BOOK 6

DAY 2
BENEFITS OF JOINING CTBT?

• 1. It will strengthen India's credibility towards nuclear disarmament.

• It will strengthen India's case for entering in NSG.
NEGOTIATIONS ARE HAPPENING UNDER SHANNON MANDATE

India is under obligation to cooperate for earliest conclusion. At present Pakistan has blocked the conclusion of treaty.
FMCT

- FMCT will be a real disarmament measure because it bans the production of Fissile material or weapon grade material.
- FMCT negotiations are going on since 1950.
NEGOTIATIONS ARE HAPPENING UNDER SHANNON MANDATE

As per Shannon Mandate Treaty will be agreed by consumers.
NEGOTIATIONS ARE HAPPENING UNDER SHANNON MANDATE

There are differences in Pakistan's position and USA and India's position.
1. INDIA AND USA POINT OF VIEW.

- Ban should not apply to the existing stock file it should apply for future material.
2. PAKISTAN'S POSITION

- It should cover the existing stockpile of the weapon.

- Though Pakistan's position is more correct yet not for right reason.
2. PAKISTAN'S POSITION

- Pakistan feels that it has less stockpile than India at present, hence Pakistan is buying time to gain parity with India.
- Thus, since negotiations have been renewed the productivity of fissile Material by Pakistan has increased.
THERE IS ALSO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INDIA AND USA.

• USA does not support verifiable disarmament whereas India wants verifiable system.

• USA want to keep the list of weapon grade material to be minimum and wants to exclude many radioactive elements.
THERE IS ALSO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INDIA AND USA.

- For Example-
- American such materials are not used directly but can act as catalyst can increase the shelf time, can increase the potency.
TREATY ON PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPON

• It has come into existence on 7 July 2017.
• 124 countries participated 122 countries have given assent/accepted.
• Singapore abstained and Holland used negative vote.
TREATY ON PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPON

- However, the treaty is enforceable only on state parties. It is noted that none of the nuclear weapon state and their allies including Japan signed the Treaty.
According to Scott D Sagan, Treaty is just an aspirational document it may not result into the destruction of even single weapon.
HISTORY

• In the year 2012 ICAN posted a Civil Society Forum to demonstrate the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons.

• Conference called upon state to outlaw nuclear weapons.
HISTORY

- It has led to the first ever conference on humanitarian impact of nuclear weapon.

- In the conference government and intelligence is concluded that we will not be in a position to adequately respond to detonation of nuclear bomb.
It has led to the subsequent conference as well as the adoption of resolution 67/56 in UNGA which called for establishment of open-ended working group to develop proposals for carrying forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations.
1. It recognizes the Catastrophe and humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, it also takes into account the ecological consequences.
SALIENT PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY

2. In an ambitious manner, it communicates the desire to achieve and maintain Nuclear weapon free world.
It Prohibits-

a) Development
b) Training
c) Stockpiling
d) Stationery
e) Production
It Prohibits-

f) Transfer

f) Use

h) Threat of use

i) Assistance and encouragement to prohibit activities.
TREATY ON PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPON

- It does not contain all the legal and Technical measures required to reach the elimination of nuclear weapons, It is left on subsequent negotiations.
TREATY ON PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPON

- It also provides the system of verification and safeguards so that disarmament goals can be achieved in a time-bound, transparent, and irreversible manner.
TREATY ON PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPON

• Treaty provides for assistance to the victims of use and testing obligation for remedial work for containment of environment treaty.

• Treaty encourages state to join disarmament and create pathway for nuclear weapon state to eliminate nuclear weapons.
TREATY ON PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPON

- It also contributes in development of international humanitarian law in context of nuclear weapon killing millions of civilians.
CRITICAL EVALUATION OF TREATY

• According to critics it will not result into the elimination of even the single weapon.

• None of the nuclear arms state had supported the treaty.
VIEWS OF UK, USA AND FRANCE
VIEWS OF UK, USA AND FRANCE

- They have released a joint statement immediately and clarified that they will not clarify that retain more ever become the party to treaty. They have given some following argument.
THEY HAVE GIVEN FOLLOWING ARGUMENT

1. It ignore the current Security Environment.
2 It is incompatible with deterrence which is essential to maintain the peace.
3. It does not address the security consideration which makes nuclear deterrence essential.
4. It will undermine NPT
5. It will not result into limitation of even a single weapon.
6. It does not enhance the security of even a single country.
7. No resolution to the crisis of North Korea.
They have given following argument:

8. This is the time when world needs to be together, it undermine the solidarity.
MoEA has released the official statement on 18th July 2017.
VIEWS OF GOI

1. India attaches utmost priority and was committed to Universal non-discriminatory verifiable nuclear disarmament.
2. India is not party to the Treaty and is not under any obligation.
• 3. According to India Treaty does not contribute to the development of any customary law.
VIEWS OF GOI

4. India recognizes that there is no change in International laws related to wars or humanitarian effects of war.
5. From India's point of view the only appropriate platform for such negotiations is conference on disarmament and not UNGA.

In CoD decision has to be taken by consiness.
VIEWS OF GOI

6. India sticks to three pillared Approach, Universal Prohibition, Complete elimination, International verification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Should India Have Joined The Treaty? | No, If India joins and others do not.  
It will be detrimental to India’s security, however India should continue its effects for global disarmament. |
Question

• Is Treaty Irrelevant?
According to Nina Tannenwald, even when Treaty does not result in the elimination of single weapon Treaty it is not irrelevant.
**IS TREATY IRRELEVANT?**

- The biggest achievement of treaty is that, it developed global consensus in disarmament.
- It clears pathway for nuclear disarmament.
- The ultimate objective of the Treaty is to create new norms and values.
IS TREATY IRRELEVANT?

- When world public opinion favors the Treaty, nuclear weapons automatically get digitalized.

- Thus if possession is not illegal, but it is also not illegitimate.
IS TREATY IRRELEVANT?

• The existing norms are that the position of nuclear weapon is a matter of right.

• Treaty changes the approach and project that the possession is a stigma and not a matter of pride because majority disapproved possession.
IS TREATY IRRELEVANT?

• Thus Treaty is this social constructivist approach which aims to change the culture and develop norms and taboos with respect to the use of nuclear weapon.
ACCORDING TO NINA TANNENWALD THAT IT ALSO OPENS THE NEW TRENDS

A) The democratization of disarmament diplomacy so far it has been monopolized by the states, the Treaty is a product of the Civil Society and grassroot activism.
ACCORDING TO NINA TANNENWALD THAT IT ALSO OPENS THE NEW TRENDS

B) For the first time it recognizes that position of nuclear weapon not just a security issue rather than humanitarian concern.
ACCORDING TO NINA TANNENWALD THAT IT ALSO OPENS THE NEW TRENDS

C) It provides for adoption of New Norms, Attitude, Ideas, Principles, Discourses and Meaning.
INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE
Question

• Question- What are the salient features of India's nuclear Doctrine and what are the major debates surrounding it. Do you think India should change its posture from no first use to first use?
SALIENT FEATURES OF INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

- India has declared itself as de facto nuclear weapon states in 1998 after operation Shakti.
- The draft nuclear Doctrine was release in 1999.
- It was one of them first initiative of newly constituted National Security Council.
SALIENT FEATURES OF INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

- Indian strategist K Subramanyam was the chief architect of the draft doctrine.

