroad* challenged conventional wisdom about Russia's soft power and its practice, taking into consideration public skepticism over universal values; Russia's and Europe's rival integration projects; the restoration of order in Russia and Russians' opportunity to achieve prosperity; and soft power's integral role in Russian foreign policy that seeks to expand Russia's influence along its perimeter and to intensify allegiance within the former Soviet Union.¹⁰² To understand soft power in the Russian context, Sherr advocated adoption of a revised vocabulary that reduces the emphasis on values and increases the emphasis on identity narratives, and encourages the assessment of Russia's soft power influence on Russia's own terms.

In his Foreword to *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work*, Nicholas Cull explored the formative role of European public diplomacy in the creation of the European Union. Cull credited European officials for heeding public opinion at home and abroad, to craft sound policies that facilitate the flow of soft power. Cull also noted the subsequent failure of public diplomacy: the divide between Brussels and "the street" was an overt sign that EU members had fallen out of step with their respective populations.¹⁰³ *European Public Diplomacy* opened a new area of study regarding an entity's ability to exercise regional soft power, offering assessments of the extent to which Europe's public diplomacy has formed a coherent image of the European Union,

and the interplay of member states who share many goals but also operate independently and in competition with each other.¹⁰⁴

Studies that advance relational and collaborative strategies in public diplomacy have interrogated the underlying ethics of soft power. Kathy Fitzpatrick is recognized as an early proponent of a relational approach as the conceptual core of public diplomacy, arguing in *The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy* that “public diplomacy’s fundamental purpose is to help a nation establish and maintain mutually beneficial relationships with strategic publics that can affect national interests.”¹⁰⁵ Fitzpatrick asserted that the ethical shortcoming of soft power lies in the asymmetrical relationship between an entity that possesses and wields influence and an entity that is to be influenced. Because of this imbalance, it is unlikely that the entity with influence would be open to change.

Relational strategies of engagement stress that both parties engaged need to be conducive to changing their attitudes and behaviors in order to achieve mutual benefit.¹⁰⁶

Furthermore, the superordinate-subordinate position of influencer and influenced works against efforts to empower foreign publics’ voice in public diplomacy outcomes¹⁰⁷ in an atmosphere that generates understanding and trust.¹⁰⁸

The shift toward engagement requires reconceptualizing audience as a part of a functioning ecosystem of international communication, a point which Craig Hayden explored in his ongoing effort to identify the arguments that justify, elaborate, and constitute public diplomacy,¹⁰⁹ and to provide a theoretical understanding of how soft power is conceived and implemented.¹¹⁰ In *The Rhetoric of Soft Power*, Hayden examined how soft power is articulated in public diplomacy and strategic communications policies in the United States, China, Japan, and Venezuela. Hayden’s

analysis elucidated the comparative perceptions of what constitutes relations, the meaning of “public,” the connections between audiences and the media, and policy makers’ expectations for what soft power can achieve.¹¹¹ More broadly, Hayden’s project questions what public diplomacy can reasonably achieve as a purveyor and creator of international influence, and what identifying oneself as a public diplomacy advocate and practitioner entails. The result is a rhetoric of public diplomacy in the making, leading to wholly different forms of persuasive discourse to achieve U.S. foreign policy objectives.¹¹²

Joining Rhetoric and Soft Power

In my review of the literature, I set out to accomplish three tasks. First, I wanted to orient readers to the frames of reference that have guided my research and rhetorical critique. Toward this end, I introduced scholarship in the rhetoric of foreign policy, including works that treated rhetoric-as-persuasion and rhetoric-as-constitutive. I also presented an overview of Nye’s collective works and described the evolution and current direction of scholarship in soft power theory and practice. Second, I have clarified my own entry point into the stream of literature. I ally my own scholarship with the rhetoric-as-constitutive approach to foreign policy rhetoric, and join colleagues’ critical inquiry of soft power as it is currently conceived and practiced.

Lastly, I am confident that my project will generate new knowledge. It advances our understanding of how discourse functions in bilateral diplomacy, an area that remains relatively pristine in comparison to rhetorical critique of presidential discourse in response to crises and in pursuit of foreign policy goals. Furthermore, I offer a

fundamentally different approach to the study of soft power, elaborating the rhetorical dimension of soft power attraction through bilateral diplomacy.

Elaborating Soft Power with Rhetorical Sensitivity¹¹³

In this section, I bring the foregoing discussion on soft power theory down to earth, introducing additional works in rhetorical criticism that simultaneously problematize and elaborate core assumptions of soft power with real-world examples. I focus on three aspects of soft power theory: the nature and expression of national values; how international actors exercise voice and social agency; and how issues are framed. Placing these aspects at the center of a conversation on soft power and rhetoric allows me to demonstrate the value of rhetorical critique for understanding soft power's influence as well as its limitations. In addressing national values, voice and agency, and issue frames, rhetorical critics answer two fundamental questions: what is the generative source of soft power, and how do international actors achieve consensus and move in unison? For both of these questions, Nye provides an answer that is generally mechanistic and agent-centric. Rhetorical critics respond to Nye by animating soft power and by making discourse (vice actors who speak) the focal point for understanding soft power attraction.

The Nature and Projection of National Values

Nye wrote that soft power attraction “tends to arise from such resources as culture and ideological attraction as well as rules and institutions of international regimes.”¹¹⁴ The attractiveness of a nation's culture and ideology, the establishment of international norms consistent with its own society, and institutions able to channel and limit others'

activities in preferred directions¹¹⁵ are the leitmotiv of soft power. Universal values such as democracy and respect for human rights are a soft power booster. Nye argued that “when a country’s culture includes universal values and interests that others share, it increases the probability of obtaining its desired outcomes.”¹¹⁶

Nye’s writings convey a sense of automaticity in how governments and non-governmental actors project national values onto the world stage. Projection of national values in turn relies upon national leaders adept at framing values, policies, and actions as mutually reinforcing and consonant. Resonance of messages among domestic and foreign audiences rests in an ideational or imagined experience, rather than lived, intersubjective experience. Moreover, Nye has treated soft power resources—culture, values, norms, policies, and institutions—as inert elements.

A rhetorical perspective animates soft power substances in and through discourse. Mark P. Moore and J. Gaut Ragsdale captured the animation of values in their critique of President Clinton’s rhetoric on the North American Trade Agreement.¹¹⁷ During the 1996 Presidential Campaign, President Clinton—a NAFTA advocate—drew skillfully on the American Dream to promote his foreign policy vision. He argued that the small town values to which he owed his success—opportunity, equality, and responsibility—were the very ideals and aspirations that guided the NAFTA negotiations.¹¹⁸ These same values, when applied to NAFTA, would restore the American dream.¹¹⁹ Moore and Ragsdale’s essay demonstrated how personal narrative and mythologized biography cued participants in discourse to adopt these values in their own efforts to make a livelihood.

To appreciate the distinction between transmission and enactment, one need not look exclusively to post-Cold War presidents. President Reagan’s speech at Moscow

State University,¹²⁰ delivered on May 31, 1988, appealed to shared principles—freedom of thought, freedom of information and communication, and free enterprise. President Reagan linked faith and freedom, using as rhetorical resources images and principles deeply rooted in Russian culture, including ties to land, family, and community. The speech demonstrated that values such as freedom had the potential to constitute a domestic Russian rationale to pursue glasnost and perestroika. President Reagan thus promoted freedom not only as an American ideal, but as a universal, human value with the power to constitute a transnational bond.

If Nye gives us the substance of soft power, rhetoric answers the question of its change and sustenance. Culture, taken as a soft power resource, attracts not as a stimulus for imitation, but in the hybridity created when two or more cultures meet. Values, taken as a soft power resource, attract not merely through their transmission but also by their enactment.

New Actors' Exercise of Voice and Agency

Nye drew on soft power to explain the growing influence of new and non-traditional actors in diplomacy. New and non-traditional actors do not necessarily possess the traditional resources of national power, such as resource-rich territory or a standing military. Instead, they possess soft power resources such as values and institutions, and can match or even surpass nation-states' technological prowess, knowledge, and economic wherewithal to attain global status.¹²¹

New and non-traditional actors named in Nye's writings include media editors and other cue-givers, private sector corporations, non-governmental organizations,

intergovernmental organizations, and networks of scientific communities.¹²² Nye assumed that these new actors would form coalitions that could generate soft power influence.¹²³ Nye also correlated open participation with an expansive international affairs agenda, increasing the prominence of the economic and ecological dimensions of global security.¹²⁴

Nye is less well equipped to explain how new and non-traditional actors achieve consensus and move in unison. Rhetoricians have filled in this gap by putting discourse at the center of diplomatic action. Actors within the diplomatic arena use language to convert soft power into shared purposes and cooperative action. Discursive forms such as narrative place actors and issues together in a rhetorically constructed moment that serves as a call to action.

Ann LeMare's essay on the Fair Trade Narrative exemplified individual actors' capacity to frame global issues and politics as a call to action.¹²⁵ The Fair Trade Narrative broke the dominant frame of market access to describe global economic and environmental issues, and replaced it with a narrative of trade justice.¹²⁶ A cultural circuit of identity, regulation, representation, production, and consumption reinforced the trade justice narrative, such that consumers' purchases placed them in the narrative, partaking in a shared moral position.

LeMare's essay provides a real-world example of what William Kirkwood termed the rhetoric of possibility, that is, the role of rhetoric in creating possibilities of awareness and action.¹²⁷ The Fair Trade Narrative constituted the socially aware consumer. If consumerism is itself a type of performance, narrative accounts reduced the ambiguity of where and what the consumer purchased.¹²⁸ Narrative created in consumers a frame of

mind that heightened awareness of their moral responsibility, constituting a bond between consumer and producer.¹²⁹

The Framing of Issues on the International Agenda

Nye expressed concern that a call to action would be framed too narrowly, triggering an emotional response from specific groups of actors and advocates who had particularized interests in a foreign policy decision or diplomatic outcome. When left unchecked by an American public that is indifferent and complacent about international affairs, Nye wrote, “the battlefields of foreign policy are left to those with special interests.”¹³⁰ A rhetorical perspective offers an alternative to Nye’s “battlefields” analogy.

Rhetors may select strategies that (re)frame an issue or a relationship in its broadest terms. Synecdoche—the interaction of microcosm and macrocosm, or the particular and the universal¹³¹—is one strategy well suited to Nye’s preference for universal values and national interests broadly defined. President Clinton’s policy toward Africa exemplified this form of synecdoche. The “new partnership anecdote,” coined by Jason A. Edwards and Joseph M. Valenzano, III,¹³² established a synecdochic relationship between particularized concerns about Africa and strategic partnership with African governments, bilaterally and collectively. From the “new partnership” signature initiative with African nation-states, synecdoche progressed one additional order of magnitude, from African Affairs to global affairs.

Edwards and Valenzano found that President Clinton’s “new partnership anecdote” was a template to describe the United States’ role as a world leader, to promote

democracy, and to reconsider the threat environment. President Clinton's advocacy of a new partnership with Africa launched a successful engagement strategy that contained within it the Administration's orientation toward stability, prosperity, and security. When contextualized in African Affairs, the strategy resolved the tension among national, strategic, and parochial interests. A rhetorical perspective on soft power thus explains how the distinctions between parochial and strategic interests can be reconciled productively.

Nye's writings infer that international agendas are built serially; new issues that arise are added to the list; issues that are resolved are subtracted. By contrast, a rhetorical perspective expects an interplay of issues, with the potential for a transcendental issue or cause to emerge. Such was the experience of participants in the "Battle of Seattle" who fused social, economic, technological, environmental, and political processes into a call to global citizenship.¹³³ The narrative of global citizenry made the "Battle of Seattle" a transformative moment, not only for those physically present, but also for those who heard the call from afar and performed their own acts of global citizenship in their own country contexts.

The rhetorical-critical essays cited above demonstrate that discourse is the generative source of soft power. Open-ended and participatory narratives converted national values into universally held precepts, called rhetorical communities into being, and framed the call to action to shape parochial interests as a microcosm of national interests. The authors delved into the underlying processes of human communication that energize, direct, and sustain soft power's circulation within and across communities.

When approached with rhetorical sensitivity, soft power discourse holds the potential to constitute new identities and transform relationships.

Soft Power's Rhetorical Force

My perspective on rhetoric shapes my rhetorical critique, through which I elaborate the rhetorical work of soft power. The rhetorical dimension of soft power can be discovered and understood only after grounding theory and testing methods in lived discourse. The selection of an exemplar in bilateral diplomacy is critical to this endeavor. In this section, I present the rationale guiding my decision to focus on the U.S.-India bilateral relationship. In the section immediately after, I discuss the narrowing of my critique to a transformative moment in the bilateral relationship, during which U.S. and Indian interests converged in the pursuit of full civilian nuclear cooperation, leading to the formation of an enduring and resilient strategic partnership.

A Partner Country in Bilateral Dialogue

The selection of a paired relationship is a precursor to rhetorical critique. Given the complexity of how nation-states interact bilaterally, regionally, and multi-laterally, elucidating the movement of soft power throughout the community of nations cannot be achieved with one stroke. From a soft power perspective, I wanted to better understand the rich and deep texture of soft power substances—values, norms, institutions, policies, plus language—that generate attraction. From a rhetorical perspective, a bilateral relationship—as opposed to regional or multilateral fora—offered greater likelihood of recognizing and studying soft power attraction as a rhetorical process.

My choice to isolate the U.S.-India bilateral relationship can be explained initially by personal and professional considerations. From a personal perspective, I possess a general understanding of the U.S.-India relationship, gained through my tenure as a foreign affairs officer at the U.S. Department of State. For example, I managed the private sector aspects of the U.S.-India knowledge trade initiative in the late 1990s, and more recently explored the feasibility of public-private partnerships with indigenous Indian organizations to achieve labor reform goals and generate sustainable livelihoods. I have learned much about the influence of the Indian-American Diaspora community through my engagement with the U.S.-India Business Council and not-for-profit organizations including the American India Foundation.

Pragmatically, India is a good choice because of the accessibility of discourses available in English, including public statements issued by the Government of India. Online access to English-language journals and studies published by indigenous Indian think tanks and research institutes, as well as major Indian papers that publish in English, eases collection of texts to analyze. Further, Indian Government officials' proficiency in English and their willingness to address U.S.-based audiences in English reduces anxiety about mistranslation.

Personal and pragmatic considerations aside, the U.S.-India relationship is worthy of serious study through the lens of any discipline. I base this opinion in the complexity, significance, and continuing evolution of the bilateral relationship from estrangement to engagement. Shared values, mutual interests, reciprocal commitments, and a joint vision of how to deter geopolitical threats and meet transnational challenges underpins the U.S.-India relationship.

My aim to elaborate the rhetorical dimension of soft power makes the U.S.-India relationship a compelling choice. To yield insights, my critique should encounter discourses generated by advocates of two countries that possess a parity of soft power resources. To this point, India harbors and wields soft power resources of its own. These soft power resources include normative influence (e.g., a founding philosophy of nonviolence and consistent voice for global equality on behalf of the underprivileged); institutional influence within the G-77 and G-20 communities of nation-states, and more recently, as a potential additional permanent member of the U.N. Security Council; and cultural influence, including not only film but also cuisine, art, music and dance.¹³⁴

India's soft power parity with the United States can be assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Turning first to the rare quantitative ranking of soft powers, the Institute for Government, a London-based independent charity whose mission is to make government more effective, listed India among the top-25 influencers in 2010¹³⁵; India dropped a few notches to 27 in the 2011 report, and fell to 36 based on 2012 data.¹³⁶ Among the rapid-growth markets, India ranks second behind China, according to Ernst & Young's Rapid-growth Market Soft Power Index, which is based on metrics that take into account a country's global image (e.g., Olympics), global integrity (e.g., rule of law), and global integration (e.g., English fluency). Whereas aspects of any given index will generate reasonable questions about methodology, a metric-based comparative analysis of soft power resources is more rigorous and defensible than public opinion alone, and validates the assumption that India is a *de facto* soft power.

In the ongoing conversations about soft power, qualitative considerations more typically buttress statements regarding how much soft power a country possesses.

Hymans' summary of soft power trends—Bollywood, Bangalore, the “Boy Next Door” and the Bomb”¹³⁷—is a serviceable qualitative framework through which to consider India's soft power prospects. The popularity of Bollywood is but one signifier of India's cultural influence. In addition to popular culture phenomena such as Bollywood films and Bollywood-inspired dance and music, India's ancient history of civilizational and cultural links extend today throughout Asia, Europe, and the Middle East,¹³⁸ providing a regenerative soft power resource independent of popular tastes. The Indian Council for Cultural Relations, which manages 22 cultural centers in 19 countries, and the Indian Brand Equity Foundation, established as a public-private partnership to promote India as a modern and dynamic state through initiatives such as the “India Everywhere” campaign,¹³⁹ ply both ancient and popular cultural resources.

Bangalore symbolizes the consonance of American and Indian values with regard to entrepreneurship and prosperity. Bangalore also stands for India's capabilities to develop dual-use high-technology, to harness that know-how to international development initiatives that generate good will, and to solve transnational, soft-power problems such as mitigating climate change and combating pandemics. The entrepreneurial success signified by Bangalore, and the companion center of finance in Mumbai, have added credibility to India's role as a promoter of regional economic integration. Whereas India formerly treated South Asia as a protectorate vital to its own national security, today, India emphasizes its attractiveness as an economic hub and development model for its neighbors' emulation.¹⁴⁰

Bangalore and Mumbai together project India's image as an investment-friendly, pro-market democracy.¹⁴¹ India has demonstrated its willingness to tap into its own

wealth to support other countries' development goals. From 2000-2010, India tripled its foreign assistance, disbursing more than \$1.5 billion in foreign aid in 2011.¹⁴²

Furthermore, India has built capacity to manage its foreign aid, putting in place a bureaucratic infrastructure that elevated the country's visibility in the global aid arena. In 2011, India created a new agency similar to the U.S. Agency for International Development and the United Kingdom's Department for International Development, which was authorized to spend \$11.3 billion over 5 years.¹⁴³

The "boy next door" refers to affinities created through people-to-people diplomacy and interaction with members of the Indian Diaspora in the United States.¹⁴⁴ Diasporans can be change agents both in India and in their adopted communities. For example, Diasporans may convince the people in their country of residence that their home country's preferences are valid and attractive. Additionally, Diasporans may influence the foreign policy of their host government in favor of their home government.¹⁴⁵ To be agents of change, the divisions of region, language, and caste are muted in the construction of an outward facing "Indian" identity that both personalizes and amplifies affirming myths, legends, and traditions.¹⁴⁶ Diasporans may also influence how deeply and quickly their Indian and adopted home communities converge to generate cultural capital and catalyze collective action.¹⁴⁷ In this mode of action, the Diaspora promotes the diversity of its members and constructs a hybrid identity. The Diaspora embodies—literally and symbolically—India's creative and cultural industry, its syncretic spirituality, and its civilizational ethos.¹⁴⁸

India's possession of the Bomb acknowledges India's role as a nuclear power within its regional sphere of influence, vis-à-vis China and Pakistan, and within the

international nonproliferation regime. Hymans' direct reference to India's nuclear power status implies interdependence between hard and soft power resources. Absent a hard power foundation, soft power resources are too anemic to sustain global influence.¹⁴⁹ Because India possesses resources across the power spectrum, whether and when to exercise soft power, singly or in combination with hard power tactics, remains a dynamic calculus and India's strategic choice.

In the context of my dissertation, the Bomb has a more benign meaning that is consequential to India's soft power calculus. India's independent mastery of the full nuclear fuel cycle was a scientific and technological achievement attributable to an intellectual culture deeply embedded in the Indian tradition.¹⁵⁰ Indian rhetors would translate this particularized intellectual culture into a universal or civilizational culture, including autonomous universities, a democratic polity, and facility in the English language.¹⁵¹

In sum, as a partner to bilateral dialogue and engagement, India has access to the full range of power resources when selecting strategies and tactics to manage that relationship. India's ancient and popular culture resources, accessible to international audiences and furthered by public and private people-to-people interaction, fuel India's soft power influence. India's military successes and influence within its regional sphere of influence demonstrate India's capacity, if not also the will, to wield hard power to protect its interests. India's centers for finance and high tech, extended through leadership in multilateral economic dialogue and amplified by Diasporans' entrepreneurial success, allow the exercise of punitive, competitive, or cooperative tactics.

Civil Nuclear Cooperation

The U.S.-India bilateral relationship is long-standing, and encompasses a range of security, economic, and socio-cultural issues. The two countries' interactions offer a panoply of decisive moments that offer insight into the rhetorical dimension of soft power. In this section, I introduce the particular, transformative moment in the U.S.-India bilateral relationship that generated discourses for my rhetorical critique of soft power's rhetorical force.

I begin with the general observation that the U.S.-India relationship has been marked by alternating periods of engagement and estrangement. Nuclear diplomacy often punctuated the purposeful distancing and warming of relations. Even as both countries enjoyed the latitude to forge new alliances in the post-Cold War moment, and cooperation blossomed in many formerly contentious areas, civilian nuclear cooperation remained elusive. Strategic dialogue plateaued on issues of high technology, energy cooperation, and scientific exchange. India's foreign policy doctrine and steadfast refusal to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, along with international sanctions and export controls, barred robust dialogue and technical exchange.

In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, the United States lifted sanctions that had been imposed on India since 1998. As the contours of the Global War on Terrorism took shape, foreign policy makers reassessed approaches to global security, including nuclear nonproliferation. The possibility of non-state terrorist actors obtaining and using weapons of mass destruction created an opening to reframe nuclear nonproliferation. Nuclear rhetorics evolved from highly technical exchanges focused on compliance with

the Nonproliferation Treaty to inclusive and vernacular narratives focused on cooperation to keep nuclear weapons and materials in responsible hands.

The United States and India pressed the opportunity to expand bilateral dialogue into areas previously verboten. The formation of the U.S.-India High Technology Cooperation Group in November 2002 increased dual use technology exports. India consented to a U.S. export control attaché to monitor end-use of U.S. technology transfers in exchange for the United States removing the Indian Space Research Organization from the Entity List, repealing extra licensing and regulatory requirements for technology exports. In 2004, the United States and India formally launched a strategic dialogue with reciprocal steps for civilian nuclear regulatory and safety issues, space cooperation, and expansion of high-tech commerce. In July 2005, on the eve of a state visit by Prime Minister Singh, the Indian Parliament passed a bill titled “WMD and Their Delivery Systems (Prohibition of Unlawful Activities)” that brought India’s export control regime in conformity with the United States and international export controls.¹⁵²

Having discovered common cause in the Global War on Terrorism, followed by the removal of several legal barriers to cooperation, President Bush and Indian Prime Minister Singh selected the Prime Minister’s July 2005 state visit as the moment to jointly commit to full civilian nuclear cooperation, which would culminate in the signing of a U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement, or 123 Agreement. The “123 Agreement” refers to Section 123 of the U.S. Atomic Energy Act. Section 123 requires the conclusion of a specific agreement for significant transfers of nuclear material, equipment, or components from the United States to another nation. Beyond commercial interests, the 123 Agreement allows cooperation in other areas, including technical

exchanges, scientific research, and nuclear safeguards. It is generally understood that a country that is party to a bilateral 123 Agreement will adhere to U.S.-mandated (and by extension, international) nuclear nonproliferation norms.¹⁵³

The joint commitment to full civil nuclear cooperation broke the previous decades' hard power cycle of coercion and punitive sanctions, and cleared a path to realize an enduring strategic partnership. U.S. and Indian officials staked their respective national interests in cooperative action taken together. The fulfillment of this commitment, achieved through the rhetoric of soft power diplomacy, transformed the bilateral relationship from estrangement to permanent and comprehensive engagement. Rhetoric effectuated this transformation by creating a convergence of world views and sustaining concerted action.

The joint statement issued during Prime Minister Singh's visit sparked a legislative and public debate that would continue through the 123 Agreement's October 2008 ratification by both governments. The debate played out in the U.S. Congress, the Indian Parliament, multilateral organizations, and the transnational public sphere, contextualizing nuclear nonproliferation in democratic norms and bilateral interests writ large. The debate framed, contested, and reconstructed national interests and international cooperation between partners, by virtue of the attitudes and intentions expressed, and the consequence of those attitudes and intentions on how and what one argues.¹⁵⁴

Gathering Discourses Concerning Civil Nuclear Cooperation

The systematic collection of discourses is a prerequisite to rhetorical critique. Recounting the steps taken to create the discursive archive allows peers to form their own judgments regarding the soundness of my critique, and gives scholars a platform from which to pursue and discuss related questions. My aim here is to make transparent to readers the process I used to develop a holistic understanding of the debate, and from which I mined dialogue and discursive exchanges in which the tenor of soft power's rhetorical force can be heard.

The discourses generated by the debate are publicly available through open sources. For general news coverage and broadcast transcripts, I mined texts through LexisNexis. Searches occasionally provided day book announcements of events hosted by public policy organizations and think tanks, surfacing the availability of transcripts and summaries from sponsoring organizations' websites. I also searched the online archives of the *Times of India*, to supplement news coverage captured in the LexisNexis search.

Layering in official documents and statements, I searched through the Department of State online archive of daily press briefings, news releases and transcripts, and the Government of India's online archives of the Ministry of External Affairs. I also contacted the Embassy of India to acquire transcripts of officials' remarks and congressional testimony. The online archives of *India Abroad*, a long-standing weekly newspaper for the Indian Diaspora community in the United States, proved to be an invaluable source for first-person texts, through news coverage and interviews with

officials of the U.S. Government and Government of India, Members of Congress, public policy specialists, and advocates of U.S.-India commercial ties.

Adding another layer of Congressional records, I searched for transcripts of Congressional hearings and reports, combining LexisNexis and GPO sources of information. I found supplementary texts by searching back issues of *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, *Nonproliferation Review*, and the *Economic and Political Weekly* (of India), and by searching web sites of advocacy organizations such as the U.S.-India Business Council and the Arms Control Association.

Placing the artifacts in their chronological sequence, I have confidence that my critique emanates from discourses that reflect the ebb-and-flow of negotiations. The debate played out in three phases, beginning with a U.S. Congressional debate on legislation authorizing the Bush Administration to engage in bilateral negotiation of a U.S.-India 123 Agreement. Prime Minister Singh's state visit in July 2005, during which he and President Bush signed a joint statement to pursue full nuclear cooperation, and President Bush's reciprocal visit to India in March 2006, punctuated the first phase of debate. Numerous Congressional hearings and public events hosted by agreement supporters and nonproliferation advocates occurred during this time as well. The first phase closed on December 18, 2006, when President Bush signed into law the Henry J. Hyde U.S. and India Peaceful Atomic Energy Promotion Act of 2006. The law approved an exception to U.S. law to allow shipments of civilian nuclear fuel to India, and to allow US companies to engage in nuclear trade with India.

The second phase accelerated in March 2007 and carried through July 2008, during which time U.S. and Indian negotiators hammered out the specifics of a U.S.-India

123 Agreement. Following three rounds of negotiations, including intensified engagement in March and April 2007, the two governments initialed the draft text of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement on July 20, 2007. More than a year would pass before further progress could be made, owing in large measure to domestic opposition in India led by the Communist Party of India-Marxist and other Parties of the Left. Prime Minister Singh's survival of a July 2008 no-confidence vote, in which the Prime Minister staked his Government on Parliament's passage of the draft text, placed the capstone on this second phase of negotiation.

The third and final phase of the debate occurred between August and October of 2008, during which time the U.S.-India 123 Agreement progressed toward ratification. Following the Indian Parliament's action, diplomacy shifted to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which approved an India-specific safeguards agreement, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), which approved India-specific exemptions from U.S. and NSG nuclear trade restrictions on states that do not allow full-scope international safeguards. With actions by the IAEA and NSG complete, the Bush Administration took the final steps for U.S. ratification of the 123 Agreement, obtaining Congressional approval of the U.S.-India Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. President Bush signed legislation enacting the 123 Agreement on October 8, 2008.

Taken as a whole, the discourses collected capture the varying pace and inflections in the debate's progression toward a final resolution in the ratification of the 123 Agreement. A related consideration is whether the artifacts collected can be characterized as soft power. Were the discourses dominated by bargaining tactics,

threats, or coercive appeals, I could not honestly claim that the 123 Agreement was a product of soft power diplomacy. Thankfully, the archive contains a preponderance of artifacts that reference soft power substances such as culture, values, norms, policies and institutions, and transnational soft-power issues that demand bilateral or multi-national cooperation.

The discourses demonstrate the usefulness of rhetoric in constructing meaning, identifications, and community. The interplay of influence among competing voices comes through in the texts. These voices include not only heads of state and their senior representatives, but also economic and trade organizations on both continents, public intellectuals and policy experts, elected officials in the U.S. Congress, and the U.S.-based Indian Diaspora community.

Prior to the debate on civil nuclear cooperation, the Diaspora community's public advocacy flowed from and sustained its place of privilege within the knowledge economy.¹⁵⁵ Organized efforts attended to economic, trade and taxation issues; issues affecting particular occupations such as health and medicine; and immigration and visa issues that impacted study in the United States. The debate on full civilian nuclear cooperation expanded the "political" to include international development, environmental conservation, and Indian domestic security policies.¹⁵⁶ The means of exerting influence likewise multiplied, including investment, repatriation of skills and technology, and corporatized philanthropy and charitable works.¹⁵⁷

During the debate on civil nuclear cooperation, the Indian Diaspora drew cultural and social resources into their argument that India was ready to serve the world.¹⁵⁸ No longer mere accompaniment, geopolitical visions and discourses interlaced transnational

commerce to boost Diaspora community pride and influence.¹⁵⁹ The Diasporans' narrative displayed a wide spectrum of experience¹⁶⁰ to promote India's role as a "stable democracy in an unstable world."¹⁶¹

Each of the voices present in the debate attempted the rhetorical task of re-definition. Proponents created an expansive frame for civil nuclear cooperation, redefining national and mutual interests. Commercial advocates sought to redefine the energy sector, harnessing a low-emissions high technology to a traditional industrial sector. Policy experts, whether speaking from the geopolitical or nonproliferation domain, had the task of redefining responsible conduct of the nation-state within the long-standing context of the nonproliferation regime. The Indian Diaspora community redefined itself.

Everything, Preferably All at Once

In the foregoing pages, I presented a number of commitments that my rhetorical critique promises to fulfill. The promise upon which all others depend is to elaborate the rhetorical dimension of soft power in the context of bilateral strategic dialogue. India's soft power standing and advocates' reliance on soft power approaches provided the impetus to elicit from discourses the transformation that took place during the debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement. My critique surfaces and then distills the rhetorical work of soft power in catalyzing and sustaining that transformation.

My critique promises to nurture the seeds of interdisciplinary scholarship. Drawing on rhetorical theory to underpin soft power, I explain soft power's processes of attraction and its sustenance over time, and identify dialogue that represents soft power in

the making. I elaborate rhetors' use of language to effectuate a convergence of world views, purposes, and interests and to undertake concerted action. And I highlight those moments in which discourse created synergy between strategic and parochial interests, and opened ideologically charged terms to new interpretations and meanings.

By fulfilling these theoretical and critical aims, I will have succeeded in staking new ground for the rhetoric of diplomacy. I am conscious of the call for rhetorical critics to balance judgment of rhetors' techniques and purposes, and to use and create new tools for consensus building and rational decision-making. As an academic and former foreign affairs officer, I expect to put these tools in the hands of practitioners, deepening the skills of public diplomacy officers and broadening soft power's scope to encompass a multitude of diplomatic objectives and areas of expertise. If successful, the expansion of soft power diplomacy will establish a robust platform for further research in the rhetoric of diplomacy, thus initiating a virtuous circle to expand our knowledge of diplomacy and enhance practitioners' rhetorical perspective.

Notes

¹ Rudra Chaudhuri traces the beginnings, gains, setbacks, and broad arc of U.S.-Indian diplomatic relations, built through interviews and primary source documents, as well as secondary sources, summarized in *Forged In Crisis: India and the United States Since 1947* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014).

² National Nuclear Security Administration, “123 Agreements for Peaceful Cooperation,” <http://nnsa.energy.gov/aboutus/ourprograms/nonproliferation/treatiesagreements/123agreementsforpeacefulcooperation> accessed December 24, 2011.

³ Rhetorical resources can be drawn from a wide range of experience, including spiritual, cultural, interpersonal, economic, and biological connections. Eric M. Eisenberg, “Building a Mystery: Toward a New Theory of Communication and Identity,” *Journal of Communication* 51, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 534-552.

⁴ M. Karen Walker, “The Importance of ‘Standing’ in Argumentation: Transformational Diplomacy and the U.S. Department of State” (paper, National Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November 2007).

⁵ M. Karen Walker, “Economic Growth as Terministic Screen: An Essay on the Millennium Challenge Corporation” (paper, National Communication Association, San Diego, CA, November 2008).

⁶ M. Karen Walker, “Co-Constructing Frames to Warrant Preservation of Iraq’s Cultural Heritage,” http://208.73.48.91/?page_id=112 accessed April 13, 2014.

⁷ George Herbert Mead, *Mind Self and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*, ed. Charles W. Morris (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1967).

⁸ Raymie E. McKerrow, “Critical Rhetoric Theory and Praxis,” *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (June 1989): 91-111.

⁹ Jeff Pruchnic, “Burke In/On Public and Private: Rhetoric, Propaganda, and the ‘End(s)’ of Humanism,” *Burke in the Archives, Using the Past to Transform the Future of Burkean Studies*, eds. Dana Anderson and Jessica Enoch (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2013), 120.

¹⁰ Stuart Hall, “Who needs ‘Identity’?” in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996), 1-17.

¹¹ Eric King Watts, “‘Voice’ and ‘Voicelessness’ in Rhetorical Studies,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87, no. 2 (May 2001): 179-196.

¹² Joseph S. Nye, Jr. "The Changing Nature of World Power." *Political Science Quarterly* 105, no. 2 (1990): 178-181.

¹³ President Bill Clinton, Speech to the Indian Parliament, March 22, 2000. Accessed from the [AP Archive](#) on May 29, 2014.

¹⁴ Kenneth Burke "Rhetoric—Old and New" *Journal of General Education* 5 (1951): 203.

¹⁵ Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California, 1984), 266.

¹⁶ James Jasinski, *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001), 590.

