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Abstract— Sri Lanka under different heads of state had witnessed and experienced diverse foreign policies from a post-independent pro-western policy to a cold war non-aligned policy. Subsequent to the dénouement of the protracted conflict in 2009, Sri Lanka’s relations with its neighbours and other actors in the international arena engendered features of non-alignment. Nevertheless President Rajapaksa’s Independence Day speech at Trincomalee in 2013 cogently established that post war Sri Lanka is a country with a non-aligned foreign policy. Moreover, given the fact that Sri Lanka has been the cynosure of international fora such as the United Nations Human Rights Council and the Commonwealth it is of cardinal importance for this island nation to adopt and maintain a non-aligned foreign policy. In addition India’s fear psychosis and threat perception on the “string of pearls” strategy, involvement of China, Russia and the US, Sri Lanka’s growing ties and cooperation with the ASEAN nations, the non-aligned movement, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization must also be taken into consideration in observing Sri Lanka’s non-aligned foreign policy orientation.

This research intends to address contemporary issues contributing to the foreign policy making of Sri Lanka since 2009. In addition, such an analysis shall be conducted in the light of George Modelski’s views on foreign policy. Moreover Geoffrey Stern’s ideas on “foreign policy making” are used comprehensively to evaluate Sri Lanka’s foreign policy. The author nonetheless intends to analyze “how post war Sri Lanka would benefit from a non-aligned foreign policy.” The paper shall further look into the factors which distinguish neutrality from non-alignment. The research will be mainly based on primary sources such as hansard reports of the Sri Lankan parliament, bilateral and multilateral agreements, speeches made by heads of state and foreign ministers, wikileaks, commission reports and United Nations resolutions. Secondary sources such as journal articles, books written on foreign policy by SU Kodikara and SD Muni, “Foreign Policy” magazine articles, web sites of Ministry of External Affairs of Sri Lanka and of Chinese think tanks and the international media shall also be used extensively. Therefore primary and secondary sources shall contribute for qualitative research with the absence of an experimental design. Hence the author shall produce content based analysis through archival research. Collected data on foreign policy of Sri Lanka will be analyzed through the lens of “neutrality.”

As the concluding remark the author shall determine whether Sri Lanka, since the end of the war in 2009 has benefited from a non-aligned foreign policy thus making Sri Lanka a hub in Asia. The author may also suggest an alternative foreign policy if non-alignment has failed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

President Mahinda Rajapaksa addressing the nation on the 65th Independence anniversary celebrations held at the Eastern port city of Trincomalee reiterated that “Sri Lanka’s foreign policy is that of non-alignment. It is necessary for us to build a new era in foreign affairs based on this policy. This is essential for the freedom of Sri Lanka today. In addition to our traditional relations we have established new links with Asian, African, Arab, and Latin American countries.” (President, 2013) This is no surprise since such a stance was encouraged by the President through his election manifesto; “Mahinda Chinthana” where he stressed that “I will follow a non-aligned, free and progressive foreign policy. Priority will be given in the political, defense, economic, trade and cultural spheres to the cordial and friendly relationships that we already have with countries in the Asian region including India, Japan, China and Pakistan. It is my belief that the United Nations Organization and International Financial Institutions should be more democratic in their approach. We will actively intervene in this regard. It is my intention to strongly implement international treaties, declarations on anti-corruption. This will enable us to act under international law against those found guilty of corruption, when engaging in trade with foreign countries or foreign institutions.” (Ministry of External Affairs, 2013)

Understanding the contemporary world order and the diffusion of power from West to East, it is highly questionable whether Sri Lanka has been able to balance its relations with the existing sole superpower in the West and with the emerging superpower in the East. Besides, Sri Lanka, emerging victorious from the war against terrorism, has embarked upon a rapid development programme with
the intention of transforming itself into the wonder of Asia. However in such a context China’s increasing influence over Sri Lanka, China replacing Sri Lanka’s traditional donors; the United States (US), Canada, and the European Union (EU) and China defend Sri Lanka in international fora provide sufficient evidence to refute the fact that neutrality is at the crux of Sri Lanka’s foreign policy. Such tangible evidence further establishes that Sri Lanka’s “Look East Policy” has begun to make unpardonable inroads into its non-aligned foreign policy. Sri Lanka’s engagement with a number of African states, Russia and many East European states emphatically establishes Sri Lanka’s non-conformity with its non-aligned policy.