- Cabinet committee on security has released the official doctrine in 2003 with some modifications.
SALIENT FEATURES OF INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

• It is to be noted that all features of the doctrine are not in public, few are kept secret.
• The Doctrine explains India's nuclear poster and rationale.
• The doctrine is based on defensive realism.
SALIENT FEATURES OF INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

- India has acquired Nuclear weapon not for a offensive purposes but for defensive purposes.
- India has been at the forefront of global disarmament movement, India had "crossed the Rubicon".
FEATURES

1. No first use.
2. No use against non nuclear weapons states.
3. India will maintain credible minimum deterrence.
4. India will go for massive retaliation incase India or Indian forces are attacked by nuclear weapon anywhere in the world.
5. India will go for the use of nuclear weapon in case adversary uses chemical and biological weapons.
6. India will develop the nuclear triad to gain survivable second strike capability.
7. Command and control of nuclear weapon in India will be under the Civilian Authority.
DEBATE ON NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE
1. ON NO FIRST USE

- A) India's no first use remains ambiguous
- why former NSA in one of his interactions held that it is not no first use rather no first use policy against non a nuclear weapons that which means not against nuclear weapons state like China Pakistan.
1. ON NO FIRST USE

- B) official doctrine suggest that if Indian forces are attacked anywhere or attack on Indian territory by chemical and biological weapons India can beat it by the use of Nuclear Weapons in one way it become first use.
1. ON NO FIRST USE

• C) MIT professor Bipin Narang in one of his lecture has mentioned that India is fast acquiring the first strike capability the manifesto of BJP means for 2014 election mention that if they will come to power we will go for revision of the doctrine.
1. ON NO FIRST USE

- D) Defence Minister not in official capacity has also give similar indications.
WHY DEBATE ON NO FIRST USE

- Nuclear Weapons are ultimately for the security and to prevent attacks but even after acquiring nuclear weapons we have not been successful in preventing act of aggression (Mumbai terror attack Uri attack Pathankot attack) from Pakistan.
- Indian deterrence didn't work and within month Pakistan had gone for Kargil misadventure.
WHY DEBATE ON NO FIRST USE

- There is a possibility of proliferation of nuclear weapon in Pakistan in the hands of non state actors.

- In Pakistan the command and control is Under Army hence it is suggested that India can have more offensive posture.
SUGGESTIONS

1. Like France India can at least to go for mentioning the right of use of nuclear weapon in any future Attack by terrorist actor.
2. It is suggested that India develop first strike capacity to an extent to destroy the capacity of throat irritation by Pakistan.
3. It is also suggested that India should go for developing missile defence.
SUGGESTIONS

- Development of first Strike capacity as well as nuclear defence requires huge investment India at present does not have that much capacity.
- If we go for first use we have to keep Nuclear weapon in ready to use format where as at present they are kept in demented format keeping nuclear weapons in ready to use format main result into even accidental use.
4. First strike capability will create additional administrative challenges.
WHY DEBATE ON NO FIRST USE

- Hence looking from different perspectives it would not be advisable that India goes for first strike capacity.

- It will also result into new arms race on the subcontinent, it will create new strategic imbalance vis a vis China.
• According to former Foreign Secretary Shyam Saran India will lose many diplomatic gains which it has got because of defensive posture.

• At present there is a bigger urgency for India to get into NSG. Such goals may get impacted.
Former NSA Shiv Shankar Menon in his Book “Choices Inside The Making Of India's Foreign Policy” has given reference to K Subrahmanyam who believe that deterrence is more to do with perception rather than numbers.

If other side perceived that the country has survivable nuclear capability, deterrence will work.
• **S. S. Menon** also suggest that first use policy would be destabilizing and could not serve the purpose.
• It may not stop other Nations blackmailing.
• China also continuous with no first policy despite huge asymmetry with USA.
• China's focus is on survivability. Hence we should focus on quality research.
• On the other hand experts like Bharat Karnad suggest that no first use poster is possible only for the country which has extreme confidence in the survivability of its nuclear forces, retaliatory strike and crisis management.
• However he believed that nuclear Doctrine are peace time declarations, No Country abide by doctrines during war.
Former Commander in Chief of Strategic focus command, Lieutenant General B S Nagal had suggested that No first use is morally wrong, it is putting our population under huge threat. There is no logic of accepting large-scale destruction in first strike. India has no alternative but to go for missile defence.
2. ON THE QUANTITY OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

- Official doctrine mentions credible "Minimum" deterrence.
- India wants to communicate that it is not in arms race and nuclear weapon are only for defence.
- India's Doctrine on one hand does not satisfy Pakistan because it has not mentioned what is minimum, "Minimum" according to India.
2. ON THE QUANTITY OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

- Pakistan is fast developing the edge over for India in terms of number of nuclear bombs.
- Even at present it is believed that Pakistan has more number.
- On the other hand Scholars like Brahma Chellaney believes that India should have much larger stock to make its deterrence credible.
P Mukherjee when acting as defence minister has also suggested that India should go for minimum credible deterrence.
Lieutenant General BS Nagal also suggested that India's approach should be dynamic in accordance to the requirement.
• **K Subrahmanya**, however believe that credibility does not depend on numbers.
• Credibility is a function of command and control. Capacity for counter-attack and willingness of the leadership.
• Hence, he believed that credible minimum deterrence is the right posture for India.
• According to C Raja Menon the biggest challenge in India administrative.
• There is a lack of coordination among different departments like DRDO and ISRO.
• There are also infrastructural issues which could put question marks on our ability for the second strike in timely manner.
3. ON MASSIVE RETALIATION

- There are two types of Strikes-
  - First is Counter forces (Targeting the Military).
  - Second is Counter value (Targeting the Civilians).
3. ON MASSIVE RETALIATION

- Massive retaliation means counter value strike.
- Context of debate - Cold start Doctrine (Rajya Sabha TV video).
- It is a doctrine of Indian Army in context of terrorist attack from Pakistan.
3. ON MASSIVE RETALIATION

- According to the Doctrine, if provoked by the terror attack, India will launch a quick conventional military assault across the border to capture valuable territory before the International community pressurizes for ceasefire.

- Hence, India can go for limited war by another nuclear threshold.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

- In response to Cold Start Doctrine, Pakistan has started developing low yield short range tactical weapons to be used against the Indian armed forces occupying its territory.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

• In above context scholars suggest India should adopt flexible response in its nuclear doctrine.

• Flexible response means having both counter value as well as counter force option.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

• India should also develop tactical weapons.

• In case Pakistan you just nuclear weapons on armed forces, it would be difficult to go for Counter value response that is to kill civilians.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

● However, it is suggested that India need not worry about Pakistan tactical weapons, in practice Pakistan will not be able to use nuclear weapon on its own territory without collateral damage.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

- Maintaining massive retaliation is much better for the purpose of deterrence.

- Above discussions show that there is no need for bringing any fundamental change in India's nuclear posture.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

• India should focus more on crisis management survivability by strengthening nuclear triad.
RESPONSE OF PAKISTAN

- Focus on addressing the administrative and infrastructural loopholes.
- India is the only nuclear power country which lacks a chief of defence staff, defence ministry is considering to introduce the Institution.
INDIA AND NSG

• NSG was created against India peaceful nuclear explosion in 1974.

• NSG established nuclear apartheid against India.
INDIA AND NSG

• As a platform it determines guidelines for nuclear commerce under India US civil nuclear deal, USA has promised India's entry in NSG and other commercial regimes like MTCR, Australia group and Wassenaar group.
INDIA AND NSG

• In 2008, India got specific waiver from NSG guidelines which allow India to go for nuclear commerce with different countries.
• Though the waiver exist get it is in India's interest to get the permanent membership.
• It will have multiple benefits:-
1. At present India is able to do commerce because of waiver. NSG members can end waiver were anytime.
2. India is just a beneficiary and not the part of decision making process.
3. India still does not have access to all sort of technology which will be required for India for various purposes. 
Example- Clean Energy and Medicinal Interest.
4. It will promote India civil nuclear export to other countries.
5. It is also a matter of pride for any country.
6. It legitimizes the position of India's nuclear weapons. If India is a member, India can stop the future entry of Pakistan in NSG.
7. India's entry is opposed by China, Turkey, Ireland, Brazil, South Africa, Norway, Austria, and New Zealand.
WHAT IS CHINA'S PROBLEM

• China is not against any country but China want that there should be non-discriminatory meant for all countries who are not signatory to NPT.

