MSI Journal of Economics and Business Management (MSIJEBM)

Volume: 3, Issue: 9 (September-2026)
Published by *MSI Publishers*
ISSN 3049-141X (Online)

Received: 11-07-2026
Accepted: 02-09-2026
Published: 12-09-2026

Globalisation vs Swadeshi: Atmanirbhar Bharat, Civilisational Economics, and the Vision of Vikshit Bharat 2047 in a Multipolar World

Authors Details

Rakesh Kumar[1*]
Pandit Deendayal Energy University Gandhinagar, India.

Corresponding Author: *Rakesh Kumar*

ABSTRACT: Globalisation, once seen as an unstoppable process of economic and political unification, is now being reshaped by multipolarity, geopolitical fragmentation, economic nationalism, and the resurgence of civilisational identities. This paper explores whether India's current policies—Atmanirbhar Bharat and Vikshit Bharat 2047—indicate a move away from globalisation or a strategic response to a changing international landscape. Using a qualitative political economy perspective, it analyses the history of globalisation, its ties to geopolitics, and the rising importance of resilience, strategic autonomy, and building domestic capabilities. Examples from the US, China, Russia, Japan, and Europe show a global shift away from convergence-based globalisation towards diverse development paths driven by national priorities, cultural identities, and strategic interests. The paper argues that India does not aim for economic isolation but seeks to develop domestic capacity while engaging actively in global markets and institutions. Incorporating ideas of Swadeshi, civilisational economics, and multiple modernities, it suggests India is pursuing a development model that blends openness with resilience and cultural continuity. The study proposes that India is not rejecting globalisation but reconfiguring it through a model of resilient, culturally rooted global engagement.

Keywords: *Globalisation; Multipolarity; Atmanirbhar Bharat; Vikshit Bharat 2047; Strategic Autonomy; Civilisational Economics; Economic Nationalism; India.*

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

1. Introduction

Global trade dates back to the establishment of maritime and silk trade routes. However, the modern form of Globalisation, which has influenced economic, cultural and political discourse, is approximately 3.5 decades old. After the Cold War ended, the Western liberal order, mainly led by the USA, promoted free markets, deregulation, and institutional multilateralism as universal solutions. In public debates, globalisation was often seen as a one-way process: integration would deepen; trade and finance would bring prosperity; and national borders would gradually become less relevant. In India, the 1990s reform era reflected this optimistic mood. Globalisation was frequently called the "mantra," and those who questioned it were viewed as anti-modern or unrealistic.[1]

If we analyse this 35-year period, we can confidently say that from 1992 to 2000, i.e., for 18 years, the USA was the leading manufacturer and exporter of both goods and services, and the US way of life was viewed as the model of modernity. After 2000, during the 'Internet era', the USA shifted towards technology, e-commerce, the service sector, and the dominance of large companies. Its manufacturing focus declined, and it began outsourcing manufacturing primarily to China. From 2000 to 2008, China consolidated its manufacturing capacity and, with the Beijing Olympics in 2008, demonstrated its dedication, technological progress, industrial capabilities, and political resolve. Between 2008 and 2020, i.e., from the 2008 financial crisis to the COVID-19 pandemic, China enjoyed a full 12 years as the world's leading manufacturer. (Charles, K. K., Hurst, E., & Schwartz, M., 2018)

After COVID-19, rising great-power rivalry, and ongoing wars in Europe and West Asia have emphasised the fragility of hyper-integration. Tariffs are back, industrial policy has regained popularity, and terms like "national security" increasingly influence decisions in technology, energy, and trade. The global order is shifting from a unipolar structure to a more dispersed and contested multipolarity (Acharya, 2014; Khanna, 2019). At the same time, many regions are asserting their cultural and civilisational identities anew: Russia describes itself as a civilisational state; China's revival occurs alongside its communist governance; Japan's history of selective modernisation continues; and Europe strives to protect its industrial and regulatory sovereignty.

 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22719991

In this context, India’s policy language has changed. It began with the whisper of Swadeshi, and the idea of Atmanirbhar Bharat (Self-Reliant India) became prominent during the 2020 pandemic response and economic package, which emphasised capability-building, resilience, and “vocal for local” (PIB, 2020). Meanwhile, Vikshit Bharat 2047 frames development as a long-term mission for India’s centenary of independence, connecting economic growth with technological progress, infrastructure, social empowerment, and sustainability (Government of India, 2025; Virmani, 2024). These frameworks raise an important question: Is India viewing globalisation as a threat and wanting to replace it through ‘swadeshi,’ or is it adjusting globalisation to strengthen national resilience and civilisational continuity?

2. Methodology and Approach

The study adopts a qualitative, interpretive methodology rooted in political economy and global historical analysis. It synthesizes secondary literature in international political economy (IPE), development studies, and global history with policy texts and speeches. For India-specific arguments, the paper draws on official statements on Atmanirbhar Bharat (PIB, 2020) (Gurumurthy, 2023), Viksit/Vikshit Bharat 2047 (Government of India, 2025; Virmani, 2024) (Government of India, 2025; Virmani, 2024), and the book by S Gurumurthy, “India and the Changing World Order: Emerging Paradigm Shift in the Global, Political and Economic Order,” (Press Information Bureau, 2020) along with his talks on Swadeshi and economic nationalism. Comparative illustrations are drawn from the work of Sebastian Conrad and his research on ‘rejecting the idea of a singular path of modernity’ and an overview of Japan’s Meiji-era modernization. The paper is conceptual rather than econometric; its value lies in integrating multiple domains—geopolitics, institutions, culture, and development—into a coherent explanatory narrative. The analysis, therefore, focuses on causal mechanisms and patterns (e.g., how tariff politics follows security competition; how cultural revival emerges when universalism weakens) rather than on estimating effects of individual variables.

