THE POST-COLD WAR GLOBAL POLITICS: A STUDY OF INDIA'S ROLE IN NONALIGNED MOVEMENT

Dissertation Submitted to Central University of Punjab

For the award of
Master of Philosophy

In

Department of South and Central Asian Studies

By
Manish Kumar

Under the Supervision of
Dr. Sudheer Singh Verma

(Assistant Professor)

Department of South and Central Asian Studies

(Including Historical Studies)

School of Global Relations

Central University of Punjab, Bathinda

March, 2018

Date:

Declaration

I declare that the dissertation entitled "The Post-Cold War Global Politics: A Study of India's Role in Nonaligned Movement" has been prepared by me under the guidance of Dr. Sudheer Singh Verma, Assistant Professor, Department of South and Central Asian Studies (Including Historical Studies), School of Global Relations, Central University of Punjab. No part of this dissertation has formed for any award of any degree or fellowship.

Manish Kumar

Department of South and Central Asian Studies (Including Historical Studies)

School of Global Relations,

Central University of Punjab,

Bathinda-151001.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Manish Kumar has prepared his dissertation entitled "The Post-Cold War Global Politics: A Study of India's Role in Nonaligned Movement" for the award of M.Phil. Degree at Central University of Punjab, under my guidance. He has carried out this work at Department of South and Central Asian Studies (Including Historical Studies), School of Global Relations, Central University of Punjab.

Dr. Sudheer Singh Verma

Assistant Professor

Department of South and Central Asian Studies (Including Historical Studies)

School of Global Relations,

Central University of Punjab,

Bathinda- 151001.

ABSTRACT

The Post-Cold War Global Politics: A Study of India's Role in Nonaligned Movement

Name of the Student: Manish Kumar

Registration Number: 15mphsca12

Degree for which submitted: M.Phil.

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Sudheer Singh Verma

Department: South and Central Asian Studies (Including Historical Studies)

School of Study: Global Relations

Key Words: Global Politics; India; Nonalignment; Nonaligned Movement

The post-Second World War confrontational bipolarity enforced infant decolonised nations to adopt the policy of nonalignment to preserve their hard won sovereignty. India as pioneer nation introduced the notion of nonalignment and contributed to the development of Nonaligned Movement through prolonged collective deliberations with Asian and African countries for global peace and equitable global order. Using Nonaligned Movement's platform, India significantly gained her security, national development, and world order interests but loses some strategic interests during the war with China in 1962. However, being non-aligned, India has constructed enough capacity to cope further security challenges through building strategic alliances with suitable powers. India being a frequent participant country in periodical summits of Nonaligned Movement has committed to its principles and objectives. The end of the Cold War had posed several questions over its enduring existence in the global politics. The post-Cold War unipolarity has made Nonaligned Movement increasingly "responder" rather "demander". India's increased economic, military and political weight in global politics in the 21st century, realised New Delhi to calculate the potentials of Nonaligned Movement in accordance with its aspiration of great power status. In this context, by all reckoning, India is likely to be crediting the third world solidarity, nonetheless passionate for multialignment with major powers to gain its commensurate office in global governance.

Name & Signature of the Student   Name & Signature of supervisor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

(Name and signature of student)

Table of Content

List of Abbreviations

Sr. No.	Descriptions	Abbreviations
1.	United States of America	USA
2.	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	USSR
3.	United Nations	UN
4.	New International Economic Order	NIEO
5.	New International Information Order	NIIO
6.	Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa	BRICS
7.	India-Brazil-South Africa	IBSA
8.	Russia-India-China	RIC
9.	Gross Domestic Product	GDP
10.	Group of 77 Countries	G-77
11.	Nuclear Supplier Group	NSG
12.	International Atomic Energy Agency	IAEA
13.	World Trade Organisation	WTO
14.	International Monetary Fund	IMF
15.	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty	CTBT
16.	Nuclear Proliferation Treaty	NPT
17.	United Nations Security Council	UNSC
18.	United Nations General Assembly	UNGA
19.	Association of South East Asian Nations	ASEAN
20.	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation	SAARC
21.	Indian Ocean Region-Association for Regional Cooperation	IOR-ARC
22.	Nuclear Weapon Free Zones	NWFZs
23.	Nonaligned Movement	NAM

Chapter 1

Introduction and Review of Literature

1.1 Introduction

In the twenty-first century, international relations has been transforming into global politics due to the advent of non-state actors, complex political environment on the global stage, "the increased interdependence and interconnectedness," "the erosion of domestic and international division," and the rise of global governance. The word "global politics" incorporated the politics, not only the politics of local, national, regional level but also the worldwide, multifaceted and multidimensional which conduct through the particular kind of system and structure of institutions (Heywood, 1-2). With the aftermath of the Second World War, the two powerful countries - the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) divided the world into the two antagonistic military and ideological blocs. These ideological blocs were the capitalist and the communist ideology represented by USA and USSR respectively. The rivalry between the two blocs was aimed to spread their political dominance and ideological sphere of influence over the world. The ideological confrontation and the arms race between those blocs was known as the "Cold War" (Mohanty, 77-78; Painter and Liffeler, 1-2). The Cold War refers the presence of a war like situation and tension between/among the countries in the region and in the global politics. At the same time, after the long running freedom struggle movements, countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were gaining their independence from the colonial and the imperial rulers. The Cold War at the international level had posed a political challenge before these newly independent countries for sustaining their gained freedom and pursuing development in their respective countries. In response of that political environment, these countries were agreed to adopt such a policy at the global affairs that kept them away from the Cold War power politics. That policy was later known as "Non-alignment" (Muni, 862-863).

India also worried about the possible costs regarding her national interests if gave predilection toward either of the ideological spheres. Therefore, India's leadership under Indian National Congress sought not to align with either of the ideological blocs and announced its foreign relation behaviour as an independent

one, without influencing from outside powers and their policies. For that, India's prominent leader Jawaharlal Nehru's idea was to "keep away from the power politics of groups" (Nehru, 2) and rejected the military alliances of both blocs. This step of the then Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru was an outcome of the experience of the long imperial rule in India. Eventually, the colonial experience of two centuries culminated into a political consensus - not to allow any sort of foreign intervention in domestic and external affairs of the country. Subsequently, Burma, Shri Lanka, Indonesia and Egypt also declared their foreign policy as independent one for foreign affairs.

Further, with an objective of crystallisation of the notion of non-alignment into the movement, India had made efforts to mobilise other newly independent countries to adhere the same policy in their foreign affairs to prevent the possible intervention of the outside power in their decision-making process. For that, prior to attain India's independence, Jawaharlal Nehru had called for an Asian Relation Conference (March 1947) in which he expressed the colonial consequences in Asia and urged to all Asian countries to build the sense of collective Asian unity for their collective progress and development. He addressed in Conference that-

> one of the notable consequences of the European domination of Asia has been the isolation of the countries of Asia from one another…The countries of Asia can no longer be used as pawns by others; they are bound to have their own policies in world affairs…Nationalism has a place in each country and should be fostered, but it must not be allowed to become aggressive and come in the way of international development…time come for us, peoples of Asia, to meet together, to hold together and to advance together (Nehru's speech at Asian Relation Conference, 24 March 1947).[1]

Further, upon the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma and Pakistan, the Asian-African Conference convened on April 1955 at Bandung in which the collective problems and common interests of Asian and African countries discussed. The final communique reviled India's successful endeavour to give the basic principles to the conference that is "nonalignment" and "peaceful coexistence" among other principles. It was appealed for friendly cooperation for the contribution to the maintenance and promotion of international security and peace in the final communique of the conference (Final communique

---

[1] Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi.
http://icwadelhi.info/asianrelationsconference/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=51&Itemid=137. Accessed on 15 July, 2017.

of Asia-Africa Conference, Bandung)[2]. Through that conference, participant countries aspired to bring the common and collective prosperity and well-being for all participant countries.

In addition to this, the preparatory meeting was called upon President Josip Broz Tito (Yugoslavia) and President Gamal Abdel Nasser (Egypt) at Cairo, Egypt (June, 1961). The first preparatory meeting at Cairo was for the purpose to decide the framework and agenda for the first meeting of nonaligned countries at Belgrade in September 1961. In Cairo preparatory meeting, Indian delegation emphasised on the "flexible definition" for membership of Nonaligned Movement and collectively framed the agenda for the Belgrade Conference (Shrivastva, 12-13). India has become a pioneer country by contributing efforts to transform the idea of nonalignment into a movement of newly independent countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin American continents. Although, the concept of nonalignment evolved as an instrument of foreign policy through constant interactions with "domestic circumstances and external environment" (Harshe, 1).

Fundamentally, the nonalignment refers as "not to join any military alliances" with either of power blocs during Cold War rivalry, however, a state can effectively and actively participate in global politics (Haq, 41). Nonalignment is also a policy to achieve articulated objectives and ideals according to the ability of country's best judgment independently and to ensure to preserve the "genuine independence" of decision-making and not to accept the policies of other countries, which may lose national interests (Pillai 4; Malone, 252) and national autonomy.

Nonalignment also has been understood as a fundamental principle of the foreign policy of a country, to achieve the national interests by rejecting military alliances of Cold War and active participation in the global affairs, and ensure the friendship with all countries during the independent foreign policy formulation process. Thus, the idea of nonalignment refers not to join any military blocs and keep away from the power politics of the Cold War.

---

[2]http://www.ena.lu/final_communique_asian_african_conference_bandung_24_april_1955-2-1192. Assessed on 15 July, 2017.

The three statesmen Josip Broz Tito from Yugoslavia, Gamal Abdel Nassar from Egypt taken the initiative for the development of Nonaligned Movement further joined by Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. The formal journey of this Movement starts from the Belgrade Conference in 1961 with 25 member countries (Pillai, 4; Ali, 6). Although, the foundation for the development of the Nonaligned Movement was prepared through collective deliberations of various meetings such as Asian Relation Conference (March 1947), Afro-Asian Conference (April 1955) and Cairo meeting (June 1961).

The more newly independent countries attracted towards joining the movement because of its nature. Their natural affinity toward Nonaligned Movement seems inevitable because the movement consistently supported the freedom struggle for the self-determination of colonised territories. The Movement always concerned about the problems of infant independent countries for their internal and external setting. In this context, India had predetermined position over the foreign relations even prior attained independence. Indian leadership was fully aware and determined about the consequences of cost and credit, if join either of power bloc during Cold War.

India's historical colonial experience as an economically subjugated and stagnated country attempted to apply this policy of nonalignment in the context of both domestic and external setting through foreign policy. However, this India's position seems like a strategic stance at the hostile and adverse political environment at the global sphere. That strategic stance made India capable enough to attain its priorities of national interests in the field of national security, national development, and world order interests despite adverse external and destabilise internal environment. All these India's national interests as immediate priority linked (overtly or covertly) with the notion of nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement for dealing with outside world at every stage of the decision-making process. India used nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement as a mean to accomplish its national interests.

On the occasions of focal issues whether at the domestic or the international level, India scrutinised every decision under the lens of non-alignment and also consider the membership of Nonaligned Movement while dealing at international level. However, those decisions calculated keeping in mind the

4

national interests of the countries. However, India had less involvement on such intense, controversial international issues that may exacerbate the situation worst for all countries in general and India in particular until India gained the capability to influence the concerned issues.

India's engagement in the global politics, particularly in the participation in Nonaligned Movement was highly significant in the 20th century. India's participation in the development phases of Nonaligned Movement provided the pace and strength to the Nonaligned Movement. India's role in the Belgrade Summit (1961) of Nonaligned Movement was important in the determining the major concerns of the movement, which was needed to be focused at that time. However, the inclusive priorities were determined in the final declaration of the summit, expressed by the other main countries. Subsequently, in the further summits of Nonaligned Movement India's principled stand remained constantly endure on the key issues such as on disarmament, the democratisation of the United Nations (UN), colonialism, imperialism and international peace and security.

The Nonaligned Movement developed gradually by time with the increasing number of members of the movement. Simultaneously the intensity of the Cold War rivalry started to reduce at the international level, which was known as Détente period. Further, the disintegration of the Soviet Union, which led to the end of the Cold War, provided a space for the emergence of the United States (US) in the center of global politics. Consequently, in the US dominated world order, the previous international political and economic structure remain endure which perpetuated the more economic disparity and imbalanced development among countries. In the changed global political environment in the post-Soviet period, the priorities of Nonaligned Movement also transformed according to the emergence of new challenges such as the unjust international economic and political architecture, development disparity among countries, and terrorism among other challanges. However, some traditional issues have remained as primary objectives of Nonaligned Movement such as disarmament and democratisation of the United Nations system.

Simultaneously, running with the narrative of the development journey of Nonaligned Movement in the post-Soviet period, India remains the frequent

participant in the periodical summits of Nonaligned Movement. Moreover, India has continued committed to Nonaligned Movement's fundamental principles and objectives. The fact reflected in the frequent participation and in the content and issues, of which India gave high priority in the speeches of political/official representatives in the summits of Nonaligned Movement. In all summits of Nonaligned Movement, India continuously emphasised over the international issues such as the democratisation of international economic and political architecture for maximum representative and inclusiveness which responsible for imbalanced development among countries. India also called for international collaboration to tackle international terrorism, needs for the redefining the agenda and articulating the new strategies, urged for international peace and security through complete nuclear disarmament and by combating transnational crimes. Simultaneously, India is increasingly realising for its fortune, so that gave more attention to its "enlightened national interests" through more "pragmatic" approach to foreign relations (Bharatiya Janta Party Election Manifesto, 2014[3]; Ganguly, 4).

1.2 Review of Literature

The Nonaligned Movement has served India's significant national interests and interests of other developing countries as well during confrontational bipolar global order and holding meaningful existence. In that whole progress and development of Nonaligned Movement, India contributed considerable labour in shaping the contour of the movement over time. To making sense of understanding of this study, the available literature has been reviewed under the following thematic heads-

a) Cold War and Origin of Nonaligned Movement;

b) India's National Interests and Nonalignment;

c) Role of India in Nonaligned Movement and;

d) India and Relevance of Nonalignment in post-Cold War

---

[3] http://www.bjp.org/images/pdf_2014/full_manifesto_english_07.04.2014.pdf. Assessed on 15 July, 2017.

1.2.1 Cold War and Origin of Nonaligned Movement

The term Cold War has attached the history of two World Wars of the first half of 20th century. Heywood (2011) examined the emergence of two superpowers and predominant actors on world stage apparently called 'great powers' named USA and USSR representing capitalist and communism ideology respectively. Heywood argued that the post-1945 superpowers era of 20th century marked by highly tensions between/among states characterised as "Cold War", exacerbated by ideological confrontation. This ideological battle shifted the contour of international system from multipolarity of pre-Second World War to Cold War bipolarity of post-Second World War period in 20th century. He also examined the reduction of Cold War intensity through détente and political and economic restructuration of Soviet Union. Similarly, Richard W. Mansbach and Kirsten L. Taylor (2012) characterised Cold War as the "ideological confrontation" between the USA and the USSR in second half of 20th century, along with their allies and supporters of capitalism and communism respectively. Mansbach and Taylor also described Cold War as period of "long peace" in which the possibility of conflict was ever present in global politics. They examined and explained the onset of Cold War using different level of analysis such as individual level, unit level and system level of analyses through different theoretical lenses. They also examined the entire course of Cold War thoroughly.

Painter and Liffeler (1995) pointed out that the ideological antagonistic confrontation and competition between two blocs influence the social, economic and political situations of other countries over the globe and enable nonaligned countries to manipulate Cold War and great powers accordingly to attain their national interests. The world order of second half of 20th century inculcates continues tension between the United States and the Soviet Union such as ideological conflict, the arms race, politics of power and polarization. Therefore, a division of the world into two military and political blocs defined as Cold War. However, Charles S. Maier (2005) understood differently the Cold War politics from Heywood (2011) and Painter and Liffeler (2005). He argued that Cold War was not the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union to spread the ideological influence over the world. Maier rejected the rhetoric of maintenance of peace through a balance of power during Cold War. In support of

his rejection of the others understanding about the Cold war logic, Maier argued that the Cold War was the idea to formulate the favourable global order to accomplish their imperial objectives. However, Kaarbo and Ray (2011) examined that the Cold War emerged due to the aggressiveness and suspicions between the USSR and the US against each other's intensity of territorial expansionism. The intensity of Cold War exacerbated by building security alliances such as North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO) and Warsaw Pact.

In the above discussion about Cold War scenario in the second half of 20th century, the newly independent countries protected their independence by adopting nonalignment foreign policy and rejecting military alliances of powerful countries. B. N. Mehrish (1985) analysed the evolution the notion of nonalignment in India under Indian National Congress (INC) leadership. Mehrish argued that India's origination of the concept of non-alignment is distinctive contribution to international system. Mehrish also examined the application of the concept of nonalginment in India's foreign policy under the leadership of India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Rajan Harshe (1990) also explains the evolution of the notion of nonalignment in India through the interaction of internal and external situations with consistent changes in it demanded by circumstances. He analysed that the evolution process of the Nonaligned Movement was through mobilization of Afro-Asian countries by India to preserve their hard-won identity and sovereignty from imperialist powers. Harshe argued that India's effort to mobilize Afro-Asian countries provide strengthen the Nonaligned Movement which resulted in the transformation of movement's direction from East-West political confrontation to North-South economic confrontation.

Devdutt (1962) investigated the phrase "non-alignment" in Indian context. He defined nonalignment as a broader concept and wider portion of the principle of India's foreign policy. The "nonalignment" is one of the three aspects of India's attitude to the Cold War; rest two are "independent polity" and "peace area approach." Devdutt elucidated the implication of those three values in India's foreign policy by denoting India's response to the fluctuating intensity of Cold War. M. V. Naidu (1991) elucidated the gradual process of the evolution of the idea of nonalignment in the response of Cold War, just after the end of Second World

War. Naidu provided the criticism of the idea of nonalignment from both Eastern and Western point of view. By explaining the evolution of nonalignment, he also examined the basis premises of Cold War and nonalignment as well. Obaid Ul Haq (1977) examined the basic tenets of nonalignment and the temper of Nonaligned Movement to evaluate the role it has played. During his attempt to evaluation, he made a distinction between nonalignment and neutrality. Further, he argued that nonalignment not develop as the uniform doctrine of international relation by one particular pundit. However, the idea emerged as a response to the world situation which confronted newly independent countries.

Bimal Prasad (1983) provided the extensive elaborative process of the evolution of the concept of nonalignment under INC leadership in India. However, he argued that the policy of nonalignment emerged as the natural result from experience of colonialism. Nonalignment was the aspiration of those countries which acquired their independence after the Second World War. Prasad also examined the whole process of the development of the Nonaligned Movement and map India's part in that process. Christos A. Frangonikolopoulos (1995) also examines the evolution of nonalignment and provided the distinction between nonalignment as a policy and as a movement. He defined nonalignment initially as a policy of moderation of global East-West relations during Cold War. Further, Frangonikolopoulos described that the nonalignment was transformed into a movement of nonaligned countries which committed to international political and economic reforms. M. S. Rajan (1965) explained the specific meaning and essence of the policy of nonalignment in the context of the bipolar global political order of mid-20th century. Rajan defined nonalignment as the deliberate and calculated rejection of any military or political commitment toward either of power bloc and not to allow foreign military bases on one's territory. It is simply a means to attain the goals of foreign policy. Further, Rajan argued that the future of nonalignment depend on the continued existence of the fundamental principles of nonalignment.

Babaa and Crabb (1965) made a clear distinction between the terms neutralism and neutrality and isolationism, which often highly ambiguous engender misapprehensions about nonalignment. To understand nonalignment, Babaa and Crabb make differentiate the terms close to nonalignment and identify common

elements in the diverse African, Asian and Arab interpretation of the doctrine. A. P. Rana (1969) provides the intellectual dimensions of India's nonalignment perspectives. He explained and interpreted India's nonalignment in the context of security policy during Nehru years providing the rationale behind that. Rana also examined that India's particular security response through nonaligned policy and why it was so. Sisir K. Gupta (1965) defined nonalignment origination as Asian deliberations through overcoming the confrontation with imperialist powers. He noted that the adherence of nonalignment by a large number of Arab and African countries has strengthened the concept of nonalignment and gave new meaning to it. Gupta argues that nonalignment gradually achieved respect is largely a result of African and Arab countries support of it.

In the post-Second World War period, suspicions and aggressiveness of USSR and US against each other, in terms of territorial expansionism toward each other territory led emergence of military confrontation between two superpowers. This military confrontation was exacerbated by ideological battle. This bipolar military and ideological rivalry between both the powerful countries characterised as Cold War. To prevent the hard won independence, the newly independent countries adopted the nonalignment foreign policy. The idea of nonalignment introduced by India at first and further adopted by many African, Latin American and Asian countries.

1.2.2 India's National Interests and Nonalignment

The bipolar global politics of mid-20th century created circumstances from which the idea of nonalignment took birth, gradually the idea evolved and transformed into a movement of nonaligned countries. In such political environment in the international relations, countries pursued their national interests through diplomacy and foreign policy. Sumit Ganguly (2010) illustrated the three factors such as "personal, national, and systemic," which contributed to the choice of India's ideational foreign policy. At personal level, Nehru's normative goals embodied in the doctrine of nonalignment; the national experience of colonialism; and at systemic level, the structured policy of nonalignment provided ability to India to turn its limitation into a possible asset. Ganguly also characterised Indian foreign policy toward the persuasion of "enlightened national interests" in post-Cold War era. In line with Ganguly's argument, Rahul Mukherji (2010) argued that India's

foreign policy was determined by the domestic factors, however, Mukherji aided the international factors too. Which are, one, the rivalry and power politics during Cold War; two, the international structure was mediated by domestic political consideration and influenced by the idea of nonalignment. Further, Ganguly argued that aspiration of self-reliance to accomplish national interests, the nonaligned policy was India's response to the complexity of Cold War situation having colonial experience. However, Itty Abraham (2008) clarified the relationship between nonalignment as a distinctive feature of Indian foreign policy and India's interests in the Nonaligned Movement. He argued that the nonalignment in Indian foreign policy was "contingent outcome of a sophisticated analysis" of global order and "defensive" political choices in the contemporary regional affairs during the 1950s and early 1960s.

David M. Malone (2011) examined on India's economic policy since the independence of the countries in 1947. Malone examined India's economic development journey since independence in three phases. The search for autonomous economic policy (1947-1966); a toxic mix: socialism and autocracy (1966-1990); reforms, globalisation and growing global interdependence (1990-2010). Malone further examined that how growing evolving pattern of economic relationship among various actors affected the India's foreign policy and its ties with major partners. Chris Ogden (2014) also focused on India's rationale and approach towards its economic development over the last sixty years. He also examined similar to David M. Malone that India initially focused on economic self-reliance and socialism, further embraced with more liberalism and globalisation principles. In addition to this, Ogden further also examined that how these adaptation contributed in India's contemporary rise and bolstered her aspiration to become a great power.

Chris Ogden (2011) investigated the roots of India's great power aspiration and how India's behaviour becomes normalised and conditioned by internal and external events. Ogden underlined India's aims, goals, and interests which continuously driven India's foreign policy under different regimes of different political parties. He further examined the difference in approaches concerned with the attainment of India's great power status such as idealism of earlier Indian leadership and more realist and realpolitik attitudes which emerged in the 1990s.

Ganguly and Pardesi (2009) surveyed of India's foreign policy from 1947 to 2009 into three distinct historical sections. They explained the period from 1947 to 1962 as constituted as the most idealistic phase of India's foreign policy. The second period from 1962 to 1991 saw a gradual shift from idealism to "self-help" approach, keeping elements of idealism. Further, the period from 1991 to 2009 characterised as the adoption of more pragmatic foreign policy approach. Similarly, Mukherjee and Malone (2011) examined the gradual transformation of India's foreign policy from its inception to the first decade of 21st century. It elucidated that India's foreign and domestic politics as a transition from idealism (under Nehru period) through realpolitik (from mid-1960s to mid-1980s), to more oriented toward pragmatism driven by economic persuasion. They also highlighted concerns of India's domestic, regional and global security challenges.

C. Raja Mohan (2015) extensively analysed the inception, development and relevance of the idea of nonalignment and the Nonaligned Movement in Indian context. Mohan argued that the nonalignment was an attempt to avoiding the limitation which alliances imposed on nations in various forms. Further, Mohan raised question over the enduring relevance of the idea of nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement for India. He argued that India's foreign policy behaviour would bear no resemblance to the idea of nonalignment which shaped its image in the early decade of the republic of India, however, India did not discard this idea formally. However, Ian Hall (2016) examined the India's emerging multi-alignment approach in foreign policy. Hall argued that the multialignment approach has developed in India's foreign policy behaviour since the mid-2000s as a means of achieving national interests. This multialignment approach characterised by emphasis on engagement with regional multilateral institutions, conducting strategic partnerships. He emphasised that multialignment is being utilised to enhance India's economic development and national security.

The bipolar power politics in international system in second half of the 20th century created the circumstances for the emergence of the idea of nonalignment. India became the pioneer country who introduced the idea of nonalignment which was influenced by three level of factors such as personal, national and systemic level. Means, India's initial leadership, national consensus and systemic structured ideational nonaligned foreign policy. Nonetheless the external factors also

determined India's foreign policy. India's initial ideational approach in early years of post-independence was the "contingent outcome" of sophisticated analyses of intense confrontational bipolar world order of post-Second World War for the persuasion of aspired national interests. Further India shifted in her foreign policy approach toward pragmatism due to changed geopolitical environment, especially in post-Cold War era.

