

POLITICAL SCIENCE & INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS

Crash Course & Test Series 2020
TEST : 04

Name : SADAF CHOUDHARY

Test Date : 05th Dec, 2020

Email :

Mobile :

URSC Roll No. : 6306505

S. No.	a	b	c	d	e	Total
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						

Grand Total :

	Poor	Average	Good	V. Good
Understanding of Question				
Structure & flow				
Subject Knowledge				
Presentation				

OVERALL REMARKS

Q-1(a):

India has no good reason to overturn its nuclear doctrine.

After the Pulwama attack (2019), there were renewed calls for revisiting India's nuclear doctrine.

Indian nuclear doctrine is based upon the principle of No-First Use, and non-usage against non-nuclear states. However, people like Gen. Hooda calls it morally defeating, as it puts large no. of people at risk during first strike.

But, in the words of former NSA K. Subrahmaniyam, "Nuclear doctrine has more to do with credibility than posture". Moving to a 'first-use' posture would mean keeping arsenal ready at all times. This will not only be costly, but also more risky.

2

due to all-time risk of accidents.

Hence, the current doctrine has worked well in India's favour till now.

And given the world opinion shifting away from nuclear weapons after 'Nuclear weapon prohibition treaty', there is no good reason to overturn our nuclear doctrine.

Q-1(b):

India's role in UN Peace-keeping

Since the inception of UN - Peacekeeping, India has participated in 40 out of 65 UNPK missions.

Beginning from Israel -

Palestine conflict (1948), Indian forces have worked in almost all parts of the world. Not only the forces, India has also provided equipments, fighter aircrafts, medical ambulances, etc. for the humanitarian relief.

India has an unfortunate distinction of losing most no. of men during peacekeeping forces. Yet India's resolve, in line with its constitutional values of peace & prosperity, has not been deterred.

India equally takes part in

decision-making when it comes to UN-IPKt, and ~~has~~ been the major force pushing against robust peace keeping (use of weapons).

Thus, India combines the Panchsheel values of non-interference & sovereignty with USHA values of human life & dignity while carrying out peacekeeping operations.

Q-1(c):

As Sino-Indian relations occur a free fall, New Delhi finds itself on the margins of SCO.

Beginning as Shanghai + 5 in 2000, both India & Pak joined SCO in 2017. India is also set to host current year's SCO summit.

However, deteriorating relationship between India and China, earlier due to BRI & QUAD and now due to Galwan valley clashes, has made it a tightrope walk for India.

While China forms the core of SCO, Russia, ^{Pak} and other central Asian nations are also Chinese allies. Thus, India will surely find itself marginal-ized. But every challenge is an opportunity, and India needs to balance deftly such opportunities.

India should use the platform of SCO to bring out Chinese high-handedness, and try to wear away its allies.

There are multiple observers, like Nepal & Cambodia, who can be assured of India's kept to stand against China.

India, vying for a global power status, would do well to rise from the ashes like a phoenix, rather than getting bogged down by Chinese might.

Q-1(d): The role of PMO in shaping India's foreign policy

The institution of PMO came into existence during Lal Bahadur Shastri's tenure (1964), and gained prominence under Indira Gandhi. Now, it has a life & hierarchy of its own.

In words of Subasini Haider, "PMO is currently steering the foreign policy ship, rather than straddle it towards MEA institutions". PMO, consisting of officers on deputation from MEA, keeps itself apprised of all the developments. The NSA reports to the PMO, and so does the other relevant institutions (including intelligence apparatus)

PM can appoint special envoys to particular regions like Afghanistan or over particular issues like nuclear

cooperation.

Thus, PMO is playing a hefty role in foreign-policy making of the country, even to the level of compromising the jurisdiction of MEA.

Q.1(c): China is a pivotal actor in South Asia's hydro diplomacy.

South Asia is one of the world's most populated region, but also least water-rich. Thus, hydro-diplomacy has always been the part of S. Asia's diplomatic manoeuvring.

Being the largest as well as most populous country, China is an important player in hydro-diplomacy. Located in the north, most of the rivers flow through China to other countries.

