



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Could the United Nations Security Council be made more
representative to include India?

Case study: India's Leaders' historical experiences and future impacts

MA International Relations

Specialization: Global Order In Historical Perspective

Name: Rohan Malsawm Prasad
Student Number: s2077426
E-mail: r.m.prasad@umail.leidenuniv.nl
Academic Year: Feb 2018-Feb 2019
Thesis Supervisor: Prof. Alanna O'Malley

Word Count: 14,828

Contents

Introduction	3
Methodology	7
Literature Review	9
The Reformation Debate	9
Theoretical Concepts Pertaining to the Case Study	15
One world	15
Nehruvianism	15
Breaking Free	18
Jawaharlal Nehru	19
Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit	20
India looking in the Mirror and the Cold War Offers	23
Strike 1- The 1950 Washington Offer	25
Strike 2- 1955 and the Soviet Offer	28
Rationale of Rejection	29
India's Vison	34
Modern India and Why It Believes It Deserves A Seat	34
A Modi-fied Foreign Policy?	35
Conclusion	39
Bibliography	41

Introduction

“I firmly believe that the council should be reformed: it cannot continue as it is. The world has changed and the UN should change and adapt.”

-Kofi Annan, Former UN-Secretary General (cited in the Guardian, 2015)

The United Nations was born in 1945, in the wake of arguably the deadliest conflict in history, the Second World War, with a death toll estimated between 50 to 85 million. With its end, the world seemed to be morphing into a better place, with the change of the political alliances and social structures of the world that culminated into the establishment of the United Nations. To avoid the scourge of war and establishing long lasting peace, in the future, one of its six principal organs, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), was charged with the responsibility of international peace and security, by welcoming new members and being instrumental in bringing forth changes. It held its first session on January 17th, 1946, with the founding vision and aim, “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetimes has brought untold sorrow to mankind.” (United Nation Preamble). Therefore, kick-starting the UNSC’s long road of peacekeeping operations, authorization of military interventions, investigation of international frictions or disputes, recommending solutions to conflicts, establish systems to regulate armaments, taking military action against aggressors, recommend admission of new members, determine the existence of threats, calling on members for the imposition of sanctions, and recommending the General Assembly the appointment of a Secretary-General (UN.org). To establish international political legitimacy and global institutional dominance, during the transition of the world order to new power balances, the 5 Allied powers were incentivised with the carrot of ‘veto’. This ensured their engagement in the fledgling institution, while also forming the basis of an enduring reflection of the geo-political realities of 1945. This refers to how the winners of the day still remain in charge of the helm with the privilege of being part of the permanent 5 (P5), namely being- The United States, The United Kingdom, France, China and Russia (the former Soviet Union).

Shortly after this gruesome world war, the two power blocs-the USA and the Soviet Union- plunged the world into a cold quarrel that threatened the existence of humanity. With cold fingers on the nuclear triggers, and heated debates about inequality, justice and poverty, threatened the people which did not belonging to a certain bloc. As a counter and protection mechanism, the “Third World” rose up. With personalities such as Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) and Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit (also known as ‘Madame Pandit’; 1900-1990), preaching for

“one world” or a “World Community”. Their articulated aspirations reflected that of majority of the world, which had just gained independence and started their journey of decolonization, but unfortunately, their moment was reduced to picking sides due to their lack of influence and capabilities (Bhagavan, 2013). During the Cold War, the UNSC was deemed nothing more than a forum for interaction of the ideological opposition between the two superpowers, essentially being a political theatre. However, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the Council’s role gained more prominence, showcased by the effective cooperation amongst the P5, such as in the settlement of the 1990-1991 Gulf Conflict (Morris, 2000).

Fast-forwarding to the 21st century, the world witnesses a different variety of influential players on the field that one could not have been forecasted to have accumulated the economic, military and soft power capabilities they possess. This refers particularly to countries of the G4, namely-Brazil, Germany, India and Japan. At the end of the Second World War, these countries were colonies (India), devastated by war (Germany and Japan), undergoing civil upheaval (China), and surprisingly, predicted to disintegrate by renowned journalists and academics (except Germany). However, these forecasted power transitions having shifted the gravity to a diversified stack of countries accompanied by efforts to change the UNSC’s composition. This is because of overwhelming rhetoric suggesting that the UNSC reflects the geo-political realities of 1945, and not that of the 21st Century. This particularly refers the Council’s creators, or the P5, that enjoy the privilege of veto that can essentially nullify any motion in the organ. Hence, holding disproportionate influence in security affairs, unlike what their power statistics would dictate.

A lively debate of reformation remains pertinent, especially given the added spotlight after the failures of the UNSC in Rwanda and Darfur, and starkly, the American invasion of Iraq to curb the P5’s interests or include the interests of other global players (Teng, 2003). With frequent measures and actions discussed to reform the council, one can conclude a form of discontentment with the current council order. As Patrick summarizes, “practically speaking, none of today’s international problems can be resolved in a conference room with representatives from the West alone” (Patrick, 2010: pg 44-53). This brings us to the case study and one of the prime contenders, India and the research question: -

Could the United Nations Security Council be made more representative to include India?

Case study: India’s Leaders’ historical experiences and future impacts

To answer this question, it is necessary to first explore the relevance of this issue at large, before viewing it through the prism of the Indian case study. It will then be followed by a section dedicated to getting the reader up to speed with the historical and contemporary, scholarly thought on UNSC reformation. The next section of the paper then introduces the reader to theoretical concepts that are essential to understand the case study and methodology. With the contemporary case of India being one of the prime contenders alongside its G4 counterparts for UNSC permanent status. A country that boasts the 3rd largest economy on PPP (Purchasing Power Parity) terms, administrates a population 1.4 Billion people, and flexes a nuclearized military which is ranked as the 4th strongest army in the world, while also being the largest UN peacekeeping troops contributor (World Firepower Index 2018, OECD 2018, World Bank, 2018). The World Bank predicts India to grow on its ‘newly-industrialized status’ (World Bank 2018). This is topped off by a democratic parliamentary regime, and New Delhi’s various leaps to eradicate poverty. Historically, as will be explained in more depth later, India has also engaged religiously in the UN from the very birth of birth of independent India and the organizational organ, such as- Agenda for Peace and the Agenda for Development, the Millennium Development Goals, and various UN summits, including most importantly on climate change (Dabhade,2017). It also played a major role in facilitating the creation of the G77, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

India’s contemporary stats, coupled with the larger motion to expand the UNSC’s permanent membership roster is largely the motivation for the research. With additional reasons being the feared consequences of UNSC stagnancy, according to various scholars, causing the UN organ to lose its international political legitimacy as a forum for international security and peace enforcement, or the worst outcome being the world overrun by institutions comprising of self-appointed *directoires* (United Nations University, 2015; Kofi Annan, 2015; Tharoor, 2011 & 2012). Either way, leading to disrespect and hindrance to, and the application of, international law. Additionally, the UNSC has also been criticised for many years for not having a democratic structure, and relatively recent developments have expressed an increasing emphasis on ensuring the principal of democracy and representativeness at the national level, while also extending it to the International level (GA/48/264, 20 July 1993, p. 48).

The gap in the literature discovered, and the one the paper intends to weave is found between the following components of a larger Venn diagram containing- the contributions to the field of the UNSC reform debate, the candidacy of aspiring permanent members, modern-

day stats set to boost the profile of these countries to permanency, and the inference that countries overwhelmingly wish expansion but can't draw consensus on how to go forward. Hence, the paper adds a feature of drawing the historical candidacy of India. Thus, on looking past contemporary stats of modern India, the thesis' primary aim is to address the gap in the Indian case for the privileged seat. The knowledge deficit that is addressed is within the methodological shortcoming of measuring India's candidacy, by only viewing the parameter of its contemporary stature, and not that of its historical participations and contributions that augment its curriculum vitae. A particular deficit that contains the historical argument for India's candidacy. Referring to the country's integral role as a leader of the 'Third World', and New Delhi's rejection of two permanent seat offers on the notion of the UNSC not being a true reflection or representative of the geo-politics of the time, and pushing forward China's seat instead. As a matter of irony, and a factor inspiring this research, is the fact that India today pushes for a permanent seat on the same grounds that it used to promote the People's Republic of China's (PRC) place on the table. Referring to the notion of 'representation'.

The paper admits that the procedure of reformation is a close to improbable, due to the structural framework of the organization and the overpowering interests of the P5, which Paul Kennedy describes as the "the Catch 22" of the charter reform (Kennedy, 2004). Nevertheless, while the probability of the UNSC reformation lingers close to zero, the UN organ's considerable formal authority in the realms of war and peace has made increasing representation within the council of paramount importance that needs to be readdressed and re-examined, in hopes of hastening the process (Albright & Gambari, 2015).

Therefore, as a provisional conclusion, the paper expects the Indian case study lens adding a historical component to the contemporary résumé of the G4 member, due to the country's prominent past as an advocate of the 'Third World' in its constant engagement within the UN system and its declining the two permanent seat offers during the Cold War. And in the expectant fulfillment of harnessing a historical arsenal for India's candidature, the paper would recommend a similar analysis of the other G4, or arguably worthy members.

Methodology

As the thesis makes use of an Indian case study through two of its prominent leaders- Jawaharlal Nehru and Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit-, to define the larger point about representation increase in the United Nations Security Council permanent membership, the research design will possess a qualitative foundation. A foundation including the documentary analysis of *the Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, as Nehru the then Foreign Minister's engagements in the UN System and his actions of steering India's narrative of standing up for 'One World'. It will also include his books 'The Discovery of India' and 'Glimpses of World History' to describe his thought processes, and construct how he conducted Indian Foreign Policy to explain actions such as the rejection of the UNSC permanent seat. There will also be an initial emphasis in his stint at Ahmednagar Fort and his letters encapsulated to his family and fellow-political counterparts, as this period is labelled a time of great self-reflection and intellectual experimentation. With the period being cited a great source of Nehru's high quality works which are deemed credible in academia due to him being a 'Class-A' prisoner, that provided the benefits to access to books and news outside the boundaries of the prison on command. Regarding 'Nehruvianism', which is defined later in this paper, to work within the functional and acceptable word limit, we will use the conclusion of Davis and Thakur (2016) to postulate the success the ideology as a whole outside the borders of India. On conceding this source limitation, the merit of this approach is to keep the thesis focused on the research by highlighting and not delving into intricacies of unquantifiable and ideational victories.

This is then supplemented by the recorded foreign interactions and archived letters to and from Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, who was the face of Indian diplomacy and garnered a reputation of not only being a great orator, but of having the ability to convince the world to join India's cause and combat its plight. With illustrations of how she connected, not only with the people belonging to the metropole, but with that of the periphery as well while travelling the US, her presence in San Francisco and her powerful relationships with other known personalities. To support this, the thesis will also use news media articles and historical narratives from respected academics and historically archived newspaper sources such as- the New York Times, Washington Post, The Hindu and Times of India-, that define her engagements abroad to create a sense of the atmosphere and the events that transpired. The news agencies cited, of an American and Indian variety, will allow us to escape any biasedness or propaganda that could taint our analysis, while also being accredited as trustworthy sources that have a wide variety of readership in the diplomatic and political spectrum.

The paper will then engage briefly with Modi's contemporary India, particularly the country's foreign policy and the scourge of desire for permanent that dominating national debate. The popular opinion in the nation will be deciphered from examining videos from primetime television and national daily newspapers. This will then be augmented by the academic thought on Indian foreign policy (by Indian and Western sources). Allowing us to juxtapose historical and contemporary India foreign policy, to assess whether there is a broader theme existent within Indian foreign policy discourse, or it is divided into mutually exclusive relics of the past and present.

Additionally, the thesis also concedes to potential weaknesses in the methodology. Firstly the periods under examination can be considered narrow, as it only includes India from 1940-1960 and the Modi era of 2014-present, especially when put in contrast to the longstanding debate given within India and beyond about expanding permanent membership. With the periods selected being a product of the desire for feasibility. Secondly, the source selection may also be labelled as dominated by Indian authors, regardless of them being part of scholarship, news articles, interviews and primary sources. However, the exclusion of other possible sources and outlets was a decision to keep the scope of the thesis measurable and achievable. The discourse might seem to only partly describe the rhetoric concerning the UNSC reformation debate and expansion, and will try its level best to mitigate the probability of unintentional false correlation and causation; thus, various sources will be used to corroborate the data under investigation. Another intentional omission in the research is regarding the inner workings of the UN, as the thesis is designed to explore exclusively the realm of 'representativeness', and not that of the institution's functional efficiency.

Therefore, to summarise, the thesis will analyse in sub-sections the case study of India via Nehru's and Vijaya's contributions, Indian Foreign Policy in action within the first few years of the advent of the UN, the UNSC permanent seat offers to India, Modi and the Subcontinent's current popular opinion and action to gain permanent status-, to validate and add to any pre-existing theory of the widely agreed on strength of the Indian candidacy profile. Then finally, extrapolating on the structural workings off the UNSC (present and past) that will be discussed as well, in order to reach a conclusion of whether it can become more 'representative'.