1.2.3 Role of India in Nonaligned Movement

Ritu Shrivastva (1995) worked on India's seminal contribution to the emergence and growth of nonalignment as a posture of foreign policy and as an international movement of developing and nonaligned countries. India articulated the policy of nonalignment and injected the moral path for other Asian and African countries. India was one of the leading countries in the collective deliberation for developing Nonaligned Movement. Shrivastva concentrated the study on the development journey of the Nonaligned Movement from Belgrade Summit to Jakarta Summit of the Movement focusing on India's participation in the deliberations. Wajid Ali (2004) also concentrated his study on the background of the advent of Cold War and Nonaligned Movement that, with the conclusion of Second World War the decolonisation process started. Among newly independent countries of Asia and Africa, India at first declared its foreign policy as nonaligned. Ali further also worked on the journey of the development of Nonaligned Movement from First Belgrade Summit to Sixth Summit held in New Delhi. Ali further examined India's participated role in the periodical summits of Nonaligned Movement from since its inception to the New Delhi summit held in 1983.

Rajan Harshe (1990) analysed that the evolution process of the Nonaligned Movement was through mobilization of Afro-Asian countries by India to preserve their hard-won identity and sovereignty from imperialist powers. He argues that India's effort to mobilize Afro-Asian countries provide strengthen the Nonaligned Movement resulted in the transformation of movement's direction from East-West political confrontation to North-South economic confrontation. R. S. Yadav (2012) argued that the policy of nonalignment significantly influences the foreign policy and relation of many countries including the great powers in the second half of 20th century. He critically analysed India's significant role to provide stability in the world to advocating decolonization, rejecting apartheid, subjugation and support

the national freedom movements in former colonial countries through Nonaligned Movement. Providing active leadership in Nonaligned Movement and call for new international economic order, effort for nuclear disarmament, emphasis on the cooperation among developing countries, to implement the program, policies of Nonaligned Movement and campaign for the development of the movement. Yadav further explicated that India utilized the Nonaligned Movement to discuss and solve the problems of developing countries, participated actively in all summits and secure the possibilities of decline the movement. Yadav argued that India's contribution in Nonaligned Movement resulted in strengthen of world peace process.

C. Raja Mohan (2015) explained that during the decade of the 1970s, due to political defeat of United States in Vietnam, Nicaragua, Iran, and Afghanistan the Nonaligned Movement shown the predilection of pro-East. Simultaneously, cooperation among third world countries within the Nonaligned Movement on natural resources and economic issues was strengthen the movement. The reflection of this strength with majority in United Nations General Assembly utilized as opportunity by India to challenge the western dominance and set the agenda of inclusiveness using the tools of Nonaligned Movement and G-77 in General Assembly to call for New International Economic Order, transformation of global economic regimes and the demand for New International Information Order. Similarly, Kalyanaraman (2016) explained that Nonaligned Movement had served India well to preserve the autonomy of action in global politics. India also participated actively in the movement and advocated decolonization, end of apartheid and also initiate the articulation of new international economic, information and communication order to augment the capability of developing countries. Moreover, India has initiated the step for global nuclear disarmament through United Nations and taken a critical stance on Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which is discriminatory of the global nuclear order.

As a pioneer country to introduce nonalignment, India also contributed its part in the development of Nonaligned Movement. India advocated for the common concerns of developing countries such as colonialism, imperialism, democratisation of international political and economic structure using platform of Nonaligned Movement which provided incentives to developing countries to join

the movement. India's contribution marked seminal to reduce the intensity of Cold War and strengthen the world peace process.

1.2.4. India and Relevance of Nonalignment in Post-Cold War

Harsh V. Pant and Julie M. Super (2015) explored the foundation of nonalignment and its operationalisation process in India's foreign policy. India's implementation of the policy of nonalignment has been examined by Pant and Super and argued that India is likely to continue its rhetoric of nonalignment for the quest of strategic autonomy. Simultaneously, moving closer to the Western powerful countries to efficiently balance the growing Chinese influence in Asia. Sunil Khilnani, et. al. (2014) gave a comprehensive overview of the challenges and opportunities available to India in the years coming ahead. The document "Nonalignment 2.0" argued that even in post-Cold War scenario, the nonalignment as a strategy has become highly pertinent for India than ever before. The document identified the basic drivers and principles of foreign policy on world stage while preserving its value system and strategic autonomy. However, Sumit Ganguly (2010) argued that India's foreign policy marched toward pursuit of "enlightened national interests," provided the personal, national and systemic factors which drive this march. That, the national consensus emerging for pursuing pragmatic foreign policy to enhance economic and military clout and India's desire to realise the more strength in an increasingly multipolar world.

R. S. Yadav (2013) noted that Nonaligned Movement emerged as a strong movement gradually. Yadav made a genuine attempt to assess India's role in Nonaligned Movement at different fronts since its inception. Further, he analysed that instead of dismantling the Nonaligned Movement, the need of the hour is to redefine its priorities in the dramatically changed post-Cold War scenario. Marco A. Vieira (2016) studies on the Nonaligned Movement and it's ontological security aspects in which it is provided the space for the discussion of the raised questions of the continued relevance of Nonaligned Movement. Vieira argued that the Nonaligned Movement's enduring relevance and legitimacy resilience are the results of continued adherence to the core principles of nonalignment by key member states. Vieira claimed that the source of Nonaligned Movement's contemporary resilience is the sense of stabilising and continuity of the movement, ratified by developing countries. K. S. Pavithran (2010) examined the India's policy

of nonalignment and also analysed the relevance of Nonaligned Movement in 21st century. Pavithran argued that despite disintegration of Soviet Union the problems of the developing countries remained unchanged. Further Pavithran emphasised on the strengthening and redefining the role of Nonaligned Movement.

However, Ogden (2012) argued that India highly consider its basic principles while conducting foreign relations but the priorities shifted among the principles which depend on the demand of the circumstances. Ogden argued that India limited her interaction with multilateral institutions if the expected outcome was not received. Sahni (2007) examined contemporary drivers and non-drivers of India's foreign policy. He defined driver factors as India's quest for strategic autonomy, desire to play a role in global system, need to access technology and hunger for energy and the democracy, market, norms, culture and geography defined as non-driver actors of India's foreign policy.

Surendra Chopra (1986) provided the understanding of bipolar global politics during Cold War. He analysed that over the time, the Nonaligned Movement has changed with the emergence of new trends resulted from various socio-economic and geopolitical factors. Chopra examined the transformation of Nonaligned Movement's priorities from political to economic. Similarly, Pavithran (2008) agree with Chopra that the Nonaligned Movement's development process has changed in a significant way. The Nonaligned Movement shifted its priorities from political to collective economic priorities of member countries and developing countries as well. It is an attempt to redefine the role of Nonaligned Movement in unilateral economic and military coercion. Rajan Harshe (1990) also attempted for conceptual reconstruction of the concept of nonalignment on the basis of its recent past. Harshe, discern the essence of India's nonalignment from the principles which sustained the policy of nonalignment. He situates entire nonalignment around the defence and promotion of peace. He critically examined the two phases of India's nonalignment which are the initial political aspects till the early seventies and the second phase in which economic factors dominated. Harshe argues that India's effort to mobilize Afro-Asian countries provide strengthen the Nonaligned Movement resulted in the transformation of movement's direction from East-West political confrontation to North-South economic confrontation.

With the demise of Soviet Union, question raised over the further relevance of the nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement. However, the exponent of the idea of nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement defined both the ideas in more sophisticated manner for endure relevance of the idea of nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement.

1.3 Knowledge Gap

The major studies focused on the global political developments of the second half of 20th century such as origin of Cold War, decolonisation, emergence of the idea of nonalignment and on the development of Nonaligned Movement. Those political developments also found in Indian context which provide the understanding of the structural process of India's conceived national interests in such global political environment of 20th century. Little literature found on the relationship of Nonaligned Movement and India in post-Cold War period and its impact on India's national interests. Completely missing the literature on India's role in Nonaligned Movement in post-Cold War era.

1.4 Research Objectives

The study has been undertaken by the keeping in the mind the below mentioned research objectives. They are-

i)   To understand the evolution of Nonaligned Movement in the global politics.
ii) To examine India's role in the Nonaligned Movement.
iii) To evaluate the relevance of Nonaligned Movement for India in post-Cold War era.

1.5 Research Questions

The newly independent countries adapted the nonaligned foreign policy in an intense Cold War rivalry at mid of 20th century. India and other associated countries provided the space for the transformation of the idea of nonalignment into an international movement. India has played a leading role in the development of Nonaligned Movement. From this broader narrative, the study has been conducted through raising research questions they are as follows:

i) What were the reasons behind the evolution of Nonaligned Movement?

ii) Has Nonaligned Movement served India's national interests?

iii) To what extent India has made efforts to achieve the objectives of Nonaligned Movement?

iv) How much has the Nonaligned Movement have relevance for India in the post-Cold War era?

1.6 Hypotheses

i) Bipolar politics in international relations after the Second World War was the driving force behind the origin of Nonaligned Movement.

ii) India's passive participation in Nonaligned Movement in the 21st century has created a leadership crisis among nonaligned participants.

1.7 Theoretical and Operational Definition

In post-Second World War period, the decolonisation process started, and imperialist tendencies begin to erode. Subsequently, the colonised territories became sovereign identity as an independent nations. The colonial experience of newly independent countries and bipolar rivalry forced infant nations to adapt nonaligned foreign policy to secure their hard won independence. The policy of nonalignment initiated by India as a policy and strategy was aimed to maximise its capacity for maximum gain from bipolar global politics. In addition to this process, the idea of nonalignment transformed into an international movement of nonaligned countries through collective labour of Asian-African countries. India very efficiently utilised Nonaligned Movement as a platform to enhance its stature and tried to build favourable external environment which suited its national interests. The Nonaligned Movement effectively deal with the global issues and concerns of developing countries.

The post-Second World War bipolar politics created the vacuum in international system for the inception of the idea of nonalignment. Further the idea transformed into an international movement of nonaligned countries. India played key role in the development of that movement, however, in post-Cold War period, lack of consensus on economic and political issues, among member countries, Western neo-liberal project and India's less priority in the Nonaligned Movement derailed the direction of the movement.

1.7 Rationale

As India nurture and provided guardianship to the idea of nonalignment and provided space in her internal and external setting, it also contributed to the development of the Nonaligned Movement too. India emerged as a relatively fastest growing economy in the world; having nuclear weapon status which seems the great and gradual achievement toward its aspiration to be a 'Great Power.' In this context, a slight contradiction reflecting in India's foreign relation behaviour for instance, adherence of basic principles of Nonaligned Movement such as universal disarmament, and India being a nuclear weapon state for aspiring great power status. Hence, the study has significance to trace out India's shifting approach in her foreign relation behaviour in 21st century. Moreover, this study is also a venture to provide India's contemporary *de jure* and *de facto* affiliation with Nonaligned Movement. This scholarly work provide the sufficient insight of India's relationship with the idea of nonalignment, Nonaligned Movement and its shifting foreign policy approach for the researchers, journalists and students who are working on India's foreign policy.

1.8 Scope of the Study

The study is an attempt to scrutinise India's role in Nonaligned Movement, particularly in the post-Cold War period. It provides the understanding about the gradual process of the development of the idea of nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement too. The study examines the circumstances and global political scenario during Cold War through which the idea of nonalignment evolved and developed as a movement and their relation with India's national interests. The study particularly focuses on India's role in Nonaligned Movement in post-Cold War period. The study confine with the data of available declarations of the summits of Nonaligned Movement and Government of India's record till 2016.

1.9 Research Methodology

The present study has been applied the qualitative methodology which provides the thoughtful cognitive understanding of the local, national, regional and global political and economic events, incidents and phenomenon. In this study deductive method and analytical approach has been used.

The data has been collected from both primary and secondary sources. The sources for primary data are based on the first-hand experience such as annual reports of Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India; debates and proceedings of both houses of the Parliament of India (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha); speeches of the Prime Minister of India and other ministers of Government of India, in Parliament and at other multilateral fora; reports and deceleration of other multilateral institutions or organisations such as United Nations and the Summits of Heads of State or Government of Nonaligned Movement.

The source for secondary data is based on the work which is not the first-hand experience to build cognitive understanding, understanding the views of different eminent scholars and for other useful information, and for facts and other data. The secondary source includes books, edited books, and articles from various reputed journals and newspapers.

Chapter 2

Global Politics and Nonaligned Movement

2.1 Introduction

The 20th century experienced with two tragic World Wars which culminated into worse catastrophic of the stakeholders of wars of European empires at large scale. American President Woodrow Wilson's fourteen point principles, especially the principle of "self-determination" embarked the sense of nationalism among colonies of great empires (Richard and Taylor, 85-87). Consequently, the quest of colonies for self-determination challenged the domination of great empires until attained independence. This continued process of decolonization gone through different experiences in different countries, mostly was through prolonged arms struggle with colonial masters, which eventually eroded the intensity of imperialism. With the end of Second World War, the economy of European powers exhausted even of victors of the war. The potentials of the economic and military strength of United States and Soviet Union subsequently demonstrated for the acquisition of European territory (Bayles and Owens, 56-59).

The ideological confrontation and the extension of 'sphere of influence' over the European region between the United States and the Soviet Union had spill over effect over the rest of world. That spill over effect had been seen in the form of the involvement of the both superpowers in regional, and local conflicts of other countries in different-different regions in the world. The Cold War politics was making anxious of those newly independent countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. They were anxious because if they joined any group of the then power politics between the US and the USSR, they would lose their hard earned independence. So, they were not willing to join any blocs of the power politics. At the same time, India had proposed the idea of non-alignment and chosen it as an approach of foreign policy. India also had called other countries to join the non-alignment – not joining any blocs of the power politics, but developing good relations with the all. This idea had turned into movement when other newly countries joined it.

In the above-discussed existing political environment in the global politics, the chapter has raised certain questions to enquire the nature of the international relations and emerging a new politics in the form of non-alignment in the already existing cold war politics in the global politics. These questions are - how has the idea of nonalignment emerged in the global politics? Why had the newly independent countries adopted the policy of nonalignment? What are the basis and objectives of Nonaligned Movement? Moreover, was the Nonaligned Movement inevitable? The chapter has progressed by step-by-step doing inquiry of the raised concerns regarding the global politics and the non-aligned movement.

2.2 Understanding Global Politics

The phrase "Global Politics" is more appropriate than "International Politics" or/and "International Relations" for sufficient interactions with the concern of this scholarly work in the contemporary period. Often, the terms international politics and international relations are used synonymously to describe the interactions between and among nations to define international political system. Further, with the development of these nations of defined territories as a distinct national character, the contour of their relationship shaped as genuinely "inter-national." In modern time, these political units are called as "nation-state" and aspire to be called as "state"[4] rather than "nation"[5] (Heywood, 4). Thus, inter-state political, economic, cultural relations described as international relations. However, the term 'international politics' is narrow in scope than 'international relation,' because, only inter-state political relations are considered in the term international politics and all over relations considered in international relations. Since the Peace Treaties of Westphalia and Osnabruck (1648), the constitutional framework of international system articulated as "state-centric"[6] modern international system in which state play a key role, holding sovereignty and political autonomy. Over the span of time, the contour of international relations altered into global politics due to "increased

---

[4] A state is the means of rule over a defined or sovereign territory. Defined territory, a government, absolute sovereignty, stable population and capacity to maintain the foreign relations, are the characteristic of a state.

[5] Nation is a community of people, having common belongingness such as history, culture and ethnicity. It may be living in a state or more than a state.

[6] State –centric means the political pattern of a state in which state is the sole actor in its all kind of behaviour.

interdependence and interconnectedness," "globalization" and the emergence of non-state actors on the world stage (Heywood, 4; Bayles and Owens, 24).

Since the inception of the state as a distinct identity possessing autonomy and sovereignty, was associated with the realist theory, reflected the premise that survival and power gain are the immediate concern of the state, till the mid of 20th century. This pattern of international system reflected the clear distinction between domestic and international politics in the relationship among states through cooperation and conflicts. Since, the beginning of second half of the 20th century, it is impossible for the individual state to cope the increased transnational crimes, environmental degradation, and other common pandemics. Therefore, states are bound to invest collective energy and efforts through cooperation, these circumstances created a "web of relationship" and the condition of "complex interdependence." By that, states were drawn into "cooperation and integration by force such as closer trading and other economic relationship" (Heywood, 8). This complex interdependence and interconnectedness also may reflect negative aspects, perpetuating conflict, and domination rather than peace and progress.

Trends of substantial growth of ease transnational flow of capital, transaction of ideas and information are associated with the notion of globalization. This progress poses the challenge to the traditional pattern of Westphalian, state-centric international system. Because, non-state actors, those who are not having the existence of an entity of a state but being as an individual, group or organization, hold power to influence the policy formulation process of state, are emerged and become the significant influential actors on the world stage. These non-state actors are such as multinational corporations and institutions, nongovernmental organizations and the actors having existence other than states. Thus, these non-state actors play a significant role in shaping the international system. Subsequently, the state has reduced its sole capacity to define global political dimensions, however, the state remain most important actor among others rather than irrelevant or invisible.

Since the inception and the nexus of the regional and international institutions and organizations, the state asserts its sovereignty reduced among other stakeholders of the international system. Therefore, the Westphalian international system seems outdated, in which state sovereignty defined as

indivisible. Subsequently, "Post-Westphalian" international system is emerging, in which sovereignty of states is considered as the "shared exercise of public power and authority" (Bayles and Owens, 28) among emerging actors on the world stage. Therefore, advent of these non-state actors in the international system, altered the nature and scope of international relations largely. The phrase global politics/global relations seems more appropriate and inclusive instead of international relations.

Historically, war has been the central to the international system for millennia. The history indicates that there are repeated cycles of largescale wars and the appearance of two World Wars in the 20th century was not exceptional. Historically, revelries between Britain and France (1066-1904), France and Germany (1815-1955) and United States (US) and Japan (1905-1945) are the examples of occurred hostilities. So, the rise and fall of great powers through engagement of wars created global instabilities in the history of world politics. It is the essential concern of international relation. Similarly, the 'long-cycle theory' indicates that history is full of repeated cycles of largescale war and rising and fall of great powers (Mansbach and Taylor, xxiv). Thus, the cycle of war and peace continued in the 20th century with the emergence of World War I and II. These World Wars often called Total War because overtly and covertly major countries of the world were involved in these wars which negatively affected entire world, relatively. Allied forces (United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union) confronted with the Axis forces (Germany, Italy and Japan) adhered the ideology of "racial superiority, slavery, and genocide" for the attainment of relative gains. The rise of fascism, extreme realism, and climate of might is right in Germany and Italy and Germany's "imperialistic quest" after First World War, stimulate Japanese desire of colonialism and imperialism, which created the circumstances for the World War Second (Kegley and Charles W, 104). The advanced modern military technology was used in these wars resulted in the consequences of massive casualties and destruction on a large scale. Eventually, the Second World War ended in 1945, allied forces down the axis forces with the use of weapon of mass destruction called atomic bomb, on Japan.

After the end of World War Second, world elite leadership desired to establish an international organisation named United Nations Organisation for the

purpose of international peace to secure humankind from the menace of war and destruction. These developments culminated into the end of European international system. Consequently, European international system started in flux toward the genuine bipolar international system, in which distrust increased among the groups of rivals (US and USSR). Because, European empires of Germany, Britain, France, was exhausted and their economy devastated due to high investment in militarization and development of advanced weapons rather than social and economic spheres of welfare. Thus, due to economic subtraction it was hard to maintain the colonial territories for European imperial powers. Simultaneously, national freedom movements were on peak to over through the imperial rulers. Consequently, colonies of Asian, African countries became independent. Europe was no more at the center of international system, the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as two centers of powerful blocs with their allied countries, which accelerated bipolar international system for the second half of the twentieth century (D'Anieri, 34-36).

2.2.1 Rise of Nationalism and End of Colonialism

From the beginning of the 20th century, the sense of nationalism drafted into the colonial territories of Asian-African countries and became popular in the mid of 20th century. Simultaneously, suffered from the high catastrophic of World War I and II and wave of nationalism in colonial territories increasingly subverted imperial powers into their respective territories. At the end of Second World War, one-third of the world population lived in dependent territories. National movements and struggles intensified the pace of national consciousness among colonial population and leadership was provided by the educated native elites who studied liberal thoughts in Western educational institutions. Nevertheless, the outcome of World War I and II pressurize the European empires to lose the grip from their colonial territories. Because, maximum investment on militarization and technology of modern warfare, resulted into the complete rupture of European economy. Thus, the European empires realise that it will be very hard to maintain the overseas colonies further. Consequently, the pace and scope of declining empires were unforeseen. However, Japan's role was influential to the beginning of decolonization in East Asian countries by provocation of national freedom movements such as in Dutch Indonesia, French Indochina and British Burma

(McWilliams and Piotrowski, 109-113). In India, under the banner of Indian National Congress and other political forces along with collective national consciousness attained independence in August 1947 and similarly, Indonesia became independent in 1949.

However, African decolonization started later than Asia because the ethnic divisions in African continent were major obstacle in the development of national consciousness. In February 1960, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan stated that-

> the wind of change is blowing through the continent, and whether we like it or not this growth of national consciousness is a political fact. We must all accept it as a fact, and our national policies must take account of it (Evans, 1).

It shows that Britain was more willing for the transfer of sovereignty to the indigenous native subjects. In December 1960, United Nations General Assembly resolution no 1514 (XV) , approved the end of colonialism unconditionally and swiftly in all its forms. The western colonial powers realised and changed the behaviour towards African countries on order to prevent them from falling into the Eastern sphere of influence. Hence, the pace of decolonization enhanced, and more than 45 countries attained independence between the years of 1947 to 1970 (Kennedy, 9). The continuous efforts were taken by the Nonaligned Movement and United Nations General Assembly to decolonise more and more dependent and colonial territories from foreign rule. At present, the 193 countries are the members of the United Nations.

2.2.2 Onset of Cold War

The end of the Second World War resulted into the transformation of international system from multipolar world order to towards the bipolar system. Seldom had these sort of dramatic changes taken place in history, which happened during the 20th century and just after the Second World War. The bipolar international system emerged, in which competition of leadership for domination between two superpowers (United States and Soviet Union) continued in the second half of 20th century. The chain of relationship of conflict, confrontation, and cooperation between United States and Soviet Union in the second half of the twentieth century, was an essential feature of Cold War. Both powerful countries had experience of heavy causalities during the World Wars, but the Soviet Union was

more affected than the United States. The United States was in more predominant situation than Soviet Union at the end of Second World War, this lies in the fact that United States economy was double than Soviet Union at that time (D'Anieri, 44-45).

The third battle of persuasion for domination over the world in the twentieth century has debated to postulate the different interpretation of the causes of Cold War. First, under the lenses of realist interpretation that primary aim of the state is survival in an anarchical milieu. For that, state work for the acquisition of power as a mean to achieve the relative gains. In international law, the state holds sovereignty, freedom, and responsibility to pursue the policies to promote national interests and secure the state of everlasting survival. In the last decade of the first half of the twentieth century, the rivalry begins between Soviet Union and the United States, resulted out of their geopolitical interests in the Europe. Thus, the Cold War was the consequence of "power transition" that drive the Soviet Union and the United States in a competition of power accumulator for the domination in the international system and ambition for supreme status in the power hierarchy. Naturally, suspension over each other's policies turned this competition into an inevitable rivalry. Therefore, these circumstances were the reasons to engage in the establishment of their own respective sphere of influence (Kegley and Charles W, 31).

The second interpretation is that the manifested economic and political beliefs of both superpowers were the source of mutual suspension, which clearly reflected in their policies. United States reaction to Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 was the inception of acrimony to counter and eliminate the communist ideology from the world. Similarly, Soviet Union sought the encirclement of United States over Eastern hemisphere, by giving pace to the communist ideology against capitalism in a certain manner, which will eventually led to the spread of communism in the opposite power bloc. Each policy and action of both powers justified under the lances of ideologies; foe and friends have scrutinized through ideologies also (Kegley and Charles W, 109).

Third and foremost factor of elucidation to the interpretation of the causes of Cold War is the ideological confrontation between Soviet Union and United States represented communism and capitalism ideology respectively. The American

revisionist scholars portrayed Soviet Union as "relentlessly expansionist" and "ideological motivated" and expressed a legitimate and catastrophic apprehension. However, post revisionist argues in the 1960s after the Vietnam War that wisdom of United States' policies was also expansionist. Ideological belief and "economic expansionism" also contributed to the pace of Cold War (Heywood, 41).

Eventually, above events and factors affected each other for such a rivalry between great powers. Besides, advancements in the warfare technology, ideological confrontation and liberation movements in colonial countries, resulted in the increasing tensions between Western and Eastern powers which accelerated the arms race. The world order shifted in a bipolar known as Cold War (Leffler and Painter, 9-12; Schlesinger, 23). Thus, during rivalry, Cold War intensity continued in fluctuation from conflict, intense confrontational situation to cooperation and released tensions, further more arms race and revised tensions were the occurred events, eventually, end of Cold War evolved a unipolar world order.

2.2.3 Evolution of Nonaligned Movement

The concept of nonalignment was not evolved suddenly in the realm of global politics. In post-Second World War global landscape, the entire globe divided into two antagonistic and military blocs having their respective ideology. Simultaneously, colonial territories embarked freedom struggle and nationalist movements for self-determination. Collective efforts of national leaders of colonial territories to secure post-independence national sovereignty, world peace and security, gave birth to the notion of Nonalignment, particularly in India. Further Nonalignment gained support from other newly independent countries and became popular at international level, further the nonalignment transformed this concept into a Nonaligned Movement.