Recent scholarship on geoeconomic fragmentation, multipolarity, and strategic autonomy has increasingly emphasized the interaction between geopolitical competition and economic integration (Norring, 2024; Luo, 2025). This study also incorporates contemporary policy discussions on Viksit Bharat 2047 and India's developmental

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

trajectory (Virmani, 2024; NITI Aayog, 2025), allowing the analysis to situate India's evolving policy framework within wider global debates on fragmented globalization and multiple pathways to modernity.

2.1 Research Questions and Objectives

The paper is guided by four questions:

a. How did the post–Cold War model of globalization emerge, and why is it under stress today?
b. How do geopolitics and multipolarity change the "rules" of globalisation in trade, finance, and technology?
c. How do leading regions—Russia, China, Japan, Europe, and the United States—demonstrate a broader civilizational and nationalist shift that reshapes their engagement with global norms?
d. Do Atmanirbhar Bharat and Vikshit Bharat 2047 represent isolationism or a resilience-focused approach to development and global engagement rooted in India's civilizational values?

The objectives of the paper are:

a. To provide a conceptual history of globalisation as both an ideology and an economic process.
b. To analyse the geopolitical factors driving de-globalisation, re-globalisation, and fragmented globalisation
c. To position India's policy response within the global waves of economic nationalism and civilizational revival
d. To craft an interpretive framework about India's effort to shape a plural, multipolar global order while maintaining strategic autonomy.

2.2 Literature Review

Over the past thirty years, literature on globalization has significantly shifted from highlighting economic integration and convergence to acknowledging fragmentation, resilience, and diverse development pathways. Initially, scholars viewed globalization as an inevitable process driven by trade liberalization, technological progress, and institutional multilateralism. Researchers like Held et al. (1999) and Stiglitz (2002)

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

considered it a transformative force that reshapes political, economic, and social relations globally.

More recent literature has focused on the emergence of geoeconomic fragmentation and multipolarity. Norring (2024) argues that globalization is not disappearing but is being reorganized around competing geopolitical and economic blocs. Luo (2025) highlights how firms and states increasingly operate within a multipolar strategic environment where economic decisions are shaped by security considerations. The International Monetary Fund (2025) and World Trade Organization (2025) likewise note that geopolitical rivalries, sanctions, technological restrictions, and supply-chain diversification are reshaping patterns of international trade and investment.

Alongside these developments, scholars have questioned the idea that modernization only follows a Western model. Conrad (2007; 2024) introduces the idea of multiple modernities, highlighting how different societies incorporate global institutions through unique cultural and historical paths. This view appears in current debates about civilizational states, strategic autonomy, and indigenous development approaches. In India, researchers like Gurumurthy (2023), Virmani (2024), and NITI Aayog (2025) discuss initiatives like Atmanirbhar Bharat and Vikshit Bharat 2047, focusing on resilience, domestic capacity, and culturally grounded growth. However, there remains limited scholarly focus on placing these initiatives within the wider contexts of multipolarity, civilizational economics, and globalization's evolution. This paper aims to fill that gap by combining insights from globalization theory, political economy, geopolitics, and civilizational discourse into a comprehensive analytical framework.

3. Concept and Historical Evolution of Globalisation

Globalisation refers to the increasing movement of goods, capital, people, information, and norms across borders, resulting in greater economic and cultural interconnectedness (Conrad, 2007). However, this phenomenon is not new; historic trade routes connected India, West Asia, Africa, Southeast Asia, and the Mediterranean via maritime and overland corridors, facilitating the exchange of spices, textiles, and ideas. India's historical involvement in the Indian Ocean economy highlights that long-distance integration can coexist with distinct civilizations.(Stiglitz, 2002) Modern globalisation is often associated

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

with European imperialism, industrial capitalism, and global finance. The late 1800s and early 1900s saw an earlier wave of global integration driven by steamships, telegraphs, and colonial trade, which was interrupted by protectionism and geopolitical conflicts during the interwar years. Post-1945, institutions like the IMF, World Bank, and GATT established a rules-based economic order under U.S. leadership. This order was not purely free-market; it combined trade expansion with capital controls and welfare policies.

3.1 Globalisation as a Business Opportunity

The so-called "hyper-globalisation," beginning in the late 1970s and 1980s, accelerated due to neoliberal reforms, deregulation, and technological advancements. During the 1990s, U.S. dominance in global trade peaked, shaped by the end of the Cold War and a unipolar world. The U.S. led international trade rules through organizations such as the WTO, IMF, and World Bank, reflecting the Washington Consensus of trade liberalization and deregulation. The dollar's role as the global reserve currency allowed the U.S. to sustain large trade deficits while exporting its consumption-driven growth. For many developing nations, like India, this era offered greater market access, capital, and technology but also exposed industries to fierce competition and limited policy options for protection. Overall, U.S. trade leadership sped up economic integration and global value chains but also reinforced structural inequalities, making developing economies more reliant on Western markets, finance, and standards, thus perpetuating a hierarchy that values efficiency over equity and resilience.

Following the Soviet Union's collapse and the USA dominating the world trade, globalisation was portrayed as a natural culmination of history, and Western liberal democracy and free markets were treated as universally valid. As Gurumurthy explains, this ideological climate framed the "world at the core" and the "nation as an add-on," thereby encouraging countries to subordinate national policy space to global market pressures.