Literature Review

The Reformation Debate

According to the UN Charter, “the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security”, and as previously stated, the UNSC was founded in 1945, with a membership strength of 51, and 11 Council seats (UN Charter Articles 24 and 26). Thus, 22 percent of member states enjoyed council seats (Tharoor, 2012). Whereas today, the strength has increased to 193 members, with 15 on the council. It includes the P5 with veto capabilities, and 10 non-permanent members, which enjoy a tenure of two years each. The traditional non-permanent member regional distribution of seats being defined by the following guidelines for composition - 2 from Asia, 3 from Africa, 2 from Latin America, 1 from Eastern Europe and 2 from Western Europe and other regions (Baehr and Gordenker, 1999: 25; UN Charter Article 27). Hence, reducing the previously mentioned percentage to about 8 percent (Tharoor, 2012). Additionally, under the UN Charter, “all Member States are obligated to comply with Council decisions” (UN.org). In 1945, the representative of the United States highlighted that a few nations having the veto power, was integral to uphold international stability and is supported by the following section: “The great powers had every reason to exercise the requirement of unanimity for high and noble purposes, because they would not want again to expend millions in wealth and lives in another war” (United Nations Document 936, III/1/45, June 12, 1945).

In 1965, the UNSC underwent a round of expansion of an extra 4 non-permanent seats, and a wholesome expansion of members of the United Nations from 51 to 114. This expansion was said to address a more, “geographically equitable representation” gap (General Assembly Res. 1991; Weiss, 2003). With the General Assembly passing Resolution 47/62 to mark the end of the Cold War by signalling the need to providing seats to developing countries on the idea of, “sovereign equality to members of the United Nations” (General Assembly Res. 48/26, 29, U.N. Doc. A/RES/48/26). This was sparked a motion that signifies ‘representation’ becoming a key point of contention for revision and expansion.

Extrapolating from former Undersecretary General, Shashi Tharoor, the continents of South America and Africa do not enjoy a permanent representative, the P5 consists of predominantly Caucasian nations with the exception of China, and lacks coverage of religious diversity such as an Islamic representative (fastest growing religion in the world and currently forming 24% of the World’s population) are a few cracks or hurdles to actualize absolute representation (Tharoor, 2011 & 2012). Given these generalized shortcomings, one could

extrapolate hope for further expansion. However, the water gets murky from here, as this time it would include a question for permanent member status acquisition, which equates to dilution of P5 veto power that in some cases goes against their respective national interests, and an overwhelming support to overcome the primary obstacle to change.

This primary obstacle being the Amendment Procedure itself. It consists of two mechanisms- the Amendment Procedure (Art. 108) and the Review Procedure (Art. 109). Article 108 provides each permanent member the veto power that can overrule any motion of expansion or dilution of permanent membership, which virtually all of the other 186 member states criticize as inequitable (Weiss, 2003; Hoopes & Brinkley, 1997). With Bourantonis describing Article 108, as essentially the blocking element to any reform process (Bourantonis, 2005). Whereas the latter, Art, 109, foresaw a General Conference to be held 10 years after consolidating the GA Agenda, in 1955 (Ronzitti, 2010). Unfortunately, the timing made it impossible to organize such a conference as the Cold War was at its peak (Ronzitti, 2010, Schlichtmann, 2011). Pirozzi and Ronzitti explain this herculean task of amending the UN Charter, not only needing a two-thirds of the vote of the General Assembly (GA) or the Review Conference, but the green light by each member of the P5 (Pirozzi and Ronzitti, 2011; Gowan and Gordon, 2014). However, the permanent 5 cannot influence motions to the GA or Review Conference, they can halt adoptions of decisions via rejection or abstention (Aneke, 2012; Pirozzi and Ronzitti, 2011; Wouters and Ruys, 2005; Kennedy, 2004).

Following, Brain Valley's 'path dependent' method of evaluating the rigidity of the UNSC. The primary goal of the UNSC was to prevent the occurrence of another global conflict, and because it is perceived that this is achieved, the probability to revise the institution has decreased (Valley, 2015; Pierson, 2004). However, though this equilibrium is preferable to the ones in power, the nations left out initially will constantly try to reach a new equilibrium (Pierson, 2004). Therefore, Valley states that the incongruent reflection of 21st century international politics has effected the incentives and actions of each individual P5 member, in terms of nominating new permanent members, and displaying intention of reform to preserve their place on the table.

The issue of veto power is the main point that tilts the current UNSC to its existing structure, especially when matched-up with UN Charter reform process that is required (Luck, 2005, Valley, 2015, Pirozzi and Ronzitti, 2011; Gowan and Gordon, 2014). Hinting at the requirement of consent by each P5 member to change the status quo. Pierson, hence summarizes that, "Where the same set of actors who would lose influence as the result of an

institution reform must agree to any revision one would naturally expect a higher level of institutional resilience” (Pierson, 2004, p.146). Thus making the Veto a large contractor to the stagnancy of the organ due to the unwilling nature to dilute veto authority in the P5’s perspective (Luck, 2005, Ariyouk & Hoffman, 2005; Tharoor, 2011). Technically, the obstacle of the ‘veto’ can arguably be overcome by the alignment of interests of the P5 to those that desire reformation, but seems highly unlikely to be in the interest of the respective permanent staff.

In the experiences regarding the UNSC, discounting the 1965 expansion that was a result of African and Asian efforts in 1963, the institution has seen major reform drives by the introduction of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters (Global Policy Forum 1997; Luck, 2005). With Malaysian Diplomat and President of the GA Razali Ismail enlivening the debate yet again from 1996-1997, with the Razali Policy Paper (1993). This drive managed to draw together the P5 and two-thirds of the member states, but hopes were thwarted and blocked by the Non-Alignment Movement (NAM) due to the perceived threat of dismantling the movement’s cohesion (Gowan & Gordon, 2014; UN Charter Article 108; Draft Resolution A/61/L.69; Uniting for Consensus). Additionally, another such initiative was taken by Kofi Annan, on addressing the GA how he wants to overhaul this relic (UN Document SG/SM/8855, 8 September 2003; UN Document SG/SM/8891-GA/10157, 23 September 2003). Leading him to create the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (UN.org). Pushing forward two methods of reform- Model A and Model B, that establishes 6 extra seats without veto power, and therefore, expands the council to 24 members to speak more directly to the grievances of smaller states. (Luck, 2005; Hoffman & Ariyoruk, 2005; UN Document A/59/2005, 21 March 2005, 61, para. 170). This gave way for 4 likely and large aspirants, namely the G4 who catalyzed Model A into a new reform proposal that would a lot membership states in the following numbers- 2 to Africa, 2 to Asia, 1 to Latin America and the Caribbean, 1 to Western Europe and Other Groups, while adding 4 new permanent members (A More Secure World, 81, para. 251). With the right of veto only expanding to the new permanent seat holders after the framework of the review has decided to extend it (Luck, 2005; UN Document A/59/L.64, paras 5(b) and 7). This reignited and gave birth the Coffee Club or the United for Consensus (UfC). A diverse set of countries whose national interests are at risk, and argue the organ will become inefficient if their larger neighbors get the helm Pakistan (Opposes the Indian seat), Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Malta, Mexico, Republic of Korea, San

Marino, Spain, Turkey, and UfC's leadership- Italy. Magalhaes Barreto Silva in 'Spoiler of Reformer? The Uniting for Consensus group and UN Security Council reform' concludes that it can be said the UfC is a reform group and not just a bunch of 'angry neighbors' that are using 'delaying tactics' (Silva, 2014). Additionally, just because they oppose any reform from the G4, does not mean they are able to block it (ibid.). Therefore, for the functional scope of this paper we will not include the UfC's contestation, as India (or the G4) have bigger mountains to overcome, such as the ratification required from two-thirds (i.e. 127 states) of the participating member states of the General Assembly and the approval of the P5. And on overcoming these two hurdles, any of UfC's pleas will not affect the motion of the debate, as the group consists of 12, which is 54 short of nullifying a two-third GA majority.

Concerning the case study, Dabhade hypothesizes that India's (then including Bangladesh and Pakistan) interest in the Security Council can be traced back to Mahatma Gandhi, and under the Nehruvian reign, New Delhi characterized its approach as "whole-hearted cooperation" through full participation "in its councils to which her geographical position and contribution towards peaceful progress entitle her." (Murthy 2010). Whereas in the contemporary era, India's laments its status as a demographic juggernaut and nuclear power (The Hindu, 2012; Tharoor, 2012). Under Nehru from the 1940s to 1960s, the UNSC was vital to Indian interests because, as stated by George because- it indicated India's aspirations of leading the emerging world, to embody a symbol of pluralist religious and linguistic state, and provide bureaucratic experience to the Indian Civil Servants (George, 2016; Nehru, 1946). In Nehru's mind, the UN mechanism was central in projecting India as an internationalist modern-state, which would also fulfill the dual purpose of combatting injustices (Such as the prevalence of Apartheid in South Africa) and subject domestic happenings to international judgements and scrutiny (Roy,2011; George, 2016). Thus, in his opinion, fostering global stability.

Indian diplomatic efforts to become a permanent member can be traced to 1979, when India's ambassador to the UN, Brajesh Mishra submitted a draft to increase non-permanent membership from 10 to 14 (Dabhade, 2017). Leading to India's increased efforts culminating in a number of countries pushing for the adoption of General Assembly Resolution A/RES/47/62 in the agenda of September 1992. However, the Indian experience at the UN and UNSC was rather disappointing after Nehru claimed Pakistani aggression under Article 35 in the Kashmir dispute (Bhagavan, 2011; Gorman, 2017). Nehru and Vijaya were both Kashmiri natives. With Nehru believing that a Muslim-Majority Kashmir an undisputed validation the India's secular nature and the personal bias as stated by Bhagavan, of Nehru not being able to

imagine an India without his home region (Bhagavan, 2011). Unfortunately for the PM of India, the UNSC verdict went in favor of Pakistan. Persuading India to recourse its dispute on the grounds of it being a sovereign matter, which did not play well as it aligned itself with the colonial powers' line of argument of colonial administration and retention, while New Delhi already juggling the issues of the responsibility of independence and partition (Cohen, 2001; Gorman, 2017). In the midst of this, India was offered permanent status by the Americans and the Soviets, but turned them down due to strategic and ideational reasons as will be discussed later (Harder, 2015).

New Delhi, so far, has served as a temporary member from 1950–1951, 1967–1968, 1972–1973, 1977–1978, 1984–1985, 1991–1992, and 2011–2012, and with the Ministry of External Affairs of India dubbing India's permanent seat candidature as 'legitimate' (Permanent Mission of India to the UN Website). With the UNSC permanent status pre-occupying Indian foreign policy, given India's belief that fulfilling this objective would reaffirm its international stature. Reaffirming this notion is Prime Minister Modi pressing Secretary General Ban-Ki Moon to make the body more representative (The Indian Express, 2015). Modi words have been also been accompanied by actions, by making countries aware or reminding them of the contributions India has made to "global order and desires to sustain international peace and security" (George, 2016). Evidence of this is Modi expressing in France, Germany and Canada, the contribution of Indian personnel in both World Wars (Modi pays homage at war memorial for Indians in France: India Today 2015, Pant, 2015). Attempting to bolster bilateral relations to solidify India's posture and showcase its willingness to global responsibilities, such as- climate change and increased engagement in multilateral organizations like the G4 and L69 (Narlikar, 2013; The Hindu 2015). Stuenkel claims that India has adopted a multi-layered strategy of 'revision integration' that intends to maximize UNGA support and minimize UNSC resistance (Stuenkel, 2010). Attempting to achieve this goal by demonstrating leadership in forums of the Global South (g77, NAM, BRICS- Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) to sway many members in the UNGA. It also seeks to create a rapport with P5 members- including the nuclear deal with the US in 2005, reiterating historical relations with Russia, and initiating rapprochement with China- that will reduce the resistance in UNSC (Stuenkel, 2010; pg. 59). The last being highly significant, because of China's insecurities in the event of inclusion of India and Japan, which would curtail its regional ambitions (Freiesleben, 2008). Henceforth, also in the event of the interests of veto wielding powers aligning to the benefits of expansion, say in the form of increase legitimacy of the institution in

the eyes of the international community, a single-permanent member could preserve the status quo. Leading many to believe the UNSC's reformation is insurmountable due to the requirement of fulfillment of two clauses-, the amendment procedure and having the veto powers go in favor of changing the status quo that will dilute their power in the international security sphere. As Cristol summarizes that states only support the motion for reformation as it aligns with national interest or because they believe it will not ever happen (Cristol, 2015). Designing a situation where the permanent members that wish to maintain the status quo ride on the principle that proponents for reform will not agree on the reform proposal to be implemented (Cox, 2009; Luck, 2005). This unwillingness is also illustrated by P5 heads of state, such as- Obama (back in 2014) and Putin, constantly expressing wholehearted support for expansion to include India, but amalgamating to nothing according to the Indian Foreign Secretary, S. Jaishankar even in 2015. Leading to it becoming a norm in reformation debate to put forward propositions and highlight inequity, tantamount to hollow-goodwill.

