

EMENDATION OF INDIA'S STRATEGIC POLICY: NON-ALIGNMENT 2.0.

Arpan Mandal

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Don Bosco College Golaghat 786521
India, Email: arpanmandal386@gmail.com

Mrigakhi Goswami

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Don Bosco College Golaghat 786521
India, Email: mrigakhigowami124@gmail.com

Mabel Aind

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Don Bosco College Golaghat 786521
India, Email: aindmabel@gmail.com

***ABSTRACT** – Non-Alignment movement was started in the Cold War era by the countries which came out of the hands of colonial rule with a motive to stay away from the power politics carried on by USA and the then USSR and thus retain their newly gained freedom. But with the end of cold war the significance of Non-Alignment also started to diminish. Even many political scientists questioned the relevance of the movement in the present context and also India's position in the movement was frequently questioned. As such the Indian analysts and policy makers came up with a newer version of Non-Alignment under the banner of Non-Alignment 2.0. It was a foreign strategic policy which deals with both internal and external problems of India. It tries to strengthen India's position in the international platform by giving many strategic advices to the government.*

Keywords: Foreign policy, Non-Alignment2.0, National Security, Economic Growth.

LITERATURE REVIEW: The policy of Non-Alignment was announced by Jawaharlal Nehru, soon after taking charge as the Prime Minister of India. It is said to be directly related to the Cold War period which had commenced as soon as the Second World War ended. The policy of non-alignment was to keep away from joining any of the power blocs, maintain friendship with both countries-USA and USSR, and evolve an independent foreign policy. (Khanna, 2009) The World War II created a different international order; there emerged a period, neither of world peace nor of world war. It was a period of cold war where the world appeared to be divided into two rival camps ideologically opposed to each other; it was a period of intense hostility, competitive rivalries, mutual suspicion and arms race. Amidst this the Non-Aligned Movement emerged which was supported by the newly emerging independent nations of Asia and Africa and simultaneously backed by a host of Latin American Countries. Non-Alignment Movement is not merely a foreign policy for countries like India; it is a movement as well. (Arora, 2016) A proposal was made in the Belgrade Summit to call for an international conference within the UN framework to discuss economic problems of the Third World states (Chopra 1986). Drezner (2007) pointed out; the contemporary global institutions have

conferred “untold benefits for the United States”. He also highlighted the fact that the European states had been unwilling to reduce their “overrepresentation” in international multilateral institutions (Drezner 2007, p. 34). Since an overwhelming majority of the states in the Third World region are either small or weak, they find it difficult to compete with powerful states, mostly from the Global North. In order to safeguard their independence and protect national interest, they need the assistance of either powerful states or a regional organization. Many of these states are a part of regional organizations. The NAM, in its position as one of the largest Third World organization, could provide a strong forum to advance the interests of the Third World countries.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:

- The core objective of the paper is to examine how a strategic approach ought to be to give India maximum options in its relations with the outside world—that is, to enhance India’s strategic space and capacity for independent agency—which in turn will give it maximum options for its own internal development.
- The second objective is to examine the context in which India’s practice of Non-Alignment has changed over time because any national strategy needs to adapt and to take on board changes to be credible and effective.

INTRODUCTION: Non-Alignment had its birth in international relation in the post 1945 period. During that period decolonization started to happen and as such many new countries emerged in the international political scenario. These countries tried to retain their newly gained freedom by not inclining to any of the power house. As at that time cold war evoked and the world got divided into two blocs viz. capitalist bloc headed by the USA and communist bloc headed by the then USSR. Thus, Non-Alignment came out as a reaction to the cold war politics, where the new sovereign states denied joining any of the two blocs in order to maintain their freedom and to keep the forces of cold war weak. Thus, dissociation from bloc politics and military alliances became the focal point of non-alignment.