¹⁷ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1945; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 21-23. Citations are to the California edition.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ The term consubstantiation is typical of Burke's borrowing of engrained and powerful terms from religious doctrine. Consubstantiation is typical of Burke's linguistic philosophy governed by a "both-and" ontology. Consubstantiation is neither the complete and total unity of two substances, nor mere representation of one thing for another; it is a joining that preserves the originating essences. Margaret D. Zulick has characterized Burke's treatment of consubstantiation in *Grammar of Motives* as "an alchemic moment, wherein momentous miracles of transformation can take place. For here the intrinsic and extrinsic can change places. To tell what a thing is, you place it in terms of something else." See Kenneth Burke: A Roadmap, accessed from <http://users.wfu.edu/zulick/454/roadmap.html> on May 30, 2014.

²⁰ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1950; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 21. Citations are to the California edition.

²¹ Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California, 1973), 1.

²² James Jasinski, *Sourcebook on Rhetoric*, 328.

²³ William F. Lewis, "Telling America's Story: Narrative Form and the Reagan Presidency," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 280-302.

²⁴ James Jasinski, *Sourcebook on Rhetoric*, 329.

²⁵ Wayne Brockriede, "Arguers as Lovers," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1972): 10.

²⁶ Brandon Rottinghaus, "Presidential Leadership on Foreign Policy, Opinion Polling, and the Possible Limits of 'Crafted Talk,'" *Political Communication* 25 (2008): 138-140.

²⁷ Ibid., 140.

²⁸ J. Michael Hogan and Leroy Dorsey, "Public Opinion and the Nuclear Freeze: The Rhetoric of Popular Sovereignty in Foreign Policy Debate," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 55 (Fall 1991): 321.

²⁹ Ibid., 322.

³⁰ B. Wayne Howell, "Reagan & Reykjavik: Arms Control, SDI, and the Argument from Human Rights," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11, no. 3 (2008): 392.

³¹ Ibid., 389.

³² David S. Birdsell, "Ronald Reagan on Lebanon and Grenada: Flexibility and Interpretation in the Application of Kenneth Burke's Pentad," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, no. 3 (1987): 267-279.

³³ Ibid., 277.

³⁴ David C. Klope, "Defusing a Foreign Policy Crisis: Myth and Victimage in Reagan's 1983 Lebanon/Grenada Address," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Fall 1986): 336.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ D. Ray Heisey, "Reagan and Mitterand Respond to International Crisis: Creating Versus Transcending Appearances," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Fall 1986): 327.

³⁷ H. W. Brands, "The World in a Word: The Rise and Fall of Détente," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 1 (1998): 49.

³⁸ Richard M. Weaver, *Visions of Order: The Cultural Crisis of Our Time* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1995), 65.

³⁹ Robert P. Newman, *Invincible Ignorance in American Foreign Policy: The Triumph of Ideology over Evidence* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2013).

⁴⁰ Philip Wander, "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, no. 4 (November 1984): 339-361.

⁴¹ Ibid., 342.

⁴² Ibid., 349.

⁴³ Ibid., 341.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 350.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 345.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 357.

⁴⁷ John F. Cragan, "The Cold War Rhetorical Vision, 1946-1972," (dissertation thesis, University of Minnesota, 1972), 7.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 19.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 20.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 28.

⁵¹ Ibid., 36.

⁵² John Lewis Gaddis, "Grand Strategy in the Cold War," in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, vol. 2, Crises and Détente, eds. Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1-21. Jeremy Suri, "American Grand Strategy from the Cold War's End to 9/11," *Orbis*, (Fall 2009): 613. Accessed from <https://strausscenter.org> on February 13, 2014.

⁵³ Thomas A. Hollihan, "The Public Controversy Over the Panama Canal Treaties: An Analysis of American Foreign Policy Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Fall 1986): 368-386.

⁵⁴ The fear of annihilation attendant with the Cold War rhetorical vision is represented in the timeline of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists'* iconic doomsday clock, accessible at <http://thebulletin.org/timeline>.

⁵⁵ G. Thomas Goodnight, "Ronald Reagan's Reformulation of the Rhetoric of War: Analysis of the 'Zero Option,' 'Evil Empire,' and 'Star Wars' Addresses," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72 (1986): 390.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 391.

⁵⁷ Denise M. Bostdorff, "The Evolution of a Diplomatic Surprise: Richard M. Nixon's Rhetoric on China, 1952 – July 15, 1971," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 1 (2002): 32.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 45-48.

⁵⁹ Robert L. Ivie, "Presidential Motives for War," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 3 (1974): 345.

⁶⁰ Mary E. Stuckey, "Competing Foreign Policy Visions: Rhetorical Hybrids After the Cold War," *Western Journal of Communication* 59 (Summer 1995): 214.

⁶¹ Ibid., 225.

⁶² Timothy M. Cole, "When Intentions Go Awry: The Bush Administration's Foreign Policy Rhetoric," *Political Communication* 13 (1996): 94.

⁶³ Timothy M. Cole, "Avoiding the Quagmire: Alternative Rhetorical Constructs for Post Cold War American Foreign Policy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2, no. 3 (1999): 370.

⁶⁴ Martín Carcasson, "Unveiling the Oslo Narrative: The Rhetorical Transformation of Israeli-Palestinian Diplomacy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3, no. 2 (2000): 211-245.

⁶⁵ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power* (New York: Basic Books, 1991).

⁶⁶ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Changing Nature of World Power."

⁶⁷ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Soft Power," *Foreign Policy* 80 (1990).

⁶⁸ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *The Future of Power* (New York, NY: Public Affairs, 2011), 91.

⁶⁹ Brian Hocking, "Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy," in *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, ed. Jan Melissen (New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 36.

⁷⁰ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (March 2008): 95.

⁷¹ Amit Kumar Gupta, "Commentary on India's Soft Power and Diaspora," *International Journal on World Peace* 25, no. 3 (September 2008): 62.

⁷² Lam Peng Er, "Japan's Question for 'Soft Power': Attraction and Limitation," *East Asia* 24 (2007): 349-350.

⁷³ Sheng Ding, "To Build a 'Harmonious World': China's Soft Power Wielding in the Global South," *Journal of Chinese Political Science* 13, no. 2 (2008): 193. This essay builds on Huang and Ding's assessment of China's soft power status, based on their unique model connecting soft power resources, e.g., language and culture, to policy outcomes.

⁷⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Changing Nature of World Power," 178.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁷⁶ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," 100.

⁷⁷ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Soft Power," 157.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 163.

⁷⁹ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Redefining the National Interest," *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (July-August 1999): 26.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁸¹ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone* (New York, NY: Oxford, 2002), 106.

⁸² Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Redefining the National Interest," *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (July-August 1999): 25-26.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 234.

⁸⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The American National Interest and Global Public Goods," *International Affairs* 78, no. 2 (2002): 237.

⁸⁵ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Limits of American Power," *Political Science Quarterly* 117 no. 4 (Winter 2002-2003): 548.

⁸⁶ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Changing Nature of World Power," 179.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁸⁸ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Bound to Lead*, 4.

⁸⁹ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Future of American Power: Dominance and Decline in Perspective," *Foreign Affairs* 89, no. 6 (November/December 2010): 11.

⁹⁰ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Limits of American Power,” 548.

⁹¹ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “The Changing Nature of World Power,” 178.

⁹² Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Soft Power,” 160.

⁹³ Peter van Ham, “Social Power in Public Diplomacy,” in *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*, eds. R. S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault, and Ali Fisher (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), 23.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Brian Hocking, “Rethinking the ‘New’ Public Diplomacy,” in *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, ed. Jan Melissen (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 28-31.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 35.

⁹⁷ Edward Lock, “Soft Power and Strategy: Developing a ‘Strategic’ Concept of Power,” in *Soft Power and U.S. Foreign Policy*, eds. Inderjeet Parmar and Michael Cox (New York, NY: Routledge, 2010), 35.

⁹⁸ R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher, and Amelia Arsenault, “Introduction: The Connective Mindshift,” in *Relational, Networked, and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy*, eds. R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher, and Amelia Arsenault (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), 1.

⁹⁹ Jan Melissen, “The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice,” in *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, ed. Jan Melissen (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 3-27.

¹⁰⁰ R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher, and Amelia Arsenault, “Introduction,” 7.

¹⁰¹ Peter van Ham, “Social Power in Public Diplomacy,” 23.

¹⁰² James Sherr, *Hard Diplomacy and Soft Coercion: Russia’s Influence Abroad* (London: Chatham House, 2013), 2-5.

¹⁰³ Nicholas Cull, Foreword, *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work*, eds. Mai’a K. Davis Cross and Jan Melissen (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), ix-xi.

¹⁰⁴ Mai’a K. Davis Cross and Jan Melissen, “Introduction,” *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work*, eds. Mai’a K. Davis Cross and Jan Melissen (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), xvii.

¹⁰⁵ Quoted in the Introduction to *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*, eds. R. S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault, and Ali Fisher (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), 6.

¹⁰⁶ Kathy R. Fitzpatrick, "Public Diplomacy and Ethics: From Soft Power to Social Conscience," in *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*, eds. R. S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault, and Ali Fisher (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), 33.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹⁰⁹ Craig Hayden, "Logics of Narrative and Networks in U.S. Public Diplomacy: Communication Power and U.S. Strategic Engagement," *Journal of Communication* 19, no. 2 (2013): 197.

¹¹⁰ Craig Hayden, *The Rhetoric of Soft Power: Public Diplomacy in Global Contexts* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012), 11.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹¹² Craig Hayden, "Logics of Narrative and Networks," 196.

¹¹³ As a construct, "rhetorical sensitivity" is attributed to Rod Hart and co-author Don M. Burks, who argued that an instrumental (vice expressive) style of communication, the purpose of which is to achieve or move toward a goal, best promises to facilitate human understanding and effect social change. Hart and Burks identified role taking, plain speaking, adaptation, discernment of information appropriate for communication, and the ability to look at a situation from multiple perspectives as the characteristics of someone who is rhetorically sensitive. See Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction," *Speech Monographs* 89, no. 2 (June 1972): 75-76. I am using the term "rhetorical sensitivity" in a more generic sense, placing the emphasis on *rhetorical*—to explore the implications for soft power's core precepts and assumptions when inquiry centers on the quality of discursive interaction and symbolic exchange. My usage therefore represents a disciplinary perspective without the entailments of Hart and Burk's instrumental style.

¹¹⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr. "Soft Power," 168.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 167.

¹¹⁶ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power*, 11.

¹¹⁷ Mark P. Moore and J. Gaut Ragsdale, "International Trade and the Rhetoric of Political Myth in Transition: NAFTA and the American Dream," *World Communication* 26, no. 2 (1997): 1-14.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 2.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 6.

¹²⁰ John M. Jones and Robert C. Rowland, "Reagan at Moscow State University: Consubstantiality Underlying Conflict," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 1 (2007): 77-106.

¹²¹ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Changing Nature of World Power," 179.

¹²² Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," 100.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Soft Power," 157.

¹²⁵ Ann Le Mare, "Fair Trade as Narrative: The Stories Within Fair Trade," *Narrative Inquiry* 17, no. 1 (2007): 69-92.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 70.

¹²⁷ William Kirkwood, "Narrative and the Rhetoric of Possibility," *Communication Monographs* 59 (March 1992), 44.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 34.

¹³⁰ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Redefining the National Interest," 234.

¹³¹ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 507-509.

¹³² Jason A. Edwards and Joseph M. Valenzano, III, "Bill Clinton's 'New Partnership' Anecdote: Toward a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy Rhetoric." *Journal of Language and Politics* 6, no. 3 (2007): 303.

¹³³ Kevin Michael DeLuca and Jennifer Peeples, "From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the 'Violence of Seattle'." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19, no. 2 (June 2002), 126.

¹³⁴ Baldev Raj Nayar and T. V. Paul, *India in the World Order: Searching for Major-Power Status* (New York, NY: Cambridge University), 58-62.

¹³⁵ *The New Persuaders: An International Ranking of Soft Power* (London: Institute for Government, December 2010), 5.

¹³⁶ Jonathan McClory, *The New Persuaders III: A 2012 Global Ranking of Soft Power* (London: Institute for Government, September 2013). The index compares the relative strength of countries' soft power infrastructure through an index comprised of a range of indicators that capture perceptions, policies, and outcomes. Raw data for each indicator is normalized according to the min-max method, which converts raw data to a figure between 0 and 1.

¹³⁷ Jacques E. C. Hymans, "India's Soft Power and Vulnerability," *India Review* 8, no 3 (July-September 2009): 252.

¹³⁸ Uma Purushothaman, "Shifting Perceptions of Power: Soft Power and India's Foreign Policy," *Journal of Peace Studies* 17, nos. 2-3 (April-September, 2010), 4.

¹³⁹ Christian Wagner, "India's Soft Power: Prospects and Limitations," *India Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (2010), 335.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 340.

¹⁴¹ Daya Kishan Thussu, *Communicating India's Soft Power: Buddha to Bollywood* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 12.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 109.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ Pablo Shiladitya Bose, "Home and Away: Diasporas, Developments and Displacements in a Globalising World," *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29, no. 1 (February 2006), 113.

¹⁴⁵ Devesh Kapur, *Diaspora, Development and Democracy: The Domestic Impact of International Migration from India* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 187.

¹⁴⁶ Ajaya Kumar Sahoo, "Issues of Identity in the Indian Diaspora: A Transnational Perspective," *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 5, nos. 1-2 (2006): 89.

¹⁴⁷ Devesh Kapur, *Diaspora, Development and Democracy*, 187-188.

¹⁴⁸ Daya Kishan Thussu, *Communicating India's Soft Power*, 9-12.

¹⁴⁹ Nicolas Blarel, "India's Soft Power: From Potential to Reality?" in *India: The Next Superpower?*, an IDEAS Special Report, SR010, March 2012. (London: London School of Economics), 31.

¹⁵⁰ Daya Kishan Thussu, *Communicating India's Soft Power*, 112.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 112-113.

¹⁵² Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2009), 95.

¹⁵³ National Nuclear Security Administration, "123 Agreements for Peaceful Cooperation," <http://nnsa.energy.gov/aboutus/ourprograms/nonproliferation/treatiesagreements/123agreementsforpeacefulcooperation> accessed December 24, 2011.

¹⁵⁴ Wayne Brockriede, "Arguers as Lovers," 2.

¹⁵⁵ Smitha Radhakrishnan, "Rethinking Knowledge for Development: Transnational Knowledge Professionals and the 'New' India," *Theory and Society* 36 (2007): 142-143.

¹⁵⁶ Ajay Gandhi, "The Indian Diaspora in Global Advocacy," *Global Networks* 2, no. 2 (2002): 360.

¹⁵⁷ Sanjay Chaturvedi, "Diaspora in India's Geopolitical Visions: Linkages, Categories, and Contestations," *Asian Affairs* 32, no. 3 (2005): 149.

¹⁵⁸ Amit Kumar Gupta, "Commentary on India's Soft Power and Diaspora," *International Journal on World Peace* 25, no. 3 (September 2008): 62.

¹⁵⁹ Sanjay Chaturvedi, "Diaspora in India's Geopolitical Visions," and Walter Anderson, "The Indian-American Community Comes into its Political Own," *India Abroad* 36, no. 48 (September 1, 2006): A12-13.

¹⁶⁰ Pablo Shiladitya Bose, "Home and Away," 114.

¹⁶¹ Rafiq Dossani, "Indian Soft Power and Associations of the American Diaspora," p. 6. Full text downloaded from <http://aparc.stanford.edu> on October 20, 2010.

Chapter 2

Identification and India's Move from Outside to Inside the Nuclear Regime

When I surveyed the developments and elements of the U.S.-India Dialogue, one aspect the bilateral relationship stood out. The two countries had signed a bilateral agreement—the U.S.-India 123 Agreement introduced in Chapter 1—that Americans and Indians alike credited with transforming their bilateral relationship. From a diplomatic perspective, I wanted to know how U.S. and Indian officials adopted a soft power approach to overcome their long-standing impasse on civilian nuclear cooperation. As a rhetorical critic, I wanted to understand how discourses constituted the U.S.-India partnership, and therefore explored rhetors' public narratives sparked by President Bush's and Prime Minister Singh's joint commitment.

I believe that bilateral transformation, in its essence, is a rhetorical process, by which I mean to emphasize the potential of soft power discourse to constitute identities and social relations. This disciplinary bias sets me apart from scholars and practitioners of public diplomacy who are employing theories of persuasion and strategies reliant on persuasive appeals. Each has its merits. Combined efforts can improve diplomatic tradecraft with evidence-based insight into which mode of communication is preferred to achieve foreign policy and international security objectives in a given scenario. But first we need to create some daylight between persuasive and constitutive approaches, if only to see each more clearly.

I also need to give probative force to my claim that the rhetorical work of soft power is to transform relations. This defense will allow practitioners of diplomacy to

translate my research into tradecraft that can be learned and applied. In short, I need to name the processes of transformation that are rooted in rhetorical theory and serviceable in a diplomatic context. In this chapter, I introduce “courtship” as a fitting metaphor for the early stages of bilateral transformation. Courtship is a useful construct through which to explore transformation because it has meaning in both academic and “real-world” contexts. It is part of the vocabulary that scholars and practitioners can use without further translation.

Seizing a Watershed Moment

Estrangement is more than an abstract state of affairs. Estrangement places limits on what the diplomatic corps can say and do. It also has ripple effects across the broader spectrum of governmental, private sector, philanthropic, academic, and people-to-people relations. That said, estrangement does not entail a full stop in relations and bilateral activity. One might aptly describe estrangement as an attitude of wariness and mistrust.

Actors seeking to foment bilateral ties necessarily adapt their discourse to the current state of affairs. During periods of estrangement, the result is vacillation, as bilateral partners constantly seek to protect their position or press their advantage. During periods of engagement, by contrast, actors may be more willing to make the first move with confidence that their partner will reciprocate.

The successful negotiation of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement was a transformative moment in the bilateral relationship. The word “transformation,” invoked by a number of U.S. and Indian proponents, cues us to the performance of soft power’s rhetorical work. Kneading through a couple statements from South Asian affairs expert and Agreement

proponent Ashley Tellis, we can appreciate how debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement opened the possibility of putting bilateral relations on a permanent path toward engagement, and the rhetorical capital attached to “transformation.”

Tellis spoke of bilateral transformation both indirectly and denotatively in Congressional testimony and public interviews. As legislative debate commenced in November 2005, Tellis asked Members of the House International Relations Committee:

Could we have crafted an agreement with India minus the nuclear cooperation element and still have the relationship deepen? We tried doing this for 10 years in the early nineties and we failed. We failed because we reached a point in the relationship where we had done pretty much everything that is easy to do, and the one outstanding issue that was left there was whether we treat India as a partner or as a target under the nonproliferation regimes, and by 2001 we had reached the point in the relationship where we could not navigate around the problem.¹

The 123 Agreement would set the bilateral relationship on a more durable path because it tested U.S. policies and thus imposed a burden on the United States. The Agreement promised a new type of partnership, born of reciprocity for mutual gain. Both sides would have to open themselves to the possibility of change and attendant risks.

Tellis buttressed his claim that the 123 Agreement was a singular opportunity to establish a durable partnership when speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April 2006:

Thanks to the tight bipolarity of the Cold War, U.S.-India relations during the entire epoch were characterized by alternation: in almost every decade, troughs of estrangement invariably followed peaks of strong cooperation. The transformation of US-India relations, as desired by the President and which enjoys bipartisan support in Congress, cannot be inherently schizophrenic if it is to be successful enough to advance common American and Indian interests in this new century.²

The pattern of estrangement and cooperation to which Tellis alluded no doubt conditioned the goals of bilateral diplomacy. The turn from estranged to engaged and

back again was near certain; what might trigger a turn, and when the turn would occur, was less predictable. Caught in this pattern, the diplomatic corps looked for quick wins when times were good. Transformation depended on a greater degree of confidence that both sides could forego short-term “wins,” especially at the other’s expense, in favor of long-term gains.

For Tellis, the U.S.-India 123 Agreement represented a “grand *summum bonum*,” (i.e., highest good), possible only through sustained collaboration.³ The *summum bonum* would be judged by deeds: preventing Asia’s domination by a single, aggressive power; eliminating threats from state sponsors of terrorism and halting the spread of weapons of mass destruction; promoting democracy and economic prosperity; and protecting the global commons, preserving energy security, and safeguarding the global environment.⁴ Such comprehensive and forward-looking aims depended upon a permanent state of normalcy that the U.S.-India 123 Agreement would provide.

In an April 2007 interview with *India Abroad*, the leading weekly paper published for Indian Diasporans in the United States, Tellis staked both the reputation of national leaders and the future of the bilateral relationship on negotiators’ success in crafting language that would gain both countries’ assent:

From the U.S. perspective, this is a cutting of the Gordian knot of nuclear disagreement—the one thing that held the relationship back for 30 years. So this is a very high-stakes gamble the President and the Prime Minister have undertaken. In my view, this is the ultimate reason why it cannot fail, why it must not fail, because both leaders have staked a lot in trying to do something really important—something that implicates issues of credibility, issues of commitment, and finally issues of confidence for the future of the relationship. So, for both sides, it’s absolutely imperative that we not fail.⁵

Tellis again emphasized joint action. The fate of the relationship and the fate of the Agreement were linked. The United States and India took a mutual risk and held a joint stake in the outcome.

Tellis was not the only individual who spoke of a transformative moment. I chose Tellis's remarks because he conveyed most clearly what transformation implied for the conduct of bilateral relations. Transformation is not an abstract ideal. Through Tellis, I sense what those involved in planning Prime Minister Singh's July 2005 state visit intuited. The joint statement issued at the conclusion of the visit presented the right diplomatic setting and moment to build a durable, strategic partnership, with the Agreement as its keystone.

Recognizing Authenticity in Soft Power Diplomacy

During periods of estrangement, discourse tacks toward persuasive appeals, as diplomatic actors seek quick wins that maintain and hold the *status quo*, if not an advantageous position. During periods of engagement, by contrast, diplomatic actors may be more willing to risk making the first move, with confidence that their prospective partner will reciprocate. Periods of engagement therefore call for an open-ended form of rhetoric. The trick, however, is to generate a discourse that is both participatory and sustainable.

The rhetorical act of courtship is performed through discourses that are open-ended, allowing rhetors to place themselves and their purposes in a co-constructed narrative. Courtship plays out in the hail-and-response between prospective partners. When rhetors perform the act of courtship, they gain confidence in each other and

progress toward a permanent union. The openness of courtship fits the circulatory nature of soft power. Whereas persuasive appeals are calculated and interjected in discourse, the co-construction of narrative comes about in a give-and-take exchange of words and deeds that gives soft power diplomacy a ring of authenticity.

The Call for Rhetorical Sensitivity⁶

Tellis's description of the transformation of bilateral relations presents a paradox. On the one hand, Tellis described the 123 Agreement and its benefits as a matter of fact; the transformation was no longer propositional, but concrete reality. The Agreement stood as an *a priori* example of the progress that could be achieved if the United States and India stopped the cycle of unilateral action and coercive measures to enforce cooperation under the Nonproliferation Treaty. On the other hand, we hear an imploring tone and ascertain the tenuousness of negotiations. Arrival at mutually agreeable terms was not at all assured, and the two countries could have reverted easily to their prior oscillation between estrangement and engagement.

This paradox between being and becoming centers my rhetorical critique through which I explore this question: How did the U.S.-India 123 Agreement evolve from an idea about nuclear cooperation into discourses that embodied and propelled forward a resilient and comprehensive bilateral partnership? As a practitioner of diplomatic tradecraft, I would like the answer to be more than an accidental event born of unique circumstance. I look for assurance that transformation is purposeful and replicable, even when accounting for varied cultural and historical contexts. As a rhetorical critic, I assert that transformation of a bilateral relationship is possible within and through diplomatic

discourse. Moreover, transformation can be understood, learned, and exercised by participants in diplomacy to effectuate positive change in bilateral relationships.

Throughout my critique, I make a distinction between persuasive and constitutive approaches, and find the latter more sustainable. Tellis's statements—carried out in public venues and thus accessible to all participants and observers to the debate—are notable for eschewing gain- and loss-framed appeals to gain India's consent with U.S.-established conditionalities. The *quid pro quo* bargaining of a typical negotiation and enticements offered in exchange for India's ceding of its autonomy are absent from the narrative. Tellis's discourse is doing something different than persuasion. Tellis's narrative begins rather than ends with U.S.-Indian mutuality, reciprocity, and shared commitments; it thus sets a scene that calls for joint action. It is invitational,⁷ and thus hopeful. It imbues a sense of confidence in India's role as a willing partner who need not be coerced or co-opted.

Separating Persuasive and Constitutive Forms of Rhetoric

Rhetorical theorist and critic Wayne Brockriede offered insight into how we judge the quality of argument, describing three attitudinal stances that distinguish persuasive and constitutive forms of rhetoric. Coercion, or conquering one's opponent by force of argument, and seduction, winning over one's opponent through charm (or deceit), are persuasive forms of rhetoric that imply a social hierarchy. One participant, seeking to win the argument, limits the co-arguer's freedom to assent. Coercion and seduction are unilateral poses in which power is held, and held over, the co-arguer.

The manner in which Brockriede described coercion and seduction as means of persuasion is akin to Nye's co-optation as the telos of soft power. Coercion, seduction, and co-optation are forms of persuasion. In the persuasive mode, rhetors frame values, norms, culture, and other soft power resources as logical, emotive, or epideictic appeals. Rhetors select the words most likely to earn the audience's good will, giving voice to some opinions in order to move the audience to change one opinion in particular.⁸ Rhetoric as persuasion seeks to refine the material of discourse, and the stylistic devices with which that material is presented, to gain the audience's trust and agreement. If the target audience's opinion is swayed, and behavioral outcomes achieved, then it is presumed that the rhetor successfully converted soft power resources into influence.

A third attitudinal pose, according to Brockriede, is to love. For arguers as lovers, the exchange is level rather than hierarchical; the exchange is bilateral rather than unilateral; the relationship rests in parity rather than zero-sum winning and losing; and acts are characterized not by gain but by self-risk and sacrifice. Paraphrasing Brockriede, when we participate in discourse, we express our humanness. This expression binds together the influences we hold over ourselves, the social influences of our co-arguers, and the relationship between the two.⁹ When we participate in discourse, we open ourselves to the possibility of changing our held notions of who we are, our perceptions of others, and our orientation to the world we inhabit.

Brockriede's description of this third pose fits how Tellis described the transformation of the bilateral relationship. Both convey the sense of openness, possibility, and risk in the diplomatic exchange. The discourse that transformed the

bilateral relationship not only eschewed coercion and hard bargaining. It constituted a bilateral relationship in the co-construction of values, world views, and purposes.

Soft Power as Constitutive Rhetoric

Taking exception to how soft power is widely understood and practiced, I believe that soft power is a constitutive rather than persuasive process. Values, norms, and culture are symbols that come to possess power within and through discourse.¹⁰ These symbols do rhetorical work. More specifically, these terms do the rhetorical work of identification. Identification is the driving force for constitutive rhetoric. It invites openness to self-transformation as well as the transformation of those whom we engage, to collaborate in the construction of the argument and its conclusion.¹¹ Collaboration engenders a sense of ownership or investment in a successful exchange, a giving and returning of material and symbolic resources available to all parties as co-arguers.¹² The constitutive form creates meaning for a situation or scene in which we place ourselves and our co-arguers.

Parties estranged are parties divided, but with the potential for belonging together. Paraphrasing William Rueckert, division and unification are symbiotic; division is a potential for a belonging together.¹³ Belongingness remains latent so long as the parties are satisfied with their own and each other's positions and relations. However, when a member "inside" and a member "outside" recognize in each other shared qualities, values, or beliefs, they experience a sense of dissonance or agitation that generates discourse.

Whether we are using the vocabulary of soft power (i.e., attraction) or rhetoric (i.e., identification), the common aim is to dissolve recalcitrance. Whereas soft power attraction dissolves recalcitrance through co-optation, identification dissolves recalcitrance through the adoption of a new perspective. Perspective is the interpretive frame through which we assign value to relationships and explain our actions and the actions of others. A change in perspective has the potential to relieve our sense of being estranged from one another. As recalcitrance dissolves, discourse transforms individual interests into shared commitments.¹⁴ Co-optation is a unilateral and thus lesser means of sustaining soft power's attraction. Shared commitments give both parties a stake in maintaining cooperation over the long term, casting soft power attraction as an affirmational and regenerative force.

The process of identification compensates for division through rhetorical acts that reach toward unification.¹⁵ In more straightforward terms, identification explains how participants in discourse gain a sense of belongingness and unity that catalyzes concerted action. Unfortunately, renaming soft power attraction as identification doesn't get us very far. In this chapter and the next I attend to two processes of identification, more appropriately described as the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation. In brief, courtship deepens familiarity, intimacy, and trust, but it remains ephemeral. When successful, courtship leads to a union. The rhetorical act of consubstantiation, the subject of the next chapter, renders the act of courtship complete and binding.

Enacting Constitutive Rhetoric in Courtship

This chapter describes how two nation-states participating in bilateral exchange overcame their sense of estrangement. In the words of Indian Foreign Secretary Saran, “after years of India and the United States being told that they are talking past each other or talking at each other, I think finally we have come to a point that we are talking with each other.”¹⁶

Burke would describe this exchange as *courtship*. Burke defined courtship as the use of suasive devices for the transcending of social estrangement.¹⁷ Courtship responds to the discontent and agitation of individuals who recognize in each other similar qualities, but whose attempt at union is materially, socially, or symbolically frustrated. In social (or diplomatic) relations, these differences are expressed by placing groups (of nation-states) in different classes. In the hail and response of courtship, rhetors dissolve their class distinctions of “this kind” and “that kind,” to become the “same kind.”¹⁸

Courtship is apropos of discourses surrounding the U.S.-India 123 Agreement because this rhetorical act overcame the estrangement of differing classes and social hierarchies.¹⁹ The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty imposed such a social hierarchy. It divided nation-states into bad actors outside the nuclear nonproliferation regime and good actors inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

Courtship is also a familiar way in which to describe the interplay of diplomatic protocol and public discourse, a pattern in which one party hails the other and awaits a response that will narrow differences and bring the two into a closer alliance. The discourses I critiqued exhibited such a pattern. The pattern was especially noticeable during reciprocal visits of the two heads of state, accompanied by joint press events and

state dinners with the exchange of toasts. The public nature of the debate allowed for the hail and response of courtship to continue, albeit at a more languid pace.

Courtship and consubstantiation are constitutive processes in which the quality of the act is shaped by language choices made by participants to discourse. Choices may differ at various moments, but have a cumulative effect on how we interpret the rhetorical act in its entirety. These language choices reveal the rhetor's orientation in general, his or her perspective on the particular situation or moment at hand, and the desired change in social relations achieved through discursive exchange.

In this chapter and the next, I tease out of discourse the language choices that grounded the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation. Examples of the choices made by U.S. and Indian rhetors included national pride, kinship, shared values, a shared journey and destiny, and converging interests. In the persuasive mode, these choices would be interjected into discourse as appeals, selected to reinforce or maximize the desired change in interlocutors' attitudes or behaviors. In the constitutive mode, these choices ground the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation.

Courtship and consubstantiation deepen identification and hold open moments of unification, enabling discourse to transform the context, social order, and nature of the relationship binding participants in the discourse. When understood as a product of constitutive rhetoric, soft power diplomacy is accessible, contextual, and integrative. Those who participate in soft power diplomacy co-construct narratives that possess a quality of authenticity, which gives partners confidence that a permanent union is both desirable and within reach.

Outside to Inside: Changing India's Place among Cooperating Nuclear States

The foregoing discussion of constitutive rhetoric and courtship is more meaningful when placed into context. My project grounds these constructs in a critique of discourses generated by public debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement. Within this context, the United States and India began their courtship separated into two classes of nation-states: those outside the nuclear nonproliferation regime, and those inside the regime. Nation-states staked their position based on whether they had signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

My purpose here is not to judge India's refusal to sign the Nonproliferation Treaty. My argument is that rhetoric-as-persuasion fights against or supplants other countries' reasons for their actions. In the rhetoric-as-persuasive mode of discourse, good reasons are extant; the rhetor assesses his or her audience and picks those reasons most likely to resonate and convince. Constitutive rhetoric, by contrast, accepts the reasons as "good" and bases rhetorical action in those good reasons. Following the rhetoric-as-constitutive path, reasons emerge from discourse, transforming the grounds upon which to judge action. Whereas rhetoric-as-persuasion requires acceptance by the auditors only, rhetoric-as-constitutive opens both parties engaged in discourse to critical evaluation; judgment applies equally to oneself and to the other.

India's Strategic Autonomy

Indian strategic autonomy became the "good reason" that gave India pride of place outside the nuclear nonproliferation regime, remade in discourse as India's choice to enjoin its interests with those of the United States. Whereas the previous

understanding of strategic autonomy would have defined such a move as a dependency that weakened India, the narratives emerging from discourse promoted the belief that India's participation in cooperative agreements and frameworks would make the world more stable and peaceful, thereby reducing external threats and the corollary impetus for a heightened posture of national defense. Soft power discourse created political and strategic space in which to constitute a new bilateral relationship, and as such, answers in part the question of how India managed its rapprochement with the United States without losing its ability to pursue an independent foreign policy.²⁰

In its most basic formulation, strategic autonomy is India's commitment to international freedom of action.²¹ In its full complexity, strategic autonomy is a culture of security that emerged after the advent of nuclear weapons, shaped by India's historical context, technological capability, economic resources, and ethical norms relating to nuclear weapons.²² For example, strategic autonomy justified India's nuclear deterrent against China. After India's loss in the 1962 Sino-Indian war over a disputed territorial boundary, and the Chinese government's first nuclear test on October 16, 1964, Indian proponents of nuclear weapons development argued that their government needed to ensure national security, that national security should be a fiscal priority, and that deterrence against China should be a cornerstone of India's security policy.²³ The Indian media, public, and political parties aligned in the belief that India's capability to make and detonate a nuclear weapon would enable India to engage in diplomacy from a position of strength.²⁴

This sequence of events conditioned India's refusal to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, resulting in India's isolation from nation-states engaged in

nuclear cooperation, trade, and development for peaceful purposes. As a matter of diplomatic law, the Treaty recognized as nuclear *weapons* states only those countries that had exploded a nuclear device prior to January 1, 1967.²⁵ If India were to join the community of cooperating *nuclear* states, it would have to divest itself from nuclear development for strategic defense and agree to nuclear safeguards.