Furthermore, Mukherjee and Malone (2013) believe there are three fundamental challenges to the Indian aspiration. Them being- lack of the Indian Government's resources for multilateral high-level diplomacy, limited interaction with the normative aspects of various issues raised in the UNSC, and "over-reliance on entitlement as the bedrock of India's claims to permanent membership, at the cost of more hard-nosed realpolitik bargaining in the UN" (Dabhade, 2017, Mukherjee & Malone, 2013). And by jumping into bed with the G4 and limiting its ability of negotiation, India has constrained itself to only being able to acquire permanent membership if the other members of the group obtain it as well (Paul & Nahory, 2015; Baru, 2015). And this is discounting the fact that the status quo maintaining amendment procedure, as mentioned above.

Theoretical Concepts Pertaining to the Case Study

One world

“When you fly around the world in 49 days, you learn that the world has become small not only on the map, but also in the minds of men.” (Willkie, 1943)

American Liberal Republican, Wendell Willkie, on completing his 49-day journey across the world published a book in April 1943 titled, “One World”. It pioneered the beginning of the World Federalist Movement, with notable participants such as-Albert Einstein, Mahatma Gandhi, Madame Pandit and Jawaharlal Nehru. The latter two, especially Nehru, experiencing a profound alignment in belief with the author.

Willkie’s survey of the world had a humanistic demeanor, with his work demanding the end of American ally’s- Great Britain’s colonial territories, along with that of Spain, Belgium, Dutch, Portuguese and French (Willkie, 1943). It pushed forward the following ideas too:-

- The accepting and promotion of economic and political cooperation,
- Stabilization of foreign policy, and
- Battling racist and bigoted societal structures in each individual’s home country (Willkie, 1943).

He and the other believers of this line of thought believed in promoting supranational democratic institutions, which is argued to have sown the seeds of the United Nations System and the post war international order, while also propounding the extension of the Atlantic Charter beyond Europe’s demarcated borders. The latter interest in this extension and inclusion of the non-European world was induced by the dichotomy he witnessed at home, referring to divisive character of American society that had racial and Anti-Semitic underpinnings while that very society hypocritically claimed to stand by the values propagated by the Atlantic Charter. Therefore, culminating in a form of ‘World Government’ that it is to be built on a plan for world peace, which he argued the world was ready for (Willkie, 1943).

Nehruvianism

Stemming from Nehru’s thought processes, is the concept of Nehruvianism. It’s a concept based on the Westphalian nation of nation state and order, where the former pursues its interests with vigor and are solely responsible for self-preservation (Krishna, 1984). In addition to that, another realm existed within it, where states transcend individuals’ pursuits for the common good in an anarchic world with the ground rules of respecting territorial sovereignty,

non-aggression, non-interference and internal affairs, economic and racial equality, and peaceful co-existence (Bajpai, 2003; Nehru, 1945; Krishna, 1984).

As Bajpai (2003) describes it, the concept has four key components:-

- a. *Rejection of siding with a superpower during the Cold War*- Nehru emphasizes that rejecting bloc membership was not equivalent to neutrality. He insisted on the notion of freedom to strategic choice, as per the circumstance the non-aligned country finds itself in (Bajpai, 2003) .This would support any given power on a particular issue, hence providing them with the right to choose (Krishna, 1984; Nehru, 1948).
- b. *Utility of international institutions and rules*- Due to the ability of strong states to unfairly influence world affairs, Nehruvians admitted to a balance of power element to non-alignment, where weak states can huddle up to create collective resistance to a great power (Krishna, 1984; Nehru, 1948; Bajpai,2003).
- c. *The Weak allying with the strong*- extrapolating the balance of power element, Nehruvians believed that though a ‘Third World coalition’ would still be overwhelmed by a great power in terms of influence, this team-up would provide individual weaker nations the impetus to maintain autonomous foreign policy.
- d. *Mediation*- the non-aligned countries which were insulated from bloc selection would play the decisive role of mediating between the two superpowers (Krishna, 1984; Bajpai, 2003)

As early as 1947, Nehru stated the difference between neutrality and non-alignment. Though he conceded that not attaching itself to any bloc would be a difficult task, but would not allow India to enter any war if he could help it and allow the pushing of agenda from the South in the United Nations (Allison, 1998).

As mentioned before, to measure the success or failures of this ideology, we will use Davis and Thakur (2016), which contests the approach of most studies on Nehruvian Indian Foreign Policy, especially Bajpai (2009) and Mallavarapu (2009), that tend to paint it as lacking ‘theoretical or descriptive richness’, and also being highly critical towards Nehru’s supposed ‘moralistic rants’ with Nehruvianism being labelled ‘abnormal’ and ‘non-existent’ (Davis & Thakur, 2016; Pant, 2009; Ganguly, 2004; Paul & Nayar, 2004). They further state that there is also the over-emphasis on the ideology while studying Indian Foreign Policy (Davis & Thakur, 2016). In their paper “Walking the Thin Line: India's Anti-Racist Diplomatic Practice in South Africa, Canada, and Australia, 1946-55”, they breakdown Indian Foreign policy as a

post-colonial practice, with varying degrees of success in South Africa, Canada and Australia, while advancing their national interests of removing racial discriminatory practices within the confines of international relations and the UN system (Davis & Thakur, 2016).

Breaking Free

(Case study: Nehru's and Madame Pandit's Historical contributions, and India's Contemporary Experiences)

On 15th August 1947, India was declared an independent country with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru announcing the nation's "*Tryst with Desitiny- a moment which comes but rarely in history, when we pass from the old to the new, when an age ends and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed finds utterance*" (Nehru on the night of Indian Independence, 1947 cited in Tharoor, 2012).

Unlike countries like Singapore, vast majority of former colonies took a socialist route on gaining liberation that was possibly a bi-product of the 'freedom fighters' that soon to be heads of state and ministers having an education in the metropole and being influenced by socialist ideology, the COMINTERN etc. (Tharoor, 2001, Bradley, 2010 ; Imlay, 2013). Therefore, we will study the role of two members of the Nehru family that were prominent to Indian independence and later, in maintaining the domestic and foreign policies of the sub-continent.

Thus, before the commencement of the core content of this chapter, its relevance has to be highlighted to prevent the interpretation of a disconnected leap. As mentioned before, India has been offered permanent membership twice, and has rejected it both at both instances, which makes its history unlike that of other candidates. To decipher this rationale of rejection, and later India's voice for a seat in the 21st century under the Modi Government, we will analyze Nehru's character and the foreign policy that sprung from him. We will also delve in Vijaya Lakshmi contribution to Indian cause inside, and at instance outside the UN system. By studying both their personal interactions and the contribution in the development of India's vital role in the UN system, we will attempt to draw the first steps of India's Historical profile within the organization. A provisionally hypothesized image of India being an ever-engaging diplomatically engaging country that gained independence from colonization, represented the 'Third World' and pioneered non-alignment under Nehru, and was offered the seat (in 1950 and 1955) that it is so obsessively chases in the 21st century.

Jawaharlal Nehru

“there is no more place for imperialism within their society than in them in creating a new society, global in scope, free alike of the economic injustices of the West and the political malpractices of the East” (Wendell Willkie’s speech, 1942)

Nehru firmly believed that foreign policy should emanate national values. Values that were derived from his experiences, Hindu texts and Buddhist precepts. During his stint in Ahmednagar Fort Prison, Willkie’s messages struck a chord with Nehru’s ideals in 1943 when the printed version of “One World” reached his cellar. Subsequently, he included this principle of ‘One World’ in his book, ‘The Discovery of India’ that he completed in 1946 along with his sentence. As Bhagavan claims, the idea of One World, caught the imagination of India’s First Prime Minister that permitted its infusion into the Quit India Resolution (Bhagavan, 2013). Other signs of impact were showcased when Nehru advocated for ‘One World’ in 1946 as the head of the Interim Government and articulating his disdain for power politics on The USA’s proposal of ‘Indian Monroe Doctrine’ (Tharoor, 2003).

Nehru was from Kashmir, schooled at Harrow’s and graduating from Cambridge. His ideas were a bi-product of his time and upbringing, a firm believer in socialism injected with a dose of idealism that possibly arose from his frequent participation in Fabian societies at school (Tharoor, 2003; Nehru, 1946). Having escaped from the mindset of wanting to be free from the view he held of India when he was still just a teen, sparked in him a desire to learn about the makings and undoings of India. This made him learn and concede his absolute truth that India was in his blood, but his discovery of it would be as a friendly-westerner as he only came to realize it via the West (Nehru, 1963). In his book, Nehru concedes the shame and pride for his homeland, with the former germinating from the prevalent practices of “superstitious practices and outworn ideas” and their status of being colonized subjects that were neck-deep in poverty (Nehru, 1963).

Critics of him argue that he had a tendency of romanticizing the struggle for justice invigorated by the masses, which was a mindset he gained from his imperial travels, which was later complemented by Gandhi’s notion of “self-reliance”. Nehru is popularly characterized by his critics to have a mind shaped towards a future of intimate international cooperation in the realms of economics, politics and culture. Like many leaders from the colonies, he observed the hypocrisy of the parentalistic view the metropole had over overseas territories, and believed how in the name of ‘enlightenment’, lives were being washed away or disregarded in the

periphery. Therefore, while serving as Prime Minister and Foreign Minister from 1947-1964, many critics argue that Nehru imported his overt idealistic, socialist and secular tendencies to diplomatic tables and negotiations. Further accusations include his foreign ministership to be the root cause of India's current absence as a UNSC permanent member. Though he denied it at the time, the Soviet offer in 1955 is a well-documented affair, which still dominates Indian media debates which highlights India's surviving ambition even in the second decade of 21st century (The Hindu: *This Day That Age*, 2005; Harder, 2015).

Due to Nehru's position in these two ranks, his personality can be argued to have impacted, or straight-up dictated, Indian foreign policy. Making it essential to study his character, and personality peeves, with Ahmednagar Fort from 1942-1946 being a decisive period of intimate self-reflection and intellectual experimentation as he insisted on not being consumed by the thoughts induced by the limited environment of prisons and its routines. Thus utilizing his time in Ahmednagar to acquaint himself with India's history that led him to write his book- *The Discovery of India*. A major component of the of his book was the traced out development of the idea that distrusted Western Capital, which can be argued to have taken him down a path of forging foreign policy on the basis of national values that were, as mentioned above, derived from the ethics of Hinduism and Buddhism (Tharoor, 2003). Over the course of Nehru's imprisonment, halfway across the world, another book of significant impact on his life had was printed and destined to reach Ahmednagar. Referring to Wendell Willkie's- "One World", which also included many of his previous speeches, grasped Nehru's imagination as observed in Nehru's work to propagate the concept of "One World" in 1946. (Bhagavan, 2013).

Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit

Nehruvian ideals seemed to be uniform across the family, with Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Jawaharlal's sister, who was pre-independent India's first woman cabin minister and was popularly known as 'Nan' for her dominant role in freedom movement of the sub-continent (Bhagavan, 2013). Leaving all her professional duties, the second called for *Satyagraha* (Gandhi's policy of passive resistance) and *Swaraj* (Independence or self-Governance for India).

Vijaya served 3 years for her political activism against British rule, with her final term coinciding with that of her daughter, Naini. She later served more prestigious terms as the first Indian to lead the UN delegation in 1945, and also the India-UN delegation while her brother was in the highest office on the land from 1947-1964. Her other stints included being the first

woman Asian president of the UNGA in 1953, and the strategically placed Ambassadorship of the India to the Soviet Union. She used all 4 periods of to promote international dialogue in polarized world where colonies were trying to make their voices heard which allowed her to rapidly catapult her reputation as the face of Indian diplomacy (Bhagavan, 2013, Rana, 1970).

Her rise to become somewhat of a 'diplomatic celebrity' garnered support while she journeyed the US in December 1944 on the Indian National Congress's ploy to send a spokesperson to capitalize on the post-WW2 situation. Her nationalism aimed her to, "acquaint the American people with the true state of affairs "of famine experiencing India and nullify the effects of anti-Indian and pro-British propaganda endorsed by the war strained British Government. (Bakshi, 1993: pg 145; Nehru, 1946). As Bakshi (1993) succinctly summarizes, that Americans believed India was a hot pot of snake charmers and astrologers that lived on tress, who were loyal natives to the British. With the British trying to keep the peace amongst the savages that would tear each other apart, and that Gandhians and the Indian Congress were agents of Japan with the latter being a wolf dressed in 'fascist Hindu Capitalist' clothing that wanted to plant a Hindu bureaucratic state (Bakshi, 1993; Weigold, 2010). Her public addresses, dinner engagements, radio approaches and off-record debates spread her popularity amongst the Indian elite and American sympathizers, while re-instating the Indian desire for popular democratic governance, and not a 'fascist Hindu state' (Bhagavan, 2013). In the American environment, she won many friends in the American political classes, and the Indian Lobby in the country that is said to have positioned her into representing the Indian National Congress in the United Nations Conference on International Organizations (UNCIO) (Laut, 2018). This development was preceded by American popular opinion stirring trouble for Churchill's ambition and the failure of American based British propaganda of maintain a grip on The Jewel in The Crown- India (Sherwood, 1996). This was with good reason, as Roosevelt's sympathies and that of the American masses lay with the Indian cause, therefore creating an awkward wedge of contention in the Anglo-American relationship. Back in India, swaying the United States 'to its favor was deemed essential due to the looming threat of Japan in the east (Bhagavan, 2013; Dulles & Ridlinger, 1955). Vijaya contributed to the capitalization of this opportunity, by empathizing with the concerns of the US progressives that drew a parallel with the interests of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Equating India's plight to that of the large struggle, in the US and the world, for racial justice (Bhagavan, 2013). In one instance, Vijaya led a passionate verbal attack against Churchill and the latter's defense of the old order that reflected India's belief systems, ideological

underpinnings and its natural goodwill it had for post-colonial non-western oppressed nations (Bhagavan, 2013).