Ex → Brahmaputra & Indus (Indo-China), Mekong (China, Myanmar, Cambodia), etc.

China, being the upper riparian state, has built multiple dams, leading to water scarcity in other regions. Also, there are fears about Chinese using dams for flood-weirs, thus debilitating

the public from lower riparian states.

Water, being a public good, there is a need for institutionalized mechanism for working out fair & equitable solution for water-sharing.

Chinese unilateralism should not be let ^{to} prevail in S. Asian hydro-diplomacy.

Q- 2 (a):

Deconstruct the recent territorial dispute b/w India & Nepal. What are the possible factors behind escalation of the problem? What are the mechanisms available to address the dispute in structured and institutionalized manner?

In the words of S.D. Muni, India & Nepal are lodged into each other's intestines. Hate or love, the relationship is going to stay forever, there is no other escape mechanism.

Two Himalayan nations have been co-existing since time immemorial. However, British rule over India happened to leave behind a legacy of unsettled borders.

The recent territorial conflict is the same complex carryover from Treaty of Sagauli (1816), which settled Kali river as the boundary between two nations. But on account of ambiguity over its origin point, both India & Nepal have been claiming the Kalapani region.

Another area of dispute is

Indo-Nepal border at Susta in Bihar, where changing Gandak river course has rendered several villages as disputed territory.

The reasons behind rise of these disputes have been varied, and can be classified as :

- ① Chinese pressure on Nepal so as to keep India engaged in border disputes, and hence stall its rise as an Asian superpower
- ② Domestic imperatives of Nepal's fractured polity, making K.P. Oli play the role of high-handed PM
- ③ Disastrous handling of COVID crisis, requiring attention-diverting tactics.
- ④ Residual grievance due to 2015 Blockade by India, which created a perpetual feeling of animosity between two nations.

Thus, the big brotherly attitude that India has been playing in region have always been a thorn in its path, no matter how benevolent it is. In the words of Kaprymson Jacob, "India has always treated Nepal complacently, and is an example of how not to deal with its neighbours".

But India & Nepal have many institutionalised mechanisms to sort out their disputes. The talks at the level of Military Chiefs have been going on for decades on an annual basis.

Apart from this, there are group of experts set up especially for delineating borders for a permanent solution.

India & Nepal have synergies on

many matters & are regular participants of SAARC, though it doesn't deal with bilateral issues.

In the age of complex interdependence, both India & Nepal need to work closely with each other, rather than against each other.

Q. 2(b)

West Asia has now become a centre of internal squabbling & rivalries with civilizational & sectarian dimensions. Elucidate. Suggest how the power struggle in W. Asia affects India's interests.

West Asia lies in the extended neighbourhood of India, and has been the hallmark of Indian deft foreign-policy making.

West Asia is a region of faultlines. There are multiple conflicts going on in simultaneously in the region:

- ① Sectarian conflict between Shia & Sunnis, esp. Iran & Saudi Arabia
- ② Civilizational conflicts between Turkey (Ottomans), Syria & Iraq (Mesopotamia), Arabs, etc.
- ③ Monarchy v/s Democracy
- ④ Religions abound in the region, viz, Islam, Jews, Christianity, Pagan, etc.

The entire region has faced many conflicts, internal as well as external.

The Wars between Israel & Arab nations, Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, etc. are some of the examples of external conflicts; while the civil wars in Lebanon & Syria, rise of ISIS, etc. gave birth to internal conflicts.

The presence of external actors like US, Russia, EU, etc. has made the matters worse.

India has deftly balanced all the faultlines in the region, becoming a trusted partner of all the countries. In the words of former ambassador Ranjit Gupta, "Indian policy in W. Asia has been non-~~part~~ prescriptive, non-judgemental, non-aligned & non-interventionist".

However, increasing conflict poses a problem to Indian interests :-

- ① 70% of India's oil & gas supply from W. Asia
- ② 7 Million strong diaspora
- ③ Huge investment from sovereign wealth funds of Gulf Monarchies
- ④ Repercussions on larger stability of Indo-Pacific region

Being a net-security provider in the region, as well as a rising global power, India has larger responsibility towards ensuring the stability in W. Asia. A safe & secure W. Asia is the key to stability & prosperity of India.