Strategic autonomy was more than a defensive posture, however. It also represented India's pride in its national achievements and affirmed the country's ability to go it alone. Schaffer attributes strategic autonomy to Indian exceptionalism, based in India's ancient civilization and its success in forging from its extraordinarily diverse peoples a nation recognized by its democratic traditions.²⁶

We hear this sense of pride in Prime Minister Singh's statement to the Indian parliament upon his return from his July 2005 state visit during which he and President Bush announced their intent to pursue full civilian nuclear cooperation. Addressing Indian parliamentarians required Prime Minister Singh to express this intent in terms acceptable to India's political class:

Our nuclear programme in many ways, is unique. It encompasses the complete range of activities that characterize an advanced nuclear power including generation of electricity, advanced research and development and our strategic programme. Our scientists have done excellent work and we are progressing well in this programme as per the original vision outlined by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Dr. Homi Bhabha. We will build on this precious heritage. We have ensured the principal of nondiscrimination.²⁷

The declarative on non-discrimination spoke to India's rationale for refusing to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Indians viewed the Treaty as an unequal arrangement between nuclear "haves" and "have-nots" that failed to guarantee their security against the threat of a nuclear attack.²⁸

In one interpretation of the Treaty's effect, India was penalized for prioritizing peaceful purposes and delaying nuclear weapons testing. As a nuclear weapons state that lacked formal recognition, India turned mastery of the nuclear fuel cycle into a national errand. India continued its course in isolation—in the wilderness—with international assistance limited to India's generation of electricity and related development needs.

Prime Minister Singh honored those who led India's journey through this wilderness: Prime Minister Nehru's vision and Atomic Energy Chairman Homi Bhabha's ability to turn that vision into reality. Repeating this theme in a subsequent statement to Parliament, Prime Minister Singh said that "the nation is justly proud of the tremendous work of our nuclear scientists and the Department of Atomic Energy in mastering all the key aspects of the full nuclear fuel cycle—the product of their genius and perseverance—will not be frittered away."²⁹ Prime Minister Nehru and Dr. Bhabha had together endowed the Indian people with a moral inheritance that rested in Prime Minister Singh's hands. Because the bilateral agreement would welcome India into the community of nuclear states as an equal, Prime Minister Singh had discharged his debt to the Nehru-Bhabha legacy and justified the sacrifice they made in pursuing nuclear development in isolation.

Strategic autonomy eschewed arguments and justifications based on the preferences of world powers.³⁰ Doctrinal arguments against the U.S.-India 123 Agreement—that it would circumscribe Indian foreign policy making³¹ and make India prey to America's carrot-and-stick treatment³²—possessed a tenor of fear. This subtext promoted a zero-sum view of global power and influence in which any movement oriented toward the United States would be a loss for India. The hard power tactics and

rhetoric of persuasion that had characterized nuclear diplomacy through the 1990s served to justify this sense of fear.

Soft power diplomacy and the constitutive form of rhetoric ascribed to India its desired and claimed position of privilege. India would enter into a reciprocal agreement on nuclear safeguards of its own accord, preserving the country's options to pursue nuclear capabilities as it deemed necessary to protect its interests. The United States would have to trust India to define its interests in consonance with American interests, and the interests of the international community as a whole.

Rhetorical Work: Engaging as Equals

Once I realized that a narrative invoking strategic autonomy constituted new grounds for nuclear cooperation, three questions emerged to guide my critique. First, I asked how discourse reduced India's recalcitrance. My critique demonstrates how the hail and response of courtship "leveled up" India and the United States, so that both would see the other as a worthy partner. Exceptionalist rhetoric accommodated India's strategic autonomy while bolstering India as an attractive partner worthy of U.S. attention. As an equal, India possessed freedom of movement and the will and means to act.

Second, I asked how discourse allowed participants to rhetorically perform the outside-to-inside movement with regard to the nuclear nonproliferation regime that the 123 Agreement would achieve, while deferring to India's strategic autonomy. My critique reveals the construction of what I call the "deliverance narrative," which reframed India's exclusion and isolation as a mistake of history that could be corrected.

Third, I asked how discourse reconciled India's desire for belongingness without sacrificing its autonomy. Through my critique, I discovered that the construction of a kinship narrative, including the rhetorical construction of binational familial ties, accomplished this reconciliation.

Exceptionalism Narrative

The move from outside to inside was more than a legalistic redefinition. The division also implied a normative judgment: those inside the nonproliferation regime were responsible members of the community of nations; those outside were either undeserving or had not earned the privilege of membership. As the rhetoric of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement developed, U.S. and Indian rhetors co-constructed a narrative of exceptionalism that created a new set of grounds in which to judge India, based on the character and accomplishments of the nation and its people. The exceptionalism narrative emerged in the hail and response of courtship, as U.S. and Indian rhetors exchanged words on what it meant to be exceptional and the expectations that this status conferred. The exceptionalism narrative laid groundwork for cooperation without reducing Indian pride in what it had achieved on its own.

As the negotiation began, India's position outside the nuclear nonproliferation regime conditioned its response to international community efforts to gain its compliance and cooperation. India perceived events and diplomatic overtures through its outsider position. Similarly, India's nuclear rhetoric responded to what the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty symbolized. Position was both definitional and attitudinal.

Narratives that incorporate position in this way have the potential to deepen identification through shared geometric substance. Substance is a touchstone in Burke's ontology, the notion that language simulates "what is really there."³³ Substance is central to the ways in which language and essence play out in everyday judgments. It is the core meaning of an object, a person, or an idea that language can reshape, recast, reclaim, and represent. In practice, "language used substantially" attributes motive, assigns value, and confers identity.³⁴

As Burke explained, geometric substances of identification privilege external factors that shape and reflect the quality of one's character, that is, the material possessions, achievements, and connections that make one's personal characteristics count.³⁵ The geometric substance of identification melds the duality of a physical or geographic place, with its natural and man-made features, and its symbolic meaning rooted in lived experience.³⁶ The characteristics that guide the construction of place carry through to the characteristics of the people from that place.

Discourses wrapped around geometric substance work from the construction of place to change relationships of placement within the social hierarchy. An exceptionalism narrative co-constructed by American and Indian rhetors established a consonance of place and people to transform India's position from outside to inside the community of responsible nuclear weapons states. The exceptionalism narrative infused the hail and response of courtship, celebrating both nations' character and accomplishments as models of democracy.

Rhetors drew on two traditions of exceptionalist rhetoric: the exemplarist and the interventionist.³⁷ The exemplarist tradition defines a nation-state's status as a role model

for social and political achievement for others' emulation. This tradition possesses inward-facing energy, to perfect the model that other nation-states will be compelled to adopt. The interventionist tradition adds the duty to project that model through active economic, political, cultural, and social engagement with the world. Whether exceptionalism is exemplar or interventionist is less important than the synchronicity of expression.

The willingness of a nation-state to gravitate from one tradition to another, so as to align itself with another nation-state, witnesses the attraction of soft power. The underlying communicative process is a change in orientation that promotes stronger identifications between the two nation-states. In the case of the United States and India, the exceptionalism narrative engendered a joint obligation to make their achievements visible, enviable, and replicable—to move together into the world.

The open question was whether discourse would convert the exemplarist narrative into the interventionist impulse. State Department South Asia expert Daniel Markey framed a desired shift from exemplarist to interventionist traditions:

India has long preferred to promote democracy by its own example, rather than through more active international policies and programs. We hope to see an even greater convergence in U.S. and Indian views about the natural connections between democratic governance, human rights protection, development, security, and peace. We believe that India has a great deal of relevant experience in the many aspects of democratic governance that should be shared with the world.³⁸

Indian rhetors' expansion of their vocabulary supported identification through a shared understanding of global needs, threats, and remedies. The modification of the rhetoric of exceptionalism from being a "model" to being an "actor" required a corollary shift from a passive to an active vocabulary, from "the United States and India are" to "the United States and India will."

Both interventionist and exemplarist strains of exceptionalism emerged in the discourses of President Bush and Prime Minister Singh during the Prime Minister's July 2005 state visit. The tension between the two strands animated the call and response of the two leaders' public statements. The interventionist appeal is contained in President Bush's portion of a joint news statement on the outcomes of the two leaders' discussions:

India and the United States share a commitment to freedom and a belief that democracy provides the best path to a more hopeful future for all people. We also believe that the spread of liberty is the best alternative to hatred and violence. Because of our shared values, the relationship between our two countries has never been stronger. We're working together to make our nations more secure, deliver a better life to our citizens, and advance the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world.³⁹

Through this statement, President Bush established a natural progression from internal perfection—"our nations"; "our citizens"—to external projection "throughout the world." Also key, however, was that President Bush displaced the binary away from the nonproliferation regime and toward global security, setting the two countries' shared values of liberty, freedom, and democracy against a common foe. The new binary placed the United States and India on the same side. "Works" reinforced this new binary, between those who were active and those who were apathetic. The United States and India, pursuing the path of democracy in their respective spheres of influence, and in their own way, were nonetheless "working together" to achieve the broader aim of displacing hatred and violence with peace and freedom.

The President's use of the word "path" left the means of democracy promotion open-ended. On the one hand, the statement raised the expectation that India would join the United States in clearing safe passage through a dangerous world. On the other hand, a path may be made through natural forces, to be discovered or ventured. The ambiguity

made both the interventionist and exemplarist expressions of exceptionalism available to Prime Minister Singh, who responded in the exemplarist mode:

As democracies, we must work together to create a world in which democracies can flourish. India's democracy has been fashioned around India's civilisational ethos which celebrates diversity. The field of civil nuclear energy is a vital area for cooperation between our two countries. As a consequence of our collective efforts, our relationship in this sector is being transformed.⁴⁰

"Create" was an adroit choice, a companion term for President Bush's "spread of liberty," a joint connotation of natural and unrehearsed movement toward concerted action. Prime Minister Singh's use of "create" maintained a degree of ambiguity, should President Bush settle into the interventionist mode. Situated within the interventionist tradition, to create is an ultimate act, wound up with will and purpose. Interpreted within the exemplarist tradition, to create is to invite others to gaze upon and emulate one's good works, a template for others' action. Contextualized within the exemplarist tradition, the grammar describes democracy promotion as an organic process that adapts to its environment without human intervention.

The ambiguity and potentiality of "create" was one of two ways that Prime Minister Singh blended pragmatism and principle. The United States and India must work together not only because of mutual desire for India's economic growth, but *because they are both democracies*. The Prime Minister issued an imperative; a failure to act together would be a failure for democracy itself. Pragmatic outcomes were secondary to shaping a world consonant with their two countries' democratic values.

During the courtship period, "create" achieved its strongest resonance within an exemplarist vocabulary. In the month following the Prime Minister's state visit, U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford responded in kind to Prime Minister Singh, while

also incorporating India's strategic autonomy as a long-standing principle critical to successful negotiation of the 123 Agreement:

It is my firm belief that India can be a development model for the world by demonstrating the ability of a multi-ethnic democracy to deliver sustained growth and prosperity to its people. These developments in no way compromise India's sovereignty or independence. Therefore these are agreements between two equal, important partners, who look to the future and understand what some of their shared values and objectives must be.⁴¹

Ambassador Mulford's exemplarist frame reinforced India's striving for internal perfection, with the instrumental capacity to deliver sustained growth and prosperity to its people. The grammar of Ambassador Mulford's statement suggested a conservative reading of India's potential influence, placing universal values—pluralism and democracy—in service to the achievement of a comparatively bounded and definitive end—to be a development model for the world. The development model harkened India's long-standing place of privilege and influence. Building on the exceptionalism narrative in all its facets, Ambassador Mumford's statement promoted India's economic and political leadership.

These exchanges remind us that values are a resource for soft power, but not exclusively so. Situated in an alternative rhetorical frame, the same values stated above—democracy, liberty—could warrant direct action in the interventionist strain of exceptionalism argued through the rhetoric of persuasion. As the hail and response of courtship progressed, reciprocal statements signaled that both the United States and India could be models for democracy. In carrying out their responsibilities to uphold their models of democracy, they performed an act of identification.

The exemplarist tradition of exceptionalist rhetoric served proponents well. Through the hail and response of courtship, America and India identified with each

other's political, economic, and technological accomplishments. In partnership, their accomplishments made the two countries worthy of *each other's* emulation. This narrative gave India and the United States shared and elevated status as responsible leaders who uphold and defend international norms. Through this construction, India entered the dialogue on its own terms, its commitment to reciprocity preserved in the doctrine of strategic autonomy.

My critique confirms that the exemplarist tradition of Indian exceptionalism is among the rhetorical tracings that influenced the debate. The key take-away is that neither the interventionist nor the exemplarist tradition is better suited to soft power. Rather, it is that the nation-state “attracted to” and the nation-state “attracted by” are more likely to merge their interests if they adopt a synchronous approach to achieving their foreign policy aims. In the more specific case of U.S.-India civilian nuclear cooperation, the exceptionalism narrative shifted the criterion for belongingness from a nation-state's position defining correct actions to a nation-state's actions determining its correct position and membership.

Deliverance Narrative

The exceptionalism narrative redefined India's position vis-à-vis the nonproliferation regime and the United States, overcoming the two nations' estrangement. But once “inside” the circle of cooperating nuclear states, India would continue to exercise its independence to determine its future course and select its allies accordingly. Furthermore, in making the move from outside to inside, the exceptionalism narrative was one-sided, placing the onus on India to step forward.

A companion narrative would be needed to complete the movement from outside to inside. This companion narrative, which I call the “deliverance” narrative, reframed India’s exclusion from the nonproliferation regime as a mistaken action that could be corrected, allowing the United States to explain its own break from the past without losing stature. The outside-to-inside narrative characterized India’s placement as an injustice—a mistake of history—and offered India’s deliverance from isolation as a corrective. The deliverance narrative focused less on India’s position and more on India’s record of upholding nonproliferation norms.

The deliverance narrative was problematic, however. Its early construction featured agent-centric accounts, in which the United States took on the responsibility of bringing India out of its isolation and into the mainstream. Inherent in this formulation was the division of power and class that had kept the United States and India estranged. As the deliverance narrative evolved, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns and Prime Minister Singh participated in an exchange of discourses that shifted from an agent-centric account to make the U.S.-India 123 Agreement itself the locus of action.

This change in perspective would allow India to make the move from outside to inside the nonproliferation regime without having to depend on a deliverer. This evolution in how accounts were framed might have evened the power relationship between the two nations, but Under Secretary Burns’s performance in this particular act of courtship was flawed. He could not totally surrender the U.S. advantage in guiding the bilateral relationship.

In the rhetorical act of courtship, we hear tension in the repartee between Under Secretary Burns and Prime Minister Singh. This tension arises from the locus of action—whether India would be delivered out of isolation by the United States, by its own action, or by an external force acting upon both parties. We hear this tension in an editorial penned by Amitabh Mattoo, among India’s leading academics on international relations and disarmament, in the Indian foreign policy trade publication *Economic and Political Weekly*:

Neither an old ally, Russia, nor a new enthusiast, France, would be able to exert enough pressure to be able to suitably modify NSG guidelines to give India access. Only the U.S. has the weight and influence to be able to adjust the nuclear regime to be able to accommodate India. A *modus vivendi* with the United States is seen as not just desirable, but a necessity if India is to translate its aspirations into reality. The current debate, in essence, reflects this Indian paradox: of loving and hating the U.S. simultaneously.⁴²

By attributing weight and influence to the United States, Professor Mattoo placed the United States in the position of a deliverer. Because India depended on a rapprochement with the United States to achieve great power status, Professor Mattoo placed India in a role in which it was no longer in control of its own destiny.

Professor Mattoo captured the resulting tension between Indian autonomy and dependency in describing the love-hate relationship that India had with the United States during the earliest phase of the two nations’ courtship, when the transition from estranged to engaged was more possibility than certainty. As the deliverance narrative progressed, U.S. and Indian proponents of the 123 Agreement found a way out of their rhetorical conundrum. Proponents assigned agency to the Agreement itself, achieving India’s deliverance absent a deliverer.

To make India's move from outside to inside explicit—a *de facto* rather than *de jure* change in position—Under Secretary Burns crafted exceptionalist rhetoric to function as a double entendre. Because India is unique, so the logic went, it was worthy of an exception from the path taken by other countries who signed the Nonproliferation Treaty:

India is unique. It is soon to be the largest country in the world by population. It is a country now where the United States is the largest investor and the largest trade partner. It has a growing interest in developing peaceful nuclear energy. It had developed its entire nuclear program over 30 years alone because it had been isolated. So the question that we faced was the following: is it better to maintain India in isolation, or is it better to try to bring it into the international mainstream?⁴³

The construction of this statement belies a U.S.-centric perspective and a rationale based in U.S. rather than joint interests. Whereas Under Secretary Burns could have praised India's ability to attract international investors, the statement mentions only U.S. investment. Furthermore, Under Secretary Burns could have cited the success of the U.S.-India trade relationship, but instead formulated his words in a way that reinforced India's dependence on the United States to maintain its economic growth. The United States had the capacity to either "maintain" or to "bring" India out of isolation, robbing India of its own volition.

Under Secretary Burns' claim to India's uniqueness served a practical purpose, to inoculate against nuclear nonproliferation advocates' opposition to a single country exemption for nuclear cooperation with India. Statements made by nonproliferation advocates in response reinforced the United States' position as deliverer. The Carnegie Endowment's Miriam Rajkumar, speaking to *India Abroad* in reaction to the July 2005 Joint Statement, said that "the Administration policy seems to be that the good guys can

have nuclear weapons but not the bad guys.”⁴⁴ Arms Control Association Executive Director Daryl Kimball repeated this argument in an essay published in India’s *Economic and Political Weekly*, arguing that by advocating a special exemption, the United States was saying “we’ll decide who is good and who is part of the ‘axis of evil’ and we will relax the rules when they are inconvenient for our friend and our business dealings.”⁴⁵

The binary of “good guys” and “bad guys” presumed that the United States had passed a favorable judgment on India. If the United States determined that India was a friend today, it could easily reverse itself and determine that India was a foe, should circumstances or U.S. interests change in the future. These accounts thus contravened the overarching effort to transform the bilateral relationship into an enduring partnership that could withstand the vagaries of circumstance.

The Administration and non-proliferation advocates’ accounts subjugated India to the actions of others. These discourses therefore demanded a reassertion of Indian independence. Prime Minister Singh accomplished this by constructing the outside-to-inside move as two independent and sequential steps:

There is I believe a large measure of support within the country in favour of breaking out of our isolation, and in joining the international mainstream in a manner that secures for India full civil nuclear cooperation with the international community while protecting our strategic programme and maintaining the integrity of our three-stage programme and indigenous R&D. This is the objective set out as far as the bilateral nuclear agreement is concerned.⁴⁶

Prime Minister Singh’s statement divided India’s isolation and India’s belongingness into two distinct acts. To “break out” relayed India’s sense of false imprisonment; a willful act would be necessary to give India the freedom to exercise its sovereignty. India’s freedom would be unconditional. Joining the international mainstream was an

independent aim that needed additional supports (i.e., conditionalities) to stand on its own.

In contrast to Prime Minister Singh's hyphenated movement, Under Secretary Burns drew the outside-to-inside move in one steady arc:

We're quite confident that this is a good agreement both for India and the United States, and we think it's good for the world because it will bring India into the nonproliferation system at long last. It will relieve India of its isolation that it's had to live in for 30-odd years, and it's going to strengthen our international efforts because India has been a country that has respected its nuclear technology.⁴⁷

In this iteration the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, not a state actor, would free India from its isolation. By joining the Agreement, India could maintain its freedom of choice absent dependence on the United States. And yet, Under Secretary Burns implied that the Agreement may be good for India and good for the United States in different ways, based in each nation's severable interests. Even while lauding India for respecting nonproliferation norms, Under Secretary Burns spoke to, rather than through, the Indian perspective. Under Secretary Burns's accounts addressed India as an object of action.

Over the course of the debate, the source of India's deliverance migrated toward an organic force within the international scene and the 123 Agreement itself. The following statement, through which the deliverance narrative first emerged, highlights the degree to which perspectives needed to change in order to shift the locus from agent-centric to scene-based accounts:

We sought the agreement because India's nuclear weapons program and its status outside the nonproliferation regime has proven to be a longstanding stumbling block to enhance U.S.-India relations. It is now time to end the isolation of India and to integrate it into nonproliferation norms.⁴⁸

The United States would take action on India's behalf. The United States controlled not only the action, but also the time at which the action would take place. The subtext gave the United States a place of privilege in defining and stewarding international norms. By bending the forces driving the nonproliferation regime to its will, the United States demonstrated mastery over diplomacy and time itself.

Placing the United States in the role of deliverer was an affront to India's strategic autonomy. On the other hand, assigning India this role could unbalance the reciprocity initiated through the July 2005 joint statement. Rejecting both the United States and India as "deliverers," Prime Minister Singh made an asymmetrical discursive move, placing the locus of action in the agreement itself: "I believe that this agreement provides a way forward for India to break out of its present isolation and expand international cooperation, enabling us to enhance the contribution of nuclear energy in meeting our future energy needs."⁴⁹ Under Secretary Burns's statement bounded time to the present; India's isolation would end in one decisive action. Prime Minister Singh's construction was future focused; the Agreement provided "a way forward" that neither demanded nor negated direct or independent action.

Congressman Henry Hyde enjoined the Prime Minister's construction of the deliverance narrative with a locus of action in the Agreement. Congressman Hyde kept the future focus and added a patina of idealism:

The measure is an important step in transforming the strategic alliance of two of the oldest and largest democracies, while strengthening international security. While the world has known that India possesses nuclear weapons, India has not had a seat at the table of nuclear stakeholders. This brings India into the mainstream with other accountable countries, giving rise to the same benefits and responsibilities as other such states.⁵⁰

We hear in Congressman Hyde's remarks consonance with India's position that the nonproliferation regime had unfairly denied the country's recognition as a nuclear weapons state. India's claiming its "seat at the table" gave a nod to India's move from observer to participant in dialogue and decision-making. Congressman Hyde's construction connoted an equitable Agreement that respected Indian equities.

As debate progressed, Under Secretary Burns attempted to repair his construction of the deliverance narrative to synchronize his perspective with that of Prime Minister Singh and influencers such as Congressman Hyde. Under Secretary Burns placed both the United States and India within a scene that possessed a controlling influence on their behavior:

People on both sides of the equation in India and the Department of Atomic Energy as well as my own government and other governments need to adjust to this new world—that means compromise. It means to understand that maybe what you did in isolation will not be the same as what you would do in a more integrated world where India is working with the rest of the international community to provide for civilian nuclear power.⁵¹

In this revised construction, the scene is an integrated world. Filling out this perspective, actions were interdependent, and actors achieved their purposes through cooperation.

The entailment of interdependence and cooperation within a multilateral and multinational system adhered to a soft power frame. The tone, however, was persuasive. The phrase "what you did in isolation" emphasized India; the effects remained unidirectional. Under Secretary Burns's statement lacked sensitivity to the influence of the scene on the United States.

In a subsequent statement, Under Secretary Burns assigned greater agency to India, describing the country as a rising power in the world, which the U.S.-India 123 Agreement signified and symbolized. As a proponent of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement,

the United States demonstrated its intent to treat India “with greater respect and equality,”⁵² a theme that Under Secretary Burns incorporated in discourse in the last phases of the Agreement’s negotiation and ratification:

This agreement is indisputably in India’s national interest from our perspective. It will deliver India from over 30 years of international isolation. It will allow the country to be treated in a fair and egalitarian way. It will allow the country to be—to take its place among the leaders of the civil nuclear community and the world today as a responsible state.⁵³

By the end of the debate, Under Secretary Burns had reconciled Prime Minister Singh’s perspective in his own account, placing agency in the Agreement rather than either of their two nations. The Agreement and the Agreement alone would deliver India from its isolation. Yet Under Secretary Burns remained steadfast in speaking from a U.S. rather than a joint perspective. In addition to the explicit phrase “from our perspective,” to say that the Agreement would *allow* India to be treated in a fair and egalitarian way negated the belief that India was deserving of fair and equal treatment on its own merits. As an architect of the Agreement, the United States would afford to India the respect that Indians believed to be their natural right.

The deliverance narrative concluded once it became clear to all parties that the U.S.-India 123 Agreement would be signed into law, followed by the signing of bilateral treaty instruments. Its final resolution occurred absent a deepened sense of identification. Even after adopting Prime Minister Singh’s account, which imbued the Agreement with agency, Under Secretary Burns could never fully grasp the Indian perspective. Accordingly, his U.S.-centric narrative kept the two nations estranged.

Through the hail and response of courtship, the exceptionalism narrative transcended division by establishing common ground and shared identifications among

Americans and Indians. The synchronicity achieved in the rhetoric of exceptionalism gave America and India a shared status as models of democracy, global economies, and leaders in science and technology. Mutual recognition of exceptionalism provided the means to reconstruct and recontextualize India's strategic autonomy, establishing a new default position that favored engagement over isolation. Rhetors refocused attention away from India's status vis-à-vis the Nonproliferation Treaty and toward India's status vis-à-vis the United States. Assertions of equality and India's belongingness among responsible nuclear actors departed from the hard power, competitive frame associated with the Nonproliferation Treaty, and instead adopted a soft power, cooperative frame that emphasized shared democratic and nonproliferation norms.

Despite the difficulties arising in the exchanges between Under Secretary Burns and Prime Minister Singh, the deliverance narrative conditioned the rhetorical act of courtship; its positive effect was subtle, changing perspectives on India's past behavior and its attractiveness as a partner. Functioning at this deeper level, the compression of "out of isolation" with "inside the mainstream" fused the temporal and spatial dimensions of India's position. This linkage between India's past, present, and future made visible India's incongruous relationship to the nonproliferation regime. U.S. proponents of the 123 Agreement identified with India's claim of discriminatory treatment.

The dissonance associated with India's placement outside the nuclear regime prompted a rhetorical shift in perspective about India, from a nation-state that had obstinately refused to sign the Nonproliferation Treaty, to a responsible nation-state unfairly constrained by a punitive and discriminatory system. India's isolation was a result of human foible.⁵⁴ Those who had isolated India denied themselves the long-term

security that they had hoped to achieve when denying India's entry into the nuclear club in the first place. The intertwining of the exceptionalism and deliverance narratives reframed both countries' past and present actions. Because India's placement outside the nonproliferation regime was due to a mistake, and not an act of malevolence, India could make the move from outside to inside while preserving its pride, and the United States could make a conciliatory move toward India while saving face.

Kinship Narrative

Both the exceptionalism narrative and the deliverance narrative were grounded in position—the move from outside to inside the regime, or from isolation into the mainstream. The exceptionalism narrative placed India and the United States in the same class, as models of democracy, and by extension, responsible actors. The deliverance narrative allowed participants to perform India's movement from outside to inside the nonproliferation regime, but the United States' performance was flawed.

The exceptionalism and deliverance narratives needed to be rounded out with an additional narrative that would dissolve the focus on nation-states as actors and reconcile India's strategic autonomy with its desire to belong. The kinship narrative resolved the tension between autonomy and community by promoting familial bonds. Substances of identification play a correlative role in rhetoric; discourse beads together a material reality or event, its socially constructed meaning, and its symbolic representation. Familial substance works in this way, creating a sense of belonging through a common lineage that substantiates discourse.

Secretary of State John Kerry has said that India and the United States share a “common DNA” of ingenuity and initiative that compels both countries to create a better future for their successor generations.⁵⁵ Secretary Kerry’s DNA metaphor encompassed the breadth of familial substance. The literal meaning of DNA as a biological connection extended to a constructed meaning of characteristics that are part of a people’s genetic make-up.

A biological relationship offers a direct correlation between physical and socially constructed familial substance. Familial substance may also engender a “spiritualized” sense of belonging, in which identification achieves a connection among individuals with a shared nationality or ideology. Functioning between the material and the symbolic, participants in discourse construct a memory of a shared founder, covenant, constitution, act, or experience.⁵⁶

Through the process of co-constructing cultural memory, individuals form a rhetorical community whose members recognize in each other the “rightness” of how they interpret external events and explain their own actions in response. This degree of correspondence reaches further into constructed meanings and symbolic representations to promote a vicarious sense of kinship.⁵⁷ At the highest degree of symbolic representation, discourse takes place completely in the symbolic realm, with expressions such as “we are brothers in the cause of human liberty.”⁵⁸ U.S. and Indian proponents of the 123 Agreement wove together threads of parentage to construct a kinship narrative that achieved a high degree of correspondence between the material and symbolic. This accomplishment may be attributed to the unique rhetorical resources available to one proponent in particular.

Congressman Joe Wilson was a vocal proponent of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement. During World War II, Congressman Wilson's father served in India as a member of the Flying Tigers, which allowed the Congressman to construct a uniquely personal tie between himself and the Indian people. Congressman Wilson introduced this connection so frequently during interviews and congressional hearings that it became his rhetorical signature in the debate, typified in the following interjection in a September 2005 House International Relations Committee hearing: "My dad served in India during World War II and so I grew up with an appreciation of the people of India. He told me how hard working they were, entrepreneurial, and now we see that coming to fruition."⁵⁹

Congressman Wilson expanded on this connection during his participation in a Congressional Delegation (CODEL) visit to India in January 2006:

What was very meaningful to me is that I had a picture of my father standing in front of the Taj Mahal, in March 1944, and I stood on the exact same sandstone location and had my picture taken, with the Taj Mahal in the background. It was so emotional to me, so heart-warming, to visit the country that he had told me all about – its very confident people, its very capable people, people who worked hard, and I saw it all first hand.⁶⁰

This is a thick expression of familial substance: an iconic image that harkens India's cultural soft power resources and gives permanence and intergenerational reach to the scene; a parental bond; and a personal and emotive statement about the experience.

Drawing on this thick expression, Congressman Wilson expanded the circumference of U.S.-Indian familial ties from his own, deeply personal account. The emotional charge of Congressman Wilson's words promoted a vicarious joining in the familial bond.

When Congressman Wilson gave Diasporans living in the United States a place in his story, he converted the personal into a universal experience:

The most important thing I got out of it was an extraordinary realization that there are 300 million, maybe more, Indians who have a direct family relationship with someone back in the U.S. Everywhere I went, I would run into people who would warmly greet us and point out that they have a cousin, a son, a daughter, an immediate relative, living somewhere in the U.S. It just really brought home to me that the close relationship that we have is going to become ever close and it just seemed like one happy family.⁶¹

Those hearing or reading Congressman Wilson's words could immediately place themselves in the narrative, whether as one of the Indians whom Congressman Wilson greeted during his travels, or as American neighbors, classmates, or coworkers to a son or a daughter of India. The breadth of community, from 300 million people to one family member, gave listeners multiple ways to belong and find acceptance in this one happy family.

Other rhetors were partially successful in inviting vicarious identification through personal contact and lived experience. Speaking to television talk show host Charlie Rose during the week prior to President Bush's state visit, the Prime Minister Singh observed:

There is hardly any middle class family in India who doesn't have a son, a daughter, a son-in-law, a brother-in-law in the United States. That is a very powerful new bond. I should like to express our profound gratitude to the Americans of Indian origin. The way that they have conducted themselves, the way they have worked hard to carve out a niche for themselves in the Silicon Valley, I think this has also given American(s) a new idea about what India is capable of.⁶²

Both Congressman Wilson and Prime Minister Singh constructed an image of the Indian people that privileged their industriousness. Congressman Wilson characterized the Indian people as confident, capable, and hard-working; Prime Minister Singh drew on the popular image of the Indian entrepreneur. In contrast to Congressman Wilson's common

vernacular as a “man of the people,” Prime Minister Singh spoke magnanimously in the voice of an authority figure.

Drawing on familial substance as a source for rhetorical invention absent a genealogical or Diasporic tie, rhetors fell back to familiarity in its broadest (and most shallow) sense, as we hear in this statement from Secretary Rice:

The need for democracies to have a strong realization of the concept of upward mobility is absolutely fundamental. And so, education is more a key in a democracy than in any kind of system. And one of the things I have been very proud of is we do have students going back and forth and some of the brightest students of India came to the United States. Indeed, some of the brightest students in the United States—I taught some of them at Stanford—go to India.⁶³

Secretary Rice placed herself in the role of observer rather than a member of the binational community. Her constructed role as faculty member widened physical and emotional distance. In fairness, the familial reference in this passage is a contextual element that buttresses the Secretary’s larger point on education. As such, the statement solicits an interpretation in which Secretary Rice’s affinity for the Indian people is presumed. A more personalized telling of her experience at Stanford, conveying her connection to her students rather than the educational system, would have opened the possibility of response instead of repose.

Familial substance cues us to the depth of identification. In his exploration of language and identity, Gary Woodward wrote that “it is surprising we have so few constructs that allow us to characterize levels of intensity for identifications.”⁶⁴ Gerald Hauser’s work with human rights rhetoric offers a rejoinder to Woodward, distinguishing between “thin” expressions that are abstract, offered in a third-person voice on victims’ behalf, and “thick” expressions in which survivors of human rights abuses speak for themselves.⁶⁵ A “thick” vernacular is value-laden, culturally translated and situated, and

particularized as opposed to universal. It lauds ordinary rather than heroic virtues and renders judgment in response to ordinary vices.⁶⁶

My critique suggests that individuals engaging in diplomatic discourse will be better able to initiate and manage soft power processes of attraction by adopting Hauser's thick vocabulary, or by cultivating support from surrogates who are personally or culturally attuned. The thin versus thick distinction is helpful in critiquing a rhetor's incorporation of familial substance to create identification. Familial substance is thin when the connection asserted is to a representative of a collective, absent an affective subtext. Familial substance is thick when the connection is expressed through talk that is personalized, individualized, and emotive. A thin discourse places the rhetor in the role of observer or commentator. A thick discourse places the rhetor in the narrative of experience.

Comparing accounts, Congressman Wilson's narrative was personalized and thick; Prime Minister Singh's was depersonalized and thin. Congressman Wilson could make present the familial ties forged in a time of war; his father, and the fathers of those to whom he spoke, were brothers in arms, fighting for the same cause. His story tightly wound past, present, and future. Owing to his Office, the Prime Minister constructed the familial as a symbolic rather than a biological tie. Prime Minister Singh assumed a paternal role, and spoke as head of a national family. The abstraction does not negate a vicarious association; it is only in contrast to Congressman Wilson's unique rhetorical resources that we may appreciate the distinction.

