

Reconceptualising Indian Wisdom *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* through Karl Deutsch's Security Community Framework

Aman Bora¹

Abstract

Modern International Relations theory has predominantly seen universalist ethical principles as normatively attractive yet politically unfeasible. This paper asks whether the ancient Indian ideal of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, the idea that the world is one family, can be rendered analytically meaningful within contemporary International Relations theory. Instead of seeing *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* as a dream of world peace, this paper rethinks it as a set of moral rules that include self-control, mutual respect, and shared responsibility. Drawing on Karl Deutsch's concept of security communities, it argues that *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* should be understood not as a blueprint for global political unity but as a normative logic compatible with pluralistic security communities. By analysing illustrative cases of NATO, ASEAN, and the EU, the paper shows how shared identity, repeated interaction, and institutionalised trust can operationalise universalist ethics without dissolving sovereignty. The article contributes to Global IR debates by bridging non-Western normative philosophy with established Western theoretical frameworks, highlighting how civilizational ethical traditions can serve as analytical resources for understanding cooperation and order in global politics.

Keywords: *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, Security Community, Global Citizenship, Multipolarity, Peace, Karl Deutsch.

¹ Aman Bora is a PhD Candidate at SSJDWSSS Govt. PG College, Ranikhet, Almora, India.

Introduction

The phrase ‘*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*’ has become even more relevant since 2023, after serving as the theme of India’s G20 presidency and International Yoga Day (Raina & Kumar, 2023). Indian leaders have also used the phrase to project India’s foreign policy objectives on various platforms, thereby shaping New Delhi’s image in the international sphere (MEA, 2023; Sidhu, 2017). Through the Sanskrit expression *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, India conveys the message that ‘*the cosmos is one family*’, a core philosophy of Indian culture that has endured for ages. The phrase encourages people to accept diversity and to consider all living things, including people, animals, birds, and plants, as a single extended family. It speaks of peaceful coexistence, unity and the need for proper communication and dialogue between individuals to foster harmonious relations.

In the 21st century, the concepts of global citizenship, intercultural communication, and international collaboration are increasingly relevant due to advancements in technology and connectivity, or, to put it simply, globalisation. The principle of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* promotes unity among humanity and emphasises our collective responsibility for peace and a rule-based world order. It encourages individuals to see themselves as global citizens, connected beyond national boundaries and motivated to engage in environmental, social and economic actions (Israel, 2012). Both *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* and global citizenship foster a broader perspective that emphasises empathy, responsibility and connection to all people and the planet (UNESCO, n.d.; Kar, 2023). Conceptually, *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is best understood not as a theory of International Relations (IR) or a policy philosophy, but as a civilizational ethical standard that stresses moral self-restraint, mutual acknowledgement, and the indivisibility of communal well-being.

However, in the present global order, where there is a constant struggle for power and unresolved differences between countries, the idea of a global family seems too idealistic and utopian to realist scholars. Expecting the United States of America (US), the People’s Republic of China, India-Pakistan, Russia-Ukraine, Israel-Iran, Sudan-South Sudan, and many other countries around the globe to live as an inclusive global society and follow the ideals of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* seems utopian in the near future. With a unified world and a global society, the problematic question is: *Who will be the authority?*

Realist scholars such as Hans J. Morgenthau in *Politics Among Nations* (1948) and Kenneth Waltz in *Theory of International Politics* (1979) conceptualise international politics as a contest for power and security, thereby explaining the frequent dismissal of universalist moral assertions as unrealistic. At the same time, liberal institutionalists like Robert Keohane in *After Hegemony* (1984) and Ikenberry in *After Victory* (2001) argue that international institutions may change incentives and make it easier for countries to work together. Building on these debates, this study contends that Karl Deutsch's notion of security communities offers a feasible analytical framework for operationalising *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* while preserving sovereignty. Instead of imagining a world state or a hierarchical global family, this study sees *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* as a normative ethic that works with pluralistic security groups based on common identity, regular interaction, and institutionalised trust. As also supported by constructivist scholarship, such as Alexander Wendt's Social Theory of International Politics (1999) and Martha Finnemore's National Interests in International Society (1996), which contend that norms and collective identities can transform state interests, provides a theoretical framework for *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* to shape interstate behaviour. Accordingly, *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* should not be seen as a plan for world peace, but as a moral code that explains why and how security communities last.