“As Rajapaksa recently stated, the end of Sri Lanka’s civil war has ushered in a new era in the nation’s foreign policy. But in the aftermath of the LTTE defeat, there is likely to be growing strategic rivalry between India and China, something which will also complicate Sri Lanka’s relations with the West.” (Silva-Ranasinghe, 2010)

II. FOREIGN POLICY?

The term “foreign policy” is of diverse and of ambiguous meaning. Many may tend to believe that the foreign policy of a country is a mirror image of the domestic policy or the domestic and foreign policy are intricately interlinked and it is immaterial to differentiate between them. Supporting the above fact senator J.W. Fulbright postulated that if even the link between the domestic and foreign affairs could be drawn, it is now wholly erased. However conversely “even if the distinction between domestic and foreign policy is today less clear-cut than it once was, the latter remains an activity of government both directed at and implemented largely in an environment external to the state in question. As such it is generally formulated in greater secrecy and by fewer hands than domestic policy.” (Weisband, 1974)

National Interests also do play a major role in determining the foreign policy of a country. According to Rosenau, “foreign policy inputs are geography, culture and history, technological and economic development, social structure, moods of public opinion, political accountability, government structure, values, talents, experience and personality of leader and external and internal situation etc.” (Rosenau, 1976) Nevertheless Prakash Chandra in “International Relations” has narrowed the above broad determinants to “internal factors, external factors and policy making factors.” (Chandra, 2004) Fascinatingly from a different perspective, another school of thought may also reckon that a country need not have a foreign policy not taking into account the globalized international system. Therefore what constitutes foreign policy and what factors may contribute to the foreign policy making of a country must be rigorously examined.

George Modelski, in his critique “A Theory of Foreign Policy” provides that, foreign policy is “the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment.” (Modelski, 1962) A vague concept such as “communities” according to Modelski is at the crux of foreign policy making. Moreover Geoffrey Stern in “The Structure of International Society: an introduction to the study of international relations” provides four diverse meanings of foreign policy. “It can refer to the goals, purposes and objectives sought by political authorities in the arena beyond a country’s national jurisdiction... Second, foreign policy can mean the norms and principles from which such goals are derived, ranging from the fundamental precepts of self-preservation and enhancement to the more altruistic tenets of respect for international law, rendering humanitarian assistance where needed, peaceful coexistence between ideological rivals.... Third, foreign policy can refer to the inventory of means, measures, stratagems, tactics and devices by which political authorities seek to obtain their goals in the international arena..... Fourth, a plea for support, an appeal to sentiment based on ideological or religious affinity, kith and kin and so forth.... Fifth, it can refer to a particular decision or action undertaken in pursuit of a particular objective.... Sixth, it can refer to an accumulation of piecemeal and pragmatic day-to-day reactions to situations, events and pressures emanating from the international arena.” (Stern, 1999)

In analyzing the distinction between neutrality and non-alignment, understanding what foreign policy is of vital importance. Sri Lanka possesses a non-aligned foreign policy which is contrastingly different from neutral policies of Sweden or Switzerland. It is general perception that neutrality emerged from Europe while Asia adopted a mutated form of neutrality, which is termed as non-alignment. “The term ‘neutralism’ emerged among the domestic critics of French policy in the late 1940s and indicated distrust of alliances in general and of membership of NATO in particular.” (Martin, 1962) Sweden and Switzerland (Griffiths & O’Callaghan, 2002) “could maintain armed forces but enter no alliance commitments, while their neutral status was to be strictly respected and guaranteed by the” (Stern, 1999) states. “Though at the time its protagonists had little effect on policy, their ideas contributed to the development of the concept of ‘non-alignment,’ taken up by a number of governments in the 1950s. Nowadays non-alignment has economic overtones. It has become a movement of Less Developed Countries (LDCs) seeking a new international economic order” (Stern, 1999) thus alienating itself from the orthodox cold war interpretation of ‘non-alignment.’ Nonetheless Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru’s contribution in establishing non-alignment as a concept in international relations and in promoting such a concept as India’s foreign policy since 1946 must be noted and it is credible to deduce that an identical policy is being adopted by the Rajapaksa Administration since 2009. However neutrality as a
legal doctrine “provides rights for states to remain non-aligned with adversaries waging war against each other.” (Kegley, 2009) Albeit in certain instances neutralism may be synonymous with non-alignment, it is the latter which is used extensively by Asian states since the inception of the cold war. An extract from Prime Minister S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike’s statement to the House of Representatives on 24 July 1957 provides that “It [neutralism] certainly means this: that in the pursuit of that policy we reserve to ourselves the right of criticizing our friends – and I hope all our friends – when we feel they have not acted correctly. We shall not incur the charge of having double standards in dealing with questions of this kind, nor indeed shall we play to the tune of anyone side powers in trying to get their own back irrespective of the merits of any particular case or another. It is in that spirit that we shall conduct our foreign affairs. It is one that I trust will not be misunderstood by any of our friends whether they are of the Western world, within the Commonwealth or whether they are representatives of any other section.” (Jayawardane, 2005) In conclusion it must be reckoned that neutralism used by Sri Lanka is drastically different from the one that was used by the Europeans and it is known as “non-alignment.”