• It is also important that entry of any country should be not against core value of NSG & NPT.
INDIA IN MTCR LEAGUE

INDIA & MTCR
Even MTCR was constructed against India in 1987 to prevent India from developing delivery vehicles.

MTCR makes guidelines for the commerce of missiles, rocket system, unmanned aerial vehicles and any other system for the delivery of weapons of mass destruction.
INDIA & MTCR

- It prohibits the sale of missile having capacity to carry payload of 500 kg or more as well as missile having the range beyond 300 km.
INDIA & MTCR

• In year, 2016 India became member of MTCR, that's the total strength is 35, China could not get the membership because it is believed that China has helped it in the development of missile of Pakistan, Iran and North Korea.

• Inclusion of India is a matter of pride.
INDIA & MTCR

- It is a recognition of India’s sound non-proliferation record.
- It is a recognition that India is a country with advanced technology.
- It will boost India's space programme.
• It will boost India’s make in India program.
• India can become exporter of missiles.

• India will be able to sell BRAHMOS Supersonic Cruise missile to Vietnam and other countries.
INDIA & MTCR

- India will be able to buy surveillance drones. India can acquire Auro-11 theatre missile defence interceptor from Israel.

- It brings China a step closer to NSG membership.
INDIA & NUCLEAR QUESTION
India & Nuclear Question

I Phase (1947)

II Phase (1974-1998)

III Phase (1998 Onwards)
I PHASE (1947)

- 1974 Indian leaders like Nehru called nuclear weapon Satanic.
- Gandhi called nuclear weapons most diabolical use of science.
- India has been at the forefront of nuclear disarmament effort.
However, International community never accepted that India's program was entirely peaceful considering the secrecy of India atomic energy programme under Pandit Nehru.
George Perkovich has cited the statement of Pandit Nehru where he mentions the role of nuclear weapon in India defence.
 Appointment of Homie Jahangir Bhabha as a scientific advisor of Nehru itself made it clear that he was not against the development of nuclear weapons for India's defence.
Hence, International community thought that India is buying time and is bound to make nuclear weapons.

According to C. Rajmohan, dilemma for Indian leader was never that India will make nuclear weapons or not, the dilemma was when it will be most suitable.
II PHASE (1974-1998)

- India conducted its first underground test, India stayed away from NPT.
- There were strong reactions against Indian decision.
- India was accused of misusing the dual use technology.
II PHASE (1974-1998)

- It is held that India's nuclear program has not been entirely indigenous.
- Till that time nuclear exports were continuing to India.
- There were sanctions against Indian entities.
- NSG and MTCR where construction against India.
According to professor Bipin Narang, India’s nuclear program reflect lot of ambiguity.
II PHASE (1974-1998)

• It was not clear as to why despite developing capability, Indian elite waited so long before declaring India as a de facto nuclear weapon state.

• It is also not clear that which factors were ultimately responsible for the decision in 1998.
II PHASE (1974-1998)

• Despite peaceful nuclear explosion India continued with its program of promotion of nuclear disarmament.

• In 1988, Rajiv Gandhi presented Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan.
RAJIV GANDHI ACTION PLAN
1. Every country should undertake to eliminate nuclear weapons by 2010.
2. Country should take binding commitments.
3. Countries can adopt phased approach.
II PHASE (1974-1998)

- Elimination can be done in 3 stages in each stages.
- In each stage there will be verification.
- All countries should include the goal of nuclear disarmament in their Nuclear Doctrine.

- Note- In 2008 government again presented India's approach at UN.
In 2008, the government again presented India’s approach at UN.

- All countries should negotiate a global no First Use Agreement.
- All countries should negotiate no use against Non Nuclear Weapon States.
- All countries should reduce the dependence on nuclear weapons in their security doctrine.
- Establishment of global non-discriminatory verifiable time bound elimination.
III PHASE - 1998 ONWARDS CROSSING THE RUBICON

- In 1998 India ultimately decided to declare itself as Nuclear weapon State.
- Indian elites took calculated risks.
III PHASE - 1998 ONWARDS CROSSING THE RUBICON

- They knew that there will be sanction but they also knew that sanction will not continue for long, considering the attraction of Indian economy it was also believe that US may not ultimately oppose India, because US had started looking at India as a swing state.
- USA will prefer nuclear India as a balance over non-nuclear India
III PHASE - 1998 ONWARDS CROSSING THE RUBICON

- USA will prefer nuclear India as a balance over non-nuclear India
According to professor Bipin Narang systematic factors, domestic factors and personality factors played role in India's decision.
SYSTEMATIC FACTORS

1) Collapse of USSR and loss of security umbrella.
2) The possibility of Pakistan developing capacity of Nuclear Weapon. It is believed that Pakistan nuclear weapons are in response to India's program but it is actually the other way round.
SYSTEMATIC FACTORS

3) Changing external security environment because of rising China. Even the then, Defence Minister Road wrote secret letter to US President to China factor. Surprisingly China does not impose any sanction on India but USA imposed.
• According to professor Bipin Narang even after claming nuclear weapons India was ambivalent about what to do with the nuclear weapons, it took long time to release official doctrine.
However, since 2003 India has become more confident about its nuclear weapon capabilities.

Bipin Narang calls it as a phase of consolidation. India even constituted strategic forces command and fast acquiring second strike capability like nuclear submarines.
1. As mentioned in India's nuclear doctrine India believes that its interest are better serve in nuclear weapon free world.
2. In 2008, India has again proposed steps to achieve nuclear disarmament. India proposes comprehensive verifiable universal Disarmament regime.
INDO US CIVIL NUCLEAR DEAL
INDO US CIVIL NUCLEAR DEAL

• Also known as 123 agreement entered in 2005, considered as a symbol of the strategic partnership.

• As far as India is concerned the importance of deal goes beyond the benefits of nuclear commerce, it is a recognition of India's nuclear weapons by international community.
INDO US CIVIL NUCLEAR DEAL

• India has got a special treatment and the nuclear world order changed for India.

• It ends nuclear apartheid against.
• India it is considered as the best deal ever.
USA OBLIGATION UNDER THE DEAL

• USA will amend its domestic laws, USA will get India specific favour from NSG guidelines.

• USA will help India in getting entry in the Four Arms control regimes.
INDIA'S OBLIGATION

- Continue Moratorium on further testing.
- Negotiate FMCT.
- India will sign facility specific safeguard with IAEA.
INDIA'S OBLIGATION

- India will sign facility specific safeguard with IAEA.
- India will bring the nuclear liability law.
- India will sign convention on supplementary compensation.
| Q- How do you explain the nature of the present world order. Do you think we are living in post American world. | Q- Discuss the challenges to us hegemony. Do you think China is a real challenge to US hegemony. Substantiate your view points. | Q- Discuss the future prospects of US-China relations and what are the major irritants in their relation. | Q- Do you think the bricks represent the rise of rest and decline of west. Is BRICS a real challenge to US hegemony? |
ANALYSIS OF US HEGEMONY
ANALYSIS OF US HEGEMONY

• The term hegemon comes from Latin word Hegemone which denotes leader.
The two theories in International politics analyze the nature of US hegemony.

1. Hegemonic stability theory
2. Gramscian traditional represented by Robert Cox.
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY

• With intervention of USA in WW I and USA’s instrumental role in ending WW 1 and establishing new world order, we see the beginning of US hegemony or leadership.