This tension stimulates a theoretical inquiry that has received insufficient systematic attention within IR studies. Although universalist ethical philosophies like *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* present persuasive normative frameworks for global unity, international politics remains organised around a Realist understanding of pluralistic sovereign states functioning in a state of anarchy. The principal research inquiry of this study is: *under what circumstances may universalist ethical philosophies be implemented within pluralistic international frameworks?*

While ancient universalist concepts such as *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* express a vision of global unity based on collective moral obligation, the field of IR has yet to systematically examine how these normative ideals can be implemented within interstate political frameworks. *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is most often found in philosophical or ethical discourse, lacking definitive connections to conceptions of interstate cooperation. Deutsch's security community framework defines regions where violence is rendered inconceivable through shared values and nonviolent conflict resolution (Deutsch et al., 1957). However, existing literature predominantly emphasises regional dynamics and identity formation, rather

than the translation of universal ethical principles into structural cooperation (Bellamy, 2004). This paper bridges the gap between moral philosophy and structural IR theory by integrating the normative ideal of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* with the analytical frameworks of security communities. This paper contributes three significant aspects to the field of IR. First, it redefines *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* as a normative ethic instead of a utopian political initiative. Second, it shows how Deutsch's idea of a security community provides institutions with a way to put universalist ethics into practice within diverse international regimes. Third, it adds to global studies by highlighting how ethical traditions from outside the West can be used as analytical tools rather than merely as cultural artefacts.

Normative and civilizational foundations of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*

The origin of the phrase can be traced back to the verse in the Maha Upanishad's Chapter 6 VI.71-73 as a quality of a 'brahmayogi': '*ayaṃ bandhurayaṃ neti gaṇanā laghucetasām, udāracaritānām tu Vasudhaiva Kuṭumbakam.*' This may be translated as: 'This one is a relative; this other one is a stranger' is for the mean-minded. To those recognised for their generosity, the entire world constitutes but a family (The Theosophical Publishing House, Chennai, n.d.). Also, in V.3.37 of the Panchatantra (3rd century BCE) and in V.1.3.71 of the Hitopadesha (12th century CE), this verse is also employed. The concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is also found in Sangam (300-100 BCE) literature in the phrase '*Yaadhum Oore, Yaavarum Kelir,*' which translates to 'every country is my own and all the people are my kinsmen'. The term 'Global Village' 's modern relevance is evident in its coinage by Canadian thinker Marshall McLuhan in the 1960s (Karekatti, 2013, pp. 52–53).

While *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is primarily recognised in the Maha Upanishad, Indian political thought offers supplementary concepts, such as public welfare and state responsibilities in Kautilya's Arthashastra and the moral obligations of rulers in the Mahabharata, that provide a more expansive indigenous framework for assessing cosmopolitan ideals. The Mahabharata expresses an ethical conception of monarchy, i.e., *Lokasamgraha*, which articulates the principle of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, in which political authority is founded on moral restraint, impartial care, and accountability to all beings, rather than mere allegiance to a limited society (Verma, 2025). The phrase *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, meaning the world is one family, is not limited to just a sense of peace and unity among people living

far across the globe. However, it also emphasises the need for the world to live as a family, disregarding economic and social differences, to build a secure and harmonious future.