2.2.3.1   Nonalignment: Conceptual Understanding

Lack of clear definition of nonalignment, Western and Non-Western scholars interpreted this concept differently. Often, Western scholars made various interpretations of nonalignment and used synonymously with the terms neutrality and neutralization. George Liska was the first scholar who attempted to scrutinize the term nonalignment scientifically. Further, some scholars accepted the concept

of nonalignment as a very distinct phenomenon. George Schwarzenberger used the terminologies such as Isolationism, Non-commitment, Neutrality, Neutralization, Unilateralism, and Non-involvement, which are not a synonym but approximate to nonalignment (Khanna, 390).

These terminologies have a different sense of existence from nonalignment. Where isolationism support the policies of aloofness from world politics (this can be a result of geographical environment), nonalignment refers the policies of aloofness from Cold War and military alliances in global politics. Likewise, non-commitment mean maintaining equal relationship with each power of international system without dedication toward individual state or power; neutrality is a legal and political status of a state which compels a state not to involve with belligerents and wars; neutralization is different from neutrality because neutral state can abandon the status of neutrality at any time but neutralization is a permanent legal and political status of neutrality until violation of the treaty of neutralization; unilateralism allow a state to follow the ideal principles with calculated actions such as nuclear disarmament, without considering the policies of other states; non-involvement emphasis to understand the worse consequences of ideological power struggle and suggest not to involve in power politics of Cold War struggle (Mohanty, 75; Kumar, 335-337). Here, neutrality and nonalignment have similar meaning in the context of non-involvement. However, the non-involvement in neutrality is during real war time, and nonalignment is non-involvement in during Cold War. In other words, non-involvement refer the neutrality in the context of actual war time, however, on the other hand, non-involvement associated with the nonalignment defined in the context of Cold War. Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru described this nonalignment as a "positive neutralism" applying dynamically in global politics rather than neutral or passive on the questions of global peace and security as Nehru stated that "Where freedom is menaced or justice is threatened or where aggression take place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral" (Udokang, 13).

Nonalignment is neither a principle of aloofness nor a legal status of a state. On the contrary, it is a fundamental principle and an attitude toward foreign policy of a state, keeping herself away from the military alliances, Cold War, and power politics on the basis of national interests, simultaneously participate actively in

global politics through independent decision making for the accomplishment of national interests. Therefore, in this context, the crux of nonalignment in Mr. Crabb's great words is *"diplomatic freedom of action and choice"* (Brown, 517). It means the independence of foreign policy of a state while conducting foreign relations. Thus, nonalignment is also associated with the foreign policy of a state. Nonalignment is both, a mean to achieve national interests and a principle of foreign policy. In post-Cold War circumstances, nonalignment may be an objective for some states to save the existence of nonalignment.

On the philosophical point of view, the core essence of nonalignment is right to make decisions "according to best judgment" and "independent approach" to each international controversial or disputed issues in the light of country's national interests (Rana, 1). Nonalignment was also a quest for "separate identity" in international system and "independent expression of intellectual wisdom" toward any problem or crisis. Nonalignment rejects the notion of balance of power which perpetuates instability and conflicts instead it assimilate and endorse the concept of "Panchsheela" which perpetuate the stability and cooperation through "peaceful co-existence" and "non-interference" among states (Haq, 41-42). These notion of non-interference and peaceful co-existence promoted the idea of pluralism, cohesiveness and also promoted the regional peace and stability through cooperation. However, nonalignment relentlessly opposed all form of colonialism and imperialism; equally opposed all form of manifestation of radicle oppression, apartheid, and racialism at all strata.

2.2.3.2   Nonaligned Movement: Factors Responsible for its Evolution

The Second World War concluded with the substantial changes in the global political scenario, subsequently bipolar global order emerged. The ideological confrontation between superpowers begun in a view to spreading their ideological sphere of influence over the world. Nevertheless, newly independent states wanted to preserve their hard won independence to be free in the era of military alliances. The infant states expressed the common desire to non-involvement in Cold War, preserve for separate identity and independence of foreign policy, opinion, and action, through nonalignment, initiated by India, supported by other Afro-Asian states as their fundamental principle of foreign policy. After investing

prolonged meetings and conferences the concept of nonalignment transformed into a Nonalignment Movement.

Bipolarization of International System: Post Second World War bipolar political and ideological rivalry between Soviet Union and United States represented communist and capitalist ideology respectively, was one of the fundamental and primary causes of the inception of the idea of nonalignment. Besides, the relentless efforts of both two groups to eliminate the influence of next enemy's ideology or power accelerated the pace of aggression and antagonism toward each other. To spread the sphere of ideological influence over the globe in general, both superpowers ensured the national security and sovereignty of infant states through providing them economic and military aids. United States introduced the Truman Doctrine (1947) and Marshal Plan to reconstruction of European infrastructure and economy to check the communist expansion in Europe. Besides, Washington and other Western European countries signed a security pact called North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 and introduced the notion of collective security.

Soviet Union also acquired the East European countries such as Czechoslovakia in 1948 toward Germany and install pro-Soviet regimes. In retaliation of NATO, Soviet Union signed the Warsaw pact in 1955. Simultaneously, decolonization wave peaked in the post-Second War period. The then US Secretary of State stated that "those who are not with us are against us" (Pant, 121) made infant states anxious about their post-independence journey of development. These states were in a dilemma that how to react the situation despite weak internal political, economic conditions. Newly states realised that the bloc power politics is neither in favour of their national interests nor decent for world peace and security. Therefore, they subvert the idea of collective security and articulate the different path for post-independence by which they alone can achieve their vital national interests. Nehru as a member of India's interim government convinced newly states through his broadcasted address, emphasised to "keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another, which has led in the past two World Wars and which may again led to disasters on an even vaster scale" (Nehru, 2). New states also realised that joining either of the military blocs would jeopardise future national interests. After that, other states like

Burma, Indonesia, Yugoslavia, Shri Lanka and Egypt adopted their foreign policy based on nonalignment by 1950.

Quest for Independence: Newly independent states visualised their post-independence contour of establishment in the international system. They sought not merely to be an independent state in international system despite Cold War rivalry but independent from domination and influence of powerful states. The desire for the nonalignment of large extent was to pursue independent foreign policy in international system. It was felt that if one state aligns herself with either of bloc it would lose freedom and individuality and become a camp follower of other, which Prime Minister of India, J. Nehru had stated "I have no intention of doing that" (Abraham, 206). It would also subvert the freedom of action in a biased manner in global politics. The original quest of infant states was that they wanted to be recognised as a distinct political, social, cultural identity of a distinct community not as a faceless state or western representation in a better global order which existed. They accomplished formally to become the member of United Nations, but practically it would demonstrate through the policies and decisions on critical international issues and situations that came for the solution before them from time to time. Newly independent states realised that their submission toward either of the Eastern or Western bloc would subvert their independence and sovereignty (Pant, 122).

The ideological Factor: The important basis of nonalignment is that newly independent states would not show the dedication of faith in Eastern and Western ideological, economic, political and social system. However, some states like Cuba and Yugoslavia might share the cultural and religious values and like India share the political belief and values with Western capitalist bloc or camp. Nonetheless, all of those states opposed Western ideology in different degree despite affinity with the economic, political and social system of the Western bloc. Similarly, most of the Asian and African states had an attraction toward Soviet Union and even admire their achievements, but all of them opposed the Communist bloc or camp in different degrees. On the other side, many of newly independent states did not aligned with the Western bloc because of recent gained independence from them, nor they aligned themselves with Eastern camp because of the practice of

Communist ideology dominated on the social, political and economic system of their allied states (Rajan, 124).

Most of the newly independent states despite intellectual inclination toward both blocs, could not accept either Western form of liberal democracy or Eastern form of political system. They had suffered from unique circumstances with the emergencies of their society from caste-ridden, feudal and tribal into egalitarian and modern societies. The collective leadership did not found the satisfactory model from either of blocs. They could not ready to accept neither the private and market oriented system of enterprise of Western style nor do they accept the State owned means of production of Eastern bloc. They have suffered from intense anxiety that their separate identity would not be acknowledged. Though, they prefer to build a distinct suitable form of political structure using "trial and error method" simultaneously accepted the suitable experiences from both ideologies according to the needs of domestic circumstances (Rajan, 125).

The Economic Factor: Approximately most of the newly independent states were economically underdeveloped with the deficient living standard. Therefore, it was the obvious for those states to promote the rapid economic development through foreign economic policy from the availability of whatever source without tilting toward the great powers, However, lack of experienced skill and technology, those states decided not to join either of the Cold War rival blocs; they realised that doing that would reduce the possibilities of diversifying sources of economic aids. The leading countries such as India and Yugoslavia had experienced that dependent on either of bloc for aid would result as an instrument of domination power rivals (Pant, 125). Thus, it was realised that political or economic dependence on either of Cold War rival would limit their freedom of action in the global system.

2.2.3.3 Development of Nonalignment Movement

After the end of Second World War, the term nonalignment emerged as a natural outcome through the colonial experiences of newly independent Asian states. During colonial period those countries experienced a controlled foreign affairs by their imperial masters. They created a strong urge during freedom struggle to peruse the independent foreign affairs abandoning the policies persuaded by their

imperial masters. These urges manifested through the policies of nonalignment adopted by the states in post-independence.

It is acknowledged that India plays the pioneer role in the evolution of the notion of nonalignment. It illustrated during the journey of freedom struggle of India under the leadership of Indian National Congress, which strongly opposed "not be committed to any war" on behalf of the British government. Indian Prime Minister Nehru in his book *The Discovery of India* articulated the framework for India's post-independence foreign policy keeping in the mind of his contemporary great bipolar rivalry (Nehru, 423-426). Later on, as a member of India's interim government, Nehru stated in a press conference in 1946 that-

> As far as possible to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past two world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even larger scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere, and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples, and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races (Nehru, 2).

Likewise India, Burma also declared her independent foreign policy despite serious internal conflicts after independence. Taking cognition on foreign affairs, Burmese Prime Minister indicated the clear indication in 1949 that Burma did not desire to aligned either of power bloc and opposed their antagonist behaviour despite the expectation of friendly relation by great powers. Similarly, other Asian countries such as Sri Lanka and Indonesia declared their independent foreign policy for external world by 1950. Besides, another South-eastern country, Yugoslavia confronted with Soviet Union and eventually preferred the independent foreign policy instead inclined toward either of bloc of great powers. Moreover, Egypt also declared her foreign policy as nonaligned with either of the bloc. Therefore, the notion articulated by Indian leadership started popular outside Asian continent. Countries like Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Egypt along with India, Burma and Shri Lanka not only made nonalignment as a fundamental principle of their foreign policy but also provided the collective conscience for the initiation of the nonalignment movement (Shrivastva, 5-11). Further, Asian Relation Conference in 1947 and Bandung Conference in 1955 held which provided the basis and background of nonalignment movement. These deliberative efforts resulted in the

manifestation of first Nonaligned Summit in 1961. Further efforts provided more strength and dynamism in the concept and movement of nonalignment.

i)   Pre-Take off Period of Nonaligned Movement

The emergence and development of Nonaligned Movement is not an outcome of overnight labour, although, it took more than one decade to reach at a level for formal initiation of the movement. Its evolution and developmental journey embarked from Indian land and further evolved with the support of other Asian and African countries. The active deliberation of Yugoslavia, Egypt and major countries made possible to shape its contour as a distinct entity. It was the results of continues efforts through regular conferences and meetings to finalise the criterion of its membership and decide its agenda for consideration.

Asian Relation Conference (March 1947): Jawaharlal Nehru as Head of the interim government of India convened the Asian Relation Conference in March 1947 through non-official Institute named Indian Council for World Affairs. In this conference, total, 28 countries participated including Soviet Union Republics of Central Asia (then part of USSR) and Arab league as an observer member. This conference brought together Asian leaders for independence movement in their respective countries and experienced the first attempt to build Asian unity. Through this initiative and effort, India made possible to create the climate of cooperation among infant Asian countries and realised the prospects of cooperation for a common destiny. Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru praised the essence of the Asian continent and urged to all Asian Countries to build an Asian cohesion to overcome their common miracles, avoiding their regional disputes and internal politics. In his address to the Asian Relation Conference, Nehru stated that:

> Asia, after a long period of quiescence, has suddenly become important again in world affairs…This dynamic Asia from which great streams of culture flowed in all directions, gradually became static and unchanging…it is the pride and privilege of the people of India to welcome their fellow Asians from other countries, to confer with them about the present and the future, and lay the foundation of our mutual progress, well-being and friendship…time had come for us, peoples of Asia, to meet together, to hold together and to advance together…we have many problems in common, especially in the Pacific and in the Southeast region of Asia, and we have to co-operate together to find solutions…In this Conference there are no leaders and no followers. All countries of Asia have to meet together on an equal basis in a common task and endeavour…The countries of Asia can no longer be used as pawns by others; they are bound to have their own

policies in world affairs…For too long we Asia have been petitioners in Western courts and chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and to co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us.[7]

In that conference in March 1947, under British administration, India paid attention to global problems and urged for Asian cohesiveness for prospects of the whole of Asia. Though, the Asian Relation Conference catch substantial attention from rest of the world. Western media was anxious to observe this conference as an anti-Western deliberation. This conference was the first step towards the Asian connectedness. Through this diplomatic effort, India laid the seeds for the evolution of nonalignment movement. Because through this conference independent Asian countries gathered to discuss the regional and global problems.

Asian-African Conference of Bandung (April 1955): In Asian Relations conference, many Asian countries desired to adopt independent and nonaligned foreign policy. By mid-1950s some African countries also attain independence such as Libya in 1951, Egypt in 1954 and Sudan, Morocco and Tunisia in 1956. These African countries along with Asian countries were invited in Afro-Asian conference in April 1955 at Bandung in Indonesia. The purpose of this conference was to promote cooperation among Afro-Asian countries to counter the cultural, economic, political and social problems such as colonialism and racialism. Pakistan and India's Prime Ministers both provoked by their speech to emancipate the citizens of Asian-African countries from the hunger and poverty which was the consequences of subjugation of colonialism and also ensured the peace and security through cooperation and coordination. Moreover, India popularised the doctrine of Panchsheel and peaceful coexistence in the conference for the promotion of the scope of peace and cooperation. The conference also emphasis on economic, cultural cooperation and self-determination.[8]

Preparatory Cairo Meeting for Nonaligned Movement (June 1961): The arrangement for the first meeting of a conference of nonaligned states called from the Marshal Tito from Yugoslavia and Sukarno from Indonesia where Nehru was

---

[7]Indian Council for World Affairs, New Delhi.
http://icwadelhi.info/asianrelationsconference/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=51&Itemid=137. Accessed on 13 Feb. 2017.
[8] http://www.ena.lu/final_communique_asian_african_conference_bandung_24_april_1955-2-1192. Accessed on 16 July, 2017.

"less enthusiastic" and "reluctant" to that idea of nonaligned nation conference. During the 1950s decolonization wave flown across the Africa. Marshal Tito promote the idea of a conference of nonaligned nation taking tour of African countries and met with Egypt's President Nasser in April 1961. They urged to all nonaligned countries to organize themselves through a conference and build a salutary effect" in upcoming United Nation General Assembly session in September 1961 (Ali, 36-40). To conduct the Belgrade conference of nonaligned nations, a preparatory meeting held from 5 to 12 June 1961 at Cairo in Egypt called upon President Tito, joined by President Soekarno of Indonesia, President Nasser of Egypt and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India. This preparatory meeting finalized the broad five point definition for the membership criterion of nonalignment, which became the basis of the membership of nonaligned conference in 1961. The Cairo meeting decided the criteria for the membership of Nonaligned Movement which was as:

a) The country to be invited should have adopted an independent policy based on the co-existence of states with different systems and on nonalignment, or show a trend in favours of such a policy;
b) It should have consistently supported the movement of national independence;
c) It should not be a member of any multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of Great Power conflict;
d) If it has a bilateral military agreement with a Great Power, or is a member of a regional defence pact, that agreement or pact should not be one deliberately concluded in the context of Great Power conflict;
e) If it has conceded military bases to a foreign power, the concessions should not have been in the context of Great Power conflict (Haq, 43).

Participant member countries also discussed the agenda for the conference of nonaligned countries. With the collective deliberation, participant countries summited a draft of the agenda to the administrative committee. The core theme of that agenda for nonaligned summit articulated in Cairo conference was as:

a) Respect of the right to people and nation to self-determination, the struggle against imperialism, liquidation of colonialism and neo-colonialism.
b) Respect of the territorial sovereignty and integrity of states, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the state.
c) Racial discrimination and apartheid.
d) Peaceful co-existence between states with different policies and social system.

e) Role and composition of United Nation and the implementation of its resolutions, problems of unequal development, improvement of international economic and technical cooperation (Ali, 41).

To maximum accommodation of newly independent countries under the definition of non-aligned, India espoused for the flexible nature of the definition of non-aligned (Shrivastva, 13-14). Eventually, in this preparatory meeting at Cairo, method of the policy of non-aligned affirmed and approached by participant members and expressed consensus for the conference of nonaligned countries in Belgrade in early September 1961. This conference date decided just before the two weeks before the sixteenth session of United Nation General Assembly to show the weight of nonaligned countries. It was decided that a type of a large political force at the international level would be established. That formulation became known as "Nonaligned Movement" and still stands.

ii) Take-off Period of Nonaligned Movement

The course of deliberative meetings and conferences of nonaligned countries catch the attention of countries beyond Asia and Africa continent. Countries, those declared their foreign policy as nonaligned, enthusiastically participated for the development of Nonaligned Movement. These deliberative efforts transform this concept of nonalignment into Nonaligned Movement based on some basic principles decided in Bandung Conference. The precise execution of this movement started from the first summit of nonaligned countries in September 1961 at Indonesia in Belgrade.

The general agenda of the summits of Nonaligned Movement remain agenda for global peace, anti-colonialism, imperialism, apartheid of all its manifestation, disarmament, democratisation of international political structure, international peace and security, economic disparities among states, promotion of economic cooperation and aids between developing and developed countries. These themes reiterated in every upcoming nonaligned summit, but in addition to this, each summit paid attention over their contemporary and new problems or issues of global level.

The First Belgrade Summit (1961) of nonaligned countries held (September 1961) in such a turbulent period of intense confrontation between great powers known as Cold War. Due to that, the global uncertainty continued. This Belgrade summit pictured and elaborated more clear interpretation and meaning of

nonalignment. Indonesia described nonalignment as a "lofty causes of independence, abiding peace, social justice, and the freedom to be free," where Saudi Arabia explained as "being innocence of any bias towards any bloc in dispute." Nehru explicated nonalignment as a positive doctrine to "keep away from power politics" while participating actively in global affairs. While all the participants agreed for "freedom to be free" and independence to take a decision on every issue according to merit and capacity of state. To build global peace and security, Indonesia President Soekarno urged to nonaligned countries "to draw the non-aligned countries into a coordinated and accumulated more force to help preserve world peace and bring about a new stable equilibrium based on a world order and social justice and prosperity" (Ali, 42-48). In final document of this conference, global uncertainty considered by participant countries and agreed to address the question of world peace and security, the question of global inequality, nuclear disarmament, all form of imperialism and colonialism had detailed discussion. In this summit, emphasised on the question of the recognition of China. With the success of this summit, the Nonaligned Movement has launched.

The Second Summit of nonalignment movement held in 1964 at Cairo in Yugoslavia. In this summit, it is called for developing countries to embark on mutual economic cooperation on trade, economic, finance, transportation technology, and communication. India suffered a war with China in 1962 due to that the summit emphasized on peaceful settlement of disputes and needs on disarmament to preserve global peace. This summit declared the peaceful co-existence as a moral principle and imperialism as a source of the threat to global peace and security.

The Third Lusaka Summit of Nonalignment Movement held in 1970. This summit was attended by 54 countries. The withdrawal of foreign military forces from Vietnam, such resolution was adopted in that summit. The Israel was criticized to destabilize the peace in West Asia and appealed to boycott that country. Apartheid policies in South Africa became the pertinent issue in the summit, Nonaligned Movement urged member countries to boycott South Africa too. The economic cooperation among countries encouraged and promoted. The proposal rejected to establish a permanent secretariat for Nonaligned Movement. In this summit, the impetus put for the democratization of international relations.

In the Fourth Algiers Nonaligned Movement Summit (1973), the movement membership increased by 75 members, as African continent almost decolonized by 1970s. During that period, the bipolar rivalry became reduced into the detent. The summit encouraged member countries to cooperate in economics, technology, and trade among developing countries. Algiers summit criticized to Israel aggression toward Philistine also condemned Western countries, particularly United States who supported Israel. South Africa's apartheid policies also condemned which were exercised. The final declaration mentioned the supported of the national liberation movement in different countries in Africa.

The Fifth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 1976 in Colombo. This conference supported the demand for New International Economic Order (NIEO) and called for a just world monetary system which can serve the interests of developing and under developing countries. It also demanded New International Information Order (NIIO) and emphasized on mutual economic cooperation on trade, finance, agriculture, and transport. The threat of peace increased in Indian Ocean Region (IOR) due to increased bipolar rivalry into the Asian and Indo-Pacific region. Summit reiterated and urged to exercise of the absolute sovereignty of countries over their resources and capital.

The Sixth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 1979 at Havana attended by 92 member countries. This summit stated serious concerns over the situation in West Asia, South-East Asia and strongly opposed imperialism, colonialism and apartheid regimes. It was strongly denounced the growing military presence of a rival power in Indian Ocean Region. The summit declared Indian Ocean Region as a zone of peace. In this summit President Fidel Castro said that Nonaligned Movement and Soviet Union shared a close affinity, his statement criticized by other countries.

Seventh Nonaligned Movement Summit postponed due to Iran-Iraq war, which was secluded at Bagdad in 1982. Therefore it held in 1983 at Delhi. During this time war and conflicts started in Asian continent due to the spill over effect of Cold War. Soviet intervention in Afghanistan escalated pace of Cold War. In this summit nonaligned countries divided on this issues. Some countries criticize Soviet Union but some remain silent where New Delhi handled in a balanced manner. Iran-Iraq war, Chinese attack on Vietnam, Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and disputes in Cambodia these issues troubled Asian continent. In

final document of the summit, it is called for peaceful settlement of disputes, end of conflict, human right promotion, democratization of international system and nuclear disarmament and also expressed the need of New International Economic Order in favour of developing countries.

Eight Summit of Nonaligned Movement Summit held in 1986 at Harare in which less economic cooperation among nonaligned countries considered to promote cooperation among nonaligned countries. Harare summit reiterated the various subjects such as imperialism, colonialism, human right issues, nuclear disarmament and economic cooperation among nonaligned countries. It was decided to impose sanctions on South Africa against her apartheid policy. The summit decided to set up Africa Fund to resist colonialism, apartheid, and imperialism in South Africa. Harare summit also demanded New International Informational Order to make information order more inclusive.

The Ninth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 1989 in Bandung. The bipolar rivalry almost came to an end, disarmament treaties signed between Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. This summit admired the end of East-West power struggle and called for the South-North cooperation. The self-determination doctrine reiterated, and menace of smuggling, international terrorism, and drug trafficking addressed. The final document of this summit urged its member countries to work collectively on nuclear disarmament, complete decolonization, protection of the environment and human rights, global economic inequality and strengthening international institutions. In this summit NIEO demand persistently insisted and called industrialist countries to change the mind set on the environment.

The Tenth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 1992 in Jakarta. Before this summit, a lot had changes occurred in global politics, the Soviet Union collapsed, and Cold War ended. The bipolar international system shifted into the unipolar system. The legitimacy and relevance of nonalignment movement questioned, but it relentlessly grows even in unipolarity. President Suharto of Indonesia urged for South-South cooperation in trade, education, finance, security and science and technology, to become self-reliant instead became dependent on developed countries. The greater impetus was given to democratization of UN system and to redefine the United Nation Security Council's responsibility to General Assembly. The main focus remained of the implementation of NIEO and

focused on other international socio-political and economic issues. The North-South dialogue and South-South cooperation strategy espoused to address these problems. US ban on transfer of dual technology was objected in this conference. Growing terrorism deeply concerned to resist and the emergence of unipolarity considered where some countries signaled for multipolarity in the international system.

Eleventh Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 1995 in Cartagena (Colombia). Colombia's President in his address claimed the continued relevance of Nonaligned Movement in Post-Cold War period for new challenges arises before developing countries such as technological and non-tariff trade barriers. He dismissed the raised questions over relevance of nonalignment movement. Bilateral issues raised in this summit but are asked to avoid bilateral issues on the multilateral forum. The final document of the summit emphasis on complete nuclear disarmament and called for nuclear weapon free world. It also stressed to reform of United Nations and to combat terrorism in all its forms.

The Twelfth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 1998 in Durban. In that summit, member countries called for nuclear disarmament and criticized the discriminatory nuclear treaty which was signed by some powerful states and monopolized on nuclear weapon capacity. The summit addressed the issues of international terrorism, good governance, and sustainable development. Durban summit stressed to create more participatory and balanced international economic system. It also concerned of conflicts in West Asia, Cyprus, and Lebanon.

The Thirteenth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 2003 at Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia). Here it was called for the democratization of international system, elimination of nuclear weapons and international economic order based on principles of NIEO. It also adopted the United Nations General Assembly resolution for the promotion of multilateralism to eliminate nuclear weapons and to tackle other threats. The weapon of mass destruction and terrorism both harshly condemned in this summit and it was called to immediate withdrawal of Israel military from Philistine territory which violated human rights in Philistine.