• USA hegemony came to be established in a better way after WW2.
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY

• USA was the only country to possess nuclear weapons while European Nations were devastated by WWI, USA emerged as the leader.

• USA support became critical for reconstruction and development of Europe and the maintenance of liberal world order.
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY

• USA had established UN and Bretton-wood institutions to establish its hegemony.
• For a very short period of time world was unipolar.
• Very soon USSR had challenged US hegemony, another challenge to US hegemony came from NAM.
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY

• Thus, US hegemony remained limited to the western world and in some pockets of 3rd world.
• There was a time when the hegemony of USSR was bigger than that of USA.
• Since USSR projected itself as anti capitalism and anti- imperialism, there was a greater popularity of USSR.
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY

- Even in the Western world, US hegemony was challenge because of the revival of Europe and Japan's economy.
- USA was criticized because of its involvement in Vietnam War.
- Vietnam War was responsible for decline of US Hegemony.
EVOLUTION OF US HEGEMONY

- US economy started facing crisis.
- USA was not ready to take the burden of maintaining the liberal world order which has given rise to G7.
- The Nixon shock which ended bretton woods system and made US dollars a free floating currency was a symbol of crisis of US hegemony.
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR

- US hegemony was never as total as it happened after collapse of USSR.

- Even third world countries started looking towards USA as a single superpower.
The initial 10 years can be considered as a unipolar moment as suggested by the polarity of power thesis. Unipolarity can never be stable.

As commented by John Lewis Gaddis, we have killed the python but we have given the rise to numerous poisonous snakes.
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR

• The first challenge to US hegemony in past cold war world order came from the non state actors like Al-Qaeda.
• Al-Qaeda conducted the first ever attack on USA mainland September 11, 2001.
• Thus giving rise to Clash of Civilization us hegemony has been challenged by the Islamic world.
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR

- Since 2008 BRICS economics have started challenging the US hegemony and it is predicted that by the year 2050 the GDP of BRICS countries will surpass the combined GDP of G7 countries.
- Out of all BRICS countries, the biggest challenge to USA comes from China.
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR

- China has already surpassed US economy in term of PPP.
- It will surpass US economy and will become the world largest economy by the year 2030
- According to the Scholars, Islamic challenge is not the real challenge as it can easily be managed by using the divisions in the Islamic world, however the real challenge will be from China.
Lee Kuan Yew, the father of Singapore, has mentioned that never ever in human history, has there been the rise of any country in terms of comprehensive national power (CNP all dimensions of power) as happened in the case of China.
Lee Kuan Yew quotes Napoleon who had commented that when China will come out of its slumber it will astonish the world.

Hence, US foreign policy makers are concerned about the rise of China.
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR

• Though there are scholars who believe that there is no threat to USA from China yet scholars like Mearsheimer warn against China fantasy and the rhetoric of peaceful life.
According to Mearsheimer, China is acquiring power not for its security but to alter the existing rules.
Graham Alison suggests that USA is the status quoist state and China is the revisionist state and hence future of their relations can be understood only through the concept of Thucydides trap.
US HEGEMONY AFTER END OF COLD WAR

- The use of Thucydides trap for US-China relation is the recognition of the emergence of China as a great power.
However, present president of China XI Jinping who described himself as a social constructivist suggest that we should not be trapped in the old mindset, US and China should seek new model of great power relationship thus Thucydides trap is not necessarily the destiny great powers.
## Indication of Rise of China

1. China has been the biggest beneficiary of globalisation.
2. In G20 summit China has made herself to be ready to lead the world.
3. China is the top trading nation.
4. China is the leading trading partner of most of the countries in the world.
### INDICATION OF RISE OF CHINA

<p>| 5. China is fast increasing its defence budget between 1990 to 2017 there is a 900% increase in defence expenditure. |
|---|---|
| 6. Defence budget of China was 17 billions US dollars in 1990 which has become 152 billion US dollars in 2017. |
| 7. China has acquired aircraft carrier, sophisticated missiles, advanced submarines and cyber-war capabilities. |
| 8. China is challenging US domination in Asia. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATION OF RISE OF CHINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. China has string of pearls policy in Indian ocean and is acquiring Naval bases.</strong></td>
<td><strong>10. China has recently acquired a Naval bases of Djibouti, in a very strategic location in horn of Africa which is very near to the Persian Gulf. China is also developing Qatar port, China can easily choke the Communications.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATION OF RISE OF CHINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>China has started building Institutions, so far China has created around 22 Institutions like AIIB, SCO, NDB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>China is also aiming to create FTA in Asia-Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>China has given serious challenge to US hegemony in Latin America and Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDICATION OF RISE OF CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. China is expanding its footprints in Central Asia, Middle East, Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Chinese neighbours have already started bandwagoning with China. For example Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIETNAM IS ALSO STEPPING UP DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.

- It shows that Asia pivot is now defunct concept.
- Even South Korea chose the leadership which favours closer relations with China.
- The Chinese economy is getting slower yet China is going to overcome the size of US economy.
VIETNAM IS ALSO STEPPING UP DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.

- Chinese currency so now being accepted by Chinese trading partners.

- It gives China the advantage to use this money to stimulate Economic growth with limited risk of inflation.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY.

1. China cannot challenge US hegemony because China is not located in such zone as US.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY.

Chinese neighbours will definitely challenge the rise of China because China's record has not been good. China has land grabbing attitude. Once US withdraws from globalization, China story will be over.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY.

2. China will stumble before it will grow and China will grow old before it becomes strong.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY.

3. China suffers from domestic issues and passing through pressure cooker syndrome. There are resentments in Xianxing and Tibet region.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY.

4. China also has economic problems. For example, excessive numbers and size of state owned enterprises, opaque governance, huge government debt which is 200% of GDP.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY.

5. Chinese trade relations are not balanced and China is not ready to change its unfair trade practices.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY

- However, it is believed that China will be able to overcome most of its weaknesses, China has started currency reforms.
- China is also taking steps like OBOR to maintain the growth momentum.
- China can easily manage the Debt because in China Government is both debtor and creditor.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHINA CHALLENGING US HEGEMONY

• China has established Asset Management Company to address the bad loans.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

1. USA has always been concerned about the rise of middle Kingdom.
2. Hence, USA had followed the policy of Containment of China, it is because of USA involvement, China cannot achieve the objective integration of Taiwan.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

• Though USA recognises Taiwan as Chinese territory yet Taiwan is under US security umbrella. USA has assured that any integration will not be based on force.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

2. USA has been involved in the unrest in China’s Tibet as well as Xinjiang provinces, US Congress has passed Tibet relation Act 2002 and has special coordinator for Tibetan issues.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

- USA is committed to protect the cultural linguistic and religious heritage of Tibet.

- There are 60,000 US Naval personnels in and around China.
What are the irritants?

3. USA’s 7th fleet conduct intelligence gathering and surveillance operations just at the distance of 12 nautical miles.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

• 4. USA has placed missiles in Taiwan and South Korea.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

- 5. USA has Naval bases in Guam And Pearl Harbour.
WHAT ARE THE IRRITANTS?

6. China accuses USA of unfair trade practices, USA’s imposition of non tariff barriers does not have transparent policy and in context of anti dumping measures and countervailing duties.
According to China, USA is a biggest obstacle in realization of Chinese Dream and ending the national humility of two centuries.
FROM USA POINT OF VIEW

1. Unfair Trade Practices
FROM USA POINT OF VIEW

3. Restricted market access to Foreign Countries.
4. Non Tariff Barriers
FROM USA POINT OF VIEW

5. Reverse engineering.
FROM USA POINT OF VIEW

6. China forces countries for technology transfers as a condition for mergers and joint venture
FROM USA POINT OF VIEW

7. Currency manipulation
• 1. Realists like Mearsheimer, Graham Alison suggest to contain the rise of China and to go for balancing the threat by supporting Chinese neighbours like India Japan.
WHAT SHOULD BE USA'S APPROACH TOWARDS CHINA?