III. RAJAPAKSA, MILIBAND AND KOUCHNER

“Now is the time for the fighting to stop... Protection of civilians is absolutely paramount in our minds.” (Guardian, 2009) These were the words uttered by the former British foreign secretary David Miliband to the media on a one day visit to Sri Lanka in 2009. Miliband and his French counterpart Bernard Kouchner rushed to Sri Lanka towards the later part of the protracted conflict under the guise of “responsibility to protect” to force the Rajapaksa administration to call for “humanitarian aid and their workers to be allowed in and the fighting to be stopped.” (Dayasiri, 2011) Nonetheless former Prime Minister Gordon Brown also contacted President Rajapaksa to halt the fighting at such a decisive juncture. However history did not repeat that day. It is no secret that the two high level European delegates were backed by the overseas Tamil diaspora which also constituted a strong vote base. According to a leaked cable from the US embassy in London in 2009 “Waite said that much of [Her Majesty’s government] and ministerial attention to Sri Lanka is due to the ‘very vocal’ Tamil diaspora in the UK, numbering over 300,000, who have been protesting in front of parliament... With UK elections on the horizon and many Tamils living in Labour constituencies with slim majorities, the government is paying particular attention to Sri Lanka, with Miliband recently remarking to Waite that he was spending 60% of his time at the moment on Sri Lanka.” (Guardian, 2010) Sri Lanka nevertheless acted with cordiality perfectly understanding domestic political convulsions. Sri Lanka still maintains friendly relations with the UK and this has been crystalized by UK’s confirmation of the participation at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in Colombo this November. (Ministry of Defence and Urban Development, 2013)

Dissappointed but determined Miliband and Kouchner enlightened the United Nations Security Council at an informal session about the developments in Sri Lanka. However “Russia’s UN envoy, the new president of the UN Security Council, has assured its country’s fullest support to Sri Lanka in the ongoing military campaign against Tiger guerrillas” (Sunday Times, 2009) in May 2009. Furthermore in an earlier occasion Austria, Mexico, and Costa Rica with the US backing wanted to highlight the conflict at the UNSC. Such a move was debunked by Russia in particular while China “vehemently” opposing any discussion in the UNSC on the Sri Lankan issue. In addition Japan, Turkey, Uganda, Vietnam and Libya had “expressed the view that the current situation in Sri Lanka does not warrant a briefing in the Security Council.” (Sunday Times, 2009) Therefore it is an undeniable fact that Sri Lanka’s non-aligned foreign policy has unequivocally facilitated and strengthened the existing relations with the other non-aligned countries. Specifically China and Russia have been unconditionally supporting Sri Lanka in international fora as explicitly provided above.

Prima facie Sri Lanka’s relations with the US in 2009 may have seemed to be deteriorating but President Rajapaksa as a response to such allegations had reiterated and emphatically stated that the US Navy’s Pacific Command helped Sri Lanka by alerting “Sri Lanka to the presence of ‘floating arsenals’ on the high seas. This confirmed the recent revelation by ‘the Island’ that a foreign power had helped the Sri Lanka Navy to destroy four of the eight ships, including three sunk in two-day operation in 2007, causing a severe setback to the LTTE.” (Island, 2009)

IV. UNUS PRO OMNIBUS, OMNES PRO UNO

Sri Lanka may be unfairly and specifically targeted in the international arena but post conflict Sri Lanka’s demand for rapid economic development is being met by both the East and the West in different degrees. China may have surpassed Japan and other traditional donors to Sri Lanka but the involvement of the US, India, and other Middle Eastern and EU countries must also be underscored.