Fourteenth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 2006 at Havana (Cuba). Summit discussed for the reforms of United Nations and particularly in Security Council. It was urged to develop and engage in research for uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purpose. In this summit expressed the need for

multilateralism too to deal the common problems such as transnational crimes. It was agreed to revitalize the purposes, structure, principles, and mechanism to strengthen the Nonaligned Movement. The idea of sustainable development promoted through international cooperation and multilateralism, where the manifestation of unilateralism condemned.

Fifteenth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 2009 at Sharm-el-Sheikh, Egypt. In this summit expressed the strong commitment to principles of United Nations international law and to promote multilateralism. Major problems of the world were discussed such as terrorism, climate change, and global economic recession. Reform of United Nations and expansion of Security Council and its working methods were discussed in this summit. The unilateral imposition of sanctions criticized which contradict the charter of United Nations and international law. Due to the financial crisis, it was committed to enhancing the cooperation among developing countries to further collective self-reliance. It was ensured to full implementation of the outcomes of the conferences and summits of United Nations in economic and social fields.

The Sixteenth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 2012 in Tehran, Iran. 120 countries attended it; all affirmed the continued relevance of Nonaligned Movement's vision and principles even in Post-Cold War period. It was committed to building an international order based on the principle of peaceful co-existence, the right of equality and cooperation. It declared the commitment to construct the transparent, inclusive and fair global governance with maximum participation of countries. It also stated that United Nations should deliberately address the common global issues with the coordination of other international and regional agencies. It was stated that the individual state has right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and that should be respected. This statement was in the context of Iran which experienced sanctions by United States for having alleged nuclear weapons.

The Seventeenth Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in 2016 at Iceland of Margarita (Venezuela) under the theme of "Peace, Sovereignty, and Solidarity for Development" and reviewed the state of international situation. The sovereignty, right to peace, self-determination, and solidarity was defended for the peaceful development of member countries. It upheld the fundamental principles of the movement decided at Bandung conference also reaffirm the faith in UN charter

and international law. Summit reiterated the need for revitalization and strengthening of movement. The fundamental principle of Nonaligned Movement, "peaceful co-existence" reiterated to strengthen the international peace and security. It was called for a deliberation for time bounded nuclear disarmament. Other serious subjects of mutual concern of member countries were addressed such as unilateral sanction beyond the international law and UN charter, terrorism, reform in United Nations, climate change, refugees and migration issues. The South-South cooperation, dialogue among civilizations promoted while expressed the concerns of biased media coverage of developing countries.

2.3   Objectives of Nonaligned Movement

The idea of Nonaligned Movement had derived from the concept of nonalignment. Moreover, the idea of nonalignment was initiated by Indian leadership during freedom struggle for independence under colonial rule. Nehru sought the Asian solidarity for oppressed nationalities. Further, this aspiration resulted in the movement at international level as the movement of nonaligned countries. India has announced before independence the international norms of her post-independence foreign policy; nonalignment was one among others. Further, this nonalignment became the cornerstone of Nonaligned Movement. With the emergence of collective consensus for the deliberation of Asian negotiations, the Asian Relation Conference held in March 1947, in which colonialism, imperialism, self-determination of states, economic self-reliance, cooperation and other relevant issues was decided for a discussion (Shrivastva, 2-10). These attributes not amplified only in the Asian Relation Conference but in further negotiations also in Bandung conference (1955) and in Belgrade conference (1961) too and manifested as the core tenets of the Nonaligned Movement.

In the first ever meeting of Head of the State and Government of nonaligned countries, gave signalled the formation of Nonaligned Movement formally, met at Belgrade from 1 September to 6 September 1961. The conference held at the juncture when the intensity of Cold War reached at high peak, deteriorated the relations between East and the West. In such an intense Cold War milieu, the conference of nonaligned countries exchanged the views that how to restore the world peace and security through the active contribution of collective efforts. This Belgrade conference took place when the international events became worse and

international peace and security threatened. In this regard, nonaligned countries took responsibility to safeguarding world peace, to create an environment of mutual benefit and equality and produced the collective, deliberative deceleration. In which nonaligned countries expressed the present and future concerns regarding international political, economic and security aspects, in the context of developing countries. From those raised concerns of nonaligned countries in the deceleration of Bandung conference, the five major objectives of Nonaligned Movement which are identified as:

1. Ensure Self-Determination, Independence, and Sovereignty of States
2. Restore International Peace and Security
3. General and Complete Nuclear Disarmament
4. Economic Development of Developing Countries
5. Democratisation of United Nations[9]

In Belgrade conference (1961) the nonaligned countries firstly, they affirmed the conviction of self-determination of their domestic social, economic and political structure by the demand of their indigenous circumstances. Therefore, they would be able to celebrate and enhance their own inherent social and cultural values. They sought the Independence of decision-making process from any outside influence in their domestic legislation and claimed over sovereignty. Second, the participant countries noticed that the big power rivalry and other acute emergencies are the sources of international insecurity. It was also considered that for a lasting global peace, it is required to radically alter the world order based on domination, colonialism, imperialism, and apartheid in all its manifestation. Because, it was apparent that any violence or war occurred between or among countries in the 20th century, explicitly was the result of the quest of domination by one state over another territory for territorial expansion. Third, it is considered that the disarmament is the imperative need and urgent task for humankind. Therefore, it was pointed out that general and complete disarmament should be eliminated increasingly, except the need according to the matters of internal security. Because the mass destruction in Japan from the nuclear weapon was experienced which culminated at the end of Second World War. Therefore, to eliminate the fear

---

[9] Deceleration of Cairo Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1961. Pp. 6-14.

of nuclear weapons from the humankind, it was pertinent for complete nuclear disarmament. It was decided that the efforts would be made under auspices of United Nations. Fourth, participant countries considered that the effort should be done to reduce the economic disparity between states, which resulted from colonial or imperial subjugation. The economic disparity between and among states increased due to colonial exploitation by imperial powers. Therefore, the eradication and elimination of the tendencies of imperialism realised to finish. Fifth, the participant members considered that it is essential to reform the international political structure which channelized through the United Nations. The needs for the inclusive and more democratic nature of United Nations was aspired to be accomplished particularly for the equitable representation in the United Nations Security Council (Mohanty, 71-73; Ray, 35-39).

At sum, India, being a pioneer country to introduce the notion of nonalignment not only contributed in shaping the contour of Nonaligned Movement but also helped in the development of Nonaligned Movement through actively participation in the periodical summits. However, it was the mutual collaboration of Asian and African countries. The common issues and concerns of all nascent countries were the sources of the development of Nonaligned Movement such as security of hard won independence and sovereignty during Cold War and for the establishment of peace and security of the world in which their development would be possible. The Nonaligned Movement increased its membership as colonised territories gained independence. International common issues in general and the issues of newly independent countries mainly focused in the deliberation of agendas of the summits of the Nonaligned Movement.

Chapter 3

India's National Interest and Nonaligned Movement

3.1 Introduction

The immediate concern of any state supposed to be everlasting survival in any sort of global order. For their survival, state's primary interest is to accumulate power which is the fundamental source of their existence. Besides, the state always aspires for the extended power and influence the global order accordingly. In the late 18th century, particularly in the post-French Revolution, liberal democratic political order started to emerge with democratic nationalism. Simultaneously, the authoritative tendencies began to erode, particularly in Europe, further, its slip over effect was seen in other parts of the world. Moreover, the national interests of a state became more inclusive and legitimate (George, 6-7) instead of "will of King" and "will of empire" (Kumar, 274).

The national interest of a state is defined by J. Bandyopadhyaya (2003) as the priority of a state for National Security, that deal with survival and sovereignty; National Development, which means to build stable infrastructure and economic strength; Global Order, means to maintain the favorable external environment. For which, state dedicate herself all the time to secure its national interests. As far as India's national interests are concerned, India's leadership articulated 'nonalignment' as a fundamental principle of its foreign policy, predilection with pragmatism in adverse circumstances at the internal and external environment. Simultaneously, India has suffered from large scale of stagnation of economy and agricultural production due to two hundred years of subjugation by colonial rulers. Despite that relatively weak condition during Cold War in early post-independence, India aspired to be a "Great Power." Due to India's internal and external circumstances, India was not able to play an influential role in global politics. India's ideological and strategic principle of nonalignment in foreign policy made able India play a significant and influential role in global politics. In fact, the Nonaligned Movement also facilitated India to play leading role to perform on behalf of its member states, which culminated India as an acknowledged leader of the non-aligned movement.

Thus, in this context an inevitable demand emerges to inquire the following questions. They are as - How has India applied the notion of nonalignment in her foreign policy? How has India maintain the strategic relationship with the United States and the Soviet Union in the realm of Cold War binary? Moreover, to what extent India has secure its strategic interests being an active member of Nonaligned Movement? In this chapter at first, the concept of national interests and India's foreign policy is being defined theoretically. Further, India's strategic dealing with outside world is being analysed in the context of India's relationship with Nonaligned Movement and its quest for realisation of national interests.

3.2 National Interest: Conceptual Understanding

The concept of national interest as a criterion of national and foreign policies of a state has developed through the historical transformation of the international system. The concept of national interests has emerged with the emergence of nation-state system in 16th and 17th century with the reduction of traditional diplomacy in which the idea of *raison d'état* (reason of state) was dominant in authoritative political orders. Hitherto, the concept of national interest was entirely associated with the "will of King" and "will of empire" (Kumar, 274). The unitary decision-making process was easy and simple to determine the national interests. In post-French revolution period, "democratization" of nationalism was promoted in liberal democracies, and traditional authoritative values such as "*raison d'état*" (reason of state) and *"l'état c'est moi"* (the state is me) started to erode. Further, the state started to encompass the multiplicities of interests of different groups within state. Besides, inclusive, legitimate sovereignty emerged within the liberal democratic political framework, called democratic nationalism. Subsequent consequences resulted in with the emergence of the more nebulous concept of national interests, because of different groups claimed to legitimize their aspiration and interests, which prior was ignored within the state (George, 6-7).

It is all acknowledged that to define the national interests; the basic criterion must be decided. Therefore, the surpassing and superordinate criterion for national interests is evident. This criterion must involve and encompass the multiplicities of values and interests of different groups that may difficult to harmonize all in a framework. These various values may pull cost/benefit calculation of decision makers in different direction in a cloudy environment. Under

these kind of circumstances, decision makers must employ the criterion for national interests to cope the uncertain and complex choices among alternative policies. The intellectual guidance and careful attempt may help to alleviate those complexities. Defining that criterion George (2006) labelled the term "national interest" as "misnomer." He asserted that the term "national value" would be appropriate and better term to define "national interest" (George, 9). He found the fundamental distinction between national values and national interests. According to him, the "vital national interests" of a state have three irreducible or fundamental national values, which are:

First, "*security and physical survival*" which involves the eternal existence of a state, meaning that the preservation and security all of its territory. This sort of threat might be the result of foreign threat and aggression over state territory, or it might be an internal threat too. Second, "*sovereign independence and liberty*" which include, free from any external influence during policy formulation process for domestic and external setting. It also included the state's subjects to have the freedom to decide and choose their personal and political preferences, which requires retaining the significant amount of autonomy, sovereignty, and liberty inside the state system. Third, maintenance of "*economic substance*," which involves the economic prosperity and wellbeing of the population of state (George, 9-10) and the maintenance of healthy and productive economic relations among states to enhance economic leverage.

With the distinction of irreducible national value from national interests, the term national interest is defined as the "specific requirements for preserving these [national] values" (George, 10) in different historical context. Moreover, Nuechtealein (1976) defined national interest as "perceived needs and desire of one sovereign state in relation to other sovereign state comprising the external environment." He further elaborated this definition that the needs and desires of the state are a decision and a political process of a sovereign state for public interests. In this context, the notion of national interests may be characterized as a non-operational goal and possible to familiarize with the concept of general welfare and linked with the specific choice of action of policy makers (Nuechtealein, 2).

For the preservation of irreducible national values of a state, Nuechtealein has described the specific primary requirements for a state which is pertinent to preserve those national values [defined above], which are:

a) *Defence***:** It indicates the protection of a state and its inhabitants against any external or internal threat and violence, instigated by any of power.

b) *Economic Enhancement:* Is a consistent effort of a state to gain more economic strength and leverage, which is a prerequisite condition for a state to feed its population.

c) *Ideological Protection:* Means state has to protect, enhance and furtherance of those set of values in which subjects of state believe as universally useful with in state territory.

d) *Maintain World Order:* It means the state has to maintain international economic and political order in a manner in which state feel secure of itself survival. Formation of a world order in which state economic development would be possible.

Furthermore, similarly, J. Bandyopadhyaya (2003) defined comprehensively and explicitly the "minimum essential components" of national interests in the context of the present global political setting, which are: One, *National Security* is the first and foremost guarantee of a state's international existence. Two, *National Development*, for which national security of a state is a minimum guarantee, and Third, *World Order* means that without favourable world order of a state, security and national development of a state is hard to realise in practical terms (Bandyopadhyaya, 9-10).

Eventually, from above discussed different perspectives, the common values observed here which might possibly be define as national interests of a state which are: One, National Security, for endure survival of a state, preserving territorial integrity and sovereignty. Second, National Development, means the requirement of a state for stable infrastructure establishment and development, which provide the basis for economic development of state. National development also ensure the national security from internal and external threats. Third, maintain Global Order, involve the preference of a state to maintain the global order in a way, where national security and national development of a state can be ensure.

In unfavourable global order, national interests and national development of a state might be endangered.

It is evident that in globalized era, constraints of external environment determine the behavior of state in international system relatively more than domestic, individual and political variables. However, certainly, internal and external factors both determine the foreign policy of a state. For instance, the status of a state in international system and the internal political system and relative power capability determined the specific behaviour of state's foreign policy. Similarly, Harsh V. Pant has argued that in international system, state's position and its "relative material power capabilities" are the most important drivers of its foreign policy (Pant, 5; Breuning 13). According to Pant, improved state's position in international system and relative power determine the scale and scope of ambition of state in foreign policy. Thus, the rising powers in international system also efforts to alter the status quo with new arrangements to find their equitable, due position in international system.

3.3 India's National Interest and Nonaligned Movement in the Changing Contour of Global Politics

On the nature of national interests, various approaches are in the academic discourse in international relations, particularly in the field of foreign policy. The two major approaches represents the two major ideologies in field of foreign policy. The realist account equates the national interests of a state with the national power of a state regarding material strength, particularly and primarily military and economic strength. On the other side, the idealist equates national interests with the aspiration of uniform sort of moral values such as ensuring peace and tranquillity. For this account of idealism, the material power might be sacrificed for the achievement and persuasion of universal moral values for humanity. Despite both two extreme approaches, there are also scholars and leaders, those who moderate views between both the ideologies realism and idealism.

In the history of India's foreign policy discourse, both spectrums of thought (idealism and realism) expressed by thinkers and leaders, and also of those who moderate views between both of the two. For instance, realist views expressed by Kautilya in 4th century B.C. viewed the interstate relations as "game of power." He

advised to the king to accumulate the material power for state by all means. Kautilya in the real sense was the founder of the realist school of thought in international relations. In the contemporary period, the modern thinker and leaders followed those realist ideas in the various political spectrum are Vallabhbhai Patel in India and in West, from Machiavelli to H. J. Morgenthau admired and glorified the doctrine of power politics. Moreover, the idealist views expressed in India too, in the context of foreign policy by Ashoka, who articulated the vigorous system of "cultural and quasi-missionary" diplomacy (Bandyopadhyaya, 4-5).

In modern India, some eminent thinkers and leaders expressed the powerful idealist thoughts in the context of international relations and for political setting such as M. K. Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, and Arbindo. Although, with the syntheses of both the approaches Jawaharlal Nehru defined the idealism as the "realism of tomorrow" (Nehru, 51). Therefore, the doctrine of nonalignment which India has applied in her foreign policy might be considered as a strategic and pragmatic stance. Because it is used to maximise the strategic interests of India and even Nehru explained it in the context of Cold War binary that "when the time comes to make a choice, we will choose for our interests" (Nehru 24). Nehru successfully syntheses and articulated both the approaches in the context of India's national interests. However, the Nehruvian idealistic foreign policy is defined as a belief against any sort of ideological verity in foreign policy and against the excessive zeal toward particular ideology (Mehta, 231). Where summited response by India seems determined by particular situations rather depend on predetermined idea or logic. However, It is argued that India's foreign policy have chosen "quite deliberately" to ignore "systemic constrains" for the persuasion of explicitly "ideational foreign policy" (Ganguly and Pardesi, 4).

In previous chapter number second, it is explicitly defined the meaning of nonalignment and India's compulsions and inherent desire to adopt the doctrine of nonalignment as a pioneer concept, even before independence. Further, the evolution and development of Nonaligned Movement defined too in the second chapter. However, in addition to this, this chapter dealing with India's national interests and Nonaligned Movement. India is potentially "big power" and "great nation" (Nehru 36; Nayar 224) due to its strategic geographical location and huge natural resources. Thus, India has aspired to acquire the "Great Power" status

which is historically rooted in perceived earlier standing of Indian empires (Ogden, 4; Ogden, 36).

To possess the great power status, India's relatively weak political, economic and military strength guided to adopt a strategy for the acquisition of that status. That strategy was based on ideational principals to deal with its adverse external environment. India, at the early years of post-independence period had to cope the challenging disturbed and destabilised setting at both internal (partition and poverty) and external (Cold War) setting. In such kind of environment India's priority was to secure its above defined national interests. For that, India adopted the noaligned position in dichotomous bipolarity. Therefore, the rational calculation of that decision to build the cohesion of heterogeneous weak nonaligned states in power politics would "far outweight the benefits" rather going it alone (Abraham, 196). Besides, the Nonaligned Movement gradually developed by collective deliberations. At the advent of 21st century, both internal and external political and economic environment changed again. In that changed context in globalised world, India struggled again to secure its national interests facing adverse circumstances such as balance of payment crises at home and emergence of unipolarity at abroad. In this chapter it would be attempt to scrutinize the calculation of India's attained national interests through the participation in the Nonaligned Movement. Before scrutinizing the India's national interests, the internal and external factors of India has kept in mind which influence India's behaviour of foreign relations. Those internal and external factors would also be discussed with in.

3.3.1 National Security Interests

The concept of national security in the context of India explicitly deals with the elements of preservation of territorial integrity and absolute sovereignty. Thus, in general, sovereignty without full territorial integrity and territorial integrity without absolute sovereignty does not seem to be national security in the true sense, for which India constantly aspire to maintain. Besides, national security has the two source of threat, internal and external. Thus, the national security has two aspects, internal security, and external security. The external security of India closely linked with internal security in globalized world. India's internal security meant the stability, viability, and performance of its very existence against, disordered forces using violence against it, which may weaken India directly and finally may

endanger in the result of foreign aggression or dominance. India secured its national interests and performed endure exercises for continues insurance for national security interests.   India also secure her national autonomy and sovereignty through nonaligned policy not only during power politics of Cold War but beyond that period of bipolarity. Therefore, nonalignment seems like a positive exercise of "independence of judgment and action" in international relation judging every issue on its merits (Dubey, 3).

The post-independence India was excessively exploited and subjugated during the colonial period, due to that India had the weak and poor infrastructure and less agricultural production, heavily depended on foreign aids for food security. In such a weak condition, India's leadership had aspirated India as a great power and strategically devoted its resources primarily to the development of a strong and stable Indian economy. Because, if India would involve in power politics during Cold War, the limited resources would be diverted from main developmental agenda and could compromise the "freedom of manoeuvre" (Ganguly and Pardesi, 6). Simultaneously, India made an unavoidable investment in defence sector to ensure long term security for India. Besides, Instead of investing resources in building military capacity, is seemed the unproductive sector to feed India and may lead the shortfall of the industrial and agricultural production. Therefore, India invested for the development of basic infrastructure to secure long term security. The long term security is distinguished from short term military strength. The production of armaments and other defence materials would not be able to feed the needs of social and economic infrastructure. Moreover, the established social and economic infrastructure would facilitate the long term social and economic security. However, the necessary military capability is essential for each state. Therefore, India's primary objective was to build a strong economic strength through basic infrastructure development.

India's foreign policy was primarily based on principled diplomacy rather than military power. It means the nonalignment adhered as a fundamental principle of India's foreign policy, well defined in the Indian context. The nonalignment neither is isolationist nor neutral rather did it emphasise on the aspects of decision making on behalf of national merit, in the interest of the nation. Therefore, India's foreign policy was not calculated by systemic constraint rather designed by a

framework of ideational principles (Ganguly and Pardesi, 4). Similarly, this autonomy of choice, judgment, and action, India sought in global politics. For that India enjoyed that privilege of autonomy of judgment criticising various international issues and mute on some issues. Therefore, India deliberately choose to ignore systemic constraints and decide to pursue the ideational foreign policy. Such as being a staunch proponent of nonalignment and the Nonaligned Movement, which based on the ideal principles such as *Panchsheela*[10] among others. Foreign policies base on these ideational principles further led the "disastrous consequences" for India, received "serious security threat" and humiliated by People's Republic of China on border dispute in 1962. Which resulted in considerable losses for India as China acquired 14000 square mile territory on which they claimed initially (Ganguly and Perdasi, 8).

India realised the advantage of the strength of military after fought wars with China (in 1962) and Pakistan (in 1965 and 1971). Thus, in such an aggressive kind of environment and weak economic strength compelled India to make some practical steps to sought help from available sources. In late October 1962, India had turned for military aid from many countries, and since November 1962, India started to receive arms from Commonwealth countries and United States (Bhardwaj, 10) and Israel (Bhattacharjee, 1). Those military aids were "incompatible with the policy of nonalignment," despite that India maintained the "posture of nonalignment," being an active member of Nonaligned Movement (Nasenko, 295). It is also observed that India consistently affirmed the course of nonalignment despite criticism at home that India suffered an adverse effect on security choices. Therefore, nonalignment was defined as a "rational response" to the post-Second World War international system (Mukherji and Malone, 313) and embrace with Nonaligned Movement also regarded as plus point in India's bargaining basket. India's version of nonalignment enabled India to construct enough arrangements to secure its national interests without compromising sovereignty through building strategic engagement with suitable powers. It would not be possible for India to ensure sovereignty through military alliances with US or USSR (Khilnani et al., xxiii). Therefore, India's experienced foreign policy

---

[10] Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs; Mutual non-aggression; Equality and cooperation for mutual benefit; Peaceful co-existence.

behaviour increasingly assumed a sort of realist orientation. Which reflected in the Indo-Soviet treaty of peace, friendship, and cooperation in 1971, which ensure India's security from Beijing-Islamabad-Washington's de facto consensus of the coalition. Through which India had "socialized experience in Great Power *realpolitik*" (Ogden, 7). Further, Peaceful Nuclear Explosion (PNE) in May 1974 made her an undisputed dominant power in the region, which shows the pragmatic step of India (Ganguly and Pardesi, 8-9).

In post-1991, with the disintegration of Soviet Union, India had handled the balance of payment crisis at home through economic reforms. As a result, India's economic performance grew significantly due to changed economic strategy for development that is, the endorsement of greater private sector and trade oriented economic system. Which contributed to the high growth rate of Indian economy (Mukherji, 311-312). Besides, in the decade of 1990s, the "Hindu nationalism" emerged under Bharatiya Janta Party (BJP) which wished to reclaim India's rightful place at the global stage. Indian strategic community and BJP leadership believed that India could only gain strength for great power status if she had nuclear capability. In fact, India crossed the nuclear Rubicon in 1998 under pressure of continues US sanction since 1974 Peaceful Nuclear Explosion and the continued nuclear discrimination through NPT and CTBT by United Nation Security Council permanent members (UNSC P-5) (Ogden, 8-9). This nuclear test (May 1998) transformed India's foreign diplomacy which supplanted the earlier idealism without discarding the core principle of nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement such as autonomy and independence of foreign policy and regular participation in the summits of Nonaligned Movement (Mohan, 30). India continuously adhered the principles of Nonaligned Movement and dedicated toward its objectives beyond the post-1998 nuclear test.

India withstands with the US sanctions, supported by other countries and international corporations through financial linkages. Further, India's transformed diplomacy took efforts to inculcate deeper and energetic relationship across the world. India started to engage with new grouping such as Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa (BRICS), Russia-India-China (RIC), and India-Brazil-South Africa (IBSA) to build the multilateral engagement for a multipolar world. Besides, India improved relations with all countries, particularly with the US to declare itself

as "natural ally." India, as a nuclear power now became significant to the US for her geostrategic interests in the Persian Gulf and Asia Pacific, is a balancer under "Asia rebalancing" strategy of US (Ogden, 9-10). Therefore, improved India-US relations received India's international standing through strategic partnership and bilateral defence agreement drawn up in 2005.

Strategically, India almost consistently needed armaments, defence technology and defence equipment, assurance of energy security from foreign countries in the form of aid or purchase without compromising sovereignty, which is successfully imported through diplomatic strategy. Certainly, the safeguard of long term security of a state does not merely depend on military strength, but the diplomatic leverage or strategy make an immense contribution. Thus, India constructed its "military diplomacy" during Cold War and beyond, through strategic choices and actions to protect her national security interests. In fact, national security cannot be safeguarded alone by foreign policy based on ideational principles and lack of enough military capability. For that, it is evident that India used political, economic, and cultural diplomacy for the maximum realisation of national security interests. Although, India felt some serious setback from the aggressive neighborhood and received minor support from member countries of Nonaligned Movement (Mohan, 40), however, India constructed the capacity to cope further potential threats through strategic engagement with both Eastern and Western countries. Indeed, India maintained cooperative relations with the different regions and states, where India's national security interests had lied.