Mahatma Gandhi's 'non-violence' or 'ahimsa' is also related to *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, which holds that harming others is harming the self (Maheshwari & Gehni, 2023). It also highlights the fact that the welfare of one person or community affects the welfare of the entire world. Gandhi's philosophy emphasised the virtues of truth, nonviolence and love as a means of establishing a peaceful global society. He emphasised the *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* principle, which states that to realise the dream of world peace, one must consider all people as members of one family by spreading the values of love and selflessness. He promoted the idea of 'Purity of Means' to emphasise the value of nonviolence. His belief in the idea of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* can be seen in one of his statements-

If I want freedom for my country... I do not want that freedom in order that I, belonging to a nation which counts one-fifth of the human race, may exploit any other race upon earth, or any single individual. If I want that freedom for my country, I would not be deserving of that freedom if I did not cherish and treasure the equal right of every other race, weak or strong, to the same freedom (Kumar, n.d.).

These civilizational and ethical articulations position *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* not only as a cultural slogan but as a normative ethic of communal responsibility, which the succeeding parts analyse within the framework of security community theory.

Security community

In 1957, Czech political scientist Karl Deutsch coined the term Security Community in his book *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* and defined it as a group that has become integrated, where integration is defined as the development of a sense of community, endorsed by formal or informal institutions or practices, sufficiently robust and pervasive to ensure peaceful transitions among group members with 'reasonable' assurance over a 'extended' duration (Deutsch et al., 1957; Koschut, 2014, p. 520; Adler & Barnett, 1998b, p. 6; Tusicisny, 2007, p. 426). Deutsch believed that peaceful transition methods are essential for addressing societal challenges. A security community involves deeper interdependence and understanding among member nations beyond mere state-to-state collaboration.

Adler and Barnett defined security communities as ‘social facts,’ indicating that they are neither psychological processes within the minds of particular decision-makers nor mere epiphenomenal effects of the (material or normative) costs associated with conflict (Adler & Barnett, 1998b). Security communities can help reduce or end violent conflicts by connecting people and weakening borders. These groups of governments promote confidence and cooperation in addressing security concerns, fostering interconnection and shared responsibility for peace and stability.

One of the major characteristics of the Security Community and the concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is the sense of ‘collective identity’. States prioritise the security and well-being of the community as a whole over personal interests, seeing themselves as members of a greater community. The question arises: how can a feeling of community be developed? Deutsch responds that a significant number of transactions are required to foster a strong sense of community. These interactions foster a sense of trust, compassion and obedience as well as reciprocal empathy and devotion (Ditrych, 2014, p. 351).

A shared identity encourages collaboration and solidarity during times of adversity, generating a sense of unity. Bellamy (2004) argues that social norms are produced by and embedded in security communities (p. 52). These norms define agent identities, impose behavioural restrictions, and provide a structure for members to convey their identities. An increase in security communities will lead to tighter coupling, obscuring distinctions between insiders and outsiders. Tuscisny (2007) found that residents of four security communities, Europe, North America, Southeast Asia, and South America, exhibit greater tolerance toward out-groups than the global population (p. 425). Complete security communities also show higher interpersonal trust, making civil and interstate conflict unimaginable.

Some of the major present-day examples of a security community are the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which has defined itself as a ‘*transatlantic security community*’ (NATO, 2010); the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) also committed in 2003 to form a security community at Bali Concord II and prepared the updated blueprint titled- ASEAN Political-security Community Blueprint, 2025 (ASEAN, 2016). ‘*Building a security community*’ was the objective set forward by the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in 2012 (OSCE Secretary General, 2012).

According to Adler and Barnett, security communities frequently emerge in response to threats. States band together to lower the transaction costs associated with addressing that threat. This is illustrated by Bellamy (2004), who gives examples of the EU and ASEAN: Europe formed a security community to reduce the possibility of future war among its member states, as in the past, and ASEAN formed to improve relations among its member states. Also, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) emerged to protect them from external threats (pp. 183-184). ASEAN's response to regional crises, such as during the 1997 Asian financial crisis, shows that even in times of great stress, standards of consultation and non-violence remain important. This strengthens the idea that member states could resolve their differences peacefully. This norm-driven approach aligns with *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*'s focus on living together despite differences and with a regional order that is pluralistic rather than hierarchical.