3.2 Globalisation as Ideology

Beyond simply trade and markets, globalization also served as an ideology, promoting the idea that there is a single best way to organize the economy and society. This ideological layer was significant because it influenced policy priorities and delegitimized alternatives.

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

Rodrik (2011) suggests that the conflict between deep economic integration, national democracy, and sovereign policy space forms a "trilemma." When integration deepens—when rules limit domestic policy options—democratic politics tends to push back. This helps explain why globalization has increasingly triggered political backlash, not only in developing countries but also in advanced economies that have supported it.

The convergence ideology also viewed culture as secondary, assuming that economic integration would gradually lead to similar lifestyles and consumption patterns. However, cultural convergence was never automatic, and in many contexts, globalization sparked identity defense. When societies see global norms as threatening their historical identity, they often respond by reaffirming local languages, traditions, religions, and civilizational narratives. This dynamic is essential for understanding today's global politics and India's ongoing search for development with cultural continuity.

Globalization contained ongoing contradictions. Firstly, it led to an uneven distribution of benefits, fueling inequality, job displacement, and political backlashes (Stiglitz, 2002). Secondly, it depended on political stability and predictable rules, but shifts in power and domestic polarization undermined these foundations. Thirdly, it assumed that economic integration would decrease conflict, yet geopolitics continued to influence trade, technology, and finance. Fourthly, it was built on a monetary system with the U.S. dollar at its core. This provided the United States with major advantages but also introduced vulnerabilities through persistent deficits and financial cycles (Eichengreen, 2011).

3.3 Globalisation and Geopolitics: From Unipolarity to Multipolarity

Globalisation and geopolitics are inseparable. Economic integration has always been shaped by security alliances, strategic competition, and the distribution of power. The post–Cold War period appeared to reduce geopolitical constraints, enabling a rapid expansion of global value chains and cross-border finance. However, this expansion was anchored in a particular power configuration: U.S. primacy, Western institutional dominance, and an ideational claim that the liberal order was universal. In unipolar settings, the leading power can promote rules that serve its interests while presenting them as neutral. But as relative power shifts, other states seek autonomy and greater voice. The rise of Asia—especially China and India—has altered the global economic center of gravity. Scale, industrial

DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

upgrading, technology diffusion, and demographic weight have enabled major non-Western economies to demand greater participation in global rule-making. (Acharya 2014 and Khanna 2019). This has contributed to a more multipolar distribution of influence, with multiple centres shaping outcomes.

3.4 Recent Conflicts and the Weaponisation of Interdependence

Conflicts since the 2010s have shown how interdependence can be exploited as a weapon. Sanctions, export controls, and financial restrictions are now often used as tools of statecraft. Wars also impact commodity flows, energy security, shipping routes, and insurance costs, prompting states and companies to reevaluate risks. The Russia–Ukraine conflict has transformed European energy policies and highlighted the geopolitics surrounding pipelines, LNG supply chains, and critical minerals. In West Asia, ongoing conflicts and regional tensions continue to influence energy markets and create volatility in global risk assessments. These developments are significant for India because it is deeply integrated into global energy and technology networks. A key lesson from recent conflicts is that "efficiency-only" globalisation can be fragile: supply chains optimised for cost can falter under strategic pressure. As a result, resilience and redundancy—once considered inefficient—are now increasingly important. This perspective supports policies such as Atmanirbhar Bharat, aimed at boosting domestic capabilities and building strategic buffers. (Bremmer 2022)

Recent research refers to this trend as geoeconomic fragmentation, where trade, technology, finance, and supply chains are increasingly shaped by strategic rivalry among leading powers (IMF, 2025; WTO, 2025). This situation has prompted countries to reconsider their dependencies in key areas like semiconductors, digital infrastructure, energy systems, and critical minerals.

In this context, "economic security" has become a key focus. Governments are now viewing semiconductors, critical minerals, digital platforms, and energy infrastructure as strategic assets. The resurgence of industrial policies in the US, China, Europe, and India highlights this shift. Countries are more inclined to form flexible coalitions and issue-specific alliances rather than follow universal rules. For India, this situation offers

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

opportunities to influence new regulations as an emerging power while also navigating the risks of bloc divisions.

4. The Liberal Global Order led by the US and Allies

The liberal global order is often linked to U.S. leadership and backed by Western Europe and multilateral organisations. Yet, America's approach to multilateralism has consistently been selective and driven by national interests. Lately, this selectiveness has become more pronounced, as evidenced by claims regarding Greenland and actions against Venezuela. Different U.S. administrations have frequently bypassed or pressured international institutions when such bodies threaten national priorities. This pattern is also reflected in suspicion towards the United Nations on security issues, disputes over the World Trade Organisation's dispute resolution process, and inconsistent commitments to climate diplomacy.

The dollar's central position grants the United States influence over sanctions, finance, and trade. Yet, it also facilitates persistent deficits and the temptation of excessive monetary expansion. Gurumurthy (2025) characterises this as a structural issue: ongoing consumption surpassing production through "printing and exporting dollars," supported by strategic strength. The Greenspan era is pivotal here. His late-1990s emphasis on productivity to combat inflation (Greenspan Note, 2025) coincided with financial innovations and asset bubbles.

Critics contend that loose monetary policies have increased financial vulnerabilities, but the relationship between policy, technology, and global savings is still debated. Ultimately, monetary influence is geopolitical: currency dominance relies on trust and the issuing nation's strategic ability, and this dominance is increasingly challenged in a multipolar world.