2. Liberals like Henry Kissinger who was the chief architect of USA rapprochement towards China, suggest USA and China should go for greater cooperation and suggest the idea of US-China forming Pacific community.
WHAT SHOULD BE USA'S APPROACH TOWARDS CHINA?

• There are scholars who believe that USA should address the genuine concerns of China, USA has to accept the rise of China.
• It is natural for China to disapprove USA policies of containing China military in its neighbourhood.
• USA and China have huge interdependence.
WHAT SHOULD BE USA'S APPROACH TOWARDS CHINA?

• USA can not depend on India. Indians are reluctant to join formal alliance, Indians are too argumentative.

• US and India has conflictual interests in IPR, agricultural negotiations Actually Indian democracy is too noisy, Liberals talk about G2 (great 2) equations.
WHAT SHOULD BE USA'S APPROACH TOWARDS CHINA?

- USA should not look at Chinese institutions as against US hegemony.
- These institutions should be treated as parallel rather than alternatives.
- It is good that China is increasing its contribution to public good.
WHAT SHOULD BE USA'S APPROACH TOWARDS CHINA?

• For example China has increased its participation in UN peacekeeping.

• China has accepted obligations in Paris climate change, China will not destroy the order which has benefited it the most.
Question

- Is US Hegemony in the State Of Decline?
1. Fareed Zakaria.
2. Joseph Nye
3. Eric Edelman
4. Niall Ferguson
1. FAREED ZAKARIA

- Talks about post American world and rise of rest.
2. JOSEPH NYE

- Excessive Reliance on Hard Power.
3. ERIC EDELMAN

- Economic Downturn and failure to achieve success in global war on terrorism has impacted us hegemony.
4. NIALL FERGUSON

- We are living in apolar world where Power is getting increasingly diffused.
1. S.P. Huntington
2. Madeleine Albright
3. Charles Krauthammer
4. Michael Mandelbaum
1. S.P. HUNTINGTON-

- USA’s power come from its location, if there are challenges to USA hegemony there are many more challenges to any other country.

- No other country is so well equipped to deal with challenges.
2. MADELEINE ALBRIGHT (FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE UNDER BILL CLINTON)

- According to her USA indispensable Nation.
- More than USA other countries want US hegemony.
3. CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER

- Decline is Choice.
4. MICHAEL MANDELBAUM

- Because there is USA there is order and so long there is order there is US hegemony.
IS BRICS A CHALLENGE TO US HEGEMONY?

- Answer- The acronym BRIC was coined by Jim O Neil an economist belonging to an investment firm Goldman Sachs.
- He coined the term in 2001, predicted that by 2050 the combined GDP of the economics will surpass the GDP of G7 countries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What Is Emerging Market?</td>
<td>Those economies, where if investment is done, it will result into higher returns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFILE OF BRICS

1) 40% of Global Population.
PROFILE OF BRICS

2) 17 trillion dollars in combined GDP.
3) 2 of BRICS countries are members of P 5, Others are Aspiring members
4) They have huge Natural Resources, Industrial Base, Manpower, Technological Strength, Military Power.
5) These economics also have huge complementarity
PURPOSE OF BRICS

• BRICS agenda is evolving.
• According to former President of China Hu Jintao BRICS is an idea which is taking shape.

• It is said that BRICS are building brick by brick. However it is also said that BRICS lack the mortar.
PURPOSE OF BRICS

- Western Scholars call BRICS as Motley cow (spotted cow).
- Formerly BRICS came into existence in the year 2009 after global financial crisis in 2008.
- The first BRICS summit took place at Yekaterinburg, Russia.
- BRIC became BRICS in 2010 when South Africa joined.
PURPOSE OF BRICS

• In 2009 BRIC countries which have been demanding the reforms in IMF and World Bank thought that global financial crisis is the best opportunity to give lecture to the west.
PURPOSE OF BRICS

• Global financial crisis has been because of irresponsible profit-driven policies of the west, which has adversely affected the people living in other regions without any fault out theirs.

• Present status of BRICS and whether it is a real challenge to US hegemony.
As suggested by former Chinese President Hu Jintao, it is still an idea that is taking shape.
According to C Raja Mohan, The present phase of BRICS is the phase of transition. BRICS will get shattered or it will become a major pole.
ALL WILL DEPEND ON

1. How BRIC Nations manage their internal coordination.
All will depend on

2. How global power equations unfold.
ALL WILL DEPEND ON

3. How much commitment leaders show to make BRICS a successful initiative.
PROGRESS UP TILL NOW

• Though initially BRICS meeting resulted into nothing but formal declarations.

• BRICS countries use to give their positions on-
BRICS COUNTRIES USE TO GIVE THEIR POSITIONS ON-

1. Reforms of global financial architecture.
BRICS COUNTRIES USE TO GIVE THEIR POSITIONS ON-

2. Issues of South South Cooperation like Food Security.
BRICS COUNTRIES USE TO GIVE THEIR POSITIONS ON-

3. Issues of Geo political concerns like Iran's nuclear crisis or conflict in Syria. Gradually BRICS started building Institutions and started moving towards concrete cooperation.
1. The biggest achievement of BRICS is the establishment of new Development Bank.

Up till now it has given $ 6 Billion in loans to finance 23 project across BRICS Nations.

At Xiamen Summit decision has been taken to establish the first Regional Centre or branch of the bank in Africa.
2. BRICS countries have published currency reserve arrangement to help each other in the situation of BOP crisis.
3. At Goa Summit decisions have been taken to establish BRICS credit rating agency because there is a western hegemony in the financial sphere.
• The first three global credit rating Agencies like S&P, Fitch & Moody's biased toward the Western world and give pessimistic Outlook for emerging markets.
BRICS

- 4. At Goa Summit pessimism prevailed over the future of BRICS because none of the country has supported India's stand in context of terrorism sponsored by Pakistan.
However in its bid to revive BRICS, China has incorporated the concern of regional security because of terrorism without naming Pakistan.

BRICS declaration mention many terrorist organisation (Pak based) operating in the region like Haqqani network, Jaish-e-Mohd., Lashkar-e-Toiba, TTP.
BRICS

- 5. BRICS countries have taken initiatives for development partnership for Africa and Latin America.
Chinese President XI Jinping has mentioned that despite differences, countries can develop partnerships for prosperity and can make the coming decade as golden decade of BRICS cooperation.
Indian Prime Minister explain that BRICS heading not just a robust Framework for cooperation and has contributed to the stability and growth in a world drifting towards uncertainty.
ACHIEVEMENTS OF XIAMEN SUMMIT

• Theme- Globalisation in the time of transition shared opportunity challenge and responsibilities for the BRICS.
MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

A) Road map for BRICS trade and services
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

B) Outlines for bricks investment facility
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

C) Initiative for E-Commerce.
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

D) Action plan for Innovation and cooperation
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

E) Setting model e-port network
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

F) Local Currency Bond
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

G) Greater people to People Contact, Tourism, Film Festivals.
1. BRICS COUNTRIES HAVE TAKEN INITIATIVE FOR

H) Solidarity and resolve in fight against terrorism and work to adapt India sponsored comprehensive convention on International terrorism.
Is BRICS a real challenge to US hegemony

Farid Zakaria
Sameer Saran
C Raja Mohan
Farid Zakaria suggested that we are living in a post American world.
Sameer Saran

BRICS can go for soft balancing against USA but before achieving such ability it has to create new institutions that can help in consolidation of their alliances.
C Raja Mohan

• BRICS lack the soft Power of USA and USA is a great gambler which can play simultaneously at many tables and has more chips than any other player.
MAJOR WEAKNESSES OF BRICS

1. It's a paradox that these challenges US hegemony, yet all countries are having greater dependence on USA than among themselves.
MAJOR WEAKNESSES OF BRICS

2. Intra- BRICS trade remains very low in comparison to their trade with USA.
3. They have geo-economics confluence on restructuring but have geopolitical and geostrategic disputes.
MAJOR WEAKNESSES OF BRICS

4. Even on economic issues, there are disputes between India and China because of Chinese protectionism and there are differences between India and Brazil on issue of Agricultural Exports.
5. BRICS has become a China nominated platform, much of the BRICS revolves around China. India and the other countries are losing their significance.
Non Aligned Movement

A) Non-Alignment as a Foreign Policy option

B) Non-Alignment as a moment.
NON-ALIGNMENT AS A FOREIGN POLICY
INTRODUCTION

• Non alignment is considered as India's contribution in the theory of International politics.