China has been unconditionally supporting Sri Lanka in facing diplomatic challenges and further has been selling sophisticated weaponry to end the prolonged conflict. “When the US ended direct military aid in 2007 over Sri Lanka’s deteriorating human rights record, China leapt into the breach, increasing aid to nearly $1 billion to become the island’s biggest donor, giving tens of millions of dollars’ worth of sophisticated weapons, and making a free gift of six F-7 fighter jets to the Sri Lanka air force. China encouraged its ally Pakistan to sell more arms and to train pilots to fly the new planes.” (Independent, 2010)
Sri Lanka further entered into an agreement with the state-owned China Aviation Technology Import-Export Corporation (CATIC) which exports military aeroplanes to Sri Lanka. (Economist, 2011) In addition “government data show that in 2009 China was, in terms of commitments, Sri Lanka’s biggest aid donor, with $1.2 billion out of a total of $2.2 billion offered – hardly a huge amount for China. The Board of Investment reveals it is the biggest investor, too. Chinese companies have been investing in electronics, infrastructure projects, garment-making, and much else. The government has set up a free-trade zone for Chinese companies.” (Economist, 2010) However such brotherly affection may be highly questionable and increasingly doubtful. “There is no disguising China’s enthusiasm for good relations with Sri Lanka’s government, though the thinking behind it remains a topic of debate. One aspect is clearly commercial. Sri Lanka is a ready market for Chinese goods, services and labour, and runs a sizeable – and growing – bilateral trade deficit. But another is strategic. China is looking for a presence in the Indian Ocean – part of its ‘string of pearls’ strategy of links with regional maritime nations, that it hopes may eventually help secure its supply routes. China also gains a staunch ally in international forums.” (Economist, 2010)

Japan and Sri Lanka have been enjoying one of the strongest friendships, since President J. R. Jayawardene’s San Francisco speech which crystalized the intimate relationship. Japan played a leading role in the Peace Process in 2003 and Mr. Yasushi Akashi’s role in the process must be much appreciated. According to the official web site of the Embassy of Japan in Sri Lanka, “as of the end of 2010, the Government of Japan has provided around 1,100 billion Japanese Yen (JY) (approximately Rs. 1,400 billion) as assistance to Sri Lanka under its various funding schemes... this assistance is provided through several funding schemes such as Grant Assistance, Technical Cooperation, and Yen Loan scheme and mainly executed by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) in close cooperation with the Government of Sri Lanka.... Japan’s assistance to Sri Lanka mainly focuses on.... Consolidation of peace and reconstruction and medium and long term vision for development.” (Embassy of Japan in Sri Lanka, 2012) “The upper Kotmale Hydro Electric Project, Colombo Port Expansion, Colombo Airport Aerobridges and expansion, and telecom network expansion” (Island, 2012) are some of the noteworthy development projects carried out with JICA assistance. Moreover Japan has also been instrumental in blocking measures against Sri Lanka at the UNSC as mentioned earlier, and abstained the UN Human Rights Council Resolution against Sri Lanka in 2013.

The US has been highly critical of the so called human rights violations committed by the Sri Lankan government during and after the conflict. Nevertheless the US Navy’s Pacific Command helped Sri Lanka Navy towards the latter stages of the conflict in 2009. According to the official web site of the US embassy in Sri Lanka, “despite some serious disagreements over policies, 2010 also witnessed a further strengthening in relations between the US and Sri Lanka. Guided by an equal-partnership and by mutual interests, the people and governments of our two countries continued strong collaboration across a number of fields... There will certainly be times when our governments have policy differences, but those differences do not have to hinder our broad cooperation.” (Embassy of the United States for Sri Lanka and Maldives, 2011) The US spearheaded the resolution against Sri Lanka at the UN Human Rights Council in 2013 which according to the Rajapaksa Administration may hamper post conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts. Besides, bilateral economic relations between the two countries have been growing, “Exports to the United States, Sri Lanka’s most important single-country market, were estimated at $2.09 billion for 2011, or 20% of total exports. The United States is Sri Lanka’s second-biggest market for garments, taking almost 40% of total garment exports. United States exports to Sri Lanka were estimated to Sri Lanka were estimated at $302 million for 2011... The International Broadcast Bureau (IBB) operates a radion transmitting station in Sri Lanka. US Armed forces maintain a limited military – to military relationship with the Sri Lanka defense establishment. US also provides technical assistance/ training opportunities to Sri Lanka in many areas including biotechnology, intellectual property rights protection, cyber security.” (US Department of State, 2012)