Vijaya Lakshmi embodied the periphery and India's belief of postwar moral leadership with her arguments to end colonial rule and discrimination. Adding to her celebrity status was the increasing media attention claiming she engendered the future tense of post-colonial India that attracted the Western observer's orientalist gaze which was fascinated with this "diminutive, silvery-haired woman", dressed always in a sari, who could speak with such force as she "Twist[ed] the Tail of the British Lion", as described by William Moore in the Chicago Daily Tribune (Laut, 2018; Moore, 1945).

In San Francisco in 1945, Khipple describes her presence as, "With such puppets representing India at San Francisco people were naturally disappointed and did not expect much from the Conference, so far as India's interest was concerned. The only ray of hope was the presence of Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit in America" (Khipple, 1946: p. 79). Painting the picture of a one-woman army, and her unremitting energy that ensured a 'floodlight of publicity for Indian claims' whilst the audience were anxious about formation of polices that were to shape their future (Times of India, 1947 cited in Laut 2018). India, then still a colony, caused uproar by marking inconsistencies in UN membership, as various dependent states (including India) were joining an organization meant for sovereign nations (Laut, 2018). Furthermore, there were many present at the conference which were dissatisfied by the incapability and undesired priority of addressing the griefs of racial subjugation and imperial rule (Sherwood, 1996). Matters got worse when the new Trusteeship Council adopted a similar framework of the Mandate system installed by the League of Nations that Mark Mazower points out to be European reassertion on their South-East Asian possessions in San Francisco, and the Americans saving their dwindling relation with Western Europe (Mazower, 2009). This anti-colonial grievance also marked the perfect set for Vijaya Lakshmi to enter 'World Diplomacy', that allowed her to align India's, and the World's, goals (Laut, 2018). Goals that described Indian assertions that India embodied "the pivot of the whole system of imperialism and colonialism" (Moore, 1945). And dubbing India's fate to be an "acid test" of the ideals laid down in the UN Charter, and voicing Gandhi's views that "The freedom of India will demonstrate to all the exploited races of the earth that their freedom is very near and that in no case will they henceforth be exploited" (New York Times, 1945). Pandit's theme of argument consistently followed the exposition of international hypocrisy and the parallels of Indian and Global goals, eventually propelling her into the favor and attention of a wide array of observers.

Vijaya's family's political lineage, charismatic self-representation, devotion to Gandhinism and Anglophonic education, had groomed her to be seen as an "educated, 'modern,' new woman" early twentieth century Indian nationalism desired (New York Times, 1945). Making observers, belonging from the East or West, identify her to be "the Woman who swayed America" that was the living persona of the East meeting the West (Khipple, 1949; p. 149). Laut mentioned this to be the factor that allowed many in the West to approach her as a "British subject", rather than an "Indian" (Laut, 2018). That, as Bakshi comments, also presented a window of opportunity to insert Nehruvian Non-Alignment in the divide between Soviets and the West during the Cold War (Bakshi, 1993). Therefore, from the endowment of birth into the Nehru family, to her three imprisonment terms and her skills of oratory, Vijaya was to become the personification of Modern India, its iron woman of Indian diplomacy, 'the First Lady of India', and earning her the nickname- Madame Pandit (Laut, 2018; Haynes, 1945).

India looking in the Mirror and the Cold War Offers

"Fifty years after independence, and almost a decade after the Cold War, Nehruvian internationalism continues to inform Indian thinking about the nature of war, peace and international order"

-Jaswant Singh in *Defending India* (1999)

Dixit claims, India's foreign policy originates from a time pre-independence, with its roots in the thought processes of the leaders of the subcontinent's renaissance in the first 4 decades of the 20th century (Dixit, 2003). Therefore, when India was structuring its unique geopolitical identity right after liberation, Jawaharlal (Then Foreign Minister) and Vijaya (Indian Ambassador to the US and its prime diplomat) steered the course of the country's foreign policy. This was rooted in a belief of instinctive antagonism, mutual in the Siblings, that prevailed amongst many former oppressed peoples which stood up to any form of White domination. This was supplemented by Nehru's idea, which reduced European power struggles to a cycle of cataclysmic wars that repeatedly failed humanity (Roy, 2018; Dixit, 2003). Further hastened by the siblings' observing an inability of the Western powers to cooperate in the Cold war, even after witnessing the world tattered by WWII.

Thus, around the time of the formation of the P5 and their veto capabilities, Asaf Ali (Indian Freedom fighter and the first ambassador of India to the United States; 1888-1953), deciphered that India was not going to be a part of a tug of war between the two superpowers.

Ali had stated that India's people and bureaucracy believed that India had a vital role to play in the world, both in the spheres of morality and material (Ali, 1948). With a population 400 million in 1945, which consisted of 1/5th of humanity, India would be seen as a worthy ally in stabilizing the East and a prime example if it takes off economically (Ali, 1948). A similar line of argument prompted Nehru, and in time Vijaya, to submit to the 'veto' proposal, which was to give five nations the helm of global security decision-making. This initially caused a clash of opinion between the siblings regarding the 'constitutional monstrosity' of veto that resembled to the Vijaya a future where equality, freedom and justice are excluded (Roy, 2018; Morgenthau; 2012). Later, she came around and conformed to her brother's view out of a sense of necessity, as even Nehru believed this to be an undesirable characteristic, but an indispensable one due to the realities of the world (Roy, 2018; Nehru's note to the Indian Foreign Secretary in 1946). With Pandit later announcing, "I would prefer myself to look upon the so-called veto in a positive way and as the necessary device for securing that vital decision by the great powers rest on unanimity" (cited in Reddy, 1968).

Additionally, during the Cold War, Nehru drove home his views in his letters in 1960 that expressed his discontentment with the dangerous state of the World by highlighting the rift between the Communist (including the People's Republic of China) and Western Nations, basic interpretations and attitudes of the West towards the PRC (People's Republic of China), Indo-Chinese disagreements, and the grievance stemming from Africa in regards to colonialism (Nehru to Chief Ministers on 23rd Oct, 1960). Thus equating 'great power discord' to wars, and viewing the UN as the only mechanism to avoid another catastrophic war (Roy, 2018). Within this era, India saw an exacerbation of block relations during its diplomatic role in the Korean War. With Vijaya's letters to her brother stating widespread hysteria in Washington, with Acheson hinting at the use of the Atom bomb given the worries stemming from the deep bond between the communist nations-Soviet Union and the PRC (Sahgal, 2010). Leading Nehru to promote a PRC permanent seat, as will be discussed shortly.

Many scholars extrapolate from the above-mentioned sampled history, such as Noorani (2002), Dixit (2003), Harder (2015) and Tharoor (2003), argue that India was not familiar with the harsh realities of international relations. And that it rode on the notion of self-righteousness, which from the *Discovery of India* and *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, can be described a philosophical conviction produced by the Prime Minister himself. Hence, the undercurrents of India's prime intellectual elite, including the siblings, expressed a belief that foreign relations should "contribute to peace, stability, and well-being of the international community; had to be

responsive to the profound aspirations of common people all over the world” (Dixit,2003, pg 15). Dixit continues, that this belief was reinforced by the recent memories of the British Raj and “the bloodshed witnessed by partition” which caused a reinforcement of democratic ideals in India, and the re-merging nations of Asia and Africa that wanted to their strategic autonomy free of Cold war bickering (Dixit, 2013). Therefore, to ease the Cold War pressure of picking, Indian leadership formed the notion of ‘non-alignment’, which minimized external diplomatic strain.

This idealistic stance of India was received differently by the two blocs, as Truman and Stalin vied for more allies and strategic partners. The Western bloc, led by the US was irritated by India’s seemingly low-resolution indefinite decision of not straddling one of the clearly available paths, and that New Delhi was “blind to the perils of communist imperialism” (cited by anonymous in Middle East Journal, 1955 vol. 9). The Americans initially believed India should have propensities of a Western kind, because of the British styled parliamentary democratic system and the USA’s involvement in India’s independence struggle (Dixit, 2003). Whereas, Stalin’s Soviet Union formed an early opinion that India’s independence was a ‘sham’, and that the Nehrus along with Gandhi, were counter-revolutionary agents of the bourgeoisie (Ray, 1969). Ideologically interpreting, the anti-colonial Indian struggle as a bourgeoisie ploy in the guise of fulfilling the hopes of the Indian masses.

Nevertheless, in the Cold War context, both power blocs viewed India as a resourceful strategic partner in the Third World periphery. Not only due to its widely agreed upon leadership of the formerly oppressed peoples, extrapolating from McMahon, but also India’s inability to meet its development aspirations could deal a crushing blow to either Cold War ideologies (McMahon, 1996). This is because the Americans, with as far back as the Eisenhower administration, feared the non-fulfillment of India growth ambitions leading to a communist upsurge within the subcontinent and contributing to the PRC’s communist model (McMahon, 1996). All the while the Soviet Union began to become a source of aid and trade for India, which was winning it incrementally increasing influence.

Strike 1- The 1950 Washington Offer

The Korean War was in full swing, when in September, New Delhi ‘allegedly’ received an offer for permanent membership by the United States. ‘Alleged’ because, as opposed to the Soviet offer, this one is not well documented, and the date of the proposal is contested, such as

Tharoor citing it to be 1953 (Tharoor, 2003; The Hindu; 2005; Vijapurkar, 2004). Nevertheless, History informs us that Nehru rejected the offer (Roy, 2018; Tharoor, 2003; Harder, 2015 and 2018). The geo-political dynamics of the time that prompted Washington to offer New Delhi a seat was to unseat the PRC (Noorani, 2002). Harder (2015) concedes that Nehru does not record the context of this offer, but uses the correspondences of Vijaya that describe the US State department as “unseating of China as a permanent member in the Security Council and India being put in her place” (Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit to Jawaharlal Nehru, 24 August 1950 in Private Papers of Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit).

Before the offer, on 30th August 1950, Nehru writes to Vijaya that accepting the offer would “mean some kind of a break between us and China” and though he personally believed in the Indian candidature, India would not do it at the cost of China as it would culminate in a geopolitical catastrophe (Jawaharlal Nehru to Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, 30 August, 1950). Therefore, New Delhi pushed for a Beijing occupied seat instead, and Nehru wrote a letter to the US State Department expressing his concerns regarding a potential wedge between India and the PRC (ibid). Vijaya was in agreement, as she viewed this tactic a catalyst for the delegitimization of the UN that would create a domino effect of USSR and other countries opting to exit it (Harder, 2015). Hence, creating the world ripe for conflict yet again.

From 20/20 hindsight, given the Korean War and the spread of the Cold War across Asia, India was imagined as a democratic country-sharing border with the communist PRC that would naturally be expected to cooperate with the US. However, as mentioned earlier, one of the factors where Washington expected India’s cooperation was the British installed parliamentary system, and Nehru’s international campaign against ‘communist tactics’ (Harder, 2015 and 2018). Concluding that an India aligned with Washington would prevent a communist dominated UNSC (with the Soviet Union and the PRC) due to India’s non-aligned democratic regime, and instead form a democracy oriented council that could sway the international security sphere to the West’s favor (Lie, 1954; George, 2016).

The two siblings believed that the Cold War distribution of power left no room to maneuver and pursue national autonomy, but escaping this tug-of-war was of paramount importance as they feared the bi-polar choice would lead the former colonies to inadvertently enter neo-colonial relationships with far more powerful metropolises (Nehru, 1948; Selected works of Jawaharlal Nehru). Exacerbating this situation was the advent of nuclear weapons, which assured grave destruction, further, pushing nations to choose a side (Bajpai, 2003). It would, as Nehru feared, squander precious resources that were need to resolve economic

backwardness which Krishna claims to be a foundational element to the Nehruvian notion of 'non-alignment' (Krishna, 1984). Simultaneously in Washington, Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles relegated Nehru's strategy as highly counter-intuitive, as they expected it to side with the West due to India's requirements for defense, technology and economic assistance, and its democratic colonial connection to Britain (Dixit, 2003). Washington held a distaste for non-alignment, as Dulles concludes it to be a "blunt expression of general sentiment", and that "Neutrality between good and evil, is itself evil". (Tharoor, 2011). Meanwhile, Stalin's bloc characterized the relationship with India through an ideological lens created by the President, Molotov and Vishinsky. Soviet strategy dictated the undermining of bilateral relations due to India's intellectual background regarded to possess a colonial mentality. Therefore, even though the USA's relations with India faded, the Soviet's did not budge their indifference or attempt to foster a deeper link. Nonetheless, non-alignment's aim of keeping away from the bipolar tug-of-war, eventually allowed India to chart an independent course regardless of its disproportionate exercise of influence in international relations based on international trust of its non-partisan status to commit to the UN objectives (Dixit, 2003; Tharoor, 2011, Roy, 2018).