The kinship narrative promoted identification through a vicarious sense of belonging. Rhetoric pulled the familial substance of identification into accounts of U.S.-

Indian affinity, involving the audience as active participants who assumed the obligation to realize India's move from outside to inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime. The emotional pull of the kinship narrative added texture to the logic-based narratives of why India should move from outside to inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime. When rhetors braided together the exceptionalism, deliverance, and kinship narratives, they constructed a new meaning for the nonproliferation regime itself, from a class of nation-states based on legal standing, to a community of nations committed to combatting the proliferation of nuclear weapons while sharing the benefits of peaceful nuclear cooperation.

Augmenting Soft Power Theory and Practice through Identification

In this chapter and the next, I set out to answer the question of how the U.S.-India 123 Agreement evolved from an idea about nuclear cooperation into a discourse that transformed the U.S.-India strategic partnership. Rhetoric-as-persuasion does not satisfactorily explain the power of discourse to transform the context, social order, and substance of the U.S.-India relationship. Transformation became possible only when leaders of both the United States and India explored new ways of defining themselves and their interests, their partners in discourse, and the global context in which they conducted diplomacy.

Kenneth Burke's theorizing on the process of identification grounds my understanding of the transformative power of discourse in the diplomatic arena. Identification is the constitutive process through which U.S. and Indian leaders overcame their estrangement and poised themselves for concerted action. In this chapter, I explored

the rhetorical act of courtship as an initial deepening of identification. By performing the rhetorical act of courtship, U.S. and Indian leaders compensated for the artificial division imposed by the opposing placements of India and the United States outside and inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

The rhetorical act of courtship reduced recalcitrance emanating from India's doctrine of strategic autonomy. Participating in the hail and response of courtship, the United States and India validated their respective assessments of the other as an attractive and worthy partner. An exceptionalism narrative co-constructed by U.S. and Indian rhetors celebrated both nations' character and accomplishments. By making the United States and India consubstantial in their obligations to stand as models of democracy, discourse established a consonance of place and people that transformed India's position. This discourse changed the perspective on India's relationship to the nonproliferation regime and with the United States. No longer would India's position define the correctness of its actions; rather, India's actions would determine its correct position, meaning its belonging within the community of responsible, cooperating nation-states.

The hail and response of courtship allowed participants to rhetorically perform the movement that the 123 Agreement would achieve by incorporating India's strategic autonomy as a fundamental rationale. The deliverance narrative emanated from India's sense of isolation and desire to join the mainstream of international nuclear cooperation. As an act of rhetorical courtship, the deliverance narrative failed to deepen identification between the United States and India. Nonetheless, the narrative worked as subtext to frame India's isolation as an outcome of an injustice imposed by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty at its inception. India's isolation was not due to the overt actions

of previous leaders of India or the United States. Rather, India's placement was a mistake of history that required a corrective. India's actions as a responsible nuclear weapons state were incongruous with its isolation. The deliverance narrative thus predisposed rhetors to privilege India's record of upholding nonproliferation norms.

The deliverance narrative evolved to locate action in the 123 Agreement itself. Although the deliverance narrative *per se* came to a natural end before U.S. and Indian perspectives fully meshed, discourses assigned agency to the Agreement. The text would embody a reciprocal, resilient, and comprehensive strategic partnership. Synecdoche of the Agreement and bilateral partnership is more apparent in an additional narrative—which I call the convergence narrative—that unified American and Indian national interests. I will explore the convergence narrative in depth in the next chapter.

Lastly, the rhetorical act of courtship resolved the ambiguity between autonomy and belongingness, weighing in favor of the latter in a compensatory move. Rhetors fulfilled this need with a narrative of kinship and the construction of familial ties. Benefitting from personalized and thick accounts of familial ties, the kinship narrative fulfilled the rhetorical act of courtship by promoting a sense of belongingness. The kinship narrative pulled familial substances of identification into the American-Indian experience, drawing more participants into the hail and response of courtship with their vicarious support. The kinship narrative possessed an emotive pull and magnetism that carried parties across the threshold, taking the step from courtship to union.

The hail and response of courtship is a “testing out” of partners' suitability and affinity that allows either or both partners to call the whole thing off. Indeed, there were inflection points in the course of the debate and bilateral negotiations on the 123

Agreement that could have led one or both sides to abandon their cooperative efforts. Courtship put the United States and India on a path toward a permanent and resilient strategic partnership. To complete the act of courtship, rhetors would need to achieve unity of purpose and action, which Burke called “consubstantiation.”

In the next chapter, I likewise take the step across the threshold, using my understanding of courtship to critique the narratives that made the United States and India consubstantial in their values, purposes, and actions. This chapter and next work together to offer an alternative telos for soft power. For consubstantiation is a transcendence of held identities, and transcendence is a type of convergence that is fulfilled in the formation of a union. And it is the unity of action, purposes, and principles that best captures the diplomatic transformation of the U.S.-India bilateral relationship from estranged to engaged.

Notes

¹ Ashley Tellis, Congressional Testimony before the House International Relations Committee, November 16, 2005.

² Ashley Tellis, Congressional Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, April 26, 2006.

³ Ashley Tellis, "What Should We Expect from India as a Strategic Partner?" in *Gauging U.S.-Indian Strategic Cooperation*, ed. Henry Sokolski (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2007), 243.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 241-242.

⁵ Ashley Tellis, interview with *India Abroad*, July 20, 2007.

⁶ As a construct, "rhetorical sensitivity" is attributed to Rod Hart and co-author Don M. Burks, who argued that an instrumental (vice expressive) style of communication, the purpose of which is to achieve or move toward a goal, best promises to facilitate human understanding and effect social change. Hart and Burks identified role taking, plain speaking, adaptation, discernment of information appropriate for communication, and the ability to look at a situation from multiple perspectives as the characteristics of someone who is rhetorically sensitive. See Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction," *Speech Monographs* 89, no. 2 (June 1972): 75-76. I am using the term "rhetorical sensitivity" in a more generic sense, placing the emphasis on *rhetorical*—to explore the implications for soft power's core precepts and assumptions when inquiry centers on the quality of discursive interaction and symbolic exchange. My usage therefore represents a disciplinary perspective without the entailments of Hart and Burk's instrumental style.

⁷ Sonja K. Foss and Cindy L. Griffin, "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric," *Communication Monographs* 62 (March 1995): 2-18. The authors argue that the traditional understanding of rhetoric-as-persuasion implies a desire to control and dominate, to exercise power of the change agent over another (p. 3). The authors offer an alternative theoretical approach, which they term invitational rhetoric, rooted in feminist principles of equality, recognition of the intrinsic value of all beings, and self-determination (p. 4).

⁸ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1950; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 55-56. Citations are to the California edition.

⁹ Wayne Brockriede, "Arguers as Lovers," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1972): 10.

¹⁰ Raymie McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (1989): 91-111.

¹¹ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 57-58.

¹² Wayne Brockriede, "Arguers as Lovers," 10.

¹³ Gary C. Woodward, *The Idea of Identification* (Albany: State University of New York, 2003), 27.

¹⁴ Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches," *Western Journal of Communication* 71, no. 4 (October 2007): 289.

¹⁵ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 22.

¹⁶ Foreign Secretary Saran, Carnegie Endowment, December 21, 2005.

¹⁷ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 208.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 176-177.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 208.

²⁰ Guillem Monsonis, "India's Strategic Autonomy and Rapprochement with the US," *Strategic Analysis* 34, 4 (2010): 611-624.

²¹ Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2009): 16.

²² Rajesh M. Basrur, "Nuclear Weapons and Indian Strategic Culture," *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 2 (2001): 183.

²³ Bhumitra Chakma, "Toward Pokhran II: Explaining India's Nuclearisation Process," *Modern Asian Studies* 39, no. 1 (February 2005): 196-200.

²⁴ Haider K. Nizamani, *The Roots of Rhetoric: Politics of Nuclear Weapons in India and Pakistan* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 34.

²⁵ Leonard Weiss, "India and the NPT," *Strategic Analysis* 34, no. 2 (March 2010): 260.

²⁶ Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership*, 7.

- ²⁷ Prime Minister Singh, Statement to Parliament, July 29, 2005.
- ²⁸ Dennis Kux, *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991* (Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific, 2005), 263.
- ²⁹ Prime Minister Singh, Suo-Moto statement, February 27, 2006.
- ³⁰ Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century*, 7.
- ³¹ CPI-M Statement on IAEA Resolution on Iran, September 25, 2005.
- ³² CPI-M Press Statement, June 28, 2006.
- ³³ Weldon B. Durham, "Kenneth Burke's Concept of Substance," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 4 (December 1980): 351.
- ³⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁵ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1945; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 24. Citations are to the California edition.
- ³⁶ Danielle Endres and Samantha Senda-Cook, "Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 3 (August 2011): 259.
- ³⁷ Jason A. Edwards and David Weiss, "Introduction: American Exceptionalism's Champions and Challenges," in *The Rhetoric of American Exceptionalism: Critical Essays*, eds. Jason A. Edwards and David Weiss (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011), 2.
- ³⁸ Daniel Markey, Carnegie Endowment, May 16, 2006.
- ³⁹ President Bush, Joint News Conference, July 18, 2005
- ⁴⁰ Prime Minister Singh, Address to Joint Session of Congress, July 19, 2005.
- ⁴¹ U.S. Ambassador to India David C. Mulford, Remarks, August 18, 2005.
- ⁴² Amitabh Mattoo. *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 27, 2005.
- ⁴³ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, press briefing, March 2, 2006.
- ⁴⁴ Miriam Rajkumar, *India Abroad*, July 29, 2005.
- ⁴⁵ Daryl Kimball, *Economic and Politic Weekly*, August 27, 2005.

- ⁴⁶ Prime Minister Singh, Lok Sabha intervention, December 18, 2006.
- ⁴⁷ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, interview with CNN-IBN of India, August 6, 2007.
- ⁴⁸ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, Congressional Testimony, House International Relations Committee, September 8, 2005.
- ⁴⁹ Prime Minister Singh, Newsmaker Luncheon, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., July 20, 2005.
- ⁵⁰ Congressman Henry Hyde, *India Abroad*, July 7, 2006
- ⁵¹ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, *India Abroad*, June 1, 2007
- ⁵² Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, *Times of India*, February 29, 2008.
- ⁵³ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, *Hindustan Times*, February 29, 2008
- ⁵⁴ Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History* 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California, 1984), 170-171.
- ⁵⁵ Stephen Kaufman, "India-U.S. Partnership Can Build Networks in Asia, Kerry Says," IIP Digital, June 25, 2013, accessed from <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2013/06/20130625277526.html#axzz2ZGUpZAvE> on July 16, 2013.
- ⁵⁶ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 29.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁵⁸ President Bush, March 3, 2006.
- ⁵⁹ Congressman Joe Wilson, House Intl. Relations Committee, September 8, 2005.
- ⁶⁰ Congressman Joe Wilson, CODEL to India, January 5, 2006.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Prime Minister Singh, *Charlie Rose*, February 27, 2006.
- ⁶³ Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, *India Abroad*, July 6, 2007

⁶⁴ Gary C. Woodward, *The Idea of Identification* (Albany: State University of New York, 2003), 39.

⁶⁵ Gerald A. Hauser, “The Moral Vernacular of Human Rights Discourse,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 41, no. 4 (2008): 441.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 456.

Chapter 3

Rhetorical Enactments: From Estranged to Engaged

This chapter concerns the United States' and India's bilateral diplomatic move from estranged to engaged. I explain this move as an achievement that began with the rhetorical act of courtship. Courtship is an ever-deepening form of identification that is contingent in the future. As courtship progresses, uncertainty is wrung out of the relationship and replaced with a sense of optimism. If the diplomatic move is a transformation of relations from estranged to engaged, the companion rhetorical move is a transformation of relations from contingent to permanent. Those courting intuit and express the "rightness" and inevitability of their union. Working through my critique of soft power diplomacy, I wanted to understand how participants in discourse embraced and enacted this idea of permanent union.

In the previous chapter I captured how discourse effectuated India's move from outside to inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime. Further, I explored how discourse established India's place and belongingness in the community of cooperating nuclear states. When the United States and India were estranged, nuclear diplomacy relied on coercive tactics such as sanctions and export controls. Discourse rested in persuasive strategies to justify U.S. and international policies that kept India in isolation until it changed its ways. I touch on these coercive tactics very briefly to sharpen the distinction between hard and soft power approaches. My critique centers on a period of engagement when discourse promoted cooperation to achieve mutual aims and benefits in political, economic, and social development.

Rhetoric needed to reshape the conditions and material facts upon which nuclear diplomacy was based. Even if India were inside the nuclear club, that change of status alone would have been insufficient for the United States and India to share an orientation toward the global order, global threats, and global possibilities. Once accepted within the system of cooperating nuclear states, India could have pursued bilateral ties with countries other than the United States. Not to be discounted, nation-states inside the nuclear club—including India—maintained their prerogative to exercise power in all its forms, including the projection of military force and punitive measures. U.S. and Indian leaders chose to stake their interests in strategic partnership—achieving mutually beneficial ends through joint action.

The United States and India activated a shared world view. Their world view emanated from a set of assumptions and conditions for making sense of world events, and promoted a shared interpretation of actions taken by themselves, by each other, and by third-party actors in the international scene. Diplomacy presumes the necessity of an acting-together of nation-states. When two nation-states approach the world and each other with shared interpretative frames and purposes, strategic cooperation naturally follows.

Burke observed that “a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them *consubstantial*.”¹ Consubstantiation is the deepening of identification that gives the act of courtship momentum toward and proximity to unification. My reading of Burke tells me that unification occurs in moments, but can never be total or unending. Unification—to communicate naturally, spontaneously, and totally as part of our very essence—is an

ideal. Soft power diplomacy does rhetorical work by holding open these moments of unification. When appreciated as a mode of constitutive rhetoric, soft power discourses make participants consubstantial in a human endeavor.² My overarching argument is that these rhetorically constructed moments of unification transformed the U.S.-India bilateral relationship into strategic partnership.

The Hard Power Cycle

The hard power cycle aptly describes the broad patterns of bilateral nuclear diplomacy prior to the U.S.-India 123 Agreement. The pattern entailed an external event that spurred India to take unilateral action in its nuclear program, which in turn resulted in coercive measures such as sanctions imposed by the United States and other members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, followed by a thaw and efforts at compromise, but eventually leading back to unilateral action and punishment. In this section, I condense 40 years of nuclear diplomacy to a few emblems around which the hard power cycle revolved. These examples capture in microcosm the freezing and thawing of the U.S.-India relationship prior to the U.S.-India 123 Agreement.

In chapter 2, I explained India's adherence to its foreign policy doctrine of strategic autonomy. Strategic autonomy seeded India's world view and diplomatic discourse in a way that for many years justified India's unilateralism. Strategic autonomy also had a kinetic consequence, catalyzing and recharging cycles of hard power diplomacy. Strategic autonomy was not only an irritant that called forth a rhetorical response, but also a barrier to long-term engagement. If the relationship were to be transformed into strategic partnership, persuasive appeals to justify actions and defend

policies could not be countenanced; rhetors would need to break the hard power cycle and replace it with a more virtuous circle of reciprocity.

Sanctions

Two types of hard power tactics, sanctions and export controls, drove this hard power cycle. India's underground nuclear tests spurred the first tactic. India conducted the nuclear tests to signal its capacity to develop nuclear weapons independently. In response, America and the international community imposed sanctions to check the militarization of India's nuclear program.

On May 18, 1974, India successfully conducted a test explosion of an underground nuclear device at Pokharan, in the deserts of Rajasthan; the test is referred to as Pokharan I.³ The official reaction from the State Department framed the issue as a matter of global security, stating that "The United States has always been against nuclear proliferation because of the adverse impact it will have on world stability."⁴ In Pokharan I's wake, the United States created the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), composed of most of the countries capable of making equipment necessary to the research and development and operation of peaceful nuclear technology.⁵ The NSG added a multilateral dimension to U.S.-led efforts to entice nuclear weapons states to sign the Nonproliferation Treaty, or to isolate those who refused.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi argued steadfastly that Pokharan I advanced India's pursuit of peaceful uses of nuclear technology; to claim that India wanted to produce nuclear weapons was a *non sequitur*. This argument lacked convincingness, given the era's tautology of nuclear *programs* for nuclear *weapons*, in which multiple meanings of

nuclear power collapsed into one register.⁶ Analysts reduced India's history with a variety of nuclear programs to a pre-determined path with weapons development as a singular outcome.⁷

Pokharan I made an indelible impression on public discourses regarding nuclear weapons, demanding repeated assurances from the Government of India that it was committed to nonproliferation. During President Carter's January 1978 state visit to India, President Reddy made clear that the Government of India shared the world's abhorrence at the prospect of nuclear war:

In the final instance, peace will remain fragile if nuclear weapons, capable of such annihilative destruction, are kept and multiplied. We appreciate the concern and sincerity which you have expressed at these dangers and the efforts you are making to arrest the proliferation of nuclear weapons.⁸

President Reddy also used the occasion to frame the Government of India's stance on the nuclear nonproliferation regime and India's right to pursue nuclear development for peaceful purposes without sanction:

For our part, we have unilaterally abjured the development of such means of mass destruction. But, Mr. President, we hope that you will agree with the dangers of nuclear war, by accident or design, will remain, until such time as all nations, without arbitrary distinctions, join in a firm commitment for the progressive reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons from all parts of the world. The challenge demands not just restraints from nuclear weapons but pledges by the nuclear "haves" to turn away from the use of this instrument of modern science for military purposes. But, in the meanwhile, must countries who have no nuclear weapons be inhibited from using nuclear science as an instrument for economic transformation? I would like to emphasize with a full sense of responsibility that India, for her part, will not indulge in the perverse use of nuclear science.⁹

This statement holds traces of the narratives that would be recast through discourses on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement. We hear in President Reddy's remarks the belief that the nuclear nonproliferation regime was a discriminatory system that divided nation-states

into nuclear “haves” and “have-nots” based on accession to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The question regarding the benefits of nuclear science for economic development savored of indignation. This plaint notwithstanding, the Government of India’s pledge to refrain from nuclear weapons development (but reserving the right to continue nuclear tests) helped return the bilateral relationship to a state of normalcy.

The Government’s commitment would be codified in the U.S.-India Delhi Declaration, signed on January 3, 1978. Marking the occasion, President Carter proclaimed “our belief that each individual has inalienable rights, our commitment to justice among nations and within societies, and our determination that disputes must be resolved without violence, especially in this age when nuclear weapons threaten the total destruction of humankind.”¹⁰ During Indian Prime Minister Morarji Desai’s state visit to Washington in June 1978, he spoke of “a similar vision of building a world free from strife and tension.”¹¹ President Carter stated that India had “reaffirmed its commitment not acquire nuclear weapons and to refrain from the explosion of peaceful nuclear devices.”¹²

Nearly two decades passed before the prospect of India’s renewal of nuclear testing rose to the level that warranted a stronger deterrent. In December 1995, Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee halted plans for a second nuclear weapons test when the United States threatened additional sanctions. The Prime Minister reversed himself in May 1998, with two tests conducted on the 11th and the 13th of that month, referred to as Pokharan II. President Clinton, who “was personally irked,” issued the following statement:

They're a very great country. ... But to think that you have to manifest your greatness by behavior that recalls the very worst events of the 20th century on the edge of the 21st century, when everybody else is trying to leave the nuclear age behind, is just wrong. It is just wrong. And they clearly don't need to maintain their security, vis-à-vis China, Pakistan, or anybody else.¹³

American and international reaction was swift. The Clinton Administration imposed economic sanctions. Additionally, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1172, passed unanimously on June 11, 1998, put in place a full set of markers for international acceptance of India's nuclear program, including India's signing the Nonproliferation Treaty.¹⁴

Circumstances varied between Pokharan I and Pokharan II. Each test took place against a complicated economic, security, and political backdrop, and generated nuclear rhetorics and arguments particular to its bilateral and regional diplomatic context. For my purposes, I subsume the particulars to hit home a different point. To break the cycle, India would need to sign the Nonproliferation Treaty—the very thing that had catalyzed the process of unilateral action and punitive reaction.

Export Controls

Sanctions were not the only coercive measure used in the attempt to gain India's compliance with the nuclear nonproliferation regime. Shipments of enriched uranium necessary to run India's civilian nuclear power plants gave the United States bargaining power. In order to receive enriched uranium, India would have to open its nuclear facilities to inspection in order to verify that its safeguards were sufficient to prevent the diversion of fuel for weapons production. The Tarapur nuclear power plant was

emblematic of this hard-edged bargaining tactic that held sway over nuclear cooperation from the mid-1950s through the 1990s.

Tarapur had its beginnings in President Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace program, under which India and the United States began a bilateral conversation on civilian nuclear cooperation. India's Atomic Energy Chairman Homi Bhabha argued that building a nuclear power plant in India would demonstrate dramatically U.S. support for peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Third World. American Ambassador to India Ellsworth Bunker added his own argument in support, that India would build the plant with Soviet assistance if the United States refused.¹⁵ Following feasibility studies and negotiations over nuclear safeguards including India's exclusive use of U.S.-supplied enriched uranium, the United States and India signed the Tarapur agreement in May 1963.¹⁶

The exclusivity of supply was intended as a safeguard. Prior to Pokharan I, the United States routinely exported enriched uranium to India for Tarapur's starter or feeder fuel. After Pokharan I, the export of enriched uranium became a bargaining chip. The 1974 shipment was delayed pending receipt of India's written assurances that special nuclear material would not be diverted from Tarapur for other uses.¹⁷

Tarapur remained in limbo through America's elections in 1976, and President Carter—who ran on a nuclear nonproliferation campaign plank—not only continued the *quid pro quo* but also upped the ante. In remarks with reporters on a formal review of U.S. nuclear policy, President Carter acknowledged concern about the precedent of providing feeder fuel to India:

I think it's obvious that some of the countries about whom we are concerned have used their domestic nuclear power plants to develop explosive capability ... India, which is basically a peaceful nation, at least as far as worldwide connotations are concerned, did evolve an explosive capability from supplies that were given to them by the Canadians and by us. And we feel that there are other nations that have potential capacity already for the evolution of explosives. But we are trying to make sure that from this point on that the increasing number of nations that might have joined the nuclear nations is attenuated drastically.¹⁸

To paraphrase the President's stance colloquially: fool us once, shame on you, fool us twice, shame on us. This excerpt hints at why the Government of India would perceive the nuclear nonproliferation regime as a system of denial rather than cooperation. We also hear an early vestige of the "slippery slope" argument favored by opponents of the U.S-India 123 Agreement. In an exchange with reporters during a May 1977 international economic summit, President Carter said:

The nations who do produce large amounts of enriched fuel like ourselves, have a great deal of influence on the others. And, of course, we want to be fair to them because it's a very divisive political issue in some of the countries. They want to retain their legitimate independence and autonomy. They don't want other nations like ourselves telling them how to act. And still, I think, there was a unanimous belief that unless we do take action, that there will be a lot of other of the so-called threshold nations who will produce explosives in the future, as India did a few years ago. And all of us want to prevent that.¹⁹

In his remarks, President Carter acknowledged but dismissed India's doctrine of strategic autonomy. It was outweighed by the U.S. responsibility to prevent nuclear proliferation and the precedent that India created when it conducted underground nuclear tests.

The U.S policy review established the justification for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, a cornerstone of the Carter Administration's nuclear policy.²⁰ The Act mandated that a country's eligibility for civilian nuclear cooperation included consent to place all nuclear facilities under international safeguards (i.e., full scope safeguards).²¹ On the one hand, President Carter committed to Indian Prime Minister

Desai that shipments of nuclear fuel would be made available for Tarapur,²² On the other hand, and under the provisions of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, India's continued ability to generate power at Tarapur became hostage to U.S. demands that India allow inspectors inside all of its nuclear facilities.

President Carter put political capital behind continued fuel exports for Tarapur only to maintain the dialogue on bringing all of India's nuclear facilities under international safeguards.²³ President Carter made explicit reference to this *quid-pro-quo* when transmitting an executive order to Congress requesting export of special nuclear material to India:

The Government of India has given us its commitments to use our exports only at the Tarapur Atomic Power Station and not for any explosive or military purpose, and I have the highest confidence that it will honor these commitments. I am convinced that denial of this export would seriously undermine our efforts to persuade India to accept full-scope safeguards, and would seriously prejudice the achievement of other U.S. non-proliferation goals.²⁴

And reiterated in a June 1980 message to Congress:

India's failure to accept international safeguards on all its peaceful nuclear activities and its failure to commit itself not to conduct further nuclear explosions are of serious concern to me. These exports will help us to maintain a dialogue with India in which we try to narrow our differences on these issues. The exports will avoid the risk of a claim by India that the United States has broken an existing agreement between the two governments and has thereby relieved India of its obligation to refrain from reprocessing the fuel previously supplied by the United States.²⁵

The *quid-pro-quo* was clear, but even more significant was the lack of trust revealed in President Carter's remarks. The President implied that India was waiting for an excuse to militarize its nuclear program. Absent the carrot-and-stick of continued fuel exports and sanctions, India would pursue its own interests, to include nuclear weapons development. The Government of India responded to President Carter's bargaining with a move of its

own, reiterating its view that safeguards must apply equally to all countries engaged in civilian nuclear development and calling for the creation of an international panel of experts who would examine the question of safeguarding nuclear installations around the world.²⁶

As President Reagan took office, U.S.-India nuclear cooperation and fuel supplies to Tarapur remained unresolved. Indira Gandhi flirted with the idea of denouncing the Tarapur agreement, which would have required India to either produce an indigenous feeder fuel or obtain enriched uranium from the Soviet Union.²⁷ Instead, the Prime Minister publicly ruled out unilateral action on Tarapur, informing her parliamentary advisers that any decision to terminate the fuel supply agreement would be taken in the context of India's national interest and overall bilateral relations with the United States.²⁸ The end result was a settlement on Tarapur, under which India agreed to maintain nuclear safeguards on the plant in exchange for enriched uranium fuel from France.²⁹

Like the Pokharan underground nuclear tests, negotiations over Tarapur and fuel exports were conducted against an evolving scene of international and domestic politics and influenced by differing degrees of personal affinity between the heads of state. My more narrow interest in Tarapur relates to its role in perpetuating the hard-power cycle. Prime Minister Gandhi's stance on Tarapur was a decisive gesture from Indian independence toward a recognition of mutual interests. In this regard, Tarapur made a distinction in how India promoted its strategic autonomy, taking unilateral action in its nuclear weapons program and cooperative action in its civil nuclear program.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi made a pragmatic decision to achieve a settlement amidst the hard bargaining tactics employed by both sides. A period of U.S.-Indian

bonhomie followed. When her successor Rajiv Gandhi met with President Reagan in October 1987, he sought recognition as America's partner in technological progress and congratulated President Reagan on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces agreement. President Reagan attributed concrete bilateral achievements to the two nation-states' dedication to democracy, and expressed his renewed confidence to set ambitious new goals.³⁰

Breaking Free

Balancing the 1998 sanctions imposed after Pokharan II with Administration policies for international development, the Clinton Administration introduced a new negotiation tactic. The nuclear "carve out" simultaneously advanced bilateral interests where consensus allowed without ceding ground on nuclear nonproliferation and nuclear safeguards.³¹ The negotiating tactic essentially bracketed nuclear cooperation to allow progress on bilateral objectives including global health, global economic growth, democracy, and human rights and labor.³² As explained by President Clinton, the Nonproliferation Treaty "should be seen in the context of the whole relationship. ... the differences remain, but in the context of our common interests and our common values, we believe they can be managed in a very constructive way and still allow this relationship to grow and strengthen."³³

The carve out created a manageable and acceptable co-existence of cooperation in areas of mutual interest, and sanctions and hard bargaining deemed necessary to gain India's accession to the Nonproliferation Treaty. It also allowed President Clinton to express empathy for India's security concerns: "Any dialog (sic) we have with India on this would be in the context of what is pivotal for India's security: How can we enhance your security, not diminish it? It would be wrong for the United States to tell your great

nation, or the smallest nation on the face of the Earth, that we recommend a course of action for them that would reduce security.”³⁴

At the start of the new millennium, bilateral progress in science and technology cooperation outpaced and became stymied by export controls on dual-use, high technology. In the words of Indian Prime Minister Rao, during his state visit in May 1994, “the President and I agreed that we have an unprecedented opportunity to free India-U.S. relations from the distortions induced by the Cold War, to look for areas of converging interest in the changed international situation, and work together for our mutual benefit.”³⁵ The nuclear carve out made the disconnect between civil nuclear cooperation and other aspects of the relationship more apparent. Nonetheless, neither country felt a sense of urgency to change the *status quo*. The 9/11 attacks would introduce that urgency.

The 9/11 attacks refocused nonproliferation experts’ attention toward non-state actors’ proclivity to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction. This counter-terrorism frame connected nuclear nonproliferation with global security, creating an impetus to revisit diplomatic tactics. Perhaps aided by the ability to cross-fertilize terrorism and nuclear proliferation, two transnational threats whose amelioration depended on nation-states working together, both sides began to reassess their *quid-pro-quo* bargaining behavior.

The exigence of the 9/11 attacks led to concrete, if incremental, confidence-building steps including structured bilateral dialogues and cooperative agreements that generated greater latitude for rhetorical work. The U.S. Government lifted the 1998 sanctions on India. The lifting of sanctions permitted the two governments to form the

U.S.-India High Technology Cooperation Group, which led in turn to increased dual use technology exports. India consented to a U.S. export control attaché to monitor end-use of U.S. technology transfers, in exchange for the United States' removing the Indian Space Research Organization from the Entity List, thus repealing extraordinary licensing and regulatory requirements for technology exports.

In 2004, the United States and India formally launched a strategic dialogue with reciprocal steps for civilian nuclear regulatory and safety issues, space cooperation, and expansion of high-tech commerce. In July 2005, on the eve of a state visit by Prime Minister Singh, the Indian Parliament passed a bill titled “WMD and Their Delivery Systems (Prohibition of Unlawful Activities).” The legislation brought India's export control regime in conformity with U.S. and international export controls.³⁶

When President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Singh embarked on the path toward strategic partnership, they tacitly repudiated the past decades' hard power tactics as a means to gain India's accession to the international nonproliferation regime. The joint declaration and subsequent debate on a U.S.-India 123 Agreement broke the hard power cycle of sanctions and coercive bargaining. This qualitative change in approach defined a watershed moment that would make bilateral diplomatic engagement durable and resilient.

Soft Power Diplomacy: Rhetorical Strategies to Achieve Bilateral Unity

Breaking free of the hard power cycle was a precursor to the hard work of building a bilateral partnership. I began my inquiry with the premise that discourses constructed a mutually desirable future state of relations that the U.S.-India 123 Agreement would fulfill. My critique explores how discourse created and held open

moments when the United States and India could imagine and enact a permanent union, achieved through shared ideological commitments. My critique also alights on discourses that constituted community, paying particular attention to the transformation of political identity experienced by the Diaspora community. Lastly, my critique introduces “convergence” as a discursive frame through which participants in the debate reinterpreted the post-Cold War scene and strategic interests, establishing a synecdochic relationship between the U.S.-India 123 Agreement and strategic partnership.

Unity of Ideals: A Shared Commitment to Democracy

In this section, I explore how U.S. and Indian rhetors created and held open moments of unification. Specifically, I critique their successful co-construction of ideologically-charged terms of commitment, called ideographs.³⁷ Ideographs chart changes in perspective and orientation that underlie identification and prompt concerted action. “Freedom,” “liberty,” and “equality” are examples of words that have the potential to function ideographically.¹ These words possess the potential to call disparate individuals into a community to take collective action based on the gestalt of the word’s historical and contemporaneous meaning and nuance.³⁸

Given my overarching aim to understand how the United States and India remade their relationship in the form of a permanent union, my rhetorical critique explores how ideographs generated a sense of bilateral unity in a specific moment. This form of ideographic critique, called synchronic critique, focuses on a clustering of terms within

¹ In the presentation of rhetorical critique, quote marks indicate a referential use of a common now, i.e., “democracy.” When a word is placed between carrots, this indicates that the term is functioning ideographically in its rhetorical context, i.e., <democracy>.

the same time period. Synchronic critique generates insight from terms' interconnectedness, and charts the coherence of meaning created by and for participants in discourse at that moment of inflection. Synchronic usage unifies a community in their co-construction of an ideograph's meaning, or in the generation of transformed ideographs that transcend differences of meaning rooted in lived experience.

When individuals invoke an ideograph in discourse, they open the possibility of changing its meaning. Rhetorically, this occurs in the back-and-forth of striving toward an ideal and assigning meaning to concrete experience. As an ideal, "democracy" contains the full potentiality of meaning—how things ought to be—of which only a sliver can be represented in discourse. As part of everyday experience, "democracy" entails a set of expectations for how things are done. Electing a group leader, blogging on current events, and avoiding or patronizing restaurants in a show of protest or support (to vote with one's feet) represent the familiar rituals and habits that keep democracy's ideographic potential at the ready. The interplay between ideals and experience introduces fresh nuance that in turn refocuses an ideograph's interpretative lens that frees participants in discourse to imagine alternative futures and paths forward.

Co-constructing <Democracy>

"Democracy" is a long-standing trope of U.S.-Indian relations premised on the joining of the world's oldest and largest democracies. When President Bush and Prime Minister Singh announced their intent to pursue full civilian nuclear cooperation, they opened <democracy> to new meanings and interpretations. My critique describes how U.S. and Indian rhetors transcended their division by reaching toward the same

idealization of <democracy>, celebrated in discourse and lauded in lived experience as pluralism. When textured with pluralism, <democracy> became a universal value that transcended the divide of geography, history, and national experience.

Prime Minister Singh's July 2005 state visit presented an opportunity to achieve consubstantiation, effectuated through the hail and response of courtship. President Bush's welcoming remarks, however, failed to tap into the potency of the moment. Note the partitioning of nations, and issues, in President Bush's welcome to Prime Minister Singh:

We meet as leaders of two great democracies committed to working together for a better and safer world. Your visit reflects the growing bonds of cooperation between your nation and mine. ... Our nations believe in freedom, and our nations are confronting global terrorism. As diplomatic partners, we're meeting this threat in our own nations and abroad. And as economic partners, we're working around the world to displace hatred and violence with prosperity, hope, and optimism. India's embrace of democracy and human rights has ensured that its great diversity will remain a national strength.³⁹

Whereas President Bush drew upon a shared belief in freedom, independent action remained uppermost in the constitution of the moment. The two nations were confronting terrorism in their particular spheres of influence. In the President's world view, democracy inoculated a society against the global threat of terrorism. Believing in freedom and confronting global terrorism were distinct actions.

