

WRAP Exams · wrapexams.com

Prelims PYQ, Mains model answers, and copy evaluation. Write to the desk for this paper, a doubt, or the AI waitlist.

ask@wrapexams.com · +91 85951 84903 · wrapexams.com

Q6(a)

Would you concur with the view that of late, India's foreign policy has been in a transition mode from Nehruvianism to Neoliberalism? Support your answer with the help of suitable examples.

UPSC Civil Services Mains 2024 · PSIR GS 2 · 20 marks · Recent developments in Indian Foreign policy

Recent developments in Indian Foreign policy: India's position on the recent crisis in Afghanistan, Iraq and West Asia, growing relations with US and Israel; vision of a new world order.

Core demand of the question

- Define Nehruvianism and neoliberalism in Indian foreign-policy debate
- Periodise 1991, nuclear deal, Act East, Quad
- **Comment:** partial transition, not a completed conversion; autonomy remains

Revision summary

Nehruvianism meant NAM, UN moralism and refusal of blocs; neoliberalism in this debate means markets, U.S. partnership and globalisation.

1991, Act East, the U.S. nuclear bargain and the Quad are the visible transition.

India still refuses formal alliance, keeps Russia, defends WTO policy space and talks Global South - Nehruvian residues.

- **Concur partly:** instruments have shifted; doctrine of autonomy has not been abolished.

Multi-alignment is the mix, not a clean replacement of one school by the other.

Introduction

Nehruvianism in foreign policy meant non-alignment, Afro-Asian solidarity, UN moral language, and suspicion of military blocs, with a weak material base. **Neoliberalism** here does not mean only domestic market reform. In the foreign-policy debate it means engagement with global capital, closer ties to the United States, and comfort with economic globalisation. The view that India has been **in transition from Nehruvianism to neoliberalism** is **partly right**. It is wrong as a completed story.

Body**Where the transition is visible**

1991 opened the economy and forced diplomacy to seek capital, oil and technology. **Look East / Act East** replaced a purely continental NAM map with ASEAN and later the **Indo-Pacific**. The **civil nuclear** path with the United States, the 2+2s, **LEMOA**, **COMCASA** and **BECA**, and revival of the **Quad** are not **Nehru**'s instruments. India signs trade talks, courts supply chains, and speaks the language of ease of capital. **C. Raja Mohan** and others have described this as a turn from idealism to a more interest-based, market-compatible diplomacy. Examples are concrete: India as a lower-cost manufacturing hedge in

China-plus-one; ITEC plus digital public infrastructure as exports; a G20 presidency that sold investment as much as NAM memory.

Where Nehruvianism has not died

India still refuses a **NATO-like alliance**, which is the point of 7(c). It still buys oil and platforms with **Russia**. It still uses **strategic autonomy** and Global South voice - a Nehruvian habit in a new accent. It did not join a condemnation camp on Ukraine in the way neoliberal Atlanticism demanded. At the **WTO**, India defends food stocks and policy space rather than a pure open-market catechism. Neighbourhood policy still uses civilisational and security language that is not reducible to FDI.

So the transition is **in the economic and U.S.-facing layers**. It is not a conversion of the whole doctrine. **NonAlignment 2.0** already tried to name autonomy after NAM's bipolar script died. Multi-alignment, treated in 8(c), is the current mix: Nehruvian refusal of a camp, neoliberal use of markets and minilaterals.

Comment

Concur **in part**. Late Indian foreign policy has moved toward markets, the United States and issue-based coalitions. Do not concur that Nehruvianism has been replaced. The state still wants **autonomy in a hierarchical world-economy** that **Wallerstein** would recognise. Neoliberal tools serve that autonomy. They have not abolished it.

Flow diagram

Nehruvian NAM UN -> 1991 Act East US nuclear
1991 Act East US nuclear -> Quad markets
Nehruvian NAM UN -> Autonomy Russia WTO food
1991 Act East US nuclear -> Partial transition

Conclusion

India has used neoliberal economic diplomacy and U.S. minilaterals that **Nehru** would not have signed. It has not become a camp follower or a free-trade fundamentalist. The transition is real in instruments. The end remains autonomy. That is a partial, not a total, shift.

Facts & figures

1991

Balance-of-payments crisis opened the economy and the search for capital in diplomacy.

U.S. foundational pacts

LEMOA, COMCASA and BECA deepened logistics and information sharing without a treaty alliance.

Quad revival

Post-2017 minilateral with the U.S., Japan and Australia - a neoliberal-era security instrument, not a NAM forum.

WRAP Exams · Write. Read. Analyse. Practice. · <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-2/2024/would-you-concur-with-the-view-that-of-late-indias-foreign-policy-has-been-in-a-transition-mode-from-nehruvianism-to-neoliberalism-support-your-answer-with-the-help-of-suitable-examples/> · ask@wrapexams.com · wrapexams.com

WRAP Exams