Despite that, New Delhi rejected the offer due to additional concerns pertaining to portrayal of multilateral and hypocritical strategic positions on the international arena. As India's leading role in the Non-Alignment Movement and 'Third Worldism', would spell betrayal in the hearts of much of the subcontinent's allies if New Delhi accepted the dethronement of Beijing through UNSC ascendancy. Hence, Nehru maintained his stance of epitomizing global stability to national ambitions, while attempting to preserve Indian bilateral (with China) and multi-lateral relations. Further, allowing Nehru to avoid any misinterpreted swing to America in Soviet eyes on accepting the offer (Noorani, 2002).

Although this decision led to mutual admiration for India by both blocs, India's anti-imperial stance swerved it a bit towards the Soviets and the eastern nations due to India voting against the resolution in the Korean War that would have handed America full command of UN forces in the Korean Peninsula (Harder, 2015). With Truman expressing discontentment with India, and claiming it 'holding aloof' democratic nations in pursuit of a neutral foreign policy (Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit to Jawaharlal Nehru, 29 June, 1950).

Summarizing, given India's non-aligned stance and Anglo-saxon interests to minimize communist influence on the Council, the Americans wished to win an ally in the form of India that would surely aggravate Indo-Sino relations. Simultaneously, though India supported the Kuomintang regime and the Chinese revolution, a gap emerged in the bilateral relations of the

two Asian giants (Dixit, 2003). With the US trying to take advantage of ongoing occurrences such as the PRC making moves to reclaim Tibet and Chinese maps portraying certain Indian territories as its own (Dixit, 2003). With Nehruvian critics arguing that “it was one thing to fulminate against Great Power machinations, another to run a national foreign policy with little regard to the imperatives of power or the need for a country to bargain from a position of strength” (Tharoor, 2017). Further stating that Nehru’s pride of his disdain for power politics and pushing forward his great virtues on the global diplomatic stage are what is argued to have cost India the seat in the first place, with the idea of “One World” stepping in the way of India’s dreams.

Strike 2- 1955 and the Soviet Offer

According to Stalin’s views about non-alignment, especially given its Chinese Communist ally’s interests, one would tend to conclude that an offer from the Soviet bloc to the subcontinent was inconsistent with soviet sentiment. However, as the Cold war started gaining momentum in the 1950s, the Soviets’ perception of ‘non-alignment’ and ‘neutrality’ shifted. It viewed non-alignment as an instrument of transition to the world diplomatic stage that would eventually create a ‘socialist system of states’ (Allison,1988; Croan, 1990). Soviet officials viewed it as verbal jargon for short-term military and political denial of the West, hence opening the Third World’s pockets of opportunity for a deeper relationship with the Soviets (Allison,1988).

The Soviet offer to India in 1955, was under the pretext of the marked absence of China and India in the Four Power Agenda. Noorani quotes the offer from Bulganin- “While we are discussing the general international situation and reducing tension, we propose suggesting at a later stage India's inclusion as the sixth member of the Security Council” (Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru; Harder, 2018; Noorani, 2002). Nehru apparently responded by bringing up the previous attempt of the US to replace China, defining how hard it would be to amend the charter to create this 6-member council, and how it is a premature move to make as China was a far more worthy candidate (Harder, 2015; Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru). With Bulganin replying, “We proposed the question of India's membership of the Security Council to get your views, but agree that this is not the time for it and it will have to wait for the right moment later on” (Harder, 2015; Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru). Judging from the bending of words, Noorani defines this as ‘bait’, arguing that by refusing the trap in guise of an

offer, Nehru managed to avoid contempt from China, a sprouting sense of betrayal in the Third World nations and the US, with a clear steer towards Soviet sympathies (Noorani, 2002).

Rationale of Rejection

Further recordings can be found in the *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru* over the course of his tour of the Soviet States. On 1st August, 1955, Nehru wrote, “Informally, suggestions have been made by the United States that China should be taken into the United Nations but not in the Security Council and that India should take her place in the Security Council. We cannot of course accept this as it means falling out with China and it would be very unfair for a great country like China not to be in the Security Council. We have, therefore, made it clear to those who suggested this that we cannot agree to this suggestion. We have even gone a little further and said that India is not anxious to enter the Security Council at this stage, even though as a great country she ought to be there. The first step to be taken is for China to take her rightful place and then the question of India might be considered separately” (Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru). This action by the PM stood in line with the Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung, held that very year and thus fortified India’s commitment to the formerly oppressed peoples, and resulting in Nehru’s sound judgements saving India from geopolitical perils (Noorani. 2002). With Singh marking the consistency with the former PM’s evolution of thought, from a, “stance of anti-colonialism based on humanitarian and civilizational norms, to a stance of anti-imperialism based on principles of self-sufficiency, non-alignment and autonomy from great-power interference” (Singh, 2011).

The aftermath of these two propositions and their global advertising, fed India’s rhetorical leadership. Bolstering India’s stature among the newly independent nations, which saw “non-alignment as a strategy for leveraging their material weakness on the world stage” (Tharoor, 2003). With Post-offers Nehru surfing across “global diplomacy like a colossus, quoted, admired, and feted” and “embodying the emerging nations with grace” (ibid.).

Making matters personal, given the siblings’ Kashmiri origins, Vijaya gave up the shot at a permanent seat given the deepening frustrations of the US and UK meddling in the Kashmiri debate in the UN, and how the permanent seat could reverse their fortune (Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit to Jawaharlal Nehru, 2 September, 1949; Guha, 2007). On denying even this personal incentive warrants why Nehru did not instinctually fall for any of the two offers. With the paper hypothesizing that it was more than just instinct, given the denial of the first offer and the

continuance of the measure. To end this sub-section, the paper will now sum up the possible Nehruvian rationale for both rejections, by dividing it into 2 overlapping but larger themes: -

1. China and the UN being Keys to a Stable World

In 1942, Nehru published his book- *Glimpses of World History*, an amalgamation of 196 letters sent to his daughter Indira from 1930-1933, he explains his view of world history while being transferred between various prisons in British India. He describes a civilizational camaraderie with China. Dignifying this thought by narrating the two countries' solidarity in the face of imperialist powers:- : 'Like China, India is aspiring and fighting for national freedom. The forces of national freedom in both countries extend to each other the hand of sympathy and support. They must band themselves together against the urge of imperialism for exploitation and conquest.... The ancient friendship of the two peoples of China and India must now be reinforced by the new camaraderie of the two freedom-loving nations.' (Nehru, 1942: pg 303; Shah, 2017). Thus revealing Nehru's mode of interpreting political events related to its northern counterpart, of it being a civilizational neighbor with similar interests that he believed would never attack a non-aligned country, as it was India's "great sister in the East" (Nehru, 1982; pg. 328; cited in *The Hindustan Times* by Parthasarathi, 2018).

Exposed to critics, Harder contests that Nehru's strategy was sound due to his intentions to lower tensions at its borders, given a limited Indian military budget and somewhat aggressive Mao (Harder, 2015 and 2018). Furthermore, risking the gesture of going for permanent membership, in the event that it was only a false-offer would deteriorate relations with Beijing and not ride well with the other members of the NAM. (Noorani, 2002; Harder, 2015). With Sahgal claiming the West, in Nehru's opinion, was repeating the fatal mistake it had made in treating the Soviet Union as a pariah, with its unending confrontational consequences" and that Nehru's observation of the neighbors aggressive tendencies would not mix well with grievances stemming from exclusion (Sahgal, 2015, Roy, 2018). Harder continues by including the context at large, where the UN and its agenda were contaminated by the national ambitions of the power blocs, and their respective Cold War interests that put the newly emerged communist PRC at odds with the democratic subcontinent (Harder, 2015 and 2018). He adds that the USSR had walked out of the UN due to the PRC being blocked in January 1950, giving the US enough maneuverability to pass a nearly undisputed resolution that condemned the aggression in the Korean conflict (Harder, 2015 and 2018; Keylor, 2006). Referring to Resolution resolutions 25

and 27 against the North Korean military advance, which was in the larger Cold War context perceived as a joint effort to throttle communist aggrandizement (Stueck, 1995). Resulting in the Kremlin being caught off guard due to its absence during the American Sponsored Resolution, and the battement of its Communist client (Keylor, 2006). Complimenting this, Nehru's constant assertion for a stable UN, with that goal only attainable with a permanent PRC seat, and therefore moved away from a Washington proposed 'Pacific Pact' which was deemed anticommunist, as it would illustrate India's ideological leanings and antagonize India's neighbor (Jawaharlal Nehru, *Letters to Chief Ministers, 1947-1964*, vol. 2 in 1950; Cable to Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, New Delhi, 19 July, 1949, in *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, vol. 12).

2. India's self-perception as a pivotal leader in Asia and the World

Roy's work defines India's exclusion from the "realpolitik" mannerisms of Europe and self-asserted characterization of being a non-expansionist power, driving foreign policy to believe that the nation would not face threats in its immediate neighborhood (Roy, 2011). Though Roy does not agree, he mentions this persuades many Nehru critics to argue that the previously mentioned beliefs, along with a self-perception of having a pivotal role as a leader in Asia made the siblings, especially Nehru, hold onto an idealism that blocked Indian UNSC aspirations (Roy, 2018). As Nehru's misplaced enthusiasm for Asian solidarity inclined him to see the two countries as "fellow travelers in the broader historical journey", which mistakenly persuaded him in supporting the PRC permanent seat (Nehru, 1946; cited in Roy, 2018). This can also be extended to the previous point to rationalize Nehru's belief that the PRC was key to a stable world, and that it was India's responsibility to ensure global stability. And Indian driven foreign policy believed that this could only be achieved via a table of great powers with the PRC seated as an equal (Roy, 2018).

On the other hand, Noorani defends Nehru's policy decision of rejection, using a larger deconstruction of the tendency of states, including India, to formulate their respective foreign policies from the image that they carry of themselves (Noorani, 2018). He draws the examples of-

1. Britain and its clear historical adherence to the balance of power outlook from the 18-20th century, which would cause Britain to limit any continental European country to amass enough power to threaten Britain security;

2. The United States and its Monroe doctrine to ensure US hegemony goes unchallenged in Latin America by any European power (Noorani, 2018).

On extrapolation, he argues that the Indian National Congress (INC) constructed a doctrine inspired by Nehru in 1946, which imagined India's grand role in Asia, and the World which with India's clearly distinguishable role in the United Nations system between 1947-1962 (Kochanek, 1980). A doctrine spelling India's active role that Nehru communicated to the General Assembly (GA) regarding India's intentions to follow independent policy and steer clear of the power blocs (Indian Council of World Affairs, 1957). He remarked that India would simultaneously "uphold the freedom for dependent peoples and oppose racial discrimination", "work with other peace-loving nations for international cooperation and good-will without exploitation of one nation by another" (Indian Council of World Affairs, 1957). This falls well with the two seat offers as Kochanek attributes to Nehru's country's emergence warranting it more recognition due to its population, geography, geopolitical position, moral standing and historical tradition (Kochanek, 1980). Additionally, this would also be coherent with keeping the world free of conflict, which Nehru believed could be realized by a PRC permanent seat, because vilifying and ignoring the Chinese Great Power would only prove catastrophic (Roy, 2018).

The UN witnessed both super powers being highly non-cooperative and desiring to woo India's favor, constantly looking for opportunities to humiliate the other, and causing a lack of agreements in the forum (Bhagavan, 2013). With Nehru articulating it to be a product of the mistrust of two competing ideologies, and that only Nehruvian thought plus NAM could permit India to access a unique position as a UN mechanized mediator during the Cold war, that would only help in propelling New Delhi's global standing (Bhagavan, 2013). Additionally, the consistency observed in Indian diplomatic rhetoric, can be claimed to be a clear extension of Nehruvian ideals to a newborn India within the UN system, as combatting racism, decolonization and liberation, and non-alignment came to be the pillars of Indian Foreign Policy (Berkes and Bedi, 1958; Heimsath and Mansingh, 1971). Though reality suggested that India lacked economic and militaristic prowess, not only did it become a significant liberated former colony, but also enjoyed a steadily growing economy, success in the UN diplomatic realm with the Korean settlement, strong domestic support, domestic stability and predictors of treading the path to great power status (George, 1965; Kochanek, 1980). Therefore, agreeing with Harder (2015 and 2018), making it strategically viable for India not to jeopardize its position in

world affairs by accepting an American or Soviet offer, while effectively also revealing the subcontinent's preference for a stable international system (Harder; 2015 & 2018; George 2016).