Karl Deutsch's security community framework explains how shared expectations for peaceful change emerge through transactions, communication, and institutionalisation. However, it mainly neglects the normative foundations of restraint that sustain such communities over time. Adler and Barnett (1998b) assert that security communities depend on common norms and identities; nevertheless, the ethical underpinnings of these norms remain underexamined in the literature. *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, as a civilizational ethic, provides the moral rationale for restraint, thereby supporting the formation of security communities.

Encouraging understanding and amicable dispute resolution fosters world peace. Communities grow through transparency and open communication. A security community enhances international peace by promoting cultural and economic interactions while addressing shared issues like climate change and terrorism. By tackling root causes like injustice and poverty, it supports long-term peace and well-being.

The impracticality with *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*

The interpretation of the phrase '*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*' has been done in numerous ways in different situations, and a Sutra from the Rigveda- '*Ekam sat Vipra Bahudha Vadanti*', fits perfectly with this, which means '*truth is one, the wise perceive it differently*'. Presently, *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is used globally as a reference for the optimal path states should take for peace and harmony. However, if we look at one of the ancient texts, '*Hitopadesha*' or

‘Beneficial Instruction’, we come across fables that mention the phrase ‘*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*’ but take a different stance. In the tale, a cunning jackal asks a deer for shelter, using the phrase *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*. Ignoring the warnings from other animals about trusting strangers, the deer lets the jackal move in. The jackal then plots to have the deer killed (Pritchett, n.d.).

A practical approach recognises the need for caution while promoting harmony and peace, particularly towards those not fully understood. The concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, which advocates a unified world, offers guidance for policy-making but may be unrealistic given significant ideological, political, and religious differences. Tiwari (2011) likens it to a hoax, highlighting public misunderstandings that lead to flawed policy applications. While the idea encourages a global perspective, it may conflict with individual countries’ objectives. National governments must prioritise sovereignty and citizen interests, which can clash with the notion of a borderless global family. The concept of global citizenship, which also speaks of global unity and the expansion of boundaries, is criticised by Bhikhu Parekh, who argues that it is unrealistic and detached from one’s immediate community. A world state of this kind would unavoidably be ‘*remote, bureaucratic, oppressive and culturally bland,*’ he adds (Parekh, 2002, p. 12). However, unlike the abstract universalism that Parekh criticises, *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* does not aim to erase cultural or political differences in favour of a single global identity. *Vasudhaiva*, rooted in Hindu moral philosophy, emphasises moral growth through self-control and acceptance of differences rather than the removal of communal borders. In this way, it supports pluralism by promoting moral responsibility among cultures while respecting their unique characteristics.

Waheguru Pal Singh Sidhu has outlined the major inadequacies of the idea of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* in an article. He, too, states that although the phrase has entered India’s diplomatic lexicon as a mantra, it remains ambiguous and is rarely clarified. He further states that everyone has equal rights inside the ‘family’, which is seen as the ideal and most effective entity. However, most of the families are dysfunctional. He puts the following serious questions about the idea of the global family (Sidhu, 2022):

- a) Who is the family’s head, and how is authority divided?
- b) How will disagreements be settled and judgments be upheld?

- c) How will power be distributed among the numerous leaders and centres in the new multipolar world?

According to realists, the theory of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* ignores the competitive character of IR and the self-interest that motivates state behaviour. In contrast to emphasising a more glamorous picture of world unity, the *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* philosophy downplays the relevance of nations and their inalienable pursuit of national interests. Although it advocates an enchanting vision of world solidarity and connectivity, it becomes overly simplistic, appropriates cultural practices, is impractical, and may run afoul of national interests and economic realities.

Bridging gaps of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* with the security community

The concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, while idealistic, can be interpreted as relevant for global peace, harmony, and sustainability. With advancements in science and technology, a full-fledged war between nuclear-capable countries poses a significant threat. Current tensions, such as the Russia-Ukraine War and the India-Pakistan-China disputes in the Himalayas, contribute to global uncertainty and strained relations among nations.