A number of East European states and South East Asian states have signed bilateral agreements with Sri Lanka on air services, supply of man power, tourism, transfer of prisoners, avoidance of double taxation, cultural cooperation and promotion and protection of investment. (Ministry of External Affairs Sri Lanka, 2013) Furthermore similar agreements were signed with East Asian countries thus enhancing cooperation and strengthening friendship. Sri Lanka has in addition concentrated on Afro-Asian solidarity by investing in and cooperating with a number of growing African states. “Sri Lanka-Uganda Friendship Vocational Training Centre would be established in Uganda... Towards this project Sri Lanka has granted $1.5 million as a gesture of goodwill. Sri Lanka donated 10,000 mt of rice to the famine stricken people in the Eastern Africa region with the assistance of the World Food Programme. In 2012, people affected by the explosion in Brazzaville received Rs. 3.3 million worth of medical supplies from the Government of Sri Lanka.” (Asian Tribune, 2013) Furthermore Sri Lanka’s growing relations with South Africa, Seychells and Swaziland should also be highlighted.

Sri Lanka’s non-aligned foreign policy orientation was further mirrored through Sri Lanka’s relations with Iran.
“Iran has helped funding a number of development projects in Sri Lanka. In April 2008, Iran began work in several infrastructure development projects in Sri Lanka, all part of a $1.5 billion loan to the South Asian Island. These projects included doubling the oil refinery capacity of Sri Lanka’s Sapugaskanda refinery as well as creating a 100-megawatt hydropower project and irrigation plan in Uma Oya. In June 2009, the country signed a $106 million agreement with an Iranian firm to provide electricity to roughly 1,000 villages in Sri Lanka. In 2010 they agreed to post $450-500 million for the Uma Oya Multipurpose Development Project, a 90-100 megawatt hydroelectric power plant around the Central Province.” (Asian Tribune, 2011) Sri Lanka unfortunately had to stop the importation of oil from Iran since 2012 subsequent to sanctions imposed on Iran by the US Congress. (Sunday Times, 2013)

India and Pakistan as closest neighbours and as members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) have built strong relations with Sri Lanka. Pakistan in particular provided military assistance during the latter part of the conflict. “Pakistan is the second largest trading partner of Sri Lanka in South Asia. Sri Lanka was the first country to sign a Free Trade Agreement with Pakistan... Bilateral trade between the two countries was $400 million in early 2010, and is expected to increase to $2 billion by 2012. In November 2010, President Asif Ali Zardari mulled a $250 million export credit line that Pakistan would extend to Sri Lanka. Trade between the two countries reached $500 million by the end of 2010.” (Pakistan Defence, 2012) In the diplomatic sphere Pakistan provided Sri Lanka with unwavering support specifically at the UN Human Rights Council in 2013 where Pakistan was instrumental in winning the votes of the Muslim countries in favour of Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka is further “considering a nuclear pact with Pakistan after India voted against it at the UN this year.” (Express Tribune, 2013) It is also acknowledged that “Sri Lanka needs to foster a strong mutual relationship with Pakistan and China to maintain strong economic and military development... all the countries come together to form a new association so that they all can benefit from each others expertise with this new friendship block in Asia.” (Pakistan Defence, 2012) India conversely has been acting in support of the US and its allies. Particularly at the UNHRC India voted in favour of the resolution against Sri Lanka in 2013. But India also has been supporting Sri Lanka in a number of other international fora such as the Commonwealth. It is strongly believed that India was instrumental in convincing the Commonwealth not to change the venue. Moreover Kamal Shyam Sharma, the Secretary General of the Commonwealth was also defending Sri Lanka and its right to hold the CHOGM in 2013 in Colombo at a recent press briefing amidst Canadian protests.

Both the countries have recognized that trade proliferation and economic cooperation is the way forward. Although there are political tensions between the two South Asian nations trade ties have been rapidly growing in the current austere world. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh an economist himself has recognized the paramount importance of increasing cooperation in trade with Sri Lanka. Trade relations between the two countries accelerated with the implementation of the Indo-Lanka Free Trade Agreement in 2000 thus making Sri Lanka India’s largest trading partner in the region. As a consequence “total investments from India are estimated to be about US$ 400 million. Investment projects in various stages of implementation for which Sri Lankan Board of Investment approvals have been obtained involve an additional investment of approximately US$ 300 million... In 2008, India was ranked second among major investors to Sri Lanka.” (High Commission of India, Colombo, 2013)