5. Climate, Tariffs, Trade Wars, and the Fragmentation of Global Markets

According to the World Trade Organisation (2025), trade policy is increasingly influenced by concerns related to economic security and strategic resilience. The International Monetary Fund (2025) similarly warns that persistent geoeconomic fragmentation could reduce global growth and increase costs for developing economies, while simultaneously

 DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

creating opportunities for countries capable of attracting diversified supply chains. (Rodrik 2024)

Issues discussed during the Paris Agreement, including countries' carbon emissions pledges and policies like Europe's Carbon Border Adjustment, affect free trade. Tariffs have re-emerged as key symbols of economic nationalism. Classical trade theory suggests that tariff barriers decrease welfare by disrupting comparative advantage. However, current politics often prioritise security, resilience, and fair distribution over overall efficiency.

5.1 Paris Agreement Credibility, Climate Trade and India's Swadeshi Approach

Climate politics increasingly expose the tension between environmental commitments, economic competitiveness, and national development goals. The credibility of the Paris Agreement depends on sustained cooperation, technology transfer, and climate finance from developed nations. Yet, inconsistent commitments by major countries, along with the rise of carbon border taxes and green subsidies, have sparked concerns about "green protectionism," especially among developing economies. In this context, India's modern Swadeshi-inspired strategy, represented by Atmanirbhar Bharat, aims to boost domestic manufacturing, renewable energy, electric mobility, green hydrogen, and local supply chains. Rather than rejecting globalisation, this approach seeks to reduce dependence on foreign suppliers while building resilient, sustainable domestic industries. Coal will play a significant role in India's pursuit of self-reliance for power generation. However, by promoting indigenous clean technologies and green industrialisation, India can achieve climate goals alongside economic growth, despite its pledge to reach zero carbon emissions by 2070. These policies could also transform global trade by fostering regional supply chains, strategic self-reliance, and diverse production networks, contributing to a more multipolar, sustainability-oriented world economy.

5.2 Tariffs as Geopolitical Signalling

Tariffs today act both as economic tools and geopolitical messages. They can convey dissatisfaction with other countries' policies, support domestic political agendas, and push for renegotiation of trade agreements. When tariffs become unpredictable, it raises uncertainty for investors and leads companies to "de-risk" by diversifying their production

DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

locations. This trend has partly driven re-shoring in advanced economies and the practice of "friend-shoring," where supply chains are prioritized with aligned partners.

Trade wars are reshaping global value chains, prompting firms to diversify production sites and build in redundancy. These changes may open up opportunities for India to attract manufacturing and boost exports. However, uncertainty caused by tariffs can deter investment if trade rules seem unstable. For developing countries, fragmentation poses a mixed risk: it can speed up industrial relocation and support import substitution, but it may also limit market access and raise costs for imported intermediates. Additionally, export controls and sanctions can hinder technology transfer and increase development expenses. In this context, strengthening domestic capabilities becomes essential—not just a political slogan but a practical strategy for security.

5.3 Rift between the US administration and the WTO

The relationship between the Trump administration and the World Trade Organization (WTO) highlights a growing divide over the future of global trade governance, raising concerns about the WTO's relevance today. The U.S. has openly criticized the WTO's core principles—especially Most-Favored Nation (MFN) and reciprocity—considering them outdated assumptions of convergence among trading partners. The Trump administration has consistently argued that the WTO cannot resolve systemic issues like trade imbalances, state subsidies, and what it sees as unfair practices by countries such as China. It also criticizes India and others for blocking reforms. Meanwhile, Washington has warned that if the WTO cannot support plurilateral agreements—where countries that agree move forward without unanimity—it may no longer be viable for negotiations. This reflects U.S. opposition to consensus-based multilateralism in its current form. Although the administration has not formally withdrawn from the WTO and maintains limited engagement, its position indicates a move away from rule-based multilateral trade toward power-based, negotiated outcomes. This shift challenges the WTO's central role in global trade and accelerates the fragmentation of trade governance.

6. Civilisational Assertion and the Rise of Multiple Modernities

A major intellectual change linked to multipolarity is the rejection of a single route to modernity. Traditional modernisation stories suggested that societies advance by adopting

 DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

Western institutions, values, and lifestyles, a view supported by colonial histories and post-war development ideas that saw non-Western traditions as barriers to progress. However, scholars now increasingly support the concept of "multiple modernities," which posits that civilisations can modernise differently while maintaining their cultural identities.

Contemporary scholarship increasingly rejects the assumption that modernisation requires convergence toward a single Western model. Conrad (2024) argues that global history demonstrates multiple pathways to modernity, where societies selectively adapt global institutions while preserving distinct cultural identities. This framework is particularly relevant for understanding India's developmental discourse under Atmanirbhar Bharat and Vikshit Bharat 2047.

6.1 Conrad, Entanglement, and Plural Pathways

Sebastian Conrad's global historical perspective remains pertinent to contemporary discussions. Conrad highlights that modernity arises from global interactions such as borrowing, adaptation, and reinterpretation at the local level. This suggests that development does not necessitate cultural imitation; instead, societies can selectively incorporate technologies and institutions, integrating them into their moral frameworks. This concept clarifies why civilisational narratives gain strength as universalism diminishes: as Western dominance over modernity wanes, various civilisations assert the legitimacy of their own developmental paths.