India's Vision

Modern India and Why It Believes It Deserves A Seat

As a recap, India was one of the few colonies that directly participated in multilateral international forums since the 1920s, including the Brussel's conference, League of Nations processes, and eventually engaging as one of the founding members of the United Nations. With the Indian diplomatic corps engendering the message of racial equality and non-proliferation of WMDs after it gained independence. With historical landmarks in the UN, such as- Medical assistance in the Korean War, Indian forces mediating and monitoring North Korean repatriation, and exemplary roles in peacekeeping troop contributions in Gaza, Lebanon, Congo, Cyprus etc. (Dixit, 2003). The third being largely a result of India's overseas credibility of promoting peace, and its reluctance to swing towards a bloc (Roy, 2018; Dixit, 2003). Nevertheless, judging from its engagement in the UN, India has played a unique role as a non-Western formerly colonized nation in world politics. In addition to India's proactive role, we also observe that unlike any other seemingly worthy candidates, India was offered and has declined UNSC permanent status. Regardless of the much-debated reasons for declining these opportunities, India now strives for a seat with more vigor than ever. This is because the dawn of Modern India, has awakened different aspirations and changed the view of its role in the world.

In 2015, at the G4 Summit, India's Prime Minister, Narendra Modi underscored that the UN Security Council "must include the world's largest democracies, major locomotives of the global economy, and voices from all the major continents" to carry "greater credibility and legitimacy." (Modi at the G-4 summit, 2015). This is a rational assumption to make, given economic, population and growing influence with its soft power influence, covering everything from Bollywood to yoga to its vibrant pluralistic democratic regime (OECD website, World Firepower Index 2018, Tharoor, 2011). India like any other self-proclaimed rising power has, and is, constructing a narrative about its place in the "global pecking order" (Pant, 2018). Exemplified by the Indian-elite and the diversion of disproportionately large diplomatic investment into the body and new outreach efforts to unfamiliar countries to manufacture soft power traction (Bidwai, 2010, Pant, 2010).

Furthermore, from a bird's eye view, the Indian media seems to be thoroughly obsessed with the permanent membership in national household popular debate (Pant, 2017; Bidwai, 2010; Abdi, 2015). This illusion of it being the epitome has brought forward challenges in the form of an unending national obsession, and raised questions about what this unquantifiable

recognition will contribute to the larger future of India (Bidwai, 2010). Journalists categorizing it as an ‘unhealthy obsession’ that does not allow the strategic measurement of the pros and cons of this ambition, and proclaiming India is driven by the illusion that ‘permanent membership’ equates to power of the “ultimate, total or unchallengeable kind”.

Dixit recalls that this topic garnered particular attention at the first ever UN Security Council Summit in 1992, in which former Indian PM- Narisimha Rao- delivered a policy statement demanding a more democratized UNSC, and from there the issue has accelerated to become a prime yardstick to measure success (Dixit, 2003). Leading Indian foreign policy gearing itself to its acquisition. This re-routing has included an overwhelming pouring of resources in lobbying for a seat, which can be observed from the sheer excitement of temporary status in 2010. With Bidwai textualizing the bizarre moment of S.M. Krishna defining “big day for Indian diplomacy” and a “reflection of the expectations that the world has from us”, by saying that such jubilation and exultation was not required as India did not seem to have any competition in the given circumstances (Bidwai, 2010). Backed by Pant, that India has played its role in the Global Commons, and has repeatedly seen failure in any form of reciprocation. Further stating that Nehruvian idealism has failed to acquire Indian national interests through the UNSC mechanism, and that it is time for a forceful disassociation with the UN, as fixation can lead India astray from preserving vital national interests (Pant, 2010 & 2015). Nonetheless, the Indian media has continued to portray permanent membership “as a platform for establishing India’s place in the world” (Tharoor, 2012).

A Modi-fied Foreign Policy?

PM Narendra Modi addressed the General Assembly in 2015 regarding India candidature and reiterated its commitment to the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), pitching and demanding concrete reform (Hall, 2017; Statement to the 69th Session of the United Nations General Assembly). Consistent to his roots of belonging to a *Hindutva* found political party, this section will explore ideological implications on foreign policy in regard to the enhanced membership of the elite UNSC. Despite China’s reluctance to elevate India’s active role, the subcontinent’s candidature, has largely been supported by members of the UN. With a constant exception being Pakistan and the ‘Coffee Club’ or UfC under the leadership of Italy. On the other hand, the rest of the P5 on many occasions have backed India too, alongside the significant support of influential players such as the UAE, Malaysia, Singapore and the African Union. However, the very workings, as mentioned before, of the UNSC mount a formidable amendment procedure, for India or any other 21st century power to be admitted.

As ironic as it might be, India declined UNSC permanency on the grounds of increasing 'representation' by raising a more prominent power (the PRC), and now strives to obtain the permanent seat on the same notion. A notion of 'representation' that is fueled by a historical candidate that overtly led the Third World and an arguable selfless policy move to promote the PRC. While its two prominent leaders, Nehru and Vijaya, in their own opinion revealed and stuck to their principles of epitomizing the preservation of world peace at the price of sacrificing national interests for global good (Harder, 2015; Noorani, 2002).

The landslide BJP triumph in 2014, witnessed a single parliamentary majority, which was unheard of since 1984. The same party which presided over India's nuclear tests between 1998-2004 that exposed India to sanction from the World Community, especially from the US and Japan, and survived the ordeal with the Russian vetoing UNSC motions (United Nations Security Council Resolution 1172). Modi's reputation by impartial observers is that of an arch-Hindutva nationalist, with the Hindutva tag inserting ideas in one's mind of a more strategically aggressive governance policy (Basrur, 2017, Ogden 2014). His controversial leadership led to a premature expectation of substantial an extremist religious and Hindutva oriented foreign policy shifts, such as- a pragmatic foreign policy, binning of non-alignment ideas and scrapping Nehruvian ideals in general. (Mohan, 2015; Bjornson, 2012; Chacko,2004; Vanaik, 2004, Gilboy & Heginbotham, 2012; Tiwari on India Today 2015). Additionally, under Modi's foreign policy, and the Bhartaiya Janta Party's (BJP) manifesto, a permanent seat is marked as a high priority (BJP Election Manifesto 2014). Given the largely historical Indian view of the UNSC being a suitable yardstick to proclaim its ascendance onto the global stage, *Hindutva* ideology would arguably not have found a better platform to show its innate belief in the superiority of the Hindu way of life, and the destiny of a Hindu civilizational state to lead the World (Bajpai, 2003; Golwalker, 1966).

India's transition from its mediator Cold War role between world powers, with an intentional distancing from capitalism and lean towards socialism, has been reversed to a point where the country seeks a place amongst the great powers by maximizing strategic autonomy, jumping onto the bandwagon of globalization and creating strong relations with other major countries (Basrur, 2017; Tharoor, 2011). Establishing an India which hedges and creates strategic partnerships, like the one with the other G4 countries, to play hand-in-hand with the major existing support of Washington and Moscow (Haidar, 2015; Lakshman, 2015). Amalgamating in an India seeking and succeeding in gaining international standing amongst its peers. Complementing this is the generalized, non-specific and tame exposition of the Hindutva

Vision by Modi (BJP.org). Including mentions of India being colonized and oppressed by two foreign groups successively, the need to maintain independence, and the paramount importance of power in the World order; while acknowledging the reality of a globalizing world and fostering an expectation of playing a leading role in it (to Heads of Mission 7th February 2015; Business Standard Interview of Modi 2015).

The transition mentioned above was also accompanied by a change in approach to integration with and within international institutions. The ‘change’ referring to an India that initially ostracized the idea of integration to most international institutions under Nehru due to hints of being a continuation of imperialism, to New Delhi seeking a prized status within them. Larson, Wolf and Wohlforth subscribe to the definition of ‘status’ that encompasses “collective beliefs about a given state's ranking’ based on attributes such as power, wealth and diplomatic influence” (Larson, Paul & Wohlforth, 2014; Basrur & Sullivan de Estrada, 2014). Basrur argues the recognition seeking via the membership of elite clubs- Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) and Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR)-allowed to obtain respect from other states, with Modi announcing ‘those days are gone when India had to beg. Now we want our right’ and ‘it is India's right to get a permanent seat in UNSC’ (Larson, Paul & Wohlforth, 2014; G4 Summit 2015; Hindustan Times 2015). Though political think tanks pass commentary about the unlikely probability of reformation, India has managed to eliciting support from major and minor nations alike.

Basrur further laments India and Modi have networked itself to climb the international social ladder, and have successfully drawn an alliance with Washington to raise its status in the international system while containing or balancing its rising China (Basrur, 2017). Like his predecessors, Modi has also continued relationships with Russia, Japan, France, the UK, ASEAN, SCO, BRICS and IBSA, by using bilateral and multilateral forums to increase status projection (Basrur & Sullivan de Estrada, 2017).

Though Modi re-packages issues of a global nature well, the transcendental nature of Indian foreign policy is conclusively not constrained to the one who holds office (Hall, 2016 & 2017). As the issue at hand lies at the desire for status, which stretches beyond the election manifestos of any future ruling party (INC Election manifesto 2014, 2009, 2004; BJP Election Manifesto 2014, 2009, 2004). Therefore, we can expect a continuation of the same, even higher, investment and attention to diplomatic efforts to fulfill the UNSC Permanent membership agenda. Hence concluding that a Modi-fied policy, if any, would not transcend

the desire of a UNSC permanent seat, and is rooted in a larger national obsession of wanting to be courted a mighty power.

Conclusion

In July 1948, Asaf Ali, stated that, “the World is sharply divided by conflicting ideologies, and the realization of progressive co-operation, which the masses of humanity are still awaiting, seems to be receding into the background, distrust, and gnawing fears are looming on the horizon” (Ali, 1948). This holds true today, as it did yesterday, with the world’s attention to the refugee crisis or issues to do with crossing borders, iron clad right wing leaders springing-up, terrorist outfits like ISIS destabilizing regions etc. Thus, calling upon a Security Council that plays a far more active role today, but missing the mark by being ‘United’ on the idea of increasing representation and self-interested ‘Nations’ in being indecisive on how to implement expansion. For example, as Paul and Nahrory state, all council members agree on the institutional structure being divorced to the workings of the 21st century, and that P5 are group of self-appointed oligarchs that are able to preserve their thrones because of a seemingly un-reformable UN Charter. (Paul & Nahory, 2005).

Like other members of the G4, India believes it can make an immense contribution to the moral and material fields of human activity, but getting an opportunity to do so, portrays a tough road ahead. Despite increased interest over the past two decades in UNSC reform by the broader UN membership, veto authorities -China, Russia, and the United States- appear reluctant and skeptical of change. With recent member state negotiations lacking robust commitment to reform (Gowan & Gordan, 2014). Therefore, on revisiting the question, “Could the UNSC be more representative by expanding permanent membership to include India?”. The answer does not tilt either way, given the amendment procedure in Article 108, but signifies another deadlock even on the revelation of this new information.

Nevertheless, to measure against the provisional conclusion that the research will be able to build a historical argument or component to India’s UNSC permanent seat candidacy, we observed India’s experiences with the UN. With the country’s character transmuted from a Nehruvian idealistic internationalism that led the ‘Third World’, to that of a more assertive country that is far more capable in fulfilling national interests, and which continues to believe it has an important role to play in the non-bifurcated world of the 21st century (Pant, 2015). Moreover, on denying control of the helm in 1950 and 1955 on ‘representation’ grounds, on the loose idea and hope of ‘One World’ while battling the shackles of oppression in varying forms, helps build contemporary India’s case, by adding its capacity of having been ‘selfless to glory’. Hence, has created itself a historically moral qualification unlike its G4 counterparts.

Though considered an ideational qualitative fact, this historical supplement is largely excluded in the general framework of pushing forward New Delhi's candidature for permanent membership, and should be combined with its contemporary curriculum vitae (Nafey, 2005; Jabeen, 2010; Mishra, 2006). The research conducted here, and the assumed resulting likelihood of rigidity, even on expanding a country's case to engulf a historical argument remains consistent with reality, as reform remains elusive. In line with the provisional conclusion, this historical candidature augmentation can also be extended to other G4 and worthy members, and hence add to the academia and real-time debate regarding United Nations Security Council reformation. Actualizing this scholarly commitment will enlarge the modern debate by building a new historical parameter, such as the one the paper demonstrated for the G4 member- India. Henceforth, on adding this new perception and conceding the rigid reality of stagnancy, the debate might make headway in at least getting closer to an absolute answer that solves which country deserves permanent status the most. Hence making progress in crossing the first hurdle, of 'who', before 'how'.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

(EDGE) Seminar, Autumn, 2013.