Non alignment is not neutrality or isolation from international politics. It only stands for aloofness from bloc politics and military alliance. In simple words it can be described as a feature of foreign policy which is opposed to cold war politics and military alliances of the power blocs. Its stands for the policy of acting interdependence in international relations and taking all decisions on the basis of national interest and an independent view of the world. It stands for full participation in international relations. It is further more beautifully described by the founder member of NAM and the first prime minister of independent India Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru...

“Non-Alignment means attempt by a nation to keep itself aloof from military blocs. It means trying to view the things as far as possible, not from military point of view though that has to come in sometimes, but we must have independent view point and must have friendly relation with all countries”

The term non alignment was coined by Jawaharlal Nehru in his speech in 1954 in Colombo, Sri Lanka. Later it comes as a movement due to the combined initiative of Yugoslav President

Josip Broz Tito and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, Sukarno of Indonesia, Gamel Abdel Nasser of Egypt and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. Their action was known as the “initiative of the five”. And in 1961, Belgrade, Serbia it was formally founded. Though there were five founding members but the role played by India in the NAM was worth mentioning and crucial. And as such India is often known as the root of NAM. India in its foreign policy always reflects the ideas of non-alignment. The architect of India's foreign policy Jawaharlal Nehru strongly opposed to inclination to any particular super power. But his ideals were strongly criticized when India concluded a 20 years peace, friendship and cooperation treaty with the then USSR (1971). This led India to get the tag of pro-soviet country. But India justified it by saying it as a friendly gesture and nothing more than that. No matter what India succeeded in its policy of non-alignment as India was able to get aid from both USA and USSR for its development. In the Nehruvian era India maintained friendly relation with both of them but later on when Pakistan got aid from America or direct support in the Kashmir issue India tilted towards the USSR. And this resulted in the 20years treaty.

As we know that NAM was established in the backdrop of cold war politics and as such with the end of cold war NAM also came to an end or we can say that the strategy of Non-Alignment 1.0 came to an end. As such the relevance of NAM was questioned by many political thinkers and mainly the question over the strategy of India in the post-cold war era was frequently been aired. As such the Indian analysts and policy makers come up with a newer model of non-alignment viz. Non-Alignment2.0 OR NAM 2.0 in the year 2012. It tries to focus on many of the strategic dilemmas that India faces as it emerges into the post–Cold War environment. The main minds behind this are Sunil Khilnani, Rajiv Kumar, Pratap Bhanu Mehta, Lt. Gen (Retd.) Prakash Menon, Nandan Nilekani, Srinath Raghavan, Shyam Saran, Siddhartha Varadharajan. It was an attempt to identify the basic principles that should guide India’s foreign and strategic policy in the forthcoming decades. The present strategy document has a threefold purpose:

- the first, to lay out the opportunities that India enjoys in the international sphere;
- the second to identify the threats and challenges it is likely to confront, and;
- the third to define the broad perspective and approach that India should adopt as it works to enhance its strategic autonomy in global circumstances that, for some time, are likely to remain volatile and uncertain.

But the document did not provide any specific policy to fulfill these objectives. That remained the prerogative of the government. The document only tends to focus on the urgent need of India to have a strategic consensus and to a unified approach to India's international interactions.

The document is an intensive analysis of 309 paragraphs and thus it’s very difficult to sum up as it will not do justice to the original document. But I have tried to highlight a few of the central arguments of the report below under the following heads-

A FOCUS ON THE INTERNAL DIMENSION

Many international observers view India as the fastest growing global power. Still the perceptions inside the state are very different. So Non-Alignment 2.0 begins to analyze by

declaring that an effective grand strategy for India would be the one that maximized India's internal development which would depend mostly on how we manage our global opportunities. It focus mainly on internal development because it reflects the perception of the state that is conscious first and foremost of its own weakness. Hence the authors of Non-Alignment 2.0 see India as contemplating its external engagement principally from the viewpoint of how it maneuver in order to protect itself while it remedies its infirmities.