The idea of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* offers a constructive approach to the tense global environment by promoting unity and respect among countries. In a world where social harmony is often threatened, this concept encourages cross-border collaboration. Its perceived impracticality can be addressed through the framework of a Security Community. As highlighted by Mitzen (2016), the defining characteristic of a security community is the internalisation of norms that make war inconceivable rather than merely improbable. This reasoning strongly aligns with the ethical concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, which posits a collective moral constraint in political interactions.

The concept of a security community can be utilised to answer the following major questions posed by realists regarding the practicality of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*:

‘Who will be head of the global family and how the authority will be divided?’

One primary question realists raise about the practicality of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is the need for consensus-based leadership rather than a hierarchical one. In today’s world, creating a single unit by dissolving national borders is impractical. Therefore, fostering a sense of

community across borders is essential. This is exemplified by a security community in which states share a sense of unity, treat each other with respect, and build mutual trust through repeated interactions and adherence to shared norms. As a result, member nations view each other's intentions and commitments as predictable and reliable in their security relationships.

NATO operates without a formal leadership hierarchy, relying on consensus-based decision-making among its member countries. This democratic approach grants the Alliance political legitimacy and military credibility, ensuring that all members are involved and accountable for decisions. Disagreement thus signifies both a collective failure and individual dissent (Olsen, 2020, p. 64). The NATO Secretary-General fosters collaboration as the alliance's representative, but lacks power over member countries. Similarly, the European Union has rotating chairpersons who lead meetings but have limited authority, with member nations involved in the decision-making process. NATO's transformation into a security community was enabled not just by institutional frameworks but also by profound socialisation processes, including military integration, standardised joint planning, and the internalisation of collective democratic principles. These behaviours created reciprocal expectations of restraint, making it impossible for members to use force against one another, even while they still disagreed. This dynamic is similar to the moral logic of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* because both are based on self-control and trust instead of a hierarchy of power.

In a security community like *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* or the 'Global Family', member states can exercise leadership individually or jointly, depending on the situation. They develop skills in diplomacy, negotiation, and collaboration to address collective security concerns. Decision-making authority is shared based on trust and consensus. Members share intelligence and work together on security measures, including military drills and conflict resolution, fostering unity and amicable resolutions.

'How will disagreements be settled and judgments be upheld?'

In the concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, when thinking of a global family, conflict is inevitable. When heterogeneous societies unite to form a single global family, differences may arise over time, and to resolve them peacefully, diplomatic channels, mediation, arbitration, and other peaceful dispute-resolution techniques can be used.

The Achilles' heel of the contemporary idea of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* is the rivalry between states worldwide. Adler & Barnett, in the book 'Security Communities', recognised that it would be tough for the rival states to form a community of self-restraint, but each nation needs to take a 'leap of faith' even though there is a vulnerability for the first nation doing so. This leap of faith is essential, as repeated positive interactions will build trust between the nations and, ultimately, a sense of collective identity will form (Barnett & Adler, 1998, p. 414).

One contemporary example is the relationship between India and the US. Since Indian independence in 1947, their ties have fluctuated. During the Cold War, India maintained a non-aligned stance, resulting in cordial but limited relations. The US supported Pakistan during the 1971 Indo-Pakistan war, and relations further strained after India's nuclear tests in 1998. However, positive developments in the 21st century have transformed their relationship into a strategic partnership. Other examples include US-Japan relations and Germany's role in Europe after World War II. The border dispute resolution of 2015 between India and Bangladesh is another example of peaceful dispute resolution in which the two countries swapped 162 enclaves peacefully in the border region (Bhattacharya, 2015), which was even quoted as '*The conclusion of these international disputes prepared the path for development in more challenging conflicts*' (Shonk, 2023). Although limited in scope, the agreement illustrates how ethical restraint and mutual recognition can guide pragmatic conflict resolution, reflecting the micro-level operation of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* within a pluralistic political context.