Q-2(c): Permanent seat in UNSC is neither necessary nor the only way for India to assert its arrival on global centre stage. Comment.

While moving Objective Resolution in Constituent Assembly, Jawahar Lal Nehru had assured the nation that 'India will gain its rightful place in the comity of nations on account of its civilizational values'.

However, this esteemed status has so far been elusive for India. Despite decades of campaigning for permanent membership of UNSC, there is hardly any hope at the end of the tunnel.

However with time, there is a notion gaining currency that UNSC seat is not as important as it is made out to be. For ex → UNSC itself remains paralyzed most of the times due to P2 & P3 rivalry, thereby effectively

losing its mandate.

In the words of Subhasini Khaidur,

"UNSC membership is not as important as to let India get blackmailed by superpowers". There are other ways through which India can, and it already is, announce its arrival

on the global stage :

- ① India still has leadership of NAM, the largest group outside of UN
- ② India is simultaneously in the coveted league of neo-liberal countries through G-20
- ③ India collaborating with like-minded countries through QUAD to protect its strategic interests.
- ④ Not getting bogged down by West in climate change negotiations (BASIC) as well as trade negotiations (WTO).

⑤ working towards global good of humanity by chairing WTC, sending large no. of peacekeepers & being a member of UNHRC.

Thus, India is playing its card very smartly. It is playing an important role in global governance, while trying to get an even bigger role through UNSC. But it has not allowed its ends to destroy its means.

Q-5(a)

Delineate the relative degree of continuity & change in India's foreign policy in the light of major initiatives taken by present govt.

foreign policy of a country is a set of objectives, and policies, to pursue those objectives that a country uses in its engagement with other countries.

foreign policy of a country is determined by many factors operating simultaneously viz. history, geography, culture, personality of its leaders, etc.

but still in this age of flux, India's foreign policy has retained large degree of continuity, an instance of stable & well-laid policy-making mechanism:

- ① Continued focus on strategic autonomy and saying no to alliances
- ② Good & benevolent relations with neighbours ; e.g., Myanmar, Maldives, etc.

- ③ Continued belief in the power of multilateralism, and working towards strengthening institutions of global governance (LIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM)
- ④ Humanitarian foreign policy, e.g., medical aid to COVID-affected countries
- ⑤ No muscular nuclear posture, and continuing with no-first use policy
- ⑥ Doubling down on terrorism, organized crime & other such transnational threats like climate change

But given the exigencies of time, foreign policy of a country keeps on evolving. India has been deft in updating and revising its posture to so as to reflect the contemporary global realities?

- ① Diversifying away its reliance as well as alliances from erstwhile USSR to the US & EU now.
- ② QUAD alliance
- ③ Muscular posture against China during Galwan clash
- ④ More involvement in global affairs

Q-5(b)

How India should prioritize its economic, political & security needs in face of China's increasingly powerful & aggressive strategies?

The world is in a constant state of flux. And the troubled transition times are more pronounced in Indo-Chinese relationship than elsewhere.

Growing Chinese aggression is calling for a more proactive strategy on the part of India to prioritize its interests in following manners:

- ① Economic : Restricting market access, banning Chinese companies from sensitive sectors like transport & communications, protection of MSMEs, reinvigorating WTO
- ② Political : Using platforms like SCO, BRICS, etc skilfully, aligning with like-minded countries in the region, strengthening multilateralism, fighting the menace of propaganda & fake news.

③ Security : Internal capability building, skilled use of QUAD, cyber-security must be prioritised

India needs a multipronged strategy to counter China's multilayered tactics of containing India.

Q. 5(c):

The story of bilateral relations b/w India & Sri Lanka is a story of ups-and-downs.

India & Sri Lanka got independence at around the same time, and their journey upto now has been a tale of ups-and-downs.