• It was Nehru’s signature initiative devised, So that India can sail through the choppy waters of cold war politics.
INTRODUCTION

• The nature of nonalignment as a foreign policy option and the consequence of non alignment in protection of India's vital National interest remains a matter of debate.

• Some Scholars consider non alignment as Nehru’s idealism and some consider it as Realism.

• It is also considered as India's exceptionalism.
Question

• What is Non alignment as a Policy?
WHAT IS NON ALIGNMENT AS A POLICY?

• The declaration of India that it will remain non aligned, will not join either of the blocs created a lot of confusions.

• It was not clear as to what were India's real intentions.

• The decisions to remain non aligned was strongly reacted against India by the superpower.
John Easter Dallas, the then US Secretary of State, called non-alignment at India's immorality.
WHAT IS NON ALIGNMENT AS A POLICY?

• India want to take the best of the both worlds without offering anything in return.

• It means India will soon realize the utopianism of its position because there is no free lunch.
WHAT IS NON ALIGNMENT AS A POLICY?

- Stalin - In a categorical manner stated that those who are not with us are against us.

- At times, non-alignment was compared with US policy of isolationism or the policies of certain country is known as neutrality.
Pandit Nehru from time to time, clarified the idea of non alignment.
PANDIT NEHRU IDEA OF NON ALIGNMENT

- Non-alignment is not isolation.
- India will play active role in world affairs.
- However, India's position cannot be taken for granted.
Like Nehruvian Secularism, Non-alignment was not equi-distance rather principled distance.

India will take principled stand on world issues.
According to Pt. Nehru government can never compromise with the national interest for the sake of ideology.
Non alignment is a policy that is most conducive for India’s interest because

1. India will stay out of military conflicts
2. India will be able to get help from both the blocs.
PANDIT NEHRU IDEA OF NON ALIGNMENT

• Non-alignment is conducive to international peace and we are fortunate that there is no contradiction between core national interest and prevalence of world peace.
THUS, INDIA DECLARED

1. India will not join any Bloc.
2. India will stay away from military alliances.
3. India will contribute towards the strengthening of international law and UN.
EVOLUTION OF INDIA’S NON ALIGNMENT

- Whether India is truly non aligned.
Evolution of India’s Non Alignment.

I Phase

Golden Phase of Non Alignment (Up Till 1962)

II Phase

(From 1962 onwards Till the End of Cold War)

III Phase

(Non Alignment since End of Cold War)
I PHASE- GOLDEN PHASE OF NON ALIGNMENT (TILL 1962)
I PHASE- GOLDEN PHASE OF NON ALIGNMENT (TILL 1962)

• India could pursue non alignment in Idealistic sense.

• India did get economic and military aid from both the superpowers India did gain respect among the developing countries.
I PHASE- GOLDEN PHASE OF NON ALIGNMENT (TILL 1962)

• However India did suffer on the question of Kashmir issue and subjected itself to the bargaining of great powers.

• Considering India's strategic importance, USA kept on courting India and India kept on flirting with both superpowers.
I PHASE- GOLDEN PHASE OF NON ALIGNMENT (TILL 1962)

- Despite Pakistan being a member of US led military alliances, even in 1965 war USA did not come for Pakistan's defence.

- Ultimately USA left India for a better partner Pakistan.
In 1962 war India had to approach USA for military support.

USA agreed to support India but before help reaching India, China has declared unilateral ceasefire and even withdrawn from India's North Eastern region.
I PHASE- GOLDEN PHASE OF NON ALIGNMENT (TILL 1962)

- India was disappointed with the stand taken by non alignment movement countries for 1962 war.
- None of the country took the stand which was completely favourable to India.
- They held that 1962 war was because of mistakes of both parties.
II PHASE - (FROM 1962 ONWARDS TILL THE END OF COLD WAR)
II PHASE- (FROM 1962 ONWARDS TILL THE END OF COLD WAR)

- India realised the limitations of its choices.
- India realised, its a realistic approach towards security India realised that even when India will maintain a non aggressive stand and idealistic principles, India's neighbours will not leave cynical realism against India.
II PHASE- (FROM 1962 ONWARDS TILL THE END OF COLD WAR)

- After lot of hesitations, India ultimately entered into the Treaty of peace and friendship with USSR in 1971, by this time US- Pakistan-China Axis started developing.
- India would have been isolated and defenceless.
- Indian elites didn't want to repeat 1962.
II PHASE- (FROM 1962 ONWARDS TILL THE END OF COLD WAR)

• Hence there was no option but to enter into "Quasi Alliance" with USSR.
• Article 9 of the Treaty provided mutual security guarantees to each other.
• Once India entered into the Treaty, India got enough confidence to even militarily intervene in East Pakistan in 1974 India even tested its nuclear capabilities
II PHASE- (FROM 1962 ONWARDS TILL THE END OF COLD WAR)

- Since India entered into treating with USSR, India could never pursue genuine non alignment, it become deformed tilted towards USSR.

- India could not maintain so called principal stand.

- India was extremely critical towards US imperialism but was mute towards Soviet imperialism.
II PHASE- (FROM 1962 ONWARDS TILL THE END OF COLD WAR)

• Thus India's non alignment by this time became "India's reflective anti Americanism".

• Hence US has been allergic to the India's policy of nonalignment which is deconstructed in Washington as code word for Anti- Americanism.
III PHASE-
(NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)
According to C Raja Mohan, Contrary to the belief that there has been domestic consensus on foreign policy, in reality there was no domestic consensus ever.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

- Initially Non Alignment was supported by congress (Centric Party of India), Rightist in India (Swatantra Party, Jan Sangh) Favoured closer integration with west, Whereas leftist favoured integration with communist bloc.
III PHASE - (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

• After the end of cold war because of systematic changes, domestic changes and personality factors we see that there is no real support for India's policy of non alignment.

• Rightists never had any illusion.

• After the end of cold war even Congress left illusions.
• At present only left parties talk about Non Alignment.

• India's economic and security interest forces India to come closer to USA - since USA had grievances against India's policy of nonalignment.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

• As a gesture to India's new friend, military strategy community has stopped using the term non-alignment and it has been replaced by the term strategic autonomy to reflect India's freedom of choice on various issues.

• The rightist government in India led by Vajpayee had no hesitation in declaring USA as India's natural Ally.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

- Even Manmohan Singh government called USA as India's natural partner.
- Present Prime Minister Modi has acknowledged that India and USA relationship has become truly Global strategic partnership.
Modi held that India has overcome all the hesitations of past and potential of the relation was never in doubt.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

- At present USA has emerged as one of the leading defence partner of India.
- Interoperability is developing between the defence forces of India and USA.
- The strongest element of Indo-US defence partnership is military to military contact.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

- There are regular joint exercise of all the three forces India has also been invited for RIMPAC exercise.
- India has entered into defence pact like EUMA, LEMOA and CISMOA.
- May join Soon Beca
According to C Raja Mohan, India was never genuinely non-aligned. Indian officials have never formally abandoned the policy of nonalignment.