3.3.2 National Development Interests

National development or lack of it provide the support or hindrance for national security respectively. However, national development is imperative for contemporary modern states in globalised world. National development is the primary and significant responsibility of a state, and also the national security is the minimum guarantee for that. Therefore, national security is the essential for national development. The term national development deals with the whole country. Lawal and Oluwatoyin (2011) defined national development as "overall development or a collective socio-economic, political as well as religious advancement" (Lawal and Oluwatoyin, 2) of a nation. It means, the political, social

and economic development for the sustainable development and growth of a nation in which the batter and quality life of population can be ensured.

Post-independence India found herself one of the poorest, most illiterate (85 percent), food-scared, famine-prone most backward and diseased society on earth had a lack of material capability (Nayar and Paul, 14). The growth rate of Indian economy was not even one percent during the colonial period in the first half of the twentieth century, where in early nineteenth century India enjoyed the status of one of the richest country in the world had a share of 23 percent of global Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Imperial rulers left India with 16 percent of literate, destroyed all major domestic industries and the 90 percent population living in below poverty line (Tharoor, 9). In such a weak social, economic status, India's had a "quasi-differentiated" and "relatively unstable infrastructure" (Bandyopadhyaya, 15). In such kind of circumstances, foreign policy became the major instrument of India for her economic development, modernization, especially to secure the foreign aid, technology, and capital for the promotion of export through economic diplomacy. India's stagnated status of national development certainly influences and determined by the principle of nonalignment of foreign policy to pursue the national development, maximising the source of development. Though, India persuaded the mixed economic approach for the development process, different from both of super power blocs during Cold War. India sought independent, nonaligned economic policy which could enhance the interests not only for India rather for vast majority of Third World countries (Seethi and Vijayan, 50). This bargaining placed through the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and through formation the Group of 77 (G-77) developing countries, which represented the majority in UNGA.

In addition to this, post-independence Indian leadership was acutely concerned about the opportunity cost of India's defence spending (Ganguly and Pardesi, 6). In this context and situation, India's nonalignment policy comes as a "rational outcome of a calculated approach" which maximised the national interests in Cold War bipolarity (Rana, 311). In this sense, the nonalignment policy was the tool for gaining economic leverage from Cold War rivals seeking attraction from both sides. However, India's rational calculation also assessed to construct the political cohesion of newly born countries, providing a way for nonalignment through which developed a movement of nonaligned countries at international

level. In fact, India's strategic geographical size, location and its efforts for developing Nonaligned Movement turned into a natural leadership of post-colonial world (Abraham, 196).

Therefore, India initiated the "economic diplomacy" for state building and infrastructure development as an instrument of national development. Seeking foreign economic and technological help from all sources which was available, particularly from industrialized countries, even from World Bank for long term infrastructure development in the 1950s and 1960s. For instance, India developed friendly relations with the Soviet Union due to Chinese aggression, received the economic and technological aid from Soviet Union. Particularly investment in heavy industry such as Bokaro and Bhilai steel plants, which was the worth of 33 percent of total Soviet Union's credit between 1956 to 1965 (Mukherji, 307). Much of that assistance was used to import of food and necessary items which was crucial for India's survival as subjugated country by British rule. That received aid was vital for India at that time which helps to increase the investment in India in the 1960s. The Soviet Union has provided India a substantial political, economic and diplomatic support during the Cold War period (Malone, 77).

Importing foreign aids, using nonaligned economic diplomacy through foreign policy and applied "inward oriented heavy industry" strategy at domestic level through five-year plans, India, no doubt successfully established the large industrial base with the capacity for necessary future industrialization. Although this strategy created the serious "disequilibria" in Indian economy (Dubey, 5). Simultaneously, India suffers from "foreign exchange crises" in 1957. Thus, India sought foreign aids from the great powers (Nayar, 226-227). India had advantageous from the competitiveness of the Soviet Union and the United States regarding providing aids because India received substantial financial assistance from both sides. In five years, from 1951 to 1966, 51 percent of India's foreign aid or assistance came from the US while 11 percent received from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. (Mukherji, 303-305). This Western aid was provided for the democracy promotion instead of falling under communist influence. However, at some degree, this strategy made dependent India on foreign aid and influenced India's economic decision-making process. The fact reflected in the instance when the United States and World Bank insisted India for the implementation of liberalisation and devaluation of Indian rupee for continues aid (Mukherji, 307). On

that time, India devaluated its currency almost 60 percent in June 1966 (Nayar, 227). However, the internal economic and agricultural stagnation and aggressive neighborhood made that decision inevitable for India. To ceasing this US dependency, India moved more close toward the Soviet Union and signed the "peace, friendship and cooperation treaty" in 1971, which provide security guarantee. This India's move reduced US's aid to India from 51 percent (1951 to 1966) to 1 percent in 1975 and engaged closed economic engagement with Soviet Union. Further, India, during Janata Party government received 2.25 billion worth of non-project aid (Mukherji, 308).

Further, two significant changes had happened in India's internal and external environment in the decade of 1980s and 1990s. The erosion of commitment to socialism in domestic politics and adopted the reform toward economic liberalisation in domestic politics. For that Atul Kohli has argued that "pro-business" economic liberalization approach in the 1980s and 1990s resulted in the high levels of economic growth in contemporary India. However, poverty and gap between rich and poor increased and hundreds of millions of Indians adversely affected (Kohli, 1-2) due to unequal distribution of perceived benefits from economic reforms. Till the early years of the decade of 1990s India's early post-independence inward looking state controlled, planned economic approach failed to achieve significant growth of the economy, instead faced the balance of payment crisis in beginning of the 1990s. In this context of economic performance of Indian economy, the "third force" of Nonaligned Movement in strategic political realm and G-77 in the realm of economy hardly gain significant economic profit for India. Simultaneously, the disintegration of Soviet Union and end of Cold War, Nonaligned Movement rendered obsolete (Basrur, 13-14).

Subsequently, in changed such environment, India's foreign diplomacy changed considerably in terms of foreign economic dealing in an atmosphere where the ideological dilemma has ended in global politics between East and West. Now, India's economic diplomacy not investing labour to maximise the inflow of economic aid from two powerful Cold War rivals rather maximise the efforts for possible receiving Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) (Bandyopadhyaya, 49-50) from Western countries and other developed countries frequently.

In the post-Soviet period, India entered in a new phase of economic diplomacy in which it needed to nurture new friend for further national

development. It found United State in that context as a potential supporter. Therefore, the success of India-US negotiation on nuclear cooperation in 2008, accepted by International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) enhanced the geostrategic and economic interests for India. The Foreign Direct Investment and trade oriented strategy became the important aspect of India's development strategy. Which contributed to India a high economic growth trajectory through engagement with major powers and international institutions (Malone, 93) such as World Trade Organisation (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), European Union (EU), US and Japan. In fact, the post-economic reform period, which constituted an "economic revolution" in the Indian economy, had a positive impact on "Indian productivity and competitiveness" (Nayar and Paul, 207). These economic reforms contributed to India's growth rate which is highest among the major economies (Stannard, 1). It is evident that India's economic growth rate gradually increased in the post-Soviet period. It grew 5.4 percent per annum between 1975 and 1990, 6 percent per annum in post-1991 and beyond 2003, it possessed average 7 percent per annum in the new millennium and became a fastest growing economy in the world, after China (Tellies, 2).

However, evidently, India's foreign economic policy during the 1980s and 1990s shown remarkable shift and undergone remarkable transformation and increasingly influenced by the idea of "neoliberal globalist"[11] through which foreign policy shifted from developmental practice to "neo-liberal practice" (Ramakrishnan, 27). Moreover, it also argued that India's economic reforms engender the increasing dependency of Indian economy on global capital and international financial institutions. The economic implication of this resulted in the policy changes at domestic sphere such as the introduction of more liberalisation and privatisation. Therefore through this process, the nature of Indian state is increasingly changing in the era of globalisation (Ramakrishnan, 28).

3.3.3 World Order Interests

Almost 200 years of colonial rule inculcated the sense of political culture in India, by which the compromise with sovereignty and intervention in internal affairs sought quite unacceptable in India. This sort of political culture gave birth to the

---

[11] Neoliberal globalist means the "global ascendancy of non-state actors in political sphere" such as market and transnational corporations (Ramakrishnan, 27).

concept of national autonomy. Therefore, Indian leadership was quite aware of keeping India outside the ambit of Cold War pattern which might surely endanger India's independence. In this context, national security and national development of a state may endanger by discriminatory and dominated world order (bipolarity or unipolarity), discriminatory economic and political regimes such as Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG). Powerful countries are imposing serious restriction on non-nuclear weapon states over their military capabilities those who refuse to admit their discriminatory nuclear regimes. Due to the rejection of those discriminatory regimes, state's security and national development process distress immensely by imposing sanctions. Thus, to preserve and enhance the favourable world order might be inevitably considered as a part of the national interest of India.

At the time of India's independence, the external environment was characterised by Cold War rivalry and bipolarity. To safeguard the hard won sovereignty and independence in such a contemporary environment of military alliances and counter alliances, India adopted the doctrine of nonalignment as a principle of her foreign policy in the bipolar international milieu. It is evident that India applies nonalignment doctrine as an instrument of foreign policy to handle such a bipolar global political environment. It was articulated by India's first Prime Minister J. Nehru at the time of independence that we will "keep away from the power politics of groups, [and] alliances against each other" (Nehru, 2). Thus, India had rejected the realist approach of power politics while conducting the foreign relations. Nehru strongly criticized the pure realist view of international relation based on military and economic power rather emphasised on idealist approach in the foreign policy of modern India (Bandyopadhyaya, 51). Because of India, had agricultural and economically stagnated, was supposed not to fit suitable on the risk of national development by building the military capability to cope the foreign military blocs. Thus, India adopted the idealist approach in her foreign policy by rejecting military alliances and power politics. One possibly may characterise Nehru's idealism as pragmatist one, because, he defined idealism that today's "idealism is realism of tomorrow" (Nehru, 51).

India has a central position in global politics and particularly in Asian politics, due to her geographical and strategic location, because all the major sea route passes through the Indian Ocean. Besides, India is a major connecting link

between East and West Asia and play a bridge role in between. Therefore, India had inevitable attention from rest of the world on major crisis. This was the certain reason for super powers during Cold War to attempt to influence India's national developmental process and foreign policy for their strategic interests (Bandyopadhyaya, 33). For that quite simple reason, India articulated the design of the architecture of the doctrine of nonalignment and actively contributed to the development of Nonaligned Movement through the participation in various initial meetings and summits. In fact, India managed its external environment in such a way where "peace and freedom" might ensure for at least Asian continent to eliminate the imperialistic tendencies out of Asia (Nehru, 24). India also tried to build the Asian and further Afro-Asian continental solidarity through Nonaligned Movement on the basis of their shared history and challenges they had faced for national independence and development. Further, the Nonaligned Movement provided the India a voice and distinct political profile in global politics due to its efforts and leading role for the collective demands for the interests of infant nations from the continued domination of international system by former colonial powers. This solidarity attracted other newly independent countries to join the Nonaligned Movement. These efforts made India a natural leader of Nonaligned Movement.

In fact, internal and external peace and freedom was not only a moral imperative for India but also a prerequisite condition for its national security and national development process. Moreover, for that purpose, India has strived not only through nonalignment but significantly utilised the multilateral platforms such as Nonaligned Movement and United Nations. Through which India consistently strived for the peace, disarmament, development, decolonization effort for the establishment of equitable and just world order and of course strengthened the multilateral fora (Dubey, 3). India applied the principle of nonalignment in the conducting of international relation and of course in United Nations also. For instance, India played a significant role in settlement of conflict reduction in Asia-Pacific. Because India endorsed the UN intervention in Korean crisis, did not target either of the party as an aggressor involved in that crisis. It facilitated the field ambulance in the battlefield. India maintained equidistance approach in Indochina conference in 1954 and also contributed the highest number of troops in peacekeeping mission under UN. In fact, India utilise nonalignment at international level not evenly but occasionally. Because, India had intense desire and support to

all anticolonial and anti-imperialist movement, while on "real situations" India supported to "maintain of status quo" (Chamling, 155). In fact, India criticised the expansionist policies of various states rather than ideological predilection. Therefore, India used nonalignment not as a third bloc but as a means through which it could remain "safeguard in a dichotomous and adversarial environment" (Ogden, 101).

India campaign for anti-colonialism in Asian Relation Conference (1947) in Delhi. It pursued the special provisions for the protection of nascent developing economic for international competition through General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) in 1954. Further, India had promoted the Afro-Asian solidarity through Afro-Asian Conference in 1955 at Bandung. India also took efforts to mobilize the developing countries for the support of the expansion of United Nations Security Council and given a part in the creation of G-77 (Mukherji and Malone, 314).

In less than one decade between 1962 and 1971, India faced three wars with its neighbours (with China in 1962; with Pakistan in 1965 and 1971). Probably, India's ideational foreign policy principles were undermined by India's neighbours, such as Panchsheel, nonalignment, and membership of Nonaligned Movement. Consequently, post-Nehru period India seems less obsessed with Nonaligned Movement and UN. The more pragmatic thinking qualified the Nehru's idealism in the conduct of foreign relations. In fact, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi introduced the "realpolitik" in the conduct of foreign policy because of the much less support from member countries of Nonaligned Movement in 1965 and 1971 war with Pakistan. Therefore, India's engagement with Nonaligned Movement became "general, rhetorical and distant" (Mukherji and Malone, 314). However, in the decades of 1970s and 1980s, India realised the relevance of existence of accumulated hard power. Therefore, India turned a shift in her strategic thinking which reflected in the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation with Soviet Union in 1971, materialised the Peaceful Nuclear Explosion (PNE) in 1974 and use of force in Shri Lanka, Maldives and East Pakistan for peaceful South Asia. These systemic steps made India an undisputed powerful country in the South Asian region having a large territory, three-quarter of its population and satisfied power at the regional level (Nayar, 313).

Further, in 1989, to counter the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, United States provided the foreign assistance to Pakistan. Therefore, to maintain the military superiority over Pakistan, India engaged with the Soviet Union in military cooperation. This strategic diplomacy realised Regan administration to improve relations with India to reduce India's dependency on Soviet Union (Ganguly and Pardesi, 10-11). India continues commitment on nonalignment made possible to maintain good relation with both the Cold War rivals, for India. Although, India had limited relations with other important countries because the overt or covert influence of Cold War rivals had in those countries. Thus, India kept herself away from other important countries as much as possible.

Two events occurred in global politics in the decade of 1990s, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of Cold War. Due to that, the global scenario has changed dramatically. The global order shifted from bipolarity to unipolarity, under single superpower, the US. In that changed scenario, India had experienced change at the domestic and external environment. The domestic economic reforms accelerated the high rate of growth at domestic level. At the external field, the disintegration of Soviet Union and end of Cold War eroded the ideological dilemma for India between East and West. Therefore, India had embraced its economy with the global economy.

Besides, the leadership of the third world and Asia-African solidarity became started to discontinue or secondary goal for Indian foreign policy. The disintegration of Soviet Union regarded as the "the final nail in the coffin of nonalignment" as an instrument (Mukherji and Malone, 315) in Indian foreign policy behaviour. Similarly, Ganguly and Pardesi (2009) argued that in the post-economic reforms era, India's commitment to nonalignment had "eroded in practice, if not in rhetoric" (Ganguly and Pardesi, 12). Therefore, the increasing reduction of the importance of nonalignment for India obviously further raises doubt of its seriousness toward Nonaligned Movement. However, in the post-Soviet period, India reinvigorated its foreign and economic policies in changed outlook without rejecting the commitment toward nonaligned and Nonaligned Movement (Mohan, 30).

In the decade of 1990s, the India's Prime Minister Narashimha Rao sought to introduce a new course of foreign policy regarded as "radicle departure" from previous. Which was the response of the end of Cold War and collapse of its ally

through "Look East" policy and opening way for South Korea and Israel (Baru, 2). Look East policy was institutionalised through the increasing engagement with South East Asian Countries. In post-Pokhran-II, the Look East policy was regarded as strategically important for India's economic interests (Ogden, 111). The US and its allied powers sought to create hurdle in India's articulated great power ambition. The controllers of NPT proposed to extend the NPT into more rigid CTBT in 1996. Despite pressure to eliminate existed nuclear capability, India successfully conducted the second nuclear test in 1998. Consequently, India possessed significant attention at global level despite bearing heavy sanctions by the US; the France and Russia supported India for a permanent seat in United Nations Security Council (UNSC).

Besides, US reproached to India and recognised a major potential power through offering India exceptional civil nuclear deal and cooperation without being NPT signatory. The US Congress approved the deal on 1 October 2008. India's nuclear stature and success of nuclear deal with the US, C. Raja Mohan pointed out on that-

> Nuclear reconciliation between the global nuclear order and India must be seen as a consequence of the changes in the international distribution of power as well as the perceived need to adapt to the changing dynamics of nuclear politics in the post-Cold War period (Mohan, 44).

Eventually, US too supported India for her rightful due for the permanent membership of UNSC in 2010 and acknowledged India as an "already emerged" nation (Wax and Lakshmi, 1). These changed Indo-US relations narratives inevitably changed the international nuclear regime exceptionally for India. India accommodated exceptionally in the NSG too for global nuclear trade.

In this context, India's emerged relatively economic, military and political strength at the international stage which enhanced India's leverage to bargain at international institutions which made able India to shape favourable world order in the 21st century. This India's possessed international status credited to the persuasion of the foreign policy of increasing predilection toward pragmatism given less consideration toward idealistic credo such as nonalignment, which remain the rhetorical dedication toward Nonaligned Movement. However, on the contrary of above arguments (Mukherji and Malone, 315; Ganguly and Pardesi, 12), it is argued that some of "ideological residue of the nonaligned era still remain" in

India's external engagement, due to distrust experience of the 20th century (Nayar, 318). Moreover, India changed its strategy in post-Soviet era to cope the unipolar world order through multilateral engagements, cooperation and multialignment with major countries, breaking pathways in foreign relations through "Look East" policy and opened diplomatic relations with Iserial, building regional and transnational alliances such as ASEAN, SAARC, IBSA, IOR-ARC and BRICS (Shaji, 19-25). Eventually, the major constrains in the ambition of India's great power status are still existed, manifested in the enormous poverty, widespread corruption, breakdown of the rule of law, separatist tendencies, communal and insurgency elements (Malone, 53-59). In fact, the status of major power status for a state never could be a bestowed gift by another country, but it has to achieve through efforts and by building capabilities

Chapter 4

India and Nonaligned Movement in Post-Cold War Era

4.1 Introduction

The military alliances were rejected and policy of nonalignment was applied by the infant independent countries in their foreign behaviour during Cold War. Simultaneously, they contributed to the development of the nonlaigned movement. In that process of development of the Nonaligned Movement, India had contributed its due role through active participation during the period of its development. India's contribution had provided the momentum in the pace of Nonaligned Movement. Initially, the Movement's strategy was mainly for the objectives for political purposes particularly against colonialism, imperialism, apartheid regimes and promotion for disarmament, international peace and security backed by a number of developing countries which increased timely. Further, the colonialism and imperialism became the experience of the past due to the independence of colonised territories at large scale. Thus, the political objectives of Nonaligned Movement transformed into the objectives of primarily economic development of the developing countries in late 20th century, particularly in the post-Cold War period. It was because of the increasingly and relatively emergence of US centered unipolarity in economic and political terms. The unipolarity further inculcated the inequality and injustice among countries through the existence of continued dominated international economic and political structure. Although, other aspects of the issues of global politics remain the focal concerns of the Nonaligned Movement, for instance, the democratisation of international system, disarmament, and terrorism.

The transformation of the objectives of Nonaligned Movement of the 20th century has changed with the demise of bipolarity and advent of unipolarity in the international system of the 21st century. However, the fundamental principles of the Nonaligned Movement remain unchanged. In this context, the obvious questions emerge from the development process of Nonaligned Movement in general and from the Indian point of view regarding her participation in the Movement in particular. The questions are that what priorities Nonaligned Movement had focused at the initial stage of the Movement? What priorities have Nonaligned Movement shifted with changed global environment at the end of 20th century?

The question from the Indian point of view that what position India held on the main objectives of Nonaligned Movement at the initial phase of the Movement and in post-Cold War period? In this chapter, firstly the objectives of Nonaligned Movement has been defined then India's role has been discussed in various Summits of Nonaligned Movement held during Cold War. Further, India's position has been discussed in changed priorities of Nonaligned Movement in post-Cold War. At last, India's recent (in 21st century) course of participation in Nonaligned Movement has been discussed.

4.2 Nonaligned Movement: Redefining Objectives in Post-Cold War Era

The Head of State or Government of Nonaligned Movement Summit held at Jakarta (1992), Indonesia at a historic juncture when the profound changes had occurred at international level. The disintegration of Soviet Union and end of bipolar international system culminated international system into the unipolar international system. In this context, the Nonaligned Movement sought for the rapid transformation in established architecture of international legislature and executive framework. However, with the demise of Soviet Union, the further relevance of Nonaligned Movement was questioned. Even though, the member countries remained an active participant in the Nonaligned Movement. On the other side it was considered that with changed realities at international level, Nonaligned Movement also needs to revitalise its agenda and redefine its articulated objectives to meet the realities and challenges of 21st century. Therefore, Nonaligned Movement shifted its priorities in the post-Cold War period. In Jakarta Summit and further summits, the major concerns were expressed for further articulation of the priorities of Nonaligned Movement and the major priorities identified are:

1. Building New Equitable Architecture of Global Order
2. Strengthening Multilateral Cooperation for Development
3. International Security and Disarmament
4. Combating Terrorism
5. Reaffirming Old Commitments

4.2.1 Building New Equitable Architecture of Global Order

At the Jakarta Summit (1992) of Nonaligned Movement, the high level Working Group charged with the concrete proposal for the restructuring of the UN for democratisation of UN System. The Nonaligned Movement showed dedication to shape the new international order free from war, intolerance, poverty, and injustice based on the principle of peaceful co-existence and genuine independence. Besides, it was ensured that the new global order should preserve and promote the interests of nonaligned countries and the Nonaligned Movement should be an important partner in shaping that order. In this regard, the Summit took note for the efforts to restructure the UN Secretariat with the hope to consider the issues which seemed critical and urgent need for developing countries. In the process of reform of UN, the organisation should be more responsive to changing realities in a dynamic context. This process of democratisation of UN and its bodies should not be perpetuated current inequalities and disparities. Further, the Summit emphasised on the ensuring the role of Security Council according to the mandate defined in the UN Charter. With regard to UNSC veto power, the Summit noted the contrary of veto power with the idea of democratisation of UN. It needs to review the structure thoroughly with the aim to bring greater democracy and transparency.[12]

Moreover, in Jakarta Summit, the Heads of State or Government of Nonaligned Movement had noted that the international economic situation has not conductive to development for developing countries, it was marked by their sluggish and uneven growth. The Summit stressed on the failure of the international financial system to deliver the adequate development finance over the past decades. It was also expressed the concern and urged that the producer and consumer countries to make an effort to reactivate commodity agreements for mutual interests. Through that, the commodity price would be easy to maintain ideally. In this context, it was urged in this Summit to build a new, global consensus and commitment to strengthening international economic cooperation for development. For that, it was emphasised to reactivate the dialogue between North and South for mutual interests and shared responsibility. In addition to this, it

---

[12] Deceleration of Jakarta Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1992. Pp. 25-30.

was stressed for the efforts to attain the "collective self-reliance" which would enhance the negotiation strength of developing countries and opportunity for development. These efforts added the strength to efforts to achieve just and equitable international economic order based on mutual interests.[13]

At Cartagena Summit (1995), the Head of State or Government expressed the concern that the special privilege and dominant role of Permanent Member of Council, which is contrary to the aim of democratisation of UN. In this context, it was reiterated regarding the special privilege of the member of UNSC to exercise the veto. The Summit committed to eliminating that provision. The Summit reaffirmed the reform and the expansion aspects of Security Council should be considered as an integral part of reform to ensure the transparency, accountability, and democratisation of Security Council. For this purpose, the Heads of State or Government examined various mechanisms for the revision of the Charter of the UN at the appropriate time.[14]

The Head of state or Government of Nonaligned Movement at Cartagena Summit noted that increasing interdependence and globalisation of world economy aided the imbalance and stagnation of developing economies. To reduce the economic imbalance between developing and developed countries, the Summit reiterated the need for democratisation and transparency in international economic and financial decision making at all fora. It would ensure the interests of the developing countries has been taken into account.[15]

The Durban Summit (1998) of Nonaligned Movement welcomed the decision adopted by the UNGA to reform proposal presented by Secretary General in his report "Renewing the United Nations: A Program for Reform." The Summit stressed on the success of reforms could be judged by the real functioning of UN and by its positive impact on developing countries. Reforms should enable General Assembly capable enough to meet the contemporary challenges. Besides, the Summit comprehensively reviewed the discussions on the reform and restructuring of Security Council in the light of the papers adopted by the

[13] Deceleration of Jakarta Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1992. Pp. 39-42.
[14] Deceleration of Cartagena Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1995. Pp. 24-27.
[15] Deceleration of Cartagena Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1995. Pp. 55-57.