“India is Visualized Seizing Independence”, New York Times, 27 January 1945

“Modi pays homage at war memorial for Indians in France: India Today 2015” doi:
<https://www.indiatoday.in/world/story/modi-war-memorial-indians-france-248180-2015-04-11>

“This Day That Age,” The Hindu, September 28, 2005,

“UNSC Must Include India to Make it More Representative: PM Narendra Modi”, The Indian Express, September 18, 2015, <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/unscmust-include-india-to-make-it-more-representative-pm-narendra-modi/>

03 G.A. Res. 48/26, 29, U.N. Doc. A/RES/48/26 (Dec. 3, 1993)

1942: Declaration of The United Nations DOI: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/history-united-nations-charter/1942-declaration-united-nations/index.html>

2018 Military Strength Ranking. (2018). Retrieved from
<https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing.asp>

BJP Election Manifesto 2014,2009, 2004 URL:
<http://www.bjp.org/en/component/taxonomy/Manifesto>

Business Standard Interview of Modi 2015- https://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/full-text-of-pm-narendra-modi-s-interview-to-115052800367_1.html

Chapter V: Article 24 — Charter of the United Nations — Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs — Codification Division Publications. Retrieved from
<http://legal.un.org/repertory/art24.shtml>

Countries | Data by the World Bank (2018) . Retrieved from
<https://data.worldbank.org/country>

Document 936, III/1/45, June 12, 1945 (also found in Summary Report of Eighteenth Meeting of Committee III/1, Document 936 III/1/45, compiled in Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945, Vol. XI, at 474).

Draft Resolution A/61/L.69 submitted in 2007

Ezulwini Consensus Draft Res., U.N. Doc. A/59/L.67 (July 14, 2005).

G.A. Res. 1991 (XVIII), at 21-22, (Dec. 17, 1963)

G4 Draft Res., U.N. Doc. A/59/L.64 (July 6, 2005)

GA Plenary Meeting on “Intermediate model” at the United Nations on 3 September 2009

GA/48/264, 20 July 1993, p. 48

INC Election manifesto 2014 URL:

<https://www.inc.in/images/Pages/English%20Manifesto%20for%20Web.pdf>

India and the United Nations: Report of a Study Group set up by the Indian Council of World Affairs. New York: Manhattan Publishing Company, 1957

Nehru to Chief Ministers, 23 Oct. 1960. Palat (ed), SWJN-SS, lxiii, 6–7

Nehru’s note to Foreign Secretary, 7 Sept. 1946. S. Gopal (ed), Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru (SWJN) (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1984), 442.

Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit”, India Today, 5, 10, January 1945, p. 4; “Events Today”, New York Times, 26 January 1945, p. 19.

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2014. Joint G4 Statement delivered by Amb. Asoke Mukerji 23 April 2014, retrieved December 30 2018

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2014. Statement by Asoke Mukerji 1 April 2014, retrieved December 30 2018

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2016. 71st Session 2016, UN General Assembly: Background and Approach, retrieved December 30 2018

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2016. Statement by Ambassador Syed Akbaruddin, retrieved December 30 2018

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2016. Statement by Ambassador Syed Akbaruddin, Feb 22, 2016, retrieved December 30 2018

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2017. Joint G4 Statement by Brazil, Germany, India and Japan March 7-8, retrieved 31 December 2018.
<https://www.pminewyork.org/adminpart/uploadpdf/89066statement.pdf>

Permanent Mission of India in New York 2017. Joint G4 Statement by Brazil, Germany, India and Japan March 7-8, retrieved December 30 2018

Permanent Mission of India to the UN Website DOI: <https://www.pminewyork.org/>

Permanent Mission of India to the UN, New York, Introduction, retrieved December 30 2018

PM to Heads of Indian Missions- <http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=115241>

Press Trust of India (2016) , ‘India decries “undemocratic” Global Governance,’ 26 April, The Economic Times, <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/india-decries-undemocratic-global-governance/articleshow/51986885.cms>.

Private Papers of Hansa Mehta, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library (NMML), New Delhi.

Private Papers of Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library (NMML)

REPERTORY OF PRACTICE OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANS SUPPLEMENT No. 10
(2000-2009) Volume VI ARTICLES 108 AND 109 DOI:
http://legal.un.org/repertory/art108_109/english/rep_supp10_vol6_art108_109.pdf

The Guardian 2015, UN Security Council must be revamped or risk irrelevance, Kofi Annan warns,” 23 September, retrieved 31 December 2018,
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/23/un-security-council-must-be-revamped-or-risk-irrelevance-kofi-annan-warns>

The Times of India 2015, Full Text of G4 Joint Statement. September 26, retrieved 31 December 2018, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Full-text-of-G4-joint-statement/articleshow/49117843.cms>

UN Document A/59/2005, 21 March 2005, 61, para. 170

UN Document A/59/L.64, paras 5(b) and 7

UN Document SG/SM/8855, 8 September 2003

UN Document SG/SM/8891-GA/10157, 23 September 2003

UN General Assembly, Note [transmitting report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, entitled "A more secure world : our shared responsibility"], 2 December 2004, A/59/565, available at:
<http://www.refworld.org/docid/47fdfb22d.html> [accessed 26 May 2018]

UN Secretary General (1992) Report of the Secretary General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992, ‘An Agenda for Peace, Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-Keeping’, 17 June, A/47/277 — S/24111.

Un.org. (1945). Preamble. [online] Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/preamble/index.html> [Accessed 26 May 2018].

Un.org. (2016). SECRETARY-GENERAL NAMES HIGH-LEVEL PANEL TO STUDY GLOBAL SECURITY THREATS, AND RECOMMEND NECESSARY CHANGES | Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. [online] Available at:
<https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sga857.doc.htm> [Accessed 26 May 2018].

United Nations (1945) Charter of the United Nations, 24 October, 1 UNTS XVI.

United Nations Document 936, III/1/45, June 12, 1945

United Nations General Assembly (1997). Razali Reform Paper. [online] New York: The United Nations. Available at:
https://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/Security_Council/Razali_Reform_Paper.pdf [Accessed 26 May 2018].

United Nations General Assembly Resolutions and Draft Resolutions: Available at
<http://www.un.org/documents/resga.htm>

United Nations Secretary General 2005. In *Larger Freedom- The Changing Role of the United Nations*, New Delhi, 28 April, retrieved 31 December 2018, <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statement/2005-04-28/secretary-generals-public-lecture-india-international-centre-larger>

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1172- <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/1172>

United Nations University (2015). *The relevance of the United Nations for stability in the world*. [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8nFfKQhd8nc&t=957s> [Accessed 26 May 2018].

United Nations. (2004). *A more secure world: our shared responsibility : report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change*. [New York?], United Nations [Dept. of Public Information].

Uniting for Consensus Draft Res., U.N. Doc. A/59/L.68 (July 21, 2005)

Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit cited in T. Ramakrishna Reddy, *India's Policy in the UN* (New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1968), 50–1.

Secondary Sources

Abdi, S. (2015). *We are not welcome: Why PM Modi should stop chasing UN Security Council mirage - Firstpost*. Retrieved from <https://www.firstpost.com/world/we-are-not-welcome-why-modi-should-stop-chasing-un-security-council-mirage-2397448.html>

Albright, M., & Gambari, I. (2015). *Confronting the Crisis of Global Governance*. *Global Policy*, 6(4). doi: 10.1111/1758-5899.12292

Ali, A. (1948). *India's Role in One World*. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 258, 22-26. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1027736>

Allison, R. (1988). *The Soviet Union and the Strategy of Non-Alignment in the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511521867

Aneke, C. C. (2012). *The Struggle for a Permanent Seat at the Security Council: A Critical Assessment of the Contestants in 2012*. Unpublished M.Sc Thesis, University of Nigeria.

Annan, K. (2015). *UN Security Council must be revamped - Kofi Annan Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://www.kofiannanfoundation.org/building-lasting-peace/un-security-council-must-be-revamped-2860/>

Baehr, P. & Gordenker, L. (1999). *The United Nations at the end of the 1990s*. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p.25.

- Bajpai, K. (2003). Indian Conceptions of Order and Justice: Nehruvian, Gandhian, Hindutva, and Neo - Liberal. In (Ed.), *Order and Justice in International Relations*. : Oxford University Press,. Retrieved 31 Dec. 2018, from <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0199251207.001.0001/acprof-9780199251209-chapter-10>.
- Bajpai, K. (2009). Obstacles to Good Work in Indian International Relations. *International Studies*, 46(1–2), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002088171004600208>
- Bakshi, S. (1993). Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
- Baru, S. (2015), G4 Summit: Will India utilize the group’s strengths or pick up other’s baggage?, *The Economic Times*, September 28, retrieved December 30 2018
- Basrur, R (2017). Modi's foreign policy fundamentals: a trajectory unchanged, *International Affairs*, Volume 93, Issue 1, pp 7–26, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiv006>
- Basrur, R. & Sullivan de Estrada, Kate. (2017). *Rising India: Status and power*. 10.4324/9781315227825.
- Bhagavan, M. (2013). *India and the Quest for One World: The Peacemakers* (1st ed.). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Bidwai, P. (2010). What would Gandhi say? | Praful Bidwai. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2010/oct/21/india-un-security-council>
- Bjornson, G. (2012) ‘The geopolitics of Hindutva’, *Katehon*, , <http://katehon.com/article/geopolitics-hindutva>.
- Bosco, D.L. (2009). *Five to Rule Them All: The UN Security Council and the Making of the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourantonis, D. (2005). *The History and Politics of UN Security Council Reform*. London: Routledge.
- Bradley, M.P.(2010). “Decolonization, the Global South, and the Cold War, 1919–1962” in Leffler, M.P. and Westad, O.A. eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, vol. 1: *Origins* (Cambridge)
- Chacko, P. (2004). *Indian foreign policy: the politics of postcolonial identity from 1947 to 2004* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge)
- Cohen, S.P. (2001). *India: Emerging Power*, Brookings
- Cox, B. (2009). United Nations Security Council Reform: Collected Proposals and Possible Consequences. *South Carolina Journal of International Law and Business*, 6(1), pp.89-128.
- Cristol, J. (2015). Don’t Reform the Security Council. Retrieved from <https://worldpolicy.org/2015/09/21/dont-reform-the-security-council/>

- Croan, M. (1990). Soviet Policy toward the Third World: The Long Road to Thermidor-And beyond? *The Russian Review*, 49(3), 317-320. doi:10.2307/130157
- Dahbade, M. (2017). India's Pursuit of United Nations Security Council Reforms. *Rising Powers Quarterly*, 2(3), 63-73. doi: <http://risingpowersproject.com/quarterly/indias-pursuit-united-nations-security-council-reforms/>
- Davis, A & Thakur, V. (2016). Walking the Thin Line: India's Anti-Racist Diplomatic Practice in South Africa, Canada, and Australia, 1946–55, *The International History Review*, 38:5, 880-899, DOI: 10.1080/07075332.2016.1144630
- Dixit, J.N. (2003). *India's Foreign Policy, 1947–2003*. (New Delhi: Picus)
- Dulles, F. & Ridinger, G. (1955). The Anti-Colonial Policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt. *Political Science Quarterly*, 70(1), 1-18. doi:10.2307/2145412 Edited by H. Y. Sharada Prasad and A. K. Damodaran, *Frontline* 19, no. 2 (January-February 2002),
- Foot, R., Gaddis, J.L & Hurrell, A. (2004). *Order and justice in international relations*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Freiesleben, J. (2008). Reform of the Security Council in Managing Change at the United Nations. Center for UN Reform Education available online at www.centerforunreform.org/?q=node/308 (Accessed June 11, 2018).
- Ganguly (2015). Hindu nationalism and the foreign policy of India's Bharatiya Janata Party. *Transatlantic Academy Paper Series*, no. 2, (Washington DC: Transatlantic Academy), http://www.transatlanticacademy.org/sites/default/files/publications/Ganguly_HinduNationalismForeignPolicy_Jun15_web.pdf
- Ganguly, S. (2004), "India as an Emerging Power". (London: Frank Cass, 2004), p. 1.
- GDP and spending - Gross domestic product (GDP) - OECD Data. (2018). Retrieved from <https://data.oecd.org/gdp/gross-domestic-product-gdp.htm>
- General Assembly Res. 48/26, 29, U.N. Doc. A/RES/48/26
- General Assembly. Res. 1991
- George, J. (2016). Rethinking geopolitical ambition: An analysis of india and its role in the united nations security council (Order No. 10147126). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1812310498). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1812310498?accountid=12045>
- Gilboy, G. & Heginbotham, E. (2012) *Chinese and Indian strategic behavior* (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 30–31.
- Golwalkar, M. S. (1966). *Bunch of thoughts*. Bangalore: Vikrama Prakashan; sole distributors: Rashtrorathana Sahitya.
- Goodrich, L.M. et.al. (1969), *The Charter of the United Nations*, Columbia University Press, New York

