

EVALUATION INDICATORS

1. Alignment Competence
2. Context Competence
3. Content Competence
4. Language Competence
5. Introduction Competence
6. Structure - Presentation Competence
7. Conclusion Competence

Overall Macro Comments / feedback / suggestions on Answer Booklet:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

All the Best

SECTION-A

From Non-Alignment to Multi-Alignment → Shift in India's foreign policy

In a small area off the coast of
Hawaii in the Pacific Ocean, a diver
also saw a nursery of fish everyday,
observed their natural behaviour.

Even though, the small fish competed
with one another for eating the
plants on the phytoplanktons, whenever
a shark came near their group,
they huddled together to create a
mirage & confuse the shark, thus
ensuring their collective security. This
provides us a glimpse of the world,
as it is today.

India's engagement with the
world probably started during the

Indus valley civilization, wherein trade of important commodities propagated the diplomatic relations, especially with the Mesopotamians.

Such relations were carried forward throughout ancient and medieval India, when some South India rulers began conquering South-east Asia, while rulers like Ashoka, Kanishka brought various 'modern' countries under their control & established cultural diplomacy as well.

India's vast wealth soon became a bane as it became the reason for its colonisation. The British foreign adventures in the world wars, as well as in our neighbouring countries, shaped the boundaries of our present day relationships, which finally culminated in India's partition.

1947, is the year from which India's
modern age Foreign policy actually
began taking shape, guided by the
contours contours of its past.

Non-Alignment: A ray of warmth
in the war of coldness

The first stance of India's foreign
policy soon after independence,
was to separate itself from the
bipolar international order and
support the ideological movements
for independence in various
colonies.

This took shape in the form
of the Non-Alignment policy,
whose seeds were sown in the
Bandung Conference of 1955. The
leaders of Egypt, Indonesia,
Yugoslavia etc, too came together
and supported India to create

a new world order based on peace, sovereignty and welfare for all.

The countries of the bipolar world order, strongly objected to such a stance by claiming that, "Either you are with us or against us". ~~Be~~ Inspite of being resource starved and in dire need of help to feed the masses, India as a flagbearer of NAM, held onto its position for many years.

As the cold war became colder and hotter, USA & Russia tried to woo India through help in various scenarios. USA's support to India during the Indo-China war in 1962, or the plethora of weapons that Russia provided to India even during wars with Pakistan, highlight such

attempts. This phase of India's foreign policy can be called as the heydays of non-alignment, because it seemed that the world ~~was~~ had the choice of looking at NAM as a serious third choice, rather than joining USA or Russia.

The Rise of unipolarity -
Vulnerabilities of Non-alignment

As the Cold war ended, USA rose as the superpower that questioned the validity of NAM as an option. India, suffering from its own issues regarding fiscal crisis, sought help from other countries and IMF, in particular from USA, to initiate economic liberalisation.

The loss of USSR as a defence

provider, due to its own domestic issues, brought India closer to USA & pushed it away from NAM.

The rising threat of China and Pakistan on both sides of India's borders, pushed India towards a realignment of its alignment policy. Terrorism too emerged as a global threat, with USA suffering from 9/11 attacks while India saw the terrorist attack on her parliament in 2001. Such scenarios, led to the realisation of the need for collective action in a world faced with global threats and hence non-alignment began losing its relevance.

The Modern Phase - Strategic
autonomy as opposed to NAM

with India's march as a
possessor of nuclear weapons,
since 1998, India began facing
various sanctions, bearing an
impact on its energy security &
environmental commitments.

The nuclear agreement with
USA in 2008, was a ~~the~~ proof
of India's strategic engagement
with the Superpowers. This
agreement led to a domino
effect that opened a Pandora's
box for India's strategic
collaboration with other
countries.

with India becoming a major

defence partner of USA with access
to critical defence equipments in
recent times.

Such strategic collaborations
were also implemented with the
European Union, Japan, etc.

In fact, Japan went a step ahead,
allowing the transfer of critical
nuclear energy production
technologies to a non-signatory
of the non-proliferation
treaty.

India's strategic shift from
NAM is also seen in its
dehyphenation principle with
regards to Israel-Palestine
relations. Rather than non-
involvement in their conflicts,
India has been seeking active

engagement with both of them,
to resolve their issues in a
peaceful manner, as well as
pursuing its own strategic
interests with each of them
bilaterally. Such efforts are
seen in Indo-Israel cooperation
in research, agriculture,
water desalination, entrepreneurship
(I4 fund), etc.

The dehyphenation principle
has been a part of a larger
strategy, largely derived from
the Panchsheel principles, ~~and~~ and
the Gyal doctrine. India
pursues collaboration in certain
fields even with its long term
competitors, inspite of contentious
issues in certain areas.

for example, in the case of Indo-China, the Doklam issue did not become a roadblock in their collaboration in RCEP negotiations, on their joint leadership for justice & equality in climate change negotiations.