6.2 Comparative Illustrations: Russia, China, Japan, Europe, and the United States

Japan exemplifies early selective modernisation, balancing western influence with cultural preservation. After the 1868 Meiji Restoration, it swiftly embraced modern industry, military, education, and technology to prevent colonisation, yet maintained its cultural and traditional identity. Even now, Japan merges technological advancement and global economic ties with a focus on social cohesion, cultural heritage, and national uniqueness. This shows that economic progress can coexist with cultural continuity.

China poses perhaps the greatest challenge to the traditional Western development model. Since Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms in 1978, it has become the world's manufacturing centre and a key player in technology. Unlike liberal market economies,

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

China blends state-led capitalism, centralized politics, and a focus on its civilizational heritage. Under President Xi Jinping, ideas like the "Chinese Dream" and the "great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" have become central to national identity. China now presents itself not just as a rising power but as a 5,000-year-old civilization offering an alternative route to modernity and growth.

Russia has revived civilizational narratives in response to the post-Cold War order. It increasingly presents itself as a unique Eurasian civilization rooted in its own history, culture, and spirituality, separate from the West. President Vladimir Putin often highlights traditional values, Orthodox Christianity, and national sovereignty as core elements of Russian identity. The rising focus on a "Russian World" signifies the idea that national strength and geopolitical influence should be based on civilizational continuity rather than just economic factors.

Europe, historically a staunch supporter of globalization and economic integration, is now gradually adopting greater strategic autonomy and regulatory independence. The European Union's approach to industrial policies, digital laws, climate commitments, and the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) reflects a balanced effort to safeguard European interests without abandoning international collaboration. This trend suggests that even established liberal democracies are shifting from unregulated free-market globalization toward more strategic, state-supported economic models.

The United States, traditionally seen as the main driver of globalization, has experienced notable changes. Recent government initiatives emphasise industrial policy, strengthening supply chains, advancing semiconductor production, and engaging in strategic rivalry with China. Legislation like the CHIPS and Science Act and the Inflation Reduction Act show a renewed emphasis on domestic manufacturing and economic security. These trends indicate that globalization is being increasingly influenced by national interests and strategic considerations instead of a universal convergence assumption.

These examples illustrate a global shift from convergence-driven globalization to a multipolar order marked by diverse modernities, strategic autonomy, and culturally rooted development pathways. India's Atmanirbhar Bharat and Vikshit Bharat 2047 initiatives should be seen not as exceptions but as part of a broader international trend where nations

DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

aim to balance global involvement with civilizational identity, economic resilience, and national development goals.

Table 1 Comparing Economic Model, Strategic Goal, and Globalisation Approach

Region	Economic Model	Strategic Goal	Globalisation Approach
USA	Strategic Liberalism	Preserve leadership	Selective openness
China	State Capitalism	National rejuvenation	Controlled integration
Russia	Resource Sovereignty	Strategic autonomy	Selective engagement
Japan	Adaptive Modernisation	Technological leadership	Open but protected
Europe	Regulatory Capitalism	Strategic autonomy	Rules-based openness
India	Atmanirbhar Development	Vikshit Bharat 2047	Resilient globalisation

Source: Compiled by the Author

7. India's Civilisational Response: Swadeshi to Atmanirbhar Bharat

India's focus on self-reliance today draws from the long-standing Swadeshi tradition, emphasising local production, community strength, and political independence. Historically linked to the moral economy and independence movement, it influenced debates on industrialisation, village economies, and cultural pride. In the 1990s, Swadeshi was often marginalised by the dominant pro-globalisation narrative. Promoting Swadeshi was viewed as regressive by elites. Yet, this criticism anticipated major issues of hyper-globalisation, including over-dependence on foreign supply chains, the decline of national industrial capacity, and greater susceptibility to financial crises.

7.1 India's Economic Growth in the Last Decade

Over the past decade, India's economic revival has shifted from a largely consumption- and services-driven growth model to a more balanced and confident development path. This transformation enables India to present itself as a "New India" to the world. Key factors include sustained macroeconomic stability, extensive infrastructure growth in highways, railways, ports, airports, and digital connectivity, along with structural reforms like the Goods and Services Tax (GST), Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), and direct benefit transfers, which have laid a solid foundation for growth. India has become a global leader in digital public infrastructure through platforms such as Aadhaar, UPI, and CoWIN,

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

showcasing scalable, low-cost governance solutions for both developing and advanced economies.

The manufacturing and strategic sectors have gained momentum via Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes, defence indigenisation, and the development of semiconductor and electronics ecosystems. Additionally, India's start-up scene has expanded rapidly, establishing the country as a hub of innovation and entrepreneurship. Coupled with its rising geopolitical influence, resilience to global shocks, and a focus on self-reliance alongside international engagement, this economic resurgence positions India as a "New India"- confident, capable, reform-driven, and prepared to shape rather than merely follow the changing global economic landscape. (Saran and Singh 2023)

Recent evaluations indicate that India's mix of infrastructure development, digital public platforms, manufacturing boosts, and demographic edge positions it as a top growth hub in the emerging multipolar economic landscape (World Bank, 2025; Virmani, 2024). The Observer Research Foundation (ORF) describes India's economic progress as resilient, driven by strong domestic demand and ongoing structural reforms. Their reports show that India has maintained vigorous economic growth, with GDP increasing by 7.7% in FY26, affirming its status as the world's fourth-largest economy. (Sarkar, 2025) These achievements bolster India's goal to shift from a developing country to a developed nation by 2047.