Against this backdrop of acceptance of India's own weaknesses, the authors' states three central strategic tasks facing India: sustaining high level of economic growth, strengthening democratic consolidation and enhancing national security. In each of these areas the collective deliberation of experts provides a great detail analysis.

- **SUSTAINING ECONOMIC GROWTH-** Non-Alignment 2.0 emphasize on maintaining high levels of economic growth. Sustained economic growth is indispensable because it provides the material for India's political aspiration, which can be realized only to the degree that the country is able to improve the quality life of its large population. The report maintains that India's *“economic growth requires deepened economic engagement with the outside world at all levels – trade, labor, technology and ideas.”* The country therefore, *“has to strive to maintain an open global order at many different levels.”* (Para11). The report welcomes the globalization and its policies. It even states that *“India has to realize that globalization presents it with more opportunities than risks”* (Para 91) and that consequently *“India's primary strategic interest is to ensure an open economic order”* (Para 99). The report talks about India's domestic growth (Para 91). The report urges the creation of social nets so as to sustain continued openness to the global economy without hampering the social cost. Further it urges the government to maintain India's current growth route through continued domestic consumption. The report emphasizes the importance of transforming *“India's research and educational infrastructure, right from the apex pure institution down to the access points for effectively imparting primary education and vocational skills to the wider citizenry”* (Para 13). The emphasis in Non Alignment 2.0 on accelerating economic growth as the solution to overcoming India's development deficits is praiseworthy. But its endorsement of deeper Indian integration into the global economy as the means of elevating growth rates is even more commendable.
- **CONSOLIDATION OF INDIAN DEMOCRACY-** Regenerating India's democratic system becomes a important strategy in its own. And Indian democracy is stressed by both success and weakness which together fuel rising popular expectations about the states capacity to *“effectively deliver public goods and services and to discharge its law and security responsibilities”* (Para 22) precisely when many national institution is in disrepair. For this reason, regenerating India's democratic strategy is very crucial. The Indian state is a vast country with diverse ethnic identity but the Indian state is often not responsive to the demands and needs of its diverse population. This has collectively affected the quality of Indian democracy. This has

become more in the era of globalization where the gap between the rich and the poor has widened much. In such an environment the renewal of Indian democracy becomes a matter of national security. Non alignment 2.0 emphasize on the necessity of reforming India's higher decision-making institutions in a variety of issue areas including from the planning commission to office of the prime minister. Recognizing that India's administrative weakness often derives not from the bureaucratic control but infact from the excessive or misguided control from political field. The report states that, *“democracies elect leaders, and ultimately there can be no getting away from the fact that the political leadership has to take responsibilities. In a democracy only a political leadership can have the authority to mobilize general consent. The administrative apparatus of the states takes its cues from the example of the political leadership. No amount of structural reform of the state, or continuous economic growth, will yield the necessary dividends if political leadership is indecisive, irresponsible or indifferent”*. (Para 300)

STRENGTHENING NATIONAL SECURITY Protecting national security receives enormous and detailed attention in Non-Alignment 2.0. The whole report is about national security because the authors emphasize on economic transformation, democratic renewal and reformed foreign and security policies which determines the safety of Indian nation in a competitive international system. The system of national security can be understood from the following sub heads:

- **INDIA'S STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT** The discussion of national security in Non- Alignment 2.0 begins with the survey of the strategic context and India's stand about foreign and security policy. In the post-cold war era, the report emphasizes what all in the west have by now internalized, but which has special meaning for India, that Asia is the emerging geopolitical core of the international system for economic, political, ideological and strategic reasons simultaneously. This development has directly linked to China's economy and strategic footprint (Para 26), its import to India poses threats to Indian security. Further the border dispute between the two, China's relationship with Pakistan, its suspicions about India's role in Tibet, its growing nuclear capabilities, and now its gradual emergence of power in the Indian ocean combine to intensify the relation between the two despite China also happens to be India's greatest trading partner. The report concludes that *“India's China strategy has to strike a careful balance between cooperation and competition over economic and political interest, bilateral and regional contexts. Given the current and future asymmetries in capabilities and influence between India and China, it is imperative that we get this balance right. This is perhaps single most important challenge for Indian security in the years ahead.”* (Para 41) Again Pakistan is also regarded as a threat to India's security. In the report Pakistan is viewed as posing dangers to India because of a peculiar combination of increasing state weakness married to a propensity for perilous risk taking. But thanks to the presence of nuclear weapon on both the side that prevents a high scale hot war. The Non-