In the President's world view, the partnership between the United States and India was additive of economic and diplomatic gains. The two countries' independent actions happened to place them on the same trajectory, with an overlap of mutual aims that was more coincidental than deliberate. The President's formulation placed a premium on past demonstrations of partnership in the diplomatic and economic arenas. The grammar

revealed an inductive logic: if India were a good economic partner, and if India were a good diplomatic partner, then it followed that India would be a good security partner.

President Bush made pluralism instrumental to the global war on terrorism, as a means to ameliorate grievances and to provide a bulwark against violent extremism.

India's diversity was instrumental to the country's ability to act. Whereas President Bush made democracy and human rights the simultaneous genesis and product of diversity, diversity remained bound to the nation-state. The United States and India did not yet possess a holistic or total understanding of each other or the world they jointly inhabited.

The President's discourse established a pragmatic frame through which to interpret the means and ends cooperative action. This sense of pragmatism worked with soft power discourse, offering an enlightened view of compromise that did not require naming of winners and losers. Nations acting together could achieve much in the world without diminishing their position or jeopardizing their interests. Compromise no longer implied the loss of advantage. The President's work with pluralism was pragmatic because it framed values-in-action as a way of doing.

A more idealistic frame emerged in Prime Minister Singh's discourse, in which values were both embodied and enacted—a way of being from which action naturally sprung. Prime Minister Singh asserted that the two nations' ideological commitments were integral to their relationship and an impetus for acting together:

We share a common commitment to democracy, freedom, human rights, pluralism and rule of law. We face common challenges that threaten our way of life and values that both our countries hold dear. We share a common resolve and a common responsibility to meet those challenges. Mr. President, your personal commitment to our relations is widely appreciated in India. I am confident that from our talks today will emerge an agenda of cooperation that reflects a real transformation of our relationship.⁴⁰

Prime Minister Singh changed the locus of action from “our two” to “we.” The change of locus indicated that the courtship between India and the United States was developing a sense of mutual obligation, the type of obligation that emerges freely from deepening identification. By pairing “we” with “our relationship,” Prime Minister Singh blended the personal and representational roles that characterize gatherings of heads of state. The progression translated personal admiration into national affinity. In place of President Bush’s partitioning of economic and political aims, Prime Minister Singh constructed a holistic frame for partnership. In contrast to President Bush’s pragmatic view of pluralism and partnership, Prime Minister Singh spoke idealistically of a common resolve and common challenges, an acting together.

Prime Minister Singh’s choice of pluralism, rather than diversity, and the addition of rule of law in the cluster of <democracy>’s related terms, moved the dialogue toward governance. Governance can be interpreted as an instrumental term, the means by which public and private codes of conduct produce societal benefit. Governance can also be contextualized as an idealistic term, as good governance implies a set of core values such as fairness, stewardship, and human rights and dignity. In this regard, the idealism that seeped through Prime Minister Singh’s statement was empowering, turning means into the combination of capacity and will, which we call agency.

The next interlude occurred during the exchange of toasts at a state dinner in honor of Prime Minister Singh. President Bush’s welcoming remarks opened the conversation in a pragmatic tone. Now, having heard Prime Minister Singh’s own welcoming remarks, President Bush elevated his discourse:

Above all, India and the United States are bound together by common values. As two strong, diverse democracies, we share a commitment to the success of multi-ethnic democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. And we believe that by spreading the blessings of democracy and freedom, we will ensure lasting peace for our own citizens and for the world.⁴¹

I categorize this excerpt as having a pragmatic frame because the primary action is one of means and ends. We spread democracy *because* it will lead to lasting peace. The tone begins to change, however, as President Bush ascribed to India and United States the same underlying quality of democracy, naming both as “diverse democracies.” As a quality, diversity was no longer instrumental, but integral, to their relationship. President Bush took a step back from “what we do” to valorize “what we are.”

This integrity carried through to the outcomes of shared commitments, the “success of multi-ethnic democracy.” In this regard, the President’s statement harmonized well with Prime Minister Singh’s holistic construction. The President’s statement echoed Prime Minister Singh’s “we,” but only within the realm of beliefs and commitments. Whereas President Bush’s rhetoric drew him closer to a unified stance, he stopped short of unified action.

“Lasting peace” was too ambiguous and broadly scoped to envision the possibilities for joint action. An equally desirable but more tangible aim was required. Prime Minister Singh recast pragmatism as joint action. His narrative drew the United States and India into the action as protectors against a global threat:

India and the United States are great nations and great democracies. We cherish the openness of our societies and of our economies. We value our pluralism, our diversity, and our freedoms. These shared values that bring us together must be more visible not only in how we deal with each other, but also in our approach to the world at large. We must strengthen democratic capacities jointly. We must oppose the evil of terrorism together. To meet such vital challenges, we must be together on the same page. We must speak the same language and display the same resolve.⁴²

In the Prime Minister's construction, pluralism determined the quality of the act, i.e., to build capacity and to counter terrorism. In turn, the quality of the act reflected upon the quality of national character. Pluralism, as a quality of a society and its governance, provided a common characteristic in which to consubstantiate the United States and India in <democracy>. Pluralism made Americans and Indians consubstantial in how they enacted democracy in public life and civil society.

Introducing <Creativity>

Pluralism did additional rhetorical work by cross-pollinating the political and economic arenas of the bilateral relationship. In the political arena, pluralism fostered consubstantiality in a democratic way of life. In the economic arena, pluralism likewise implied diversity of thought and freedom of movement. President Bush made the linkage explicit during his state visit to India in March 2006, offering reassurance that:

The partnership between the United States and India begins with democracy and it does not end there. Our people share a devotion to family, a passion for learning, a love of the arts, and much more. India's innovative people have begun to look outward and connect to the global economy as never before."⁴³

Through the hail and response of courtship, President Bush, Prime Minister Singh, and their surrogates translated pluralism into a new ideograph, <creativity>, which celebrated both countries' success in unleashing the forces of global prosperity.

By attuning pluralism to globalization, <creativity> consubstantiated the United States and India as builders and inaugural members of the new economy. The new economy is defined as the aggregate of economic sectors that are the leading edges of growth and innovation, such as high technology, media, and other cultural products

industries. The new economy is composed of extended networks of firms that are served by an extremely mobile, dynamic, and competitive workforce.⁴⁴

“Creativity” was a term in vogue prior to Prime Minister Singh’s July 2005 state visit. In 2002, Tyler Cowen’s *Creative Destruction: How Globalization Is Changing the World’s Cultures*⁴⁵ landed in the bookstores. Among Cowen’s key findings was that cross-cultural exchange not only alters and disrupts each society it touches, it also supports innovation and creative human energies.⁴⁶ Technological innovation is a touchstone in Cowen’s book, in which he describes the adoption of technological innovation to enhance the character and quality of cultural products, and the role of technological innovation in aiding the emergence and sustenance of niche interests that increase the variety and diversity of cultural products.⁴⁷

Richard Florida’s essay, “The Rise of the Creative Class,”⁴⁸ published in May 2002, and his subsequently published book *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life*, sparked discussion among academics, policy planners, and business leaders. Florida defined the creative class as “a fast-growing, highly educated, and well educated workforce” whose members worked in a wide variety of industries including technology, entertainment, journalism, finance, high-end manufacturing, and the arts.⁴⁹

At the “supercreative core” were scientists and engineers, university professors, poets and novelists, artists, entertainers, actors, designers, and architects, as well as the “thought leadership” of modern society. Like Cowen, Florida allied creativity and innovation. Reprising his argument in the *Atlantic Monthly*’s October 2005 “World in Numbers” column, Florida wrote that creative people form and cluster around hubs of

innovation where “ideas flow more freely, are honed more sharply, and can be put into practice more quickly.”⁵⁰

By Florida’s definition, many of the individuals who stood to benefit from the U.S.-India 123 Agreement were members of the creative class, especially those working in scientific and high technology fields who would be allowed to pursue collaborative, applied research and to initiate joint economic ventures. The creative class also resonated with members of the Indian Diaspora who were making their mark in Silicon Valley and other top-tier creative cities such as Boston and Washington-Baltimore.⁵¹ More broadly, Indians who had not ventured beyond their provincial or national boundaries were bolstered by the belief that the new economy and its creative class of knowledge workers would transform the lives of ordinary people, both socially and economically—spurring India’s own industrial revolution.⁵²

The shared values that defined the creative class—creativity, individuality, difference, and merit⁵³—were bound up in <creativity> in U.S.-India bilateral discourse. These qualities of the growing, transnational creative class provided a ready resource for Prime Minister Singh and President Bush to transcend individual identities. In their narrative construction, <creativity> shed its material competitiveness to represent a joint endeavor to provide a better life for all people regardless of their national allegiance. If <democracy> was a way of doing, <creativity> fully embraced idealism as a way of being. <Creativity>’s achievements belonged not to a national claimant, but to all humanity.

<Creativity> established Americans and Indians as innovators. This identification provided a sturdy foundation upon which to build consensus. <Creativity> did rhetorical

work in predisposing Members of Congress toward writing and voting on legislation authorizing the Bush Administration to conduct negotiations on a U.S.-India 123 Agreement. On the day after his arrival in Washington, Prime Minister Singh had the rhetorical task of reintroducing India and promoting the perception that the United States and India were indeed engaged democracies. In the bi-cameral and bi-partisan setting of a Joint Session of Congress, <creativity> had the benefit of nonpartisanship:

We admire the creativity and enterprise of the American people, the excellence of your institutions of learning, the openness of the economy, and your ready embrace of diversity. ... The field of civil nuclear energy is a vital area for cooperation between our two countries. As a consequence of our collective efforts, our relationship in this sector is being transformed.⁵⁴

Prime Minister Singh recognized that creativity and enterprise are qualities of the American character. Further, he called attention to the United States' centers of innovation, namely universities, and open economic policies that allowed members of the creative class to turn their ideas and designs into goods and services.

As stewards of these centers, the U.S.-Indian business community believed that the Agreement's promise, and their nations' partnership, extended far beyond their corporate balance sheets. Remarking on President Bush's March 2006 state visit to India, U.S.-India Business Council President Ron Somers told *India Abroad* that the Agreement was "much more important than can be quantified by near-term trade and investment. This initiative is about strengthening our partnership with the world's largest free-market democracy which, once completed, will change history."⁵⁵ The encompassing nature and impact of the Agreement and all it symbolized would become a consistent theme in the business community's discourse. Following passage of authorizing legislation in December 2006, the U.S.-India Business Council issued a statement, claiming:

What is accomplished today—given India’s wealth of human resources, its superior educational institutions, and its embrace of free-market democracy—goes far beyond the sale of nuclear reactors and atomic fuel, but is the beginning of an equal partnership based on trust and mutual respect that will change the economic and geopolitical destiny of the 21st century.⁵⁶

The embrace of “free-market democracy” connoted a belief that pluralism not only crossed but also integrated the political and economic spheres. Progress was undeniable. In the old industrial economy, progress would be achieved when competition spurred businesses to innovate, in order to stay one step ahead and dominate their respective markets. In the new economy, progress would be achieved through openness, transparency, and collaboration among the creators of knowledge and technology whose destinies were tied. The transnational business community conveyed the limitlessness of what they could accomplish together.

The Indian government and its people believed that the new economy would reduce the divide between India’s haves and have-nots.⁵⁷ In the words of Prime Minister Singh:

I am confident that from our talks today will emerge an agenda of cooperation that reflects a real transformation of our relationship. Its realization would help India meet the expectations of its people for a better quality of life, a more secure future, and a greater ability to participate in global creativity. I also believe that working together, our two countries can make a significant contribution to global peace, security and development.⁵⁸

As a bridge between domestic and global security, <creativity> signified far more than the continued growth of India’s gross domestic product. Prime Minister Singh’s invocation of <creativity> emitted idealism, with the responsibility to generate both economic and societal benefit, not only for their own countries, but for every country across the globe. Idealism is therefore an appropriate frame through which to interpret

Prime Minister Singh's welcoming remarks for President Bush, on the occasion of the President's March 2006 state visit to India:

Today, in India, we are engaged in a Himalayan adventure of pursuing development, improving the quality of life and modernizing one of the world's oldest civilizations. We seek to provide a social and economic environment at home that will unleash the creativity and enterprise of every Indian, thus enabling our people to live a life of dignity, fulfillment and self-respect. The United States has long been a partner in our journey of progress.⁵⁹

In this statement, Prime Minister Singh affirmed <creativity> as a source of inspiration common to all people. Progress, here denoted as development, quality of life, and modernization, possessed a self-actualizing telos. By describing creativity and enterprise as inherent to every Indian, these qualities represented ideals of being and living. The Prime Minister included the expression of creativity and personal industriousness within the protection of human rights and human dignity, elevating creativity to a universal value. The United States' example and the Indian peoples' own inclinations generated a magnetism between the two nations that was stronger than their individual differences.

The Indian and American people were one in spirit. U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford, in an essay titled "The Promise of India" published in *India Abroad*, validated this proposition:

It is clear beyond all doubt that our countries are linked by a deep commitment to freedom and democracy. We recognize, indeed, we celebrate national diversity, human creativity and innovation; a quest to expand prosperity and economic opportunity worldwide; and a desire to increase mutual security against the common threats posed by intolerance, terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.⁶⁰

Ambassador Mulford moved from "our countries" to "we," in quick succession, closing any lingering sense of separation. Similarly, Ambassador Mulford transitioned quickly from commitment to values to committed action. The range of action is expanded,

however. Prosperity and economic opportunity, the benefits of creativity and innovation, are felt worldwide. Ambassador Mulford's care in using a shared vocabulary aided this progression. Prime Minister Singh spoke of a Himalayan adventure and a journey of progress. Ambassador Mulford spoke of a quest to expand prosperity and opportunity. Neither India nor America could afford to stand still. The United States and India achieved consubstantiality in their movement toward an idealistic future, propelled by their shared belief that diversity, creativity, and innovation are the primogenitors of freedom and democracy.

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice affirmed this proposition in remarks to the U.S.-India Business Council, on the occasion of its 32nd anniversary in June 2007:

We know that democratic societies are those that tend to unleash the creativity of their people in order to be able to help meet these challenges. ... Sooner or later, if you want them to be creative at work and think freely and have ideas and communicate them freely, they're going to do it in the political sphere too. The fact that India, even though it is still a developing country, has, in a sense, a political system that has all of the accordion-like character of a democracy, where differences and interests can be represented, I think puts India ahead of many countries where growth is very rapid but where the political system isn't yet in place to accommodate some of those rising interests.⁶¹

In Secretary Rice's world view, the quality of a society is defined by the degree of freedom it affords to its people. Creativity is a societal force-multiplier that fosters a plurality of ideas and interests. Moreover, as a force for political and economic change, creativity cannot be contained. Rather, once it achieves its full expression, it infuses all aspects of society. A dynamic phenomenon, creativity can both channel and propagate a people's differences and interests. Accordingly, creativity introduces elasticity into political and civic life, and makes societal structures resilient to internal and external pressures.

U.S. and Indian rhetors reached into their own experience to give democracy a shared meaning that brought diversity and pluralism to the forefront. The recontextualization of democracy into pluralist societies and institutions provided the foundation for a common understanding of values and experiences that established U.S.-Indian engagement as the natural and expected condition of the bilateral relationship. The hail and response of courtship captured the energy generated when pragmatism and idealism become fused in discourse. Democracy provided a foundation that made the United States and India consubstantial in a way of life. Creativity made the United States and India consubstantial in the exercise of an intrinsic, universal, human impulse. Creativity realized future promise, and celebrated what the United States and India could contribute to the world.

Unity in Community: A Sojourning

Discourse engendered a sense of American-Indian unity in values shared and put into practice in public life. “Pluralism” and “creativity” worked as translational terms because they allowed Americans and Indians to celebrate and reify their shared experiences. Ideographs unify by reaffirming “who we are,” filtered through the lens of historical and cultural memory. They fix character. As motivators for unified action, they translate character into commitments and turn commitments into action. But they must be dynamic. Past and present temporal constraints on ideographs truncate their staying power. Ideographs need to be periodically rejuvenated through public remembrances, celebrations, and traditions to reaffirm their power to unify.

When rhetoric holds open a unifying moment that spools together the past, present, and future, that moment becomes transformative. Participants jointly constructing a narrative reach toward their envisioned future; simultaneously, the rhetorically constructed future state pulls them forward. Consubstantiation is more than an acting together. It is a sojourning together, and its narrative is self-propelling. Burke called the rhetorical resources of the sojourner “directional substance.”⁶² Directional substance privileges a present and future state of being, and externalizes an internal purpose.⁶³ When a rhetor uses metaphors for “the way” or advocates “a way forward,” he or she invokes directional substance.⁶⁴ Identification deepens in the reaching for a communal endeavor.

“Sojourning” is qualitatively different from journeying. Journey is a purposeful activity that involves movement in physical space from a starting point to an end point or destination that is pre-defined. In short, journey is goal-oriented.⁶⁵ The journey metaphor emphasizes the change in material conditions that will result from achieving the end goal, taking a predetermined path towards a socially valued destination.⁶⁶ One who is sojourning is seeking identity and belongingness; the sense of arrival—to have arrived—emerges from discourse that makes meaning of the experience. Arrival itself is a vicarious rather than physical experience; discourse reconstitutes a shared natal experience into collective consciousness.⁶⁷ The act of sojourning gives substance to this symbolic process. The experience is never fully cemented, however⁶⁸; the point of arrival is a peak that over time flattens into a plateau, a place from which to make a fresh start.

Sojourning emphasizes the change in character that comes from breaking with one's previous identity to assume a new identity. It is thus a transformational experience of being and becoming that rhetoric makes tangible and communal. The sojourner's narrative was expressed most clearly in the discourses of the Indian Diaspora community in the United States.⁶⁹ For this group, the U.S.-India 123 Agreement engendered a sense of cohesion and unity of purpose that would reconstitute Diasporans' political identity.

Attainment of an agreement for full civil nuclear cooperation, with its implications for science and technology and commerce, was a conduit for the Diaspora community to engage in all of the pillars of the U.S.-India strategic dialogue, including security cooperation. Debate expanded the range of Diasporans' socially acceptable activism, to include international development, environmental conservation, free trade, and Indian domestic security policies.⁷⁰ The range of what became permissible transformed both individual and collective identity, as the U.S.-India Political Action Committee's Sanjay Puri discussed in an interview with *National Public Radio*:

It used to be that you had two professions when you were growing up as an Indian-American, you know, you'll be a doctor or an engineer. I was the black sheep. I couldn't be either one of them. But now there are many, many more choices for young people. And they are figuring out that maybe entering into the public policy dialogue is important.⁷¹

Puri's reflection helps us appreciate the degree to which personal and professional identity overlapped within the Indian Diaspora in the United States. The younger generation of Diasporans—not coincidentally, those joining the transnational creative class—were freed from self-imposed limitations on personal and community achievement.

Diasporans drew on a range of cultural and social resources to bolster the argument of their arrival.⁷² No longer mere accompaniment, geopolitical visions and discourses interlaced transnational commerce to boost Diaspora community pride and influence,⁷³ displaying a wide spectrum of the Diasporic experience⁷⁴ to promote India's role as a "stable democracy in an unstable world."⁷⁵ California high-tech executive Arjun Bhugat, in an editorial roundtable with the *Washington Times* in the month following President Bush's state visit to India, described how a moment can unify a community:

This issue has galvanized our community like nothing we've seen in the past. If this deal does not pass, we fear those in India who never wanted a closer relationship with the United States will have all the ammunition they need to turn against us. ... Our Diaspora was always much more divided, but now we have the nuclear deal to unite us."⁷⁶

Bhugat exposed the divide between the Diaspora community and their brethren at home who had remained beholden to the Cold War paradigm. Implied in Bhugat's statement is the transformational power of the Diasporic experience to change perspectives and attitudes.⁷⁷ The debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement called the Diasporans to community. As a community, they were unified not only in their advocacy for the specific cause of civil nuclear cooperation, but also in their desire for closer relations between their home and adopted countries.

Sanjay Puri connected the moment to the Diaspora community's maturity as political actors:

The modest political power of Indian-Americans reflected the priorities of the first generation of immigrants—business and education. With so many doctors, entrepreneurs and managers in its ranks, the community targeted issues such as malpractice reform and visa policy instead of grand foreign policy issues. That's why the nuclear deal is a tipping point, a defining moment for us."⁷⁸

Puri attributed the transformation of the Indian Diaspora to generational change. The generational divide separated who Diasporans were and who they were becoming. More than the passing of a baton from one generation to the next, the up-and-coming generation possessed a wider view that informed their political aspirations. The generational theme textured the meaning of the moment. The Diaspora community's engagement in the public policy domain became integrated and holistic. Advocacy for the U.S.-India 123 Agreement transformed a fragmented group of individuals with a parochial outlook into a holistic community with a forward-looking purpose.

Within the U.S.-based Indian Diaspora, Congressman Bobby Jindal held a unique position, speaking simultaneously on behalf of the Diaspora and as a legislator who needed to weigh benefits and consequences for a range of constituents and advocates:

We are at an historic era where the relationship is finally going to be allowed to develop on its own. The U.S.-India relationship is no longer dominated by the Cold War. It is no longer dominated by other countries. You no longer have to say in the same breath Russia or Pakistan or China, but rather, the India-American relationship stands on its own.⁷⁹

The emphasis here is on the relationship, which Congressman Jindal turns into a living, breathing thing, with an inherent capacity to grow and mature, just as the Diaspora community itself had matured into political actors. Congressman Jindal removed contingencies that had prevented the United States and India from realizing the complete identification of courtship in a permanent union. The American Indian Diaspora represented in microcosm the hybridity and intersubjective understanding of being both Indian and American. Congressman Jindal directed energy from the external environment toward the bilateral relationship, in a manner that empowered the Diaspora

to act as integral members in that relationship. Only when the Indian Diaspora stood together could the Indian-American relationship stand on its own.

As debate progressed, voices within the Indian Diaspora expanded the scope of their influence. Robinder Sachdev, founder of the U.S.-India Political Action Committee, drew Indians on both continents into the moment:

India is today faced with an Excaliber moment in its young history as a nation state. The Excaliber was smelted in elements of supreme powers. Quite similarly, your farsighted vision and the conduct of the committee will smelt the Excaliber of India.⁸⁰

Excaliber represented a dawn of new potential; it was not about a purpose or a country, but a transcendent power. With this analogy, Sachdev constructed an entirely new meaning for the moment, now imbued with both urgency and purpose. By one interpretation, the moment would be a renewal and re-legitimation of India's sovereignty. Taking the Arthurian legend a step further, acting on the moment would ensure India's place at the (nuclear) table, as an equal, giving and receiving mutual aid (full civilian nuclear cooperation) and protection (maintaining its purview over its nuclear program).

The word "smelt" is itself a metaphor for the rhetorical act of consubstantiation,⁸¹ and thus provides a convenient coda to this section. In the smelting process, an object is returned to its base elements, and reforged in combination with new elements. The object that emerges from the smelter retains the essence of the former, with new qualities of the latter. And so it is with consubstantiation, when participants in discourse draw from unique and shared rhetorical resources and substances of identification to become "substantially one."⁸² The rhetorical act of consubstantiation generated a shared set of principles and desired outcomes that would allow the United States and India to act as one entity in global affairs.

Unity of Strategic Interests: A Convergence

Narratives that incorporate ideographs turn shared beliefs, values, and world views into unity. Narratives that incorporate directional substance create unity through a communal experience of identity-seeking and action. Diasporans' sojourner narrative overcame fragmentation to establish a new political identity that unified the community. Nonetheless, the transformative potential of the sojourner remained limited to this singular, albeit transnational, community.

The convergence narrative performed the additional rhetorical work required to unify the United States and India. Both Indians and Americans spoke of the passage from the Cold War into the post-Cold War era, implying a common definition of scene. The Post-Cold War period made the two countries open to change and movement, first to orient toward one another, and then to orient themselves toward their responsibilities as global actors. The convergence narrative made sense of the post-Cold War environment.

As the House of Representatives began to craft the Agreement's authorizing legislation—and proving that the golden age of oratory remained alive in the halls of Congress—Representative Henry Hyde put the future import of the changing scene on full display:

History is pockmarked with rising powers aggressively seeking their place in the sun, their singular purpose resulting in a challenge to and not an enhancement of the international order. At best, this has proved a needless drain on resources for others without any real advantage accruing to the guilty country. At worst, mindless disaster has resulted. There is no evidence that this is even a remote possibility, but the permanent anarchy of the world allows for many things once believed to be unimaginable. We have no other course but to consider such things and thereby inoculate ourselves against them.

But I would not want my remarks to be viewed through a distorting prism for my forecast is a sunny one. India is at a formative moment and facing profound decisions for her billion people, all of this occurring in a world which is quickly evolving into unfamiliar patterns, the old and familiar giving way to the unformed and new. My hope is she will join us in shaping this new era and take possession of the limitless possibilities that are hers to possess.⁸³

Congressman Hyde created a synchronic moment in which the new beginning for the international order, made possible by the dissolving of Cold War hierarchies, behaviors, and alliances, aligned with a new beginning in U.S.-India relations. The world was fluid, formless, indeterminate, and thus ready for making. Anarchy called forth a new order. External and unpredictable forces acting on the international system—not an individual nation-state—posed the threat that responsible states were obligated to mitigate. The challenge line of nation-states outside and inside the nuclear regime itself dissolved.

In Congressman Hyde's statement, identification worked as a transformative rather than a compensatory process. The expression of hope, that India "*will join in shaping this new era*" (emphasis added), was invitational, and thus affirmed India's freedom of choice to exercise sovereignty in ways deemed best for the Indian people. Congressman Hyde converted an "either/or" hard-power grammar that distinguished means and ends ("you're with us or against us") to a soft-power grammar ("we're all in this together") that reframed goals in terms of mutual stakes and shared responsibilities. The U.S.-India relationship of the past was built on contingencies and circumstances. The U.S.-India relationship of the future would combine pragmatism and principle.

The change in scene effectuated by the end of the Cold War restored to India its full volition and freedom to exercise its sovereignty. In the month following Congressional passage of authorizing legislation, as bilateral negotiations began in

earnest, Indian Minister of External Affairs Mukherjee attributed improvement in bilateral relations almost entirely to the end of the Cold War:

The end of the Cold War has liberated India to simultaneously deepen our relations with all the major power centres. We are no longer bound by the Cold War paradigm where good relations with one power automatically entailed negative consequences with its rivals. No great power today pursues exclusive cooperation with others. Nor is any one great power asking us to limit ties with others. India has learned that increased cooperation with one power opens the doors further with others.⁸⁴

The end of the Cold War, placed in the subject position, drove the action. The end of the Cold War opened a new period of time in which perspectives changed and relations were reformed. Zero-sum thinking was counter-productive. It was, as the Minister states, a learning opportunity, in which nation-states tested the trust of potential new partners (i.e., courtship) and adopted new, cooperative frameworks through which to act (i.e., consubstantiation). Minister Mukherjee presented a scene in which neighborhoods formerly separated by walls and fences gave way to a global ecosystem. Power was no longer husbanded, wielded, or contained; it circulated.

The convergence narrative performed an additional task. The convergence narrative reinterpreted the visible and kinetic effects of strategic interests and actions in a way that changed the frame for bilateral diplomacy from competition to cooperation, and from unilateralism to interdependence. Specifically, the convergence narrative removed “nonproliferation” from its controlling position in defining U.S.-India relations. The convergence narrative conjoined nonproliferation with other strategic interests such as energy independence, economic prosperity, and democratic governance.

This reinterpretation of strategic interests can be heard in Congressman Wilson’s reaction to the announcement of a major milestone in negotiations toward a 123

Agreement. Congressman Wilson established energy security and global nonproliferation as consonant and interchangeable goals that would be achieved through strategic partnership:

Today, President Bush and Prime Minister Singh made a decision to unite our common goals in an agreement which will advance our strategic partnership, enhance our energy security, and strengthen our global nonproliferation efforts. This positive development is another symbol of the strong bond that exists between our two nations.⁸⁵

Congressman Wilson employed a both/and grammar to put nonproliferation and energy security goals on the same plane. Initiatives and actions that enhanced energy security could lead to strengthened nonproliferation policies and norms just as easily as the Nonproliferation Treaty strengthened energy security. This both/and grammar shifted the definition of desirable behavior from compliance to cooperation.

The convergence narrative adopted a tone of neutrality toward strategic interests, a tacit acknowledgment of the circulatory nature in which issues and interests would ascend to the top of the agenda. As suggested in Congressman Neil Joeck's judgment of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, advancements toward one objective would generate cascading benefits for other issues and interests of concern:

Nonproliferation has historically adapted to new conditions and new opportunities. We should continue to adapt in order to achieve the overall goal of nonproliferation policy, a more secure world. The new agreement with India recognizes that international security is achieved through a layered approach.⁸⁶

If the Nonproliferation Treaty represented the views of the ecclesiastical, then the U.S.-India 123 Agreement represented the belief of evolutionists. The "layered approach" implied that one element of international security comes before another, such that any element is subject to being "overwritten" or covered by a subsequent element. However, "layering" denied any single issue a permanent, elevated position of dominance to frame

policy and action. Each issue is equally subject to being layered on, or layered over. The underlying layer will either recede or continue to express itself. An issue's place on the international agenda was contingent on the international scene from which it emerged.

As the pinnacle of nonproliferation at the center of the bilateral relationship collapsed, its energy radiated from the center outward, pushing the boundaries of strategic partnership. No longer limited to the terms and expectations of the nonproliferation regime, rhetors were free to frame partnership as a convergence of strategic interests. Burke gave license to this rhetorical move in "The Relation between Literature and Science," published in 1936 as a contributed essay to *The Writer in a Changing World*:

Imagine a circle—outside of it, imagine a series of dots—and outside these dots, imagine another circle. The inner circle represents an established structure of meanings, the familiar meanings with which one has grown up. They are "intimate." They name the important factors and relationships of one's experience, and they shape attitudes toward these factors. But in time, outside this circle of meanings, new material accumulates. This new material is not adequately handled by the smaller circle of meanings. ... People then must strive to draw a wider circle that will encompass this new matter, left inadequately charted or located by the smaller circle.⁸⁷

This passage describes the rhetorical movement that allowed rhetors to equate full civilian nuclear cooperation with the quality of the U.S.-India strategic partnership as a whole.

If nonproliferation had remained predominant, rhetors would have responded by connecting the dots radially from the center, as if drawing a line from zero to infinity,⁸⁸ interpreting strategic interests narrowly, according to a single, dominant frame. Instead, rhetors connected the outer ring of dots, defining a new, more expansive circumference for the issues and interests held in common. This robust interpretation of dramatic

motive put strategic partnership at the *generative* center of the bilateral relationship. The issues and interests that composed the outer ring could interchangeably represent the strategic partnership, just as the strategic partnership enveloped each of the issues and interests upon which the United States and India might converge at any point in time.

Following the success of President Bush's state visit to India in March 2006, Indian Foreign Secretary Saran tightly wound change in the external environment and interdependence into the convergence narrative:

India perceives the world today as one where the global agenda is being set by a constellation of nations including the United States, the EU, Russia, China, Japan and India. The United States is, and for the foreseeable future, will remain a pre-eminent power. However, no single nation can bear global burdens alone and the current international situation is characterised by the willingness of major nations to work together on issues and challenges where they perceive strong convergence. The era when global politics was a zero-sum game is now decisively behind us. Leading nations, even when they compete, have inter-dependencies and linkages amongst themselves that they ignore at their own peril.⁸⁹

The convergence narrative placed India within the constellation of other signatories to the Nonproliferation Treaty and related agreements. India no longer acted in isolation. The narrative established a center of gravity for convergence, acknowledging the pre-eminence of the United States. As a nation-state within the constellation, the United States could not act unilaterally. Rather, the United States exercised power by conditioning the system through which other nation-states navigated their own orbits. An action that strengthened one nation could benefit all the nations within the constellation; an action that weakened a nation could sap the strength of all. Convergence described the movement of the system as a whole.

In an interview with the Indian Diaspora weekly *India Abroad* in June 2006, Senator Richard Lugar amplified the idea of an interdependent constellation of nations, absent the specific metaphor:

By concluding this pact and the far-reaching set of cooperative agreements that accompany it, President Bush has embraced a long-term outlook that seeks to enhance the core strength of our foreign policy in a way that will give us new diplomatic options and improve global stability. With this agreement, the President and Secretary Rice are asking Congress to see the opportunities that lie beyond the horizon of the current presidential term. A congressional rejection of the agreement—or an open-ended delay—risks wasting a critical opportunity to begin to expand beyond our Cold War alliance structure to include dynamic nations with whom our interests are converging.⁹⁰

The expansion of the Cold War alliance structure accommodated nation-states such as India that had their own gravitational pull. Convergence was the magnetism of two members within the constellation coming into the same orbit. When the United States and India achieved their permanent alignment, the resulting energy would stabilize the system as a whole.

By the same token, failure to finalize an Agreement would place the United States and India on different trajectories. As explained by Robinder Sachdev, founder of the U.S.-India Political Action Committee, if the Agreement failed, U.S. and Indian interests might occasionally intersect, but would never fully converge:

Relations between the United States and India are truly on an inflexion point—a good deal between the two nations has a plethora of dividends for both, though there may be some interests being compromised by both countries. However, a non-deal will lead to an altogether different orbit for India in international affairs. Not to say that that orbit will be good or bad for U.S. relations, but it certainly will be a different path.⁹¹

We hear in Sachdev's statement a sense of urgency attached to the convergence narrative. Bilateral dialogue leading up to the U.S.-India 123 Agreement represented a slow and steady pace in which to expand the scope of issues and interests in common. The U.S.-

India 123 Agreement, by contrast, was a “big bang” that would birth an entirely new relationship.

Whereas Foreign Secretary Saran’s formulation presented an anodyne perspective on nation-state relations, Senator Lugar’s discourse invited participation in the narrative. Participants could foretell the promise of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, envisioning or “reading in” to the statement the benefits they most desired. Armed with this subjective foresight, participants had confidence in reciprocity as a mode of diplomatic engagement.