The only reason for continuing with the policy is that Indian elites are running short of any big idea which can replace Non-Alignment.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

• Non alignment has become India's identity in International politics. however in the age of complex interdependence, it is suggested that India cannot pursue the policy of nonalignment and so the Civil Society has presented a document known as a non alignment 2.0.
III PHASE- (NON ALIGNMENT SINCE END OF COLD WAR)

• It is suggested that India should stay away from the temptation of being in Alliance with any country or pole, considering that the field of international politics is promiscuous.

• It is better for India to maintain its strategic autonomy and hence present situation India should pursue non-alignment 2.0, which means multiple alignment.

• India should be part of USA as well as to BRICs.
• According to C Raja Mohan, it looks cute.
• However, it will be difficult for India to maintain the feasibility of relations as relation between USA and China got hardened.
NATURE OF NON ALIGNMENT
NATURE OF NON ALIGNMENT

- Whether it was realism or utopianism
- Nature-
  - Remains a matter of debate
Nature Of Non Alignment

A. Whether it was India's idealism
B. India's realism
C. Indian pragmatism
D. Indian exceptionalism
WHY IDEALISM

• India stayed away from military alliances and relied on collective security and strengthening of International Law.

• India believed that it's vital National interest can be served best by remaining Non Aligned.

• India will be getting best of both world.
WHY PROVED IDEALISTIC

• India sacrificed its territorial integrity India had to seek........

• India had to join Quasi-alliances with USSR.
• India could not execute genuine non-alignment.
WHY PROVED IDEALISTIC

- India had realised that everything comes at a price and there is no free lunch.
- Foreign policies of state (superpowers) not guided by justice or law but by narrow National interest.
INDIA'S REALISM
INDIA'S REALISM

- Non alignment was the best way to protect India’s core National interest.

- India's political system was democratic hence it could not join the communist bloc.
INDIA'S REALISM

• Since India was lying in the geographical proximity of two communist giants USSR and China.

• If India had joined Western bloc, India would have initiated aggression.
INDIA'S REALISM

• India lacked efficient means of Defence.
• India had to prioritize economic development to develop even its defence capability.

• Hence it would be beneficial for India to avoid War.
Thus, Nehru's strategy was guided by Geopolitical calculations which he presented in idealized terms.
INDIA'S PRAGMATISM

- It reflects the combo of idealism and realism.
- Nehru himself acknowledged that no government can put its security under threat whatever be its ideological moorings.
- Considering India's capabilities and priorities between the best bet India could make.
INDIA'S EXCEPTIONALISM

- It is called Indian exceptionalism because when other countries were joining other countries. India started a third way out.

- India was able to attract other countries also
- India could generate a lot of soft power.
INDIA'S EXCEPTIONALISM

• Pandit Nehru who was the chief architect of India's Foreign Policy was held that his foreign policy is not original contribution.
• It flows from India's rich culture diversity and civilization values. India believes in peace and nonviolence, cosmopolitanism provided the basic structure of India's approach to world.
Opinions of Experts

1. Aparna Pandey
2. Michael Edwards-
3. K Natwar Singh
4. Sarvepalli Gopal
5. K. Subramanyam
Opinions of Experts

6. Paul F. Power
7. Andrew Kennedy
8. J. B. Kripalani
9. J.N. Dixit
10. Teresita Shaffer
11. Henry Kissinger
1. APARNA PANDEY - CHANAKYA TO MODI

- Nehru aspired to play leadership roles in Asia.
- India was too weak literally and economically.
1. APARNA PANDEY- CHANAKYA TO MODI

- India had to adopt such policy by which it could maintain its independence, yet to be part of the world and maintain relationship with both the superpowers.

- Thus, non-alignment was the best way out.
2. MICHAEL EDWARDS

- He calls non alignment at Nehru’s doctrine of friendship, Nehru’s approach was both practical and moral aimed at leveraging India's position in given circumstances.
3. K NATWAR SINGH

- Nehru approach to non alignment was not dogmatic non-alignment was a Doctrine rather than dogma.
There was enough flexibility, instead of becoming camp followers, India retained independence of judgement, kept itself away from entrenchment and expressed its voice on the issues that method.
4. SARVEPALLI GOPAL

- Non alignment was not Prigishly parading Nehru’s emphasis was on the practical advantage which the policy of non alignment was supposed to give.
4. SARVEPALLI GOPAL

- It was pragmatic and based on current realities.

- It was not wise to put "all eggs in one basket".
5. K. SUBRAMANYAM

- It was an attempt to balance India's foreign policy in the world of superpower dominance.
- It was a sound strategy in real politics and in terms of balance of power.
6. PAUL F. POWER

1) It was Nehru’s calculated rather than ad-Hoc response.
6. PAUL F. POWER

2) For a confident foreign policy, domestic consensus was required. Rightist were favoring east. Hence, NA was the best way to get free hand in divisive internal politics.
7. ANDREW KENNEDY

• It was not moralistic concern alone. It was genuine concern to protect India's national interest.
8. J. B. KRIPALANI

- Praja socialist party he was critique of nonalignment.

- Diplomacy is not enunciating abstract principles.
8. J. B. Kripalani

- Diplomacy is about strategy and tactics. India's Prestige did not protect any real interest of India.
9. J.N. Dixit

- Non-alignment was naive policy, Nehru did not understand that India's idealism will not prevent its neighbour from pursuing cynical realism.
• Non alignment made good economic sense, it would have worked Best if India's neighbours have not joined with outside powers.
11. HENRY KISSINGER

- In his book *The World Order*, he has mentioned that India's non-alignment through irritating the USA was the best course of action which India could have followed.
NON ALIGNMENT AS MOVEMENT (NAM)
INTRODUCTION

• Former PM of India Indira Gandhi describe NAM as the biggest "peace Movement" in the world.

• Initially Pandit Nehru didn't think of developing a 3rd Bloc but later on realised that India can articulate its voice more effectively if supported by like minded countries.
HISTORY OF NAM

1. April 1947 - Asian relation Conference. (New Delhi)
2. First Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung in 1955, which led to Bandung Principles.
3. 1961- 1st conference of NAM at Brijuni, Belgrade Yugoslavia which led to the adoption of 10 Bandung principles.
2. Respect of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.
3. Recognition of the equality among all races & of the equality among all nations, both large and small.
4. Non-intervention or non-interference into the internal affairs of another country.
5. Respect of the right of every nation to defend itself, either individually or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
6. A. Non-use of collective defense pacts to benefit the specific interests of any of the great powers.
   B. Non-use of pressures by any country against other countries.
7. Refraining from carrying out or threatening to carry out aggression, or from using force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.
8. Peaceful solution of all international conflicts in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
9. Promotion of mutual interests & of cooperation.
10. Respect of justice and of international obligations.
Theme of Conference

Bandung principles

Stay away from military blocs, strengthening UN, creation of new world order based on equal respect to all states.

Panchsheel principles.
Evolution of NAM

First (1960 to 1970)
Second (1970 to 1980)
Third (1980 to 1990)
Forth - NAM in 90s
FIRST 1960 TO 1970

- Agenda- Anti racialism and Anti colonialism.
- Most successful decade.
SECOND 1970 TO 1980

- Agenda- Development

- NAM brought the resolution of NIEO. No success.
THIRD- 1980 TO 1990

• Agenda- Disarmament

• India presented Rajiv Gandhi action plan to UNGA. No Success.
FORTH- NAM IN 90S

• NAM was in search of an agenda.
Why-- With the end of cold war theory.
The very raison D'etre of Naam came into question.
Some of the founding members like Egypt suggested to end NAM.
However NAM countries had decided to re-orient NAM.
The then Indian PM Narasimha Rao held that even when there is a single superpower, it does not mean we have to align with single superpower.
It was held that NAM’s Raison d’etre of NAM does not end with the end of cold war, it is just a coincidence that NAM came into existence when world was divided into rival blocs.