Alignment 2.0 regarding the strategy against Pakistan it argues “*must be to impart stability to our relationship*” (Para 61). It also argues that Indian state should work towards building the necessary “*confidence and trust to tackle the most deep seated and thorny outstanding disputes*” (Para 61) with Pakistan. This process can be supported by greater economic relation, greater cooperation on issues like energy and water, an expansion of societal links through a more liberal visa system and a new effort at military-to-military exchanges. Besides this the report also sees India, the dominant power in south Asia as confronted by both opportunities and constraints in its own immediate vicinity. It states that “*India cannot hope to arrive as a great super power if it is unable to manage relationship within South Asia*” (Para 42). This states that the report urges India to maintain a healthy and strategic relationship with its periphery.

- **MILITARY REQUIREMENTS-** National security and military factor go hand in hand. And as such military factor got great representation in the 2.0 report. But by military it does not mean weaponry rather it means strategic. Non alignment 2.0 that gives emphasis on the area of national defense is mainly that of “*hard power*”. The fact that both Pakistan and China have nuclear power limits the use of India's military power to a large extent. As India have to keep in mind the consequences of its action. So, India has to develop new strategies that allow application of military force but without any risk of escalation. The report urges to maintain the status quo ante in dealing with the problem of China and Pakistan (Para 173). But there are incidents when China grabs our land so it is better on our part to undertake similar action i.e. “*land grabs*” so that we have an advantageous position in negotiations. And moreover, such strategy needs the creation of infrastructure for mobility and housing troops. However, in extreme conflict condition, India should conduct asymmetric warfare so that they can convince the Chinese to back down. The report in dealing with the issue of Pakistan urges the Indians to carry on the present strategy i.e., planning for operations that emphasize on “*the employment of cyber and/or air power in a punitive mode*” (Para 170) at the bottom of war fighting spectrum as well as “*shallow thrust that are defensible in as many areas as feasible along the international borders and the Line of Control*” (Para 169) at the top. Regarding nuclear policy the 2.0 report discussed about nonproliferation, the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the need of an international agreement on “*No First Use (NFU)*” (Para 245) of nuclear weapon. The report reaffirmed the old tradition of India's desire to “*complete nuclear disarmament*”. The report further states that India should not come in the way of CTBT and NPT but at the same time it states that complete elimination of nuclear weapons is not possible as nuclear weapons are taken as currency of power in international politics and so complete eradication is a chimera. So, we should direct our efforts to take measures that delegitimize nuclear weapons. Again, the report urges to take steps to strengthen the nuclear forensics, because it will help to counter the possible nuclear attack of the terrorist groups. They even

suggested to step up cooperation with the USA and other countries in nuclear forensics and also to develop our own Research and Development capabilities in this area (Para 242).