Indian Foreign Secretary Menon constructed convergence as a phenomenon that enveloped the United States and India, as well as the bilateral relationship as its own entity:

We have leaders with a vision of what we should be doing together, of our place in the world, what we want to be and a vision of how important India-US relations are. But it also is more—I think it reflects the fact that India has changed, the world has changed. Wherever I look, whether it’s in our immediate neighborhood—subcontinent Asia or in the bigger global issues—I see convergence.⁹²

The act of seeing was a common aspect of how Senator Lugar and Secretary Menon framed their narratives around convergence. Secretary Menon alluded to India’s experience of having passed through the Cold War period with a changed perspective of itself, of America, and the global order. This changed perspective enabled India to see converging interests where they previously did not exist, and to redefine its interests as converging rather than competing with the United States.

Among the rhetors who constructed the convergence narrative, Under Secretary Burns spoke explicitly on the need to take pragmatic action:

I think this partnership rests on a very solid foundation, not just of democratic values, but of converging geopolitical interests between the two countries. I believe that this partnership will be for the twenty-first century one of the most important partnerships that our country, the United States, has with any country around the world. I would argue that in 20 or 30 years' time most Americans will say that India is one of our two or three most important partners worldwide.⁹³

The United States and India managed spheres of influence that previously clashed but now overlapped. In Secretary Saran's constellation metaphor, spheres of influence are more integrated than overlapping. Cooperation allowed nation-states to pursue the same goal in their own way. Integration entailed co-dependence among nation-states, requiring each to account for and motivate the other's position and action, to put oneself in the other's place, and to see oneself through the eyes of the other.

With a future-focused and expansive temporal reach, the convergence narrative effectively reframed the bilateral relationship. At the conclusion of the debate in October 2008, Minister of External Affairs Mukherjee turned the convergence narrative into an all-encompassing vision:

We are both very satisfied with the status of our bilateral relationship and are convinced of the future potential. Today India and the U.S. engage as partners across the entire range of human endeavour. ... As we look back with satisfaction at the transformation of India-US relations, we are convinced of the future prospects of this relationship. The vision for this relationship laid down by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President Bush is one that serves the interests of our peoples, and those of the region and the world. India and the United States, as two democracies with shared values, look forward to building this partnership based on principle and pragmatism in the years to come.⁹⁴

Minister Mukherjee left the future state to the imagination. The potentiality of the future bade the partners to prospect together and to share in the rewards of their joint labor.

Minister Mukherjee's vision of the future thus encircled a transnational, regional, and global citizenry who continually strive to achieve their full—but unspecified and perhaps as yet unseen—potential. Minister Mukherjee framed cooperation around the actors

whose discourses and values would animate the partnership. Framing the partnership according to its potential agency, as a pragmatic instrument for change, helped rhetors manage away uncertainty about either partner's future intent.

The narrative pulled the United States and India from a period of estrangement through a period of engagement and into a strategic partnership. Over the course of the three-year debate, the convergence narrative acquired at first a refined range of political, economic, and security issues in which U.S. and Indian interests converged. At the end of the debate, the convergence narrative and the bilateral partnership had acquired an equally expansive and self-perpetuating quality.

U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice issued the consummate statement on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement:

And so today, we look to the future, a shared future in which both our nations together rise to our global responsibilities and our global challenges as partners. Let us use this partnership to shape an international order in which all states can exercise their sovereignty securely, responsibly, and in peace. Let us use this partnership to tackle the great global challenges of our time: energy security and climate change, terrorism and violent extremism, transnational crime and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Let us use this partnership to protect and promote our common values: human rights and human dignity, democracy, liberty, and the rule of law for people who are diverse in background but joined together in spirit and aspirations. And let us use our partnership to drive a new social justice agenda for the 21st century by promoting good and uncorrupt governance, by expanding free and fair global trade, by advancing health and education, and supporting the millions and millions of people who are striving to lift themselves out of poverty.⁹⁵

Read holistically, Secretary Rice met the expectations of an epideictic moment in U.S.-India bilateral diplomacy. Certain that the U.S.-India 123 Agreement would come into force, Secretary Rice's "let us use this partnership" litany framed the United States and India not as co-arguers, but as joint actors.

The synecdoche of Agreement and partnership allowed Secretary Rice the latitude to bind the United States and India as co-creators of both. The Agreement therefore contained the motivations of both nations' leaders. Because the leaders acted in their official and representative capacities, the Agreement expressed the aspirations and will of their people.⁹⁶ As Secretary Rice's litany progressed from material interests to global benefits and universal goods, she elevated the frame of the partnership from a vehicle to achieve pragmatic change to a character-driven relationship that channeled shared motivations into symbolic action.⁹⁷

Convergence performed rhetorical work as a transcendental term. The word itself possesses a forward-driving energy. Of the three strategies of unification discussed—shared ideals and the commitment to democracy; the sojourner narrative and commitment to community; and the convergence of pragmatism and principle in shared strategic interests—the convergence narrative offered the strongest confirmation to participants in discourse that their movement toward a permanent union was both right and inevitable. In comparison to shared values, the convergence narrative was less beholden to present space and time, creating a shared orientation, trajectory, and momentum to reach out and seize the future. In comparison to the sojourner narrative, the convergence narrative encompassed the entirety of the United States and India, as opposed to the Diaspora with its unique transnational identity.

The convergence narrative left open-ended the possibilities for where and when convergence would be complete. Participants in discourse channeled this energy toward resolution of the 123 Agreement. Because the 123 Agreement symbolized the relationship as a whole, its resolution filled out the vision of a shared destiny and the

promise of a strategic partnership that would endure through inevitable changes in circumstances and their contingencies.

Convergence rejected binary divisions, reinterpreted the relationships among issues that defined the quality of relations, and affirmed the Nonproliferation Treaty's norms while resisting the legalistic and punitive means by which those norms are typically enforced. Convergence became the synoptic frame that turned bilateral dialogue into comprehensive strategic partnership. Rhetors effectuated convergence by adapting their discourse to a dynamic ordering of issues, giving strategic partnership an agency of its own that surpassed the actions of any single party to it. The qualities of the partnership conditioned the qualities of the acts that would be performed under its auspices, and the quality of the acts in turn reflected on the national character of the actors who performed those acts.

A Relationship Transformed

The rhetorical work of soft power converted the contingency of courtship into the rightness and inevitability of a permanent union. U. S. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Richard Boucher made adroit use of this second technique in remarks to the Confederation of Indian Industry: "Years from now, when people gather to discuss our relationship, they will remark upon the across-the-board transformation of U.S.-India relations that took place in the first decades of the 21st century."⁹⁸ Assistant Secretary Boucher posited a people looking back upon the present, as if the action had already occurred and borne its benefits.

Soft power discourses replaced the hard power cycle of sanctions and export controls with a virtuous circle of reciprocity. Rhetoric-as-persuasive gave way to rhetoric-as-constitutive approaches. The soft power discourses generated during the debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement fostered attraction through rhetoric that constituted grounds for action, identifications, and relationships.

More specifically, soft power discourses deepened identification, consubstantiating the United States and India as pluralist societies committed to democracy and as innovators and builders of the new economy. The recontextualization of democracy into pluralist societies and institutions provided the foundation for a common understanding of values and experiences that established U.S.-Indian engagement as the natural and expected condition of the bilateral relationship. <Pluralism> and <creativity> were the conduits through which <democracy> could be mutually understood and jointly enacted.

Soft power discourses constituted the U.S. Indian Diaspora as a community with a cohesive political identity. The sojourner narrative incorporated directional substance to unify individuals in a shared experience and interpretation of the moment that became a call to community. The sojourner narrative condensed past-present-future, rallying the Diaspora community in the belief that the U.S.-India 123 Agreement was their moment to come into their own as political actors.

Soft power discourses reinterpreted the post-Cold War scene and established a new, cooperative frame for advancing strategic interests, consubstantiating the United States and India as strategic partners. The convergence narrative propelled the relationship forward, affirming participants' sense that their union would generate

positive changes for themselves and the global community. Through the convergence narrative, the U.S.-India 123 Agreement came to symbolize the quality of the U.S.-India partnership in its entirety. Because the 123 Agreement symbolized the relationship as a whole, its resolution constituted the United States and India in a permanent union based in shared principles and purposes. The quality of the partnership, the quality of the bilateral achievements made in its name, and the qualities of character ascribed to the partners were indelibly the same, constituting a bilateral partnership of high integrity and authenticity.

Discourse transformed the context, social order, and substance of the U.S.-India relationship, effectuating India's movement from outside to inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime, and moving the state of relations from estranged to engaged. In their deepening identification from courtship to consubstantiation, rhetors were co-arguers and co-creators of strategic partnership. Because courtship and consubstantiation have explanatory and probative force for Nye's soft power processes of attraction, and because these processes achieve unity in purposes and action—a rhetorical and material convergence—convergence is the appropriate telos of soft power diplomacy.

Notes

¹ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1950; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 21. Citations are to the California edition.

² Ibid.

³ Dennis Kux, *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991*. (Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific, 2002), 314.

⁴ “U.S. Dismayed by Blast, Soviet Union Uncritical,” *Washington Post*, May 19, 1974, A12.

⁵ Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2009), 91.

⁶ Itty Abraham, “The Ambivalence of Nuclear Histories,” *Osiris* 21, no. 1 (2006): 51.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ President of India N.S. Reddy, toast in honor of President Carter, January 2, 1978, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ President Carter, Remarks on Signing the Delhi Declaration, January 3, 1978, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

¹¹ Prime Minister Desai, joint remarks during welcoming ceremony, June 13, 1978, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

¹² President Carter, joint remarks during welcoming ceremony, June 13, 1978, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

¹³ Rudra Chaudhuri, *Forged in Crisis: India and the United States Since 1947* (New York, NY: 2014), 182.

¹⁴ C. Raja Mohan, *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy* (New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2003), 91.

¹⁵ Dennis Kux, *India and the United States*, 153.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 189.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 339.

¹⁸ President Carter, Nuclear Power Policy Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session with Reporters on Decisions Following a Review of U.S. Policy, April 7, 1977, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

¹⁹ President Carter, International Economic Summit Meeting Exchange with Reporters following a State Dinner at Buckingham Palace, May 7, 1977, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

²⁰ Dennis Kux, *India and the United States*, 356.

²¹ Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century*, 91.

²² President Carter, Remarks before the Indian Parliament, January 2, 1978, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

²³ White House Statement on Senate Approval of Fuel Shipments, September 24, 1980, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

²⁴ Message to Congress Transmitting Executive Order 12055, April 27, 1978, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

²⁵ Message to Congress, Export of Special Nuclear Material and Components to India, June 19, 1980, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

²⁶ Milton R. Benjamin, "U.S. Responds to Indian Offer in Nuclear Impasse," *Washington Post*, November 5, 1978, A27.

²⁷ Dennis Kux, *India and the United States*, 388-389.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 389.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 391.

³⁰ President Reagan and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, Joint Remarks, October 20, 1987, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

³¹ C. Raja Mohan, *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy* (New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2003), 94.

³² Ibid., 94.

³³ President Clinton's News Conference with Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao of India, May 19, 1994, accessed from the American Presidency Project, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on April 7, 2014.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Teresita C. Schaffer, 95.

³⁷ Michael Calvin McGee authored the seminal essay; see "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 1-16.

³⁸ Michael Calvin McGee, "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 7.

³⁹ President Bush, Remarks at Welcoming Ceremony for Prime Minister Singh, July 18, 2005.

⁴⁰ Prime Minister Singh at Welcoming Ceremony, July 18, 2005.

⁴¹ President Bush, Exchange of Toasts, July 18, 2005.

⁴² Prime Minister Singh, Exchange of Toasts, July 18, 2005.

⁴³ President Bush, address on the United States, India, and Nuclear Technology, March 3, 2006.

⁴⁴ Allen J. Scott, "Creative Cities: Conceptual Issues and Policy Questions," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 28, no. 1 (2006): 3.

⁴⁵ Tyler Cowen, *Creative Destruction: How Globalization Is Changing the World's Cultures*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

⁴⁶ Max Grinnell, review of *Creative Destruction: How Globalization Is Changing the World's Cultures*, by Tyler Cowen, *Annals of the National Association of American Geographers* 93, no. 4 (December 2003): 937.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Richard Florida, “The Rise of the Creative Class,” *The Washington Monthly* (May 2002): 15-25.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 17.

⁵⁰ Richard Florida, “The World Is Spiky,” *The Atlantic Monthly* (October 2005): 50.

⁵¹ Richard Florida, “The Rise of the Creative Class,” 17. Among the top 10 large cities in Florida’s ranking, Boston was tied for third with San Diego; Washington-Baltimore was ranked number 8.

⁵² Gurcharan Das, *India Unbound: The Social and Economic Revolution from Independence to the Global Information Age* (New York, NY: Anchor Books, 2002), 325-326.

⁵³ Richard Florida, “The Rise of the Creative Class,” 17.

⁵⁴ Prime Minister Singh, Address to Joint Session of Congress, July 19, 2005.

⁵⁵ Ron Somers, *India Abroad*, March 31, 2006.

⁵⁶ U.S.-India Business Council, news release issued December 18, 2006.

⁵⁷ Gurcharan Das, *India Unbound*, 325.

⁵⁸ Prime Minister Singh at Welcoming Ceremony, July 18, 2005.

⁵⁹ Prime Minister Singh, Speech at Banquet Hosted in Honor of the U.S. President George W. Bush, March 2, 2006.

⁶⁰ U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford, “The Promise of India,” *India Abroad*, May 5, 2006.

⁶¹ Secretary Rice, Remarks at the U.S.-India Business Council 32nd Anniversary “Global India” Summit, June 27, 2007.

⁶² Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1945; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 31. Citations are to the California edition.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 32.

⁶⁵ Jonathan Charteris-Black, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 74.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 95.

⁶⁷ Stephen H. Browne, "Samuel Danforth's 'Errand into the Wilderness' and Discourse of Arrival in Early American Culture," *Communication Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 92.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 100.

⁶⁹ I define Diaspora community as a people with a shared consciousness that accommodates multiple relationships, experiences, and identities. See "Diaspora as Social Consciousness," http://www.rhetoricalens.info/wp-content/themes/rhetoricalens/pdf/Diaspora_as_Consciousness.pdf, accessed April 13, 2014.

⁷⁰ Ajay Gandhi, "The Indian Diaspora in Global Advocacy," *Global Networks* 2, no. 2 (2002): 360.

⁷¹ Sanjay Puri, interview with *National Public Radio*, June 19, 2006.

⁷² Amit Kumar Gupta, "Commentary on India's Soft Power and Diaspora," *International Journal on World Peace* 25, no. 3 (September 2008): 62.

⁷³ Sanjay Chaturvedi, "Diaspora in India's Geopolitical Visions: Linkages, Categories, and Contestations," *Asian Affairs* 32, no. 3 (2005): 141-168; Walter Anderson, "The Indian-American Community Comes into its Political Own," *India Abroad*, September 1, 2006.

⁷⁴ Pablo Shiladitya Bose, "Home and Away: Diasporas, Developments and Displacements in a Globalising World," *Journal of International Studies* 29, no. 1 (February 2008): 114.

⁷⁵ Rafiq Dossani, "Indian Soft Power and Associations of the American Diaspora," p. 6. Full text downloaded from <http://aparc.stanford.edu> on October 20, 2010.

⁷⁶ Arjun Bhugat, *Washington Times*, April 9, 2006.

⁷⁷ See literature review and linked abstracts at http://208.73.48.91/?page_id=174.

⁷⁸ Sanjay Puri, *Washington Times*, April 9, 2006.

⁷⁹ Congressman Bobby Jindal, *India Abroad*, March 24, 2006.

- ⁸⁰ Robinder Sachdev, *India Abroad*, October 5, 2007.
- ⁸¹ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, xix.
- ⁸² Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 21.
- ⁸³ Congressman Henry Hyde, House International Relations Committee, November 16, 2005.
- ⁸⁴ Minister of External Affairs Mukherjee, National Launch of the Global India Foundation, January 16, 2007.
- ⁸⁵ Congressman Joe Wilson, statement, March 2, 2006.
- ⁸⁶ Congressman Neil Joeck, House International Relations Committee, October 26, 2005.
- ⁸⁷ Jane Blankenship, Edward Murphy and Marie Rosenwasser, "Pivotal Terms in the Early Works of Kenneth Burke," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 7, no. 1 (1974): 2.
- ⁸⁸ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 87.
- ⁸⁹ Foreign Secretary Shyam Saran, Heritage Foundation, March 30, 2006.
- ⁹⁰ Senator Richard Lugar, *India Abroad*, June 30, 2006.
- ⁹¹ Robinder Sachdev, *India Abroad*, June 16, 2006.
- ⁹² Foreign Secretary Shiv Shankar Menon, Carnegie Endowment, February 22, 2007.
- ⁹³ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, Heritage Foundation, May 23, 2007
- ⁹⁴ Minister of External Affairs Shri Pranab Mukherjee, Joint Press Interaction, October 4, 2008.
- ⁹⁵ Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Signing Ceremony, October 10, 2008.
- ⁹⁶ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 175.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 278.
- ⁹⁸ Assistant Secretary of State Richard Boucher, Remarks to the Confederation of Indian Industry, April 7, 2006.

Chapter 4

Fulfilling Commitments

My dissertation project broadens and deepens our understanding of soft power diplomacy. My critique demonstrates the suitability and benefit of adopting dramatism as a theoretical underpinning for soft power processes of attraction. Further, I establish a constitutive role for rhetoric in the conduct of soft power diplomacy, and find that diplomatic discourse has the capacity to transform two nation-states' strained relationship into an enduring and resilient bilateral partnership.

The question of how this transformation occurs drives my rhetorical critique. Selecting discourses generated by the U.S.-India 123 Agreement has proven to be a sound choice to help answer this question. Described as a watershed moment in U.S.-India relations, the 123 Agreement is a unique and novel element of the bilateral partnership. After decades of coercive tactics such as sanctions and export controls failed to convince India to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the U.S.-India 123 Agreement—with its reciprocal commitments, joint obligations, and mutual benefits—ushered India into the community of cooperating nuclear states. Thus, my dissertation project opens a window on how soft power discourse catalyzes and capitalizes on moments that portend a transformation in bilateral relations.

Three key words make up the above statement of benefits: discourse, transformation, and relations. For rhetorical critics, I place an emphasis on discourse. My dissertation research demonstrates the potential to enrich our limited study of diplomatic discourse. Further, my critique generates insight into dramatisitic theory and criticism,

including the development of ideographs in diplomatic discourse; the importance of Kenneth Burke's substances of identification to the joint construction of narratives; and the rhetorical enactment of courtship and consubstantiation.

For soft power theorists, I place an emphasis on transformation. This term encapsulates the rhetorical work of soft power discourse. However, acceptance of this claim requires a reinterpretation of soft power from the rhetoric-as-persuasive to the rhetoric-as-constitutive perspective. When understood as a creation of constitutive rhetoric, the telos, processes, and resources of soft power become more transparent. That is, we gain insight into how soft power actually works in and through discourse. Additionally, the rhetorical perspective on soft power diplomacy increases the ease with which soft power theory can be contextualized and integrated with diplomatic tradecraft.

For the diplomatic corps, I place an emphasis on the relationship between two nation-states. This emphasis also requires reflection on how we talk about diplomatic aims and achievements. The discourses generated by the U.S.-India 123 Agreement offer a counter-point to accounts that are centered around a nation-state or another entity as an actor on the international stage. There is value in emphasizing the relationship, along with the texts and discourses that symbolize the relationship, over and above the nation-states themselves.

Of interest to the diplomatic corps, I asked how the U.S.-India 123 Agreement evolved from an idea about nuclear cooperation into a symbol of bilateral partnership. The answer I offer is that this change occurred through soft power diplomacy, understood as a discursive process that reconstituted identities and relationships. Along with this

answer are practical steps that members of the diplomatic corps can take to recognize and act on transformative moments.

In sum, my dissertation examines a key moment when diplomatic discourse transformed a bilateral relationship. Accordingly, my research offers something of value to rhetorical theorists and critics, soft power proponents, and practitioners of diplomacy. In the pages that follow, I elaborate the findings and conclusions of my dissertation research for each of these three communities in turn.

Endorsing the Rhetoric of Diplomacy

In this section, I address the community of rhetorical theorists and scholars, opening with the proposal to treat the rhetoric of diplomacy as a distinct genre that sits at the intersection of rhetorical criticism and diplomacy studies. I summarize the benefits that a rhetorical perspective brings to diplomacy studies, highlighting examples from my dissertation in which an understanding of discourse generated insight that would not have been possible otherwise. I then discuss specific insights from my rhetorical critique that deepen our understanding of dramatistic theory and criticism, including ideographic criticism, narrative, and core elements of Kenneth Burke's dramatism.

The Rhetoric of Diplomacy

The rhetoric of diplomacy is closely related to foreign policy rhetoric, but with two important distinctions. Criticism in foreign policy rhetoric is heavily influenced by presidential rhetoric and public address scholarship, and the desire to interrogate the relationship between a president and the people. Critique is most often attuned to one

rhetor's words and their resonance. By contrast, the rhetoric of diplomacy necessarily entails the effect of discourse on participants' respective constituencies as well as diplomatic relations. The rhetoric of diplomacy therefore focuses a critical lens on dialogue, engagement, or negotiation involving two or more nation-states or other foreign policy actors. This genre of discourse requires critical methods that heighten attention to the intersubjectivity that is characteristic of dialogue and negotiation. Critics working within the rhetoric of diplomacy listen for the harmonics created when two speakers address each other.

I base my call for a rhetoric of diplomacy in the juxtaposition of the published literature with the subject matter of my dissertation research. At the conclusion of the literature review, I highlighted Martín Carcasson's essay. Carcasson performed a narrative analysis of the discourses generated by Israeli and Palestinian negotiators on the occasion of the September 13, 1993, signing ceremony of the Oslo Accord. Pulling both verbal and visual messages into his analysis, Carcasson discovered that the leaders' discourse symbolically transformed long-standing animosities of conflict by reframing protagonists and antagonists. Within this alternative narrative, the Oslo Accord was a victory for peacemakers on both sides.¹ In my judgment, this essay exemplifies rhetorical critique of diplomatic engagement, which I believe deserves attention independent of foreign policy rhetoric.

A concerted effort to generate a literature in the rhetoric of diplomacy possesses fresh opportunity and hard challenges. The opportunities come from the increased availability of texts and articles. Many texts are available through official sources, such as free subscriptions to news feeds, and articles and speeches e-published daily by the

State Department's Bureau of International Information Programs. News organizations now routinely cover happenings at Foggy Bottom, including "insider" information available through *The Cable*, a Foreign Policy magazine blog. In addition to host governments and foreign Embassies making texts and articles available online, the move toward digital diplomacy and e-diplomacy has increased opportunities to witness if not participate in government-to-people and people-to-people diplomacy. As more students with native or second language skills pursue rhetoric, the opportunities to explore diplomatic discourse increases exponentially.

The hard challenge comes from the realization that an episodic approach to diplomatic discourse will yield limited insight, even with a complete accounting of the context for the discursive exchange. The narratives that emerged in the discourses that I collected and critiqued unfolded over three years, punctuated by three diplomatic events of milestones: Prime Minister Singh's July 2005 state visit; President Bush's reciprocal state visit to New Delhi in March 2006; and statements issued by officials of both countries in the fall of 2008 when the Agreement's ratification became assured. These events included welcoming remarks and responses, joint press events, formal remarks or public address, and exchanges of toasts through which the heads of state and their surrogates initiated and furthered their courtship. Looking at one event in isolation would have told only part of the story; only by exploring multiple inflection points throughout the entirety of the debate do we gain full appreciation of the transformative power of discourse.

The rhetorical critic has a wide array of relationships available for study. The United States is engaged in bilateral dialogue and partnership building with countries too

numerous to mention, each of which offers the potential to bind rhetorical critique to the evolution of consequential and transformative issues. An interdisciplinary team approach can help increase the feasibility of longitudinal study. As students of rhetoric look for professional opportunities outside the Academy, they will discover opportunities to embed with organizations conducting bilateral strategic dialogues or implementing bilateral advocacy strategies.

More important than practicalities of access, language skills, and feasibility, rhetoricians possess the materials and methods to discover new things about discursive exchange in a diplomatic context. Rhetoricians understand how words-as-symbols function in the context of social relations. Words-as-symbols unify people into a community and direct concerted action. When words-as-symbols are working within diplomatic discourse, a text or an Agreement has the potential to become this symbol.

In my own study, a rhetorical perspective gave me the unique ability to explain how the U.S.-India 123 Agreement came to symbolize the entirety of the bilateral partnership. Discourse placed the locus of action in the agreement, imbuing the text with its own source of agency. As rhetors performed the rhetorical act of courtship, discourse made inseparable the qualities of the Agreement, national character, and the acts taken under the Agreement's auspices.

Rhetoricians have a unique perspective on new and non-traditional actors' entry into international affairs. Rhetoricians possess a unique vantage point on how new and non-traditional actors in diplomacy construct and express their identity, form a community, and exercise their voice and social agency. The debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement invited the participation of Indian Diasporans in the United States. Arjun

Bhugat described how the progress toward the 123 Agreement “galvanized our community.”² Robinder Sachdev likened to the 123 Agreement to India’s “Excaliber moment.”³ From a rhetorical perspective, the Diasporans were more than constituents or advocates in a political process; rhetorical critique uncovered the subtext of Diasporans’ influence. The sojourner narrative gave meaning and energy to a community in the process of constituting itself. Rhetorical-critical theory and methods can identify the ways in which these voices enrich the texture of bilateral diplomacy and constitute new relationships between governments, their peoples, and transnational communities.

Lastly, the study of diplomatic discourse can generate new insights into the activation of a transnational shared orientation or world view. With these insights, rhetoricians can shed insight into nation-states’ movement toward consensus and concerted action. Turning again to the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, discourse shaped the meaning of the end of the Cold War for the U.S.-India alliance, thereby changing some of the fundamental assumptions that guided how both the United States and India made sense of world events. The convergence narrative drew energy from this change of scene.

Recall Congressman Hyde’s soliloquy on the post-Cold War era as a formative moment, for India and the world; as nation-states freed themselves from old patterns, they entered a future of limitless possibilities.⁴ Interpreting the words of Shri Pranab Mukherjee, India’s Minister of External Affairs, the change of scene reduced zero-sum thinking and welcomed international cooperation.⁵ Rhetorical critique brought forward the concept maps that established “convergence” as a shared lens through which the United States and India interpreted actions taken by themselves, by the other, and by

those apart from the bilateral relationship. Convergence changed the orientational metaphor⁶ guiding U.S.-Indian relations from non-alignment to cooperation, and from competitive advantage to mutual gain.

By expanding the corpus of rhetorical critique of diplomatic discourse, we establish new foci for rhetorical study. These include the potential of diplomatic texts to reconstitute nation-state relations, as the U.S.-India 123 Agreement reconstituted the bilateral partnership; appreciation of the complexity of rhetorical resources that call a transnational community into being and empower its members to act; and the power of discourse to open liminal moments in which nation-states and their peoples may reconfigure their perceptions of their place in world affairs and their role as change agents. Discourse brings about a change in scene, and with it, a change in perspective.

Deepening Our Knowledge of Dramatism

As my critique demonstrates, scholarly attention to diplomatic discourse can generate new knowledge for rhetorical criticism and theory building. In this section, I delve into three inter-related aspects of dramatisitic theory and critique. In turn, I discuss the work of ideographs in bilateral diplomatic discourse, the ways in which narrative can deepen identification, and the rhetorical moves that participants in discourse perform to overcome their sense of estrangement and achieve a sense of unity.

Ideographic Criticism

The benefits of ideographic critique can be traced to Michael Calvin McGee's seminal works, "In Search of "The People": A Rhetorical Alternative,"⁷ and "The

‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology,”⁸ in which he provided a method to deconstruct political language that dictates decisions and controls public belief and behavior. An ideograph is representative but not entirely reductive of a political philosophy or orientation; ideographs both constrain and produce discourse, and are therefore malleable substances for narrative construction. As super-charged words-as-symbols, ideographs unify individuals in a common interpretation of their collective history, culture, and political belief, marshalling and channeling political will to effectuate societal change.⁹

My critique opens a new dimension for the study of ideographs. The hail and response of courtship performed by President Bush and Prime Minister Singh re-animated two ideographs, <democracy> and <creativity>, rooted in the two nations’ experience. My critique therefore charts the synchronic development of ideographs in a symbolic exchange, and allows me to assert that ideographic criticism is a key contributor to a rhetoric of diplomacy.

When President Bush and Prime Minister Singh announced their intent to pursue full civilian nuclear cooperation, they opened <democracy> to new meanings and interpretations. My critique describes how U.S. and Indian rhetors transcended their division by reaching toward the same idealization of <democracy>, celebrated in discourse and lauded in lived experience as pluralism. When textured with pluralism, <democracy> became a universal value that transcended the divide of geography, history, and national experience.

Discourse consubstantiated the United States and India in <democracy> and its spiral development. The exchange between President Bush and Prime Minister Singh

during the Prime Minister's July 2005 state visit illustrated this pattern. Discourse began and ended with the premise that <democracy> ensured collective security. As discourse progressed through this cycle, the locus of action shifted. The narrative opened with a focus on external threats that necessitated democracy in self-defense. It closed by exclaiming the chosen, if not ordained, role to protect others, necessitated by the fact that the United States and India *were democracies*. In this regard, <democracy> carried with it an obligation to serve as the world's protectors.

Beginning with President Bush's welcoming remarks, the pair met "as leaders of two great democracies committed to working together for a better and safer world,"¹⁰ each acting independently, overseeing his own realm. President Bush conjoined two premises, that "our nations believe in freedom, and our nations are confronting global terrorism."¹¹ <Democracy> would win the global war on terrorism. In response, Prime Minister Singh added texture to the meaning of democracy, with the following litany: "We share a common commitment to democracy, freedom, human rights, pluralism and rule of law. We face common challenges that threaten our way of life and values that both our countries hold dear. We share a common resolve and a common responsibility to meet those challenges."¹² Pluralism was the fiber of the two nations' being.

Taking this cue, President Bush offered an uplifting account of the two nations' relationship, naming both countries as diverse democracies.¹³ This move displaced the original construction of <democracy> as "what we do" with Prime Minister Singh's meaning of "who we are" as democratic nations. Having achieved consonance in framing democracy as an intrinsic quality, Prime Minister Singh affirmed that "we value our pluralism, our diversity, and our freedoms ... We must strengthen democratic

capacities jointly. We must oppose the evil of terrorism together.”¹⁴ With this statement, Prime Minister Singh adopted President Bush’s originating premise that pluralism was a force of moderation and a bulwark against terrorism. Thus, Prime Minister Singh literally circled back to the meaning that President Bush had given to <democracy> from the outset, but with a deepened sense of identification. <Democracy> infused their relationship and motivated their joint action.

In contrast to the spiral development of <democracy>, <creativity> matured in a more diffuse and open-ended manner, absent a terminus in the discursive exchange. Prime Minister Singh enjoined the United States in a “Himalayan Adventure” that would “unleash the creativity and enterprise of every Indian, thus enabling our people to live a life of dignity, fulfillment and self-respect.”¹⁵ U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford enjoined India in a celebration of “national diversity, human creativity and innovation” and a “quest to expand prosperity and economic opportunity worldwide.”¹⁶ <Creativity> thus transcended claims of national character and accomplishments. <Creativity> was a universal human quality that inspired joint action.

Through their repartee, President Bush and Prime Minister Singh recognized and admired the creativity of each other’s nations and peoples. Beginning with this initial sense of identification, discourse gave <creativity> a transcendent, universalizing role. The United States and India became consubstantial in idealistic purposes, including nurturing in every society freedom of expression and human dignity. Throughout the discursive exchange, the invocation of <creativity> maintained an open-ended and forward reaching meaning.

The way in which <democracy> and <creativity> evolved in the act of courtship suggests that the meaning ascribed to a word in its everyday usage affects its ideographic development in symbolic exchange. Quoting Burke, “words communicate to things the spirit that the society imposes upon the words which have come to be the ‘names’ for them. The things are in effect the visible tangible material embodiments of the spirit that infuses them through the medium of words.”¹⁷ We think of democracy as a system of values and governance, and its development was likewise subject to a systems structure of spiral development. We think of creativity as an open-ended, unbounded force for change, and its development was likewise unbounded.

As the courtship progressed, rhetors affirmed and extended the scope of what <creativity> could achieve. The narrative that invoked <creativity> promoted an *esprit des corps* that transcended national identities. My critique therefore illustrates how narrative can convey a sense of limitlessness. Further, the analysis of discourse suggests that deepening identification relies on a narrative that is not only open-ended and limitless, but also possesses a self-actualizing telos. Ideographs work through interpretative frames of being—to be a protector, or to be a nurturer. Functioning as an ideograph, <democracy> connected these cherished qualities of national character and identity to the underlying values of pluralism and creativity. Having picked up a positive charge, <pluralism> and <creativity> then patterned actions in public life.

Narrative Criticism

My critique underscores the importance of open-ended narratives to the process of deepening identification. As previously discussed, diplomatic discourse is

intersubjective. That is, diplomatic discourse seeks to achieve more than implanting an image or a semantic meaning in the minds audience members. Intersubjectivity undergirds the rhetoric of diplomacy in all its myriad aims and purposes. When contextualized as bilateral engagement, an open-ended and participatory narrative exploits the ambiguity of the situation, which contains many possible futures and relations. This ambiguity allows participants to try out different ways of placing themselves, their interlocutors, and prominent elements of the scene in a story or narrative account. As participants gravitate toward and build on a particular account, they make themselves consubstantial in the values and purposes that the account conveys.

The exceptionalism narrative was both open-ended and jointly constructed; U.S. and Indian rhetors celebrated both nations' character and accomplishments as models of democracy. The narrative played out in exchanges among President Bush, Prime Minister Singh, and U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford. At the beginning of the narrative, the obligations of partnering the oldest and largest democracies were ambiguous. President Bush's inclination was toward an interventionist mode of behavior, in which democratic nation-states propagate and aid other societies' adoption of democratic principles and systems. Prime Minister Singh's inclination was toward an exemplarist mode of behavior, in which the benefits of democracy were self-evident and willingly emulated.

As the narrative progressed, President Bush's construction drew in Prime Minister Singh's vocabulary and idealistic frame, which Ambassador Mulford affirmed in his own extension of this narrative thread. The joint construction of exceptionalism consubstantiated the United States and India in their obligations to stand as models of

democracy and defenders of international norms. Their joint perspective established consonance between India's character and its place inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime. No longer would India's position define the correctness of its actions; rather, India's actions would determine its correct position, meaning its belonging within the community of responsible, cooperating nation-states.