7.2 Atmanirbhar Bharat: Policy Meaning and Misinterpretations

Atmanirbhar Bharat is often misunderstood as a return to protectionism or inward-looking import substitution, but such interpretations overlook its strategic depth and contemporary relevance. As articulated by the Government of India, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, Atmanirbhar Bharat is not about closing the Indian economy; rather, it is about building **self-reliant capabilities that enable confident and resilient global engagement** (PIB, 2020). The core idea is to strengthen domestic economic fundamentals—manufacturing capacity, technological competence, logistics, and institutional efficiency—so that India can withstand external shocks while remaining integrated with global markets.

DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

Strategically, Atmanirbhar Bharat aims to provide India with vital options amid global disruptions. Recent events such as the pandemic, supply chain disruptions, geopolitical tensions, and sanctions have highlighted the dangers of overreliance on a few external sources for crucial goods, technologies, and energy. By promoting local production in sectors such as pharmaceuticals, electronics, defence, renewable energy, and semiconductors, the initiative boosts national resilience and reduces vulnerability while maintaining openness.

The policy framework clearly states that self-reliance and export focus are compatible. Global competitiveness depends on adherence to international quality standards, innovation, and participation in global value chains. The phrase "local to global" reflects this idea—Indian companies are encouraged to expand locally, improve efficiency and quality, and then compete internationally. Programs like Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes, reforms to simplify doing business, and logistics upgrades aim to make Indian industry competitive on a global scale, not just inward-focused.

Atmanirbhar Bharat should be seen as a strategic adjustment to globalisation rather than a rejection of it. It re-establishes space for national policies, encourages local innovation and entrepreneurship, and enhances India's influence in global trade and diplomacy. By blending domestic capacity development with international engagement, Atmanirbhar Bharat helps India shift from a dependent player in global markets to a confident, resilient, and influential economic power in an evolving global landscape.

7.3 Civilisational Economics: Family, Community, and Sustainability

India embraces the idea of civilizational economics, where economics are deeply linked to lifestyle and social institutions. Family networks can replace welfare spending; shared housing reduces ecological impact; and dietary choices affect land use, water use, and emissions. Thus, the essence of Atmanirbhar Bharat isn't just tariffs but a harmony of philosophy, objectives, habits, and consumption. This reflects the classical Indian concept of dharma as moral order: prosperity should align with ethical and social duties. Although policies must be grounded in evidence, this foundational perspective reminds us that development strategies that ignore cultural contexts often face resistance or foster unsustainable consumption.

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

7.4 Strategic Autonomy and Economic Diplomacy

India has historically prioritised strategic autonomy in its foreign policy. Today, this autonomy also influences economic diplomacy, involving diversifying suppliers, boosting domestic capacity, and forging partnerships with different blocs. The concept of Atmanirbhar Bharat serves as an economic framework for this independence. The goal is not to isolate from global trade but to engage in international negotiations confidently, with resilience to shocks and the ability to safeguard vital sectors when global rules are politicized.

8. Vikshit Bharat 2047: Development with Cultural Continuity

The vision of Vikshit Bharat 2047 is a comprehensive national development strategy aimed at transforming India into a developed economy by the centenary of independence. According to NITI Aayog (2025), this transformation requires sustained economic growth, technological leadership, infrastructure modernization, institutional reforms, and social inclusion. Recent policy documents further emphasize digital public infrastructure and sustainability as critical enablers of this transition (NITI Aayog, 2026).

Vikshit Bharat 2047 is a forward-looking national mission anchored in the centenary of independence. Policy articulations emphasise economic growth, technological upgrading, infrastructure development, social empowerment, and sustainability (Government of India, 2025). The framing is significant: it treats development as a multi-dimensional transformation rather than mere GDP expansion.

8.1 Development Without Westernisation

The idea of becoming "developed" is sometimes confused with Westernisation. The scholarship on multiple modernities suggests that development can be culturally plural (Conrad, 2007). India's ambition is therefore not to imitate the West's historical path but to craft a distinctly Indian pathway—drawing on civilisational confidence, pluralism, and democratic institutions. This orientation is visible in policy rhetoric that links growth with cultural rootedness and social cohesion.

8.2 Education, Culture, and Sanatan Ethical Frames

Educational reforms are crucial for long-term growth. A workforce prepared for Industry 4.0 needs skills in science, math, critical thinking, and digital literacy. It also depends on

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22719991

social trust, civic values, and ethical reasoning. Viewed through a cultural lens, Sanatan philosophy offers ethical concepts such as dharma (duty), seva (service), and balance that can promote responsible innovation and sustainability. The challenge is to interpret these ideas inclusively and in a modern way, aligning them with constitutional principles and a scientific temper. In a polarised world, such a balanced cultural perspective can serve as a strategic asset by boosting social capital and national unity.

8.3 Growth Drivers and the Political Economy of Jobs

Vikshit Bharat 2047's success depends on creating high-quality jobs at scale. Achieving this relies on enhancing productivity, upgrading industries, and fostering conditions favorable for entrepreneurship. Virmani (2024) highlights the importance of empowering job creators and removing obstacles that limit private investment and innovation. In a global economy that is increasingly fragmented, India's job strategy must tap into international opportunities—such as exports, investment, and technology collaborations—while also strengthening domestic manufacturing sectors and MSMEs. The concept of Atmanirbhar Bharat serves as the foundational capability for Vikshit Bharat 2047.

Nikam and Kothe (2025) argue that achieving Vikshit Bharat status will require balancing fiscal sustainability, productive employment generation, and international economic partnerships. Their analysis highlights the importance of integrating domestic industrial development with global market opportunities.