While initially there was a cooperation in the fields of development, trade & agriculture, it quickly gave way to divergence. While India tried to accommodate internal diversities as well as external challenges, Sri Lanka moved on a path of majoritarianism.

After a protracted civil war, where India was also targeted by Tamil insurgents, Sri Lanka finally engaged with India in 2010. Before that, India ^{had also} gave up its rights on Kuchhathivu island in the spirit of Panchsheel to Sri Lanka.

but nothing could prevent Sri Lanka from moving into Chinese embrace. This resulted into huge debt buildup, and loss of strategic assets like Hambantota port to Chinese. The Wickramasinghe govt sought closer ties with India, but the new govt. once again seems to be moving towards Chinese bait.

Hence, Indo - Sri Lanka relationships are a classic case of neighbourhood ties, having their own hot - and - cold phases.

Q. 5(d)

How India's history as a dominant & oppressed entity affected and constituted India's foreign policy discourse?

Almost 200 years of foreign rule shaped Indian foreign policy decisively. This results into India's advocacy for anti-imperialism & anti-racialism right from Bandung Conference (1955). This further christened in the form of Non-Aligned Movement (1961), of which India was a founding member. Even today, the special relationship we share with Africa is the outcome of India's identity as an oppressed nation.

However, on the other pole is India's identity as a dominant entity. Being the regional hegemon in South Asia, India always played a

role of big-brother. It was against this disparity that SAARC was originally conceived by ~~Sheikh Mujib~~ Ziaur - Rahman (Bangladeshi PM). But India was smart to mend its ways, and adopted the Gujral doctrine of giving unilateral concessions to small neighbours so as to allay their fears.

Thus, Indian foreign policy is a mix of both dominant as well as oppressed identities that India carries conveniently & comfortably.

Q-5(e)

Discuss the current state of India - Africa relations. Examine the challenges and opportunities.

Jawahar Lal Nehru had once remarked that Indian independence is incomplete without African liberty. This is the foundation on which Indo - African relationship has been built.

Currently, India is an active partner in African development process, through credit lines, capacity building, increasing people to people connect, etc. India is also working with other like-minded countries, viz. Japan (Asia - Africa Growth Corridor).

The relationship has huge potential because of demographic dividend. Democracy is taking roots in the continent, and its Vision 2063 lays down clear developmental path, where India has much

to offer.

However, the threats are also abound. There are charges of corruption against Indian firms operating in Africa, there are racial attacks on African students in India. There is also the perception that India promises, China delivers.

Thus, we still have a long way to go before Asia - Africa partnership can reach its full potential.

Q-6(a)

The relationship b/w India & USA is more robust than ever. However, the deepening of relationship is bound to bring its own challenges. Critically examine. Analyse the challenges & opportunities in Indo-US relations.

When Dennis Kux ^{had} called India & US as 'Estranged Democracies' during cold-war, hardly anyone could have imagined that they would be in a 'defining relationship of 21st century' a few decades later.

Today India & US are not only comprehensive & global strategic partners, but also two engaged democracies fighting against rise of authoritarian China. This special & privileged relationship is hinging on many bases:

- ① Large trade between two countries (\$100B)
- ② India USA's second-largest defense importer after Saudi Arabia
- ③ India central pillar of USA's Indo-Pacific strategy

- ④ Both nations carry out more military exercises than any other set of nations
- ⑤ Large diaspora connections (II largest Indian diaspora in US after Gulf)

However, there has always been a cons of partnering with global superpower. In words of Ashley Teller, "whenever US calls shots, the others just cheer. There is hardly anything left for the coalition partners to do on their own". But India, on the other hand, is not for one to be dictated around. The common notion is that India is too big, too proud & too argumentative to play junior partner of any country.

The Indo-US relationship poses varied challenges for India. The biggest casualty is its partner for decades, Russia. This has led to emergence of China-Russia-Pak axis, creating disastrous situation

in India's own neighbourhood. The emboldened China has not only himself invaded Himalayas, but is also pushing other countries to do the same, ex-Nepal's renewed claims on Kulepani territory.