- Gorman, D. (2017). UN History Project. Retrieved from http://www.histecon.magd.cam.ac.uk/unhist/image-of-the_month/image_of_the_month_Apr17.html
- Gowan,R & Gordon,N. (2014). Pathways to Security Council Reform. (Center on International Cooperation, New York).
- Guha, R. (2007). India After Gandhi: The History of the World's Largest Democracy. ,London: Macmillan, p. 72
- Haidar, S (2015) “India will always support Russia”, Hindu, 9 May 2015, <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/india-will-always-support-russia-pranab/article7186333.ece>
- Hall, I. (2016). Multialignment and Indian foreign policy under Narendra Modi’, The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs, vol. 105, no. 3, p. 271-286.
- Hall, I. (2017). ‘Narendra Modi and India’s normative power’, International Affairs, vol. 93, no. 1, p. 113-131.
- Harder, A. (2015), ‘Not at the Cost of China: New Evidence Regarding US Proposals to Nehru for Joining the United Nations Security Council’, Working Paper No. 76, The Cold War International History Project (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars).
- Harder, A. (2015), Not at the Cost of China: India and the United Nations Security Council, 1950, retrieved December 30 2018
- Harder, A. (2018). When Nehru Refused American Bait on a Permanent Seat for India at the UN. Retrieved from <https://thewire.in/diplomacy/when-nehru-refused-american-bait-on-a-permanent-seat-for-india-at-the-un>
- Haynes, S.A. (1945). India Stands For Equality, Leader Tells Baltimoreans. Afro-American, p. 1.
- Heimsath, C.H. & Mansingh, S. (1971). A diplomatic history of modern India. Bombay : Allied Publishers
- Hoffman, W. (2006). Model Duo: Could 'Dual Seating' Break the deadlock on Security Council Reform?. [online] Centerforunreform.org. Available at: <http://www.centerforunreform.org/?q=node/57> [Accessed 26 May 2018].
- Hoffmann, W. & Ariyoruk, A. (2005). Security Council Reform Models: Models A and B, Italian (Regional) Proposal, Blue and Green Models and A New Model C. Center for U.N. Reform Education, Special Paper No. 4, pp. 1-10.
- Hoffmann, W. (2006). Competing Model: A Security Council with 20 Members. Center for UN Reform Education available online at www.centerforunreform.org/?q=node/5

- Hoffmann, W. & Ariyoruk, A. (2005). Security Council Reform Models: Models A and B, Italian (Regional) Proposal, Blue and Green Models and A New Model C. [online] Centerforunreform.org. Available at: <http://www.centerforunreform.org/sites/default/files/Special%20Paper%20No.%204.pdf> [Accessed 26 May 2018].
- Hoopes, T & Brinkley, D. (1997). FDR and the creation of the U.N. New Haven : Yale University Press
- Hosli, M., Moody, R., O'Donovan, B., Kaniovski, S. & Little, A. (2011). Squaring the circle? Collective and distributive effects of United Nations Security Council reform. *The Review of International Organizations*, 6(2), pp.163-187.
- Imlay, T.C. (2013). "International Socialism and Decolonization during the 1950s: Competing Rights and the Postcolonial Order", *The American Historical Review*, Volume 118, Issue 4, pp 1105–1132, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/118.4.1105>
- Berkes, R.N & Bedi, M.S. (1958) *India: The Diplomacy of India*. California, Stanford University Press, London University Press. 1958. 30s. (1960). *India Quarterly*, 16(2), 183–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097492846001600215>
- J. Singh, (1999) "Defending India", London: Macmillan
- Jabeen, M. (2010). "Indian Aspiration of Permanent Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance", S. ASIANSTUD.
- Kennedy, P. (2004). UN reform is stuck in a Catch-22. [online] *Financial Times*. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/f10ef04e-26b5-11d9-9157-00000e2511c8> [Accessed 26 May 2018].
- Keylor, W. R. (2006). *The twentieth century world and beyond: An international history since 1900*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Khipple, R.L. (1946). *Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit: The Woman Who Swayed America*. Lahore: Lion Press.
- Krishna, G. (1984). *India and the International Order*. In H. Bull & A. Watson, *The Expansion of international society* (1st ed., pp. 272-273). [Oxfordshire: Clarendon Press.
- Kochanek, S. (1980). *India's Changing Role in the United Nations*. *Pacific Affairs*, 53(1), 48-68. doi:10.2307/2756961
- Ku, C. (1999). *FDR and the Creation of the U.N.* By Townsend Hoopes and Douglas Brinkley. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1997. Pp. xii, 277. Index. *American Journal of International Law*, 93(1), 263-265. doi:10.2307/2997975
- Lakshman, N. (2015) 'Foundational agreements won't compromise India's security: US', *Hindu*, 16 May 2015, <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/foundational-agreements-wontcompromise-indias-securityus/article7213305.ece>.

- Larson, DW, Paul, TV, & Wohlforth, WC (2014) Status and world order. In: Paul, TV, Larson, DW, Wohlforth, WC (eds) Status in World Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lau, O. (2003). United Nations Security Council Expansion: The Efficacy of Small States under Bipolarity and Uni-Multipolarity.
- Laut, J. (2018). "The Woman Who Swayed America": Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, 1945. Stronger Than Men. *Women Who Worked With Gandhi And Struggled For Women's Rights*, (37), 26-47.
- Lie, T. (1954). In the cause of peace : seven years with the United Nations. New York : Macmillan
- Luck, E. C. (2003). Reforming the United Nations: Lessons from a History in Progress. *International Relations Studies and the United Nations Occasional Papers*, No. 1, pp. 1-74.
- Luck, E. C., (2005) 'How not to reform the United Nations', *Global Governance* 11: 4,
- Mallavarapu, S. (2009). Development of International Relations Theory in India. *International Studies*, 46(1–2), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002088171004600211>
- Mathur, S. (2005). Voting for the Veto: India in a Reformed UN. London: The Foreign Policy Centre.
- Mazower, M.(2009). No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Retrieved December 30, 2018, from Project MUSE database.
- McMahon, R. J. (1996). The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India, and Pakistan, Columbia University Press.
- Mishra, A. (2014). Reforming the United Nations Security Council. *Indian Defence Review (IRA)* available online at www.indiandefencereview.com/.../ (Accessed, April 22, 2018).
- Mishra, M. (2006). India's Permanent Membership of the U.N Security Council: Changing Power Realities and Notions of Security. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 67(2), 343-354. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41856221>
- Mohan, CR. (2015) 'Modi's American engagement: discarding the defensive mindset', working paper no. 203 (Singapore: Institute of South Asian Studies, National University of Singapore).
- Moore, W. "Indian Woman Twists the Tail of British Lion," April 27, 1945, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 6
- Morgenthau, H.J. (2012). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6th ed., New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers

- Morris, J. (2000). UN Security Council Reform: A Counsel for the 21st Century. *Security Dialogue*, 31(3), 265–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010600031003002>
- Mukherjee, R. & Malone, D.M. (2013). India and the UN Security Council: An Ambiguous Tale, *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 20, Vol. XLVIII, No. 29, pp.110-117.
- Murthy, C.S.R. (2010). “UNSC: India’s membership and the road ahead,” *The Hindu*, October 30, 2010, <http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-opinion/UNSC-Indias-membership-and-the-road-ahead/article15797982.ece>
- Murthy, C.S.R. (2012), *India as a Non-permanent Member of the UN Security Council in 2011-12, Perspective*, Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
- Nafey, A. (2005) “IBSA Forum: The Rise of New Non-Alignment,” *India Quarterly* 61, no. 1 pp. 1–78.
- Nehru, J. (1946). *The discovery of India*. New York: The John Day Company.
- Nehru, J. (1982) *The Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru (SWJN), Second Series*, Gopal, S., ed. New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, distributed by Oxford University Press, 1984
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. & Gandhi, Indira. (1963). *India's quest : being letters on Indian history from 'Glimpses of world history'*. London: Asia Pub. House
- Noorani, A.G. (2002). “The Nehruvian Approach,” review of *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru, second series*, vol. 29,
- Ogden, C. (2014) *Hindu nationalism and the evolution of contemporary Indian security*(New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014);
- Pant, H. (2015). *Enough Is Enough: India Needs to Leave Behind Its UN Obsession*. Retrieved from <https://thediplomat.com/2015/10/enough-is-enough-india-needs-to-leave-behind-its-un-obsession/>
- Pant, H.V. (2016). *Indian Foreign Policy: An Overview*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pant, H.V. (2017). “The dying embers of the old order in Asia.” *Livemint*, 30 March. <http://www.livemint.com/Opinion/OpJ5mjSVw08k4qeE0EI1rN/The-dying-embers-of-the-old-order-in-Asia.html>
- Parthasarathi, A. (2018). *Nehru wasn’t naive on China*. Retrieved from <https://www.hindustantimes.com/analysis/nehru-wasn-t-naive-on-china/story-GLQ4ki5l6mbJm5721ksyEK.html>
- Patrick, S. (2010). *Irresponsible Stakeholders? The Difficulty of Integrating Rising Powers*. *Foreign Affairs*, 89(6), 44-53. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20788715>
- Paul T.Y & Nayar, B.R. (2003). “*India in the World Order: The Search for Major Power Status*” (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 26

- Paul, J. & Nahory, C. (2005). 'Theses Towards a Democratic Reform of the UN Security Council', available at:<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/reform/2005/0713theses.htm>
- Pierson, P. (2004). *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Pirozzi, N & Ronzitti, N. (2011). *The European Union and the Reform of the UN Security Council: Toward a New Regionalism?*, IAI Working Papers, available at <http://www.iai.it/pdf/DocIAI/iaiw1112.pdf>.
- Pirozzi, N. & Ronzitti, N. (2011). *The European Union and the reform of the UN security council*. Roma: Istituto affari internazionali.
- R (Anonymous). (1955). *India and the Cold War*. *Middle East Journal*, 9(3), 256-268. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4322720>
- Rana, S. (1970). *The Changing Indian Diplomacy at the United Nations*. *International Organization* 24(1), pp. 48–73.
- Ray, H. (1969). *Changing Soviet Views on Mahatma Gandhi*. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 29(1), 85-106. doi:10.2307/2942525
- Ronzitti, N. (2010) 'The Reform of the UN Security Council', *Instituto Affari Internazionali* 10(13), pp. 1–20.
- Rothwell, S. (2013). *Security Council Reform: Why it Matters and why it's not Happening*. *Open Democracy* available online at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/>.
- Roy, N. (2018) *In the Shadow of Great Power Politics: Why Nehru Supported PRC's Admission to the Security Council*, *The International History Review*, 40:2, 376-396, DOI: 10.1080/07075332.2017.1329156
- Roy, N. (2018). *Why Did Nehru Want the People's Republic of China in the United Nations?*. Retrieved from <https://thediplomat.com/2018/04/why-did-nehru-want-the-peoples-republic-of-china-in-the-united-nations/>
- Sahgal, N. (2010) 'Jawaharlal Nehru: Civilizing a Savage World' New Delhi, pg 135.
- Schlichtmann, K. (2011), *An Enduring Concept for Security Council Reform*, *Beijing Law Review*, 02, 02,(97)
- Shah, S. (2017). *India's foreign policy* (1st ed.). Vij Books India Pvt Ltd.
- Sherwood, M. (1996). 'India at the Founding of the United Nations', in "International Studies", p. 412
- Silva, Marina Magalhães B.L. (2014). *Spoiler or Reformer? The Uniting for Consensus Group and the UN Security Council Reform*. Japan: Osaka University.
- Srinivasan, K. (2013), *Image with No Definition*, *The Telegraph*, 23 January

- Stueck, W. (1995). "The Korean War: An International History" (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 59.
- Stuenkel, O. (2010), Leading the disenfranchised or joining the establishment? India, Brazil, and the UN Security Council, *Carta Internacional*, March, pp.53-63.
- Teng, M. "United Nations Security Council Reform", *Ethics of Development in a Global Environment*
- Tharoor, S. (2003). *Nehru: The Invention of India*. New York: Arcade Publishing
- Tharoor, S. (2011). *Security Council Reform: Past, Present, and Future*. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 25(04), pp.397-406.
- Tharoor, S. (2012). *Pax Indica*. 1st ed. New Delhi: Penguin India, pp.200-300
- Tiwari, R. (2015) 'BJP calls for a muscular foreign policy: Panchamrit to replace Panchsheel', *India Today*, 4 April 2015, <http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/bjp-foreign-policy-national-executive/1/428383.html>.
- The Guardian 2015, UN Security Council must be revamped or risk irrelevance, Kofi Annan warns," 23 September
- Valley, B. (2015) "Entrenched in Power: Path Dependence and UN Security Council Reform" . Honors Projects. 32.
- Vijapurkar, M. (2004). Nehru declined offer of permanent U.N. seat. Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/2004/01/10/stories/2004011004021200.htm>
- Weigold, A. (2010) *Churchill, Roosevelt and India* (London: Routledge, 2008); Eric S. Rubin, 'America, Britain, and Swaraj: Anglo-American Relations and Indian Independence, 1939-1945', in *India Review*, Vol. 10, no 1, pp. 40-80
- Weiss, T. (2003) The illusion of UN Security Council reform, *The Washington Quarterly*, 26:4, 147-161, DOI: 10.1162/016366003322387163
- Weiss, T. (2005). *Overcoming the Security Council reform impasse*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, p.13.
- Willkie, W.L (1943), 'One World'. New York. Simon and Schuster
- Wouters, J. & Ruys, T. (2005). *Security Council Reform: A New Veto for a New Century*. Institute for International Law, Working Paper No. 78, pp. 1-35.

