

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2019 · 10 marks

Compare and contrast Non-alignment 1.0 with Non-alignment 2.0.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 1.0 = **Nehru's** answer to bipolarity → materially weak new state keeps freedom of decision by refusing both blocs → 2.0 = 2012, twelve experts → same freedom, almost opposite means

R2 one label, two settings → bipolarity vs multipolarity → the real question: has the purpose changed, or only the method?

Body flow

shared ground first: anti-colonial / anti-imperialist → sovereignty + territorial integrity → no binding military bloc → 2.0's own continuity claim ("strategic autonomy... defining value") → then divergence: Cold War → globalisation | **Nehru's** personal initiative → multipolar order no leader designed | distance from blocs → several alignments at once | neighbours diluted → Act East / Link West | strict Nehruvian bar → LEMOA, COMCASA

Counter-view

Karnad → 2.0 a regressive roadmap → moral influence over-weighted where material power decides

Conclusion routes

R1 purpose survives the change of method → autonomy in decision-making is the constant

R2 **Raja Mohan** → from choosing sides to maximizing options

Non-alignment 1.0 was J.L. Nehru's answer to bipolarity. A materially weak new state guarded its freedom of decision by refusing both blocs. Non-alignment 2.0 - framed in 2012, pursues the same freedom by almost opposite means.

Both remain anti-colonial and anti-imperialist, both put sovereignty and territorial integrity first and neither accepts a binding military bloc. The document itself claims this continuity i.e. "strategic autonomy has been the defining value" since independence.

The methods diverge. 1.0 belonged to the Cold War & was largely Nehru's personal initiative. The 2.0 grew from globalisation & a multipolar order no single leader designed.

Distance from bloc politics has given way to several alignments held at once.

Ties with neighbours, diluted under 1.0, are deepened through Act East & Link West. LEMOA & COMCASA would not have cleared the strict Nehruvian bar on military alignment.

Bharat Karnad calls 2.0 as a regressive roadmap, over-invested in moral influence where material power decides. The purpose, though, survives the change of method i.e. autonomy in decision-making.

C. Raja Mohan states policy is "no longer about choosing sides, but about maximizing options."