This partnership will also give birth to the fears of India losing its strategic autonomy due to QUAD, which might turn into a military alliance.

But despite all the roadblocks, the opportunity that Indo-US relationship offers would far outweigh the above-mentioned threats. It will help in emergence of a multipolar world order, strengthen India's credentials as the net security provider in Indo-Pacific and will save the neighbour states from China's unilateralism & attractive/coercive tactics.

In the words of MEA S. Jayashankar,

" If India aspires to be a global power, it has to play a role in line with its changed stature in the global politics".

Q-6(b)

Critically examine the impact of Abraham Accords on India's West Asian diplomacy. What has been India's response to the accords?

Abraham Accords are a series of bilateral agreements signed between Israel - Bahrain & Israel - UAE, with active support of the USA.

These accords will unveil a new era in W. Asian geo-politics, being the first instance since 1954 when Arab countries recognize Israel as a state. These accords effectively set up bilateral relations between signatories, & will open up trade, investment, people-to-people connect and connectivity among these nations.

With these accords, India's West Asian diplomacy got a shot in the arm.

Long been balancing the Israel & the Arabs, India has now welcomed

the normalization of relations between the countries. This will result in greater cooperation among Arab countries, and flourishing as well as stable Arab peninsula is in India's economic & strategic interests.

However, this has adversely affected India's long-standing position on Palestine issue, which is no effectively dead. Though realpolitik might favour promoting Abraham Accords, but India's moral stand took a beating. Also, Iran denounced these accords, and given India's turbulent relationship with Tehran, this might further widened the rift between two nations.

Another less talked about, but important in long-run, would be the effect of these Accords on Indian economy.

As Israel would be the preferred partner of gulf monarchies, India will lose out both on an important market as well as source of investment. Israel would be supplying defense equipments and technologies, leading to India being marginalized.

Thus, India needs to navigate these choppy waters more skillfully than ever, keeping in mind its both strategic as well as economic interests.

Q-6(c)

What do you understand by strategic culture? Do you think India has its own strategic culture? What are the salient features of India's strategic culture?

Strategic culture refers to the policies that a country use to strategically protect its interests from external threats. Generally used in terms of war - and - peace policies, now it extends to the domain of diplomacy as well.

India has long been accused of lacking any strategic culture by the western scholars. But Edward Said gave concept of Orientalism to point out this western bias. Prof. V.R. Mehta says that India always have had a strategic culture, just that the West couldn't understand it due to cultural barrier.

Indian strategic culture is

indistinguishable from its political culture. The Manusmriti is as much a book of strategy as it is of the Dharma (politics). In real sense, the glimpses of ^{Indian} strategic culture are found in the works of Kautilya, whose Arthashastra is golden standard of statecraft. Followed by Mughal emperors like Akbar, India has never had any lack of strategic culture.

* SALIENT FEATURES OF INDIAN STRATEGIC CULTURE :->

- ① War is justified in the interest of larger good of society
- ② Territorial expansion is a source of wealth
- ③ Peace should be preferred, but not at the cost of looking toward
- ④ Mandala Theory, based on the maxim

that neighbours are natural enemies

- ⑤ In war, ends justify means
- ⑥ Strategic balancing is as important as war.

Thus, Indian strategic culture has been the reason behind continued & uninterrupted existence of Indian civilisation. The world only needs to understand & read it better.

Q. 7(a)

In recent times certain developments have given rise to increasing concerns among India's strategic community w.r.t. its reliance on Russia. Elucidate.

To what extent do you support the view that in order to protect its interest vis-à-vis China, India has to forget its reliance on Russia?

Russia was the I country India had entered into an alliance with during cold-war (1971). Even after the cold-war ended, the I strategic partnership India had entered into was with Russia only (2000).

Thus, Russia has always been the cornerstone of Indian foreign policy. From trade relations to defence, from supporting India on Kashmir to providing aid during 1971 war, it never disappointed India.

However, with emerging geopolitical equation, the Indo-Russia relations came under

scanner. As India left Russia for a more pragmatic partner, i.e, USA, Russia found new friends in China & Pak.