The application of internal conflict resolution within *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* can be observed in NATO's history since its founding in 1949. For instance, during events like the Suez Crisis (1956), France's 1966 withdrawal from military command, debates over nuclear missiles in the 1980s, and the Iraq War (2003), member states effectively collaborated toward common goals rooted in shared values and strategic interests (Olsen, 2020, p. 64).

'How will power be distributed among the numerous leaders and centres in the new multipolar world?'

Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam (The world is one family) emphasises that, like a family, every member should treat one another with respect and compassion. There is an understanding of mutual well-being, in which the dignity of each individual is recognised, shaping actions and policies on a global scale. While Deutsch's Amalgamated security communities are rare,

Pluralistic security communities, such as the EU, NATO, ASEAN, and the Pacific Island Forum, can effectively address the distribution of power among member states. A finding made by Deutsch and others was that '*pluralistic security communities turned out to be somewhat easier to attain and easier to preserve than their amalgamated counterparts*' (Tusisicny, 2007, p. 426). Moreover, the same finding can be utilised today to form a global community.

In today's multipolar world, the concept of a Deutschian pluralistic security community enables states to make joint decisions and take coordinated actions in specific scenarios while preserving their autonomy on other issues, thereby preventing a sense of sovereignty breach among members. The US-Canada and Sweden-Norway relations exemplify this type of community.

Adler and Barnett (1998a) classify Deutsch's pluralistic security community into 'Loosely Coupled' and 'Tightly Coupled' categories to clarify power distribution (p. 30). In a loosely coupled community, member integration is lower than in a tightly coupled one. The EU is an example of a tightly coupled security community, where the democratic peace theory holds that democracies do not attack each other. Despite lacking military security guarantees before the Lisbon Treaty of 2009, the EU fostered a diverse security community through increased integration, reducing conflict among its members.

The security community does not diminish a state's sovereignty or legitimacy; rather, only the state's role is transformed as Adler and Barnett (1998a) state: '*The emergence of a transnational civic community will expand the role of the state as it becomes an agent that furthers the various wants of the community: security, economic welfare, human rights, a clean environment and so on*' (p. 36). The power can be vested not in any single individual or state within the global family. However, it can be exercised by any member, individually or collectively, after reaching a consensus, or by supranational institutions tasked with doing so.

This framework is not perfect. *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* assumes a baseline of normative convergence that could be lacking in highly polarised or authoritarian environments. Also, security communities are historically contingent and limited to specific areas, making them hard to apply globally. Consequently, the concept is primarily suited for interpreting zones of restraint rather than universal peace. Deutsch's differentiation between pluralistic and

amalgamated security communities highlights the feasibility of operationalising Vasudhaiva's cosmopolitan assertion in the absence of a world state.

Conclusion

Waheeda Rana discusses the divide in global paradigms, noting that while realists and neorealists view the world as anarchic and competitive, many regions value complex interdependence and cooperation for economic gain (Rana, 2015, p. 296). Despite realists highlighting instability, positive efforts are evident at both domestic and international levels for a harmonious future. The principle of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* emphasises our shared global society, essential for tackling environmental and social challenges. Misunderstandings about this concept often lead people to believe it opposes nationalism, but as Singh (2017) asserts, benevolent humanism can coexist with nationalist ideals (p. 101). *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* fosters human connections and promotes global happiness and prosperity.

The concept of a global family, or *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*, raises questions about authority and the distribution of power within the community. While the idea may seem daunting today, Deutsch suggested that a sense of community can emerge through increased interactions (Ditrych, 2014, p. 351). The notion of security communities, exemplified by organisations such as the EU, ASEAN, and NATO, can help address the practical challenges of fostering global unity. These cases collectively illustrate that security communities operate not as idealised moral frameworks but as empirically verifiable systems in which ethical self-restraint is integrated into institutional practices, thereby providing a pragmatic approach to interpreting *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* in modern international politics. Intergovernmental organisations such as the United Nations are vital in promoting this concept, as they have established communication channels.