In the case of USA-India, though trade protectionism, IPR issues, visa issues regularly became thorny issues, their collaboration against China in the Indo-pacific, or their joint efforts for Afghan led peace process, show the viability of such an approach.

The world has increasingly moved away from a billiard ball model, towards a caboodle

model, of increased collaboration
and engagement. India's approach
of strategic autonomy is
efficacious in the age of
globalisation and interdependence.

Collaboration in diverse fields

Due to the effects of
globalisation and the advent
of the digital age, the world
has become more interconnected.

A country's foreign policy
is heavily guided by the
aspirations of its people, and
people today are increasingly
questioning the relevance of
boundaries. Ironically, the
migration of people due to wars

and climate change has also fuelled feelings of xenophobia and nationalism. The recent case of NRC (National register of citizens), showed the animosity prevalent in Assam towards illegal migrants from Bangladesh. Such events, cause

hicups in India's foreign relations, as was also seen in the migration of Rohingyas.

Such events also put the focus on global collaboration as the most viable solution for prosperity. The recent case of Kerala floods, where donations and aid came in from all corners of the world, was a case in point.

The peculiar advantages that countries enjoy, also push India to seek their expertise in their fields of strategic excellence. This can be seen in India's collaboration in the LIGO project, or its work with Iran in the Chabahar project to gain access to Afghanistan and Central Asia.

The world today is highly dynamic with political leaders acting like sharks, propagating their own benefits before anything else. In such scenarios, it is imperative for all countries to act together and tackle these problems collectively to establish

a sustainable, rules based,
and just society for everyone's
prosperity.

Thus, it can be seen that
India's shift in foreign policy
from Non-Alignment to
multi-alignment has indeed
become a reality. But such
alignment must be pursued
with the goal of becoming
a leader as well as a
reliable partner to the
corresponding countries. In spite
of the lack of effective
implementation, the ideals of
NAM - to garner respect &
Sovereignty for every country
to ensure peace, must be

upheld as the underlying principle
of India's engagement with
the world.

*

SECTION - B

Nuclear disarmament is the
need of the hour.

Abhay is an engineer working in Japan.
Like everyday, he took a bus in the
morning for his office, and the fully
congested bus stopped abruptly on the
road. Everyone's phones started ringing
with the alert "A missile is coming
from North Korea". At that moment,
without any hope of evacuation, he
along with the others in the bus,
realized the helplessness in the
event of a possible nuclear attack.
The above experience is a real life
example of the need for urgency in
nuclear disarmament process to start.

Beginning of the Nuclear race

The research on nuclear weapons started in USA during the late 1930s under the Manhattan Project, led by famous scientists such as Robert Oppenheimer.

Though the project progressed in secrecy, it came into the spotlight with the "little boy" and "fat man" bombs thrown over Japan in 1945.

Such was the impact of the explosion, that the pilot of the plane that carried the bombs, himself crashed the plane. The role of nuclear weapons for becoming a superpower became clear, and Russia challenged USA into a nuclear arms race. The test of the Tsar Bomba, whose shock wave travelled across the world 3 times, marked

the culmination of nuclear arms
research. The fear of an all-out
nuclear war reached a new high
during the Cuban Missile crisis of
1962. Over time, every aspiring
nation wanting to be a superpower,
decided to possess nuclear weapons.
Starting with China, India and
Pakistan, the technology
even reached North Korea. The
Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1979, in
response to India's nuclear tests,
failed to act as a reliable
regulatory authority and even in
principle it appeared unjust and
incapable of resolving the
security dilemma of countries like
India.

Fast forward to today, we
find nuclear diplomacy as a new found

phenomenon in global politics.
Countries such as North Korea
constantly pose a security threat to
their neighbours and the
resulting insecurities have
motivated countries in east Asia
(like Saudi Arabia) and pacifist
countries like Japan to look at
possession of nuclear arms as a
safety valve.

Nuclear Arms → Direct, short term
considerations

Nuclear weapons today act as the
primary guarantee of safety
for countries that may not have
enough resources at hand to
develop large capacities of conventional
weapons. They also act as the

basic safeguard for regime
security of countries ruled by
autocrats and dictators. Example,
North Korea, Libya, Iran etc.

On the security front,
in addition to their role in ensuring
security, they also act as a
constant source of fear of the
looming threat of war. This
was the primary reason why
first India tested nuclear weapons
after China already did, and
later following followed by
Pakistan's tests due to India's
possession. Due to a lack of
effective monitoring in some
countries, nuclear arms are also
fearful to be in easy reach of
rogue elements such as terrorists
in Pakistan. In comparison to
the limited impact from conventional

weapons, nuclear arms end up in
major collateral impact in both
fighting nations and thus, are
used for coercion, to bring the
other party to the negotiating
table, as was done between
North Korea and USA.

Nuclear arms can also
lead to significant escalation of
a war. For example, though
India's nuclear doctrine proposes
a No-first use policy, exceptions
are present in the case of
biological or chemical attacks,
wherein India can reply with a
nuclear attack.