Movement on February 1995. The Durban Summit reaffirmed that Movement should pursue directives given by previous Summit. Which is the equitable representation of the countries of Nonaligned Movement in Security Council, which should be determined on the basis of geographical distribution and sovereign equality; increase the membership of Security Council not less than 11. The negotiation should be truly democratic and transparent. The Summit also reaffirmed the proposal of the curtailment of veto power except action taken under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.[16] In the same Durban Summit of Nonaligned Movement, Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee also emphasised for the reform and expansion of Security Council of United Nations based on "global and non-discriminatory" criteria.[17]

The Durban Summit also raised the voice for the equal participation of developing countries in global economic decision-making process. It was noted for the need for such democratisation and transparency in international economic and financial decision making at all fora. The full participation of developing countries needs to be ensured so that their development interests would be fully taken into account.[18] Similarly, Indian Prime Minister also focused in Durban Summit for the priority for the management of the international economy. The concern was expressed of protectionism in the market of the developed world. India strongly urged to invest the collective "political will" for hard negotiations to take "substantive decision" at this Summit.[19] So that, it was the strong political will to strengthen collective negotiation capacity through mutually supportive actions.

The Kuala Lumpur Summit (2003) of Nonaligned Movement considered the success of the reforms of UN only if judged the improved condition of functioning and consideration of commensurate interests of developing countries. Simultaneously, need to promote and preserve the purposes and principles of UN Charter and the mandate of UNGA. The Summit emphasised on the contribution of private sector, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and civil society should

---

[16] Deceleration of Durban Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1998. Pp. 24-28.

[17] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998.

[18] Deceleration of Durban Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1998. Pp. 73-74.

[19] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998.

be serve the purpose of the principles and purpose of the Charter of UN. The Summit noted the concern of the Movement that imposition of sanction should be draw accordance with the UN Charter. It should be considered after applying all means of peaceful settlement of dispute under VI Chapter of UN. In this regard, it was also called that the objectives of the sanction should be precisely defined.[20]

The Kuala Lumpur Summit of Nonaligned Movement noted that the credit of globalisation is much far away from most of developing countries, therefore, the huge imbalance exist between developing and developed countries. The ability to exploit the opportunities within globalisation highly depends on technological, economic and institutional capacities of state. Hence, the Summit asserted on the efforts for international development where the developing countries would be able to acquire the sufficient capacities to exploit the benefits globalisation. The Heads of State of Government emphasised on need of "New Global Human Order" with the aim to reduce the growing disparity both within and among countries.[21]

The Havana Summit (2006) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the principled position concerning of institutional reforms of the UN. In this regard, India urged for collective efforts to join hands with other countries to promote the democratic global governance, ushering new global governance.[22] The Summit promoted the interests of developing countries during reform process, preserve the integrity, functions and powers of UNGA. On the contrary the Summit opposed the proposals which sought to alter the democratic nature of UN, reduce its budget level and redefine the Charter based principles. The Summit engaged constructively to revitalise the role of UNGA, democratisation of UNSC as an effective forum for the maintenance of international security and peace.[23]

The Havana Summit also noted the risk and challenges for the developing countries presented by globalisation. The present structure of globalisation produced the uneven benefits among countries. Therefore, it was emphasised to

---

[20] Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. Pp. 12-13.
[21] Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. Pp. 54-55.
[22] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XIV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Havana, 15 September 2006.
[23] Deceleration of Havana Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2006. Pp. 31-32.

transform the globalisation into a positive force for inclusive welfare for all countries instead of benefit of elite countries. India also expressed highly concern the need of transforming globalisation into a more "balanced and equitable distribution" of its benefits.[24]

The Sharam al Shaikh Summit (2009) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the Movement's principled positions regarding institutional reform of the UN that UN remain the indispensable and central forum to address the common global issues and challenges. Therefore, it seemed essential to strengthen UN capability through commensurate institutional reforms. So that the organisation's potential of proper functioning would improve for the preservation of the interests of developing countries. In this context, the UN reform shall be approved through General Assembly and the budget and resources shall be preserved. Besides, strengthening the UNGA, Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and reforming UNSC were among the top reform institutional area in the reform of UN. However, strengthening the multilateral decision making process and role of organisation in promoting cooperation for the maintenance of international security and peace were another area of reforms. Further, it was emphasised to keep the proper balance among the principle bodies of UN in the context of their power and functions.[25]

The Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Nonaligned Movement noted the concern of 2008 financial and economic crisis which aggravated the ongoing global food crisis. In this context, the Summit expressed the deep concern of the worst outcomes due to international financial and economic crisis, which affected the world at large. In this regard, India also urged member countries to take great stake in the revival of global economy. For that, Indian Prime Minister called for the commensurate representation for developing countries in the decision making process at international institutions.[26] The Sharam al Shaikh Summit also recognised the need for work collectively for institutional reforms in international financial and monetary architecture and economic governance. For that it was

---

[24] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XIV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Havana, 15 September, 2006.

[25] Deceleration of Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2009. Pp. 20-22.

[26] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Sharam al Shaikh, 15 July, 2009.

emphasised to improve the "functioning of the international economic system and mitigating the impacts of the crisis on development".[27]

The Tehran Summit (2012) of Nonaligned Movement took UN reform agenda at high priority for the movement with the view of that the UN reforms must be transparent, comprehensive, and inclusive and balanced in an accountable manner. Further, in this context, it was stressed that voice of every member state must be heard during reform process. It was noted that the UN reforms can only be judged in the context of the improvement of the all over potential of the organisation, while preserving the interests of the developing countries. In this regard, it was decided that the reforms shall be approved by the UNGA. In fact, the objectives of the UN reforms was to strengthen the multilateral institution to build the capacity for more effective outcomes.[28]

The Island of Margarita Summit (2016) of Nonaligned Movement reiterated the necessity to strengthen the UNGA as most representative, democratic and accountable body of the UN and commensurate representative, more efficient, effective and transparency of UNSC as well. Similarly, India raised doubt on the very existing structure of UN which designed almost 72 year ago in 1945, is really appropriate to cope the challenges of international community in 21st century?[29] Further, it was again reaffirmed the need for highly transparency and inclusiveness during the process of appointment and selection of Secretary General of UN.

4.2.2 Strengthening Multilateral Cooperation for Development

In Jakarta Summit (1992) of Nonaligned Movement, it was focused toward multilateral cooperation for development which seemed indispensable in changed global scenario. In this regard, it was called for the need of reforms and restructure the world economic system and strengthening the UN' capacity to enhance the international development and cooperation. For this end it was called to state the dialogue between developed and developing countries through interdependence, mutual benefits and shared responsibility. The South-South cooperation based on

---

[27] Deceleration of Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2009. pp. 74-75.
[28] Deceleration of Tehran Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2012. Pp. 29-31.
[29] Address by India's Vice President Hamid Ansari at the XVII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Island of Margarita Summit, 18 September, 2016.

collective self-reliance seemed imperative. This will reduce the dependency on North and promote South's mutual interests. This was integral element for the attainment of just international economic order. It was determined to identify the areas of cooperation through which "collective self-reliance" would be realised. The needs for coordination with G-77 was considered.[30]

The major concern was expressed in Jakarta Summit that the scientific and technological innovations would transform the pattern of production, consumption, trade and services. This would propel the pace of interdependence of countries and globalisation. In this context, the economically and technological dominance of developing countries could result in further inequities, uncertainties and instabilities among countries. To cope these problems, it seemed imperative to restructure existing international economic relations by means of effective partnership and equitable cooperation through strengthening multilateralism. In this regard the Summit noted that the severe relative disparity and inequities exists in economic and social sphere between developed and developing countries. Hence, it was emphasised to enhance the "South-South cooperation" strategy for international cooperation and development.[31] It would provide the new opportunities for direct trade, investment and access to financial resources through cooperation among developing countries with the acceleration of regional integration.

The Durban Summit (1998) of Nonaligned Movement hoped for the opportunity for North-South dialogue based on mutual interests, benefits and shared responsibility. Through those constructive dialogues the objectives of multilateral institutions would be easy to realise. It would contribute in alleviate the global inequality through mobilisation of human and material resources.[32] Besides, the Summit also noted the importance of regional arrangements for economic cooperation among developing countries which can contribute to development and growth at regional level. It needs to arrange the open, multilateral, equitable and non-discriminatory trading system.

---

[30] Deceleration of Jakarta Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1992. Pp. 30-34.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Deceleration of Durban Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1998. Pp. 21-22

The Kuala Lumpur Summit (2003) of Nonaligned Movement emphasised on the multilateral regimes and expressed the need to mobilise the resources for their use for mutual interests and benefits. The Summit also asserted the need to enhance infrastructure development in developing countries to induce economic growth. In this context, the Summit urged to all the countries to build the multilateral mechanism for international financing through which infrastructure development would be realised in developing countries.[33]

The Havana Summit (2006) of Nonaligned Movement undertook the need of expand and deepen more dynamic engagement and cooperation among developing and developed countries for building mutual benefits and "shared and differentiated responsibilities". This was exerted through constructive dialogue and engagement with the aim to generate greater convergence between developed and developing countries. Havana Summit urged the Group of Eight (G-8) to take into account of the interests of developing countries through Nonaligned Movement. Further, the important role was acknowledged of nonaligned countries of building regional arrangement among countries which promoted the reginal peace, security and economic and social development through cooperation among countries.[34]

The Sharam al Shaikh Summit (2009) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the principled position on preservation and promotion of multilateralism and its process. The UN Charter remain indispensable to preserve international peace and security. Nonetheless it remain a well-founded international legitimacy as central multilateral forum to address burning global issues and challenges. It was confirmed that the South-South cooperation would be a continued process of multilateralism which play vital role to cope the challenges faced by developing countries for mutual benefits. India also took note in this Summit for greater need for cooperation, investment and trade among developing countries which can contribute significant revival of world economy.[35] The Heads of State or Government agreed to promote multipolar world through the strengthening

---

[33] Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. P. 58.

[34] Deceleration of Havana Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2006. Pp. 55-56.

[35] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Sharam al Shaikh, 15 July, 2009.

multilateralism which is essential in promotion the interests of developing world. The initiatives were taken to realise the multilateral cooperation for economic and social development through enhancing Movement's unity on issues of collective concern. The Summit promoted the multilateralism which seemed indispensable means to enhance the capacity of developing countries through South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation.[36]

The Tehran Summit (2012) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the principled position concerning with the preservation and promotion of multilateralism. The Movement remain active in future deliberations in UNGA on the responsibility to protect people from war crimes, genocide and ethnic cleansing in accordance with the outcome of the document of 2005 Summit. Further, the Summit reiterated the strong concern toward growing course of unilaterally imposed sanctions undermining UN Charter and international law. It was also reiterated the commitment to preservation and promotion of multilateralism through UN under its charter and international law. In this Tehran Summit, India urged all member states to focus on investment in "knowledge economy" for "building human resources". India stressed on the opportunities which might be converted from challenges through building skilled human resources. India invited the initiatives for its contribution. India's initiated strategic partnership with Africa unfolded the new chapter for South-South cooperation, which enhanced the idea of multilateralism.[37] Besides, it was emphasised on strengthening multilateral arrangements and institutions without giving up the principle of equitable representation and partnership to make international system more democratic.

The Summit of Nonaligned Movement at Island of Margarita (2016) reiterated the support for strengthening and multilateral trading system to build the development friendly environment for developing countries. Particularly for sustainable development of developing countries they underlined the need of increasing aid for trade and capacity building for strengthening the participation of developing countries. Besides, the Summit reiterated the importance of South-South cooperation as an important element for international cooperation and

---

[36] Deceleration of Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2009. pp. 10-11.
[37] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XVI Nonaligned Movement Summit at Tehran, 30 August, 2012.

sustainable development. The Head of State or Government of Nonaligned Countries also affirmed that South-South cooperation represent the collective expression of solidarity among countries of South.[38]

4.2.3 Disarmament and International Security

Disarmament related matters, arm limitation and control and international security had new dimension with the end of Cold War. The nuclear deterrence became irrelevant. The argument was condemned in Jakarta Summit (1992) of Nonaligned Movement that the stockpiling more nuclear weapons would ensure the security of state. Rather, the Summit called for enhancement of security to be pursued not at the cost of other countries through total nuclear disarmament and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. For this purpose, the Summit called for the cessation of nuclear testing at all level in all environments for global objective through multilateral efforts. It was also stressed on the need to curb the development and excessive build-up of conventional armaments.[39]

The Cartagena Summit (1995) of Heads of State and Government urged all countries that with the disappearance of East-West confrontation, the stockpiles of the weapons of mass destruction to be destroyed once and at all. The Summit reiterate for the general and complete disarmament under effective international control regime is the ultimate goal to be achieved with non-discriminatory approach. Further, the Summit called for the Conference on Disarmament through which establishment of a committee to commence negotiations for elimination of nuclear weapon with in time bound framework. The Summit decided to introduce a draft resolution at 50th session of the UNGA. Moreover, the Summit urged states to conclude the agreement of nuclear weapon free zones as first necessary step toward attaining the objective. The Summit also noted to find out the mechanism to ensure the transfer of technology and cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy for developing countries.[40]

---

[38] Deceleration of Island of Margarita Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2016. Pp. 8-9.
[39] Deceleration of Jakarta Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1992. pp. 37-39.
[40] Deceleration of Cartagena Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1995. Pp. 31-36.

The Cartagena Summit (1995) rejected all kind of nuclear testing and called all nuclear weapon states to act in a manner according with the objectives of Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to cease the any nuclear testing. The Summit also urged to be ensured the exercise of the right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes of all states. The Summit called to all states to promote greater balance in conventional armaments except the necessary requirement for national security. The Summit emphasised to tackle of proliferation concerns which express the need to distinguish between civilian and non-civilian application of technologies. These imposition hampered the economic and social development of developing countries.[41]

The Durban Summit (1998) of Nonaligned Movement noted the no justification for the maintenance of nuclear weapon with the end of Cold War. The Summit also expressed the concern of complexities arising from nuclear tests in South Asia and stressed the universal adherence to the CTBT, including all Nuclear Weapon States. On the other hand, India at the Durban Summit of Nonaligned Movement justified her nuclear test due to "geo-political environment where security was becoming ever more threatened by…nuclearisation of our neighbourhood."[42] However on the contrary, India remain the exponent to abolish nuclear weapons at all, if established nuclear weapon states come to an agreement for abolish. India "will be the first to join" if other countries agree for negotiation for abolishment, Indian Prime Minister stated (ibid). India conducted the nuclear test it was explicitly demonstrated to given preference of its national security and territorial integrity, which was overtly or covertly threatened by its neighbourhood. However, the Summit emphasised on the issue of nuclear proliferation that it should be addressed through multilateral negotiations. They noted that technological advancement countries should not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes.

The Kuala Lumpur Summit (2003) of Nonaligned Movement emphasised on the necessity to start the negotiation in phased determined for complete eradication of nuclear weapons, with specific framework and time. It was also reiterated for the call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc

---

[41] Ibid.
[42] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998.

Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. The Summit reiterated the long standing principled position toward total elimination of nuclear testing at all its form. Further, the Summit also consider the establishment of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones (NWFZs) created by Tlatelolco, Bangkok and Rarotonga treaties as positive step toward the objective of global nuclear disarmament.[43] However, India emphasised on the revitalisation of the Movement by projecting views on global issues having the "objective and pragmatic" approach and tone. [44] In this Summit it was also noted again that the Non-proliferation control regimes should be inclusive in participation and should ensure open access to equipment, technology and material for peaceful purposes by developing countries. Which is essential for continues socio-economic development.

The Havana Summit (2006) of Nonaligned Movement expressed the renewed effort to achieve the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of all its form. The Summit also welcome the resolution adopted by UNGA for the promotion of multilateralism for the purpose of disarmament and non-proliferation. The relevance of United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as sole deliberate and specialised body within UN multilateral machinery. It was again called for an international conference to find out the means for elimination of nuclear threat with in time frame. The Heads of State or Government recognised the prevention of arm race in outer space would be grave danger for international security and peace. So that, the Summit emphasised on the urgent need for the commencement of effort in Conference of Disarmament (CD) to prevent arm race in outer space. The Summit welcome the signing of the Treaty of nuclear weapon free zone in Central Asia on September 2006. Further urged nuclear weapon states to provide the unconditional assurances of not to use or threat of nuclear weapons to all nuclear weapon free zones.[45]

The Sharam al Shaikh Summit (2009) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the long-standing principled positon on disarmament and international security which reiterated the necessity of multilateral diplomacy in the area of disarmament

[43] Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. Pp. 21-22.
[44] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XIII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Kuala Lumpur, 24 February, 2003.
[45] Deceleration of Havana Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2006. Pp. 45-49.

and non-proliferation. The Summit stressed on the significance of universal adherence to the CTBT, including all nuclear weapon states which will contribute in the pace of nuclear disarmament. It was noted that the realisation of the state of complete nuclear disarmament, require the essential participation of nuclear weapon state. The Heads of State or Government emphasised on the environmental norms while preparing and implementing of disarmament and arm limitation agreements. In this regard, the Summit welcomed the resolution 63/51 adopted by UNGA in this matter. The Summit called upon the nuclear weapon states to implement the commitment that not to use or threaten of nuclear weapon against any non-nuclear weapon state or NWFZs. It was the effort to provide the security to non-nuclear states from nuclear threat from nuclear weapon states. It was reaffirmed the inalienable right of a state to develop of engage in research for nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. The Heads of State or Government also stressed on the responsibility of developed countries to allow developing countries to access the nuclear equipment, technology and materials for peaceful purposes.[46]

The Tehran Summit (2012) stressed on the concern at the threat to humanity posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use. They reiterated the high concern on the slow pace of progress on nuclear disarmament and none of progress by nuclear weapon states for the total elimination of nuclear arsenals. It was reaffirmed the inalienable right of states to develop, research and produce the nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In this regard the nuclear non-proliferation issue best to address through multilaterally negotiated in transparent manner with inclusive participation.[47]

The Island of Margarita Summit (2016) of Nonaligned Movement reiterated continues promotion of peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with Chapter VI of the Charter of UN and international law. They rejected the illegal policies which aimed to overthrowing the constitutional Governments in the contravention of international law. The Summit reaffirmed to redouble their efforts to eliminate the threat of the existence of the weapons of mass destruction. Besides, it was

---

[46] Deceleration of Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2009. Pp. 40-45.
[47] Deceleration of Tehran Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2012. Pp. 64-67.

urged to all nuclear weapon states to work for the universal disarmament and for that objective it was resolved to establish nuclear weapon free zone in West Asia. It was also called for the immediate commencement for negotiations on nuclear disarmament in Conference on Disarmament. The possession, development, testing, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons would be prohibited in that conference with in specific time frame. They reserved the legitimate right of state to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes such as economic development.[48]

4.2.4 Combat International Terrorism

The Heads of State of Government of Nonaligned Movement at Jakarta Summit (1992) unequivocally condemned the international terrorism as "criminal acts" which endangers the territorial integrity of state and threaten the legitimate constituted governments. The Summit also reaffirmed the supported the UNGA resolution 46/51 of 27 January 1992, which committed to fulfil their obligations under international law to restrain the terrorist activities. Moreover, it was called on all states to convening of international conference under the UN to define terrorism. Nonetheless, the Summit reaffirmed the principled position that the struggle of people under colonial or alien rule for self-determination did not constitute terrorism.[49]

The Cartagena Summit (1995) of the Head of State or Government urged to implement the deceleration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism adopted by UNGA. It was called to all states for urgent conclusion and effective implementation of international convention for combating terrorism. The Summit reaffirmed the Movement's principled position under the international law on the legitimacy of the people struggling against colonial or alien domination and foreign occupation for national liberation and self-determination. Which could not be constituted as an act of terrorism. It also was called again to differentiate an act of

---

[48] Deceleration of Island of Margarita Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2016. Pp. 3-5.
[49] Deceleration of Jakarta Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1992. Pp. 76-77.

terrorism from legitimate struggle of people under colonial or alien domination for self-determination and liberation.[50]

The Heads of State of Government of Nonaligned Movement welcome the deceleration at Durban Summit (1998) adopted by UNGA to Eliminate International Terrorism at 52nd session of UNGA. The Summit reiterated the condemnation of all act and practice of terrorism which resulted in destabilisation of nation and disturb the social fabric of society. In the same Durban Summit, Indian Prime Minister also expressed the concern over the menace of terrorism. It was urged by India to initiate the honest effort through multilateral channel at international level.[51] The Durban Summit also urged to all members of the states to cooperate to enhance international cooperation in the fight against terrorism of all its form. Besides, the Movement's principled position was reaffirmed on the legitimate struggle of people under colonial or alien domination or occupation for national liberation could not be constituted as terrorism.[52]

The Kuala Lumpur Summit (2003) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed that all unlawful act which provoke terror in general public by anyone in any circumstances, considered as unjustifiable. The Summit unequivocally condemned the international terrorism as criminal act which destabilise legitimate governments. Besides, the Summit urged to all states to be responsible under international law. The Summit called for international conference under UN to define terrorism which differentiate it from the struggle of people under colonial or alien or foreign occupation rule for national liberation and self-determination.[53] In Kuala Lumpur Summit, India also presented the immediate commitment to cope the threat of global terrorism. It was emphasised to differentiate the terrorism and struggle of people for national independence from colonial rule or the domination of foreign rule. In addition to this, India called the negotiations at the United Nation

---

[50] Deceleration of Cartagena Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1995. Pp. 36-37.
[51] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998.
[52] Deceleration of Durban Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1998. Pp. 47-49.
[53] Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. Pp. 31-33.

on the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism.[54] More importantly the Summit totally rejected the phrase "axis of evil" chanted by some state to hit other countries using pretext of combating terrorism. This act of intervention inconsistent with international law and the Charter of UN. This form of intervention in internal affair of state defined as "psychological and political terrorism" in this Summit.[55]

The Havana Summit (2006) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the relevance and validity of Movement's principled position concerned with terrorism which considered as the most blatant violation of international law. The Heads of State or Government of Nonaligned Movement strongly and condemned and reject the all form of manifestation of terrorism. It was urged to all state to fulfil the obligation under international law to combat against terrorism. The Summit opposed the attempt to equate terrorism with the struggle of people under colonial or alien domination for national liberation. The Summit also took note for the adoption of the UN Global Counter Terrorism strategy.[56]

The Sharam al Shaikh Summit (2009) of Nonaligned Movement reaffirmed the principled position concerning terrorism that the act of terrorism should not be associated with any nationality, ethnic group, civilisation or religion. These attributes cannot be used as pretext for terrorism or counter terrorism. It was reiterated the need for the distinction of terrorism from people struggle for national liberation under colonial or alien rule and foreign domination. India also in this Summit rejected the association of terrorist activities with any of religious, ethnic or regional identity. Therefore, India urged all countries to dismantle the infrastructure of terrorism and agree to call for a Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism.[57] The Head of State or Government stressed on that states should respect all human right and fundamental freedom during counter terrorist operations, respecting international law and UN Charter. The term "axis of evil"

---

[54] Address by Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XIII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Kuala Lumpur, 24 February, 2003.
[55] Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. P. 33.
[56] Deceleration of Havana Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2006. Pp. 50-52.
[57] Address by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Sharam al Shaikh, 15 July, 2009.

rejected consistently by the Summit which used by certain States to hit other States using pretext of combating terrorism in different countries.[58]

The Tehran Summit (2012) of Nonaligned Movement again reaffirmed the principled position on the terrorism which reiterated in previous summits. In this Summit the serious threat to the international community was acknowledged from terrorism. So that, the Summit strongly and unequivocally condemned the all terrorist act and all of its manifestation and forms. Although, it was again opposed to equate the terrorism with struggle of peoples under colonial or alien domination for self-determination and national liberation. Further, it was call for all states to convening an international conference under the UN to define terrorism and keep differentiate it from freedom struggle under colonial or alien domination. The Head of States or Government also called for comprehensive and transparent implementation of UN Global Counter Terrorism Strategy. It was also agree to review timely this UN Global Counter Terrorism Strategy with enhanced engagement with other members for the work of Counter Terrorism Implementation Task Force. The Sumit welcome the UN Counter Terrorism Centre at UN Headquarter established with in Counter Terrorism Implementation Task Force Office to promote the implementation of resolution 66/10, adopted by UNGA.[59]

The Island of Margarita Summit (2016) of Nonaligned Movement reiterated that terrorism as the greatest threat to international peace and security. It was reaffirmed the strong condemnation of all kind of terrorist acts and its manifestations, for whatever their purpose and motivation, wherever and whomsoever is committing. In this regard, India rejected any pretext which killed the innocent civilians for any purpose sort of purposes. India urged all member countries of the Movement to strengthen the international legal framework to counter the menace of terrorism through inclusive cooperation. India's Vice President recognised the need to take "concrete action" against terrorism through the establishment of strong "mechanism with our movement."[60] The Summit also

---

[58] Deceleration of Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2009. Pp. 49-52.

[59] Deceleration of Tehran Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2012. Pp. 70-74.

[60] Address by India's Vice President Hamid Ansari at the XVII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Island of Margarita Summit, 18 September, 2016.

reaffirmed the rejection of any link of terrorism associated with any religion, ethnic group or civilisations.