9. Is India Confronting or Reconstructing Globalisation?

The question "Is India confronting globalisation?" might be misleading if one interprets confrontation as outright rejection or withdrawal from the global system. This view oversimplifies India's current economic and strategic stance. Policy choices, diplomatic actions, and developmental stories indicate a more nuanced and intentional approach: India is not rejecting globalisation but redefining how it engages with it to enhance national resilience, strategic independence, and civilisational principles. This redefinition involves three linked adjustments—economic, geopolitical, and cultural.

First, India is recalibrating its economic integration to prioritise resilience over vulnerability. Global value chains remain vital for accessing technology, capital, and

 DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

export markets, and India continues to pursue trade, investment, and international partnerships. However, recent global shocks—including the COVID-19 pandemic, supply-chain disruptions, and geopolitical conflicts—have revealed the risks of excessive reliance on external suppliers for critical goods such as pharmaceuticals, electronics, energy equipment, and defence systems. In response, India has prioritized strengthening domestic production through initiatives like Atmanirbhar Bharat, Production Linked Incentive schemes, and infrastructure modernization. This approach does not oppose openness; instead, it aims to combine global integration with domestic capacity so that participation in global markets becomes a strength rather than a strategic vulnerability.

Secondly, India is adjusting its diplomatic approach to embrace a more flexible multipolar stance. In a world no longer dominated by a single power, India increasingly pursues issue-based partnerships with diverse actors, including the United States, Europe, Russia, Japan, and the emerging economies of the Global South. This approach reflects India's longstanding commitment to strategic autonomy while enabling it to maximise economic and geopolitical opportunities across competing power centres. Rather than aligning exclusively with any bloc, India seeks to position itself as a balancing power capable of engaging multiple partners simultaneously.

India is uniquely redefining the concept of modernity that drives globalisation. Unlike the traditional view, which linked development to Westernisation—embracing Western consumption, social habits, and cultural norms- India's current discourse offers a different perspective. It draws on Swadeshi traditions, cultural confidence, and Sanatan ethics to present a vision where economic progress and technological innovation are rooted in moral and social values. As Conrad's theory of multiple modernities indicates, societies can progress in various ways without adopting a single cultural pattern (Conrad, 2007). Gurumurthy (2025) further emphasises that for India, economic growth is intertwined with lifestyle, family systems, and social capital, all of which significantly influence development.

Overall, these three adjustments suggest that India does not see globalisation as an adversary but as a process to be reshaped into one that is pluralistic, interest-driven, and rooted in culture. India aims for openness without reliance, engagement without subservience, and modernity that respects cultural diversity. In a world that is fragmented

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

and multipolar, this strategy not only keeps India involved in globalisation but also positions it to influence and help create a more equitable and inclusive global economic system.

10. Policy Implications for India

If India aims to recalibrate globalisation effectively in a rapidly evolving and multipolar world, certain policy implications become evident. These do not suggest withdrawing from global engagement but emphasise adopting strategic, disciplined, and value-based policymaking to enhance national resilience while maintaining openness.

1. A disciplined, performance-driven industrial policy should evolve beyond broad protection or indefinite subsidies. It needs to be targeted, time-limited, and focused on specific outcomes. Incentives must be linked to clear performance metrics like productivity gains, export expansion, technology uptake, and employment creation. This approach ensures that industrial support enhances competitiveness without fostering dependency or rent-seeking behaviors. Such a policy enables India to develop scale in key sectors—for example, electronics, defense, clean energy, and pharmaceuticals—while avoiding the inefficiencies linked to extended protectionist measures.

2. India's trade policy should strike a balance between openness and strategic safeguards. While engaging in global trade is vital for access to markets, technology transfer, and boosting exports, key sectors like food, energy, digital infrastructure, and industries related to national security require careful protections. Instead of focusing solely on tariff cuts, Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) should be assessed based on their ability to enhance domestic value addition, skill development, and integration into higher-value global chains. Overall, trade liberalization should avoid anchoring India in low-value manufacturing or commodity reliance.

3. India's technology strategy should focus on strengthening domestic R&D, fostering robust links between universities and industry, and investing long-term in scientific talent. It is also vital to establish trusted international partnerships to navigate the challenges of export controls, sanctions, and technology denial regimes. By cultivating indigenous capabilities in key sectors like semiconductors, artificial intelligence,

 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22719991

defense systems, and renewable energy, India can lessen its vulnerabilities while maintaining active global engagement.

4. Development Strategy Merging Sustainability and Inclusion
Future globalization will be increasingly influenced by climate policies and sustainability standards. India's development approach must therefore combine environmental sustainability with social inclusion. Investing in renewable energy, energy efficiency, green manufacturing, and climate-resilient infrastructure will support domestic growth and safeguard India's access to global markets amid expanding climate-related trade measures. Simultaneously, promoting inclusive growth—through job creation, skill enhancement, and regional development—helps maintain social stability and political sustainability during economic transformation.

5. Cultural confidence, rooted in India's civilisational ethos and ethical traditions, is a vital but often overlooked pillar of sustained development. It can foster social cohesion, trust, and moral legitimacy for economic reforms. To be effective, this confidence should be conveyed through inclusive and plural narratives that promote unity and avoid deepening divisions. A society with strong social cohesion is better prepared to maintain reform efforts, withstand economic shocks, and stay focused on long-term national objectives. When cultural confidence aligns with constitutional values, it transforms into an asset that enhances India's global engagement, rather than a limitation.