On the environmental
front, the nuclear radiation
fallout, can cause genetic mutations
over generations, causing long term

disabilities. Significant calamities
can occur if fuel processing
facilities are present in disaster
prone areas. Though not
directly related, the Fukushima
incident serves as a grim
reminder of such possibilities.

During the nuclear arms
race, a lot of explosions also
took place under water, with
no studies undertaken to
understand their impact on
marine geology, fish, marine plants
as well as the larger issue of
marine pollution. Even cases
by Marshall Islands to bring USA
to accept its fault of nuclear testing,
were swiftly dismissed without
any concern for the environmental
impact.

Another major issue is the

disposal of the nuclear waste
generated during the enrichment
process. The Arizona desert,
for example has a waste
disposal facility that receives
tonnes of waste every year and
since it's already brimming to its
limit, new sites are being searched
for. Such disposal, can lead to
groundwater pollution, soil
infertility, genetic mutations in
inhabitants, etc. This was one
of the reasons why the Kudankulam
plant, even for energy purposes, was
relentlessly opposed by inhabitants -

The impact of uranium underground,
is seen in Punjab too, where a
large number of cancer patients
have surfaced drinking contaminated
water. Their daily travel to
Rajasthan for treatment, has
brought the name of cancer train to

their mode of transportation.

Long term - indirect considerations

In addition to the immediate impacts, nuclear weapons pose a number of long term challenges for a nation.

The first is the need for constant monitoring and supervision of the weapons production & storage facilities.

Such monitoring functions entail a considerable diversion of funds and manpower, which can be problematic in developing countries, which must prioritise the basic sustenance of livelihood for its citizens.

The pursuit of nuclear arms, especially in the absence

of proper monitoring, can invite
international sanctions, which
can further exacerbate the
economic hardships of the
people. This was recently
seen in the case of Iran,
where the failure of JCPOA,
led to sanctions, causing outflow
of foreign investment and a
rapid downfall of the trial.

Sanctions on North Korea too,
have led to cases of hand to
mouth living, famines and even
cannibalism in some areas.

Besides this, arch enemies
perennially live ~~is~~ under fear of
a nuclear war, such as in
South Korea, where bunkers are
present in all the major cities and
mock drills are continually held.

On the environmental front,
the pursuit of such weapons,
requires large scale mining of
uranium, which itself being
a threat to the environment, can
lead to years of medical
complications for the residents.

from a social viewpoint, the
threat of nuclear weapons leads to
a discrimination between tier-I
and tier-II/III cities, especially in
cases of resource crunch. The
Indian govt's plans to secure the
airspace over major cities like
Delhi, Mumbai etc. against
nuclear missile attacks, highlights
the security related discrimination
towards rural areas. It is
further worsened, when rural or
tribal inhabitants are forced to
relocate when enrichment facilities are

Set up.

Steps to realise a future without
nuclear arms

Since the primary reason for
possession of nuclear weapons, is the
security dilemma, any plan for
disarmament, must at least answer
this problem. The recent
initiative by Nobel Peace prize
winning ICAN, at the UN, to
muster support for worldwide
spirit of disarmament is good
in spirit but unattainable in
practice, since it doesn't tackle the
security dilemma. This is why none
of the nuclear weapon nations signed
the agreement.

The second important
requirement is justice and equality
in the negotiations. The primary

Reasons why NPT and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty failed or have failed are, the blanket immunity provided to nations that already possessed nuclear arms before these treaties took shape.

Even though the NPT tackles the root cause of nuclear arms, i.e. nuclear proliferation, the absence of proper implementation and monitoring mechanism has made it a toothless tiger. At the UN too, the veto possessed by UNSC members, which are nuclear armed nations too, limits the success of any disarmament negotiation.

Therefore, any negotiation must incorporate a mechanism to bring adversaries to the negotiating table and first resolve their issues.

of thorn. Then the discussions can focus on simultaneous disarmament, or disarmament in return of security guarantee and economic benefits as was done by USA - North Korea at Singapore. Such security guarantees have worked successfully in the case of NATO, as well as USA's nuclear umbrella over Japan, South Korea.

The emerging threats of cyber insecurity, can pose a great technical challenge, wherein a remote access to a weapons facility, can create havoc worldwide. This must push countries to set aside their differences and ensure worldwide peace.

The now defunct JCPOA with Iran, showed the efficacy of

negotiations in denuclearisation
process.

The environmental impacts too
are so wide and diverse, that
a single nation by itself cannot
dispose off all its nuclear waste
and thus, collaboration, especially
through the UN would ensure
technical research towards
such problems, like using
waste at CERN for radioactive
decay studies etc.

Hence, nuclear disarmament
is quintessential for people like
Abhay to never again experience the
horror of that day's attack, and
only open minded discussions can
help in the progress towards this
goal.

X