4.2.5 Reaffirming Old Commitments

It became apparent with the demise of the Soviet Union, the United State emerged as single dominant powerful country in the world qualified the bipolarity and established US centric unipolarity or unilateralism. The US started to employ unilateralism in the international political and economic sphere. For instance, intervention of internal affairs of developing countries for political purposes with introduction of the concept (on the name) of humanitarian intervention e.g. Kosovo and Iraq; trade and tariff barrios on developing countries and imposition of other trade and technological restrictions such as NPT and CTBT. Therefore, in this context, the developing countries became more venerable in emerged unilateral world order. Moreover, particularly Western world raised question and doubt over the further relevance of Nonaligned Movement in post-Cold War period due to demise of bipolarity. Although, New Delhi shown it's endure commitment toward the basic principles and objectives of Nonaligned Movement. However, Indian intelligentsia interpreted nonalignment and Nonaligned Movement in broader sense out of Cold War context. In fact, India defined nonalignment as the autonomy of choice and action of a state, according to its merit to pursue its national interests. In addition to this, India defined Nonaligned Movement as "employing freedom of choice and autonomy and freedom of action" while conducting foreign relations in global system.[61]

During détente period, the Cold War tensions increasingly marched toward rapprochement between both of the super powers. The reconciliation initiated between the US and the Soviet Union, which was one of the major purpose of Nonaligned Movement among others. In this context, the nature of global system was in transition period, the relevance of Nonaligned Movement remained continued which defined above paragraph. However, New Delhi relentlessly and actively worked to realise the objectives of Nonaligned Movement drawn up at the Belgrade Summit (1955) through continuous collaborative engagement with the member countries and through various observer missions dispatched to

---

[61] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs- (1996-1997). P. 76.

destabilised countries.[62] Besides, through engagement with some other activities, India took efforts to stabilise the destabilised region of different parts of the world such as deliberations in observer mission to Namibia, consultative membership on Cambodia, meeting on the issues on West Asia and Palestine, attended the ministerial meeting before the special session of the UNGA on economic matters and participated in other important deliberations.[63] India also played an important role in the deliberations of the Ministerial conference in Accra as also in the Non-Aligned Coordinating Bureau meetings. As a member of the Security Council, India played a prominent role in the formulation of common positions and in maintaining the unity of nonaligned countries - the role which attracted appreciation from other Non-aligned countries[64]

In the Summit of Nonaligned Movement held at Cartagena (1995), Colombia, Indian Prime Minister addressed on various issues of Indian interests including general economic and social issues including elimination of nuclear weapons. Indian delegation played key role in finalising the salient recommendations of the Summit, including- continued relevance and validity of the principles and objectives of Nonaligned Movement[65] Besides, India participated in the meeting of Nonaligned Movement's Methodology Committee in Colombia held in May 1996, contributed actively as Experts in Science and Technology meeting.[66] Further, In the Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in Durban, South Africa (1998), India fully committed to "revitalize the agenda" of Nonaligned Movement for the concerns of developing countries through the formulation of focused strategy in 21st century. India committed for universal nuclear disarmament despite being a nuclear power, only when if the established nuclear weapon states agree to abolish nuclear weapon and urged again for the negotiation for Nuclear Weapon Convention to eliminate weapons of mass distraction.[67]

---

[62] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (1989-1990). Pp. 3-6.
[63] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (1990-1991). Pp. 68-70.
[64] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (1992-1993). p. 60.
[65] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (1995-1996). Pp. 110-112.
[66] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (1996-1997). Pp. 91.
[67] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee addressed the Summit of Nonaligned Movement held at Kuala Lumpur (2003), under the theme of "continuing revitalisation of NAM" that Nonaligned Movement needs to work on those global agendas of contemporary relevance which "unites the Nonaligned Movement rather than divides it." The agendas on which Indian delegation emphasised on are – "multilateralism, reform of UN system, South-South cooperation, North-South engagement, multiculturalism and democracy," which are highly considered in the last decades of the 20th century too. It was also reiterated for the reform in UN and particularly in UNSC and to curb the menace of terrorism that is not an acceptable justification on the basis of religious, ideological and political basis.[68] The Indian delegation also reaffirmed its conviction on the enduring relevance of Nonaligned Movement, especially at the contemporary scenario and defined Nonaligned Movement as "the voice of moderation, harmony, and reason." Also, it was called to reform UN system and revitalise the UNSC and again expressed for the initiative for nuclear disarmament.[69]

Moreover, in the ministerial meeting of the Nonaligned Movement, Indian Foreign Affair Minister, Pranab Mukherjee outlined India's stand on the enduring relevance of Nonaligned Movement in the context of the contemporary global scenario.[70] India remains committed strongly to the ideas and principles of Nonaligned Movement, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh reaffirmed old commitment in the Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in Egypt (2009). The commitment regarding global political, economic governance and expressed the concerned over the management of global economy and finance, energy supplies, poverty alleviation and other important issues for sustainable development coping with climate change. Besides, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh emphasised that Nonaligned Movement should take the lead for "building governance structure that are representative, credible and effective."[71] Indian Vice President Hamid Ansari also explicitly summited New Delhi's reaffirmed stance in Summit of Nonaligned Movement held in Venezuela (September 2016) that the values and principles on which the movement was established, are relevant today as they

---

[68] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (2003--2004). Pp. 106-107.
[69] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XIV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Havana, 15 September 2006.
[70] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (2008-2009). P. 111.
[71] Annual Report of Ministry of External Affairs (2012-2013). Pp. 97-98.

were at the time of the inception of the movement. Moreover, those of the basic principles are "peaceful settlement of disputes," "respect for sovereignty" and "international cooperation." The need for the reforms in the UN system was highly outlined in the summit and raised the serious question of the capability of UN system to serve the needs of the international community. Because of the international political and global economic system has changed dramatically since the organisation was designed in 1945 with just 51 membership state and at present, it comprises of 193 state members, which are facing severe problems than ever before such as transnational crimes.[72]

4.3 Assessment of India's Role in Nonaligned Movement

The end of Cold War gave new hope and aspiration for developing countries for building just international order for common security, stable peace, economic and social justice. However, the post-Cold War scenario of unipolarity forced India to rethink its strategic stance in context of Nonaligned Movement. Because, limitations and limited strength and leverage of Nonaligned Movement, subverted itself as "*respondeurs*" rather "*demandeurs*" (Mohan, 39). However, as global balance of power is shifting from Atlantic to Pacific, simultaneously "rise of India along with China" seems undisputable reality at present world. In fact, India is being invited to the G-8, being nuclear weapon state and one of the fastest growing economy in the world, all constituted India as a "more than merely South Asian" power (Pant, 1). In this regard of India's extended military and economic capacity sought India to be less embracement with Nonaligned Movement. The fact reflected on C. Raja Mohan's (India's leading strategic analyst) comment that Nonaligned Movement's influence on India's foreign policy diplomacy "steadily eroded" since 1990s. In addition to this, C. Raja Mohan quoted former National Security Adviser, Brajesh Mishra on India's attitude on Nonaligned Movement that "India today is ready to question these [previous] shibboleths and take decisions on the basis of national interests" (Quoted in Mohan; 2015, 32-33).

In the same context, as Mohan also noted about the priority of Nonaligned Movement for India' former Prime Minister Vajpayee that "movement was not one of his [A. B. Vajpayee] priority" (Mohan, 32) as a Prime Minister in 1998. Besides,

---

[72] Address by India's Vice President Hamid Ansari at the XVII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Island of Margarita Summit, 18 September, 2016.

Sanjay Baru (former Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's advisor) also written in his book - *The Accidental Prime Minister: The Making and Unmaking of Manmohan Singh* that Prime Minister Manmohan Singh had "actively considered skipping" the Havana Summit of Nonaligned Movement in 2006. However, Indian National Congress forced Manmohan Singh to attend that Summit (Baru, 167). Besides, the recent Summit of Nonaligned Movement held on the Iceland of Margarita at Bolivia in Venezuela, September 2017, attended by India's Vice President Hamid Ansari, skipped by India's Prime Minister Narendra Modi, can be interpreted as a signal of little importance to the ideational "moribund doctrine" of nonalignment (Ganguly, 132). Moreover, unlike Modi's predecessors, his regime did not give any single mention came out regarding the significance of Nonaligned Movement for India's foreign policy, even not mentioned in the 2014 manifesto of the general election.

Some other commentator and analyst argued that third world leadership become only alternative and secondary goal of Indian foreign policy. Because Afro-Asian solidarity had less cohesion in WTO negotiations where "African's agricultural and other interests could be at odds with those of India" (Mukherji and Malone, 316). In addition to this, India has enough reasons to alienate shed of attachment to the Nonaligned Movement. Such as in 1962 border dispute with China, the war in 1965, 1971 and in 1999 with Pakistan, neither Nonaligned Movement gave back to India's position nor member countries of Nonaligned Movement supported India; receive no understanding on its nuclear tests in 1998 and on sanctions followed. Therefore, it seems for India not to bear a moral obligation to support any member of Nonaligned Movement on international conflicts.

In this context, India's own experience of Nonaligned Movement to save national interests, guide India to work for its own national interests. Because Nonaligned Movement's experience in the area of India's core national interests had been "most unsatisfactory" (Sibal, 2). Therefore, India needs to treat its Nonaligned Movement's membership as "merely one component of its international positioning", while being clear sighted about Nonaligned Movement's limitations for India. It is nonetheless "diplomatically useful to mobilise the movement to counter one sided" on common global issues, former Foreign Secretary Kanwal Sibal emphasised (ibid). In this regard, the present (since 2014)

BJP Government of India working on the guiding principle of "pragmatism and doctrine of mutually beneficial and interlocking relationship, based on enlightened national interest"[73] (BJP Election Manifesto, 2014)[74]. Moreover, this guiding principle repeated by India's former President Pranab Mukherji at Joint Session of Parliament on 9th June 2014. It was not about the BJP Government formed in 2014, but the previous United Progressive Alliance (UPA) regime too characterised India's foreign policy as the pursuit of "enlightened national interest" by India's Minister of State for Industry Ashwani Kumar. In fact, exceptionally left wing parties in India, the consensus seems to emerge among political leadership about the "desirability of pursuing a pragmatic" foreign policy which will enhance India's material strength and standing at global stage (Ganguly, 4).

On the other side of the narrative regarding India's official intensity of embracement with Nonaligned Movement is different and opposite against the above given authentic references. The above narrative shows that India is keen to given more priority to its national interests; seems less concerned with the interests of the Nonaligned Movement. However, the official documents of India's Ministry of External Affairs and the speeches of political representative of India in the Summits of Nonaligned Movements found a different picture in this regard.

Although, even in the post-Soviet period, India's position on the participation in Nonaligned Movement remained frequent, because India participated in every Summit since the end of Cold War. Certainly, India also expressed deep concerns over the issues concerned with the objectives of Nonaligned Movement. The fact reflected in the statements made by India's representative political authorities in the Summits of Nonaligned Movement. At the first time, India took a position for focus to "revitalise the agenda" and "articulate the strategy" of Nonaligned Movement for the 21st century at Durban Summit in 1998.[75] Further, in all Summits of Nonaligned Movement, India had participated as usual, expressed grave concerns over the hitches of terrorism, economic imbalance among countries. India also emphasised on the reforms of international economic and political architecture, nuclear disarmament, multilateralism, South-South Cooperation, self-

---

[73] "The ability of [State or] its citizens to work for the common good" (Mattoo, 1).
[74] http://www.bjp.org/images/pdf_2014/full_manifesto_english_07.04.2014.pdf.
[75] Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998.

reliance and inclusive globalisation in further Summits even at recently held in Venezuela in September 2016.

Moreover, India at 17th Ministerial Conference of Nonaligned Movement in 2014 reaffirmed its "commitment to the founding purposed and principles" of Nonaligned Movement.[76] Besides, India's Ministry of External Affairs Annual Report of 2016-2017 also reported that India's participation in the Nonaligned Movement's Summit in 2016 reflected the "continued relevance and importance" as a forum for developing countries to articulate the views on the issues of political and economic range collectively.[77] For the confirmation from legislative authentication regarding the Government of India's position on participation in recent Summit held in Venezuela that, whether India's growing alliance with the US make Nonaligned Movement irrelevant or not. The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs General V. K. Singh (Retd.) answered the question no. 1278 that India "strongly committed to its [Nonaligned Movement] principles and objectives." Further, it was stated that India actively contributed its deliberations at Summit with the aim of strengthening the Nonaligned Movement's capabilities.[78]

Besides, in this context Indian foreign policy analyst reviled of less interests of Indian top Premiership in the participation of the Summits of Nonaligned Movement (Mohan, 32; Baru, 167). Although, India still holds the formal commitment to the fundamental principles and objectives of Nonaligned Movement. With the comparative analyses of both the narratives regarding India's seriousness toward Nonaligned Movement seems somewhere in between the two. It indicates toward India's less priority for Nonaligned Movement in practice without abandoning the participation in Summits and without jettisoning it officially in theory.

4.4 Relevance of Nonaligned Movement for India in Post-Cold War

In the second half of 20th century, India's quest and effort for victory over the common international issues of new-born countries provided the channel for negotiation and development of the Nonaligned Movement. India successfully

---

[76] Statement by Shri Navtej Sarna, Special Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs and leader of the Indian delegation at the 17th Ministerial Conference of Nonaligned Movement, 29 May, 2014.
[77] India's Ministry of External Affair Annual Report 2016-2017. Pp. 56-57.
[78] Answer of the Question No. 1278 given by Minister of State of Ministry of External Affairs General V. K. Singh (Retd.), asked in Lok Sabha, 23 November, 2016.

employed its inherent ideational principles into the Nonaligned Movement such as non-violence, non-alignment, non-intervention and anti-imperialism. These inherent "long-standing values and belief" constituted India's ideational principles for conducting international relations (Ogden, 2). Therefore, by rejecting power politics, India mobilised Third World countries and sought their support to realise the victory over common international issues of new-born countries. Those efforts through international fora and India's geostrategic location provided it a natural leadership in Nonaligned Movement and also provided a moral strength and influencing power in global politics. Moreover, India continuously reaffirmed its dedication toward the basic principles and objectives of Nonaligned Movement.

With the disintegration of Soviet Union, Nonaligned Movement came under attack and questions raised over its further relevance due to the end of bipolar world order. Although the Cold War ended with the demise of bipolarity, the single dominance of United States remains to exist with the same unchanged international political and economic structure. In which the developing countries are suffering continuously. United States' sponsored insurgencies on the name of freedom from communism and, intervention in internal affairs on the ground of humanitarian endured the mentality of Cold War. In the US dominated unilateralism, developing countries became more venerable. In this context, the battle against US dominated world order is the battle against new imperialism (Pavithran, 8-9). In military dominated, US centric unipolar order in post-Soviet period inculcating more inequality and injustice among countries (Dutt, 62) and Nonaligned Movement's role needs to redefine to counter the US unilateralism through which security and political sovereignty of developing countries would be ensured. The moral obligation again seems on India as a founder and leading member of Nonaligned Movement to play a vital role in the movement in the 21st century again.

Hence, India's official intelligentsia shown the continuous faith for the relevance of Nonaligned Movement in post-Cold War period and had urged to "gain the collective good of humanity is what the movement must deliberate upon."[79] In each periodical summits of Nonaligned Movement, India continued to persist the ideas which zeal of engagement with Nonaligned Movement and

---

[79] Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Sharam al Shaikh, 15 July, 2009.

expressed the concerns for developing world, opposed power politics, demanded democratisation of international system and collective global security.

On the other hand, Chris Ogden (2012) argues that during India's course of its interaction with internal and external affairs to realising the status of great power, New Delhi's authority occasionally shifted the priorities of principles of foreign policy depend upon her national strength and international environment. Nonalignment is one of the principles of India's foreign policy among others such as non-violence, non-interference, anti-hegemony, anti-colonialism, self-reliance, democracy, international peace and security and equality. The purity of these principles remained consistent and unchanged while negotiating with various multilateral institutions with outside world. Those consistency provides the validation of India's "norm-based approach" and shown the principles which are given relatively more preferential consideration among others. In this context, India has "willing to limit her interaction" with international multilateral institutions "if her needs are not met." However, toward the institution like Nonaligned Movement, India's suspicion largely absent except convincing its members against global inequality. Therefore, in India's post-economic and political transition at internal and external sphere respectively in the early years of the 1990s, New Delhi's attitude characterised toward Nonaligned Movement as "a mixture of necessity and caution" to meet the realities of post-Cold War era (Ogden, 8-9, 13-15)

Moreover, It has been observed that the structure of international system is increasingly changing in terms of "distribution of capabilities" with the emergences of increasingly new great powers such as People Republic of China, Japan, India and South Korea in economic terms. Those countries have sufficient and enough capacity to influence international system (Fathurrahman, 2). Therefore, the world order is increasingly shifting from US centric unipolarity to toward multipolarity. In the context of changing contour of world order, Kenneth Waltz (1979) argued that the changing distribution of capability in international system subsequently change in the structure of the international system, this outcome depends on the nature of the interaction among the units of the system (Waltz, 97). Likewise, the group of the countries of emerging economy, collectively building alliances such as BRICS and IBSA and pose the counter force to western dominance, in which India by all reckoning arrived on the world stage with "increasing weight" in contemporary global politics (Pant, 1-3). Therefore, in the context of India, Fathurrahman (2016)

argues that increasingly changing the contour of world order toward multipolarity has caused for the increasingly decline of the relevance of the Nonaligned Movement in post-Cold War era (Fathurrahman, 3). Therefore, on the basis of Waltz argument, India likely supposed to be a significant segment of counter force against US centric unilateralism. This reflection easily possible to trace out in India's priorities in utterly transforming global milieu since the end of the last millennium.

The resonant development is likely to seen in India's course of internal (work on economic development and political stability) and external (via strategic partnership with likeminded countries) balancing strategy in a much interdependent, strategically complex and an increasingly globalised world. Donnelly (2005) argues that balancing "facilitate to the rising other new great powers [which] provokes a 'grand coalition' that unites the other great powers" (Donnelly, 36). India's external balancing strategy led the emergence of new alliances in terms of strategic, regional economic integration such as BRICS, IBSA, and BASIC. These increasing regional groupings are culminating India's behaviour into having an increasing quest from "moving away from nonalignment" to a "multidimensional multialignment" with outside world, maximising strategic autonomy (Malik, 80; Hall, 281). India is trying "overlooking Nonaligned Movement in an explicit manner," chooses to put BRICS as a top priority (Fathurrahman, 3). Therefore, relatively more prosperous India would be with multilateral organisations if confront with Nonaligned Movement. Moreover, India being an actively and voluntarily service provider country in the UN, got unpleasant experience that receives much less support than expected from member countries of Nonaligned Movement during the various war with Pakistan (1965, 1971, 1999) and China (1962). Thus, according to Mukherji and Malone (2011), India's engagement with Nonaligned Movement increasingly became "general, rhetorical and distant."

Besides, in the post-Soviet period, United States emerged as sole militarily dominant country in global politics in which Third World countries became more venerable under pressure of West dominated multilateral financial institutions, by which majority of countries yielded pro-Western stance had little interests in Nonaligned Movement. On the other hand, US refused to accept the UNGA resolutions and quite United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural

Organisation (UNESCO). Subsequently, the NIEO became paralysed, economic differences emerged among the member countries of Nonaligned Movement, G-77, and WTO. Moreover, intervention in internal affairs in developing countries on the name of humanitarian intervention subverted Nonaligned Movement from "*demandeurs*" to "*respondeurs*" in post-Cold War era (Mohan, 39).

Therefore, such a movement which is "politically divided, economically differentiated, and ideologically exhausted," India sought to reconstruct its foreign policy to meet the requirement of the post-Cold War world. India's leadership under Nonaligned Movement "rarely provided extra ballast in the pursuit of its core national security interests" (Mohan, 38-42). For instance, the much less support India receives from member countries of Nonaligned Movement and Nonaligned Movement as an institution during war with China and Pakistan. India faced strong resistance on the nuclear test from Egypt, South Africa at Nonaligned Movement and United Nations. Therefore, former foreign minister and subsequently India's Prime Minister, Inder Kumar Gujral stated that "it is a mantra that we have to keep repeating, but who are you going to be nonaligned against?" (Quoted in Ganguly & Pardesi, 2009: 11). The transformed global scenario in unipolarity, provided room for the development of neo-liberal ideas and practices. The apparatus of Indian foreign policy shifted increasingly with the adoption of neo-liberal practices. Through which India is leaving the concerns of global south countries. The fact reflected in the voting behaviour at IAEA against Iran and in negotiation round at Uruguay Round and in Copenhagen negotiation that India had indicated the "debunking and willingness its third world solidarity approach" (Thakur, 48). Besides, India did not take effort on the issues of Indian interests and did not mobilise developing countries for their support (Seethi and Pavithran, 62). Which made more than half third world countries dependent on developed countries and subverted Nonaligned Movement and G-77 as an "obsolete" cohesion (Dubey, 60; Nair, 43).

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The Westphalian international system in which state had played the pivotal, primary and centric role, gradually transforming into the "post-Westphalian" international system because non-state actors played an important part in the shaping and execution of the international system. However, state remains the key stakeholder of the increasingly interdependent international system among other non-state actors such as international organisations, international non-governmental organisations, multilateral institutions and multinational corporations. Therefore, this gradual transformation of the international system from state centric to multi-actor participation made the scope of international system more inclusive, called as a global system. This transformation started to execute with the establishment of League of Nations at the end of the decade of the 1910s from the idealist vision of Woodrow Wilson. Besides, the catastrophe of World War I and II realised the requirement for a more sophisticated version of League of Nations, for that purpose United Nation was established in 1945. With the end of Second World War, the intensity of freedom struggle for independence and self-determination heightened among colonised territories. Subsequently, the decolonisation of colonised territories embarked. Despite the establishment of UN, tendencies of war remained the feature of the international system in second half of 20th century, which codified as "Cold War." The leading victors of Second World War (The United States and the Soviet Union) captured this opportunity of decolonisation for their strategic and long-term geopolitical interests. They provide economic and security umbrella to extend their maximum ideological influence in infant countries through providing economic aids and building military alliances.

The Cold War rivalry in post-Second World War forced infant nations to build a common mechanism to keep away from the ideological and military alliances of rival blocs. To secure their hard won sovereignty and independence and for the peaceful world, the newly independent countries adopted the policy of nonalignment. India introduced the idea of nonalignment. Moreover, collaboration with Indonesia, Egypt, and Yugoslavia build the foundation for third world solidarity, rejected to adhere the core ideologies of either of the ideological and military blocs. Nonetheless, to ensure the sovereignty of newly independent states,

Asian initiative with African support developed the movement of nonaligned countries through collective deliberations. Though, the emergence of Nonaligned Movement seems as an antithesis of the theses of Cold War politics in international relations. However, the colonial experience of two epoch also seems to inculcate a strong national consensus in India for "self-rule" which made foreign intervention in national sovereignty quite unacceptable.

Simultaneously, as the Nonaligned Movement started to emerge formally (in 1961), other multilateral forums also begin to emerge in the form of multilateral institutionalisation such as European Economic Community (EEC) (1957), ASEAN (1967), South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) (1985) and other international organisations such as multinational corporation and nongovernmental organisations. All these non-state actors significantly influence and shape the contour of international system. Which increasingly culminating to the emergence of "post-Westphalian" international system.

The Nonaligned Movement embarked its journey from first formal Summit of nonaligned countries in 1961 at Belgrade after the course of prolonged negotiations. Agenda for the movement was a priority for anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-apartheid regimes, disarmament, economic development of developing countries and world peace and security. In addition to this, the movement also gave attention to the subsequent issues related to member countries and other international issues as well. Such as, at the end of 20th century, problems of colonialism, imperialism, and apartheid became the past memories and with the end of Cold War the economic development issues, UN reforms, and transnational crimes acquired the space for consideration in the movement. Increasing membership (120 members at 17th summit held in 2016) of the movement in the 21st century provided it an authentication of meaningful existence at international level even in the post-Cold War period, on the contrary, the question raised on movement's future relevance. However, to realise the national interests of member countries using the platform of Nonaligned Movement became hard, due to lack of consensus and contradictions among members. Additionally, the Nonaligned Movement is ideologically exhausted, politically divided increasingly and economically assimilated with Western neo-liberal economic projects. India also has less interests for the concerns of Nonaligned

Movement in the post-Cold War period as it embraced during initial period of the movement. Instead of actively concerns of Nonalgined Movement, India demonstrated the pragmatic approach in foreign relation behaviour to realise it's enlighten national interests.

Therefore, in this context, in the changed international circumstance such as in the US dominated unipolarity, the Nonaligned Movement seems a relic of the movement of 20th century, merely a responder of the events. It is because of India's less interests in the Nonaligned Movement in a practical manner which remained an active and acknowledged leader of Nonaligned Movement during the second half of 20th century. Therefore, the Nonaligned Movement increasingly fading its influencing room in global politics having lack of dedicated strong leadership. In this context, based on Waltz (1979) argument that structure of international system start to change when distribution of capability changed in international system. Completion of India-US nuclear deal and exceptional admission for India in NSG without singing NPT is seen as the nuclear reconciliation between India and global nuclear order. It explicitly seems as a result of changes in the international distribution of power. Similarly on the based on the argument of Pant (2009) that increased relative power determine the scale and scope of ambition of a state in global politics, India also aspire to realise its great power status. Thus, India's increased political, economic and military stature in global politics realised India to become a "leading power" rather than just merely a "balancing power" in global politics.[80]

Now, India having colonial experience of almost two centuries, the highly subjugated country invested available resources strategically for building basic infrastructure and a strong economy. In fact, India's adapted version of nonalignment was/is a fundamental principle, the strategy of its foreign policy, and tactics to safeguard the core national interests in adverse internal circumstances and external environment. The core national interests of a state involve the National Security of a state, National Development, and World Order interests. Therefore, in such a weak material condition, India applied the ideational approach in foreign policy behaviour at early years of post-independence. India focused on

---

[80] IISS Fullerton Lecture by Dr. S. Jaishankar, Foreign Secretary of India, Singapore. http://mea.gov.in/SpeechesStatements.htm?dtl/25493/IISS_Fullerton_Lecture_by_Foreign_Secretary_in_Singapore. Assessed on 11 August 2017.

building basic infrastructure and development of heavy industry for long term stability and production to maximise export capacity rather building military strength which is merely consumption. India also played economic diplomacy being a nonaligned country to maximise the source of economic assistance without compromising sovereignty and without accusing particular country on international conflicts.