This research demonstrates that security communities facilitate the implementation of universalist ethical philosophies across diverse international contexts, suggesting that *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* can transcend its status as a utopian ideal and serve as a normative ethic for global collaboration. By contesting realist denials of the political triviality of moral concepts, the paper redefines *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* as a framework of ethical self-restraint integrated into the mechanisms that preserve secure communities. This discovery prompts academics in Global IR to re-evaluate non-Western ethical traditions not solely as cultural

artefacts but as analytical tools for understanding order and cooperation in global politics. Ultimately, the theme of ‘the world is one family’ is essential to tackling global issues such as climate change, terrorism, inflation and poverty, which require collective action rather than isolated efforts.

References

- Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (1998a). A framework for the study of security communities. In E. Adler & M. Barnett (Eds.), *Security communities* (pp. 29–66). Cambridge University Press.
- Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (1998b). Security communities in theoretical perspective. In E. Adler & M. Barnett (Eds.), *Security communities* (pp. 3–28). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511598661.001>
- ASEAN. (2016). *ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint, 2025*. ASEAN Secretariat. Retrieved from <https://www.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/ASEAN-APSC-Blueprint-2025.pdf>
- Barnett, M., & Adler, E. (1998). Studying security communities in theory, comparison, and history. In E. Adler & M. Barnett (Eds.), *Security communities* (pp. 413–441). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511598661.013>
- Bellamy, A. J. (2004). Security communities and their neighbours: regional fortresses or global integrators? *Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks* (1st ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230005600>
- Bhattacharya, S. S. P. (2015, August 1). Historic enclave swap: 68 years after independence, another freedom at midnight. *The Times of India*. Retrieved from <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com>
- Deutsch, K. W., Jr., Burrell, S. A., Kann, R. A., Lee, M., Jr., Lichterman, M., Lindgren, R. E., . . . Van Wagenen, R. W. (1957). Political community and the North Atlantic Area: international organization in the light of historical experience. *The Center for Research on World Political Institutions Princeton University*. Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9781400878512_A26057382/preview-9781400878512_A26057382.pdf
- Ditrych, O. (2014). Security Community: a future for a troubled concept? *International Relations*, 28(3), 350–366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117814545952>
- Israel, R. C. (2014, April 1). What does it mean to be a global citizen? Retrieved October 10, 2025, from <https://www.kosmosjournal.org/article/what-does-it-mean-to-be-a-global-citizen/>
- Kar, A. K. (2023). The concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* (The world is a Family): Insights from the Mahopanisad. *National Journal of Hindi & Sanskrit Research*, 1(49), 42–45. journal-article.
- Karekatti, T. (2013). The idea of ‘*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*’ and Modern Indian Writers: A study of Raja Rao, Chaman Nahal and Datta Bhagat. *Critical Space*, II(3), 52–57.

