

## **India's changing role in World Politics**

### **Timeline:**

26<sup>th</sup> January, 1950: India becomes a Republic.

The Indian economy is characterized by anti-global, near communist ideals such as protectionism, public ownership, and trade regulation.

1961: India pioneers the Non-Aligned Movement, beginning to distance itself from USA and the capitalist world.

1965: Indo-Pak War.

India begins to tend towards the USSR and the Communist Bloc, exemplifying this support by an arms agreement with the USSR.

In retaliation, the USA begins arming Pakistan, to quash any support to the USSR from India.

USA and its allies, further antagonize India and appease Pakistan when India supports the Soviet Union in its invasion of Afghanistan, by refraining from aiding India's attempts to stop genocide in East Pakistan (today Bangladesh) perpetrated by the Pakistani Government.

1970s: Indo-Pak war of 1971 liberates East Pakistan and creates Bangladesh.

USA increases arms supply to Pakistan manifold and encourages China to do the same, fearing liberation of West Pakistan, leading to a majority of Soviet support in the region. The USA also sends a nuclear warship to the Bay of Bengal.

USSR retaliates with a submarine to ward off the US nuclear warship.

India refuses to sign the NPT.

The world responds by harshly condemning India's stubbornness and nearsightedness and shortly trade sanctions are imposed upon India.

1991: Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and Finance Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh expand India's economy and trade relations, relax heavy tariffs and regulations, and begin to end the era of Indian economic protectionism.

Sanctions begin to relax as the USA begins trade with India, post Persian Gulf War.

1998: After the Indian Nuclear Test, President Clinton expresses his fury at India's nuclear policy and sanctions are heavily re-imposed upon India.

2001: After an investigation into trade losses on account of sanctions imposed upon India, the USA begins steadily removing sanctions, adding to their GDP, trade which today is worth USD 7 billion.

2005: India's nuclear policy once again attracts the spotlight, but this time it is the India-USA civilian nuclear deal.

When Pakistani and other critics express doubt about this decision, given India's nuclear opacity, the USA replies by citing India's 'amazing' track record at maintaining a nuclear deterrent against rogue groups in Pakistan and surrounding areas.

2006-10: India begins its ascent to global recognition by concluding nuclear deals with Russia, France, the UK, Israel and several other countries and joins the G4 expressing its desire for permanent UNSC membership. France, the UK, and Russia support India's bid. The USA maintains that it will begin to support India if the latter resolves the Kashmir issue.

India's economic growth rate becomes the world's second highest.

November, 2010: US Congress almost unanimously backs India's (the world's largest democracy) bid for permanent UNSC membership, the question of Kashmir in its decision nowhere to be found.

Critics accuse US support of India's bid to be fake and fuelled by the desire to align with India, for the creation of a democratic bloc to isolate China.

Pakistani Foreign Secretary Quereshi releases a statement about Pakistan and China having 'unanimously' come to a decision that India should not get the UNSC seat as it would disturb 'regional stability'.

Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao puts strategic discussion of India's UNSC seat bid on his agenda in his visit to India in December, it previously not having been there.

The rest of this timeline is a fictitious opinion of the sequence of events ensuing,

2010 onwards:

In December, 2010 Premier Wen Jiabao expresses China's support for India's bid, after being included in talks about Kashmir, citing it only fair that a country, 'like mine, in population and economy – its voice ought to be heard'

Pakistan accuses him of changing his policy in order for Indian support so that China wouldn't be isolated by democracy.

China responds by revealing the 'futility of Pakistan's regional instability theory, now that we've been included in diplomatic talks for the future of Kashmir'

Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Myanmar and Bhutan declare their support for India's bid within a year.

Israel and Iran back India fully within a year. Libya, Kuwait, Morocco, and Yemen condemn India as a State 'whose only concerns are for its own interests and one which may destroy other States in order to do so' and appeal to the USA to withdraw its support to India on account of India's continuous refusal to stop trade with Iran. Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia and the UAE condemn the other Arab states' pleas as nonsensical citing India's impressive record of deterring rogue groups in the AfPak region from nuclearizing. The USA backs this citation.

The other 3 members of the G4 reiterate their support to India.

The European Union backs India after a 9% rise in trade between European Union Countries and India in 2012.

The African Union declares its unequivocal support to India's bid, 'as India, the biggest contributor of aid in South-East Asia, is responsible enough to represent not just its own, but the world's interests at the UNSC'

Australia, Papua New Guinea and New Zealand support India after The South Asian Free Trade Agreement is expanded to South-Asia-Pacific.

Canada, Colombia, Paraguay and Mexico declare support for India's bid, after India expresses its encouragement to the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development's work and sets aside a percentage of its yearly income for it.

The Kashmir issue remains unsolved.

In the 68<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly, in 2018, India and Brazil acquire permanent membership of the UNSC, with only Pakistan, Libya, Iraq, Kuwait, Yemen, Morocco and DPRK voting against India's permanent inclusion.



Hence India's role in world politics has changed drastically since our inception. Where not so long ago, India was ignored in its attempt to quash genocide, today, it's on its way to permanent UNSC membership. Yesterday India was an unstable nuclear power, today, with no change in its nuclear policy, its 'track record for nuclear deterrence' is now earning it approximately USD 10 billion. As its economy grew, its faults began to be overlooked, and the USA, Pakistan's long time ally, allowed India to aspire to UNSC permanent membership, whilst the Kashmir issue remains unresolved. Iran, a 'rogue state', one of the USA's most bitter enemies receives a large percentage of its foreign revenue from India, yet when Arab countries cite this support to be one fuelled by India's similar nuclear policy, the USA, along with other nations with seemingly similar concerns overlook this argument without the bat of an eyelid (Is it any wonder that these countries also trade with India extensively). Sri Lanka, a country torn apart by the notorious LTTE, which India itself secretly started continues to support India, lest it lose the South Asian Free Trade Agreement, which would crush its economy. Myanmar, military coup in 1962, other democracies impose sanctions, India doesn't. India is now Myanmar's biggest Trade partner, with no suggestion of India 'standing up for democracy' and for that it receives support. And finally, Pakistan. Some would hold India responsible not only for the abysmal economic, political and humanitarian situation there today, but also for Pakistan's nuclear arsenal which on numerous occasions has come close to getting into terrorist hands. Yet, the USA, apparently Pakistan's ally has shown no concern for Pakistan's interests since the end of the Cold War, but has signed nuclear deals with India, the country it gave Pakistan arms to fight.

Thus, today, India has come to command great respect in the international arena. It has played its cards very strategically over the years, continuously undermining others while receiving compensation for doing so repeatedly, and persisting in doing so. Where support can be won, India trades and gives aid, whereas where it cannot, India makes irreversible blunders. Today, India is at its prime, but I ask you, is that really where we deserve to be? Does a country that has gained support through its impressive economic benefits to other countries, its social security to its neighbors and its convenient position near a volatile nuclear power created by its own mistakes on which to blame any and every of its faults deserve to be in such a state of power? Then again, India is by the UN considered, by all humanitarian, economic and ethical standards a model state always favoring peace; be it the NAM or India's insistence on trusting Iran, After all, India is the world's largest democracy, and it is because of India's nuclear deterrent that a vast and volatile power has been kept at bay. So, do we deserve it or not? You decide, because world politics cannot.