A narrative that is open-ended and participatory diffuses in discourse, pulling in myriad experiences and substances of identification as it progresses. Identification springs from the connection between character and action, rather than the satisfaction of having achieved an explicitly defined outcome.¹⁸ Operating from these premises, my critique suggests that an open-ended and participatory narrative will be more likely to deepen identification. This is especially true in diplomacy or other contexts in which narrative is generated through an intersubjective process, such as the hail and response of courtship.

Through my research, I discovered a connection to the literature on identification that has broad application to the study of narrative. Specifically, I contrasted how individuals drew familial substance into the kinship narrative, with varying degrees of thickness. Gary Hauser made the distinction between thick and thin accounts in his work with human rights rhetoric. "Thin" expressions are abstract, offered in a third-person voice on victims' behalf; accounts relayed in the voice of victims are "thick" expressions that are value-laden, culturally translated and situated, and particularized.¹⁹

Congressman Joe Wilson and Prime Minister Singh were among the rhetors who constructed the kinship narrative that emerged from the discourses I studied. Comparing accounts, Congressman Wilson's narrative drew on his father's World War II experience

as a member of the Flying Tigers. Reflecting on his visit to India in January 2006, Congressman Wilson said:

What was very meaningful to me is that I had a picture of my father standing in front of the Taj Mahal, in March 1944, and I stood on the exact same sandstone location and had my picture taken, with the Taj Mahal in the background. It was so emotional to me, so heart-warming, to visit the country that he had told me all about – its very confident people, its very capable people, people who worked hard, and I saw it all first hand.²⁰

Speaking through his father's memory, Congressman Wilson's narrative was highly personalized and thick. His story tightly wound past, present, and future, connecting himself to the Indian people through the actions of his father and their fathers who were brothers in arms. In contrast, Prime Minister Singh spoke as the symbolic father of the Indian people:

There is hardly any middle class family in India who doesn't have a son, a daughter, a son-in-law, a brother-in-law in the United States. That is a very powerful new bond. I should like to express our profound gratitude to the Americans of Indian origin. The way that they have conducted themselves, the way they have worked hard to carve out a niche for themselves in the Silicon Valley, I think this has also given American(s) a new idea about what India is capable of.²¹

Prime Minister Singh distanced himself from the Indian people, whom he addresses as a group apart from himself. The Prime Minister's familial relationship was not biological, but symbolic, an artifact of his political and governing role. The resulting discourse was depersonalized and thin. A thin discourse places the rhetor in the role of observer or commentator. A thick discourse places the rhetor in the narrative of experience.

The variation within the kinship narrative indicates that the "thick" and "thin" vernaculars that Hauser found in human rights discourse have broader applicability for the relationship between familial substance and identification. An open question for future scholarship is whether other substances of identification offer similar ways of

measuring intensity, thereby providing a more robust response to Woodward's complaint that we lack the means to measure the depth of identification.²² For geometric substance, is the depth of identification measured by degrees of proximity? For directional substance, is valence understood in terms of momentum? My critique raises these questions as a point of curiosity and future discovery.

My critique presents four narratives that involved the U.S.-based Indian Diaspora community directly, as participants, or indirectly, as rhetorical resources. One is the introspective sojourner narrative that constituted the U.S.-Indian Diaspora in the context of a comprehensive bilateral partnership. The sojourner narrative generated a sense of forward momentum. In the convergence narrative, Diasporans combined their voice with other proponents of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement to put the United States and India on the same trajectory toward an envisioned future state. The kinship narrative placed Diasporans within the gestalt of biological and symbolic relations that consubstantiated the United States and India in their collective and transnational achievements. Lastly, discourses that invoked creativity as a rhetorical resource consubstantiated the United States and India in the pursuit of prosperity for all peoples. The U.S.-based Diaspora community's voice came through in the sojourner and convergence narratives only, suggesting that voice is also part of the spectrum by which we can assess the depth of identification.

Beginning with the more oblique incorporations of Diasporans' voice, it is broadly acknowledged that Indian Diasporans are members of the creative class that has contributed to the global success of the new economy.²³ And yet, the Diasporans who added their voice to the debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement did not make an explicit

reference to their role as innovators; the creativity inherent in the Indian people, and by extension their Diasporans, was a trait cited by others. When Diasporans incorporated intergenerational or familial references in their discourses, it was to establish a contrast, as in Sanjay Puri's referring to himself as the "black sheep" of his family because he established a professional identity outside of the medical and engineering professions.²⁴ Certainly, the Diasporan community composed the gestalt of biological and symbolic relations that made the United States and India consubstantial, but this does not change the fact that Diasporans were placed in a narrative not of their own construction.

The sojourner narrative was a full-throated expression of a dynamic Diasporan identity. The introspective sojourner narrative reconstituted the Indian Diaspora identity in the context of the U.S.-India partnership. The sojourner narrative made present a commitment to political activism, to effectuate political change in areas above and beyond parochial concerns, thus constituting Diasporans in a communal commitment.²⁵ This conceptualization of voice echoes Hall's enunciation, the position from which one speaks in the practice of self-representation.²⁶ Hall encouraged an understanding of identity informed and guided by subjectivity, "a 'production' which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation."²⁷ Hall's perspective on voice-as-enunciation makes a critical distinction between being and becoming.

I assert that the kinship narrative and discourses on creativity involved the Diaspora as "being." By contrast, the sojourner and convergence narratives constituted the Diaspora in a continual state of "becoming." In the sojourner narrative, the process of becoming was bounded to the Diasporans' maturity as political actors and the

embodiment of the promise of bilateral partnership. In the convergence narrative, the process of becoming drew in all the representations of the U.S.-India transnational community to constitute the two nation-states and their peoples in a bilateral partnership.

I would not say that narratives of “being” are inherently weaker in their valence toward identification. However, I do believe that when narratives are intertwined in the rhetorical act of courtship, one needs both sorts of narratives—of being and becoming—to enact courtship and achieve consubstantiation. Narratives of “being” establish a sense of otherness or estrangement, with its inherent potential for belongingness. Narratives of “becoming” then realize the potentiality of belonging together in a newly constituted identity.

Burkean Criticism

My contribution to Burkean theory and criticism is a deeper understanding of the interdependencies between Burke’s substances of identification and the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation. My critique identified the narratives that emerged from discourse throughout a three-year period of courtship, and grounds those narratives in substances of identification. My critique also identified the narratives and foundational substances of identification that removed the contingency of courtship and motivated participants in discourse to act in unison.

Expressed as a Burkean critique, the core argument of my dissertation can be abstracted as follows. Performing the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation, the United States and India overcame their sense of estrangement, achieved unity in their beliefs and purposes, and took concerted action. The rhetorical acts of courtship and

consubstantiation replaced a decades' long hard power cycle of unilateral action and punishment with a virtuous soft power cycle that changed both the ends and means of the bilateral relationship. Discourse transformed the relationship by framing India's isolation as a mistake of history, corrected by restoring India to its rightful place within the community of responsible nuclear states. More fundamentally, this discourse constituted a permanent union between the United States and India, forging a bilateral partnership characterized by reciprocity, mutuality, integration, joint commitments, and concerted action toward a shared purpose.

Agreement proponents co-constructed a set of synthesized narratives that constituted a new U.S.-Indian bilateral partnership. The narrative of exceptionalism, grounded in geometric substance, constructed partnership out of America's and India's shared identification as models of democracy and defenders of international norms. The kinship narrative, grounded in familial substance, reconciled India's desire for autonomy with its desire to belong to the community of responsible nuclear states. Participants in discourse transcended geographic, national, and cultural divisions, subject to the kinship narrative's vicarious and emotive pull. The sojourner narrative, grounded in directional substance, constituted the U.S.-based Indian Diaspora as a community that represented in microcosm the potential of a comprehensive bilateral partnership. The convergence narrative, also grounded in directional substance, propelled the relationship forward and affirmed participants' sense that their union would generate positive changes for themselves and the world.

The convergence narrative established a synecdochic relationship between the U.S.-India 123 Agreement and bilateral partnership. More plainly, the U.S.-India 123

Agreement came to symbolize the quality of the U.S.-India partnership in its entirety. The quality of the partnership, the quality of the bilateral achievements made in its name, and the qualities of character ascribed to the partners were substantively and indelibly the same, constituting a bilateral partnership of high integrity, authenticity, and permanence.

Discourse transformed the context, social order, and substance of the U.S.-India relationship, facilitating India's diplomatic move from outside to inside the nuclear nonproliferation regime, and the bilateral diplomatic move from estranged to engaged. In their deepening identification from courtship to consubstantiation, rhetors were co-arguers and co-creators of strategic partnership.

Having set forth the argument *en toto*, allow me to shine a light on those aspects with greatest potential to enhance our understanding of Burke. My observations address substance, courtship, and consubstantiation. Substance is a touchstone in Burke's grammar, the notion that language simulates "what is really there."²⁸ Substance is central to the ways in which language and essence play out in everyday judgments. It is the core meaning of an object, a person, or an idea that language can reshape, recast, reclaim, and represent. In practice, "language used substantially" attributes motive, assigns value, and confers identity.²⁹

Burke's borrowing from Spinoza interrogates "language used substantially." In *Language as Symbolic Action*, Burke cites Spinoza's *Ethics* as a source for his own thought on the relationship between words and things. A particular lesson Burke draws from his reading of Spinoza's *Ethics* is that "concrete images can be instances of the abstract, insofar as they conceal our perception of essence by centering attention upon some partial aspect abstracted from the whole."³⁰ Participants in symbolic exchange

gravitate toward and express one aspect over another. One's choice of meaning lacks permanence. In other words, the meaning of an object is inherently ambiguous. Owing to this ambiguity, language has the power to transform the meaning of the object in relation to its context.

Language wrapped around substance reduces ambiguity. Substance affords the rhetor a range of rhetorical resources and accompanying choices to generate and sustain identification.³¹ Burkean criticism involves naming the substances that infuse a particular narrative.³² When I abstracted my Burkean argument, I described narratives grounded in *substance*: the exceptionalism narrative, grounded in geometric substance; the kinship narrative, grounded in familial substance; and the sojourner and convergence narratives, grounded in directional substance.

Substance interrelates a source of agency (i.e., the U.S.-India 123 Agreement), an act (i.e., bilateral partnership), and one or more actors (i.e., the United States and India). This function of substance as relating and structuring emanates from Burke's search for a theory of social relations,³³ and thus elucidates the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation through which participants in discourse deepen identification. Courtship is the process in which individuals or groups divided by hierarchy or social class overcome their sense of estrangement. The communicative process of identification enables participants in discourse to transcend perceptions of "us" and "them" to become "we" and "our."³⁴ One's membership in a class or one's place in the social order is acceptable until successfully hailed by someone who until that point had been a stranger. The hail and response of courtship deepens identification by relating both parties to their common substance. The momentum created by transcending a division generates a

countervailing desire to anchor participants in their unified stance, achieved through incorporation of one or more substances of identification.

Substance reconciles Burke the critic and Burke the theorist. With a deeper understanding of how narratives incorporate substances of identification, we can point to the underlying motivations that encourage rhetors in their performance of courtship. We can also judge how the contextualization of a substance of identification reduces recalcitrance and overcomes estrangement. A deeper understanding of substance also generates insight on social relations. Language wrapped in substance establishes the imperative to act together and catalyzes concerted action toward a jointly envisioned future. From my work with substances of identification, I conclude that the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation rely on multiple, complementary narratives, tiered throughout the life of a discourse, drawing in multiple substances of identification.

My critique of diplomatic discourse generated new knowledge for rhetorical criticism and theory-building, centered on substance and the rhetorical act of consubstantiation. Ideographs, understood as words used substantially, develop in symbolic exchange in accordance with their nature. Diplomatic discourse profits from open-ended and participatory narratives that convey a sense of limitless possibility. Participants ground their discourses in a range of substances. In contrast to the discourses of a single rhetor, diplomatic discourse is intersubjective. Accordingly, how participants braid their narrative from different substantive threads is significant. In critiquing the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation, naming the substances of identification is less important than understanding how they function synergistically. Moreover, who incorporates which sort of substance differentiates processes of

identification into being and becoming, both of which are integral to the rhetorical acts of courtship and consubstantiation. Lastly, future inquiry into rhetorical substances could generate a new schema in which to understand the depth or intensity of identification.

Reinterpreting Soft Power

My dissertation seeks to develop the rhetorical dimension of soft power diplomacy, as introduced by Joseph S. Nye, Jr., and elaborated in more recent public diplomacy scholarship that questions the biases, ethics, and perceptions of the theory and its practice. The turn toward relational strategies of public diplomacy can be found in Brian Hocking's network model of public diplomacy³⁵; the collaboration among R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher and Amelia Arsenault to catalyze a "connective mindshift" that integrates public diplomacy with other forms of statecraft³⁶; Kathy Fitzpatrick's attention to ethical concerns raised by asymmetrical power relationships³⁷; and Craig Hayden's reconceptualization of audience and interrogation of arguments that justify, elaborate, and constitute public diplomacy.³⁸ Collectively, these authors suggest alternative ways to qualitatively assess soft power.

The relational turn in public diplomacy scholarship addresses soft power as a force for changing how countries and peoples interact with each other and how the international system itself is structured and managed. Reconceptualized as a relational strategy of engagement, soft power has the potential to establish common values and understandings. Rejecting the notion that culture, values, norms, institutions and policies are soft power resources to be exploited, the relational turn explores the creation of soft power resources and how discourse integrates them into statecraft.

My dissertation research demonstrates soft power's work as a relational strategy of engagement, grounding the questions and premises of current public diplomacy scholarship in a richly textured and prolonged diplomatic exchange. A rich understanding of rhetoric illuminates soft power theory. I provide an alternative, dramatistic interpretation of soft power attraction as a process of identification. Moreover, dramatistic theory provides both a vocabulary and methodology that allows us to explain how attraction happens through discourse, through the transformation of social relations that is not contingent on public opinion. From my rhetorical critique of the discourses generated by the debate on the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, we learn two things: soft power is a constitutive rather than a persuasive force for change, and as a constitutive process, the telos of soft power requires reinterpretation.

Soft Power as a Constitutive Force

Identification occurs through discourses or narratives in which participants seek belongingness, to change their being *apart from*, to being *a part of* or *party to* a community.³⁹ Moreover, identification achieves social cohesion through a transcendent move, in which narrative accounts of what has happened, is happening, or might happen in the future are rounded out. Accounts are jointly constructed and placed in an open-ended narrative. The reasoning and supporting rationale for what one believes and how one acts emerges from discourse. In brief, discourse that achieves belongingness in social relations, cohesion of perspectives, and completeness of accounts exemplifies the rhetoric-as-constitutive move. Participants use language to navigate their way into and

through a discursive exchange, and discourse itself is the current that carries the participants along.

The distinction between rhetoric-as-persuasive and rhetoric-as-constitutive is more easily demonstrated than explained; you have to hear it to know it. The forward-looking commentaries of Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns and India's Ambassador to the United States Ronen Sen, presented below in turn, help attune us to the constitutive work of soft power diplomacy. In remarks to the Asia Society in October 2005, Under Secretary Burns presented the future promise of the bilateral partnership:

This new relationship rests on the solid foundation of shared values, shared interests and our increasingly shared view of how best to promote stability, security and peace worldwide in the 21st century. India will also be a natural partner to the United States as we confront what will be the central security challenge of the coming generation—the global threats that are flowing over, under and through our national borders. ...

The vision that I have outlined today is far from complete. We must alter our respective mindsets so that our peoples can recognize the great potential that exists. We must also shift certain ground realities to lay foundations for our long-term partnership. Just as we seek to shift perceptions of the possible in our bilateral relationship, we must also re-imagine India's role in the international community, including in the context of the United Nations.⁴⁰

Contained in the opening sentence is the assertion that soft power resources generated a joint perspective toward the future; shared values, interests, and orientation possessed the capacity to forge a new bilateral relationship. By describing India as a “natural” partner, Under Secretary Burns implied the existence of shared qualities intrinsic to both the United States and India that consubstantiated their relationship. Further, “natural” also connotes “natal,” and thus signaled a new beginning to the partnership brought about by

President Bush's and Prime Minister Singh's joint commitment to pursue full civil nuclear cooperation.

Whereas Under Secretary Burns could have dwelled on past actions and justifications for India's exclusion from the nuclear nonproliferation regime, he adopted instead a future focus, with an expansive temporal and geographical reach. In contrast to the calculated interjection characteristic of rhetoric-as-persuasion, Under Secretary Burns's narrative opened an extemporaneous exchange, in which an indeterminate future could be jointly created. Soft power discourse supported constitutive processes of being and becoming.

In the second excerpt from the same speech, Under Secretary Burns alluded to the power of a jointly constructed vision to change habits of thought and the underlying rationale that would support and sustain the bilateral partnership. Whereas rhetoric-as-persuasion is concerned with image, rhetoric-as-constitutive is concerned with imagining. Under Secretary Burns established a rhetorical spring board for India's promise and all that the nation might accomplish, if the underlying rationale and structures could be extended from bilateral partnership into a multilateral context. As a constitutive process, soft power discourse transformed the context, social order, and substance of the bilateral relationship.

Indian Ambassador Ronen Sen, in remarks at the National Press Club in February 2006, set the scene for President Bush's state visit to India:

We are confident that during the forthcoming visit of President Bush to India, and in the months and years to come, the close partnership between India and the United States will continue to intensify and strengthen. This is not idle crystal-ball gazing but an objective recognition of the inherent strength and resilience of the growing strategic ties between the world's largest and fastest growing democracy and the world's oldest and most powerful democracy.⁴¹

Ambassador Sen's discourse possessed the same future focus as Under Secretary Burns's remarks to the Asia Society. Ambassador Sen incorporated the "largest" and "oldest" trope, but not as a persuasive justification for partnership building. Because Ambassador Sen placed the partnership in the central role of his narrative, democracy was a unifying quality that simultaneously strengthens and grows stronger in the bilateral partnership. Democracy, as a soft power resource, possessed the capacity to transform the bilateral relationship.

Culture, values, and institutions are symbols that come to possess power within and through discourse.⁴² Discourse animates soft power resources. Culture, taken as a soft power resource, attracts not as a stimulus for imitation, but in the hybridity created when two or more cultures meet. Values, taken as a soft power resource, attract not merely through their transmission but also by their discursive enactments. Institutions, taken as a soft power resource, attract not merely in their demonstrative existence, but in the rhetorical traditions and current-day vernacular that gives them meaning and relevance. As a constitutive process, soft power discourse consubstantiated the United States and India in bilateral partnership.

Telos of Soft Power

According to Nye's thesis, power is a commodity held by a nation state that may be arrayed linearly with hard, command power on one end and the soft power of attraction on the other. The progression begins with coercion and ends with co-optation.⁴³ To my ears, the pairing of attraction as means and co-optation as ends strikes a dissonant chord. Co-optation is an inferior and fleeting form of attraction that negates

deepening identifications and unity. Co-optation yields from others acquiescence and non-interference; its accomplishment of goals and objectives remains a solitary and self-directed exercise dependent on others' perceptions.

In Chapter 2, I introduced Wayne Brockriede's attitudinal stances that I believe help distinguish persuasive and constitutive forms of rhetoric.⁴⁴ The three stances are to coerce, to seduce, and to love. By coercion, Brockriede meant overcoming opposition or getting one's way by force of argument. Seduction would achieve the same through charm or deceit. Coercion and seduction are unilateral poses in which power is held, and held over, the co-arguer. For arguers as lovers, the exchange is even; the relationship, mutual; acts, reciprocal.

Paraphrasing Brockriede, when we participate in discourse, we express our humanness. This expression binds together the influences we hold over ourselves, the social influences of our co-arguers, and the relationship between the two.⁴⁵ When we participate in discourse, we open ourselves to the possibility of changing our held notions of who we are, our perceptions of others, and our orientation to the world we inhabit.

Identification is the driving force for constitutive rhetoric. It invites openness to self-transformation as well as the transformation of those whom we engage, to collaborate in the construction of the argument and its conclusion.⁴⁶ Collaboration engenders a sense of ownership or investment in a successful exchange, a giving and returning of material and symbolic resources available to all parties as co-arguers.⁴⁷

The muscularity behind democracy promotion was one example of the United States and India addressing each other as co-arguers. Their interaction as co-arguers emerged within the exceptionalism narrative. As the narrative opened, the United States

leaned toward an interventionist approach to democracy promotion, which would inculcate democratic principles and processes in other nation-states through capacity building and other direct action. India remained steadfast in its tradition of being a model of democracy, enticing other nation-states to emulate its example.⁴⁸

During a joint news conference at which the two leaders announced their intent to pursue full civil nuclear cooperation, President Bush said:

India and the United States share a commitment to freedom and a belief that democracy provides the best path to a more hopeful future for all people. We also believe that the spread of liberty is the best alternative to hatred and violence. Because of our shared values, the relationship between our two countries has never been stronger. We're working together to make our nations more secure, deliver a better life to our citizens, and advance the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world.⁴⁹

The gesture toward an interventionist approach to democracy promotion follows from democracy's path-breaking action and the two nation's *advancing* the cause of peace and freedom.

The word "path" and its context were sufficiently ambiguous to allow Prime Minister Singh to express his preference for an exemplarist approach, arguing that "we must work together to create a world in which democracies can flourish."⁵⁰ The Prime Minister's "create a world" aligned well with President Bush's "spread of liberty," as both phrases implied a natural and unrehearsed movement to seed democracy throughout the world. U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford would remove the ambiguity in President Bush's and Prime Minister Singh's exchange, incorporating India's exemplarist frame in his own discourse and encouraging India in its pursuit of internal perfection.⁵¹

The discursive exchange on whether the United States and India would align in an interventionist or exemplarist approach to democracy promotion is an example of two

nation-states engaging each other as co-arguers. The ambiguity present in the exchange enabled rhetorical work in reconciling potentially conflicting perspectives and aims. Neither side attempted to force the other to agree with their starting position. Nor did Indian rhetors treat the United States' adaptation as a "win." Consensus emerged from discourse.

Accepting that participants in discourse can engage each other as co-arguers is fundamental to working with soft power discourse as a constitutive process. The rhetorical work of soft power is to dissolve the recalcitrance that prevents participants in discourse from overcoming their sense of estrangement, or conversely, from strengthening their sense of identification. Recalcitrance and identification are inversely proportional; recalcitrance dissolves as identification deepens.⁵²

In the discursive exchange between the United States and India, the source of recalcitrance on both sides was pride. India took pride in mastering the nuclear fuel cycle despite its isolation from nation-states who were allowed to help each other under the terms of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Prime Minister Singh referred to India's nuclear program as its "precious heritage."⁵³ The exceptionalism narrative maintained India's sense of pride in its accomplishments, but converted the source of pride from India's isolation to India's character and track record of upholding international norms. India joined in constructing the exceptionalism narrative in a way that would both enable cooperation in nuclear development and boost India's national pride.

The United States took pride in its role as an architect of the nuclear nonproliferation regime that had left India isolated; as an architect of the system, the United States also had the gravitas to deliver India from its isolation. The contrast

between India's character and track record with its position outside the nuclear nonproliferation regime created dissonance. To reduce this dissonance, the deliverance narrative added a subtext that changed perspectives about India's placement, re-interpreted as a mistake of history. Because India had delayed full militarization of its nuclear program, it fell on the wrong side of the time line to be grandfathered into the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

India's character and actions had proven the value of its membership in the community of cooperating nuclear states. India's isolation therefore contravened the long-term security goals that the architects of the regime meant to achieve. This subtext of the deliverance narrative allowed the United States to refocus on the original goals of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Because India's isolation resulted from human foible rather than malicious intent, both India and the United States could make conciliatory moves while preserving their respective sources of pride.

As discussed in Chapter 3 and in the next section, the deliverance narrative succeeded in reducing recalcitrance, but did not deepen identification. This is a useful reminder that soft power discourses are polysemic, relying on a synergy of narratives and resources with the potential to deepen identification. The rhetorical work of soft power as a constitutive force for change occurred through a layering of the narratives that emerged during the debate. Whereas the exceptionalism and deliverance narratives worked hardest to reduce a major source of recalcitrance on behalf of both the United States and India, other narratives present in discourse reduced recalcitrance by nurturing a sense of kinship and belongingness, transcending differences on how the two nation-

states understood and practiced democracy, and shedding Cold War era perceptions and habits to imagine a future of unconstrained possibility.

My critique demonstrates that the integration of soft power diplomacy in bilateral engagement can achieve security goals. Perceptions of India changed, from being obstinate to responsible. India's perception of the nuclear nonproliferation regime changed, from a discriminatory system to a framework for cooperation. Perceptions of the bilateral relationship changed, from the oscillation between estrangement and engagement to an enduring bilateral partnership. The United States and India achieved consonance of orientation and purpose, with interdependent roles and responsibilities, along with an energetic willingness to shape the future together.

Enhancing Diplomatic Tradecraft

In this section, I describe for members of the diplomatic corps and other practitioners of diplomacy the possibilities that come from rhetoric's ability to constitute bilateral relationships. Realizing these possibilities requires a change in perspective regarding the nature of power. Additionally, I offer guidance on enhancements to diplomatic tradecraft suggested by a rhetorical perspective.

The Nature of Power

Power is ambivalent. Like electricity, if properly grounded it brings us light and warmth; if left ungrounded, it can shock the system.⁵⁴ Ambivalence mitigates tendencies toward absolutism when labeling a thing as good or bad according to the “essence” of its power. An object's ambiguity allows any member of this semantic cluster to “stand in”

for the type and nature of power one wishes to ascribe to the object. Kenneth Burke commented in the Foreword to *The Philosophy of Literary Form* that Richard Wright's *Native Son* had opened a new avenue in which to explore the ambiguities of power. Burke thought of a power "family" that encompassed, inter alia, the social, sexual, physical, political, military, commercial, monetary, mental, moral, stylistic, emancipatory, liberalizing, wise, and knowledgeable.⁵⁵

The source and the demonstration of power shifts according to situational and relational contexts. Some shifts may be minor tremors; other shifts may be tectonic. Regardless of magnitude, the re-ordering of the members of Burke's "power family" occurs through the performance of a motive. Burke offers the example of monetary power compensating for deficiencies in other kinds of power; one's focus on amassing personal fortune may emanate from a sense of social inferiority. Wealth bestows immortality in both a material and symbolic sense.⁵⁶ The motive suggested in discourse and action may be internal, the acquisition and use of power (both hard and soft) to compensate for a nation-state's perceived deficiency in its standing and self-determination. Or motive may be externally driven, to steward the environment that regulates relations and behavior of nation-states within an international or global system.

The ambiguous and circulatory nature of power works in favor of bilateral engagement. The image of diplomatic systems as hierarchical and neatly ordered has given way to a new understanding of a network model that better represents the circulatory nature of power.⁵⁷ We hear an expression of power's circulation in the discourses arising from the convergence narrative, in which the system of nation-states was described as a constellation. For example, in the words of Indian Foreign Secretary

Saran, forces external and intrinsic to nation-states and their relationships were tightly wound:

India perceives the world today as one where the global agenda is being set by a constellation of nations including the United States, the EU, Russia, China, Japan and India. ... The era when global politics was a zero-sum game is now decisively behind us. Leading nations, even when they compete, have inter-dependencies and linkages amongst themselves that they ignore at their own peril.⁵⁸

Power not only circulates, it is a shared resource. The ways in which nation-states interconnect may have an institutional framework, but linkages and the framework itself are rhetorically constructed.

Offering another example, Robinder Sachdev, founder of the U.S.-India Political Action Committee, argued that if the Agreement failed, U.S. and Indian interests might occasionally intersect but would never fully converge:

Relations between the United States and India are truly on an inflexion point—a good deal between the two nations has a plethora of dividends for both, though there may be some interests being compromised by both countries. However, a non-deal will lead to an altogether different orbit for India in international affairs. Not to say that that orbit will be good or bad for U.S. relations, but it certainly will be a different path.⁵⁹

The movements of the United States and India were governed in part by laws of the cosmos that they transited. The opportunities promised by the U.S.-India 123 Agreement exercised a gravitational pull in which the two nation-states' trajectories would eventually converge. If, however, the Agreement remained elusive, the two nation-states would lose both momentum and attraction, to again go their separate ways. The United States and India could achieve more by acting in synchronicity. Sachdev introduced an imperative to seize the moment, telling us something else. Power is not only circulatory, it is fleeting.

Lessons in Diplomacy

The two prior sections of this chapter addressed scholars of rhetoric and soft power diplomacy, and offered lessons for practitioners of diplomacy as well. As a relational strategy of engagement, soft power diplomacy relies on dual, not unilateral, movement. As a discourse infused with intersubjectivity, bilateral diplomacy relies on both parties' willingness to critically reflect upon their own actions and identities and to change held perceptions to achieve mutual benefits.⁶⁰

Not wanting to retrace well-worn steps, I offer three specific lessons for practitioners of diplomacy. The first lesson is that we promote democracy not by naming it, but by drawing into discourse the qualities and meanings of democracy as an ideal and as lived experience. The second lesson is that future-focused and holistic accounts of the international scene give rhetoric room to work. Thirdly, alternatives to an actor-centered discourse may be more conducive to bilateral engagement.

Democracy is Constructed and Enacted

As discussed in Chapter 3, the joint construction of democracy transcended diverse historical and socio-cultural contexts. Discourse pulled from real-world experience and reached into the meanings of democracy as a universal value. Working this dialectic, discourse recast democracy as pluralism. Welcoming Prime Minister Singh to Washington in July 2005, President Bush's remarks emphasized threats based on past experience and pragmatic remedies:

Our nations believe in freedom, and our nations are confronting global terrorism. As diplomatic partners, we're meeting this threat in our own nations and abroad. And as economic partners, we're working around the world to displace hatred and violence with prosperity, hope, and optimism. India's embrace of democracy and human rights has ensured that its great diversity will remain a national strength.⁶¹

President Bush's discourse worked between the word-as-symbol and its tangible meanings, concluding by constructing a tautology between diversity and strength. Prime Minister Singh's response compensated with an upward conversion of democracy's meaning:

We share a common commitment to democracy, freedom, human rights, pluralism and rule of law. We face common challenges that threaten our way of life and values that both our countries hold dear. We share a common resolve and a common responsibility to meet those challenges.⁶²

In "the common commitment to democracy," we hear the upward reach to idealized forms, democracy's qualities rounded out by other universal values and governing principles, including pluralism. The litany of common challenges, common resolve, and common responsibility drove energy into these universal values and shared principles, bringing the new cluster of meaning into a narrative that consubstantiated the United States and India in their idealistic purposes.

In another interlude during President Bush's March 2006 state visit to India, the Prime Minister and the President again exchanged verses in universal values, constructing meaning in a dialectic of ideals and experience. Prime Minister Singh initiated the exchange:

Close to half a century ago President Eisenhower said on a visit to India: "We who are free—and who prize our freedom above all other gifts of God and nature—must know each other better; trust each other more; support each other." Today those words have a new resonance.

Your people and ours have come to regard democracy and peaceful political mobilization as legitimate and civilized instruments of social change. Our passionate commitment to democracy and human rights, our respect for equality of all before the law and our regard for freedom of speech and faith place us on the same side of history.⁶³

Prime Minister Singh deftly worked back and forth from known experience and human ideals. He began with a historical event that affirmed the bilateral relationship and ended with history of an epochal scale. In between, he touched on the kinetic force of democracy in political mobilization for social change, but quickly pulled this common experience with civil disobedience into the realm of ideals, including equality for all before the law. This quote is among the clearest examples the constitutive potential of soft power discourse to animate values.

President Bush's remarks, offered the following day, reprised Prime Minister Singh's remarks on equality:

The partnership between the United States and India has deep and sturdy roots in the values we share. Both our nations were founded on the conviction that all people are created equal and are endowed with certain fundamental rights, including freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion. Those freedoms are enshrined through law, through our written constitutions, and they are upheld daily by institutions common to both our democracies. In both our countries, democracy is more than a form of government, it is the central premise of our national character.

Even though President Bush made note of the fact that freedoms are "upheld daily," the energy within this discourse comes from the plane above. Democracy, equality, and freedom are inseparable and foundational to American and Indian identity.

The dialectical construction of democracy is an observation in subtlety compared to my primary point. In these exchanges, democracy was not a commodity to promote. Democracy was both constructed and enacted in discourse. As discourse opened and

reconstituted the meaning of democracy, identifications deepened and joint ideological commitments grew stronger.

Moments of Transformation

As previously described, a narrative that has indeterminate or ambiguous ends has the virtue of inviting participants in discourse to place themselves in the action and in relation to each other. Narrative accounts that present binaries have the opposite effect, a forced choice more reminiscent of coercion or seduction than co-arguing. To buttress this point, I offer here a statement from Congressman Dana Rohrabacher directed at Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, during a House International Relations Committee hearing in September 2005:

The Indians need to know this is another time of choosing. In the past, they chose to be in a closer relationship with the Soviet Union during the Cold War and this is a time of realignment again and a period of choosing for them. They can choose to be in a closer relationship with this outlaw Mula regime in Iran and radical Islam, or they can choose to be in a closer tie with the people in the United States of America. That is their choice. It is your job to make sure they are making that choice. That they understand, as they move forward, they are the ones who are determining the policy of how the relationship will be with the United States.⁶⁴

As a contextual point, Congressman Rohrabacher was addressing the expectation that India would support the U.S. position on an International Atomic Energy Agency resolution to address Iran's noncompliance with nuclear cooperation and safeguards agreements. Statements specific to the Iran vote were an aberration within the discursive archive, as were the binary "with us or against" construction of the situation and India's anticipated role.

Congressman Henry Hyde's account, though rare in its eloquence, typified accounts that re-formed U.S.-India relations:

India is at a formative moment and facing profound decisions for her billion people, all of this occurring in a world which is quickly evolving into unfamiliar patterns, the old and familiar giving way to the unformed and new. My hope is she will join us in shaping this new era and take possession of the limitless possibilities that are hers to possess.⁶⁵

The end of the Cold War began a new era for the international order, and for the United States and India especially. Congressman Hyde constructed a future in which the United States and India had mutual stakes and shared responsibilities. In contrast to Congressman Rohrabacher's forced choice, Congressman Hyde preserved and widened India's freedom of choice. Speaking with Charlie Rose in February 2006, Prime Minister Singh echoed the idea of renewal while offering reassurance of India's commitments:

A new India which realizes its destiny in the framework of an open society, in the framework of an open economy, respecting all fundamental human freedoms—great respect for pluralism, inclusive value system, I think that's what unites India and the United States and I do hope that working together, our two countries can write a new chapter in the history of our relationship.⁶⁶

To write a new chapter in history is a quintessential metaphor for a new beginning that also acknowledges what came before. In contrast to Congressman Hyde's account, which presents a scene of disruptive change, Prime Minister Singh's account moors the relationship to enduring values and political systems in the process of fomenting change.