India's ideational behaviour in external and internal setting undermined by its aggressive neighborhood which reflected in the engaged war with China in 1962 and Pakistan in 1965 and 1971. The aggressive regional environment realised India to take practical and pragmatic steps. Therefore, India sought help from all available sources from both Eastern and Western countries, militarily and economically. India also increased budget in defence sector and even finalised treaty for friendship, peace, and cooperation with the Soviet Union in 1971. These pragmatic steps made India experienced to utilise its nonaligned stance at international level without compromising the sovereignty to ensure India's security, economic development, and favourable world order. These steps seem rational response which enables India to build arrangements for safeguarding its security, developmental process and maintain a constructive external environment in the dichotomous adverse environment. In fact, those safeguards for national interests would not be possible if India would prefer military alliances with either of power bloc during Cold War. However, India's initial ample dedication toward ideational approach culminated in loss of New Delhi's strategic interests in the decade of 1960s. Such as India humiliated by Chinese aggression and loss of 14000 square mile territory on which Chinese claimed initially. Further, Indira Gandhi's pragmatic steps to signing a strategic treaty with the former Soviet Union without discarding the principle of nonalignment, which provided India the sufficient strength to cope such kind of further potential threat or aggression.

India's participation touches all the key issues of global concern at every Summit of Nonaligned Movement. India, being a signatory members of all decelerations of the Summits of Nonaligned Movement, agreed on the ratification of all problems and concerns which discussed in all Summits. In this context, Summits of Nonaligned Movement given the priority of global issues such as colonialism, imperialism, apartheid regimes of all its manifestation, disarmament,

ensured independence and sovereignty, democratisation of UN, economic development of developing countries and most important was international peace and security were also the highest priority of the movement. Moreover, other their contemporary incidents were also considered as an essential concerns.

At the early years of the last decade of 20th century, with the historical change in global politics, the international political and economic structure remains unchanged for the economic development of developing countries. In this context, with changed international system from bipolarity to unipolarity and increasingly toward multipolarity, the priorities of the Nonaligned Movement reframed accordingly. Therefore, Nonaligned Movement emphasising more on to change international economic and political structure, promoting multilateralism, South-South cooperation and coping with terrorism, nevertheless, other traditional key issues remained focal concerns such as UN reforms, disarmament and international peace and security. In the context of India's part of the Nonaligned Movement as a founder member in post-Cold War period, remain as a frequent participator. Indeed, on the issues of economic development of developing countries, the South-South cooperation, North-South dialogue initiated and commensurate demand for democratisation of international political and economic structure continuously raised, emphasised in every summit in Nonaligned Movement by India. On the other hand, in practice particularly in the post-Cold War period, Indian Prime Ministership found less interests to participate in the summits of Nonaligned Movement. However, India showed frequent participation in Nonaligned Movement in theory but in practice found regressive approach toward Movmment. The fact reflected in the negotiation round at Uruguay Round and in Copenhagen negotiation that India shown the unwillingness its third world solidarity approacah. Nontheless, India actively engageing with the developing countries through South-South cooperation for building collective self-reliance of developing countries.

However, on the other hand, as since the decade of 1990s India's capability grew in terms of economic, political and military leverage, India sought to bear more pragmatic approach and consider herself more than South Asian power for the quest of more material strength to realise the great power status. In this context, India focussing more on enlighten national interests than on the collective

interests of the developing countries through Nonaligned Movement and G-77. Simultaneously, India actively engaged for South-South cooperation through multilateral engagement for the quest of inclusive and multipolar world order. In fact, the common objectives of global south countries are the same what the objectives of Nonaligned Movement to reduce dependency on global northern countries by building collective self-reliance through South-South cooperation. Therefore, it seems that India reserves Nonaligned Movement's membership to mobilise countries of developing world diplomatically to counter the global challenges and US's unilateralism for inclusive and multipolar world order. The membership of Nonaligned Movement seems merely a de jure component of India's international position for Nonaligned Movement and increasingly focusing on multilateralism. However, India's official position in this regard is still as an active member of Nonaligned Movement and committed to its basic principle and objectives.

During the course of India's interaction with the international environment, New Delhi often shifted in priority of the principles of foreign policy depend on the national capability and nature of international issues. The purity of those principles remains constant and unchanged among the principles of nonalignment, multilateralism, non-violence, democracy, and self-reliance. However, India also limits New Delhi's interaction with international multilateral institutions such as UN and Nonaligned Movement, if India's national interests not met with them. For instance, India had severe experience by not receiving much support from Nonaligned Movement and member countries during India's war with aggressive China and Pakistan. Therefore, India's engagement with Nonaligned Movement became increasingly "general, rhetorical and distant." Moreover, in the post-Soviet era, US's unipolarity and their neoliberal project made Nonaligned Movement destabilise and increasingly merely responder rather demander. In this context, India realised to calculate the potential of Nonaligned Movement in accordance with India's national interests. Therefore, India is increasingly discrediting to the third world solidarity and obsessed with multidimensional alignment with major powers by all reckoning, to meet the challenges and realities of 21 century.

The analytical narratives arrive at the conclusion that India is concerned with the problems of nonaligned countries in rhetoric which expressed them at

each Summit of Nonaligned Movement. However, India is more concerned about its own national interests without discarding the idea of nonalignment and without jettison membership of Nonaligned Movement. In this context, it seems that India's priorities are more for building its own capacity for the quest for a commensurate place in international institutions for political, economic negotiations. India holding the membership of Nonaligned Movement for the support of member countries. Eventually, New Delhi's contemporary thinking and behaviour in foreign relations expressed by Pratap Bhanu Mehta (2009) seems appropriate that India is pursuing its "own form of realpolitik… [However] has never taken the shape of matchpolitik that characterize standard great power rivalry or straight forward imperial nation."

Bibliography:

Primary Sources:

- Asian Relation Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru Speech. 24 March, 1947. Accessible at: http://icwadelhi.info/asianrelationsconference/images/stories/jawaharlalnehru.pdf. Accessed on 15 July, 2017.

- Asian-African Conference Final Communique, 24 April, 1955. Accessible at: http://www.ena.lu/final_communique_asian_african_conference_bandung_24_april_1955-2-1192. Accessed on 16 July, 2017.

- Answer of the Question No. 1278 given by Minister of State of Ministry of External Affairs General V. K. Singh (Retd.), asked in Lok Sabha, 23 November, 2016. Accessible at:

  http://mea.gov.in/loksabha.htm?dtl/27667/question+no1278+nonaligned+movement. Assessed on 5 July, 2017.

- Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Durban, 3 September, 1998. Assessed at:

  http://archivepmo.nic.in/abv/content_print.php?nodeid=9166&nodetype=2. Assessed on 7 July, 2017.

- Address by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee at the XIII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Kuala Lumpur, 24 February, 2003. Assessed at: http://archivepmo.nic.in/abv/speechdetails.php?nodeid=8994. Assessed on 7 July, 2017.

- Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XIV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Havana, 15 September 2006. Assessed at: http://mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl/2320/Statement+by+the+Prime+Minister+of+India+Dr+Manmohan+Singh+at+The+XIVth+Summit+Of+%E2%80%A6. Assessed on 7 July, 2017.

- Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XV Nonaligned Movement Summit at Sharam al Shaikh, 15 July, 2009. Assessed at: http://archivepmo.nic.in/drmanmohansingh/speech-details.php?nodeid=772. Assessed on 7 July, 2017.

- Address by the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh at the XVI Nonaligned Movement Summit at Tehran, 30 August, 2012. Assessed at: http://archivepmo.nic.in/drmanmohansingh/speech-details.php?nodeid=1211. Assessed on 7 July, 2017.

- Address by India's Vice President Hamid Ansari at the XVII Nonaligned Movement Summit at Island of Margarita Summit, 18 September, 2016. Assessed at: http://mea.gov.in/outogingvisitdetail.htm?27412/Address+by+Vice+President+at+the+17th+NAM+Plenary+Meeting+September+18+2016. Assessed on 7 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 1989-1990. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?2518?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 1990-1991. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?2519?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 1992-1993. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?2386?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 1995-1996. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?2524?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 1996-1997. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?pdf2525?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 2003-2004. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?pdf2531?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 2008-2009. Assessed at: http://mealib.nic.in/?pdf2536?000. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 2012-2013. Assessed at: https://www.mea.gov.in/Uploads/PublicationDocs/21385_Annual_Report_2012-2013_English.pdf. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Annual Report, Ministry of External Affair, Government of India, 2016-2017. Assessed at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8qM_niyPuIuV1dSYzV2dW45Mmc/view. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Deceleration of Belgrade Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1961. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/1st_Summit_FD_Belgrade_Declaration_1961.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Cairo Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1964. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/2nd_Summit_FD_Cairo_Declaration_1964.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Lusaka Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1970. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/3rd_Summit_FD_Lusaka_Declaration_1970.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Algiers Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1973. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/4th_Summit_FD_Algiers_Declaration_1973_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Colombo Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1976. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/5th_Summit_FD_Sri_Lanka_Declaration_1976_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Havana Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1979. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/6th_Summit_FD_Havana_Declaration_1979_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of New Delhi Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1983. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/7th_Summit_FD_New_Delhi_Declaration_1983_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Harare Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1986. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/8th_Summit_FD_Harare_Declaration_1986_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Belgrade Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1989. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/9th_Summit_FD_Belgrade_Declaration_1989_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Jakarta Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1992. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/10th_Summit_FD_Jakarta_Declaration_1992_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Cartagena Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1995. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/11th_Summit_FD_Cartagena_Declaration_1995_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Durban Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1998. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/12th_Summit_FD_Durban_Declaration_1998.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Kuala Lumpur Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2003. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/13th_Summit_of_the

_Non-Aligned_Movement_-_Final_Document_Whole.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Havana Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2006. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/14NAMSummit-Havana-Compiled.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Sharam al Shaikh Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2009. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/15Summit-Final-_Compiled.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Tehran Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2012. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/16thSummitFinalDoc ument (NAM2012-Doc.1-Rev.2).pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Deceleration of Island of Margarita Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, 2016. Assessed at: http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/XVII-NAM-Summit-Final-Outcome-Document-ENG.pdf. Assessed on: 29 June, 2017.

- Indira Gandhi speech at United Nations General Assembly 38th session in 1983. Assessed at: https://www.pminewyork.org/adminpart/uploadpdf/73201lms32.pdf. Assessed on: 30 June, 2017.

- Statement by Shri Navtej Sarna, Special Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs and leader of the Indian delegation at the 17th Ministerial Conference of Nonaligned Movement, 29 May, 2014. Assessed at: http://mea.gov.in/Speeches%C2%ADStatements.htm?dtl/23380/statement+ by+shri+navtej+sarna+special+secretary+ministry+of+external+affairs+and +leader+of+the+%E2%80%A6. Assessed on: 30 June, 2017.

Secondary Sources:

Books:

- Ali, H. M. *India & the Non-Aligned Movement.* New Delhi: Adam Publishers and Distributors, 2004.

- Baylis, John and Patricia Owens. *The Globalization of World Politics.* New York: Oxford, 2011.

- Breuning, Marijke. *Foreign Policy Analyses: A Comparative Introduction.* USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

- Bandyopadhyaya, Jayantanuja. *The Making of India's Foreign Policy.* New Delhi: Allied Publishers Private Limited, 2003.

- Baru, Sanjaya. *The Accidental Prime Minister the Making and Unmaking of Manmohan Singh.* New Delhi: Penguin Group, 2014.

- Chamling, Dhiraj R. *India and the United Nations.* New Delhi: Associated Publishing House, 1978.

- Dubey, Muchkund. *India's Foreign Policy Coping with the Changing World.* Noida: Pearson, 2013.

- D'Anieri, Paul. *International Politics Power and Purpose in Global Affairs.* Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2012.

- Dutt, Ruddar. "NAM – Its Relevance in the Unipolar World." *Governance and Resistance in World Politics.* Ed. Srivastava, Pramila. New Delhi: Kanishka Publications, 2001. 60-72.

- Donnelly, Jack. "Realism." *Theories of International Relations.* 3rd Ed. Burchill, Scott. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 29-52.

- George, A. L. *On Foreign Policy.* London: Paradigm Publisher, 2006.

- Ganguly, Sumit. "Genesis of Nonalignment." *India's Foreign Policy Retrospect and Prospect.* Ed. Ganguly, Sumit. New Delhi: Oxford, 2010. 1-10.

- Heywood, Andrew. *Global Politics.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Kegley and Charles W. *World Politics Trend and Transformation.* California: Thomson Wadsworth, 2007.

- Kumar, Mahendera. *Antarrastria Rajniti ke Saidhantik Paksh.* Aagra: Shivlal Agraval and Company, 1995.

- Khilnani, Sunil et al. *Nonalignment 2.0.* New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2014.

- Khanna, V. N. *International Relation.* New Delhi: Vikas Publication House, 2015.

- Kaarbo and Ray. *Global Politics.* Boston: Wadsworth Change Learning, 2011.

- Kennedy, Dane. *Decolonisation A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford, 2016.

- Lammy, Steven *Introduction to Global Politics.* New York: Oxford, 1997.

- Mohanty, Biswaranjan. *Foreign Policy of India in the 21st Century.* New Delhi: New Century Publication, 2012.

- Mohan, C. Raja. "India and the Emerging Non-Proliferation Order: The Second Nuclear Age." *Indian Foreign Policy in a Unipolar World.* Ed. Pant, Harsh V. New Delhi: Routledge, 2009. 43-72.

- Mohan, C. Raja. "Beyond Non-alignment." *Critical Issues in Indian Politics India's Foreign Polity a Reader.* Ed. Bajpai and Pant. New Delhi: Oxford, 2015. 27-50.

- Malone, David M. *Does the Elephant Dance? Contemporary Indian Foreign Policy.* New Delhi: Oxford, 2011.

- Malik, Mohan. "India and China: As China Rises, India Stirs." Ed. Pant, Harsh V. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009. 163-191.

- McWilliams, Wayne and Harry Piotrowski. *The World since 1945 a History of International Relation.* Colorado: Lynne Rienner, 2012.

- Mansbach, Richard Taylor. *Introduction to Global Politics.* Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.

- Mortimer, R. A. *The Third World Coalition in International Politics.* London: Praeqer Publisher, 1980.

- Maier, Charles S. "The Cold War as an Era of Imperial Rivalry." *Reinterpreting the End of Cold War Issues, Interpretations, Periodization.* Ed. Pons and Romero. New York: Routledge, 2004. 13-20.

- Mukherji, Rahul. "India's Foreign Economic Policies." *India's Foreign Policy Retrospect and Prospect.* Ed. Ganguly, Sumit. New Delhi: Oxford, 2010. 301-332.

- Nayar, Baldev Raj. *The Geopolitics of Globalization the Consequences for Development.* New Delhi: Oxford, 2007.

- Nayar and Paul. *India in the World Order Searching For Major-Power Status.* New Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Nayar, Baldev Raj. "India and the World the Vicissitudes of Mutual Adjustment." *Routledge Handbook of Indian Politics.* Ed. Kohli and Singh. New York: Routledge, 2015. 311-319.

- Nasenko, Yuri. *Jawaharlal Nehru and India's Foreign Policy.* New Delhi: Sterling Publication, 1977.

- Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Discovery of India.* Delhi: Oxford, 1946.

- Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Unity of India Collected Writings 1937-1940.* New York: The John Day Company, 1942.

- Nehru, Jawaharlal. *India's Foreign Policy.* Delhi: (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India) the Publication Division, 1961.

- Ogden, Chris. "International 'aspirations' of a Rising Power." *Handbook of India's International Relation.* Ed. Scott, David. London: Routledge, 2011. 3-13.

- Pant, Harsh V. "Introduction." *Indian Foreign Policy in a Unipolar World.* Ed. Pant, Harsh V. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009. 1-20.

- Painter and Leffler. "Introduction: the international system and the origins of the Cold War." *Origin of Cold War an International History.* Ed. Leffler and Painter. New York: Routledge, 2005. 1-12.

- Pavithran, K. S. "Understanding India's Foreign Policy: Non-alignment and the Way Ahead." *Foreign Policy of India Continuity and Change.* Ed. Pillai and Premashekhara. New Delhi: New Century Publications, 2010. 1-13.

- Prasad, Bimal. "The Evolution of Nonalignment." *Before Nonalignment: Past and Future.* Ed. Vasudev, Uma. New Delhi: Indian Council of World Affairs, 1983. 299-309.

- Ray, Jayanta Kumar. *India's Foreign Relations, 1947-2007.* New Delhi: Routledge, 2011.

- Ramakrishnan, A. K. "Neoliberal Globalism and India's Foreign Policy: Towards a Critical Rethinking." *Engaging with the World Critical Reflections*

on India's Foreign Policy. Ed. Harshe and Seethi. New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan, 2009. 25-40.

- Tharoor, Shashi. *Pax Indica, India and the World of Twenty-first Century.* New Delhi: Penguin Publication, 2012.

- Shrivastva, Renu. *India and the Nonaligned Summits: Belgrade to Jakarta.* New Delhi: Northern Book Centre, 1995.

- S. Shaji. "Technology Transfer and India's Foreign Policy." *Foreign Policy of India Continuity and Change*. Ed. Pillai and Premashekhara. New Delhi: New Century Publications, 2010. 14-29.

- Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics*. Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1979.

- Yadav, R. S. *Bharat Ki Videsh Niti.* New Delhi: Pearson, 2012.

Articles:

- Abraham, Itty. "From Bandung to NAM: Non-Alignment and Indian Foreign Policy, 1947-1965." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 46. (2008): 195-219.

- Brown, Irene. "Study of Nonalignment." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 4. (1966): 517-527.

- Bhardwaj, Atul. "Cold War 2.0 Sino-US Strife and India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 34. (2015): 10-11.

- Bava, Ummu Salma. "India's Role in Emerging World Order." *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.* (2007): 1-7.

- Baba, Crabb and Jr. "Nonalignment as Diplomatic and Ideological Credo." *American Academy of Political and Social Science* 362. (1965): 6-17.

- Basrur, Rajesh. "Modi's Foreign Policy Fundamentals: A Unchanged Trajectory." *International Affairs* 93.1. (2017): 7-26.

- Chopra, Surendra. "The Emerging Trend in Nonaligned Movement." *Indian Political Science Association* 47.2. (1986): 161-177.

- Dash, Siddhartha. "Is NAM Relevant Today?" *Orissa Review* (2006): 70-72.

- Devdutt. "Nonalignment and India." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 23.4. (1962): 380-397.

- Frangonikolopoulos, C. A. "The Policy and Evolution of Non-Alignment: Past and Future." *Paradigm* 9.1. (1995): 62-85.

- Ganguly and Pardesi. "Explaining Sixty Year of India's Foreign Policy." *India Review.* 8.1. (2009): 4-19.

- Ganguly, Sumit. "Has Modi Truly Changed India's Foreign Policy?" *The Washington Quarterly.* 40.2. (2017): 131-143.

- Gupta, Sisir. K. "Asian Nonalignment." *American Academic of Political and Social Science* 332. (1965): 44-51.

- Harshe, Rajan. "India's Nonalignment: India's Non-Alignment: An Attempt at Conceptual Reconstruction." *Economic and Political Weekly.* 25.8/8. (1990): 399-405.

- Hall, Ian. "Multialignment and Indian Foreign Policy under Narendra Modi." *The Roundtable the Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs.* (2016): 271-288.

- Haq, Obaid. "Two Cheers of Nonalignment." *South East Asian Affairs.* (1977): 39-48.

- Kennan, George. "The Source of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* 25. (1947): 566-582.

- Kohli, Atul. "Politics of Economic Growth in India, 1980-2005 Part 1: The 1980s." *Economic and Political Weekly.* Special Article. (2006): 1251-1259.

- Lawal and Oluwatoyin. "National development in Nigeria: Issues, challenges and prospects." *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research* 3(9). (2011): 237-241.

- Mehta, Pratap Bhanu. "Still under Nehru's Shadow? The Absence of Foreign Policy Frameworks in India." *India Review* 8. (2009): 209-233.

- Mukherjee and Malone. "From High Ground to High Table: The Evolution of Indian Multilateralism." *Global Governance* 17.3 (2011): 311-329.

- Mohan, C. Raja. "India and International Peace Operations." *Sipri Insights on Peace and Security* 3 (2013): 1-8.

- Mathur, R. N. "United Nations and World Peace India's Contribution." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 19.2 (1958): 124-128.

- Mehrish, B. N. "Indian National Congress and Nonalignment: The Quest for Peace and New World Order." *Indian Journal of Political Science* 46.4 (1984): 506-514.

- Nuechterlein, Donald E. "National Interests and Foreign Policy: A Conceptual Framework for Analysis and Decision Making." *British Journal for International Studies* 2. (1976): 246-266.

- Naidu, M. V. "Nehru and Gorbachev on Cold War and Nonalignment: An Analysis of Peace Perspectives." *Peace Research* 22. (1991): 1-16.

- Ogden, Chirs. "Great Power Aspiration & Indian Conceptions of International Society." *Paper for the ESRC Seminar Series: 'Normative Challenges to International Society – Rising Powers and Global Responses.* (2012): 1-16.

- Paterson, Thomas. "The Origin of Cold War." *OAH Magazine of History* 2.1. (1986): 5-9.

- Rajan, M. S. "The Future of Nonalignment." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 362. (1965): 121-128.

- Rana, A. P. "Nonalignment as a Developmental Foreign Policy Strategy: A Conceptual Enquiry into its Systemic Capabilities." *Indian Political Science Association* 41.4. (1990): 587-637).

- Schlesinger, A. "Origin of Cold War." *Foreign Affairs* 46. (Oct, 1967): 22-52.

- Sahni, Varun. "India's Foreign Policy: Key Drivers." *South African Journal of International Affairs*. 14.2. (2007): 21-35.

- Subrahmanyam, K. "India's Grand Strategy." *Scholar Warrior* Spring. (2012): 2-8.

- Slaughter, Anne. "International Relations, Principal Theories." *Max Planck Encyclopaedia of Public International Law* (2011): 1-2.

- Strydom, Hennie. "Deceleration of Colombo Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement." *Max Plank Yearbook of United Nations Law.* 11 (2007): 1-46.

- Udokang, Okon. "The Third World as a Political Force." *The Black Scholar* 6.1. (1975): 11-22.

- Vieira, Marco. A. "Understanding Resilience in International Relations: The Non-Aligned Movement and Ontological Security." *International Study Review* 18. (2016): 290-311.

Webliography:

- Bhattacherjee, Kallol. "With Nehru Writing to its PM, Israel gave arms to India in 1962." *The Hindu*. The Hindu 27 May, 2017. Web. 10 June, 2017. Accessible from http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/with-nehru-writing-to-its-pm-israel-gave-arms-to-india-in-1962/article18591835.ece.

- Bharatiya Janta Party Election Manifesto 2014. Accessible at: http://www.bjp.org/images/pdf_2014/full_manifesto_english_07.04.2014.pdf. Assessed on: 15 July, 2017.

- Evans, Alistair. Www.Africanhistory.about.com. January 2017. Web. 17 January 2017. Assessed on: 15 June, 2017.

- Fathurrahman, Dzulfiqar. "Non-Aligned Movement in Post-Cold War Era." *Forum for International Studies.* 18 October, 2016. Web. 28 June, 2017. Accessible at: https://fois.or.id/non-aligned-movement-in-the-post-cold-war-era-121192a85790.

- Mattoo, Amitabh. "A Doctrine of Economic Levers, Soft Power." *The Hindu.* 12 June 2014. Web. 6 July 2017. Accessible from: http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/a-doctrine-of-economic-levers-soft-power/article6105078.ece.

- Kalyanaraman, S. "Was The Non-Aligned Movement Ever Relevant for India?." *Swarajya.* 29 September, 2016. Web. 22 October, 2016. Accessed at: https://swarajyamag.com/world/was-the-non-aligned-movement-ever-relevant-for-india.

- Nambiar, Lt. Gen. Satish. "India and Peacekeeping Operations." *Ministry of External Affairs*. 26 January 2014. Web. 22 June 2017. Accessible from: http://mea.gov.in/articles-in-indian-media.htm?dtl/22776/India+and+United+Nations+Peacekeeping+Operations.

- Nehru, Pt. Jawaharlal. http://icwadelhi.info/asianrelationsconference/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=51&Itemid=137. Indian Council for World Affairs. 13 Feb. 17. Web. Assessed on 7 March, 2017.

- Reddit. Web. 3 Feb. 2017. Accessible at: https://www.reddit.com/r/MapPorn/comments/3hgm9t/map_showing_the_de colonization_of_africa_1006x1139/.

- Stannard, James. "The World's Five Fastest Growing Economies." *World Finance.* 7 April, 2017. Web. 13 June, 2017. Accessible at: https://www.worldfinance.com/markets/the-worlds-five-fastest-growing-economies.

- Sibal, Kanwal. "Don't Be Limited by NAM Anyhow." *India Today.* 28 August, 2012. Web. 11 July, 2017. Accessible at: http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/nam-summit-teheran-india-nato-iraq-afghanistan/1/215028.html.

- Tellies, J. Ashley. "India as a leading power." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. 4 April, 2016. Web. June, 2017. Accessible from http://carnegieendowment.org/2016/04/04/india-as-leading-power-pub-63185.

- United Nations. Web. 3 Feb. 2017. Accessible at: http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml.

- Wax and Lakshmi. "Obama supports adding India as a permanent member of U.N. Security Council." *Washington Post*. 8 November, 2010. Web. 15 June, 2017. Accessible from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/08/AR2010110800495.html.

- Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India. 20 July 2015. Web. Assessed on 11 August 2017. Accessible at: http://mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl/25493/IISS_Fullerton_Lecture_by_Foreign_Secretary_in_Singapore.