Opposition to the military block was not the whole purpose of NAM.
THE PURPOSE OF NAM WAS

1. Build New World order based on equal respect.
THE PURPOSE OF NAM WAS

2. Strengthening of International Law and World Peace.
THE PURPOSE OF NAM WAS

3 These issues have not gone into irrelevance however it was realized that NAM needs to revitalized, "The business as usual cannot be the approach".
NAM countries did and out new agenda of Havana Summit 2016.

Theme- "Renew commitment to bandwagoning principles as well as steps to check unilateralism and arbitrariness of powerful countries"
PRESENT STATUS OF NAM
According to C Raja Mohan, NAM is in the state of coma. It is facing the crisis of relevance.
1. World order has changed.
2. NAM is hardly successful in achieving its aims
3. There is no NAM voice on issues of geopolitical concern. Example- In cases of crisis in Syria, despite Syria being the prominent country of NAM.
4. One of weaknesses of NAM was lack of solidarity. NAM is still divided between pro-US and pro- Russia, China countries.
5. NAM doesn't have concrete Agenda, Leadership, Resources Direction.
6. Among the founding members Yugoslavia does not exist, Egypt is not interested, seeks closer relations with USA, India is no work interested this is the first time Indian prime minister has not attend Nam Summit in Venezuela.
According to C Raja Mohan, it would have been better if NAM countries had taken decisions to end NAM.

At the end of cold war it would have been the graceful exit.

They could have taken the credit of end of cold war.
Question

• Is NAM relevant for India?
WHAT IS ATTITUDE OF PRESENT GOVERNMENT

- It seems present government has a little illusions towards the platform of NAM
WHY

• The present government aims to strengthening closer ties with USA in context of balancing the rise of china.

• There is a historical disliking of USA towards the platform of NAM.

• Americans used to call NAM as Team B of USSR or a club of dictators asking for democracy in international politics.
• Even for Man Mohan Singh government was interested in closer Indo-US relations, it was a very difficult decision to attend NAM Summit at Tehran.
• However it is believed that India should not ignore NAM
1. NAM is still the biggest platform of developing countries outside UNGA.
2. Though India is now in a club of neo-elites (G 20, BRICS), India shares many characteristics with developing countries.
3. India is home to the largest number of poor and malnourished children.
4. Acuteness of poverty in some regions is worse than the countries in Sub-Saharan Region.
5. India has fundamental contradiction with USA on Doha talks food security and climate change
6. India has lost the leadership of developing countries to China.
7. India has aimed for a permanent seat in UN Security Council for which support of developing countries is also important.
8 Though India want to join as permanent member of UN Security Council (UNSC) but UN reforms remained next to impossible.
India has historical ambition to be recognized as major power. NAM is a platform where India enjoys natural leadership.
According to supporters of NAM, India can gain more by strengthening, NAM rather than ignoring for the sake of profitable relations with western countries.

It is a matter of fact that India needs NAM and NAM needs India.

NAM builds India's soft power and only India can provide leadership, direction, resources to NAM.
Today India is much better positioned to contribute to the meaningful participation.

India is the only country which can act as a moderator in NAM, which remains divided between Pro US and anti US countries.
India can make NAM not only a platform for south south cooperation but also north south cooperation.

To conclude we can say that India should have functionalist approach towards NAM.
NAM OR IBSA- WHICH IS BETTER CHOICE?

• IBSA is a new platform for south south cooperation, it is considered as brainchild of Yashwant Sinha.

• Like BRICS, IBSA it's also product of globalisation.
Developing countries had joined WTO but it had adversely impacted their social and economic goals.

Hence they forced Western countries to adopt Doha development agenda (2001).
There was no progress on Doha development agenda and hence the three leading countries of the three continents represent global south to come together to present new model of cooperation.
They believed to use their strengths for benefits of global south.

These countries wanted to lead by example.
AREAS OF COOPERATION

- The most important pillar of IBSA is development corporation.
- IBSA countries have established IBSA fund.
- Each contributes 1 million dollar.
WHY IBSA IS NEW MODEL OF COOPERATION

- It is a new model different from the model of donor institutions.
WHY

1. IBSA adopts bottom up approach.
2. There are no conditional ties attached.
3. It is demand driven.
4. It is based on support of civil society
ACHIEVEMENT OF IBSA

• With small funds and new approach, IBSA has concrete achievements.
• IBSA has been awarded 2010 MDG award.
• It has taken small projects like building community health centres.
ACHIEVEMENT OF IBSA

- Capacity building of countries, fight against AIDS + HIV, Solid Waste Management system, sports system, irrigation projects in countries like Haiti, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Vietnam, Palestine.
ACHIEVEMENT OF IBSA

- Besides above IBSA has also expressed its position on the geopolitical issues like reforms of UNSC, peace in West Asia, reforms of IMF, World Bank etc.
ACHIEVEMENT OF IBSA

- IBSA has huge potential in energy cooperation of India has expertise in solar energy, South Africa have expertise in coal technology and Brazil in bio-fuels.
- The strongest feature of IBSA is growing people to people contacts & participation of civil society.
IMPORTANCE OF IBSA FOR INDIA

• It is a smart step for India to regain the lost advantage in global south, it is an opportunity to challenge Chinese hegemony.
• It is better platform than NAM because it is led by three countries and it is easy to arrive at consensus.
IMPORTANCE OF IBSA FOR INDIA

• Even West countries are not allergic to IBSA as they are allergic to NAM.

• It gives better flexibility to India to develop relations with both south and north.
CURRENT STATUS OF IBSA

• It is also in state of coma.
SHOULD IBSA GET MERGE WITH BRICS

• (Considering that the three countries India Brazil and South Africa are in BRICS.)
Question

• Question. Instead of having separate summit IBSA can work on the sidelines of BRICS meeting?
• For India, IBSA is more important than BRICS

• Why, because BRICS is a China dominated platform.
WHAT IS CHINA'S APPROACH TOWARDS IBSA

1. China knows that IBSA is to challenge China's hegemony and hence China wanted to be part of IBSA.
WHAT IS CHINA'S APPROACH TOWARDS IBSA

2. China had proposed CHIBSA however India smartly kept China out. How- By clarifying that IBSA is a platform of democracy.
WHAT WAS CHINA'S RESPONSE

• In order to make IBSA meaningless china had purposefully brought South Africa in BRICS, despite the fact that the size of South African economy is too small considering the other BRICS countries.
IT IS TO BE NOTED THAT BRICS AND IBSA HAVE COMMON AIMS:

1. Reforming Institutions of Global Governance
IT IS TO BE NOTED THAT BRICS AND IBSA HAVE COMMON AIMS:

2. South - South Cooperation. Out of all the three countries, IBSA is having strategic importance only for India.
Both Brazil and South Africa have closer relations with China.
They will have no real motivation to maintain the separate identity of IBSA.
Hence the real force has to come from India
IBSA OR NAM

• Both the platforms are complementary in nature and do not substitute in nature.

• NAM is still the biggest platform of developing countries.
IBSA OR NAM

- NAM has political orientation and IBSA has economic orientation.
- Thus, both are important but not in its present form that needs to be revitalized.
IBSA OR BRICS

- Though India has common interest with BRICS, yet IBSA is more strategic than BRICS, as a BRICS is China dominated.

- Even west is not comfortable with BRICS.
So long BRICS is securing India's interest, India should continue participation in BRICS. In the present age of complex interdependence, India needs multiple alignments and foreign policy making is no more a zero sum game.