- journal-article. Retrieved from
<http://criticalspacejournal.in/pdf/Octo%202013%20Critical%20Space.pdf>
- Koschut, S. (2014). Regional order and peaceful change: Security communities as a via media in international relations theory. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 49(4), 519–535.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836713517570>
- Kumar, R. (n.d.). Gandhi-India and Universalism. Retrieved October 14, 2025, from
<https://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/universalism.htm>
- Maheshwari, A. K., & Gehani, R. R. (2023). Gandhi's Consciousness-Based leadership: principles of Truth, Non-Violence, and Love for all. In Maheshwari, A.K. (eds) *Consciousness-Based Leadership and Management, Volume 1* (pp. 77–96). Palgrave Studies in Workplace Spirituality and Fulfillment. Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-06234-6_4
- MEA. (2023, September 9). English translation of Prime Minister's remarks at the G20 Summit Session 1. Retrieved October 21, 2025, from
https://www.mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl%2F37083%2FEnglish_translation_of__Prime_Ministers_remarks_at_the_G20_Summit_Session_1
- Mitzen, J. (2016). Security communities and the unthinkableabilities of war. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19(1), 229–248. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-040711-135425>
- NATO. (2010, May 20). Renewing the Transatlantic security community in the age of globalisation: Speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the Central Military Club, Sofia, Bulgaria. Retrieved November 21, 2025, from
https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_63773.htm
- Olsen, J. A. (2020). Understanding NATO. *The RUSI Journal*, 165(3), 60–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2020.1777772>
- OSCE Secretary General. (2012, June 25). *OSCE Security Days tackles challenges of security community* [Press release]. Retrieved November 23, 2025, from
<https://www.osce.org/sg/91579>
- Parekh, B. (2003). Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. *Review of International Studies*, 29(01), 3–17. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20097831>
- Pritchett, F. (1861). The Hitopadesha, translated by Sir Edwin Arnold. Retrieved January 14, 2026, from https://franpritchett.com/00litlinks/hitopadesha_arnold/index.html
- Raina, S. K., & Kumar, R. (2023). “Vasudaiva kutumbakam-one earth, one family, one future: “- India's mantra for a healthy and prosperous earth as the G20 leader. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 12(2), 191–193.
https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmmpc.jfmmpc_254_23
- Rana, W. (2015). Theory of Complex Interdependence: A comparative analysis of realist and neoliberal thoughts. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 6(No. 2), 290–291.
- Shonk, K. (2026, January 8). Dispute resolution for India and Bangladesh. Retrieved January 15, 2026, from <https://www.pon.harvard.edu/daily/international-negotiation-daily/dispute-resolution-for-india-and-bangladesh/>

- Sidhu, W. P. S. (2017, May 22). ‘*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*’ for the 21st century. Retrieved October 22, 2025, from https://www.brookings.edu/articles/vasudhaiva-kutumbakam-for-the-21st-century__trashed/
- Singh, M. (2016). Global Culture and Society: Considering the pluralistic perspective of Indian Philosophy of Moral. In *International Conference on Role of Arts, Culture, Humanities, Religion, Education, Ethics, Philosophy, Spirituality and Science for Holistic Societal Development* (pp. 97–102). Retrieved from <https://krishisanskriti.org/ijbab.php?Id=576>
- The Theosophical Publishing House, Chennai. (n.d.). *Maha Upanishad*: Translated by Dr. A. G. Krishna Warriar. Retrieved October 18, 2025, from <https://www.shastras.com/upanishads-sama-veda/maha-upanishad/>
- Tiwari, S. K. (2011, July 6). The hoax called *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* – 1: Hitopadesha. Retrieved December 10, 2025, from <https://bharatendu.com/2008/08/29/the-hoax-called-vasudhaiva-kutumbakam-1-hitopadesha/>
- Tusicisny, A. (2007). Security communities and their values: taking masses seriously. *International Political Science Review*, 28(4), 425–449. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512107079639>
- UNESCO. (n.d.). What you need to know about global Citizenship Education. Retrieved January 9, 2026, from <https://www.unesco.org/en/global-citizenship-peace-education/need-know>
- Verma, A. (2025, February 2). Lokasamgraha: a model for ethical and social governance in the contemporary world. Retrieved November 26, 2025, from <https://swadeshishodh.org/lokasamgraha-a-model-for-ethical-and-social-governance-in-the-contemporary-world/>

I, Aman Bora, hereby declare as per journal’s guidelines that:

- (1) this original manuscript has been neither published nor submitted for publication, in whole or in part, in any formal journal, book, or public institution repository,
- (2) There is no conflict of Interest with any party,
- (4) The author consent to its publication while retaining full copyright.
- (5) The author acknowledges using Grammarly software strictly for grammatical checks and language corrections. All refinements were reviewed and finalised under the direct supervision and responsibility of the author.