Closely analyzing it is further evident that a number of major Indian companies have also invested in post conflict Sri Lanka, particularly in the North and the East, specifically with regard to the Power and energy sector. “In the wake of China’s economic dominance in the island, India is also stepping into Sri Lanka’s mega project business in a big way by entering into building construction in the North and East... Indian companies have won bids in railway expansion projects in the North and the South as well as in the proposed coal power project in Sampur in Trincomalee. Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., National Thermal Power Corporation, Lanka India Oil Corporation (Lanka IOC), Cairn Lanka Pvt. Ltd., Lanka Ashok Leyland, and Mphasis are now devising plans making massive investments to expand their businesses in the island. Nearly a 100 Indian companies are currently operating in Sri Lanka and so far, they have invested $ 400 million or Rs. 45,600 million.” (Sunday Times, 2010)

V. THE WAY FORWARD

Sri Lanka is designed and determined to become the hub and the wonder of Asia. Sri Lanka’s strategic position in the Indian Ocean, hosting international sea lanes of communication has attracted the interest of China hence making the island a pearl of the “string of pearls.” There is tangible evidence to suggest that China is to surpass the US as the economic and military superpower. In such a context it is prudent to revitalize and strengthen Sri Lanka’s “Look East Policy” which existed since 1950, when Sri Lanka was one of the first countries to recognize the People’s Republic. However the following issues must be taken into consideration in developing a regional strategy for Sri Lanka as opined by Dinesh D. Dodamgoda:

The US will remain as the world’s super power for at least another decade or two.

India is Sri Lanka’s big brother which has a higher influence than China; hence, any strategic move should not antagonize India.

Sri Lanka’s China policy has to be worked out in the context
of a possible strategic cooperation between the US and China in the future.

China would not go any extra mile beyond the strategic objectives in assisting Sri Lanka as was evident in its refusal to give Sri Lanka a $500 million loan to buy petroleum products.

No single super power will succeed in the Indian Ocean region and therefore, India and China both will remain as superpowers in the region for the conceivable future.

Sri Lanka should aim at building neutral strategic cooperation with the US, India and China on the basis of Sri Lanka’s national interest. (Sunday Times, 2013)

Sri Lanka must nevertheless take into account non-traditional security threats in the Indian Ocean region and adopt stringent measures to counter and to combat arms and human smuggling, piracy in the Horn of Africa and the Gulf of Aden, and climate change, since they may adversely affect Sri Lanka’s rapid growth. As a consequence Sri Lanka has been able to strengthen Maritime Defence Cooperation with Japan, China, Russia, India, Australia and the US in addition Sri Lanka’s non-aligned policy has enabled the country to play an increasingly active role in international fora. Sri Lanka’s ability to host the 2013 CHOGM shall be earmarked as a diplomatic victory mainly attributable to Sri Lanka’s non-aligned foreign policy. Sri Lanka is also increasingly becoming a global player encouraging disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation at the UN.

As the concluding remark it is plausible to reiterate the fact that non-alignment is at the crux of Sri Lanka’s foreign policy orientation. Crystallization of such a policy has led to the inauguration and the completion of a number of mega projects, funded not only by China but also by other non-aligned bona fide countries, paving way for economic prosperity. “Sri Lanka has a window of opportunity to get into and become a shipping hub with the opening of the new port with higher capacity ships coming to port... There is Singapore and Dubai but the Indian ports can’t compete with the new port that can handle big ships with 18,000 TEU (twenty-foot equivalent unit) capacity.” (Ministry of Defence and Urban Development, 2013) Investments by the Australian casino magnate James Packer, Shangri-La, Marriot and the Hyatt shall transform Sri Lanka into a sought-after international destination by high-end tourists. Highways being rapidly constructed shall accelerate and ensure development. America’s and India’s contribution to positive peace building may also facilitate post conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding in Sri Lanka, enabling all the Sri Lankans to enjoy the benefits of economic development equally.

REFERENCES


**BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR**

The author is a visiting lecturer of International Relations at the Department of International Relations of the University of Colombo, Sri Lanka. He has also conducted a number of guest lectures at the Bandaranaike International Diplomatic Training Institute, Sri Lanka and at the Army Staff College, Sri Lanka. His research interests include international security, foreign policy, international law and world order, and Asia-Pacific studies. He has produced many international and local Journal publications to his credit. Mr Peshan Rajendran Gunaratne is a life member of the Bar Association of Sri Lanka and the Royal Asiatic Society of Sri Lanka. At present he works as the legal assistant at the Legal Division of the Ministry of External Affairs.