- INTERNAL SECURITY-The matter of national security concludes with the detailed discussion of India's internal problems and security. Non alignment 2.0 give a broad analysis on how the loopholes of Indian democratic system have created internal instability and which are later on exploited by the international foes. India has witnessed many internal conflicts which disturb the democratic and peaceful environment of the nation. The internal conflict has stimulated secessionism, violence and illegitimate challenge to the authority. Again, since the time of its independence, India has the political instability in Jammu and Kashmir and in the north eastern region as well as Naxalite movement in tribal India. While dealing with the problem effective measures and use of hard power when necessary is required. Many of India's domestic problems can be reduced by “*a commitment to practices and procedures of democratic incorporation of all citizens via the federal architecture. In this context, both human rights and political and civil liberties cannot be seen as discretionary grants from the political authorities, or as optional values that can be rescinded in pursuit of internal security. They have to be the bedrock of our federal democracy.*” (Para 188) The report advocates that each problem requires textured solutions that include a good understanding of the specific grievances at play and reveal willingness to deal with the dissident mainstream while isolating the fringes. Accommodating solutions must be developed through negotiations and dialogue that delivers the formal mechanism of the constitution. It also states that force must be used only on extreme condition. In short non alignment 2.0 emphasized “*in the long run, the greatest hope for dealing with internal security problems remains the strength of democracy. So long as citizens have the belief that they are genuinely being heard, the incentives to violence will come down.*” (Para 188) Besides these the report states that in the era of technology the cyber warfare pose serious threats to Indian security. As there are many instances in the global forum – Google’s claims of China’s hacking of Gmail and the breach of the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations (NASDAQ) Directors Desk Service. As such it is possible to witness cyber-attack from enemy countries and non-state actors which will affect the national security of the nation. So, the report advocates for the establishment of a cyber command agency with both offensive and defensive capabilities. This body will be responsible for setting domestic procedures to counter the attacks as well as developing capabilities in various Cyber IT Infrastructure Institutions (CIIs) so that there is better system wide knowledge of our capabilities and shortcomings. For this to be successful an entire industry revolving around cyber security should be developed including student training, insurance, software security companies and so on. All these responsibilities should be decentralized and should not be vested in one hand (Para 265). Last but not the least

the report states that national security can no longer be maintained by buying huge armaments or by buying more military hardware. Infact national security now-a-days is highly linked with knowledge society and knowledge economy, which at its core multi-disciplinary and intensively collaborative. An ecological approach will encourage collaboration within government and make it possible to leverage the assets in the rest of the economy for its overall development (Para 277). It urges the government to invite talent and expertise from corporate firms, academia, think tanks, professional communities such as lawyers, economists, project managers and so on, NGOs and the media. Government should enable these diverse knowledge groups to work together so that a good end result is achieved where the whole will definitely be greater than the sum of parts (Para 279).

CONCLUSION- It can be seen that the NAM 2.0 Report have touched almost all the areas of governance but it is not free from criticism. Many analysts have criticized it by saying that the report is nothing but an establishmentarian perspective. Again, critics like Teresita Schaffer (Brookings Institution) argued that the report has very little to say about the Indo-USA relation. She further said that USA was only talked in the light of India's economic growth and its relation with China. And thus, the report fails to give a detail discussion on its direct relationship with it as modern international world is directly or indirectly dominated by the American factor. Moreover, there was a debate regarding its title as in today's world where there is no bloc politics so Richard Fontaine (Centre of New American Security) questioned that how conceptual relevant it is divide the world in two camps. Again Sadanand Dhume (American Enterprise Institute) pointed that the report was very theoretical and divorced from India's real domestic politics. He wondered that the whether the report would able to fly in the face of the actual conditions on the ground. Further some criticized it by saying that the report was a constant struggle between the idealism and realistic analysis. Again, for some it fails to give rational solutions to the problem of security and economic interdependence and as such it tends to become a perfect example of old wine serving in a new bottle. But nevertheless, besides having all these criticisms the report is regarded as a welcome step in India's foreign and domestic strategy. It is a remarkable step of India in merging liberal and idealist stands of Indian strategy by bringing out the dark realities of India's internal conflict and the highly competitive/dangerous external environment. Moreover, it is the duty of the government as how they implement the advices given in the report as the report is nothing but a bunch of strategic advice to the government. At present it will be very interesting to see how the present government i.e., the BJP government will look after the issue as the report was published during the UPA government and at present the BJP government is trying to eliminate the plans and policies taken by the Congress. Again, skipping of the 17th NAM summit held this year in Venezuela by Prime Minister Narendra Modi also raised the question of importance of NAM for India. These point outs that due to negligence the relevance of NAM has decreased but it should always be kept on mind that in this long run NAM has grown into a bigger organization of about 120 member countries. So, it's the duty of every member nation to work for the betterment of the organization. And India being particular should not neglect the

organization as in the past it has steered India from great power politics. So, it's the duty as well responsibility of India to hold its roots and give its full participation after all it will help India to flourish both internally and externally.