The growing trade as well as strategic convergence with China, arms supply to Pak, involvement in Syrian civil war and ambitious role in talks with Taliban are some of the redlights for Indian foreign-policy establishments.

There are growing demands for a lesser reliance on Russia even in military terms. The cancellation of fifth generation fighter aircraft project is a testimony to this. There are other accusations about poor service delivery, maintenance & repair shortcomings, delayed delivery, etc. Thus, calls for India to move towards better partners like US & Israel have been growing louder than ever.

However, situation is not as dire as it has been made to be. For ex → if we consider Russian arms export to China, the same thing US has been doing for years with Pak. The signing of BECA was precisely stopped because of US agreements with Pak, about sharing location of forces. Thus, if we can handle this, we can handle Russia as well.

Also, it's not that Russia is blindly following Chinese dictates. Russia brought India into SCO to counter China.

Even during RIC Summit, Russia didn't meddle between Indo-China affairs in Galwan valley, and preferred bilateral solution to the dispute.

Thus, in the age of complex interdependence & multiple alignments, India's benefit

is in handling all the actors, viz. US, Russia, China, etc. with same rigour.

Pure geopolitics should not give way to emotions, and strategic balancing is the need of the hour.

Q-7(b)

Enumerate some of the recent developments in relations b/w Japan & India. To what extent India's decision to withdraw from RCEP creates dilemma for Japan?

India & Japan both believes in a partnership based on shared interests, value of democracy and creating an 'arc of freedom & prosperity' across the Indo-Pacific.

Recently, two countries upgraded their relationship to special & privileged partnership, while institutionalising 2+2 dialogue at ministerial level.

India & Japan have been working with shared interests in Indo-Pacific for freedom of navigation & overflight. In order to check Chinese unilateralism, they are giving shape to the idea of QUAD. While on the other hand, they are countering Chinese BRI through

Japanese PQI (partnership for quality infrastructure) in the region. India is an active partner in the initiative, extending as far as the Africa through Asia - Africa Growth Corridor.

Apart from this, both the countries have been working together for 'Make in India' project, bringing synergies with Japan's capital & India's labour as resources. Thus, Indo - Japan partnership is the most non-controversial yet defining partnership in Asia.

However, India's decision to pull out from RCEP in 2019 came as a blow to not only ASEAN grouping, but also the Japan particularly. Japan was hoping to counter Chinese influence by banding with India.

If itself has no FTA with India, and thus KCEP was a good way to enter Indian market without getting stuck in bureaucratic redtape. This is precisely why it is still working to bring India back into the grouping.

But KCEP, or no KCEP, the partnership between India & Japan is going to stay for the larger good of the region.

Q-7(c):

India's decision to remain out of RCEP shows that it's retreating from its Act East Policy. Comment.

Support your view with convincing arguments.

Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership is a mechanism entered into by ASEAN plus its 5 partners (Japan, China, S. Korea, Australia, NZ) for creating a common market and free trade area.

While India participated in 2-years long negotiations, it ultimately decided to keep itself out of the agreement. Largely due to concerns of agricultural and dairy farmers (facing competition from Australia & New Zealand), as well as the fear of Chinese exports flooding its market, India had to let go of this opportunity.

However, the prioritisation accorded

to domestic factors over strategic goals has not gone down very well with the experts. In the words of Javier Laran, "In today's world of economic diplomacy, India is retreating from market mechanisms while aiming for strategic superiority. The two counterintuitive goals are sure to end in disaster".

India's 'Act East Policy', which pushes it to be more proactive player in the eastern neighbourhood, is based on 3 pillars :

- ① Trade
- ② Connectivity
- ③ People-to-people connect

While connectivity through BBIN or IMT highway is not going any further, trade was the golden opportunity for India to appear as rule-maker.

but in pulling out of the RCEP, India has sent the signals of it being a rule-breaker. This would further dampen its prospects of joining APEC in the long run.

Hence, India needs to have a clear-cut implementation of its foreign policy priorities. The gap between policy & practice will only show it in bad light as an irresponsible ^{global} player.