The examples above contrasted accounts that contained a binary or forced-choice with accounts that were future-focused and open-ended. Whereas the binary may have persuasive force, the pose is coercive and action is taken in compliance. Narratives of renewal possess constitutive force, making an uncertain future less menacing and more promising.

Decentering the Diplomat

This section could have easily been titled “the pitfalls of agent-centric accounts.”

I am referring to the deliverance narrative presented in Chapter 2, in which Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns tried to match Prime Minister Singh’s comfort level with an Agreement rather than a nation-state being the locus of action. Under Secretary Burns began with an emphasis on “we,” interpreted as speaking for the Bush Administration rather than the two partner governments:

We sought the agreement because India’s nuclear weapons program and its status outside the nonproliferation regime has proven to be a longstanding stumbling block to enhance U.S.-India relations. It is now time to end the isolation of India and to integrate it into nonproliferation norms.⁶⁷

Under Secretary Burns continued to focus on nation-states as actors, keeping the two countries divided between two sides:

People on both sides of the equation in India and the Department of Atomic Energy as well as my own government and other governments need to adjust to this new world—that means compromise. It means to understand that maybe what you did in isolation will not be the same as what you would do in a more integrated world where India is working with the rest of the international community to provide for civilian nuclear power.⁶⁸

By the end of the debate, Under Secretary Burns had reconciled Prime Minister Singh’s perspective, which placed the locus of action in the Agreement itself:

This agreement is indisputably in India’s national interest from our perspective. It will deliver India from over 30 years of international isolation. It will allow the country to be treated in a fair and egalitarian way. It will allow the country to be—to take its place among the leaders of the civil nuclear community and the world today as a responsible state.⁶⁹

Under Secretary Burns traveled a great rhetorical distance in order to reconcile his own agent-centric perspective with Prime Minister Singh’s account that made the U.S.-India Agreement the source of its deliverance. Nonetheless, Under Secretary Burns

123

remained steadfast in speaking from a U.S. rather than a joint perspective. He lacked the rhetorical sensitivity to perceive and critically reflect on how India interpreted U.S. actions or how the Agreement would change the U.S. and the essence of its bilateral relationship.

The Agreement embodied a reciprocal, resilient, and comprehensive strategic partnership. The synecdoche of the Agreement and the bilateral partnership that emerged in the convergence narrative unified U.S. and Indian national interests. Assured that the U.S.-India 123 Agreement would be ratified, Indian Minister of External Affairs Mukherjee turned the convergence narrative into an all-encompassing vision:

Today India and the U.S. engage as partners across the entire range of human endeavour. ... As we look back with satisfaction at the transformation of India-U.S. relations, we are convinced of the future prospects of this relationship. The vision for this relationship laid down by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President Bush is one that serves the interests of our peoples, and those of the region and the world. India and the United States, as two democracies with shared values, look forward to building this partnership based on principle and pragmatism in the years to come.⁷⁰

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, speaking contemporaneously with the signing of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement, constituted the bilateral partnership and gave it unending reach:

And so today, we look to the future, a shared future in which both our nations together rise to our global responsibilities and our global challenges as partners. Let us use this partnership to shape an international order in which all states can exercise their sovereignty securely, responsibly, and in peace ... to tackle the great global challenges of our time ... to protect and promote our common values ... to drive a new social justice agenda for the 21st century.⁷¹

The synecdoche of Agreement and partnership allowed Secretary Rice the latitude to bind the United States and India as co-creators of both. The Agreement therefore contained the motivations of both nations' leaders. Because the leaders acted in their official and

representative capacities, the Agreement expressed the aspirations and will of their people.⁷² As Secretary Rice's litany progressed from material interests to global benefits and universal goods, she elevated the frame of the partnership from a vehicle to achieve pragmatic change to a character-driven relationship that channeled shared motivations into symbolic action.⁷³

Three heuristics guide the integration of a rhetorical perspective in the practice of diplomacy. First, values are rhetorically constructed from every day experience and idealized notions of all that a specific value, such as democracy, can entail. Second, future-focused and open-ended narratives have greater potential to constitute partnership than narratives constructed around binaries. Third, discourse can place the locus of action in a text or an agreement, such that the text or agreement exercises agency and has the power to transform relations.

Reading my dissertation holistically, what emerges is a rhetorical frame for soft power—a rhetorically sensitive way of thinking about, talking point, and practicing soft power diplomacy. Instead of the growing influence of new actors, there are new voices in international affairs. Rather than measure how issues ascend the international affairs agenda, we should ask how transcendent issues, such as global citizenship, emerge. Whereas international relations theorists will chart the interdependence of geo-economics and geo-politics, rhetorical theorists will attend to narrative forms and constitutive moments heard in a community's call into being and into action. Instead of balancing national and particularized interests, we create a synecdoche of national and particularized interests. We abandon the question of how to change others' behavior, and ask instead how to transform relationships. Having adopted the rhetorical elaboration of

soft power, we redefine influence as the shaping of world views through which nation-states and peoples engage each other. The signing of the U.S.-India 123 Agreement culminated a transformational moment in U.S.-India relations.

The transformation came about through a soft power approach that eschewed the previous decades' hard power tactics of sanctions and export controls. The transformation came about through soft power discourses that facilitated India's diplomatic movement from outside to inside the nuclear regime, and that moved the bilateral relationship from estrangement to engagement, and into an enduring partnership. These diplomatic moves are rich in lessons for the rhetoric of diplomacy.

Notes

¹ Martín Carcasson, “Unveiling the Oslo Narrative: The Rhetorical Transformation of Israeli-Palestinian Diplomacy, *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3, no. 2 (2000): 211-245.

² Arjun Bhugat, *Washington Times*, April 9, 2006.

³ Robinder Sachdev, *India Abroad*, October 5, 2007.

⁴ Congressman Henry Hyde, House International Relations Committee, November 16, 2005.

⁵ Minister of External Affairs Mukherjee, National Launch of the Global India Foundation, January 16, 2007.

⁶ Mary E. Stuckey, “Competing Foreign Policy Visions: Rhetorical Hybrids After the Cold War,” *Western Journal of Communication* 59 (Summer 1995): 214.

⁷ Michael Calvin McGee, “In Search of ‘the People’: A Rhetorical Alternative.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 3 (October 1975): 235-249.

⁸ Michael Calvin McGee. “The ‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 1-16.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁰ President Bush, Remarks at Welcoming Ceremony for Prime Minister Singh, July 18, 2005.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Prime Minister Singh at Welcoming Ceremony, July 18, 2005.

¹³ President Bush, Exchange of Toasts, July 18, 2005.

¹⁴ Prime Minister Singh, Exchange of Toasts, July 18, 2005.

¹⁵ Prime Minister Singh, Speech at Banquet Hosted in Honor of the U.S. President George W. Bush, March 2, 2006.

¹⁶ U.S. Ambassador to India David Mulford, “The Promise of India,” *India Abroad*, May 5, 2006.

¹⁷ Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California, 1966), 362.

¹⁸ William F. Lewis, "Telling America's Story: Narrative Form and the Reagan Presidency," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 280-302.

¹⁹ Gerald A. Hauser, "The Moral Vernacular of Human Rights Discourse," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 41, no. 4 (2008): 456.

²⁰ Congressman Joe Wilson, CODEL to India, January 5, 2006.

²¹ Prime Minister Singh, *Charlie Rose*, February 27, 2006.

²² Gary C. Woodward, *The Idea of Identification* (Albany: State University of New York, 2003), 39.

²³ Daya Kishan Thussu, *Communicating India's Soft Power: Buddha to Bollywood*, (New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 73, 83-87.

²⁴ Sanjay Puri, interview with *National Public Radio*, June 19, 2006.

²⁵ Eric King Watts, "'Voice' and 'Voicelessness' in Rhetorical Studies," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87, no. 2 (May 2001): 179-196.

²⁶ Stuart Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990), 233-234.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 234.

²⁸ Weldon B. Durham, "Kenneth Burke's Concept of Substance," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 4 (December 1980): 351.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, 372.

³¹ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1945; Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 51. Citations are to the California edition.

³² Weldon B. Durham, "Kenneth Burke's Concept of Substance," 356-358.

³³ *Ibid.*, 360-363.

³⁴ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 22.

³⁵ Brian Hocking, "Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy," in *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, ed. Jan Melissen (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 35.

³⁶ R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher, and Amelia Arsenault, "Introduction: The Connective Mindshift," in *Relational, Networked, and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy*, eds. R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher, and Amelia Arsenault (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), 1.

³⁷ Kathy R. Fitzpatrick, "Public Diplomacy and Ethics: From Soft Power to Social Conscience," in *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*" eds. R. S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault, and Ali Fisher (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), 33.

³⁸ Craig Hayden, "Logics of Narrative and Networks in U.S. Public Diplomacy: Communication Power and U.S. Strategic Engagement." *Journal of Communication* 19, no. 2 (2013): 197.

³⁹ Kenneth Burke, "Rhetoric—Old and New," *Journal of General Education* 5, no. 3 (April 1951): 203.

⁴⁰ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, Remarks to the Asia Society, October 18, 2005.

⁴¹ Indian Ambassador to the United States Ronen Sen, Remarks at National Press Club Event, February 21, 2006.

⁴² Raymie McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (1989): 91-111.

⁴³ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York, NY: Public Affairs, 2004), 8.

⁴⁴ Wayne Brockriede, "Arguers as Lovers," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1972): 1-11.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 10.

⁴⁶ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 57-58.

⁴⁷ Wayne Brockriede, "Arguers as Lovers," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1972): 10.

⁴⁸ Jason A. Edwards and David Weiss, "Introduction: American Exceptionalism's Champions and Challenges," in *The Rhetoric of American Exceptionalism: Critical Essays*, eds. Jason A. Edwards and David Weiss (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011), 2.

⁴⁹ President Bush, Joint News Conference, July 18, 2005

⁵⁰ Prime Minister Singh, Address to Joint Session of Congress, July 19, 2005.

- ⁵¹ U.S. Ambassador to India David C. Mulford, Remarks, August 18, 2005.
- ⁵² Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches," *Western Journal of Communication* 71, no. 4 (October 2007): 289.
- ⁵³ Prime Minister Singh, Statement to Parliament, July 29, 2005.
- ⁵⁴ Kenneth Burke, *Philosophy of Literary Form*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California, 1973), 55
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., xxi.
- ⁵⁶ Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 114-115.
- ⁵⁷ Brian Hocking, "Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy," 35.
- ⁵⁸ Foreign Secretary Shyam Saran, Heritage Foundation, March 30, 2006.
- ⁵⁹ Robinder Sachdev, *India Abroad*, June 16, 2006.
- ⁶⁰ Kathy R. Fitzpatrick, "Public Diplomacy and Ethics," 33.
- ⁶¹ President Bush, Remarks at Welcoming Ceremony for Prime Minister Singh, July 18, 2005.
- ⁶² Prime Minister Singh at Welcoming Ceremony, July 18, 2005.
- ⁶³ Prime Minister Singh, Toast In Honor Of President Bush, March 2, 2006.
- ⁶⁴ Congressman Dana Rohrabacher, House International Relations Committee hearing, September 8, 2005.
- ⁶⁵ Congressman Henry Hyde, House International Relations Committee hearing, November 16, 2005.
- ⁶⁶ Prime Minister Singh, interview with Charlie Rose, February 27, 2006.
- ⁶⁷ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, Congressional Testimony, House International Relations Committee, September 8, 2005.
- ⁶⁸ Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns, *India Abroad*, June 1, 2007
- ⁶⁹ Under Secretary Burns, *Hindustan Times*, February 29, 2008

⁷⁰ Minister of External Affairs Shri Pranab Mukherjee, Joint Press Interaction, October 4, 2008.

⁷¹ Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Signing Ceremony, October 10, 2008.

⁷² Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 175.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 278.

Works Cited

Rhetoric

- Birdsell, David S. "Ronald Reagan on Lebanon and Grenada: Flexibility and Interpretation in the Application of Kenneth Burke's Pentad." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, no. 3 (1987): 267-279.
- Blankenship, Jane, Edward Murphy, and Marie Rosenwasser. "Pivotal Terms in the Early Works of Kenneth Burke." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 7, no. 1 (1974): 1-24.
- Bostdorff, Denise M. "Making Light of James Watt: A Burkean Approach to the Form and Attitude of Political Cartoons." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 43-59.
- Brands, H.W. "The World in a Word: The Rise and Fall of Détente." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1, no. 1 (1998): 45-60.
- Brockriede, Wayne. "Arguers as Lovers." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1972): 1-11.
- Browne, Stephen H. "Samuel Danforth's 'Errand into the Wilderness' and Discourse of Arrival in Early American Culture." *Communication Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 91-101.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Attitudes Toward History*, 3rd ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1984. First edition by Editorial Publications, 1937.
- . *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California, 1973. First edition by Louisiana State University Press, 1941.

- . *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California, 1969. First edition by Prentice-Hall, 1945.
- . *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California, 1969. First edition by Prentice-Hall, 1950.
- . “Rhetoric—Old and New.” *The Journal of General Education* 8, no. 3 (April 1951): 202-209.
- . *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California, 1966.
- Carcasson, Martín. “Unveiling the Oslo Narrative: The Rhetorical Transformation of Israeli-Palestinian Diplomacy.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3, no. 2 (2000): 211-245.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2004.
- Cole, Timothy M. “When Intentions Go Awry: The Bush Administration’s Foreign Policy Rhetoric.” *Political Communication* 13 (1996): 93-113.
- . “Avoiding the Quagmire: Alternative Rhetorical Constructs for Post-Cold War American Foreign Policy.” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 2, no. 3 (1999): 367-393.
- Cragan, John F. “The Cold War Rhetorical Vision, 1946-1972.” PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 1972.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael and Jennifer Peebles. “From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the ‘Violence of Seattle’.” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19, no. 2 (June 2002): 125-151.

- Durham, Weldon B. "Kenneth Burke's Concept of Substance." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 4 (December 1980): 351-364.
- Edwards, Jason A. and David Weiss. "Introduction: American Exceptionalism's Champions and Challengers," in *The Rhetoric of American Exceptionalism: Critical Essays*, edited by Jason A. Edwards and David Weiss, 1-8. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011.
- Edwards, Jason A. and Joseph M. Valenzano, III. "Bill Clinton's 'New Partnership' Anecdote: Toward a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy Rhetoric." *Journal of Language and Politics* 6, no. 3 (2007): 303-325.
- Eisenberg, Eric M. "Building a Mystery: Toward a New Theory of Communication and Identity." *Journal of Communication* 51, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 534-552.
- Endres, Danielle and Samantha Senda-Cook. "Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 3 (August 2011): 257-282.
- Foss, Sonja K. and Cindy L. Griffin. "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric." *Communication Monographs* 62 (March 1995): 2-18.
- Goodnight, G. Thomas. "Ronald Reagan's Reformulation of the Rhetoric of War: Analysis of the 'Zero Option,' 'Evil Empire,' and 'Star Wars' Addresses." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72 (1986): 390-414.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, 222-237. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.
- . "Who Needs 'Identity'?" In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay, 1-17. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

- Hart, Roderick P. and Don M. Burks. "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction." *Speech Monographs* 89, no. 2 (June 1972): 75-91.
- Hauser, Gerard A. "The Moral Vernacular of Human Rights Discourse." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 41, no. 4 (2000): 440-446.
- Heisey, D. Ray. "Reagan and Mitterand Respond to International Crisis: Creating Versus Transcending Appearances." *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Fall 1986): 325-335.
- Hogan, J. Michael and Leroy Dorsey. "Public Opinion and the Nuclear Freeze: The Rhetoric of Popular Sovereignty in Foreign Policy Debate." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 55 (Fall 1991): 319-338.
- Hollihan, Thomas A. "The Public Controversy Over the Panama Canal Treaties: An Analysis of American Foreign Policy Rhetoric." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Fall 1986): 368-387.
- Howell, B. Wayne. "Reagan and Reykjavik: Arms Control, SDI, and the Argument from Human Rights." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11, no. 3 (2008): 389-416.
- Ivie, Robert L. "Presidential Motives for War," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 3 (1974): 337-345.
- Jasinski, James. *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001.
- Jones, John M. and Robert C. Rowland. "Reagan at Moscow State University: Consubstantiality Underlying Conflict." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 10, no. 1 (2007): 77-106.

- Kirkwood, William G. "Narrative and the Rhetoric of Possibility." *Communication Monographs* 59 (March 1992): 31-47.
- Klope, David C. "Defusing a Foreign Policy Crisis: Myth and Victimage in Reagan's 1983 Lebanon/Grenada Address." *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Fall 1986): 336-349.
- LeMare, Ann. "Fair Trade as Narrative: The Stories Within Fair Trade." *Narrative Inquiry* 17, no. 1 (2007): 69-92.
- Lewis, William F. "Telling America's Story: Narrative Form and the Reagan Presidency." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 280-302.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 3 (October 1975): 235-249.
- . "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 1-16.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis." *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (June 1989): 91-111.
- Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Edited by Charles W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1967.
- Moore, Mark P. and J. Gaut Ragsdale. "International Trade and the Rhetoric of Political Myth in Transition: NAFTA and the American Dream." *World Communication* 26, no. 2 (1997): 1-14.
- Newman, Robert P. *Invincible Ignorance in American Foreign Policy: The Triumph of Ideology over Evidence*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2013.

- Pruchnic, Jeff. "Burke In/On Public and Private: Rhetoric, Propaganda, and the 'End(s)' of Humanism." In *Burke in the Archives: Using the Past to Transform the Future of Burkean Studies*, edited by Dana Anderson and Jessica Enoch, 120-142. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2013.
- Rottinghaus, Brandon. "Presidential Leadership on Foreign Policy, Opinion Polling, and the Possible Limits of 'Crafted Talk'." *Political Communication* 25 (2008): 138-157.
- Stuckey, Mary E. "Competing Foreign Policy Visions: Rhetorical Hybrids after the Cold War." *Western Journal of Communication* 59 (Summer 1995): 214-227.
- Walker, M. Karen. "Co-Constructing Frames to Warrant Preservation of Iraq's Cultural Heritage." *Rhetoricalens*, accessed February 5, 2014, http://208.73.48.91/?page_id=112.
- . "The Importance of 'Standing' in Argumentation: Transformational Diplomacy and the U.S. Department of State." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November 2007.
- . "Economic Growth as Terministic Screen: An Essay on the Millennium Challenge Corporation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA, November 2008.
- Wander, Philip. "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, no. 4 (November 1984): 339-361.
- Watts, Eric King. "'Voice' and 'Voicelessness' in Rhetorical Studies." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87, no. 2 (May 2001): 179-196.

Weaver, Richard M. *Visions of Order: The Cultural Crisis of Our Time*. Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1995. First edition by Louisiana University State Press, 1964.

Woodward, Gary C. *The Idea of Identification*. Albany: State University of New York, 2003.

Zagacki, Kenneth S. "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches." *Western Journal of Communication* 71, no. 4 (October 2007): 272-293.

India

Abraham, Itty. "The Ambivalence of Nuclear Histories." *Osiris* 21, no. 1 (2006): 49-65.

Anderson, Walter. "The Indian-American Community Comes into its Political Own." *India Abroad* 36, no. 48 (September 1, 2006): A12-13.

Basrur, Rajesh M. "Nuclear Weapons and Indian Strategic Culture." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 2 (2001): 181-198.

Bose, Pablo Shiladitya. "Home and Away: Diasporas, Developments and Displacements in a Globalising World." *Journal of International Studies* 29, no. 1 (February 2008): 111-131.

Chakma, Bhumitra. "Toward Pokhran II: Explaining India's Nuclearisation Process." *Modern Asian Studies* 39, no. 1 (February 2005): 189-236.

Chaturvedi, Sanjay. "Diaspora in India's Geopolitical Visions: Linkages, Categories, and Contestations." *Asian Affairs* 32, no.3 (2005): 141-168.

- Chaudhuri, Rudra. *Forged in Crisis: India and the United States Since 1947*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Das, Gurcharan. *India Unbound: The Social and Economic Revolution from Independence to the Global Information Age*. New York, NY: Anchor Books, 2002.
- Dossani, Rafiq. "Indian Soft Power and Associations of the American Diaspora." Full text downloaded from <http://aparc.stanford.edu> on October 20, 2010.
- Gandhi, Ajay. "The Indian Diaspora in Global Advocacy." *Global Networks* 2, no. 2 (2002): 357-362.
- Kapur, Devesh. *Diaspora, Development and Democracy: The Domestic Impact of International Migration from India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 2010.
- Kaufman, Stephen. "India-U.S. Partnership Can Build Networks in Asia, Kerry Says," IIP Digital, June 25, 2013, accessed from <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2013/06/20130625277526.html#axzz2ZGUpZAvE> on July 16, 2013.
- Kux, Dennis. *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991*. Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific, 2002.
- Mohan, C. Raja. *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy*. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2003.
- Monsonis, Guillem. "India's Strategic Autonomy and Rapprochement with the US." *Strategic Analysis* 34, 4 (2010): 611-624.
- Nayar, Baldev Raj and T. V. Paul. *India in the World Order: Searching for Major-Power Status*. New York, NY: Cambridge University, 2003.

- Nizamani, Haider K. *The Roots of Rhetoric: Politics of Nuclear Weapons in India and Pakistan*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- Radhakrishnan, Smitha. "Rethinking Knowledge for Development: Transnational Knowledge Professionals and the 'New' India." *Theory and Society* 36 (2007): 141-159.
- Sahoo, Ajaya Kumar. "Issues of Identity in the Indian Diaspora: A Transnational Perspective." *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 5, nos. 1-2 (2006): 81-98.
- Schaffer, Teresita C. *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership*. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2009.
- Tellis, Ashley J. "What Should We Expect from India as a Strategic Partner?" In *Gauging U.S.-Indian Strategic Cooperation*, edited by Henry Sokolski, 231-258. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2007.
- Weiss, Leonard. "India and the NPT." *Strategic Analysis* 34, no. 2 (March 2010): 255-271.

Soft Power and Related Themes

- Blarel, Nicolas. "India's Soft Power: From Potential to Reality?" In *India: The Next Superpower*, IDEAS Special Report SR010. London: London School of Economics, March 2012.
- Cowen, Tyler. *Creative Destruction: How Globalization is Changing the World's Cultures*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

- Cross, Mai'a K. Davis and Jan Melissen. "Introduction." *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work*, edited by Mai'a K. Davis Cross and Jan Melissen, xvii-xix. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2013.
- Cull, Nicholas J. "Foreword." In *European Public Diplomacy: Soft Power at Work*," edited by Mai'a K. Davis Cross and Jan Melissen, vii-xiii. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2013.
- Ding, Sheng. "To Build a 'Harmonious World': China's Soft Power Wielding in the Global South." *Journal of Chinese Political Science* 13, no. 2 (2008): 193-213.
- Er, Lam Peng. "Japan's Question for 'Soft Power': Attraction and Limitation." *East Asia* 24 (2007): 349-363.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. "Public Diplomacy and Ethics: From Soft Power to Social Conscience." In *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*," edited by R. S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher, 29-43. New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.
- Florida, Richard. "The Rise of the Creative Class." *The Washington Monthly*, May 2002, 15-25.
- . "The World is Spiky." *Atlantic Monthly*, October 2005, 48-51.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. "Grand Strategy in the Cold War." In *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, vol. 2, Crises and Détente, edited by Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, 1-21. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Grinnell, Max. Review of Creative Destruction: How Globalization Is Changing the World's Cultures, by Tyler Cowen. *Annals of the National Association of American Geographers* 93, no. 4 (December 2003): 936-938.

Gupta, Amit Kumar. "Commentary on India's Soft Power and Diaspora." *International Journal on World Peace* 25, no. 3 (September 2008): 61-68.

Hayden, Craig. *The Rhetoric of Soft Power: Public Diplomacy in Global Contexts*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012.

———. "Logics of Narrative and Networks in U.S. Public Diplomacy: Communication Power and U.S. Strategic Engagement." *Journal of Communication* 19, no. 2 (2013): 196-218.

Hocking, Brian. "Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy." In *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, edited by Jan Melissen, 28-43. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2005.

Hymans, Jacques E. C. "India's Soft Power and Vulnerability." *India Review* 8, no. 3 (July-September 2009): 234-265.

Lock, Edward. "Soft Power and Strategy: Developing a 'Strategic' Concept of Power." In *Soft Power and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Inderjeet Parmar and Michael Cox, 32-50. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.

McClory, Jonathan. *The New Persuaders III: A 2012 Global Ranking of Soft Power*. London: Institute for Government, September 2013.

Melissen, Jan. "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice." In *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, edited by Jan Melissen, 3-27. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2005.

The New Persuaders: An International Ranking of Soft Power. London: Institute for Government, December 2010.

- Nye, Joseph S., Jr. "The Changing Nature of World Power." *Political Science Quarterly* 105, no. 2 (1990): 177-192.
- . "Soft Power." *Foreign Policy* 80 (Autumn 1990): 153-171.
- . *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.
- . "Redefining the National Interest." *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (July-August 1999), 22-35.
- . *Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*. New York, NY: Oxford, 2002.
- . "The American National Interest and Global Public Goods." *International Affairs* 78, no. 2 (2002): 233-244.
- . "Limits of American Power." *Political Science Quarterly* 117, no. 4 (Winter 2002-2003), 545-559.
- . *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2004.
- . "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (March 2008): 94-109.
- . "The Future of American Power: Dominance and Decline in Perspective." *Foreign Affairs* 89, no. 6 (November/December 2010).
- . *The Future of Power*. New York: Public Affairs Books, 2011.
- Purushothaman, Uma. "Shifting Perceptions of Power: Soft Power and India's Foreign Policy." *Journal of Peace Studies* 17, nos. 2-3 (April-September 2010): pages not numbered.

- Scott, Allen J. "Creative Cities: Conceptual Issues and Policy Questions." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 28, no. 1 (2006): 1-17.
- Sherr, James. *Hard Diplomacy and Soft Coercion: Russia's Influence Abroad*. London: Chatham House, 2013.
- Suri, Jeremy. "American Grand Strategy from the Cold War's End to 9/11." *Orbis* (Fall 2009): 613. Accessed from <https://strausscenter.org> on February 13, 2014.
- Thussu, Daya Kishan. *Communicating India's Soft Power: Buddha to Bollywood*. New York, NY: PalgraveMacmillan, 2013.
- Van Ham, Peter. "Social Power in Public Diplomacy." In *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy*, edited by R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher and Amelia Arsenault, 17-43. New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.
- Wagner, Christian. "India's Soft Power: Prospects and Limitations." *India Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (2010): 33-342.
- Zaharna, R.S., Ali Fisher and Amelia Arsenault. "Introduction: The Connective Mindshift." In *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy*, edited by R. S. Zaharna, Ali Fisher and Amelia Arsenault, 1-28. New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Additional Works Consulted

- Bhaskar, C. Uday. "India-United States Civilian Nuclear Cooperation Agreement of July 2005: Strategic and Security Implications." In *Socio-Political and Economic Challenges in South Asia*, edited by Tan Tai Yong, 1-11. Washington, DC: Sage, 2009.

———. “The Politics of Nuclear Cooperation.” *The Journal of International Security Affairs*, no. 14 (2008). Accessed from <http://www.securityaffairs.org/issues/2008/14/bhaskar.php> on December 26, 2011.

Biswas, Shampa. “Globalization and the Nation Beyond: The Indian-American Diaspora and the Rethinking of Territory, Citizenship and Democracy.” *New Political Science* 27, no. 1 (March 2005): 43-67.

Brock, Bernard L. “Epistemology and Ontology in Kenneth Burke’s Dramatism.” *Communication Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (September 1985): 94-104.

Burke, Kenneth. *Counter-Statement*, 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California, 1968. First edition 1931.

———. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*, 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California, 1984. First edition 1935.

Chari, P. R., ed. *Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Seeking Synergy in Bilateralism*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.

Charland, Maurice. “Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Québécois.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, no. 2 (May 1987): 133-150.

Cheney, George, Kathy Garvin-Doxas, and Kathleen Torrens. “Kenneth Burke’s Implicit Theory of Power.” In *Kenneth Burke and the 21st Century*, edited by Bernard L. Brock, 133-150. Albany: State University of New York, 1999.

Condit, Celeste Michelle. “Post-Burke: Transcending the Sub-stance of Dramatism.” In *Landmark Essays on Kenneth Burke*, edited by Barry Brummett, 271-279. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1993.

- Edwards, Jason A. *Navigating the Post-Cold War World: President Clinton's Foreign Policy Rhetoric*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008.
- Fisher, Ali and Scott Lucas, eds. *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*. Boston, MA: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011.
- Fisher, Walter. R. "Toward a Logic of Good Reasons." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 64 (1978): 376-384.
- Frey, Karsten. "Guardians of the Nuclear Myth: Politics, Ideology, and India's Strategic Community." In *South Asian Cultures of the Bomb: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan*, edited by Itty Abraham, 195-212. Bloomington: Indiana University, 2009.
- Gregg, Richard B. "Kenneth Burke's Prolegomena to the Study of the Rhetoric of Form." *Communication Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (Fall 1976): 3-13.
- Hauser, Gerard A. "Vernacular Dialogue and the Rhetorality of Public Opinion." *Communication Monographs* 65 (June 1998): 83-107.
- Hogan, J. Michael. "Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy: The Case of Illusory Support for the Panama Canal Treaties." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71 (1985): 302-317.
- Kamath, P. M. "Civilian Nuclear Deal: Turning Point in Indo-US Relations." *India Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (July-September 2006): 23-56.
- Karnad, Bharat. *India's Nuclear Policy*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, 2008.

- Kaur, Raminder. "Gods, Bombs, and the Social Imaginary." In *South Asian Cultures of the Bomb: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan*, edited by Itty Abraham, 150-172. Bloomington: Indiana University, 2009.
- Malone, David M. "Soft Power in Indian Foreign Policy." *Economic & Political Weekly* 46, no. 36 (September 3, 2011): 35-39.
- Mistry, Dinsaw. "Diplomacy, Domestic Politics, and the U.S.-India Nuclear Agreement." *Asian Survey* 46, no. 5 (September-October 2006): 675-698.
- Mohan, C. Raja. "Rising India: Partner in Shaping the Global Commons?" *The Washington Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 2010): 133-148.
- Mohrmann, Gerald P. "Blinking on the Brink: The Rhetoric of Summitry." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 31, no. 3 (Summer 1967): 172-179.
- Morus, Christina. "The SANU Memorandum: Intellectual Authority and the Constitution of an Exclusive Serbian 'People'." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 4, no. 2 (June 2007): 142-165.
- Nilekani, Nandan. *Imagining India: The Idea of Renewed Nation*. New York: Penguin Press, 2009.
- Nincic, Miroslav. "A Sensible Public: New Perspectives on Popular Opinion and Foreign Policy." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36, no. 4 (December 1992): 772-789.
- Nye, Joseph S., Jr. "Keeping Realism Relevant." *Foreign Policy* 111 (Summer 1998): 166-167.
- . "Soft Power and American Foreign Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 119, no. 2 (2004): 255-270.

———. “The Decline of America’s Soft Power: Why Washington Should Worry.”

Foreign Affairs 83, no. 3 (May-June 2004), 16-20.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr. and William A. Owens. “America’s Information Edge.” *Foreign*

Affairs 75, no. 2 (March-April 1996): 20-36.

Perkovich, George. “A Realist’s Case for Conditioning U.S. Nuclear Cooperation.” In

Gauging U.S.-Indian Strategic Cooperation, edited by Henry Sokolski, 215-228.

Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2007.

Ramana, M. V. “Nuclear Power in India: Failed Past, Dubious Future.” In *Gauging*

U.S.-Indian Strategic Cooperation, edited by Henry Sokolski, 71-98. Carlisle,

PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2007.

“Rapid-growth Markets Soft Power Index,” Ernst & Young, Spring 2012. Downloaded

from [http://emergingmarkets.ey.com/wp-](http://emergingmarkets.ey.com/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/05/TBF-606-Emerging-markets-soft-power-index-2012_LR.pdf)

[content/uploads/downloads/2012/05/TBF-606-Emerging-markets-soft-power-](http://emergingmarkets.ey.com/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/05/TBF-606-Emerging-markets-soft-power-index-2012_LR.pdf)

[index-2012_LR.pdf](http://emergingmarkets.ey.com/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/05/TBF-606-Emerging-markets-soft-power-index-2012_LR.pdf) on November 3, 2012.

Resnick, Evan. “Defining Engagement.” *Journal of International Affairs* 54, no. 2

(September 2001): 551-566.

Roy, Srirupa. “The Politics of Death: The Antinuclear Imaginary in India.” In *South*

Asian Cultures of the Bomb: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan,

edited by Itty Abraham, 113-132. Bloomington: Indiana University, 2009.

Rubinoff, Arthur G. “The Diaspora as a Factor in U.S.-India Relations.” *Asian Affairs:*

An American Review 32, no.3 (2005): 169-187.

- Stephenson, John and Peter Tynan. "Will the U.S.-India Civil Nuclear Cooperation Initiative Light India?" In *Gauging U.S.-Indian Strategic Cooperation*, edited by Henry Sokolski, 15-70. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2007.
- Van Ham, Peter. *Social Power in International Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- Varma, Pavan K. "Citizen India: The Many Are One." *World Policy Journal* (Spring 2009): 45-52.
- Vuving, Alexander L. "How Soft Power Works." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, September 3, 2009.
- Wyatt, Andrew. "Building the Temples of Postmodern India: Economic Constructions of National Identity." *Contemporary South Asia* 14, no. 4 (December 2005): 465-480.
- Yang, Michelle Murray. "President Nixon's Speeches and Toasts During His 1972 Trip to China: A Study in Diplomatic Rhetoric." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14, no. 1 (2011): 1-44.
- Zappan, James P. "Kenneth Burke on Dialectical-Rhetorical Transcendence." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 42, no. 3 (2009): 279-301.