References:

- Arora ,N.D. (2016).*Political Science Textbook*.Tata McGraw Hill Education Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
- Chopra, S. (1986). The emerging trends in the Non-Aligned Movement. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 161-177.
- Drezner, Daniel. (2007). The New New World Order. *Foreign Affairs*. 86. 34-46.
- Ghai,K.K.,(2015). *International Relations: Theories and Practices of International Politics* , Kalyani Publisher, Guwahati Assam.
- Kant, A. (2022). *India's NAM 2.0: Why West's response to Modi's non-alignment is restrained*. New Delhi: India Today Retrieved 4 April 2022 from <https://www.indiatoday.in/news-analysis/story/india-russia-ukraine-war-west-narendra-modi-1933326-2022-04-04>
- Khanna, V., & Kumar, L. (2009). *Foreign policy of India*. Vikas Publications, New Delhi.
- Khilnani, S., Kumar, R., Mehta, P., Menon, P., Nilekani, N., Raghavan, S., Saran, S. and Varadarajan, S., (2014). *Nonalignment 2.0: A Foreign And Strategic Policy For India In The 21st Century*. Delhi: Penguin Random House India¹.
- Rajagopalan, R. (2012). *Nonalignment 2.0: A Realist Critique of An Establishmentarian Perspective | Manohar Parrikar Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses*. Idsa.in. Retrieved 3 February 2022, from https://idsa.in/idsacomments/Nonalignment2ARealistCritiqueofAnEstablishmentarianPerspective_rrajagopalan_010512.
- Rasool, Arshad. (2013). Non-Aligned Movement in 21st Century: Relevant or Redundant? ...A Debate. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 11. 64-70. 10.9790/0837-1146470. Retrieved 3 February 2022, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269751897_Non-Aligned_Movement_in_21st_Century_Relevant_or_Redundant_A_Debate/link/61cc5bdcb6b5667157b230b4/download
- Schaffer, T., Tellis, A., Dhume, S., & Fontaine, R. (2012). *Nonalignment 2.0: A Foreign and Strategic Policy for India in the Twenty First Century*. Carnegie

Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved 4 February 2022, from <https://carnegieendowment.org/2012/03/12/nonalignment-2.0-foreign-and-strategic-policyfor-india-in-twenty-first-century-event-3587>.

- Tellis, A. (2012). *Nonalignment Redux: The Perils of Old Wine in New Skins*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved 15 January 2022, from <https://carnegieendowment.org/2012/07/10/nonalignment-redux-perils-of-old-wine-in-newskins-pub-48675>.
- *NAM Movement and Non-alignment 2.0 - GKToday*. Gktoday.in. (2012). Retrieved 3 February 2022, from <https://www.gktoday.in/gk/nam-movement-and-non-alignment-2-0/>.
- *Revival of Non-Alignment Movement*. Drishti IAS. (2020). Retrieved 6 February 2022, from <https://www.drishtias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-editorials/revival-of-non-alignment-movement>.

ⁱ The quotations marked in the paper as (Para 11,13,...) are taken from Khilnani, S., Kumar, R., Mehta, P., Menon, P., Nilekani, N., Raghavan, S., Saran, S. and Varadarajan, S., (2014). *Nonalignment 2.0: A Foreign And Strategic Policy For India In The 21st Century*. Delhi: Penguin Random House India.