

## Non-Alignment and the New World Order

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- With increasing diplomatic tensions in the international arena, a new cold war seems likely with the emergence 3 distinct poles - U.S., China and Russia.

\n

- Considering its historic role as a level headed neutral power, it is prudent for India to reinvent the principle of “Non-Alignment” to suit the current scenario.

\n

\n\n

### What are the indications of the Neo-Cold war?

\n\n

\n

- **USA** - The U.S. in its foreign policy doctrine published in 2017 has explicitly identified both China and Russia as adversaries.

\n

- Notably, in the face of an assertive China and Russia, the U.S. does indeed seem desperately resorting to ultra-nationalism under President Mr. Trump.

\n

- The “axis of evil” (or the countires that the U.S. suspects of sponsoring terrorism) has also emerged once again under Iran’s leadership.

\n

- **Russian** - President Mr. Putin announced that Russia has invincible doomsday machines like an underwater drone armed with a nuclear warheads.

\n

- Additionally, Russia has boasted the procession of weaponry powerful enough to sweep away coastal facilities, aircraft carriers.

\n

- Russia is also said to be developing hypersonic vehicles (high speed) that are impossible to intercept as it flies in a cloud of plasma “like a meteorite”.

\n

- **China** - Propelled by massive economic growth in recent decades, China has now announced its emergence as a power block in the international politics.  
\n
- It has been becoming increasingly vocal in a multitude of global issues and has upended its territorial claims in the South China Sea.  
\n
- China massive infrastructure program “Belt and Road Initiative” has also seen it bankrolling many countries, which has greatly enhanced its clout.  
\n
- **Significantly** - This time it is a three-cornered Cold War, without any corner having committed countries to act together as military allies.  
\n
- Potential allies are hedging currently, as there seems to be no clear agenda for any of these powers to protect the interests of the weaker countries.  
\n

\n\n

## What has NAM evolved over the years?

\n\n

- **Profile** - “Non Aligned Movement” was envisioned as a platform for those who didn’t want to be dictated by the then two superpowers - USSR and USA.  
\n
- It held its first ministerial in Belgrade (erstwhile Yugoslavia) in 1961 and complete independence of members in their foreign policy was ingrained.  
\n
- Notably, beyond merely asserting independent sovereign pursuits, NAM also actively worked to diffuse tensions between the warring cold war blocks.  
\n
- **Diversity** - The block was a big diverse one with 120 countries with very different cultures, economic parameters and human development indices.  
\n
- India was one of NAM’s key leaders and ensured that it remained ideologically neutral by balancing both leftist (Cuba) and rightist (Singapore) countries.  
\n
- India helped in retaining Egypt in NAM by curbing the wrath of the rest of the Arab world in 1979, and also worked to keep the group politically relevant.  
\n
- **Current Status** - As the cold war ended, there were proposals for winding up NAM in its Ghana Ministerial in 1991, as the purpose has lapsed.

- But these proposals were nixed as India argued that the essence of NAM was freedom of thought and action, which was beyond mere bloc congregations.
- Although greatly diminished, NAM continues to be relevant today as a significant power block in the international forums like the UN.

## What are recent NAM developments concerning India?

- **NAM 2.0** - There were calls for rejigging the non-alignment concept in 2012 to suit the emerging current realities of an emerging and assertive China.
- The call was for India to take the lead in strengthening the partnerships within NAM and setting new standards for power politics in the international arena.
- While the ideas rooted in humanistic values were noble, there were structural challenges for India in imagining the proposed alternative universality.
- Also, coming in the backdrop of India's growing strategic partnership with the U.S. and tensions with China, there was little incentive for India to go neutral.
- **Redundance** - The Modi government has perceived NAM as a mere remnant of the Nehruvian era, that lacks any significance currently.
- In the mesh of other developmental priorities involving economy, security, neighbourhood and the diaspora issues, NAM is largely forgotten.
- India is presently advancing a transactional foreign policy, which gives little scope for leading a diverse and largely poor bloc like NAM.

## How does the future look?

- As a close defence partner of the U.S. and a member of the "Quadrilateral"

(India, U.S, Australia, Japan), India is right in the U.S. camp.

\n

- Doklam and the Maldives have shown that China is in no mood for a compromise and has been explicitly enhancing its defence budgets.

\n

- Given the context, strengthening partnership of near equals like IBSA (India, Brazil and South Africa) could be considered as a hedge to guard sovereignty.

\n

- These groups could be knit together with the objective of dealing with consensus issues like - climate change, terrorism and protectionism.

\n

- While it is inevitable that most countries will have links with the dominant trio (U.S., China and Russia), intertwining alliances will guarantee independence foreign policy pursuits of all.

\n

- Hence, it is important for India to not get subordinated into one of the emerging poles and rather work to proliferate multiple worldwide alliances.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