These policy implications indicate that India's approach to globalisation should be strategic, resilient, inclusive, and rooted in its culture. This will allow the country not only to adapt to the evolving world order but also to influence it in accordance with its national interests and civilisational values.

11. Conclusion

This paper explores whether India is responding to globalization through Atmanirbhar Bharat and Vikshit Bharat 2047. It suggests that the traditional Western-led model of globalization is waning, pressured by multipolarity, geopolitical conflicts, tariff disputes, and cultural resurgence. The re-emergence of industrial policies, the strategic use of interdependence, and the selective actions of major powers—particularly the US—have

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.22719991*

eroded confidence in a stable, rule-based liberal order. In this context, India's approach is better viewed as recalibration rather than outright rejection. Atmanirbhar Bharat aims to develop resilient domestic industries while maintaining global links, embodying strategic autonomy. Vikshit Bharat 2047 envisions progress as a multi-faceted goal, striving for economic prosperity and technological leadership while safeguarding cultural heritage. By placing these initiatives within Swadeshi traditions and the broader framework of multiple modernities, the paper indicates India is part of a global shift from convergence-based globalization to a more diverse, negotiated international order. Success will depend on effective policy implementation, strong institutions, and balancing cultural confidence with openness and innovation. (Khanna 2019 and Acharya 2014)If successful, India could influence a new conception of globalisation that aligns better with multipolarity and cultural diversity.

Acknowledgments

I sincerely thank PDEU for inspiring me to write this research article.

Disclosure of Interest

No potential competing interest was reported by the author.

Funding

No funding was received for the conduct of this research.

Data Availability

The author confirms that the data supporting the finding of this study are available within the articles and its supplementary materials. Data that support the findings of the study are available on reasonable request.

References

1. Acharya, A. (2014). *The end of American world order*. Polity Press.
2. Baldwin, R. (2016). *The great convergence: Information technology and the new globalization*. Harvard University Press.

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

3. Bremmer, I. (2022). *The power of crisis: How three threats—and our response—will change the world*. Simon & Schuster.

4. Charles, K. K., Hurst, E., & Schwartz, M. (2018). The transformation of manufacturing and the decline in U.S. employment. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 24468. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24468

5. Clingendael Institute. (2025). *The BRICS and the emerging order of multipolarity*. Clingendael Institute.

6. Conrad, S. (2007). *Globalization and modernity*. Cambridge University Press.

7. Conrad, S. (2024). Global history and multiple modernities in the twenty-first century. *Global Intellectual History*.

8. Eichengreen, B. (2011). *Exorbitant privilege: The rise and fall of the dollar and the future of the international monetary system*. Oxford University Press.

9. Eichengreen, B. (2023). *In defense of public debt*. Oxford University Press.

10. Fan, T., Wo, M., & Xiang, W. (2025). *Geopolitical barriers to globalization*. Working Paper.

11. Ghori, U. (2025). *Globalisation disrupted: Competing futures in a multipolar world*. Routledge.

12. Government of India. (2025). *Mission statement of Viksit Bharat 2047*. Government of India.

13. 1 Gurumurthy, S. (2023). *India and the changing world order: Emerging paradigm shift in the global political and economic landscape*. Vivekananda International Foundation.

14. Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Polity Press.

15. International Monetary Fund. (2025). *World economic outlook: Fragmentation and growth*. IMF.

DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

16. Khanna, P. (2019). *The future is Asian: Commerce, conflict, and culture in the 21st century*. Simon & Schuster.

17. Luo, Y. (2025). A multipolar geo-strategy for international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*.

18. Mahbubani, K. (2020). *Has China won? The Chinese challenge to American primacy*. PublicAffairs.

19. McKenzie, F. (2020). GATT and global order in the postwar era. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108860192

20. Nikam, S. S., & Kothe, S. (2025). *Forging a developed India: Growth imperatives, fiscal sustainability, and multilateral partnerships for Viksit Bharat 2047*.

21. NITI Aayog. (2025). *India's path to global leadership: Strategic imperatives for Viksit Bharat @2047*. Government of India.

22. NITI Aayog. (2026). *DPI@2047 for Viksit Bharat: A strategic roadmap to enable non-linear inclusive socio-economic growth*. Government of India.

23. Norring, A. (2024). *Geoeconomic fragmentation, globalization and multilateralism*. Bank of Finland Discussion Paper.

24. Press Information Bureau. (2020, May 12). *PM gives a clarion call for Atmanirbhar Bharat*. Government of India.

25. Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: Democracy and the future of the world economy*. W. W. Norton.

26. Rodrik, D. (2024). Industrial policy for the twenty-first century. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 40*(1), 1–23.

27. Saran, S., & Singh, A. (2023). *Pax Sinica: Implications for the Indian dawn*. Rupa Publications.

28. Sarkar, D. (2025, April 22). Navigating structural dualism and inclusive opportunities in India. *Observer Research Foundation*.

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***

https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/navigating-structural-dualism-and-inclusive-opportunities-in-india

29. Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. W. W. Norton.

30. Tchernia, A. (2016). Winds and coins. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (pp. 229–248). https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198723714.003.0015

31. Virmani, A. (2024). *Viksit Bharat: Unshackling job creators and empowering growth drivers* (Working Paper). NITI Aayog.

32. World Bank. (2025). *Global economic prospects 2025*. World Bank.

33. World Trade Organization. (2025). *World trade report 2025: Trade, geopolitics and economic security*. WTO.

 DOI: ***10.5281/zenodo.22719991***